

RODERICK O'FLAHERTY'S
LETTERS

TO WILLIAM MOLYNEUX,
EDWARD LHWYD,
AND SAMUEL MOLYNEUX,
1696–1709

*edited with notes and
an introduction by*

RICHARD SHARPE



DUBLIN 2013

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Réamhfhocal <i>le Nollaig Ó Muraile</i>	xi
Rhagair <i>gan Brynley F. Roberts</i>	xiii
Illustrations of O’Flaherty’s Hand	xiv
Family Trees	xvi
Abbreviations	xvii
 INTRODUCTION	 I
Roderick O’Flaherty’s Life	4
The Writings of Roderick O’Flaherty	51
Letters in Roderick O’Flaherty’s Time	74
Correspondence with William Molyneux	81
Correspondence with Edward Lhwyd	93
Lhwyd’s <i>Archaeologia Britannica</i>	110
Nicolson’s <i>Scottish Historical Library</i>	143
O’Flaherty’s <i>Ogygia Vindicated</i>	145
Correspondence with Samuel Molyneux	160
The Fate of O’Flaherty’s Manuscripts	168
Note on the Text as Presented	189
 1 Letters to William Molyneux 1683–1697	 191
2 Letters to Edward Lhwyd 1700–1709	203
3 Samuel Molyneux Correspondence 1708–1709	327
 APPENDICES	 375
1 O’Flaherty’s Revised Latin Poem for Lhwyd	377
2 Books Cited or Used by O’Flaherty	385
3 Copies of <i>Ogygia</i>	448
4 Manuscripts from the Southwell Papers	460
 INDEX OF LETTERS CITED IN ORDER OF DATE	 470

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY	483
Manuscripts in O'Flaherty's Hand	483
Works Printed No Later than 1730	488
Works Printed since 1730	492
GENERAL INDEX	511

INTRODUCTION

SOME seven miles westward from Galway is the townland of Park, between Furbogh and Spiddal; here for many years lived Roderick O'Flaherty, author of *Ogygia; seu, Rerum Hibernicarum chronologia*.¹ The remains of his house were visited in 1839 by John O'Donovan, who had been working closely and respectfully with another of O'Flaherty's books, *The Territory of West Connaught or Hiar Connaught*, and he was much moved by this visit. This book was seen into print for the first time in 1846 by James Hardiman, the historian of Galway, who did more than anyone else to document the career of the writer. O'Donovan lodged with Hardiman during the months of his work in this district, and we shall see that the two colleagues shared their interest and their transcripts.²

O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* is a challenging work. Printed in London and available from booksellers in both London and Dublin, it offered a learned presentation of a traditional view of Ireland's remote past, arguing that Irish antiquity could be traced far into the era before Christianity from written records as old as the Bible and the Classics. Written in Latin it was potentially accessible to an international audience. It is also an odd book, neither contemporary scholarship nor pure tradition. O'Flaherty was perhaps not as deeply immersed in Irish manuscripts as Geoffrey Keating nor as straightforwardly at home as Sir James Ware in methods of inquiry that would be easily understood by an international audience. Students of Irish manuscripts know little of O'Flaherty. Yet he was the first writer to cite texts from medieval Irish manuscripts in a modern way by folio and

¹ O'Flaherty published under the Latin name Rodericus O Flaherty, and he usually signed himself simply R O Flaherty; on one occasion he signed himself in Irish as Ruaidhrí Ua Flaithbheartaigh (letter 7). For the English spelling of his name, he tells Edward Lhwyd, 'Have care to have my name in the MS Roderick' (letter 23). O'Flaherty was concerned only to avoid the equation with Roger—a linguistic habit he used in his youth but later came to deplore in general (see letter 23 and n. 242)—but I have adopted his spelling in preference to Roderic, used by Charles O'Connor in 1775, James Hely in 1793, John O'Donovan in 1839, James Hardiman in 1846, and a number of name-authorities since then.

² Hardiman, p. viii, thanks O'Donovan for 'several judicious observations, together with the map', suggesting perhaps that he was himself more the provider than recipient of information from manuscripts relating to O'Flaherty (Introduction, 67–8).

INTRODUCTION

column, sometimes comparing different copies of a text, sometimes noting the transmission of passages from one source to another. The trail of his reading in the Book of Lecan and other important manuscripts can still be followed. From time to time he quoted his sources in Irish—his printer had a recently made Irish fount—and he translated extracts into Latin verse. Had he been able to print Irish texts *in extenso*, his long-term influence might have been greater. Instead, he presented a precise and continuous series of Irish kings through the pagan period, always based on the evidence of texts. He was too ready to treat his sources as an authentic record, but he used the authentic sources of Irish pseudo-history. Neither O’Flaherty nor his contemporaries understood how to interpret such sources in relation to their authors’ aims and milieux. Instead they protested the objective truth of rival pseudo-histories. *Ogygia* stands up well when judged by its methods, but it has perhaps always been too difficult to be widely appreciated. Even when it was not looked down upon for credulity, the influence of *Ogygia* was limited, and little else of O’Flaherty’s writing was published in his lifetime.

My aim is to open up the background to *Ogygia* by building a portrait of the scholar at work. The letters printed here show, as no other evidence does, the personality of O’Flaherty in his dealings with other scholars. The three correspondents through whom his letters have reached us are William Molyneux (1656–1698), natural philosopher, lawyer, and parliamentarian in Dublin; Edward Lhwyd (1659/60–1709), Welsh polymath and keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford; and Samuel Molyneux (1689–1728), son of William Molyneux and nephew of Lhwyd’s friend Dr Thomas Molyneux of Dublin.³ The letters we have belong to the time between December 1696 and June 1709. There is very little overlap between the periods in which these men corresponded with O’Flaherty, and the letters are therefore presented as three distinct chapters.

This introduction will provide background on O’Flaherty’s life and writings and also on the major topics of the extant correspondence. It is worth highlighting at the start, however, some factors

³ Thomas Harrison in a letter to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 12 January 1694/5 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1830, fol. 35), writes the name ‘William Mullinex’, suggesting a contemporary pronunciation /mulineks/. On 25 June 1714 Samuel Molyneux is referred to as ‘young Molinex’ (HMC *Portland Manuscripts* (London, 1891–1931), ix. 402). I have it on the authority of the late William O’Sullivan, keeper of manuscripts at Trinity College, that the surname was traditionally pronounced /molinyuks/. In the nineteenth century Dr William Wilde wrote the plural Molyneuxes, which works for either of these but not for the modern silent x; this contrasts with the habit of Sir Capel Molyneux in the same period, who wrote Molyneuxs.

that should be kept in mind when reading the letters. We have only a glimpse of the correspondence between O'Flaherty and William Molyneux, and that glimpse suggests no great personal friendship. Molyneux, the younger man, was a scientist with modern interests who recognized O'Flaherty's learning in antiquarian subjects and encouraged him to communicate it; he remained uncertain as to its value. The difference in their situations and, especially, in wealth meant that Molyneux was always the patron. The connexion with Lhwyd was very different. O'Flaherty was seventy when he first met Lhwyd, thirty years his junior, in Galway in 1700. Lhwyd was widely recognized as someone undertaking important studies, and this gave him good connexions. In Ireland a particularly relevant connexion was Molyneux's brother Dr Thomas Molyneux. At this date Lhwyd lived on the patronage of the Welsh gentry, but O'Flaherty none the less looked on him as someone who might serve him as a patron, as Molyneux had done, through his connexions. We know, but O'Flaherty did not, that Lhwyd was becoming seriously indebted as he printed his *Archaeologia Britannica*. We read only one side of their exchanges, for almost nothing has survived from papers in O'Flaherty's keeping; and it can be demanding to make sense of the points made by O'Flaherty, usually about books, with which he expected Lhwyd to be as familiar as he was himself. In notes on the letters, I have attempted to infer some of what is now unspoken in these exchanges. The two-sided correspondence with Samuel Molyneux makes for much easier reading. Samuel was not even twenty years old when he first wrote to O'Flaherty, then approaching eighty, but this contact was welcome to the old man. Warm feelings towards the young son of a warmly remembered patron no doubt played a genuine part, but young Molyneux was also rich and well connected; for O'Flaherty this relationship brought the hope of renewed patronage. The real differences in their social positions were considerable, but Samuel is respectful and O'Flaherty receptive. After they met, however, in April 1709, Samuel appears to drop his correspondence with O'Flaherty entirely and begins instead one with Lhwyd, soon terminated by Lhwyd's death. The whole series ends with an unanswered letter from O'Flaherty to Samuel.

Querulous though he can be, O'Flaherty none the less comes across as a sympathetic personality. There is much in all his extant correspondence that must have been a source of frustration for him, but he appears always to have had the strength to carry on regardless. In reading these letters, we see a world very different from the usual

run of scholarly correspondence in the period, but it is not manifestly a world of Gaelic chiefs and guardians of tradition.

Roderick O'Flaherty's Life

The events of O'Flaherty's life are not well documented, and the biographer must deal more with evidence than with well-corroborated facts. For the most part we depend on scattered statements in his writings, backed up occasionally by the testimony of other sources. The task of bringing the information together was first undertaken by James Hardiman (1782–1855), who in 1846 published O'Flaherty's essay on his native territory with a discussion of the writer.⁴ Most accounts of O'Flaherty's career have followed Hardiman, often adding surmise, and almost always omitting reference to sources. More recently Dr Nollaig Ó Muraile has tested the evidence again, stripping away a good deal of conjecture.⁵ My account follows theirs, but information from these letters is added here for the first time. It has been possible also to add information from records not cited by Hardiman, which to some degree clarified O'Flaherty's landed interests. I shall also endeavour to place his life and work in a wider context.

The date of O'Flaherty's birth is not precisely known. In an important statement about his early life, he makes it clear that he was born about six months earlier than the prince who would succeed to the three kingdoms as Charles II. In this association he reflects his

⁴ James Hardiman, *A Chorographical Description of West or Iar-Connaught; by Roderick O'Flaherty*, Irish Archaeological Society (Dublin, 1846), 419–30. Hardiman worked for the Irish Record Commission from 1815 to 1830 and therefore learnt his way among the records then held in Dublin Castle before the opening of the Public Record Office next to the Four Courts in 1867. He was qualified in law, and one of his studies, 'Ancient Irish Deeds and Writing, chiefly relating to landed property, from the twelfth to the seventeenth century', *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 15 (1826), *Antiquities*, 3–95, makes an important and still unsurpassed contribution to knowledge of deeds composed in Irish. As well as O'Flaherty's treatise, Hardiman prints a considerable array of documents and excerpts among his additional notes (pp. 125–296) and three appendixes (pp. 299–362, 362–419, 419–42). These documents are not readily traced, even if they survive. Of the material in the records of the collegiate church of St Nicholas, Galway, much could not be found when it was calendared by H. F. Berry in 1912 (E. MacLysaght, 'Report on documents relating to the Wardenship of Galway', *Analecta Hibernica* 14 (1944), 6; this disappoints the hopes of M. D. O'Sullivan, 'Note on the St Nicholas MSS', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 18 (1938–9), 69–71). Documents among the public records were destroyed by fire and explosion at the Four Courts on 30 June 1922.

⁵ N. Ó Muraile, 'Aspects of the intellectual life of seventeenth-century Galway', in *Galway: History and Society. Interdisciplinary essays on the history of an Irish county* (Dublin, 1996), 149–211 (at pp. 182–96, 206–211).

attachment, and that of Gaelic Ireland, to the Stuart dynasty.⁶ At the mention of Moycullen, he says:⁷

This place, passed by inheritance through a long series of my ancestors, is where I was born. It was a manor by royal letters patent exempted from royal dues, endowed with the privilege of a fair and market, honoured with the liberty of a court, a seneschal's court, to determine lawsuits. Deprived of my father before I was two years old I became, according to the nation's laws of minority, a ward of the king, and I paid out money, as the custom was, in return for my guardianship. But before it was permitted to me to reach the legal age and come into my inheritance, I lost the protection of a guardian by the murder of my king, when I was nineteen, and the king's heir half a year younger than myself was forced to seek his sustenance abroad.

Charles, the royal heir, was born on 29 May 1630, suggesting that Roderick was born in November or December 1629. His ancestors, he says, had been the chiefs of Gnó Beag for some eight hundred years.⁸ He was the son of Hugh O'Flaherty, whose own father, referred to as Roger O'Flaherty, was the first of the line to submit to having his title to Moycullen expressed in terms of tenure from Queen Elizabeth.⁹

This Roger or Ruaidhrí is named along with other O'Flahertys

⁶ The lineage of the Stuarts and its connexion with the dynasties of ancient Ireland is a recurrent theme in his work. It is an interest that one can find in Irish poetry from the time of James I onwards (B. Ó Buachalla, 'Na Stiobhartaigh agus an tAos Léinn: Cing Séamas', *PRIA* 83C (1983), 81–134, and over an extended period, id. *Aisling ghéar: Na Stiobhartaigh agus an tAos Léinn* (Dublin, 1996), where O'Flaherty's sentiments are cited, pp. 147, 160, 245).

⁷ *Ogygia*, 180 (my translation); it was also translated by O'Donovan, OS Galway, iii. 157. The birth of Charles II was remembered by O'Flaherty as a significant event; in 1708 he drew Samuel Molyneux's attention to 'the shining star seen at noon in London on May 29th 1630 the birth day of King Charles the 2d' (letter 43). He kept in mind the dates of the coronations of James I and Charles II (*Ogygia*, 46). In *Iar-Connaught*, 26, in mentioning 1651, he says, 'the year in which the most potent monarch of Great Britain, our present sovereign, bowed his imperial triple crown under the boughs of an oak tree' (a reference to the story of Charles's escape after the battle of Worcester in September 1651). King William III was an intruder in O'Flaherty's view, 'the late conquest of England, Scotland, and Ireland, by the subversion of the imperial authority' (*Ogygia Vindicated*, 153, and see below, 276 n. 192). Such usage can be found in an act of the Irish parliament of 1612, referring to 'the uniting of the Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland under one Imperial Crown' (W. H. Dunham, 'The Crown Imperial', *Parliamentary Affairs* 6 (1952), 199–206).

⁸ At *Ogygia*, 387, he mentions the line of Mac Conroi, 'qui ad nostram memoriam agros in Gnobega tenuerunt sub clientela Flahertaorum, qui ab octingentis circiter annis [. . .] ibi dominium adepti sunt' ('who until within our own memory held lands in Gnó Beag as clients of the O'Flahertys, who had gained the chieftaincy there some eight hundred years before').

⁹ What follows relies heavily on documents printed by Hardiman. A richer narrative, wholly unsourced, is given by E. W. Lynam, 'The O'Flaherty country', *Studies* 3 (no. 10, June 1914), 13–40.

in a document recording the agreement over their lands, made in 1585 between the Elizabethan government and Sir Murchadh na dTuagh ('of the battle-axes') Ó Flaithbheartaigh of Aughnaneure, hereditary chief of Gnó Mór.¹⁰ Hardiman says of him, 'This individual became the most distinguished and powerful of his name, having been appointed by Queen Elizabeth chieftain or head of all the O'Flaherties, although he was not of the senior branch'.¹¹ Ruaidhrí was then placed sixth in precedence among the O'Flaherty chiefs, and was granted tenure of the castle of Moycullen with four quarters of land—the fourth part of a *baile*, notionally 120 Irish acres capable of cultivation—besides four other quarters in Gnobeg, and 'all other his lands in Gnobeg', to be held by the service of one twentieth of a knight. At this date tenure by knight's service was notional, but it meant that the estate was liable to feudal incidents, such as wardship, which the Crown could exploit. The castle of Moycullen guarded the best agricultural land in the whole barony. In the 1570s Murchadh is described as chief in the barony of Moycullen, though the document gives a confusing picture of precedence: Ruaidhrí Ó Flaithbheartaigh of Moycullen is the first of the twenty 'gentlemen' of the barony followed by his 'chief' Murchadh na dTuagh of Aughnaneure.¹² Their relations were not good: in 1584 Ruaidhrí made a complaint to Lord

¹⁰ Hardiman, 299–362, prints eleven indentures of composition made in 1585 between commissioners appointed by the lord deputy at the time, Sir John Perrot (1528–1592), and the lords and chieftains of Connacht, which had already been divided ten years before into four counties. The O'Flahertys' indenture, pp. 309–317, signed with his mark by 'Sir Murrough ne do O'Flahertie' (Murchadh na dTuagh), is dated 2 September 1585; the clause concerning 'Roger O'Flahertie of Moycullen' is at pp. 315–16. Sir Murchadh had earlier renounced 'the title of Offlaherty & all the Irish customs belonging thereto' and received his lands again by grant of Queen Elizabeth; his surrender of title and customs in return for a royal grant on 22 January 1577/8 is referred to in an inquisition dated 7 February 1610/11, calendared by Margaret C. Griffith, *Calendar of Inquisitions formerly in the office of the Chief Remembrancer of the Exchequer*, Irish Manuscripts Commission (Dublin, 1991), 372–3; the immediate source is a calendar of Galway inquisitions, Exchequer series, James I, no. 32, drawn up for the Record Commission by Hardiman himself from records that would be destroyed in 1922. The total of the O'Flahertys' land was added up to 318 quarters (notionally 38,160 Irish acres of arable) by W. F. Butler, 'The policy of surrender and regnant', *JRS* 43 (1913), 47–65, 99–128 (at p. 109).

¹¹ Hardiman, 384. From him descends the line of O'Flahertie of Lemonfield. His close kinsman Domhnall Crón Ua Flaithbheartaigh, of Knock in the townland of Aughnaneure, had been set aside by the government in 1569 though he was still alive in 1585 and described as 'competitor for the name of O'Flahertie' (Hardiman, 309, 400).

¹² Hardiman, 252, printing an extract from a so-called 'Division of Connaught AD 1586', BL MS Cotton Titus B. xiii, fol. 399. Kenneth Nicholls points out to me that this is a bad copy of an account of tenures sent by Sir Edward Fitton, president of Connacht, to Lord Burghley, 27 March 1574 (PRO SP63, vol. 45, no. 35, i).

Deputy Sir John Perrot against Murchadh that over the past ten years he had driven him from his country of Gnó Beag, despoiled his castle of Moycullen, and caused him loss to the sum of £2,947 and 400 cows. Murchadh's response indicates that agreement was reached and allowed Ruaidhrí to rebuild the castle of Moycullen.¹³

Ruaidhrí died in 1599, the estate fell into wardship, and his young heir was granted succession in 1605.¹⁴ In 1618 Hugh O'Flaherty's estate amounted to some sixteen quarters, dependent on the castle of Moycullen, where he had a manor with 500 acres of farmland, courts both leet and baron, a market, and tolls, held 'as of the castle of Athlone by knight's service'.¹⁵ His death is documented as 20 October 1631, when he was about forty-seven years old.¹⁶ His widow, Roderick's mother, was Elizabeth Darcy, daughter of Martin Darcy, of Galway, and his wife, Christick Martin, whose father Richard Martin (d. 1622) was mayor of Galway. Elizabeth was married a second time, to John Bermingham, and gave birth to three daughters. Her date of death is stated as 3 June 1636, but this is certainly incorrect.¹⁷ Because the estate was held directly of the Crown by knight service, Roderick became a ward of the Crown when his father died; he was at that time not yet two years old, and he would later refer to his

¹³ Both documents are printed by Hardiman, 387–9, 389–91, from the originals then 'in the old collegiate library in Galway', i.e. St Nicholas's College; O'Flaherty's petition still existed in 1912 (Berry & MacLysaght, 'Report', 15). He adds, 391–4, a deposition in support of Roger, dated 20 August 1585, and extracted from the Irish Patent Roll 29 Elizabeth.

¹⁴ Hardiman, 420n, citing an inquisition dated 16 November 1605. Hugh had presumably been underage and a ward between 1599 and this date.

¹⁵ Irish Patent Roll, 15 James I, pt 4, no. II 37, dated 25 January 1617/18 (*Irish Patent Rolls of James I. Facsimile of the Irish Record Commission's Calendar prepared prior to 1830*, Irish Manuscripts Commission (Dublin, 1966), 348); cited as 'Rot. Pat. 15^o' by Hardiman, 55n, 61n. In addition to the undefined knight's service, a rent of 13s 4d is specified.

¹⁶ Hardiman, 420n, gives this date from a record of *inquisitio post mortem*, dated 6 August 1632 (8 Charles I), held because the father died leaving an under-age heir. The same source is quoted as giving the date of the parents' marriage-settlement as 10 July 1626. It was surely Hardiman who provided access to this inquisition to John O'Donovan, who drew his own conclusion from its words (Introduction, 14–15). The inquisitions post mortem for Ireland were destroyed when the Irish Public Record Office at the back of the Four Courts was fired in 1922.

¹⁷ John Lodge, *The Peerage of Ireland*, revised, enlarged and continued by Mervyn Archdall (Dublin, 1789), iii. 45; cited by Ó Muraile, 'Intellectual life', 207 n. 234. John Lodge (1692–1774) was an Englishman, employed as a keeper of the records at Dublin Castle; though his sources are rarely stated, he is generally recognized as an accurate recorder. The objection to the date of death is that lands were set out to Elizabeth, widow of Hugh O'Flaherty, in 1656 and even 1657 (below, 17). They were claimed by Sir Oliver St George in October 1666 (below, 27). Lodge, on whatever authority, may perhaps have intended to say that she died 3 June 1666.

wardship as royal protection.¹⁸ His property would have been held in wardship until he came of age.¹⁹ The purpose of the Court of Wards and Liveries in this period, in Ireland just as in England, was not so much to protect heirs from corrupt guardians as to make money for the king. In Ireland wardship was also a means to train up Gaelic heirs under protestant supervision.²⁰ None the less, in the upheavals of the 1640s, Roderick tells us, the lands of widows and orphans were protected by the government.²¹ He was two months past his nineteenth birthday, when King Charles I was executed on 30 January 1648/9, and the three kingdoms were left without a king. Before Roderick could come into his inheritance, his rights were lost in the war that ensued. On account of the king's murder, this royalist says, 'I have always been burdened as someone under age'.²² In his own account of *Iar-Connaught*, he refers to the surrender of Galway to parliamentary

¹⁸ He makes this point in the passage quoted above and also in his dedication to the Duke of York, *Ogygia*, sig. *B2r: 'Duobus nativitate non integre elapsis annis, accessit mihi maior honos paternae orbitatis fato patris tui pupillus factus; maturae aetatis defectum supplebat Patris patriae tutela' ('When less than two years had passed since my birth, my father's death brought me the greater honour to become your father's ward; the protection of the father of the realm made up for my want of mature age').

¹⁹ The estate of Hugh O'Flaherty does not appear in the evidence available for the leasing of estates held in wardship between 1627 and 1633, summarized by H. F. Kearney, 'The court of wards and liveries in Ireland, 1622–41', *PRIA* 57C (1955), 29–68.

²⁰ The court had been strengthened as recently as 1622, when Sir Philip Perceval became its registrar; its operation changed with the rebellion in 1641, and it was abolished in 1662 (O'Sullivan, 'Madden', 110, without supporting evidence). A complaint from Trim (Co. Meath), made in 1643, speaks of 'the illegal arbitrarie and unlawfull proceedings of the said Sir William Parsons' [master of the court] 'and one of the said impeached judges' [Sir Richard Bolton, attorney of the court] 'and their adherents and instruments in the court of wards and the manie wilfully erroneous decrees and judgments of that court by which the heires of catholic noblemen and other catholiques were most cruelly and tyrannically dealt with, destroyed in their estates and bredd in dissolucion and ignorance' (quoted by Kearney, 29).

²¹ In his dedication to the Duke of York, *Ogygia*, sig. *B2r: 'Etenim cum tota Connactiae provincia, in qua natus fui, mea memoria fisco regio addiceretur, singulorumque possessiones, uti sors caderet, mensurum funiculis disponderentur, viduis, & orphanis cautum erat, nequid detrimenti | viduis caperent: Hac mihi cautione nulla migratio, nulla terrarum imminutio timebatur' ('For when the whole province of Connacht, where I was born, was within my own memory subjected to the royal fisc, and the possessions of all and sundry were distributed as the lot fell by the surveyors' measuring rods, care was taken for widows and orphans that they should seize nothing to their loss: thanks to this care there was no fear of displacement or of diminution of lands').

²² In his dedication to the Duke of York, *Ogygia*, sig. *B2v: 'Ob infandam patris tui caedem oppressus sum semper conditione minorennis, aetate se nescens [*l. senescens*] nunquam manumissionis rude donatus, nunquam liberationem ex lege debitam adeptus' ('Owing to the unspeakable murder of your father, I have always been burdened as someone underage, though growing old in years, yet never presented with the badge of manumission, never having obtained the deliverance due by law').

forces on 12 April 1652, the Monday after Palm Sunday.²³ In the same year he married a daughter of his kinsman, Col. Murchadh na d'Tuagh Ó Flaithbheartaigh.²⁴ It was this Murchadh's great-grandfather, of the same name, who had led the several chieftains of the O'Flahertys into composition with the Elizabethan government.

It has more than once been said that Roderick was chief of the name. Patrick O'Madden, for example, has written, 'Roderic Ó Flaherty, the only son and heir of Hugh, chief of his name and captain of the nation of the Ó Flahertys, was born in 1629 in his father's castle of Moycullen'.²⁵ In Edward MacLysaght's careful formulation Roderick was 'the last recognized Chief of the Name'.²⁶ Anthony Mathews, in a discussion otherwise dependent on Hardiman, says, 'The last O'Flaherty chief was Roderick'.²⁷ There is no genealogical or other justification for this, and Hardiman nowhere makes such a statement. Roderick was the chief only of Gnó Beag, while the senior line of descent was in Connmaicne Mara. Here Murchadh na Mart ('Murchadh of the Beeves'), who died in 1666, was the chief of the O'Flaherties in Mac Fhirbhisigh's time. Hardiman refers to him as 'the most powerful of the western O'Flaherties'.²⁸ In his heyday Murchadh na Mart had the castle of Bunowen, but, like Roderick, he was deprived, and his son had no castle. We have a description of a visit to that son, Brian O'Flaherty, in 1698. After his time the senior line was continued by the descendants of Murchadh na Mart's nephew, Éamonn, named in our letters as Capt Edmund O'Flaherty, of Renvyle, whom Edward Lhwyd met in 1700.²⁹

Brian O'Flaherty was visited in the summer of 1698 by John Dunton (1659–1733), an adventurous bookseller from London, nearly forty years old at the time, who spent more than a year in Ireland. Dunton describes Brian as 'the chiefe of the clan or family' and depicts him as maintaining his lordly way of life in his summer booley. His account is so vividly suggestive of the milieu in which a chief of the O'Flahertys lived that it is worth quoting here at length:³⁰

²³ *Iar-Connaught*, 42.

²⁴ Hardiman, 428, citing 'the books of the Heralds' Office, Dublin'. There is a family tree at the front of the present volume.

²⁵ P. L. O'Madden, 'The last of our classic historians: Roderic Ó Flaherty (1629–1716)', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 5th ser. 35 (1930), 125–34 (at p. 136).

²⁶ Edward MacLysaght, *Irish Families* (Dublin, 1957), 145.

²⁷ A. Mathews, *Origins of the Surname of O'Flaherty* (Dublin, 1968), 36.

²⁸ He as alive in the spring of 1666, when Mac Fhirbhisigh wrote his *Cuimre*, but *Iar-Connaught*, 83, gives 1666 as the year of his burial in Inishmore; quotation from Hardiman's note.

²⁹ Letter 19 and n. 175.

³⁰ John Dunton, *Teague Land; or, A Merry Ramble to the Wild Irish* (1698), partially edited from Bodl. MS Rawlinson D. 71 by E. MacLysaght, *Irish Life in the Seven-*

INTRODUCTION

A gentleman in Galway to whom I was recommended by one who was friend to us both in Dublin gave me his recommendatorye letters to one O'Flaghertie the most considerable man in this territorye. He was son to one Sir Murragh na Mart O Flaghertie; the name of na Mart [*of the beefs*] was added uppon the occasion of his killing and deuoureing in his own house, among his servants and followers, everye Shrove Tuesday at night fifty beeves; [. . .] This gentleman was among a greate company of his relations, as being the chiefe of the clan or family, when I arrived at his house, which was a long cabbin, the walls of hurdles plaister'd with cow dung and clay. I produced my credentialls and was civilly received. They were a parcell of tall lusty fellows with long hair, straite and well made, only clumsy in their leggs, their ankles thicker in proportion to their calves than the English, which is attributed to their weareing broags without any heels; but this I leave to the learned. The men, after the old Irish fashion, as well as the weomen weore theire haire verie long, as an ornament, and to add to it the weomen commonly on Saturday night, or the night before they make their appearance at mass or any publick meeting, doe wash it in a lee [*lye*] made with stale urine and ashes, and after in water to take away the smell, by which their locks are of a burnt yellow colour much in vogue among them.

My treatment here was much as the night before, only there was a mut-ton killed for supper, half of which was boyld and the other roasted, and all devour'd at the meale. After supper the priest, who as I suppose was a sort of chaplaine to the family, called for the tables to play for an half-pennorth of tobacco, but was reprimanded by the lady of the house for doing it before he had return'd thanks, and civilly enquired of me if I understood the game. My being ignorant of it made them lay it aside. I made the priest a present of my tobacco which was wellcome to them all; even the lady herself bore them in company in smoakeing and excus'd it by urging the need they were in of some such thing in that moist country, which I could not contradict. I enquired about the customs of ploweing by their horses tayl, and burning the corn in the straw.³¹ They told me the former was wholly disusd as a thing too injurious, their cattle often loosing their tayls thereby, but they still burn their corn to save themselves the trouble of thrashing, soe that in one houres time you may see the sheaves taken out of the stack and burnt, the corn winnowed, ground on theire querns and made bread for the table. This Mr Oflaghertie had converst among the English, had been at Dublin and was sensible enough of their own barbarous way of living, but sayd it was a thing soe habituall to them that it could not be suddainly removed. He told me that the high sheriff of the county, which is Galway, came thither with a design to put the statutes in execution against those who plowed by the tayl or burnt their corn and, comeing one night to lye at the house of one of those gentlemen there present (for you must know the Irish are all

teenth Century, 2nd edn (Cork, 1950), 334-9, and in full by A. Carpenter (Dublin, 2003), 56-62; extract from fols. 8-9.

³¹ J. J. McAuliffe, 'Ploughing by horses' tails', *Irish Book Lover* 29 (1943-5), 9-11, with further comments by M. Mac Enery and J. Brady, ib. 39-40.

gentlemen, tho beggars and vagabonds, if they be of a name that has ever a gentleman of it), supper was gotten ready and lay'd on the table; and at the sheriff's side on a stoole were placed halfe a dozen sheaves of oates—which he enquireing the meaning of, was told, they were unprovided of bread and durst not burn their corn before him, but such as they had he was welcome to. The sheriff was hungry and more desirous of filling his belly at that time than of putting the laws in execution, and soe was contented to see the corn burnt to provide bread for his breakfast.

One thing I saw in this hous, perhaps the like not to be seen anywhere else in the world, and that was nine brace of wolfe doggs or the long Irish grey hounds, a paire of which kind has often been a present for a king, as they are said to be a dog that is peculiar to Ireland, for I am told they breed much better here than any where else in the kingdom. They were as quiet among us as lambs without any noys or disturbance, I enquir'd the use of them and was told that, besides the ornament that they were, they kill'd as many deer as pay'd verie well for their keeping, and they promis'd to oblige me next day by letting me see how they caught their game. I discover'd some apprehension of dread to lye among such a number of monsters if they were permitted within doores at night, but they had a cabbin for their kennell, and were brought in at supper time only to surprize me with the novelty. [*anecdote omitted*]

The house was one entire long roome without any partition. In the middle of it was the fire place with a large wood fire which was in no way unpleasing, tho in summer time. It had no chimney but a vent hole for the smoake at the ridge; and I observ'd the people here much troubled with sore eyes which I attributed to the sharp smoak of the wood, and they also allow'd it but sayd they had newly put up this for a booley or summer habitation, the proper dwelling or mansion house being some miles farther neare the sea; and such ane one they commonly build everie yeare in some place or other, and thatch'd it with rushes or coarse grass as this was. We all lay in the same roome upon green rushes. I had sheets and soft white blankets which they emulate one another in verie much (I meane the housewives among them), and they assur'd me no man ever gott cold by lying on green rushes, which indeed are sweete and cleane, being changed everie day if raine hinders not. But tho they have not lice among them, they are very full of white snayles which I found upon my cloaths. I wonder'd mightily to heare people walking to the fire place in the middle of the house to piss there in the ashes, but I was soone after forced to doe soe too for want of a chambrepot, which they are not much used unto. [*anecdote omitted*]

The next morning earely after a large breakfast of six wodden bowls filled with hott flesh meate which I could not taste, and a drachm of their bulcaan [*bolcán*, 'strong ale'] or worse sort of aqua vitae, Oflaghertie invited me to walk a small mile to view their deer. I willingly consented, because I did not expect to heare of deer park in so wild a place; we walked over mountain and through boggs, thro thick and thin, sometimes out and sometimes in, untill I lost the heels of my shoes, which tyred me soe that I thought I

INTRODUCTION

should never come to the miles end, which was, modestly speaking, as farr as half way from Whitehall to Barnet.³² At last we came to a pleasant vale called Glinglass, or the green vale, of an English miles breadth encompassed with lovely green mountains which were tufted with pleasant groves and thickets of nature provideing, for none here imitate her in ought but her coarser draughts. On the sides of these hills I wonder'd to see some hundreds of stately red deer, the stags bigger than a large English yeareling calfe, with suitable antlers much bigger than any I ever saw before.

It was the most pleasing scene that ever I met with in this kingdom, and the only thing worth my notice in these parts. We return'd before the heate of the day to our greate cabbin, where we had at dinner no less than a whole beef boyl'd and roasted, and what mutton I know not so profusely did they lay it on the table. At the upper end where the lady sate was placed an heap of oaten cakes above a foot high, such another in the middle and the like at the lower end; at each side of the middle heap were placed two large vessels filld with troander [*treamhanta*] or the whey made with buttermilk and sweet milk, which being about two days old was wonderfull cold and pleaseing in that hott time of the day. We had ale (such as it was) and bulcaan, and after dinner myn host ordered his doggs to be gotten ready to hunt the stag. He had his horse saddled and one for me too, because the loss of my heels render'd me incapable of such a walk. Eighteen long greyhounds and above thirty footmen made up the company. We were not long before we arriv'd at Glinglass, our horses galloping over the bogs and hills, for I rode one of his, it being impracticable for mine to go fast on such ground. Our foote company kept close to our horses and the grey hounds did sometimes putt themselves in a trot which was noble and greate; the hills, which before were cover'd with red deer, were now quite empty and not one to be seen. It seems in the heat of the day they retire into covert and lye there untill towards evening. Oflaghertie gave the word and immediately the company with the doggs surrounded a large thicket, whilst he and I with two hunting poles enter'd into it to rouze the game. The first we saw was a stately stag who, secure [*unaware*] of daunger skipped forth of the bushes; he at first seem'd amazed at the cry which was raised looing [*hallooing*] the doggs, but he bravely endeavour'd charge through them, and was seized by one of the dogs at the haunch, which threw him on his back. The whole kenel was not suffer'd to come in for feare of spoyleing the skin which the people most value, and never did I see a spaniell more subject to command than those mighty dogs are. I desir'd the next might have more play for his life; accordingly the doggs were all taken up, and the next proving a stag too broke through the men who did not let slip more than a brace of their doggs. It was indeed a noble course [*chase*] for a little way, but the stag tooke a leap out of the sight from a prominent part of the hill into the valley where the doggs lost. After we had done beateing this thicket, where we rouzed two brace, three of which we kill'd, after the

³² Barnet is nearly twelve miles north of Whitehall. It was the first post stage on the route north from London towards Chester or York (E. Watson, *The Royal Mail to Ireland* (London, 1917), 23, 47).

same manner, I went to view the leap which the stag made that escapt. It seem'd to me as high as a steeple, and the deere was not kill'd by the fall. After this afternoones diversion we return'd home where to beef and mutton we had venison, boyld and roasted, and a fish call'd a loggerhead by them. It was a firm white fish of good taste and as bigg as a salmon, but how to describe it they could not tell, and I saw not any but that one, which I could not observe for any purpose of description.

It would be mistaken to assume that this account describes how the learned Roderick O'Flaherty lived—the hunting of deer, for example, is mentioned only in other baronies than his³³—but it well illustrates the society to which he belonged at a date from which we have some of his correspondence. Stories of such local hospitality recur even fifty years later.³⁴ Glimpses of Roderick O'Flaherty's own life at Moycul-len are rare, and there is little indication anywhere about his life at Park.³⁵ He does, however, write about the laborious agriculture of Cois Fhairrge, where the land is rocky, providing pasture for cattle, but not susceptible to the plough, yet 'the tenants, by digging, manure it so well, that they have corn enough for themselves, their landlords, and the market'.³⁶ Even at Park he was for most of his life landlord rather than tenant.

Turning now to investigate the facts of O'Flaherty's life, there are three topics on which we have information, and they are not unrelated. There is the problem of how and when he came to lose his estate at Moycullen. His dispossession has been associated with statements that have been seen as showing that he was reduced to penury, but the two are not connected in a simple way. One obvious fact stands

³³ *Iar-Connaught*, 121–2.

³⁴ James Cuffe, of Elm Hall, Co. Mayo, told such a tale to Chief Baron Edward Willes, hearing assizes in Connacht in 1761. Set in the 1750s, we hear how Cuffe and his friends, fishing in Lough Corrib, landed on the west shore and were summoned by 'the head of the sept of that district', who occupied 'what in that country was a magnificent place. There was two long cabins thatch'd opposite to one another. In one was the kitchen and apartments of the family. The other was his entertaining room neatly strew'd according to the Irish fashion with rushes, and at the upper end of the room was a kind of platform rais'd above the ground with boards' (J. Kelly, *The Letters of Lord Chief Baron Edward Willes* (Aberystwyth and Kilkenny, 1990), 90–91). Here the head of the sept, presumably Murrough O'Flahertie, of Lemonfield, dispensed hospitality with food, drink, poetry, and piping. His son, Sir John O'Flahertie, would replace this native magnificence with a Georgian mansion.

³⁵ D'Arcy McGee (below, n. 164) was mistaken in thinking that O'Flaherty was born at Park. Was he inventing or relating local tradition when he wrote of Roderick's family, 'their principal residence was at Park, where they kept a famous house hard by the remains of an ancient fort' (*Irish Writers of the Seventeenth Century*, 200)?

³⁶ *Iar-Connaught*, 56–9 (quotation from p. 57).

in the way of a simple connexion: O'Flaherty was not only well educated but was able to devote a considerable proportion of his time to his scholarly interests, to buy books for himself, and to associate with other men of learning in Dublin as well as in Connacht.

First, landed estate. It is not possible to be sure what property sustained O'Flaherty through the greater part of his life. The passage of *Ogygia*, already quoted, in which he wrote of his wardship, continues:³⁷

The Lord wonderfully recalled the royal heir to his kingdoms, without powder and bloodshed, to the acclaim of all good people: but he did not find me worthy that he should restore me to the kingdom of my cabin. *Tibi soli peccavi, Domine. Sit nomen Domini benedictum in aeternum.*

The pious words are from antiphons in the Latin breviary, a sign of his familiarity with liturgy that goes beyond attendance at mass.³⁸ This was probably written in the 1670s. About ten years later, in 1686, he says:³⁹

I am more concerned for the late conquest of England, Scotland, and Ireland, by the subversion of the imperial authority, than for all the former conquests in the world; whereby I live a banished man within the bounds of my native soil; a spectator of others enriched by my birthright, an object of condoling to my relations and friends, and a condoler of their miseries. But still I kiss the rod of the unsearchable judgements of God; whose over-ruling providence we own the efficient cause of our affliction, and men the executioners of his justice. *Dominus pauperem facit, ac ditat, humiliat, ac subleuat* [1 Samuel 2: 7].

He ends again with a quotation familiar from the liturgy, for this chapter of 1 Samuel, *Exultavit cor meum in Domino*, finds its weekly place every Wednesday in the office of Lauds. He would use similar providential language later in life, but it is significant that he does so as early as this.⁴⁰ There can be no doubt that at the time of writing he was excluded from his inheritance.

John O'Donovan formed the opinion that O'Flaherty lost the family estate as a minor because it fell to claims made in 1632. The

³⁷ *Ogygia*, 180 (my translation); it was also translated by O'Donovan, OS Galway, iii. 157. The passage was quoted in Hely's English by Hardiman, 427, and from there by others. O'Flaherty quotes two lines from liturgical antiphons, *Tibi soli peccavi, Domine; miserere mei* ('Against thee alone have I sinned, O Lord, have mercy upon me'; in the ferial office), and *Sit nomen Domini benedictum in saecula* ('Blessed be the name of the Lord for ever'; fourth antiphon at Lauds, 1st Sunday after Epiphany).

³⁸ As a young man we find him rewriting liturgical verses (Introduction, 51–2).

³⁹ *Ogygia Vindicated*, 153–4, against which O'Conor adds a note, quoting the passage from *Ogygia*, 180; also quoted by Hardiman, 427.

⁴⁰ In letter 35, written in 1708, he says, 'God was pleas'd to favour his unworthy servant with the grace of a frowning fortune, his holy name be ever blessed'.

inquisition post mortem conducted on 6 August 1632, nearly a year after Hugh O'Flaherty's death, heard that his heir was two years old and had four sisters, that his widow Elizabeth was 'dotable out of the premises', and that:⁴¹

the Earl of Clanrickard claims the Castle & 8 quarters of Moycullen to be his and his hereditary estate; that Morogh O'Flaherty claims the ⅓ part of Carrowmore, and Andrew Linch fitz-Thomas claims the ¼ part of the village [i.e. *baile*] of Moycullen.

Quoting no further, O'Donovan inferred that 'the Earl of Clanrickard was the man who ruined the *minor*', referring his reader to 'the chapter of Ogygia in which O'Flaherty carps at Walsh, the protegee of Clanrickard'. Alas, the remainder of the document is no longer in existence, but O'Donovan's interpretation goes against everything O'Flaherty himself wrote in *Ogygia*. Nor is there any chapter in which he carps against the writings of Peter Walsh.⁴² Richard Bourke (1572–1635), 4th earl of Clanricarde, had been constable of Athlone castle from 1603, and O'Flaherty's lands were held 'as of the castle of Athlone'; this connexion may have provided the pretext but it was no foundation for a claim to hereditary estate.⁴³ We should accept what O'Flaherty himself said, that his lands remained intact for as long as he remained the king's ward.

The dispossession of catholic landowners progressed by stages in the seventeenth century, and at times the course of events permitted restoration, though vested interest usually worked against this. These events have been studied at the political level but not in such a way as may allow the consequences for particular landholders to be easily plotted. The surviving documentation is not contemporary with events but retrospective and incomplete, and it is made hard to use by the layering of facts from different dates. Hardiman had access to more of the sources than any modern researcher, but he did not provide a documented account of what he might have found.

⁴¹ This inquisition was cited by Hardiman, 420n, who alone gives the date of the document. His transcript was presumably accessible to O'Donovan in 1839, and O'Donovan quotes from it, OS Galway, iii. 484. The eight quarters (960 profitable acres) correspond to four quarters at Moycullen itself and four elsewhere, more precisely assessed as 998 acres (below, 20).

⁴² The work criticized was an unidentified 'Libellus de nominum etymis', considered below, 44 n. 152.

⁴³ According to *Complete Peerage*, iii. 231, the earl became constable in 1603, with the implication that he retained this position until his death; the castle served as head quarters for the lord president of Connaught, an office which the earl filled between 1604 and 1616, when he successfully petitioned the king to exchange his role for that of governor of Galway (*ODNB*, *DIB*). If he relinquished Athlone at the same time, I can see no pretext for the claim.

He makes an unsupported statement to the effect that O'Flaherty was partially reinstated after establishing his innocence before parliamentary commissioners but was none the less reduced to poverty:⁴⁴

On the grounds of his 'innocency', he appealed to the Parliamentary Commissioners of Delinquency, who sat at Athlone, AD 1653 [*?l.* 1655], and he was decreed entitled to a considerable portion of his estate in Iar-Connaught, which was accordingly 'set out' to him by the Commissioners, who immediately after sat at Loughrea. But this was a mere nominal restitution, for the contributions levied by the State were so heavy, and the country was so much depopulated, that he derived no benefit from it, and was, consequently, reduced to the most severe privations.

The Athlone commissioners recognized O'Flaherty's innocence, which under the legislation entitled him to land equivalent to two thirds of his former estate, and we shall shortly present evidence showing that the Loughrea commissioners allocated to O'Flaherty a generous acreage of land in compensation for his inherited estate. To describe this as 'a considerable portion of his estate' is misleading. O'Flaherty himself explicitly says that, unlike Charles II, he was not reinstated in his inheritance. Indeed, he made a portent out of the invasion of his house at Moycullen by rats in 1651–2.⁴⁵ He was assigned

⁴⁴ Hardiman, 425. Hardiman's notes refer only to the punitive contributions demanded to pay the Cromwellian army and to appeals for their abatement. His inferences that this reduced O'Flaherty to penury and, further, brought him in this period into the circle of Terence Mac Donagh of Creevagh (below, 49–50) are highly implausible. Hardiman's wording is not transparent, but the commissioners who sat at Athlone and Loughrea had separate roles; the Athlone commissioners were to determine whether displaced catholics from the rest of Ireland were eligible for compensatory lands in Connacht, and the Loughrea commissioners to allocate ('set out') lands in Connacht to those accepted by the Athlone commissioners. The two commissions sat concurrently. The documentation calendared and indexed by R. Dunlop, *Ireland under the Commonwealth* (Manchester, 1913), provides more retrievable information on the Loughrea commission, 'appointed for the setting out of lands in Connaught and Clare for such Irish and other persons who are to remove thither', whose first orders are dated 6 January 1654/5 (Dunlop, ii. 387–9, § 446); five commissioners are named, a majority of them army officers. A later report, dated 12 February 1655/6, signed by six other officers tasked with advising on how to match lands for lands, says that they acted 'so that the transplanted persons might receive lands suitable (as near as may be) in quantity and quality to the place from whence they are removed', (Dunlop, ii. 565, § 786). In July 1655 there was a short-lived plan to move the Loughrea commissioners to Athlone (Dunlop, ii. 526–7, 571–2, §§ 697, 710); the two commissions were extended by the same orders on 19 October 1655, that sitting at Athlone to 10 February 1655/6, that sitting at Loughrea to 20 January 1655/6 (Dunlop, ii. 544, § 740).

⁴⁵ 'It was held an ominous presage of the following alteration, that rats frequented Moycullen for one year, ending in Lent, 1651/2, at which time they all parted in one night, after devouring a carcass of mutton to the bones. About the same time they infested the castle of Bunowen for two years, till it was all burnt, 31st January, 1652/3' (*Iar-Connaught*, 82).

other lands of almost equivalent acreage but of less value. The second half of Hardiman's comment is his own rhetoric. It can be shown that O'Flaherty was deprived of Moycullen in 1656, and in Charles II's time he lost some of the lands that had been allotted to him in lieu. Then in the 1690s he appears to have suffered further losses. Yet he was not left destitute, even in 1700, though it has become conventional to treat him as if he were and even, as Hardiman does here, to suggest that penury was his condition from an early date.

A document known as the Ormond List is a digest of the decrees made by the two commissions.⁴⁶ This provides us with some outline figures, which need to be judged against such detail as can be gathered. In broad outline, 'Elizabeth Flaherty, alias Darcy, relict of Hugh Flaherty of Muckullin', was decreed by the Athlone commissioners on 19 May 1656 to be entitled to 1038 profitable acres. More than a year later, on 29 August 1657, she and her son were assigned 1038 acres by the Loughrea commissioners in final settlement of the earlier decree.⁴⁷ Two days after his mother, 'Roger Flaherty' was decreed an entitlement to 1888 acres by the Athlone commissioners, 21 May 1656. His Loughrea decree, dated 9 September 1656, awarded him 850 acres to satisfy this award.⁴⁸ The outstanding balance is reflected in his inclusion in his mother's Loughrea decree of 1038 acres. How far these figures related to any reality on the ground can be judged, with some effort, from the sources known collectively as the Books of Survey and Distribution.

These books are themselves a digest of information from different sources and dates, which must be used with care. To make the matter more complex still, there exist five different series of the books, which reflect editing of the underlying records—now lost to us—at different times.⁴⁹ Revision was necessitated by continuing change. Where the record is most complete, it will provide detail on land-ownership through three rounds of change, under Cromwell, after the Restoration, and under King William. A comparison of the data provided by the different series is fundamental, but to understand those data properly, they must be analysed in relation both to people and places. In

⁴⁶ Name, date of decree, and acreage are given by two lists, arranged alphabetically by name, formerly among the papers of the Marquess of Ormond at Kilkenny Castle, now NLI MS 2515 (written c. 1660); known as the Ormond List, they are printed by Sir John and Lady Gilbert, 'An accompt of lands set out to the transplanted Irish in Connaught', HMC 36 (1885-99), ii. 114-62, 162-76. This source makes no mention of where the lands in question lay.

⁴⁷ 'Ormond List', 164.

⁴⁸ 'Ormond List', 163.

⁴⁹ The most accessible overview is given by Geraldine Tallon, 'Books of Survey and Distribution, Co. Westmeath: a comparative survey', *Analecta Hibernica* 28 (1978), 103-128.

Co. Galway, for example, a small number of surnames are represented by a fair number of individuals, sometimes different individuals of the same name, so that one has to be able to control for identities and relationships. Places may be still more difficult. For our purposes only three series are available.⁵⁰ The relevant volumes of the Quit Rent Office series—judged the most authoritative—have been edited by Robert Simington, but the index of personal names does not differentiate persons of the same name, and there is no index of places.⁵¹ The Annesley series is entirely unprinted, but it draws on the same source and has not been used here.⁵² The Headfort series is represented by four incomplete sets, not uniformly copied; only the third set has preserved the record for Galway, from which data were abstracted by Simington.⁵³ The requisite analysis of these records is only just beginning with John Cunningham's case study of Roscommon.⁵⁴

From these books, we need to extract the separate data for those lands held by O'Flaherty before the process of transplantation began and those lands assigned to him during and after the process.

The *status quo ante* was meant to be represented by a column showing who was the proprietor in 1641 of any parcel of land. We may call this the survey side of the data.⁵⁵ In Connacht this information

⁵⁰ The Survey General's set was destroyed in 1922; before then, only Co. Westmeath had been transcribed, which explains why Tallon used that county as her case study. The Taylor set, now among the Stowe manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy, is very early, drawn up in 1674–5, but it lacks Clare, Galway, and Roscommon.

⁵¹ Their presentation in print has done little to make their information more readily comprehensible despite many years' work by Robert Simington (1885–1976), who had himself been employed in the Quit Rent Office before 1922. From the twenty volumes of the Quit Rent Office series the Irish Manuscripts Commission published only a small part, *Books of Survey and Distribution, being abstracts of various surveys and instruments of title, 1636–1703*, ed. R. C. Simington, 4 vols (Dublin, 1949–67). The index shows Roger O'Flaherty, but the entries refer to different individuals, one holding in 1641, the other in 1677, while there are several other entires for Rory O'Flaherty, likely to represent more than one person. When dealing with transplantation continuity of tenure is no guide to who is who.

⁵² The Annesley series, datable to 1676–8, in PRONI D1854/I, which covers thirty-one counties in twenty-two volumes (only the volume for Co. Meath is lost), remains unpublished in any form but is discussed by R. C. Simington, 'Annesley collection', *Analecta Hibernica* 16 (1946), 339–73.

⁵³ R. C. Simington, *The Transplantation to Connacht 1654–58* (Dublin, 1970), provides figures abstracted from the Headfort series and from the Ormond List. It is no substitute for the primary documents.

⁵⁴ John Cunningham, *Conquest and Land in Ireland. The Transplantation to Connacht, 1649–1680* (London, 2011). I am grateful to Dr Cunningham for his advice on a draft of my discussion.

⁵⁵ I take this terminology from Kevin McKenny, 'The seventeenth-century land settlement in Ireland: towards a statistical interpretation', in *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641–1660*, ed. J. H. Ohlmeyer (Cambridge, 1995), 181–200.

is entirely missing from the Headfort book. The Quit Rent Office book supplies the deficiency from another source, known as the Strafford Survey, which dates from 1636. Because of the early date of this source, Roderick is not named, for he was still a ward and appears only as 'Hugh O'Flaherty's Heires'. I have extracted the lands so held with their extents in 1636 (Table 1).⁵⁶ The reference numbers in the first column key this listing to numbered sites shown on lost maps of the Strafford survey. For each location the extent of surveyed acres is expressed by two numbers, unprofitable and profitable acres. It should be noted that the Irish acre, like the Irish mile, was considerably larger than the English equivalent.⁵⁷ We see from the table that 1912 profitable acres were taken from O'Flaherty. It is also clear that Moycullen itself was by far O'Flaherty's major property, the best land in the very large parish of Moycullen. The distribution side, represented by the right-hand column in this source, shows who held the lands at an unspecified date after redistribution and refers only to profitable acres. The lands of Roderick's ancestral estate were divided between members of several catholic families from Galway city, Thomas French, Isidorus Lynch, Andrew Blake, and others.

These individual names as entered in the Quit Rent Office books belong, in fact, to a time twenty years later than the distribution of lands in 1656. This is clear from other sources. The digest known as the Ormond List preserves the information that Moycullen was transferred to John French fitz Stephen, merchant, of Galway, and tells us that he was decreed 2,209 acres in total.⁵⁸ The Headfort series of Books of Survey and Distribution provides some more detailed figures, reckoned up by Simington as 2,055 acres set out to John French in satisfaction of his decree.⁵⁹ This John French was father to Thomas

⁵⁶ Drawn from Simington, *Books of Survey and Distribution*, iii, *Galway*, 79–81, 73–4, 76. Hardiman had extracted much the same information, now fols. 94–100 among the loose papers of his collections relating to West Connaught, RIA MS 4 A. 28 (cat. 1099).

⁵⁷ The website of the Ordnance Survey of Ireland tells us that an Irish mile was 2240 yards as against the English (and Statute) mile of 1760 yards, larger in the ratio 1 : 1272727; an acre is an area 1/8 mile by 1/80 mile, which in England is 220 × 22 yards, 4840 square yards, in Ireland 280 × 28 yards, 7840 square yards, and the squared ratio is 1:161983, which may be expressed as 121 : 196 (and not 121 : 199, as given by Simington, *Transplantation*, xxix).

⁵⁸ 'Ormond List', 138, tells that John French fitz Stephen, of Galway, satisfied the Athlone commissioners on 28 September 1655 and received a final settlement of 2,209 acres from the Loughrea commissioners on 31 May 1656.

⁵⁹ In Simington's table, *Transplantation*, 170, we read that John fitz Stephen French of Galway was decreed 2,309 profitable Irish acres (a misprint for 2,209 from the Ormond List), while the Headfort book shows that he actually received 2,055 acres in the parishes of Killanin, Moycullen, and Rahoon.

INTRODUCTION

TABLE I

Ref.	Place	Unpr.	Prof.	Distribution of profitable acres
In the parish of Moycullen				
148	Moycullen	1594	998	575 to Thomas French 423 to Isidorus Lynch
171	Runnen <i>al.</i> Drummin	7	23	23 to Isidorus Lynch
[?162]	Killeane & Kilibrolaghan	273	207	93 to Isidorus Lynch 113 to Thomas French 1 to Richard Martin
176	Finishgline & Derrewoola	238 ³ / ₄	36 ¹ / ₄	28 to John Eyres 8 to Richard Martin
179	Laughill & Leatry Mtn, Ballecorke & Ballemallgorme	673	112	34 to Richard Martin 78 to Andrew Blake
184	Shannagarran	1577	123	106 to Anthony French 17 to Nicholas Bourke
146	Towre Mc Kean	36	108	107 to Thomas French 1 to George French
In the parish of Rahoon				
201	Corculline [Curcullen]	256	211	130 to Donnogh Kelly 78 to Andrew Blake 3 to Richard Martin
211	Knocknecarragh	Hugh O'Flaherty's heirs owed 3s 4d towards old penny rent of £4 3s 4d in land chiefly held by Sir Dominick Browne		
219	Killine	15	94	94 to Dominick Martin 47 to Walter Blake
TOTAL		4469 ³ / ₄	1912 ¹ / ₄	

French, named in the Quit Rent Office books, who had inherited at some indeterminate point. Moycullen remained the property of the French family down to the 1780s.

Richard Martin, named only in the later stratum of the Quit Rent Office series, is someone whom we shall meet again.

While the overall policy of transplantation involved the removal of catholic landowners into Connacht and the displacement of others to make room for them, here in the barony of Moycullen we see only local transplantation. Estates were broken up and distributed to others from within the county, and those who lost land in one place were allocated land in another. The intention was to break up traditional tenures, even where the land was not needed to compensate others transplanted from east of the Shannon.

On the distribution side of this process, the same books have the

name of Roger Flaherty in the right-hand column as a recipient of lands that were confiscated from others and assigned to him. I begin with his lands as they appear in the Quit Rent Office series (Table 2):⁶⁰ From this table it would appear that he had only 420 acres at an unspecified later date. The record, however, is incomplete and can be complemented by the Galway volume in the third set of the Headfort series of Books of Survey and Distribution. What the Quit Rent Office series provides here, however, which Headfort does not, is the names of those who had previously held the lands that were assigned to O'Flaherty. The people whose names are shown in brackets under the names of the properties were the holders in 1636. There may be hidden difficulties here, which I cannot pretend to resolve.⁶¹

TABLE 2

Ref.	Place	Unpr.	Prof.	Distribution of profitable acres
In the parish of Moycullen				
186	Sersey (taken from Mullogh and Owen McHenry)	211	83	60 to Roger Flaherty 17 to Nicholas Bourke 6 to Richard Martin
188	Leaghgivenagh (taken from George Mar- tin)	227	143	136 to Roger Flaherty 7 to Richard Martin
187	Calliagh (taken from Murrough O Flaherty)	33	117	114 to Roger Flaherty 3 to Richard Martin
189	Leaghguineagh (taken from Edward French)	99	113¼	110 to Roger Flaherty 3 to Richard Martin
TOTAL				420 profitable acres to R O'F

We shall need to come back to this table, but we can meanwhile compare the equivalent record in the Headfort series. This has less information on the *status quo ante* and it omits to reckon unprofitable lands. On the distribution side, however, the Headfort books

⁶⁰ *Survey and Distribution*, iii, *Galway*, 82.

⁶¹ One question is whether he retained any of his former lands. A comparison of these places with those named in the letters patent awarded to Hugh O'Flaherty in 1618 suggests the possibility that he may have done. Of the places named in O'Flaherty's decree, 'Calliagh', 'Kaylagh', appeared as 'three fourths of Keillagh, q(uarte)r' in the list of Hugh O'Flaherty's lands in 1618 (above, n. 15). Kenneth Nicholls tells me that Killagh was granted by Hugh in 1630 to his brother Roger, who may be presumed to have died before 1636, when it was in the hands of a third brother, Murrough, from whom it was taken and assigned to Roderick. The other names are not found in the 1618 document, but 'part of Forbagh, 4 q(uarte)rs' may also have included land that came back to Roderick.

INTRODUCTION

TABLE 3

Place	Distribution of profitable acres in 1656-7		Later redistribution
Barony of Moycullen, parish of Rahoon (fols. 5, 6)			
Knocknabracke	23	Roger Flaherty	5 <i>Jeoffery Browne</i> 206
Costinemore ½ qr	50		50
Shanrofearte 1 qr	103	Roger Flaherty	103
Derryloghan			
Sersey ½ qr	68	Roger Flaherty	60
		<i>Martin Darcy</i>	8
Doire 1 qr	58	Roger Flaherty	58
TOTAL to RO'F			276
Barony of Moycullen, parish of Moycullen (fol. 9)			
Sersey 1 car'	77	Roger Flaherty	60
		<i>James Bourke</i>	17
Leaghgivenagh	136	Roger Flaherty	136
Calliagh a Car'	114	Roger Flaherty	114
Derreloghan 1 qr.	130	Roger Flaherty	130
Leaghguienagh ½ qr	110	Roger Flaherty	110
TOTAL to RO'F			550

give two stages rather than one, 'To whom set out by final settlement' (which represents the Loughrea decree) and 'To whom granted by decree, certificate, or patent' (which represents the position in the late 1670s).⁶² Some of these figures are obviously in agreement. The Headfort book shows 136 acres for O'Flaherty in Leaghgivenagh; so does the Quit Rent Office book. Likewise in the case of Leaghguineagh (110 acres) and Calliagh (114 acres). In Sersey, counted in the parish of Moycullen, O'Flaherty has 60 acres in both lists, while James Bourke or his son Nicholas has 17 acres. The Quit Rent Office book, however, also shows small amounts of land in these places, known as 'found land', because its existence came to light with improved measurement. Certificates concerning found land could be awarded in 1677 to new owners, who in effect took land that had been assigned in excess of entitlement. So in Calliagh, O'Flaherty thought he had all of it, but when it was discovered that there were 117 acres, not just the 114 acres he was entitled to, 3 acres were taken from him and assigned to Richard Martin. And so too with other small parcels of land in the other places named.

⁶² Books of Survey and Distribution, Headfort Series, Co. Galway, NAI MS 2B. 33. 16, fols. 5-6, 9.

Richard Martin is referred to as O'Flaherty's 'close neighbour and neere relation' in a later legal record referring back to some collusion in 1691, designed to protect O'Flaherty from losing what lands had been set out to him.⁶³ My efforts to document his career have borne little fruit.⁶⁴ The best information comes from the genealogical research of the Office of Arms, printed by a Canadian descendant, Archer Martin.⁶⁵ Richard, known as Nimble Dick, was third son of

⁶³ The document is a plaint in chancery by Roderick's son Michael, who successfully retained his father's lands to which Richard Martin had claimed title on the strength of nominal conveyances whereby Roderick had put his lands into Martin's name. The plaint is summarized by Hardiman, 429–30. From this source the point is put into plainer words by Stephen Gwynn, *A Holiday in Connemara* (London, 1909), 22–3: without legal protection through the Articles of Limerick and Galway, Roderick, like many catholic landowners, feared forfeiture and sought to secure himself 'by a fictitious conveyance of his property to a protestant friend—Richard Martin, founder of the Ballynahinch dynasty. "Nimble Dick" was not nice on the point of honour, and, when the old scholar's son claimed to succeed, pretended that the conveyance had been a *bona fide* sale. Michael O'Flaherty won his case after several years of litigation'. (Gwynn erred in making Dick Martin a protestant.) Hardiman avoided drawing the conclusion that this evidence contradicted his picture of the destitute Roderick. Neither attempts to establish who was who. The plaint made out that Richard Martin 'had been concerned for the said Roger in the court of Claimes in 1677', and that deeds had been entered into by the two of them in 1691 and 1703. The resolution involved Michael O'Flaherty's marriage to Richard Martin's daughter, Annable, widow of Edmund Fitzpatrick, and the demise of the property to his stepson, Richard Fitzpatrick.

⁶⁴ He gets a chapter in J. M. Callwell's *Old Irish Life* (Edinburgh, 1912), a series of articles from *Blackwood's Magazine*; this focuses on the killing of his elder son, 'Robin the brave', by adherents of the O'Flahertie kindred in 1705. Callwell's mother belonged to the family of Martin of Ross. A little can be learnt from books on Dick's great-grandson, Richard Martin (1754–1834), known as Humanity Dick, whose father had become a protestant. S. Lynam, *Humanity Dick. A Biography of Richard Martin MP* (London, 1975), reprinted as *Humanity Dick Martin, 'King of Connemara', 1754–1834* (Dublin, 1989), xi–xv, concentrates on the part he played after the defeat at Aughrim in negotiating favourable terms for the surrender of Galway city and then his winning pardon for himself from William III in 1695; P. Phillips, *Humanity Dick. The Eccentric Member for Galway* (London, 2003), 1–8, draws silently on both. None refers to any evidence.

⁶⁵ Archer E. S. Martin, *Genealogy of the Family of Martin of Ballynahinch Castle* (privately printed, Winnipeg, 1890). The table is described as 'A copy of the original emblazoned parchment deposited in the Office of Arms, Dublin Castle'. Pedigrees in the Genealogical Office, National Library of Ireland, now include MS 111, pp. 75–6 ('Copy of confirmation of arms to the descendants of Richard Martin of Ballinahinch, Co. Galway, and later of Derryclare in the Co. of Haldemand, Ontario, only son to have male issue of Richard Martin, MP, lord of the manor of Clare and to the grandson of the first mentioned Richard, being the Hon. Judge Archer Evan Stringer Martin, second son of Edward Martin of Ballinahinch, Hamilton, Ontario, Nov. 30, 1905'), MS 170, pp. 89–90 (Martin of Ross and Dangan, Co. Galway, c.1580–c.1830), and MS 813 (22) (printed genealogy of Martin of Ballinahinch, Co. Galway, 1653–1904, with various drafts).

Robert Martin, of Ross, who died in 1700.⁶⁶ According to the printed pedigree, he was born *c.* 1655–8; his death must be dated between his making his will on 14 February 1730/31 and grant of probate, 13 May 1731. He can be seen to have acquired land in the process of certification undertaken in 1677, in part because he was a lawyer, who acted as trustee for a number of catholic landowners, and who made something of a speciality of securing title to small parcels of land.⁶⁷ He served as a captain in King James's army at Aughrim, and in defeat he is said to have gone to Galway and helped to negotiate favourable terms for the surrender of the city.⁶⁸ It would appear that his agreement with Roderick O'Flaherty was drawn up in the latter part of the same year. He secured pardon from William III in 1695 with letters patent confirming his lands in 1698.⁶⁹ His methods earned him the nickname Nimble Dick, but he successfully created an estate for himself and built his home at Birch Hall, near Oughterard.⁷⁰ How much land he acquired lies outside our purposes to discover—continuing conflict with the O'Flaherties of Augnure and Lemonfield suggests that they had lost out to him—but by the end of the century he was a far richer man than Roderick O'Flaherty. Within a year or two of Roderick's death, his only son Michael O'Flaherty married Richard Martin's widowed daughter Annable, and he agreed to transfer his property to his stepson.

The important question for us is to know how much property remained to Roderick O'Flaherty after the process of transplantation had been carried out. From the Quit Rent Office series we see only 420 acres. From the Headfort series we see 826 acres in the two parishes of Moycullen and Rahoon. Yet the Ormond List tells us that 'Roger Flaherty' received a decree from the Loughrea commissioners for 850 profitable Irish acres within the parishes of Moycullen and Rahoon, while his twice-widowed mother Elizabeth Darcy and he were

⁶⁶ *Burke's Landed Gentry of Ireland*, 5th edn (London, 1976), 787.

⁶⁷ Hardiman, 'Abstracts of the principal records connected with the Acts of Settlement and Explanation', Appendix to the 15th Report of the Irish Record Commission, 239, 245, 253, 259.

⁶⁸ Lynam and Phillips make him a captain in Henry Lutterell's regiment, but Archer Martin says Lord Bophin's regiment. Lynam tells of his negotiations in Galway.

⁶⁹ Archer Martin gives the date of his full pardon as 26 July 1695. By letters patent dated 5 July 1698, 'his immense territory west of the Town of Galway, containing upwards of a quarter of a million (statute) acres, exclusive of his other estates, was erected into the Manor of Clare, otherwise Claremont. He is stated to have been the owner of the largest estates in fee simple of any gentleman in the three kingdoms'.

⁷⁰ Archer Martin describes the family as 'Martin of Birch Hall, later of Dangan, and lastly of Ballynahinch'.

decreed a further 1038 acres in other parishes. Added together they were due 1888 profitable Irish acres.

We can, I think, achieve some resolution. In 1656 the Loughrea commissioners decreed that Roderick O'Flaherty should receive 850 acres; the 826 acres shown in the Headfort book were sufficient to satisfy this decree. Elizabeth Darcy was due 1038 acres, and the Headfort books shows that she received 955 acres in satisfaction of her decree, distributed between three parishes in the barony of Clare, Co. Galway, and three parishes in three different baronies in Co. Roscommon.⁷¹ Some individual entries record the beneficiary of the decree as 'Elizabeth Flaherty and her son', so that we can be sure that in 1656-7 Roderick and his mother were seen as holding together. They received between them 1881 acres to satisfy decrees of 1888 acres, in compensation for 1912¼ as assessed in 1636. By the end of 1657, then, the extent of his holding would not have been greatly reduced, though its productive value was very likely not comparable to that of the manor of Moycullen.

The disjointed nature of the sources is in harmony with the jigsaw puzzle of alienation, division, and redistribution of land that was meant to break up traditional tenures. To contextualize these complex data by creating comparable tables for other dispossessed landowners and their successors in occupation would make for a large table, but the information may be better understood with the aid of maps. The maps that were drawn up to accompany the Strafford survey in 1636 do not survive as such, though they were available to Sir William Petty, when he was mapping in the 1650s; the map of Galway that he printed in 1685 was probably engraved from Strafford's survey, and it shows the names of the lands in Cois Fhairrge allocated to O'Flaherty as they appear in the Quit Rent Office book.⁷²

The matter does not end there. When the Stuart monarchy was

⁷¹ The figure was added up to 955 acres by Simington, *Transplantation*, 170. The allocation to 'Elizabeth O'Flaherty, alias Darcy, widow of Hugh O'Flaherty', formerly of Moycullen, is completely scrambled by Simington. According to his first source, she received a total of 1038 acres, principally in the parish of Annaghdown, a figure which he restates four times, *Transplantation*, 88, 246, 260, 272, in parallel with figures for individual parcels of land given in the Headfort series, 100, 46, 8, 8, 461, 143, 189, totalling 955 acres; parts of this land lay in other parishes, Donaghpatrick, Kilcoona, and Killursa (ib. 90, 91), but on other pages only the county is named. Simington gives the date of the decree as 12 February 1655/6, which is much earlier than the date given in the Ormond List.

⁷² A reproduction of Petty's map accompanies Simington's edition of the Quit Rent Office book for Co. Galway. 'Sersey' appears as the most easterly of these lands, An tSaoirsin (M 187 234) on the modern 1 : 50 000 map; 'Culleagh' is the most westerly, An Coilleach (M 155 240), which I take to be 'Calliagh', 'Kaylagh' of our other sources. 'Leaghgivenagh' and 'Leaghguineagh' appear on Petty's map, but the

restored, Roderick O'Flaherty did not benefit from the Act of Settlement (1662) and the Act of Explanation (1665), which provided only a restricted restoration of catholic landowners from 1641. At this period, in 1666, Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh refers to O'Flaherty in terms of right rather than fact: 'Ruaidhrí Óg (ó Mhuigh Cuillinn) mhaireas anois, 1666. Ag sin an Ruaidrigh Óg dan dleacht flaitheas leathbharunachta Gnaoi Big in iarthar Connacht, ge attaid braithre gaoil aige' ('Ruaidhrí Óg (of Moycullen) who is living now, 1666. That is the Ruaidhrí Óg who is entitled to the sovereignty of the half-barony of Gnó Beag in western Connacht, although he has kinsmen').⁷³ James Hardiman had some expertise in the records from this period, for in 1825 he had drawn up a report for the Commissioners of Records on restorations made under the Act of Settlement and on sales of forfeited properties.⁷⁴ We rely on Hardiman for evidence that a certificate issued to O'Flaherty, 11 April 1677, decreed that he that he was entitled to certain lands. His abstracts have reduced this to index references, but in his edition of *Iar-Connaught* he summarizes:⁷⁵

Towards the close of the reign of Charles II a Commission was held in Dublin, to hear and determine the claims of 'transplanted persons in Connaught and Clare'. Here our author exhibited his claim, grounded on the adjudication of the Parliamentary Commissioners before alluded to; and he

impression I have seen leaves some uncertainty over their spellings, and neither appears now on the 1 : 50 000 map.

Park, now An Pháirc (M 157 234) lies close to An Coilleach.

⁷³ This is in the abridgement ('Cuimre') of the Book of Genealogies, written in 1666, at p. 1058. 1 (ed. N. Ó Muraile, *The Great Book of Genealogies compiled (1645–66) by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh* (Dublin, 2003–4), iii. 386–7). It was quoted by O'Donovan, OS Letters, Galway, iii. 160–61.

⁷⁴ J. Hardiman, 'Abstracts of, and references to, the principal records and public documents connected with the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, and preserved in the Rolls' and Chief Remembrancer's Offices, Four Courts, Dublin', *Appendix to the 15th Report of the Irish Record Commission* (Dublin, 1825), 29–702. The substance of this appendix derived from abstracts originally made by John Lodge and arranged by Hardiman. He had free access to the records as sub-commissioner on schedules and inventories between 1815 and 1830 (above, n. 4). That Quit Rent Office records were still recognized to be politically sensitive, however, is apparent from the fact that, even working for the Ordnance Survey, in 1839 John O'Donovan was denied access to them (G. M. Doherty, *The Irish Ordnance Survey. History, culture, and memory* (Dublin, 2004), 184–5, citing letters of Lieut. Larcom, who had sought access for him).

⁷⁵ Hardiman, 427, citing, 'his certificate, dated 11 April 1677, is enrolled in the office of the Remembrancer of the Exchequer, Dublin'. The certificate was enrolled in Roll 5, membrane 3, of the Connacht certificates in the office of the Chief Remembrancer, but all that remains are index entries leading to 'v. 3', 'O'Flaherty, Roger' (Hardiman, *Appendix to the 15th Report*, 582c), 'Kaylagh' (ib. 604a), and 'Legvineagh' (ib. 604a); 'Sersey' is missing from the index.

was accordingly decreed entitled to a small portion of his inheritance, viz. Legvineagh, Kaylagh, and Sersey, situate in the barony of Moycullen, containing about 500 acres, not one acre out of fifty of the ancient territory of Gnobeg. At this time he resided at Parke, part of the lands so adjudicated, [...] but his circumstances were no way benefited by the above decree. This arose from the debts which he had been previously obliged to contract, and the impoverished state of the district.

Once again Hardiman elaborates on fact with invention. The lands named equate with those lands for which O'Flaherty was entered as recipient in the Quit Rent Office book, shown in Table 2. They were not, in principle, part of his alienated inheritance. In Table 3, however, based on the Headfort book, we see that more than 200 acres of O'Flaherty's land in the parish of Rahoon had been reallocated, by certificate, to Jeoffery Brown.⁷⁶ From the same right-hand-most column in the Headfort books it appears that the lands set out to Elizabeth Darcy had been transferred to Sir Oliver St George in satisfaction of a claim conceded on 18 October 1666.⁷⁷ While O'Flaherty had come through the Cromwellian transplantation with different estates from his ancestral lands, the Headfort book shows that his holding as measured in profitable acres had not been greatly reduced. A second round of changes under King Charles II led to a much greater reduction in the extent of his lands. The certificate calendared by Hardiman and the Quit Rent Office book reflect this later stage.

Even so, if the 420 acres shown in the Quit Rent Office book, with whatever extent of unprofitable land, were all he had by the end of 1677, he was still left with lands that amounted to an estate, albeit not a quarter of what he had got in Cromwell's time. Hardiman's 'not one acre out of fifty' is empty rhetoric.⁷⁸ And the debts are surely his invention. Personal debts would not have appeared in the official record, so it is impossible to see how Hardiman could have known about them. Hardiman is here simply guessing to explain O'Flaherty's con-

⁷⁶ Presumably Jeoffrey, one of the three sons of Dominick Brown (Hardiman, *Appendix to the 15th Report*, 253–4, though this is not the relevant entry in the abstracts).

⁷⁷ Hardiman, *Appendix to the 15th Report* (see n. 74), 78–9 (a substantial list of lands awarded to St George). The basis for claiming Elizabeth O'Flaherty's land may have been no more than that she was dead.

⁷⁸ At sixteen quarters in 1618, the ancestral fee was 1,920 Irish acres of profitable land, a figure not far removed from that Roderick and his mother had in 1656–7. The acreage of the parish of Moycullen (stated as 27,294 statute acres under the Tithe Act, according to Lewis's *Topographical Dictionary* (1840)) only adds unprofitable land. By the same measure in the parish of Kilcummin, the district of Gnó Mór, 8,811 statute acres were rated as profitable out of a total of 93,982 statute acres, 'the remainder being bog and mountain'. There never was a time when O'Flaherty held 25,000 acres of profitable land.

tinuing in the poverty he has imposed on him despite his still holding some hundreds of profitable acres.

To judge whether Roderick O'Flaherty was treated more harshly than his relatives and friends, whose condoling he referred to in 1686, we should need to go through this sort of analysis for each of them, an exercise best left to someone undertaking the necessary fundamental work on the Books of Survey and Distribution.

Unknown to Hardiman, in a letter written in 1708 O'Flaherty alludes to his being restored to Moycullen, though he is not precise about how or when. The letter refers to a swarm of bees on 8 August 1691 (almost a month after the final victory of King William's troops at Aughrim), 'in an old wall next my house at Moycullen, then newly recovered by virtue of King James's Act on the 20th'.⁷⁹ It appears from these words that he was actually living at Moycullen in August 1691, though it is hard to credit what he says. In 1689 his right to recover his estate had been granted to him, as to all catholic landowners dispossessed since 1641, under the provisions made by the patriot parliament, called by James II in Dublin, which repealed the Acts of Settlement and Explanation.⁸⁰ Recovery, however, was not automatic, and the procedures envisaged in the act of repeal were never in fact implemented, so O'Flaherty's statement is more than a little surprising. A possible conjecture is to suppose that he made no legal recovery but simply returned to the house and lands, left vacant because the transplanners who occupied them had fled in 1689.⁸¹ In any case King William's victory at the battle of the Boyne in 1690 left the act void. O'Flaherty says in the same letter, 'after [*afterwards*] I was turnd out of house and home, and to this day am destitute of almost all personal and real estate (Praise be to my God)'.⁸² This was the

⁷⁹ Letter 33.

⁸⁰ The Act repealing the Act of Settlement (2 James II, c. 4, 1689) may be read in abbreviation in *English Historical Documents* viii 1660–1714, ed. A. Browning (London, 1953, 1996), 717–19 (no. 275). It was less King James's wish to do this than that of the catholic gentry who sat in this parliament, and the act sets out many exceptions. The bill was introduced into the House of Commons on 10 May 1689 and passed through its stages to receive the royal assent on 22 June 1689 (J. G. Simms, *The Jacobite Parliament of 1689* (Dublin, 1966); id. *Jacobite Ireland, 1685–91* (London, 1969), 81–4). This must be the act 'on the 20th' referred to. Subject to a number of specific exceptions, it authorized claimants to take legal steps to recover their lands from those to whom they had been transferred (§ 4), either through a commission of claims, which was to be set up for that purpose (§ 5), or through the ordinary courts (§ 6); this commission never came into existence, and it seems unlikely that O'Flaherty would have been able to pursue a claim before the provisions of the act were null and void. None the less, he was evidently in residence at the date stated.

⁸¹ This would be more probable if Moycullen had gone to protestants, but the French family were catholic transplanners.

⁸² Letter 33.

latest revolution, when, he says, he suffered the loss of many of his books, some of them apparently manuscripts on vellum.⁸³ Precisely when he was turned out is not in evidence, and the particular cannot be deduced from the general. King William and his protestant forces pursued measures to punish those who had supported King James and to dispossess catholic landowners who had so far retained their property. Yet it is very difficult to form a clear impression of the work done by various commissions set up to deal with forfeitures between 1690 and 1696.⁸⁴ A near contemporary judgement, however, shows that they took little interest in Connacht. A report on the work of the various forfeitures commissions, presented in 1699, says that, 'There has been so great a neglect in the prosecution of his Majesties Title, that no inquisition went into Connaught till the year 1695, which gave the forfeiting persons time and leisure to set up what incumbrances they pleased'; trials for involvement in the war were still taking place in Galway as late as 1699.⁸⁵ We might rush to think that O'Flaherty was able to hold on to Moycullen well after 1691, but that cannot be established. One reason is that O'Flaherty was not technically a forfeiting person, because he was not lawfully possessed of Moycullen in 1688. None the less, he may have been able to occupy his ancestral estate for a number of years. Several unexplained facts are known to us but not to Hardiman. First, in 1702, he was considered to owe uncollected arrears 'from King James's time', and he was seeking relief through influence with the commissioners of the revenue.⁸⁶ Second,

⁸³ 'Most part of my books were eloined in the last revolution, & MSS veloms made tailours meassurs for ought I know' (letter 5); 'the late revolutions in that kingdome have reduced him' [O'Flaherty] 'to a great poverty and destroyed his books and papers' (below 107 n. 337).

⁸⁴ The starting-point is J. G. Simms, *The Williamite Confiscation in Ireland 1690-1703* (London, [1956]), but he is thin on the early commissions, which have various names in the records and differing remits between goods, arrears, and lands. William Molyneux kept a manuscript copy of the first commission for forfeitures (12 July 1690), TCD MS 889 (I. 4. 18), fol. 28. In his autobiography he refers to being appointed one of the 'Commissioners of the Forfeitures', though the commission was not so named in the state papers (Introduction, 91). The last commission was wound up by warrant, dated 29 January 1695/6, 'for revoking the commission for inquiring into all the forfeitures in Ireland and for issuing letters patent authorizing the commissioners of the revenue to manage and inspect all such forfeitures' (*Cal. SP Dom.*, 1696, 31). A later commission set up in 1700 had the task of disposing of the forfeited estates in the Crown's interest. Thomas Molyneux kept a record, 'The number of acres in Ireland and vested in the Trustees by the late Act of Resumption taken from their own survey, May 28th 1703', amounting to 789,607 acres (TCD MS 888/1 (I. 4. 17), fol. 97; copy made by Samuel Molyneux, MS 883/2, p. 301).

⁸⁵ *Report made to the House of Commons, December 15, 1699, by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the Forfeited Estates in Ireland* (London, 1700), 21-2, § 84.

⁸⁶ In letter 4 he says that £10 was still demanded of him in 1702 as three years' ar-

he was in Galway gaol for a time, at least, in December 1696 and January 1697, and the belated progress of forfeitures might account for his being there.⁸⁷ Simple debt cannot be ruled out, but it is not likely if O'Flaherty had been taking the fruits of Moycullen during the preceding years. Third, in a letter written in 1700, O'Flaherty refers to one 'Mr Mandey at Sligo' as his landlord, implying that he held land as his tenant after the confiscations under King William.⁸⁸ It is not clear whether we may presume that the land was at Park, and I have been unable to identify Mr Mandey.

In spite of much uncertainty in all this, we may at least conclude that from the 1650s until King James's time O'Flaherty was excluded from the heart of his inheritance but none the less held land enough to live as a gentleman. In King James's time he returned to Moycullen but in the 1690s he was forced out and found himself worse off than ever before though still in occupation of land at Park.

Through these vicissitudes Roderick O'Flaherty matured as a man of considerable learning. He had presumably been schooled as the heir to Moycullen. Where he studied is nowhere in evidence. If the rules imposed by King James I on heirs who were wards of the Crown had been enforced, he ought to have gone to Trinity College to be educated as a protestant.⁸⁹ There is nothing to suggest that he did, and any protestant upbringing he had as boy did not influence his later conduct. His sentiments as a man were strongly catholic, and he wore his faith on his signet-ring.⁹⁰

He would have attended school in the late 1630s and '40s. This is long after the time when the ecclesiastical visitors found a thriving school under a catholic schoolmaster named Lynch, probably James Lynch, in Galway in 1615 and saw 'how well his schollers profited

rears in respect of King James's reign. Why three years and how the sum is calculated are not in evidence. In letter 5 he refers to '3½ years quit rent of King James's time, and 7 years more of wast acres'. A simple computation of 3½ years from the act in 1689 may suggest he was deemed to have held his land until the end of 1692, but we cannot assume this as a basis of calculation.

⁸⁷ Letter 2 explicitly and letter 1 implicitly were sent from Galway gaol.

⁸⁸ Letter 3.

⁸⁹ Hardiman, 420 note (m), records that from James I's time letters patent of wardship included provision that the ward should be 'maintained and educated in the English religion and habits in Trinity College Dublin'.

⁹⁰ His signet-ring, used to seal letters, carried the sign 'IHS' surmounted by a cross (letters 7, 13*). Such a seal is mentioned in Titus Oates's evidence against the English martyr Edward Colman (1636–1678): 'Lord Chief Justice: What Inscription was upon the Seal? Mr Oates: IHS with a Cross, in English it had the Characters of IHS' (*The Trial of Edward Coleman for conspiring the death of the king* (London, 1678), 27).

under him by verses and orations which they presented us'.⁹¹ It has been assumed that Roderick was schooled in Galway, but other possibilities must be allowed. As a ward of the Crown, he might have been raised in a protestant household, not necessarily in Connacht, and he might have attended school in some town other than Galway. If so, he tells us nothing about it. We have only the certainty that he had good Latin and good English.

A delight in composing Latin verse, which he would have learnt as a schoolboy, remained with O'Flaherty all his life. His eleven Latin variations on a single Irish quatrain attest to this delight, and we have examples of his Latin verse from the 1650s to the 1700s.⁹² He would have read his classics at school too, but the range of his reading in Latin and English is far wider than he would have acquired in school. He could not have depended on libraries for this, so his writings furnish proof that he had both the opportunity to study and the means to buy books for himself.

He does not tell us when he came to read Irish, but he does say, 'Myself never frequented an Irish schoole but learnt by pastime whatever smack of Irish reading I have'.⁹³ Everything that is conventionally repeated about his studying with the greatest Irish *seanchaidh* of his age, Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh, and with the learned cleric, Dr John Lynch (c. 1599–1677), stems from guesswork by Hardiman, who imagined that the young O'Flaherty progressed in learning in Galway 'under the guidance of his two more matured friends'.⁹⁴

None the less, the evidence for O'Flaherty's friendship with Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh is slender but strong: in *Ogygia*, he refers to him as 'my intimate friend', and we have direct evidence that they corresponded.⁹⁵ There is, however, nothing to date their first contact, and we may not assume contact when Mac Fhirbhisigh

⁹¹ Hardiman, 214–15, prints an excerpt from the *Visitatio regalis* (1615), an ecclesiastical visitation ordered by King James I, from the original then preserved in the office of the chief remembrancer of the Exchequer at Dublin castle and now destroyed; a transcript made by William Reeves is now TCD MS 1066. The commissioners ordered Lynch to give up teaching unless he obtained a special licence from the lord deputy, and in his place they sent a schoolmaster named Lally from Tuam. Hardiman, 421n, identifies Lynch with Alexander Lynch, said to have been teaching in Galway in 1608, who is mentioned also by John Lynch, *De praesulibus Hiberniae*, ii. 184. Ó Muraíle, however, makes the case that one James Lynch had been teaching for thirty years in 1638 and may have continued after receiving a pension from the corporation of Galway in that year ('Aspects of intellectual life', 150–51).

⁹² Introduction, 51–74; in particular, 62.

⁹³ Letter 31.

⁹⁴ Hardiman, 421.

⁹⁵ *Ogygia*, [13], 'ab intimo nostro amico' ('from our intimate friend'). It should be noted, however, that he used such words in other instances, where one might not so readily take them at face value: Dr Dudley Loftus was 'mihi intimus' (*Ogygia*, 23), Sir

stayed for a time in Galway in 1645 and again in 1649–50. We have seen that in 1666 Mac Fhirbhisigh refers to O’Flaherty as ‘entitled to the sovereignty of the half-barony of Gnó Beag in western Connacht’. His *Cuimre* was written during a stay at Tireragh, Co. Sligo, in April–May 1666, but in 1665 and again in the latter part of 1666 Mac Fhirbhisigh lived in Dublin under the patronage of the protestant antiquary, Sir James Ware (1594–1666). Ware had returned to his home in Ireland following the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, but whether they met before 1665 is not known.⁹⁶ Mac Fhirbhisigh prepared English translations from Irish manuscripts for Ware.⁹⁷ Yet it is O’Flaherty who tells us, as if from first-hand experience, that Ware was able to read and understand the language, though not to speak it.⁹⁸ And O’Flaherty would cite a *dictum* from Mac Fhirbhisigh about obscure words encountered in manuscripts.⁹⁹ A number of manuscripts associated with both Ware and Mac Fhirbhisigh have notes in the margins in O’Flaherty’s handwriting.¹⁰⁰ The full tally of these notes may not yet have been arrived at, and they do not yet form a clear picture in relation to O’Flaherty’s own studies, but comparisons of chronology are the dominant interest. There is a distinct possibility, therefore, that at this date O’Flaherty as well as Mac Fhirbhisigh was in Dublin in the circle of James Ware. If they knew one another earlier, Mac Fhirbhisigh may have introduced O’Flaherty to Ware. Mac Fhirbhisigh was working at Ware’s house in Castle Street on 6 November 1666.¹⁰¹ And here, weeks later, on 1 December 1666 Ware died. Mac Fhirbhisigh returned to Co.

Thomas Southwell ‘an intimat friend of mine’ (letter 7), and the Revd Arthur Squibb ‘my intimat friend’ (letter 10, p. 239).

⁹⁶ Ó Muraíle, 247–50, 264, 270.

⁹⁷ Ó Muraíle, 250, 255–6, 270–72. Mac Fhirbhisigh began to translate the Annals of Lecan for Ware only on 6 November 1666, less than one month before Ware’s death (ibid. 271, 375); the result is now BL MS Add. 4799, fols. 45r–70v. O’Flaherty says that Ware was able to read and understand Irish but not to speak it (letter 31). Ware no doubt had a smattering, but there is clear evidence that he used translators.

⁹⁸ He says this in *Ogygia*, 208, ‘legendi et intelligendi Hibernice licet non loquendi gnarus’ (‘capable of reading and understanding in Irish, though not of speaking’), and more than thirty years later in his last letter to Lhwyd, he cites Ware as an example to show that it was by no means impossible to learn to read Irish, ‘the difficulty is not such but by the misapprehension of som, & malignant aversion of others, I appeal to your own experience, to S’ Ja: Ware, who could reade, & understand it, tho not speak it’ (letter 31). Ware himself made no claim to skill in the language (J. Ware, *S. Patricio adscripta opuscula* (London, 1656), 144).

⁹⁹ ‘D. Firbiss: (Ogy: p: 233) told me, there was not a word so obscure in Ir. MSS. but was usually practised in som corner of Ir: or Scotl: & is still’ (letter 10). Lhwyd queried this remark, and O’Flaherty returned to clarify the point in letter 14.

¹⁰⁰ Appendix 2, 388–404.

¹⁰¹ BL MS Add. 4799, fol. 45r, ‘This translation begunned was by Dodley Firbisie

Sligo, O'Flaherty to Co. Galway, and the last evidence we have of their relationship is a reference to a letter written by Mac Fhirbhisigh to O'Flaherty from Lackan, Co. Sligo, on 1 February 1669/70.¹⁰² Mac Fhirbhisigh was murdered a year later, and O'Flaherty recorded the melancholy fact in a manuscript of chronological poems, copied in 1627–8 by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh, and for many years in O'Flaherty's own hands.¹⁰³

O'Flaherty's contact with Dr John Lynch is attested only towards the end of Mac Fhirbhisigh's life. Whether the two had ever met is not established. Lynch served as a priest in Galway from 1625; he left Ireland, never to return, in 1652, when O'Flaherty was twenty-two.¹⁰⁴ He appears to have joined the large number of Irish clergy who sought exile in Brittany, where he can be traced from at least 1661.¹⁰⁵ O'Flaherty couched his essay on Irish chronology as a letter to Lynch only long after Lynch went into exile. In this essay, however, he plainly speaks of their contact by letter:¹⁰⁶

The Irish annals, most learned Sir, delivered to the press within our memory, being the work of several authors disagreeing among one another (both in the nature of the matter and in the attention paid to it), have caused much trouble in your mind, and in mine, especially in attempting to set in order the dates of kings, because the rationale of their chronology when compared with one another had tied numerous knots that could not be easily untangled. As our

in Sir James Ware's house at Castle-Street, Dublin, vi^o Novembris 1666' (Flower, iii. 9; Ó Muraile, 271).

¹⁰² Introduction, 58. There is other evidence of correspondence on the part of Mac Fhirbhisigh, a letter written by him in Irish, answering an unknown correspondent, which deals at essay length with questions about early Irish law, 'Do gebhim isin litir ceadhna uaibh iarraidh orum AIGHNEAS CÚISI, agus tar nach bhfeiduum tre ualaighib ele sin' ('I find in the same letter I recd from you, requesting of me the PLEADINGS OF CAUSES, and which I cannot at present answer or compleat as I would wish'); it survives among transcripts by Muiris Ó Gormáin (?1720–?1787), RIA MS 23 Q. 12 (cat. 1245), pp. 274–89. I owe this information to Dr Nollaig Ó Muraile.

¹⁰³ RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fol. 111v, '1670/1 mense Janu: Dualdus Firbisius obiit, a Thoma Croftono occisus' (Ó Muraile, 375).

¹⁰⁴ N. Ó Muraile, 'John Lynch (d. in or after 1677)', *ODNB*, and his longer paper, 'Aspects of intellectual life in Galway', 155–65.

¹⁰⁵ R. d'Ambrières and E. Ó Ciosáin, 'John Lynch of Galway (c. 1599–1677): his career, exile, and writing', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 55 (2003), 50–63 (at pp. 51–3).

¹⁰⁶ *Ogygia*, [1] (my translation). The phrase, 'nostra memoria proelo traditi' ('delivered to the press within our memory'), demands explanation, for no manuscript of Irish annals was printed until the editions prepared by the Revd Charles O'Connor, privately published in the 1820s. Nollaig Ó Muraile offers one. O'Flaherty had used the Annals of the Four Masters in his research for *Ogygia*, and he would have known from the preliminaries in what is now RIA MS [Stowe] C. iii. 3 that the copy was ready for the press in Louvain, including the licences of ecclesiastical authority. Printing never began.

ideas went to and fro between us by letters, you earnestly asked me soon to put my whole strength into untying them and into weaving a unified and secure chronological sequence, so far as could be done, from the manuscripts of the antiquaries.

In his book, *The Irish Historical Library* (1724), William Nicolson (1655–1727), by that date bishop of Derry, refers to ‘Lynch’s great friend and admirer, the late learned Mr O’Flaherty’.¹⁰⁷ Nicolson had had some dealings with O’Flaherty in 1704–5, as we shall see, but the basis for his saying this is that he had read the essay which O’Flaherty had addressed to Lynch. Walter Harris formed the same impression of friendship between Lynch and O’Flaherty on the same evidence.¹⁰⁸ Hardiman too noted that O’Flaherty addressed Lynch in Latin as ‘charissime Lyncaeae’ and hinted at shared views; he then drew the phrase ‘a long literary correspondence’ from Hely’s translation of *Ogygia*.¹⁰⁹ If, as I think likely, the essay was written in 1675, Lynch had been living in France for more than twenty years. How correspondence was carried out is unknown, but there were boats trafficking between Galway and the Breton ports, on which letters could be carried.¹¹⁰ An unverifiable glimpse of the extent of this correspondence appears in the margin of a manuscript that belonged to O’Flaherty, where he cites as authority ‘P. Jo. Lynch Epist. 44’: did he really number Lynch’s letters and refer to them in this manner?¹¹¹

O’Flaherty quotes a few lines of his own verse addressed to Lynch, but he gives no clue as to the context.¹¹² It has been suggested that Lynch’s Latin poem in answer to the question ‘Cur in patriam non redis?’ was composed for O’Flaherty.¹¹³ No evidence has been offered,

¹⁰⁷ Nicolson, *Irish Historical Library*, 244.

¹⁰⁸ ‘He [Lynch] was an intimate friend to Roderick O’Flaherty, who hath prefaced his *Ogygia* to him, they being both conversant in the same kind of studies’ (Harris, *Writers of Ireland*, 114).

¹⁰⁹ O’Flaherty’s Latinization *Lyncaeus*, etymologically ‘lynx-eyed’, alludes to the keen-sighted Argonaut Lynceus. Hardiman, 421, quoting but not citing Hely’s translation, vol. i, p. xxv.

¹¹⁰ Lynch himself provides two relevant facts. When John Burke, archbishop of Tuam, escaped from custody in 1654, he found a ship in Galway which brought him to Nantes on the fourth day (*De praesulibus Hiberniae*, ii. 259). He mentions letters to him from Fr James O’Finnachty about the miracles worked in Tuam by the relics of Archbishop Maolseachlainn Ó Caollaidhe, *al.* Malachy O’Queely (1586–1645), who died of wounds received from the parliamentary forces (ib. 253).

¹¹¹ Quoted in Appendix 2, p. 406, under Mael Mura of Fahan.

¹¹² Introduction, 55.

¹¹³ D’Ambrières and Ó Ciosáin, ‘John Lynch of Galway’, 53. The poem, ‘Visendi patrios valido trahor impete fines’, was printed by James Hardiman in *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (Dublin, 1846), 90–98, from the author’s autograph, then in his own possession but now untraced. It was composed some fifteen years

but O'Flaherty would have appreciated the style and feeling of the composition. In return we find that Lynch cites various other verses by O'Flaherty in his long treatise on the succession of Irish bishops, completed in 1672. One of these was an epitaph composed for the archbishop of Tuam, John Burke, who died in 1667, which may have been sent to Lynch as soon as it was composed. Others were Latin versions of Irish poetry.¹¹⁴ The young O'Flaherty was ever eager to display his skill at Latin verse. But their exchanges were not confined to Latin poetry. O'Flaherty was well acquainted with Lynch's book, *Cambrensis Eversus*, printed at Saint-Malo in 1662 under the name 'Gratianus Lucius', and knew too that Lynch was the author.¹¹⁵ Lynch was more a controversialist than O'Flaherty. They shared an interest in Latin style, and, though Lynch was well-read in Keating's *Forus Feasa ar Éirinn* and had indeed prepared a Latin version of it, he appears to have deferred to O'Flaherty's greater expertise in the sources of ancient Irish chronology.

Their apparent closeness contrasts with O'Flaherty's use of the works of other self-exiled Irish clergy who published in Latin on the Continent, for the most part during his lifetime. Hugh Ward (c. 1590–1635) and John Colgan (1592–1658) printed Latin source-texts and discussed them in Latin prose that is markedly drier than either Lynch's or O'Flaherty's own. While O'Flaherty respected their learning, he was more in tune with Lynch, a Galway man, with whom he had personal contact. Yet he particularly eulogizes Colgan's printing of primary sources, 'in their own phrase and text', together with his 'industrious commentaries'.¹¹⁶

It is a happy chance that has preserved to this day O'Flaherty's own copy of John Colgan's most important work, *Trias thaumaturga* (1647). Internal evidence shows that this book was probably in his hands as early as 1658; it was still in his hands in 1704; and the extensive annotation, added over a considerable period of time, bears witness to the meticulousness of O'Flaherty's reading.¹¹⁷ On the title-

after Lynch left Ireland. Based on the assumption that he left straight after the Cromwellian capture of Galway, the date is c. 1667. If O'Flaherty were the recipient of the poem, it would backdate what we know of their contact. The question forms no part of the poem, and it is possible that it comes from a title in the manuscript not reproduced by Hardiman; any explicit connexion with O'Flaherty, however, would surely have been reported.

¹¹⁴ John Lynch, *De praesulibus Hiberniae* (1672), ed. J. F. O'Doherty (Dublin, 1944), ii. 244, 257, 261. For details, see Introduction, 53–4, 60–63.

¹¹⁵ *Ogygia*, 43, 244; compare letter 33, 'Jo: Lynch Arch Deacon of Tuam by the name of Gra: Lucius & title of Cambr: Eversus'.

¹¹⁶ *Ogygia Vindicated*, lxix.

¹¹⁷ The book is now paired—but not bound—with an unrelated and unmarked copy

page he wrote ‘Ex libris Rogeri O Flaherty’—he would later repudiate the equating of Ruaidhrí with Roger—and over this another hand has written, if the eye does not deceive, ‘Ex libris Joan: Conarij’.¹¹⁸ I am not certain of this reading, but one John Conry, in Dublin, was in possession of some of O’Flaherty’s manuscripts in 1724.¹¹⁹

The central question of O’Flaherty’s intellectual formation remains unanswered and probably unanswerable. Having learnt his Latin well, at some point he turned his attention to Irish manuscripts and in particular to the intricacies of chronology. In his elaborate preface to *Dr Lynch*, he reveals more than usual, for he gives a long account of his efforts to find a coherent chronology in Irish history. His starting-point was the group of chronological poems by Gilla Cóemáin and Gilla Mo Dutu Ó Caiside, of which he had copies in a manuscript in his own hands as well as knowing other copies. He was able to compare them with the annals, mentioning the Annals of the Four Masters and the Annals of Tigernach, and Conell Mageoghagan’s English rendering of the Annals of Clonmacnoise. Of these he must have come across the Annals of Tigernach in the hands of Sir James Ware between his return to Ireland in 1660 and his death at the end of 1666. As he struggled to harmonize these sources with a secure chronology, ‘there fell into [his] hands’ (*in manus incidit*) a book, long in the custody of the earls of Clanricarde, which provided him with a synchronism, as well as further copies of the chronological poems of Gilla Cóemáin and Gilla Mo Dutu; he calls this source the vellum book of Ó Dubhagáin, scribe to the Uí Cheallaigh, lords of Uí Mhaine.¹²⁰ If this represents his first discovery of what we know as the Book of Uí Mhaine, it sug-

of Colgan’s *Acta* under the shelfmark LO 1929 (2) in the National Library of Ireland. It had reached the security of the Royal Dublin Society’s library in Leinster House well before 1877, though precisely when is not known. It was cited for the sake of O’Flaherty’s notes by the Revd John O’Hanlon (1821–1905) in various volumes of his *Lives of Irish Saints, compiled from calendars, martyrologies, and various sources relating to the ancient Church History of Ireland*, for example, ii. 666; iii. 732n; vii. 519n (I owe these references to Prof. Pádraig Ó Riain). O’Hanlon began work on this as early as 1856, and it was published as a part-work, with 9 vols and part of the tenth appearing between 1875 and about 1902. His citations none the less refer to the Royal Dublin Society, not the National Library. This may be the copy of Colgan’s *Trias* already listed without additional detail in the published catalogue of the Society’s library by J. F. Jones (Dublin, 1839), 44. The Society was formed as far back as 1731, but no copy appears in earlier printed catalogues, and there seems no sure means of establishing when this copy was acquired.

¹¹⁸ The second inscription is written over the first. At the left-hand side of the decorative roundel, the writing of the both inscriptions is clear. At the right-hand side the surnames are less clear, and the second signature is much obscured.

¹¹⁹ Introduction, 170–78.

¹²⁰ *Ogygia*, [18]; Ó Muraile, 109, draws on this in considering Mac Fhirbhisigh’s earlier use of the manuscript. There is an eighteenth-century note in the manuscript

gests that his studies were already well under way when this source, one of the three manuscripts on which he leant most heavily, came to his knowledge. It had been known to Dr Lynch long before and to Mac Fhirbhisigh in 1645, and Ware had an account of the manuscript but had not seen it.¹²¹ We may suppose that it had remained at the earls' seat near Galway, Portumna Castle. O'Flaherty had family connexions with the earls, and he surely had entry to the castle.¹²² We may probably presume that he borrowed the book and worked closely with it, drawing on it for a range of texts, including some much cited ones. Indeed, unless he had an extended loan, one would imagine he made notes if not transcripts.

Another manuscript, with which he was still more closely acquainted, is referred to as Codex Lecanus, now the Book of Lecan, RIA MS 23 P. 2 (cat. 535). The manuscript is known to have been in the hands of James Ussher (1581–1656), protestant archbishop of Armagh, when that primate loaned it to Conell Mageoghagan on 4 August 1636, and from its old shelfmarks it is assumed to have come into the library of Trinity College with Ussher's books in 1661.¹²³ O'Flaherty refers to it as being in the college in 1686, and it must be supposed that he used it in the college library, though he does not say so directly.¹²⁴ His references are often to the precise folio, and his use of the book is so extensive that one must assume a long period of study and very likely the excerpting of passages he thought useful to his purpose.¹²⁵ One would tend to assume that he had the loan

itself, RIA MS [Stowe] D. ii. 1 (cat. 1225), old folio 69r, new folio 171r, beginning, 'For the right Honorable the Earle of Clanrickarde . . '. In RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fol. 109r, a marginal note added by O'Flaherty against Gilla Cóemáin's poem, *Annálad anall uile* reads: 'Habetur hoc poema in O Duvegani libro folio 174 pagina prima apud comitem Clanrickard' (noted by O'Connor, *Bibliotheca Stowensis*, 94).

¹²¹ Among Ware's papers, BL MS Lansdowne 418 (Clarendon 47), fol. 104, describes the book but does not name its owner.

¹²² In letter 2 he refers to the antlers of an Irish giant deer, 'kept for a monument in my Lord of Clanrickard's hous of Portomny', and no doubt on show to visitors.

¹²³ Ussher refers to the Book of Lecan as *Liber Sliguntinus* in his *Antiquitates*, 689, 855, 862, 882. Kathleen Mulchrone, in her catalogue description of RIA MS 23 D. 9 (cat. 148), printed a statement from 1644, which refers to Ussher's lending the book to Mageoghagan. In the facsimile, p. x, she cites J. H. Todd as saying that the old shelfmarks align with those in other books belonging to Ussher. The manuscript appeared in the catalogue at Trinity in 1688 but was missing in 1702; by 1703 it was at Saint-Germain. It is Nicolson who first states that it was taken from Trinity during James II's time in the college (*Irish Historical Library*, 39).

¹²⁴ Since he thought it was still in the college as late as 1707 (letter 29), we should not imagine that he was concerned to follow its migrations.

¹²⁵ See Appendix 2. O'Flaherty cites the manuscript by the foliation inserted in 1612 by Henry Piers, of Tristernagh (Co. Westmeath), which appears only faintly

of the book, but the college library was managed more tightly than that. Loans were not allowed, and the statutes of the college allowed visitors only if they were accompanied by the provost or one of the fellows, so at this date we must infer that O'Flaherty had someone in the college who would introduce him.¹²⁶ This work with the Book of Lecan must have been carried out in the fundamental stages of his work, so no later than the early 1670s and perhaps earlier.

If, as we have supposed, O'Flaherty stayed in Dublin for some time in the 1660s, his contacts may have extended beyond the small circle around Ware. This may have been the period when he became acquainted with the theologian Henry Dodwell (1641–1711). Their familiarity emerges only from a letter written in 1704, in which O'Flaherty asks after Dodwell, whom he had evidently known, and sends his service.¹²⁷ It is possible that they met in Sligo, where Dodwell may have had land, but it is perhaps more likely that they met in Dublin, where Dodwell was a member of Trinity College. In either case direct contact would presumably have ended in 1674, when Dodwell left Ireland. He would make a name for himself in England, and students of Dodwell's learning have taken little interest in his Irish background or contacts.¹²⁸ In 1683 Anthony Dopping, bishop of Meath, was involved in an attempt to have him appointed provost of Trinity in succession to Narcissus Marsh, but he was not successful.¹²⁹ William Molyneux refers to him as 'my particular

in the facsimile and the on-line images. The editor of the facsimile was unaware of O'Flaherty's use of the manuscript.

¹²⁶ This is mentioned as a drawback for scholars in a letter by Narcissus March (provost from January 1678/9 to May 1683) to Dr Thomas Smith, dated 19 January 1705/6, 'that which renders the library all but uselesse to all, but some of the college, is this, that by the college statutes, no man besides the provost and fellows is permitted to study there, unless carried up thither by one of them, who is bound to be present all the time the other staies in the library' (Bodl. MS Smith 52, fols. 121–8; J. H. Todd, 'Original letter of Archbishop Marsh', *The Christian Examiner* new ser. 2 (1833), 761–72; R. Gillespie, *Scholar Bishop: The Recollections and Diary of Narcissus Marsh, 1638–1696* (Cork, 2003), 58–67).

¹²⁷ Letter 18 and n. 168.

¹²⁸ Walter Harris, *The Whole Works of Sir James Ware concerning Ireland revised and improved* (Dublin, 1739–46), vol. iii, *The Writers of Ireland*, 264–8, includes a list of his works compiled by Thomas Hearne, in Oxford, who had known and admired Dodwell. Dodwell's scholarly career is well treated by J.-L. Quantin, 'Anglican scholarship gone mad? Henry Dodwell (1641–1711) and Christian antiquity', in *History of Scholarship*, ed. C. R. Ligota and J.-L. Quantin (Oxford, 2006), 305–356.

¹²⁹ In a letter the bishop tells Dodwell that he had written to the lord lieutenant of Ireland, James Butler (1610–1688), duke of Ormond, asking him to put Dodwell's name forward to King Charles for the appointment (Anthony Dopping to Henry Dodwell, dated 24 March 1682/3; Bodl. MS Eng. lett. c. 29 (SC 40785), fol. 50r; cited by Quantin, 313n). Along with MS Eng. lett. c. 28, this is one of two volumes of letters

friend and correspondent'.¹³⁰ Evidence for his keeping up his Irish connexions is limited, though he may have visited, and he certainly continued to benefit from the rents of his Irish estate until his death in 1711.¹³¹ It is an interesting reflection on both parties that O'Flaherty acknowledges the influence on him in 1685 or '6 of 'Mr Dodwell's letter'.¹³²

It is only in 1677, after Dodwell's departure from Dublin, that there is positive evidence to prove that O'Flaherty was admitted to the library of Trinity College. He examined the great gospel-book of Durrow on 19 June 1677, when he wrote and signed a note at the front of

to Dodwell; they include twelve letters written by Dopping between 1675 and 1685 as well as letters from others in Ireland, among them St George Ashe and William King.

¹³⁰ Sir Capel Molyneux, *An Account of the Family and Descendants of Sir Thomas Molyneux* (Evesham, 1820) (below, n. 242), 53–78, at pp. 76–8.

¹³¹ In a letter from Thomas Molyneux to William Molyneux, dated in London, 17 July 1683, we learn that Thomas has heard a good report of the medical school at Leiden. He goes on, 'Mr Dodwell also gives it the same character, with whom I met since I returned to London [*sc. from Oxford*], and gave him yours and the bishop's letter; he was very glad to see me, treated me at the coffee-house, and promised to write by me to Leiden' ([W. Wilde], 'Sir Thomas Molyneux MD', *Dublin University Magazine* 18 (1841), 305–327, 470–90, 604–619, 744–63, at 324). The bishop in this context must be their brother-in-law, Anthony Dopping (see n. 129 above), and it is apparent that contact was maintained between Dodwell and this family. White Kennett (1660–1728) knew Dodwell well; he was rector of Shottesbrooke (Berks), 1694–1700, a period when Dodwell lived there. Writing about the dotage of John Pearson (1613–1686), bishop of Chester, Kennett tells us, 'I well remember Mr Henry Dodwell, his great friend and fellow labourer, once told me at his house within my parish of Shottesbrooke, that in his way to or from Ireland he called to see the bishop at his palace in Chester' (E. Bridges, *Restituta; or Titles, Extracts, and Characters of Old Books* (London, 1814–16), i. 53): the visit in question can be dated to the last year or two of Pearson's life, 1685 or 1686. Dodwell kept up contact with Charles Leslie (1650–1722), another Irish non-juror living in England (*ODNB*). J. T. Gilbert, *HMC 2nd Rept* (1874), Appendix, 240–41, printed letters then in the possession of R. D. Lyons, from Dodwell to William King (1650–1729), the first dated at St Asaph, 9 February 1687/8 (now TCD MS 1995–2008/51a), when King was priest of St Werburgh's in Dublin; the second dated at Shottesbrooke, 7 December 1700, when King was bishop of Derry, was folded but not sealed inside a letter posted to Dr John Madden (1649–1703), in Dublin, also dated at Shottesbrooke, 7 December 1700, which also came into King's archive (TCD MS 1995–2008/741–2). Gilbert noted that evidence for Dodwell's Irish connexions was entirely missing from Brokesby's memoir of him. The letter to Madden has a political interest; it shows Dodwell's circulating a manuscript from c. 1635 'in defence of our Irish liberties' and reading William Molyneux's *The Case of Ireland's being bound by acts of parliament in England*, published amid some furore in 1698 (TCD MS 1995–2008/741; W. O'Sullivan, 'John Madden's manuscripts', *Essays on the History of the Library, Trinity College, Dublin* (Dublin, 2000), 104–15). Dr Madden was another brother-in-law of William Molyneux, having married Mary Molyneux (d. 1695); his collection of Irish historical manuscripts (*CMAH*, vol. ii, pt 2, 57–60) included material inherited from her grandfather Daniel Molyneux. For earlier evidence of Dodwell's continuing links with Dublin, see below, 57 and n. 182.

¹³² Letter 18 and n. 169; Introduction, 149.

it, mentioning the inscriptions of the *cumhdach* from the time of King Flann Sinna (d. 916).¹³³ In *Ogygia Vindicated*, he said, 'I have seen hand-writings of Saint Columba, in Irish characters, as straight and fair as any print, of above a thousand years standing, and in the college of Dublin Irish letters engraven in the time of Flann, king of Ireland, anno 916'.¹³⁴ He never doubted that the gospel-book was written by St Columba's own hand in the sixth century. O'Flaherty was the last person to record seeing its *cumhdach*, stolen in 1689, and, in his native Connacht, he was the first to record seeing the twelfth-century processional cross of Cong in 1680. He kept notes of the inscriptions on both these objects and, nearly twenty-five years later, communicated them to Edward Lhwyd.¹³⁵

Aside from these traces of his reading, the first documentary evidence for O'Flaherty's contacts in the capital comes in 1683. We know that William Molyneux wrote to O'Flaherty on 5 May 1683, a letter which O'Flaherty kept and reread in gaol thirteen years later.¹³⁶ Three weeks later, we learn that it was O'Flaherty who, by letter, introduced William Molyneux in Dublin to a physician, Dr Roger Mooney, arrived in Dublin within the last twelve months from the University of Paris.¹³⁷ Much later, we find that O'Flaherty refers to 'my great

¹³³ Letter 25 and n. 255. The Book of Durrow in its *cumhdach* and the Book of Kells had both been presented to the college within living memory by Henry Jones (1605–1682), bishop of Meath, who had assisted Archbishop Ussher in studying their texts of the gospels. This was reported from a conversation with Jones himself by Dr William Palliser, of Trinity College, in a letter to Henry Dodwell, dated at Dublin, 19 April 1681 (C. McNeill, *The Tanner Letters* (Dublin, 1943), 439–40; W. O'Sullivan, 'The donor of the Book of Kells', *Irish Historical Studies* 11 (1958–9), 5–7). The gift can hardly have been made before Jones became bishop on 25 May 1661.

¹³⁴ *Ogygia Vindicated*, 26.

¹³⁵ The evidence is hidden away, along with a reference to the lost *cumhdach* of the Book of Durrow, in the appendix to Lhwyd's Irish Dictionary, *Archaeologia Britannica*, 432b, 'Oroid in old inscriptions signifies prayer, and oruid pray for'. He quotes first the inscription from the *cumhdach* and then two of the inscriptions from the cross of Cong, first a Latin hexameter, 'Hac cruce crux tegitur qua passus conditor orbis', and then a commemoration in Irish, 'Oruid do Mhuireduch o Dubhthoigh do senoir Er-end. Orate pro Muredacho O Duffi Seniori Hiberniae. Copied from the Abbot of Cong's Cross, by Mr Flaherty, An. 1680'. O'Flaherty had presumably communicated these two inscriptions in his notes on Lhwyd's sheet V of the dictionary, not now extant. This source was known to George Petrie, 'On the Cross of Cong', *PRIA* 4 (1847–50), 572–85 (at p. 584), to whom Fr Patrick Prendergast (d. 1829), styled the last abbot of Cong, had shown the cross itself in 1822. It had been rediscovered in his time. His successor Fr Michael Waldron sold the cross in 1839 to Professor James MacCullagh (1809–1847), of Trinity College, who presented it to the Royal Irish Academy (a gift mentioned also by Hardiman, 8n). The cross is now in the National Museum.

¹³⁶ This lost letter is referred to in letter 1.

¹³⁷ William Molyneux to Dr Thomas Molyneux, dated at Dublin, 26 May 1683 (Wilde, 'Sir Thomas Molyneux', 316): 'On Mr Flaherty's account (whom I men-

friend Dr Loftus'. This is Dr Dudley Loftus, who held office in the court of chancery from the 1650s until his death as an old man in 1695.¹³⁸ Although he was not a high official, he had some seniority of position, and he was highly regarded as a scholar. His own annalistic compilation has survived, but he made no use of Irish annals.¹³⁹ He provided the approbation printed at the beginning of *Ogygia*, and in the work itself he was referred to as 'mihi intimus'.¹⁴⁰ Another recommendation of that work, headed 'Viri Clarissimi Richardi Bellings litterae' and addressed to O'Flaherty, says that hitherto the writer had often sought out O'Flaherty's friendly conversation on Irish chronology but was now delighted to read it. This is Richard Bellings, a catholic landowner with estates in Dublin, Wicklow, and Kildare, who died in September 1677.¹⁴¹

Far from being confined to his supposed poverty in Galway, O'Flaherty had his social contacts in Dublin. Dunton tells us that

tioned to you in my last) I am come acquainted with a physician of about thirty or forty years old in this town, one Dr Roger Mooney, come within this twelve months from the University of Paris'.

¹³⁸ Letter 33 and n. 13.

¹³⁹ The manuscript was acquired with the rest of Loftus's collection by Narcissus Marsh and is now Marsh's Library, MS Z4. 2. 7; discussed by E. Boran, 'Writing history in seventeenth-century Ireland: Dudley Loftus' Annals', in *Marsh's Library—A Mirror on the World: Law, learning, and libraries, 1650–1750*, ed. M. McCarthy and A. Simmons (Dublin, 2009), 203–233.

¹⁴⁰ *Ogygia*, 23.

¹⁴¹ 'Domine Flaherti, Chronologiam tuam legi, & perlegi; tantumque abfuit, ut reiterata ejus lectio mihi taedio fuerit, ut id ipsum, quod antehac familiari inter nos colloquio toties petierim, jam per literas enixe postulare in mentem venerit, scilicet, ut antiquissimae, & nobilissimae gentis res gestas ex illis tenebris, in quibus ingrattissima nostratum negligentia tot seculis latuerunt, educere, & luci reddere velis. Neminem enim novi, qui perspicaciori judicio eas ex antiquis monumentis colligere, & in integram formare historiam, aut stylo materiae aptiori eas posteris commendare possit. Quapropter, ut hanc subeas provinciam interim, atque iterum rogat Dominationis tuae amantissimus, Richardus Bellings' ('I have read and reread your Chronology, and yet this repeated reading was so far from boring me that it has come into my mind to ask earnestly by letter what I have so often before this said in our friendly discussions, namely that you should bring out of the darkness (in which by the ungrateful indifference of our people they have for ages lain hid) and restore to light the deeds of our most ancient and noble race. I know no one who can draw them from the ancient records with more piercing discrimination and shape them into a whole or in a style more fitting for this subject communicate them to later generations. Wherefore your most loving friend asks again and again that you make this province your responsibility'). It appears that this comes from a letter to O'Flaherty. The senatorial style *vir clarissimus* denotes a man of rank. Richard Bellings (c. 1603–1677) was himself the author of a work of contemporary history in defence of his role in the Catholic Confederacy in the 1640s, *History of the late Warre in Ireland*, which remained unpublished until printed by J. T. Gilbert as *History of the Irish confederation and the war in Ireland* by Richard Bellings (Dublin, 1882–91); R. Gillespie, 'The social thought of Richard Bellings', in *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s. Essays in honour of Donal Cregan* (Dublin, 2001), 212–28.

Brian O'Flaherty 'had conversed among the English' and 'had been at Dublin'; so too had Roderick O'Flaherty. Obviously he could afford to travel, and he must have made a respectable figure in society in the capital. He was able to mix with people of some wealth and standing.

What first brought him into contact with the obscure figure of Robert Downing, at least as early as January 1682, is now unknown.¹⁴² At that date William Molyneux had not embarked on his atlas, but over the next year or two he relied on Downing for several counties, Sligo and Mayo in the west, Down and Louth in the north. The fact that Downing knew both O'Flaherty and Molyneux does not necessarily make it likely that he brought O'Flaherty's name to Molyneux's attention for Galway.¹⁴³ We have seen that Molyneux approached O'Flaherty in May 1683. It is conspicuous that what evidence we have for their correspondence is dominated by antiquarian question and answer, even when written in difficult circumstances: letter 2 from O'Flaherty's time in Galway gaol apparently responds to queries from Molyneux about round towers and giant deer as well as alluding to the hoped-for publication of one of O'Flaherty's learned works.

There is no doubting that O'Flaherty's learning was broad. He takes delight in quoting from the Latin Classics, with which he appears to have kept up his acquaintance in adult life. He took pleasure in composing Latin verse, and examples have survived that were written at different dates over half a century. He shows a facility in quoting from the Latin Bible too, though his patristic reading appears nowhere near as extensive as his classical. He read widely in modern authors, and it is impossible to know how far he owned copies of the books he studied or had access to them by other means. A survey of O'Flaherty's reading is best presented as a list of works with some commentary: I have attempted this in Appendix 2 below. The latest-dated printed book cited by him, previous to his contact with Edward Lhwyd, was a work of catholic piety printed in 1691.¹⁴⁴ As well as printed books, O'Flaherty made extensive use of works in Irish that had never been printed. For the most part this appears as antiquarian learning more than engagement with contemporary Irish books, and he had know-

¹⁴² O'Flaherty's remarks on Borlase's book are addressed to Downing (Introduction, 64–5).

¹⁴³ Downing's contributions on Mayo and Sligo have been printed and discussed by N. Ó Muraíle (Introduction, 83 n. 248).

¹⁴⁴ This is *The Life of the Lady Warner of Parham in Suffolk*, referred to in letter 30 (and see also n. 325). His having this edition and not a later one may be a sign that it was bought in 1691–2, when he was residing at Moycullen.

ledge of older Irish texts, sometimes through medieval manuscripts, sometimes through recent copies.

O'Flaherty's place in Irish antiquarian learning is surely singular. His nearest precursors within Ireland, the priest, Dr Geoffrey Keating (c. 1580–no later than 1644), and the layman, Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh (c. 1600–1671), genealogist to O'Flaherty's kinsman Daithí Ó Dubhda, wrote in Irish and circulated their work in manuscript. O'Flaherty wrote his *Ogygia* in Latin and saw it printed in London and published by booksellers both there and in Dublin. His other works were written in English. He was not accustomed to writing in Irish, though he certainly knew how to.¹⁴⁵ In exchanging poems with the poet Seán Ó Gadhra (1648–c. 1720), of Cnoc Reamhar (Knockraver), Co. Sligo, O'Flaherty responded in Latin to Ó Gadhra's Irish verses; and when he died, Ó Gadhra paid him the compliment of a commemoration in Latin elegiacs, which have survived in a single copy.¹⁴⁶ Traditional mechanisms for circulating Irish works in manuscript may therefore not have been open to him, nor could he print his Latin work without help. Yet by the time *Ogygia* was published, it may already have seemed old-fashioned to write in Latin. O'Flaherty's later works were written in English but remained unpublished. He has no conspicuous successor in Ireland until Charles O'Connor of Belanagare, publishing in English in Dublin in the later eighteenth century.¹⁴⁷

His attitude to Keating is particularly interesting, for though he shows a considerable debt to his *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, explicit citation is remarkably rare. At one point, in criticizing another for using Keating under the guise of chronicles and records, he makes a direct point about Keating: 'although he was a man of manifold reading in the antiquities of his country, he acted like that one, among the four seasoners of salad, who picked herbs of every kind, these and those,

¹⁴⁵ 'As for Irish composition I am, as far to seek, as you are, having never practis'd as much, as to write an Irish letter to a friend', he says in letter 10 (p. 235), yet he is quite ready to explain matters of Irish orthography to Lhwyl.

¹⁴⁶ Seán Ó Gadhra names O'Flaherty ('scafaire an léiginn', 'stalwart of learning') alongside Tadhg Ó Rodaighe ('scoluidhe tréitheach', 'virtuous teacher') and himself in his lament for the decline of Irish antiquarian learning, but this is not confined to learning in Irish; he includes Keating, Lynch and Colgan, Ussher and Ware, and even Peter Walsh ([S.] Mac Domhnaill, *Dánta is Amhráin Sheáin Uí Ghadhra* (Dublin, 1955), 11–18, no. 1). Their exchange of verses is printed there, 24–8, no. 4, though it should be noted that most manuscript copies exclude O'Flaherty's Latin. Ó Gadhra's Latin poems for O'Flaherty are known only from RIA MS [Stowe] I. v. 1 (cat. 745), p. 74 (ib. 60–63, nos. 21–2).

¹⁴⁷ Fr Paul Walsh traced the line of succession from O'Flaherty to Charles O'Connor of Belanagare to John O'Donovan ('John O'Donovan, Irish historical scholar 1806–1861', in *Irish Men of Learning* (Dublin, 1947), 263–72, at p. 267).

without discrimination'.¹⁴⁸ In his correspondence he is adamant that his own work was chronologically superior to Keating's, and he reprimands Lhwyd more than once for referring to Keating's unprinted work in preference to his own published *Ogygia*.¹⁴⁹ O'Flaherty did not see himself as handing on Irish tradition but as testing the Irish historical record against international sources, aligning native, biblical, and classical chronology. His learning is better understood as chronological, even historical, than as narrowly Irish.¹⁵⁰

Even so, there is nothing about his work that suggests engagement with modern scholarship. Ussher's *Antiquitates*, written in the 1630s, is a work that speaks more readily to the twenty-first-century student than *Ogygia*. O'Flaherty has read Ussher with care, cites him, and cites early authors through Ussher, but he makes a completely different impression. The simplest explanation may be that he was essentially self-taught and never learnt the interaction of scholarship. He was always convinced that he was right, even if he nods his head in deference to others occasionally with a Latin tag.¹⁵¹ It would hardly be too strong to say that he appears deaf to all works written after his own *Ogygia*. He gives not the least sign of having read Peter Walsh's *Prospect of the State of Ireland*, printed under the initials P. W. in London in 1682, though he knew of its existence.¹⁵² He did not modify

¹⁴⁸ *Ogygia*, 211 (my translation, correcting 'omnes generis' to 'omnis generis').

¹⁴⁹ Letters 23, 26, and 28.

¹⁵⁰ Walter Harris, in making the comparison with Lynch, writes, 'O'Flaherty hath greatly the advantage of this our author in his chronological calculations; as indeed he hath of all others who have writ on that subject so far as relates to Ireland' (*Writers of Ireland*, 164).

¹⁵¹ A favourite tag, *Cupio doceri, dedoceri non erubescio* ('I want to be taught and am not ashamed to be corrected'), appears four times in the letters. See letter 1 and n. 10.

¹⁵² The only mention of Walsh's *Prospect* is in letter 1, a reference repeated from Stillingfleet by O'Flaherty, who did not even interpret the writer's initials. Even so, a tradition has grown up that O'Flaherty was severely critical of Walsh's book, which was not printed until the final copying of *Ogygia*. The starting-point of this is William Nicolson's *Irish Historical Library* (Dublin, 1724), 48, where Nicolson says, 'This honest Father Walsh is the same Modern Historian upon whom O'Flaherty has let fly a whole chapter of remarks; for his pretending to criticism in the Irish language, when he speaks of King Ængus's Sirname of Olmucadh, those of Malcolme, O'Brien, O'Neil, Cairnes'. The chapter to which he refers is *Ogygia*, 207–212, where these are indeed points made by 'quidam nostras modernus scriptor' ('a modern writer of ours') and refuted by O'Flaherty. J. H. Todd has even noted 'Peter Walsh' against this line in his copy of *Ogygia* now in Cambridge. In the earliest text of O'Flaherty's work, penned before Walsh wrote, the passage is already present (NLI MS 665, p. 43), though worded slightly differently: the section begins simply, 'Verum huic nomini Olmucadh', but in print 'verum' was replaced with 'quidam nostras modernus scriptor'; a side-note in the manuscript, however, reads, 'Libellus de nominum etymis'. Who the modern writer was is an open question, but this is the best clue we have. There is in any case nothing in Walsh's *Prospect* that resembles the points in question, so we

a sentence in *Ogygia* to take account of it. And after *Ogygia* was published, other works are only compared to it and found deficient. We shall see that O'Flaherty cites Edward Stillingfleet's work without approval. Not sharing Stillingfleet's fundamental difference with Sir George Mackenzie, he none the less attacks Mackenzie for his traditional Scottish view of the past. And his reading of William Nicolson's *Scottish Historical Library* is self-regarding and unsympathetic.

A striking contrast is provided by the letters concerning Lhwyd's Irish glossary. In commenting on the Welshman's unpublished sheets, the Irishman does not put himself forward as a scholar of the language but writes always and only from his personal experience as a native speaker in Cois Fhairrge.¹⁵³ He shows no previous knowledge of the glossarial sources used by Lhwyd and does not seek to contradict them. He wishes only to be cited for historical knowledge, as he says in a note written on one of the last sheets of the dictionary: 'I pray doe not make use of my name for any word of the Dictionary except it be already publick in *Ogygia*. But for historical passages in case you have the occasion you may quote me as I may account this of Belfast. For I would \not/ presume to be an author of words of the language; as in relation to a Dictionary'.¹⁵⁴ None the less he had some confidence in his detection of error.¹⁵⁵ His notes on Lhwyd's glossary do not survive in their entirety, but there is a good deal still extant in his own hand which should be of some interest for Irish lexicography

must suppose that Nicolson's identification was mistaken. None the less, Hardiman, 423n, repeats Nicolson's comment, explaining O'Flaherty's hostility to Walsh as due to the latter's 'advocacy of Ormond, the determined enemy of old Irish proprietors'; O'Donovan, OS Galway, iii. 484, had a similar explanation in terms of Walsh's affinity with the earls of Clanricarde, who, he supposed, had dispossessed O'Flaherty. One or other may lie behind Bernadette Cunningham's judgement, that *Ogygia* 'drew attention to the value of Keating's history, though simultaneously criticizing Peter Walsh's efforts' ('Historical Writing, 1660–1750', in *Oxford History of the Irish Book* iii *The Irish Book in English 1550–1800* (Oxford, 2005), 264–81, at p. 273).

¹⁵³ 'Ego, cui Scotica uernacula est' ('I whose mother-tongue is Irish') (*Ogygia*, 244), in a context implying his good grasp of the language.

¹⁵⁴ O'Flaherty's comment is written on the sheet with the signature Ee of the Irish–English dictionary in TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 8. Here the entry referring to Belfast reads: '†Uirthrena, Feirsde; *The pits or lakes of water remaining on the Strands at ebb or low-water. From this word Feirsde (which in the singular is Fërsad) the Town of Béal na Feirsde [Angl. Bel Fast] has been denominated.* Fl. For uirthrenaibh na traghá, i.e. Ar fearsadaibh na traghá. Cl.' (sig. Ee2vc). For this sense of *fearsad*, gen. *feirsde*, one must look to a Scottish example in Lhwyd's appendix, 'Fearsde, streams, or stagnations of low water' (p. 430a).

¹⁵⁵ 'If I erre in any of my notes, impute it rather to my insufficiency, than to any want of good will to serve you; yet sure I am, my errorrs cannot be but very few, in what I ventur to cross out: So that I would not have you confide much in my notes, nor wave them but on good grounds of better light' (letter 15).

as representing the unmediated testimony of a local Irish-speaker in the seventeenth century.¹⁵⁶

Lhwyd and O'Flaherty also discussed ideas about the relationship of languages, O'Flaherty conveys the impression of a genuine interest in the topic, and he was manifestly well versed in the received biblical opinion on the origin of languages. Two letters expressing his reactions on reading the work of the Abbé Pezron in 1706 are particularly interesting.¹⁵⁷ In such matters, however, it is clear that he is an intelligent layman, capable of taking the interest to inform himself and think about the subject but not applying his mind with the concentration he devotes to matters of chronology. The breadth of his interest, however, is surely a key factor in making his description of Iar-Connacht so much richer and more interesting than the accounts of other counties drawn up by others for the same purpose.¹⁵⁸

During the 1660s O'Flaherty developed his antiquarian interests in the circle of Ware and Mac Fhirbhisigh, and in the 1670s he engaged with John Lynch and drafted his own book in Latin. Ware had had the resources to pay a printer, Lynch had the backing of the episcopal printing press in Saint-Malo, but O'Flaherty's route to publication was not secure. We may well ask why was *Ogygia* not printed in Dublin in 1676 with the support of Dudley Loftus and Richard Bellings. It needed a patron, and it found one only in 1683, when O'Flaherty first encountered William Molyneux. This opened a successful period in O'Flaherty's life. *Ogygia* was published in 1685. It was in press when the succession of James II brought joy to catholics, and in 1688 O'Flaherty celebrated the birth of a catholic heir by printing a Latin poem on the occasion.¹⁵⁹ Then in 1689, the way was opened for him to return to Moycullen. In the 1690s his world changed dramatically. He was turned out of Moycullen and returned to Park with less than before, and by the end of 1696, when we first meet him in his letters, he was in Galway gaol.

All along he had professed his loss of estate but he did not proclaim himself poor. Yet his poverty has been much remarked upon. Two pieces of evidence are repeatedly cited. The first is his lack of money to pay postage on receipt, exemplified by a remark of Edward Lhwyd to Dr Molyneux in 1700.¹⁶⁰ Postage was seen by many people at the

¹⁵⁶ Introduction, 132–4. The sheets are briefly mentioned in the catalogue by Abbott & Gwynn, 260, and from there by Robin Flower in his introduction to *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1926–53), iii. 21n.

¹⁵⁷ Letters 26 and 27.

¹⁵⁸ Introduction, 83–4.

¹⁵⁹ Introduction, 72.

¹⁶⁰ Introduction, 115. This point about his being 'scarce able to pay postage' gained

time as an avoidable cost, which reduces its significance as an indicator. From time to time O'Flaherty had to pay for his postage and does not make much complaint.¹⁶¹ And in all his writing he never hints that he could not afford to buy paper to write on.¹⁶² The second is an observation by Samuel Molyneux that he called on 'old O'Flaherty, who lives very old, in a miserable condition at Park [. . .] I expected to have seen here some old Irish manuscripts, but his ill fortune has stripped him of these as well as his other goods'.¹⁶³ O'Flaherty in 1709 was in his eightieth year, which no doubt had some effect on his personal 'condition'. And this is the view of a well-off nineteen-year-old from Dublin, unfamiliar with the west. It would irk John O'Donovan in 1839, who none the less helped to make it more widely known.¹⁶⁴ O'Flaherty's difficulties with money and debt were no doubt real dur-

its currency, I suspect, from Hardiman, 427 (for which see below, 79 and n. 237). Hardiman qualified the sentence immediately, adding, 'It may here be observed that the destitution thus described was not confined to our author alone; it was largely shared by the Irish gentry in general at the time'.

¹⁶¹ Letter 23 arrives with ten folio sheets, for which he would have paid at a rate of 3/8 per ounce, yet O'Flaherty says, 'your letter was acceptable to me at any rate'.

¹⁶² I have no evidence for the price of paper in Galway at this date. From Narcissus Marsh's accounts, presented to Robert Boyle, for the transcription of the Irish Old Testament (Marsh to Boyle, dated at Stapleton, Co. Carlow, 24 August 1685; Hunter, v. 124-5; Maddison, 'Robert Boyle and the Irish Bible', 95), we can infer that in the 1680s a quire comprised twenty-four sheets and cost 6d or 8d in Dublin: 720 sheets cost 18/-, made up of 18 quires at 8d (subtotal of 12/-) and the rest at 6d (i.e. 12 quires costing 6/-); the 720 sheets is therefore made up of 30 quires, each comprising 24 sheets. In 1710 the cost in Edinburgh was twice that, 'Each quair of new papers or pamphlets sixteen shillings per quair' [16s Scots=16d English] (*Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh* [vol. xiv] 1701-1718, ed. H. Armet (Edinburgh, 1967), 199).

¹⁶³ 'Journey to Connacht, April 1709', ed. A. Smith in *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (Dublin, 1846), 161-178, quoted more fully below, Introduction, 166-7. It is not apparent whether this was known independently to Hardiman, O'Donovan, and Smith, or whether one provided it to the others. Aquilla Smith (1806-1890) was acknowledged by Hardiman, p. viii, 'for many facilities of obtaining information' and for helping to see his book through press.

¹⁶⁴ Samuel Molyneux also remarks on what he heard of the barbarous lawlessness of the country west of Galway, something which his editor, Aquilla Smith, contrasts with comments by O'Flaherty in *Iar-Connaught*. John O'Donovan, working with the Ordnance Survey, was unimpressed by Samuel's views on life in Cois Fhairrge and picked on these words, 'I did not see all this way three living creatures [. . .]'. At this O'Donovan expostulates, 'Molyneux, the real savage, here gets vexed with the manners of the people, of whom he tells us he saw no one at all! [. . .] for he says he did not see three living creatures (not even seagulls!). Such a savage as he was would form the same opinion at this day of the inhabitants of Connamara, but he would indeed be very much mistaken' (OS Galway, iii. 162). The text was quoted by Hardiman, 428, in 1846, the year of its publication in the same series by Aquilla Smith. In another publication of the same year, the young D'Arcy McGee (1825-1868), only recently returned to Ireland in 1845, thanked 'my friend Mr O'Donovan for this extract' and

ing the period reflected in our letters, but we should be chary of letting young Samuel determine our perceptions.

Shortage of money was not always his own problem so much as a wider one: in 1702, for example, he refers to 'a time now, wherein never was there such scarcity of money'.¹⁶⁵ His difficulty with money-transactions need not mean that his neighbours would have regarded him as a poor man.¹⁶⁶ His house was as big as the big house at Renvyle occupied by his kinsman Capt Edmund O'Flaherty, whom Lhwyd also met.¹⁶⁷ Money in Connemara was not as fundamental as it was in Dublin. And disinherited though he was, O'Flaherty must yet have been well able to support himself and his family.

If it goes beyond the evidence to imagine O'Flaherty in penury at the very end of the seventeenth century, it is much more of a mistake to think that this was his condition for the whole of his life. Hardiman over-emphasised his subject's poverty even while documenting

included it with a vague reference to 'MSS' in his hasty account of O'Flaherty, *The Irish Writers of the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 1846), 200–209 (at p. 207).

¹⁶⁵ Letter 4. The truth of the matter may be seen from the steep decline in receipts by the revenue commission between 1700 and 1703 (tables in C. I. McGrath, *The Making of the Eighteenth-Century Irish Constitution* (Dublin, 2000), 50–55).

¹⁶⁶ One could even be prosperous without much use of hard cash (D. Corkery, *The Hidden Ireland* (Dublin, 1924), 48–9).

¹⁶⁷ For Capt Edmund O'Flaherty, see letter 19, 'where you were on your travel with Capt Edmund Flaherty', and n. 175. The remains of Roderick's house at Park were visited by John O'Donovan in 1839. His account of the visit has been quoted at the front of this book, and James Hardiman's description is derived from it: 'The house is about sixty feet in length with one little chamber off it to the west. Immediately to the south of the house is a low rock, covered with a green mossy sward, commanding an extensive view of the sea, the three islands of Aran, and a considerable extent of the northern coast of Clare. On this rock our author is said to have spent much of his time in viewing the sublimity of the prospect' (Hardiman, 427n). It is more austere described as a rectangular drystone structure, 15.9 × 5.3 m, with a doorway in N wall by P. Gosling, *Archaeological Inventory of County Galway i West Galway* (Dublin, 1993), 64 (no. 356). The doorway of course faces away from the sea view. A description of the old house at Renvyle as seen in 1811 and remembered in 1823 is provided by 'H.' [i.e. Henry Blake], *Letters from the Irish Highlands* (London, 1825), 14–15: "The big house", then, was a thatched cabin about sixty feet long by twenty wide, and to all appearance only one story high. It ostensibly contained an eating parlour and sitting room, about twenty feet long by sixteen or seventeen feet wide, or as they are called in this country, two reception-rooms, from each of which opened two small bed-rooms. We had oral [aural] evidence in the night, that there was other accommodation in the thatch, but those who had the benefit of it were placed far beyond our ken. Conceive then our surprise at being gradually introduced to at least two dozen individuals, all parlour boarders'. The O'Flaherty at that date, 'lineal descendant from the old Kings of the West, O'Flaherties of centuries long since gone by', was aged 86, a JP, and made £1500 p.a. from the estate, on which he lived as middleman for the proprietor, Henry Blake. The allusiveness of the Blake letters is usefully glossed by G. St J. Williams, *A Sea-Grey House. The history of Renvyle House* (Renvyle House, Co. Galway, 1995).

circumstances in which he secured title to an ample farm in Cois Fhairrge. The most critical juncture was his removal from Moyculen after King William's conquest of Ireland. It is in this context only that O'Flaherty refers to the loss of books. Even after that, however, he had not parted with all of them. At least one manuscript was still in his hands in 1706, now RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2; this collection of verse copied by Br Mícheál Ó Cléirigh in 1627–8 had been in his hands since before 1671. He was still writing in his copy of Colgan's *Trias* in 1704, which was one of several printed works besides his own *Ogygia* available to him to quote by page-number in his letters.¹⁶⁸ At one point he specifies that he quotes the pages of the original edition of Ussher's *Antiquitates*, because he did not have the second edition to hand.¹⁶⁹ The image of old O'Flaherty, bereft and destitute, is surely misleading.

O'Flaherty's life is most brightly visible when he was in his seventies. Our last letter dates from his eightieth year. He found comfort in his faith, embracing his misfortunes as the will of God. By 1709, when Samuel Molyneux commented on his 'miserable condition', O'Flaherty's strength was failing. His handwriting had deteriorated, perhaps a sign of poor health, and he may have become more dependent on the help of others. Charles O'Connor of Belanagare told James Hely that, towards the end of his life, O'Flaherty 'was shamefully neglected by his countrymen, and Counsellor Terence MacDonagh, of Creevagh, in the county of Sligo, was his best patron and friend'.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Appendix 2.

¹⁶⁹ Letter 22.

¹⁷⁰ The sole evidence for this is O'Connor's statement, reported by James Hely in the preface to his translation of *Ogygia*, xi. It has been blended with statements that Terence Mac Donagh (Toirrdhealbhadh Mac Donnchadha), known as the Counsellor for his legal skill, protected his wife's kinsman, Thaddeus O'Rourke (Tadhg Ó Ruairc), Roman Catholic bishop of Killala from 1707 to 1735. The bishop is said to have resided in Mac Donagh's household before 1713 and thereafter with Mac Donagh's nephew by marriage, Denis O'Connor, first at Knockmore and later at Belanagare; Denis's son Charles O'Connor knew him well (Introduction, 178–9). J. C. Mac Donagh adds: 'It is painful to record that the aged and poverty-stricken O'Flaherty, who survived his patron by several years, died in utter want, at Moycullen [*sic*!], in the midst of the vast estates which had been snatched from him by Cromwell' ('Counsellor Terence Mac Donagh', *Studies* 36 (1947), 307–318, at p. 313). He also reports that Bishop O'Rourke was betrayed to the government in March 1712, by O'Flaherty's son-in-law Edward Tyrrell (see letter 38 and n. 29). Charles O'Connor recalled that he had seen 'a small part' of *Ogygia christiana* in O'Flaherty's 'own hand-writing, and found in the study of his great friend and patron, Colonel Terence Mac Donagh, of Creevagh' (*Dissertations on the history of Ireland* (Dublin, 1766), xii); since O'Connor was a toddler when Mac Donagh died, he must have seen this piece years later, and he does not even say that it was still at Creevagh. Sheehan misrepresents this, 'O'Connor had

Terence Mac Donagh himself died in 1713, and it is not clear what kind of support he provided nor how secure the evidence for it is.

The date of O'Flaherty's death has often been stated as 8 April 1718, in his eighty-ninth year, on the authority of Walter Harris, whose source is unknown.¹⁷¹ When George O'Flahertie, heir to Lemonfield, restated that date, more than a century later, there can be no certainty that he had better authority than Harris.¹⁷² Yet month and, arguably, year, may be supported on some contemporary evidence. O'Flaherty was commemorated in two Latin elegies by Seán Ó Gadhra. One of these ends:¹⁷³

Lugeo vestra morte Joannes Gara poeta
Cui dederas studii scripta legenda tui.
Aetatis vestrae prope nonagesimus annus
Et septem decies contigit esse meae.
In mense Aprili existi Roderice Flaherty,
Aetate annosa regna beata tenes.

I Seán Ó Gadhra, poet, to whom you had given the writings of your study, so fit for reading, mourn for your death. Almost the ninetieth year of your age is at hand, and the seventieth of mine. In the month of April you have been, Roderick O'Flaherty, and now in old age you have the blessed kingdom.

at one time seen several of O'Flaherty's manuscripts in MacDonagh's library' ('Contribution of Charles O'Conor', 231). Diarmaid Ó Catháin adds, 'another whom he took in when the latter was reduced to penury in his old age was Roderic O'Flaherty or Ruairi Ó Flaithearta (1629–1718)' ('Charles O'Conor of Belanagare', *JSAL* 119 (1989), 136–63, at p. 138). In 2004, in the *ODNB*, James McGuire says that 'in his day MacDonagh had a reputation for generosity to Gaelic poets, catholic clergy, and not least the impoverished scholar Roderick O'Flaherty'.

¹⁷¹ Harris, *Writers of Ireland*, 271–2, states that O'Flaherty died 8 April 1718, when he was in his eighty-ninth year. He cites no authority. The absence of any reference to Seán Ó Gadhra among his *Writers* may be taken as evidence that he did not know the Latin elegy.

¹⁷² G. F. O'Flahertie to John O'Donovan, 8 August 1839 (OS Galway, i. 8), writes, 'Looking over some papers I found a statement that Roderic O'Flaherty was a learned and studious farmer at Park in the barony of Moycullen, born in 1630 and died, April 8th 1718 in the eighty-ninth year of his age'. Reporting to the Ordnance Survey, O'Donovan interpolates, 'which is supported by Mr Harris and Mr O'Conor'. O'Flahertie's statement represents synthesis rather than record. It goes on, 'He was married and had issue one son and some daughters. His son died an officer in the Austrian Service' [this is new information]. 'He was unjustly defrauded of his estate in Cromwell's time, being a minor when it was forfeited and it was not restored by the Act of Settlement 1662' [this is a very vague view of the Connacht confiscations].

¹⁷³ Printed from a manuscript once owned by Charles O'Conor, now RIA MS [Stowe] I. v. 1 (cat. 745), section C, written by Ruaidhrí Ruadh Mac Diarmada, 1758, p. 74, by T. Ó Donnchadha, 'Seán Ó Gadhra, file, [pt] 19', *Gaelic Journal* 17 (no. 204, Sept 1907), 393–6, and by Mac Domhnaill, *Dánta is Amhráin Sheáin Uí Ghadhra*, 60–62 (no. 21).

In these verses Ó Gadhra includes a *chronostichon*, a line of verse in which those letters that have a value in Roman numerals add up to give a date: 'In Mense aprILI eXIstI roDerICe fLaherty', in which MDC LL XIII III add up to give the year 1716. Capitals are used in the manuscript both for initials and for numerals, but the L in Flaherty is missed. Ó Donnchadha's edition follows the manuscript, but Mac Domhnaill failed to reflect the significance of the numerals. Dying in April 1716 Roderick would have been in his eighty-seventh year, which may have been close enough to ninety for poetry. Another document, however, speaks in favour of 1716 rather than 1718. On 15 February 1717, Roderick's son, 'Michael O'Flaherty of Parke, gentleman', began a law-suit in the Irish court of chancery; his plaint refers to his father as 'Roger Flaherty, late of Parke, Esq.', evidence that he was by then deceased; Michael set about confirming his title to his father's estate, which had been claimed by his neighbour Richard Martin, Nimble Dick.¹⁷⁴ The plaint says that Martin had exploited the fact that Roderick was 'a quiet and easy man, no ways conversant with law affairs, having during his life addicted himself to other studies of history and antiquities of this kingdom'. There is no mistaking the implication of Michael O'Flaherty's plaint that his father was dead at the time. I incline, therefore, to think that Ó Gadhra's 1716 may have more in its favour than Harris's 1718.

The Writings of Roderick O'Flaherty

At this point I provide a list of O'Flaherty's known writings so far as possible in date order. Only three works were published in his lifetime, *Ogygia* (1685), the essay for Dr Lynch prefixed to it but dated '1665' (surely for 1675), and the verses on the birth of James Edward Francis Stuart, prince of Wales (1688). The notes on each work bring together what is known of the textual evidence and the date for each work.

Hymns for St Patrick, St Columba, and St Brigit, rewritten versions of those printed in Colgan's *Trias*, entered in Roderick O'Flaherty's hand in his own copy of the book:

¹⁷⁴ Introduction, 23–4. Passages from the plaint are quoted by Hardiman, 429–30, who states the date as 15 February 1717. He gives no precise reference susceptible of verification. If the source wrote the year as 1717, Lady Day reckoning would convert to 1717/18, but February is still before April. Hardiman may have taken Lady Day reckoning into account with a source that said 1716/17. Alternatively, if the source used a regnal year, as a legal record might, Hardiman ought to have correctly converted 3 George to AD 1717.

- ‘Exultet populus Christicolūm pius’ [rewriting in sapphics ‘Exultent filii matris ecclesiae’, *Trias*, 189, using blank p. 316];
 ‘Affulget en clarissima’ [revising ‘Ecce fulget clarissima’, *Trias*, 189–90];
 ‘Iesu corona praesulum / gregem pusillum respice’ [revising ‘Iesu corona praesulum / conserva tuum populum’, *Trias*, 192];
 ‘Splendidus collo roseo Columba’ [rewriting in sapphics ‘Columba penna nivea collo splendens roseo’, *Trias*, 454];
 ‘Iesu redemptor omnium / servos benigne respice / mites Columbae sedul[os] / castosque fac suffra[gia]’ [revising ‘Iesu redemptor omnium’, *Trias*, 455];
 ‘Festiva iam solemnitas / fulget diei Brigida’ [revising ‘Adest dies laetitiae’, *Trias*, 599];
 ‘Christo canamus gloriam / qui per beatam Brigidam / miraculorum copia / Hiberniam adornat patriam’ [revising ‘Christo canamus gloriam’, *Trias*, 599];
 ‘Clara perennis / fax bonitatis / Brigida coeli / Sole corusco / splendor, nos / ducat ad aulam’ [rewriting in adonics ‘Brigida virgo perennis bonitatis’, Colgan’s Latin rendering from Irish, *Trias*, 606].

These verses are all entered in O’Flaherty’s own copy of Colgan’s *Trias*, now NLI LO 1929 (2). Several of them are signed by him, e.g. *Trias*, 316, 453, ‘Ora pro R O Flaherty’, and below the name ‘xxix’. The best construction I can put upon the Roman numerals is that O’Flaherty indicates that he composed these verses in the twenty-ninth year of his age, 1658.

Unpublished.

Verse translation of the Prophecy of St Iarlaithe, quoted by Dr John Lynch: ‘S. Hierlathi vaticinium [. . .] ex huius vaticinii Latina versione a D. Roger O Flaherty elaborata, quae de hoc Ioanne praesagiuntur, hic subjicio,

Inde potens, a quo stat (verum testor) Iesus,
 Perpetuo huic bonitas, qui mihi fidus erit’

(‘St Iarlath’s prophecy [. . .] I here introduce what is said about this John [Burke] from the Latin rendering of this prophecy composed by Mr Roger O’Flaherty, [. . .]’).

This couplet is quoted by Dr John Lynch in his treatise, *De praesulibus Hiberniae* (1672), fol. 945, edited by J. F. O’Doherty (Dublin, 1944), ii. 257. The subject is John Burke (Ioannes de Burgo) (1590–1667), archbishop of Tuam from 1647 to his death in 1667, for whom O’Flaherty also composed a Latin epitaph. Dr Lynch was archdeacon of Tuam from 1630. What the prophecy is has eluded me, but it must have been composed after 1647. If John was the last bishop named before pro-

phesy took over, then it may have been composed towards the end of his life or a little later. His successor, James Lynch, was provided to the see in January 1669, and if he were mentioned, the date-range shrinks to between then and the completion of John Lynch's book in 1672. O'Flaherty would appear to have been translating a contemporary prophecy.

Verse translation into elegiac couplets of Maol Mhuire Ó hUiginn's poem, 'Slán uaim don dá aoghaire'; the Latin version is untraced but it is referred to by Dr John Lynch: 'politis Hibernicis versibus ad Raymundum O Galchuir Dorensem et Richardum Macbradaigh Kilmorensem episcopum missis, desiderium quo patriae adeundae ardebat expressit; quos elegiae latinae vir nobilis Rogerus O Flaherti accurate mandavit' ('the longing with which he burned to return home he expressed in polished Irish verses, sent to Réamonn Ó Gallchobhair and Risteard Mac Brádaigh, the bishops of Derry and Kilmore, which that gentleman Roger O'Flaherty perfectly rendered in Latin elegiacs').

Dr John Lynch, *De praesulibus Hiberniae* (1672), fol. 925, edited by J. F. O'Doherty (Dublin, 1944), ii. 244, in his account of Maol Mhuire Ó hUiginn, archbishop of Tuam, who died at Antwerp in 1590. Maol Mhuire was the brother of Tadhg Dall Ó hUiginn. He was a Franciscan who spent most of his life in study on the Continent and was provided to the see of Tuam in 1586. The address to Réamonn Ó Gallchobhair (1521–1601), bishop of Derry 1569–1601, and Risteard Mac Brádaigh OFM (d. 1607), bishop of Kilmore 1580–1607, points to a date between 1580 and 1590. The poem in question must be 'Slán uaim don dá aoghaire / 'gá bhfuil an .R. 'na dtosach' (5 qq.), sent to two pastors with the initial R (T. F. O'Rahilly, *Measgra Dánta i* (Cork, 1927), 143–4, no. 53). O'Rahilly was unaware that Lynch, still unpublished in 1927, had provided their names. He took his text from the Book of the O'Conor Don, written in 1631, fol. 25v, with the ascription, 'Maol Muire Ua hUiginn .i. airdeasbac Tuama', collated with two anonymous seventeenth-century copies in RIA MS 23 F. 16 (cat. 2, Book of Ó Gadhra), p. 191, and MS 23 D. 4 (cat. 5), p. 136. The first quatrain is quoted in Francis O'Molloy's *Grammatica Latino-Hibernica* (Rome, 1677), 206, and from there in *Archaeologia Britannica*, 307.

Epitaph for John Burke (d. 1667), archbishop of Tuam, quoted by Dr John Lynch: 'animam septuaginta septem annos natus exhalavit 4 Aprilis 1667, in ipsa Coena Domini. In vigilia vero Paschatis ad memoratum sacellum funere sat solenni, archiepiscopo protestante paulo ante defuncto, elatus est. Cuius aetatem mortis et exilii tempus, fortitudinem in adversis, et liberalitatem in secundis D. Rogerus O Flahertie hoc epitaphio complexus est,

INTRODUCTION

Post sex undecies sexcentas milleque brumas,
 Aprilis quarta proximior die,
 In Coena Domini dominus Tuamensis Iesu
 Fit commensalis, cui famulatus erat.
 Quinque ter exul erat, cui vitae lustra tot, annos;
 Sorte hilaris dura, largus et ante bona.
 In decimo sexto Burgorum e stirpe Ioannes
 Exilii meruit praemia vere sui'

(‘At the age of seventy-seven he gave up the ghost on 4 April 1667, the feast of our Lord’s Supper. And on Easter Eve he was carried in a solemn funeral procession to the same church, not long after the protestant archbishop had died. Roger O’Flaherty captured in this epitaph his age at death and his time in exile, his courage in bad times and his generosity in good times: “After one thousand six hundred and sixty-six winters, on the fourth day next of April, at the feast of the Lord’s Supper the lord of Tuam joined Jesus’ table, in whose service he had been. For five and three years he was an exile, whose life in years was fifteen fives. He was as cheerful in his hard lot as he was generous in his previous good fortune. And in the sixteenth John of the line of Burkes truly deserved the rewards of his exile.”’)

The epitaph is quoted by Dr John Lynch in his treatise, *De praesulibus Hiberniae* (1672), fol. 950, edited by J. F. O’Doherty (Dublin, 1944), ii. 261. The catholic archbishop John Burke belonged to the family of the earls of Clanricarde and took a central role in the dramatic events surrounding the presence of the papal nuncio Rinuccini in Galway in 1648.¹⁷⁵ Lynch himself must have been closely involved, and Ó Muraíle suggests that Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh was also in Galway at the time. John Burke spent eight years in exile between 1654 and 1662, five years in Nantes, three in Dinan, where he would have had the opportunity of contact with Lynch himself, who lived nearby at Saint-Lormel. The poem’s play with numbers is not perfect: ‘quinque ter annos’ (‘thrice five years’) suggests fifteen years’ exile, which is not supported by the biography; fifteen *lustra*, seventy-five years, is only an approximation to the length of Burke’s life, but he died in his sixteenth *lustrum*. He died at Tuam on 4 April 1667, a few weeks after the protestant archbishop, Samuel Pullen, the duke of Ormond’s protégé, who died 24 January 1666/7. Pullen was buried near the archiepiscopal chair in the cathedral, Burke in the chapel of St Iarlaithe at the north side of the cathedral. The epitaph was presumably composed in 1667. Lynch

¹⁷⁵ The primary evidence is the *Commentarius Rinuccinianus*, written from the nuncio’s papers by two Irish Capuchins, between 1659 and 1666, and edited by Fr John Kavanagh (Dublin, 1932–49). The occasion is discussed by S. O’Riordan, ‘Rinuccini in Galway, 1647–1649’, *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 23 (1948), 19–51.

also quotes another epitaph composed by the well-known Latinist Dr Edmund O'Meara (c. 1614–1681), who had only returned to Dublin from Oxford in 1666.¹⁷⁶

Verses on the Irish descent of the Stuart kings, composed for Dr John Lynch: 'Quamobrem super hoc communi necessitudinis uinculo ita ad Cambrensis Eversi authorem aliquando cecinimus,

Regem victricibus armis
Nec ferro impositum invitis, sed origine ab ipsa
Regibus ostendis nostro de Sanguine cretum.
Quis non Conarii, regna & Saturnia Quinti
Centimachi? Quis non animo memorabit Hibernus
Tempora jucundo clari pietate Briani?
Lageniae, Ultoniae, geminaeque coivit in unum
Momoniae regum jus, & Connactia, vestrum'

('For this reason upon this common bond of need we once composed these verses for the author of *Cambrensis Eversus*: "You depict a king in arms victorious, not imposed by steel over unwilling subjects but descended since the very beginning from kings of our own blood. Who knows not the happy reigns of Conaire and Conn Cétchathach? What Irishman will not mention with cheerful spirit the times of Brian famous for his piety? Leinster's, Ulster's, and both Munsters' right of kings comes together in one with, Connacht, yours."')

Not independently known.

These seven and a half hexameters were quoted by O'Flaherty in his dedication of *Ogygia* to the Duke of York, *Ogygia*, sig. *A3r. Here it may be said that James Hely's translation is positively misleading, for he renders the introductory words thus, 'We therefore concur with the author of *Cambrensis Eversus*, who has written as follows, on this claim of proximity of blood' (p. xiv). The passage was quoted from *Ogygia* by John Wilde, a lawyer in Edinburgh, in his pamphlet on the Irish parliament, *A Preface to a book on the affairs of Ireland* (London, 1800), 43 ('It was thus that O'Flaherty sung').

Undatable, but no later than 1677, the year of Lynch's death.

Essay in Latin on the chronology of Irish history, beginning 'Hibernici Annales', addressed to Dr John Lynch and dated, 'Ex Armorica Galviensi 18 Septembris Sabbato 4 Temporum 1665' ('From the Sea-

¹⁷⁶ Lynch, *De praesulibus Hiberniae*, ii. 253, quotes O'Meara's epitaph for Maolseachlain Ó Caollaidhe, al. Malachy O'Queely (1586–1645), archbishop of Tuam), and, at p. 261, his epitaph for O'Queely's successor, John Burke. How, one wonders, did these reach him at Saint-Lormel?

side of Galway, 18 September, on the Saturday of Ember Week 1665') [the date is incorrect].¹⁷⁷

No independent manuscript known.

Published at the front of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* (1685), [1]–[24], for which it was almost certainly written. The apparent discrepancy of twenty years is entirely misleading.

The date as printed must be incorrect. In 1665 the date 18 September fell on the Monday before the first Ember Day of September. The Latin *Quatuor Tempora* refers to the four Ember Weeks, and the combination of date and day provide help to correct the error. The year 1665 is too early, because at p. [13] O'Flaherty laments the bloody death of his intimate friend Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh in January 1670/71.¹⁷⁸ The simplest conjecture is to suppose that there is a misprint in the year, and 18 September fell on the Saturday of Ember Week in 1669, 1675, and 1680. 1669 is still too early, and 1680 is ruled out, because Lynch died on 30 September 1677.¹⁷⁹ Only 1675 works. The latest dated events in the main text of *Ogygia* occurred at Elphin on 9 October 1675 with sequels down to the following August (pp. 375–6). The writing of the essay would thus fit well with the drafting of the book as a whole in 1675–6. This conjecture assumes only a single-digit misprint in the year. Any other solution would presuppose more complex error. For example, a single-digit misprint in the date 18 would require a misprint in the year as well, for the Saturday of Ember Week can only fall between 18 and 24 September; it fell on 19 September in 1663, 1668, and 1674. Beyond that we should be positing double-digit misprints in both date and year.

Ogygia; seu, Rerum Hibernicarum chronologia, ex pervetustis monumentis fideliter inter se collatis eruta. Liber Primus ('Ogygia; or, a chronology of Irish matters, extracted from ancient records faithfully compared with one another. The first volume'), with a dedication to James, duke of York and Albany, dated 'ex Armorica Galviensi

¹⁷⁷ The Latin place-date represents the Irish place-name *Cois Fhairrge* 'by the sea-side'; *Armorica*, a Latin name for the peninsula of Brittany, means etymologically 'facing the sea'; known to O'Flaherty from Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*, VII 75 'quae Oceanum attingunt quaeque eorum consuetudine Aremoricae appellantur'; ib. VIII 31, 'in ultimis Galliae finibus, Oceano coniunctae, quae Aremoricae appellantur'. O'Flaherty used an English equivalent in the Letter to the Scottish Nation at the front of *Ogygia Vindicated*, 'From nigh Galway in Ireland by the seaside Westward' (as stated in letter 23).

¹⁷⁸ Hardiman, 421, recognized that a work written in 1665 could not refer to events of 1671, but, rather than question the date, he said, 'this letter appears to have been revised long after its date'. His explanation has been generally received.

¹⁷⁹ The record of his death and burial at Saint-Lormel, in the diocese of Saint-Brieuc but closer to both Saint-Malo and Dinan, was rediscovered by R. d'Ambrières and E. Ó Ciosáin, 'John Lynch of Galway (c. 1599–1677): his career, exile, and writing', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society* 55 (2003), 50–63 (at p. 53).

11 Junii 1684'. Printed at London, 'typis R. Everingham, sumptibus Ben. Tooke, ad insigne Navis in Cæmeterio D. Pauli' ('using the types of R. Everingham, financially undertaken by Benjamin Tooke, at the sign of the Ship in St Paul's Churchyard'), 1685 (Wing O160, Sweeney 3257).¹⁸⁰ The book includes an undated approbation by Dr Dudley Loftus (1618–1695), of Dublin, friend of William Molyneux and O'Flaherty, and an extract from a letter from Richard Bellings (c. 1603–1677). The edition was entered at Stationers' Hall in Easter term (i.e. May) 1685.¹⁸¹ Some copies for sale in Ireland had a different title-page, 'typis R. Everingham, prostant venales apud Jacobum Malon bibliopolam Dubliniensem' ('using the types of R. Everingham, they are offered for sale in the shop of James Malone, bookseller in Dublin'), 1685 (Wing O160A).¹⁸² Only four copies in this state are known, one of them in the NLI; other copies now in Dublin libraries all have the ordinary London title-page.

No autograph survives, nor any manuscript that exactly represents the copy text of the edition.

MS copy in unidentified hand, now NLI MS 665 (Phillipps 6677), eight sheets, folded in quarto to give pages 238 × 170 mm, with signatures A–H, paginated pp. 5–66. The Irish quotations are written in an Irish hand. The text is far from complete in comparison with the published edition, beginning at the start of Part II and ending in what became Part III, chapter 30. Against the words 'non ita pridem ad me

¹⁸⁰ Benjamin Tooke (c. 1642–1716) was an established bookseller in London at this date (H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at work in England, Scotland, and Ireland from 1668 to 1725* (London, 1922), 293). He had business connexions in Dublin between 1669 and 1693 (Pollard, *Dublin Book-Trade*, 571). His sister Mary was married to John Crooke, who was the king's printer in Ireland from 1660 to his death in 1669. Benjamin Tooke was granted the licence in succession, but he remained in London, while his sister and her son Andrew Crooke continued the business in Dublin (ib. 132–6). At the same time, books that Tooke himself handled were distributed in Dublin by the local bookseller James Malone (see n. 182). Tooke had recently published William Molyneux's translation from Descartes's *Meditationes de prima philosophia* in 1680 and would later publish his *Dioptrica nova* in 1692.

¹⁸¹ Edward Arber, *The Term Catalogues 1668–1709* (London, 1906–9), ii. 127.

¹⁸² James Malone has a long career as a bookseller between 1672 and 1719 (Pollard, *Dublin Book-Trade*, 395). In 1681 Dr William Palliser of Trinity College, writing to Henry Dodwell, who had left Dublin in 1674 and was living in the household of Bishop William Lloyd in north Wales, mentions books sent to James Malone by Benjamin Tooke, bookseller, in London, who would later undertake the publication of *Ogygia*, and refers to him as 'Mr Took's correspondent here' (William Palliser to Henry Dodwell, dated at Dublin, 19 April 1681; C. McNeill, *The Tanner Letters* (Dublin, 1943), 439–40). Tooke in London regularly received letters from Dublin for Dodwell. William Palliser (1646–1727) was born in Yorkshire but entered Trinity in 1661 and remained there until 1693 apart from a period as rector of Clonfeacle (Co. Tyrone); he ended his days as archbishop of Cashel. For later evidence of Dodwell's continuing links with Dublin, see Introduction, 39 and n. 131.

scripsit Dualdus Firbissius' (p. 61), the side-note gives the date, 'Kal. Febr. 1669/70 è Lecania' ('1 February 1669/70 from Lackan'), which is surely authorial and yet is not found in other witnesses; this is a sign that this short text may be a first draft.¹⁸³ Its route of transmission is extremely difficult to explain. Phillipps seems to have bought it at the same time as he bought the autograph of *Iar-Connaught*, though their archival history poses some difficulties (see Appendix 4). It was acquired by the National Library in Phillipps sale, Sotheby's 29 June 1936 (lot 201).

A transcript made from this manuscript is now RIA MS 24 M. 45 (s. xix), presumably made in 1841 when Hardiman's son visited Phillipps to transcribe *Iar-Connaught*. It was incorrectly described at the front as 'Copy from Sir Thomas Phillipps. Part of Ogygia Vindicated' and entered as such in the 1856 Hardiman sale catalogue, 'O'Flaherty's Ogygia Vindicated, a copy from Sir Thomas Phillipps' part. 4to. 48p'.¹⁸⁴ The sale number is pasted at the front.

MS copy in the hand of William Molyneux, in near contemporary binding, Southampton City Archives, D/M 4/13. Space is left throughout for the insertion by another hand of passages in Irish; they were never added. This copy appears not to represent the final state of the work as printed, though the differences are not large.

Dr Dudley Loftus's approbation mentions that O'Flaherty had caused a copy to be made for him.

The date of composition is uncertain. Mention of a recent letter from Mac Fhirbhisigh (dated, as we now know, 1 February 1669/70) and of his death (which occurred in January 1670/71) may indicate that the first draft was underway in the early 1670s. References in the printed text at p. 375 to 9 October 1675, when an upright stone, the eponymous *Ail finn*, fell at Elphin, and to events there in June and August of the following year are the latest dated points in the body of the book. The extract from a letter of Richard Bellings, who died in 1677, shows that O'Flaherty had shown him at least part of the work before that date. The dedication to the Duke of York and the mention at the very end of the book (pp. 442, 460) of an eclipse of the sun on 2 July 1684 in the 36th year of the reign of King Charles II must have been added in preparing for the press.¹⁸⁵ During the period when the book was in production,

¹⁸³ The marginal date is not found at the equivalent point in the Southampton manuscript, Part III, p. 48, nor in the printed text, p. 233.

¹⁸⁴ *Catalogue of the library of the late James Hardiman, sold by auction by John F. Jones at the Literary Sale Room [. . .] Wednesday, March 26th* (Dublin, 1856), 19 (lot 526).

¹⁸⁵ The eclipse, on 2 July 1684 (Old Style), 12 July 1684 (New Style), was briefly observed in Dublin, in overcast conditions, by members of the Philosophical Society: 'Observations of the solar eclipse July the 2^d 1684 at Oxford, sent in a letter from Dr Edw. Bernard to Mr John Flamsteed; at Lisbon [. . .]; at Dublin, by Mr [St George] Ash and Mr [William] Molyneux; and at Tredagh', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 14 (1684), 747–9; also noted in the minutes of the Society, Hoppen, i. 34–5 (no. 29).

the Duke of York succeeded his brother as King James II and VII on 6 February 1684/5. O'Flaherty's preface was presumably worked off before then, and there was no recourse to the author for amendment.

Carmen chronographicum Ogygiae, 'Ogygiae mihi carmen erunt primordia mundi', a poem in three parts, in elegiac couplets, printed as part of *Ogygia*, 443–60.

No independent manuscript known.

Whether composed at the same time as the main work of drafting *Ogygia* or later is not known. The final couplet assigns thirty-six years to Charles II, 1649–1684, and still reigning. It would have involved minimal change to bring this up to date when the manuscript went to press.

The poem was reprinted by William O'Kelly (d. 1751), of Aughrim, with his *Descriptio bipartita regni Hiberniae* (Vienna, 1703), and in the later reprints of that rare book, edited by Patrick O'Kelly (Dublin, 1838, 1844).¹⁸⁶

There is an Irish translation in 498 lines of verse, RIA MS 12 G. 15 (cat. 1254), part VIII, booklet 2 [fols. 25v–50v] (saec. xix^{2/4}), 'O thúis an domhain mo dhán d'Éirinn / go míle, ochtmhohgatt, ceathair is se cead [1684]' ('From the beginning of the world my poem to Ireland / till one thousand six hundred eighty four') (the translation ends incomplete at the end of the booklet, having reached only the eighth century); excerpt, the first 16 lines only, in RIA MS 12 L. 1 (cat. 1112) (saec. xix), p. 517, with the heading, 'O'Flaherty's Chronological Poem on Ireland'. Both manuscripts are mainly in the hand of Fr Matthew Horgan (c. 1775–1849), parish priest of Blarney, Co. Cork, who appears to be the translator.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁶ William O'Kelly became professor of heraldry in Vienna and was made a count in 1708 by the Emperor Charles VI (*DIB*). The original Vienna edition is an extremely rare book; there are now copies in the British Library (bequeathed by Sir Thomas Grenville in 1846) and in the National Library in Vienna. It was reprinted at Dublin in 1838 and 1844 by Patrick O'Kelly, who added a brief English index and a note on the author taken from Harris. There were copies of the original edition and the 1844 reprint at Lough Fea in 1872 (E. P. Shirley, *Catalogue of the Library at Lough Fea, in illustration of the history and antiquities of Ireland* (London, 1872), 223), but where they went is unknown. The work comprises a poem by O'Kelly, *Hibernia descripta*, 'Finibus occiduis, ubi finis clauditur orbis' (763 hexameters), ending with lines based on O'Flaherty; a verse description of Ireland by Fr Nicholas Aylmer, dedicated to Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, governor of the Austrian Netherlands, *Elegia*, 'Accipe clementi terrarum nate monarchis', 'Frigida quo tardus sequitur sua plaustra Boötes' (156 lines of elegiacs, with source notes by the author, who cites *Ogygia*), first printed at Louvain in 1650; three further elegies by O'Kelly and a prose account, *Hibernia descripta*, including extracts from *Ogygia*; O'Flaherty's chronological poem with its ending updated to reach the year 1702; a chronological summary and king-list.

¹⁸⁷ The booklet presents a curious appearance, with the text in ink on the verso of each leaf, facing a pencil version; the latter includes many alterations, of which the final reading in each case corresponds to the ink text, as if the translator were drafting in pencil on the recto and then recopying in ink on the facing verso. The booklet ends

Latin verses included in *Ogygia* are for the most part translations from Irish and no longer than a few lines.¹⁸⁸ This listing follows the sequence in which they appear in *Ogygia*:—

‘Vera datur series, quos fudit Hibernia, Regum / Loegari a primis ad tempora summa Briani’ (two hexameters), *Ogygia*, [2], translating a quatrain, ‘Atá sunn forba feasa: / fhear Néirionn gan aincheasa, / Rémeas gach Rígh ro ghabh Gíall: / Lóaóghaire go Laóchbhríán’.

O’Flaherty’s immediate source is the manuscript in his own possession, now RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fol. 107v.

In the same section of his essay O’Flaherty also renders the opening half-quatrains of two other poems, ‘Éire ard inis na rrig’ and ‘Éire óg inis na naomh’ from the same source. See Appendix 2, 414, 416.

‘Dicta Tuathalii domus Eria, regia quinti [*l. Quinti*]: / Fedlimii fundus, plaga Cobthaca, & Hugonis arvum: / Arturi regio, vestrum & Cormace theatrum’ (three poor hexameters), *Ogygia*, 19, translating a quatrain, ‘Goirthear teach Tuathail d’Eirinn, / Cró Cuinn, is fonn Finnfhaidhlim, / Iath Ugoine, is Eachoidh Airt, / Críoch Chobhthaigh, is clár Chormaic’, ‘ex Hugone O Donelli filio’.

Source not identified.

‘Septima luna, Jovi sacra lux, Maiaeque Kalendae / Appulsus annum symbola certa notant’ (elegiac couplet), *Ogygia*, 84, translating a quatrain, ‘Seachtmadh deusg dia dardaine’, from Eochaid Ua Floinn’s poem, ‘Éisted, áes ecna aibind’.

O’Flaherty’s immediate source is the Book of Lecan, fol. 5b [facs. fol. 14v, part of *Lebor Gabála B*], and another copy at fol. 282a [facs. fol. 282r, part of *Lebor Gabála C*].

‘Inter Conquovarum sunt, Kimbaithumque monarcham / Quatuor, ut doctis, secula lapsa liquet’ (elegiac couplet), *Ogygia*, 104, translating a quatrain, ‘Ceithre chéud bliaghuin brasa’.

O’Flaherty’s immediate source is side-noted as Book of Lecan, fol. 293b, facs. fol. 292v.

‘Fordremannus, Finnloch, Loch-lurgan stagna vetusta: / quos, quam

with an inked text on fol. 50v and no pencil version facing, but, if the ink is indeed the secondary copy, the translation must have continued in another booklet. A letter in the same bundle, part VIII, fol. 85, dated 15 September 1838, is addressed by John Windele to Fr Horgan, ‘I enclose you your translations. I had no opportunity of sending them before’. Part VIII is made up of translations into Irish from both Latin and English.

¹⁸⁸ Some of these are discussed by Jason Harris & Emma Nic Cárthaigh, ‘Romanising the bards: early-modern Latin translations of Irish poetry’, *Renaissanceforum* 6 (2010), 149–165 (at pp. 158–64).

culta prius, fudit Ierna lacus' (six lines of elegiacs), *Ogygia*, 164, translating three quatrains, 'Ní uairiodar loch no linn'.

O'Flaherty's immediate source is a 'vetustum poema', side-noted, 'quod incipit, Ádam athair sruith ar sluagh'; he most likely used the copy in Book of Lecan, fol. 39b, facs. fol. 30v.

'Temoriae nani tumulum lapis abtegit in quo / Vir, puer, aut infans tres, & non amplius, aequat' (52 lines of hexameters as 13qq.), *Ogygia*, 290–91, a versification of *Mirabilia Hiberniae*, 'Wonders of Ireland', presumably from an Irish text.

O'Flaherty's immediate source not identified (see Appendix 2).

'Callibus insignis Temorensia ad atria quinis / Quo primum natus tempore Quintus erat' (six lines of elegiacs), *Ogygia*, 313, translating from *Iomarbhágh na bhfileadh*, IV qq. 29–31 (ed. McKenna, i. 20–23).

O'Flaherty refers to several copies of this series of poems, dating from the early seventeenth century, but it has not been possible to identify one that he used.

'Erciadûm post hoc armis Albania cessit: / Conarii haec soboles, & gens selecta Gadelûm' (two lines of hexameters), *Ogygia*, 323, translating a quatrain, 'Clann Eirc mhic Eochaidh na ndiaigh'.

O'Flaherty's source is the poem, 'A eolcha Alban uile', known as *Duan Albanach*, printed in part by Colgan, *Trias*, 115, with a Latin translation. Another quotation, *Ogygia*, 467 (below, 63), from the same poem shows that O'Flaherty had an independent textual source.

'Dongalus a Fachtna, ter nonus Episcopus, extat / Lugadia de gente, dedit cui Rossia mitram' (two lines of hexameters), *Ogygia*, 330, translating a quatrain, 'Seacht n-easpuig fhíchíod gohán / rogabh Rosna bhfonn bhfíorbhán'.

O'Flaherty's source is cited, 'vetus distichon e codice Lecano', Book of Lecan (no precise reference).

'Regia Cormaci, regum Temoria sedes' (one hexameter), *Ogygia*, 336, translating opening line, 'Teamhair na riogh rath Cormaic'.

O'Flaherty's source was the Book of Uí Mhaine, fol. 175 (facs. fol. 117r).

'Tres Ithi excelso clari de stemmate reges, / Macconius, simul ac bini numerantur Achai' (two lines of hexameters), *Ogygia*, 342, translating a quatrain, 'Trí rígh o mhac Ithe ard', from Eochaid Ó Floinn's poem, 'Aíbind sin, a Ériu ard'.

O'Flaherty's immediate source is cited as Keating's chapter 'in regno Lugadii Maccon', but he attributes the verse to Giolla na Naomh

Ó Duinn (Appendix 2). O'Flaherty owned a copy in RIA MS B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fols. 23v–27v, and had seen another in the Book of Uí Mhaine.

'Perlustras Anglos oculis, Cambdene, duobus: / Uno oculo Scotos, caecus Hibernigenas' (elegiac couplet), *Ogygia*, 347, an epigram composed by O'Flaherty himself.

Cited as O'Flaherty's own by Nicolson, *Irish Historical Library*, 7.

'Cui minime imperium non debet Hibernia nomen / Tota, quod antiquum lingua Latina dedit' (ten lines of elegiacs), *Ogygia*, 348, translated from *Iomarbhágh na bhfileadh*, IV qq. 13–17 (ed. McKenna, i. 18–21).

'Tum peto propter aquas exstructa palatia Bonni, / Talibus & mecum rex furibundus agit' (14 lines of elegiacs), *Ogygia*, 405, with two further couplets, *Ogygia*, 406, translating a sample from 'Dáil catha idir Corc is Niall', the dialogue between Corc and Niall in *Iomarbhágh na bhfileadh*, II qq. 1, 9–15, &c. (ed. McKenna, i. 4–11).¹⁸⁹

This chapter describes the circumstances of the contention of the bards, the setting of this series of poems. He dates them to the time of James I, modern scholarship agrees, assigning the poems to the period between 1616 and 1624.

'Jus nihil est natale solo, quod quaeritur armis: / Fortior imbelli sit seniore prior' (22 lines of elegiacs), *Ogygia*, 407, elaborating on an extract from *Iomarbhágh na bhFileadh*, XIII (ed. McKenna, i. 122).

O'Flaherty, 406, had quoted a quatrain from the poem, apparently from memory, since his text is quite distinct from that provided by the manuscript transmission; in letter 27 he actually reports to Lhwyd the correct reading of the quatrain (below, 300 and n. 273). He provides an exact Latin rendering in iambics, 'Senioris agris jus cadit, / queis vi domari contigit: / virtus virorum aetatibus / non cedit imbellum senum'. At some time, he says, he had thought to play with the sentiment in varied words, and he quotes his eleven elegiac variations on the quatrain. An English rendering is given by Harris & Nic Cárthaigh, 162–3. The same quatrain was quoted to Lhwyd by another correspondent, and it appears that it was already acquiring proverbial status, but O'Flaherty certainly recognized its primary context.

'Congalius mustis bene regnat bis tribus, uno, / Cuius Inisfaliae septennis fausta potestas' (two lines of hexameters), *Ogygia*, 432, translating a quatrain, 'Conghal Cinnmaghair maith rí'.

¹⁸⁹ O'Reilly, *Irish Writers*, p. xxv, records this as the second of four poems attributed to 'Torna Egeas', and he cites O'Flaherty as giving 'presumptive proofs that they were not'.

O'Flaherty's source for the quatrain was an O'Clery copy in his own possession, now RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fol. 62. Printed from there by K. Meyer, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 8 (1910), 108).

'Praebuit e castris vestes victumque trecentis: / Quarum quaeque inopum sedes penetralibus altrix' (two lines of hexameters), *Ogygia*, 436, translating quatrain, 'Trí chéud port aig an rígh'.

O'Flaherty's source for the quatrain was the Annals of Tigernach, s.a. 1022, now Bodl. MS Rawlinson B. 488, fol. 19rb, but seen by him either in James Ware's possession no later than 1666 or in the hands of his heir before the manuscripts were sold to the earl of Clarendon in 1686. Printed from there by O'Connor, *Rerum Hibernicarum scriptores*, vol. i, p. liv; Stokes, 'Annals of Tigernach', s.a. 1022.

'Rex modo Malcolmus Donnchadi filius extat: / Scit Deus in vivis quam diuturnus erit' (four lines of elegiacs), *Ogygia*, 467, translating two quatrains, 'Malcuilm anos as Rígh'.

O'Flaherty quotes quatrains 26, 27, of the poem, 'A eolcha Alban uile', known as *Duan Albanach*, which had been printed in part by Colgan, *Trias*, 115; Colgan's extract, however, does not include quatrain 27, so O'Flaherty had an independent source, not identified by K. H. Jackson, 'The poem *A eolcha Alban uile*', *Celtica* 3 (1956), 149-67.

Ogygia Christiana, the conventional rather than authorial title of a second volume, promised in *Ogygia*, 421: 'Regum Hiberniae Christianorum de quibus libro secundo Ogygiae, Deo adjuvante, agere propositum est, catalogum heic praemittere tum chronologicum, tum genealogicum placuit' ('It pleased me to insert here a list, both chronological and genealogical, of the Christian kings of Ireland, of whom it is my intention to treat in the second volume of *Ogygia*'). It is not referred to in any later work and presumably remained unwritten.

Although Walter Harris says, 'I am informed, that Mr O-Flaherty did finish his second book, and that it yet remains in M. S. among his relations in Conaught',¹⁹⁰ he himself doubted whether the manuscript in question was this work. Charles O'Connor of Belanagare saw 'a small part', in O'Flaherty's hand, which he took to have belonged to this work.¹⁹¹ He was probably mistaken. Hardiman's offer of 'pecuniary reward' for its recovery produced no effect.¹⁹²

'Epitaphium R(everendi) Adm(odum) D. D(omi)ni Joannis Lyncaei per D(omi)num O Flaherty' ('Epitaph of the Very Reverend Mr John Lynch by Mr O'Flaherty'), six lines of elegiacs on the death of Dr John Lynch (1677),

¹⁹⁰ Harris, *Writers of Ireland*, 272.

¹⁹¹ Introduction, 179.

¹⁹² Hardiman, 425n.

‘Occidit Armoricis pius, heu! Lincaeus in oris,
 Lincaeus patriae lux columnaque suae.
 Asseruit famam, commenta refellit Iernae,
 Eruit e tenebris gesta vetusta stylo.
 Gallia habet tumulum, cunabula Galvia iactat;
 Scripta vigent terris, spiritus arce poli’

(‘Faithful Lynch has died, alas! on the coasts of Brittany, Lynch who was the light and pillar of his homeland. With his pen he asserted Ireland’s reputation and refuted her detractors, he saved from oblivion her ancient history. France has his grave, Galway boasts his birth, his writings live on in the world, his soul in the heavenly city.’)

MS copy in the hand of Fr John Donnelly OP of Drogheda (AD 1712), added on the verso of the title-page of his copy of John Lynch’s Latin version of Keating’s *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, now RIA MS 24 I. 5 (cat. 1140).¹⁹³ In 1758 this manuscript belonged to Michael Ignatius Dugan and in the 1840s to John O’Donovan, who made it available to Matthew Kelly of Maynooth.

Printed by Matthew Kelly, *Cambrensis Eversus* (Dublin, 1848–54), vol. i, p. xiv; reprinted from there by J. Wills & F. C. Wills, *The Irish Nation, its history and its biography* (Edinburgh, 1875), 659; Abbé Hamard, ‘Un prélat oublié. François Kirwan, évêque irlandais mort en odeur de sainteté à Rennes en 1661’, *Revue de Bretagne, de Vendée, et d’Anjou* 6 (1891), 435–49 (at p. 437); P. Boyle, ‘Lynch’s MS de Praesulibus Hiberniae’, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 4th ser. 12 (1902), 233–49 (at p. 240); Ó Muraile, ‘Aspects of the intellectual life’, 165.

Datable only from Lynch’s death in Brittany on 30 September 1677, news of which may have reached Galway quite quickly.

‘Observations on Dr Borlace’s Reduction of Ireland’, with a note at

¹⁹³ The transmission is at least credible, though the route is unclear. Lynch is thought to have made his translation of Keating in the late 1650s, while at work on *Cambrensis Eversus*, in which Keating is often quoted (B. Cunningham, *The World of Geoffrey Keating* (Dublin, 2000), 187–90). He was by then already living in Brittany, and the version was probably made with a Continental audience in mind. Little is known of its circulation. One copy belonged to someone who was in contact with Fr Thomas O’Sheerin at Louvain in 1672, conceivably Lynch himself; this is now in Washington (DC), Georgetown University, Woodstock Theological Library, MS 7 (not later than 1672). Another witness, now Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 919 (c. 1660), was in the hands of Lynch’s erstwhile friend from Galway, Fr Richard O’Farrell (d. 1663), with whom he subsequently disagreed. The only later copy known is Donnelly’s, which is judged by Dr Ian Campbell to be the most important witness, including Lynch’s foreword, ‘Interpres ad lectorem’. We cannot know whether Donnelly found the verses in his exemplar or added them himself. Behind that, one would like to know whether O’Flaherty sent them to someone, as he may have done, or merely wrote them in his own copy of one of Lynch’s works.

the top addressed to Robert Downing and dated at Galway, 17 January 1681/2.

MS in O'Flaherty's hand, a single sheet folded to give two leaves, 335 × 227 mm, now torn in several places but the text not damaged, NLI MS ALS Roderic O'Flaherty [Acc. 2587], acquired from the library of H. J. B. Clements, Killadoon, Co. Kildare (Sotheby & Co., 1 November 1966, item 1194, with the note, 'from the collection of the Earl of Leitrim').¹⁹⁴ It was item 348 in Thorpe's 1834 sale-catalogue of the Southwell papers (see below, Appendix 4), from where Hardiman, 422, quotes the description; it was bought by Nathaniel Clements (1768–1854), 2nd earl of Leitrim, who loaned it to Hardiman for his work on O'Flaherty.¹⁹⁵

MS copy among papers of William and Samuel Molyneux, TCD MS 883/2 (I. 1. 3), pp. 331–4.

Published from the autograph by Hardiman, *Iar-Connaught* (1846), 431–4, with a reproduction of the covering note of only five lines facing p. 431.

Dr Edmund Borlase, of Fleshmonger Lane, Chester, was known for two controversial works of recent history, first published anonymously, *The Reduction of Ireland to the Crown of England* (London, 1675), and *The History of the execrable Irish Rebellion, trac'd from many preceding acts to the grand eruption, the 23 of October, 1641, and thence pursued to the Act of Settlement, 1662* (London, 1680).¹⁹⁶ He was clearly a stranger

¹⁹⁴ Col. Henry John Beresford Clements (1869–1940), of Killadoon, Co. Kildare, was a kinsman of the earls of Leitrim. His father Henry Theophilus Clements inherited the Lough Rynn estates on the death of the third earl in 1878, and the earl's books and manuscripts came with the house. Killadoon in Co. Kildare was part of the estates. H. J. B. Clements's collection of manuscripts, printed books, and notable armorial bindings, was sold over five days in 1966 and was catalogued by Sotheby's in two parts, 4–6 July and 31 October–1 November 1966. This is not the only item that appears to have come from the Southwell collection.

¹⁹⁵ Two letters from the earl of Leitrim to Hardiman survive in the collection of Hardiman's in-letters, now RIA MS 12 N. 20–21. In the first, Leitrim to Hardiman, dated at Killadoon, 1 February 1845, the earl opens, 'Sir, I understand that you are engaged in editing a work of Roderic O'Flaherty. It has occurred to me that possibly you might like to see two letters of his which I happen to have in my possession. If so, I shall have much pleasure in communicating them to you'. They were sent to Messrs Hodges & Smith in Dublin two weeks later, and they were subsequently returned by the same route (MS 12 N. 20/133). Hardiman's draft replies are with these letters (MS 12 N. 20/135–6).

¹⁹⁶ R. MacGillivray, 'Edmund Borlase, historian of the Irish rebellion', *Studia Hibernica* 9 (1969), 86–92. BL MS Sloane 1008 contains many letters sent to Borlase as well as other papers relating to his history of the Irish rebellion. I note three letters from William Molyneux to Borlase, all dated at Dublin: 22 November 1679 (fol. 233), 31 January 1679/80 (fol. 251), 22 March 1680/81 (fol. 301); also a letter with no address, dated 18 February 1681/2 (fol. 333), 'seing our common friend Dr Borlase of honour'd memory is silent, I am well pleased to think that others will speak'. Dr Borlase had died at Chester on 5 January 1681/2, a little before O'Flaherty penned his observations. The suggestion by Jane Ohlmeyer that they had corresponded is, I

INTRODUCTION

to O'Flaherty, who denounces his remarks on supposed catholic massacres of protestants and his ignorance of Irish history as 'a hereditary malice'. He also says that 'we with all respect, duty, and allegiance acknowledge unquestionable' Charles II's title to the kingdom of Ireland. A page lists errors of simple historical fact in Borlase's book. In his final sentence O'Flaherty asks Downing to cut off the signed message at the top of the paper before circulating the comments.

'St Columb Vindicated; or, A prospect of a ravenous dove restored to his natural meekness', dated 25 November 1682.

MS in O'Flaherty's hand, Southampton City Archives, D/M 4/13, 14 pages, two sheets now bound at the end of the book behind Molyneux's copy of *Ogygia*. The text begins, 'Romances of old far different from those more artificiall', and ends 'in the same island on Sunday the 9th of June 597'.

Unpublished.

'The Territory of West Connaght 13 February 1683/4' (title-page, recto), 'The | Territory of Westconnaght | or | Hiarconnaght | In the Diocese of Tuam; and | County of Galway' (verso); ends 'Finis | Aprill ye 5th 1684'.

MS in O'Flaherty's hand, NLI MS 666 (Phillipps 6676, 'ex Bibl. Southwell'), 215 × 170 mm, 68 pages, appears briskly written, with side-note headings, page-numbers, and catchwords in O'Flaherty's hand. A loose piece of paper, now pasted in at the back, is headed by O'Flaherty, 'Additions to the description of Westconnaght' (incorporated in the later copy). The manuscript must have passed from the papers of Samuel Molyneux to the Southwell family after 1709, and Phillipps would have bought it in one of the Southwell sales (see Appendix 4). It was acquired by the National Library in Phillipps sale, Sotheby's 29 June 1936 (lot 191).

MS copy in Samuel Molyneux's hand, TCD MS 883/1 (I. 1. 2), pp. 101, 100*-101*, 102-135, 'The Territory of West- \or Hiar/ Connaught 13th February 1683/4 in the Diocese of Tuam & County of Galway. By Mr Flaherty', 'Finis | Aprill the 5th 1684'. Copied from the autograph and incorporating the author's additions at the appropriate points.

Two transcripts owned by James Hardiman were sold in 1856; these are now untraced.¹⁹⁷ The transcript of the Phillipps MS was evidently

think, unsubstantiated ('Introduction', *Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Cambridge, 2000), 17).

¹⁹⁷ *Catalogue of the library of the late James Hardiman*, lots 524-5, O'Flaherty's description of West Connaught, 1683, a transcript in 4to. 62p. Another copy of the same, 4to. 79p., were bought together with lot 526 for 2/6 (as we learn from the marked copy of the sale-catalogue in the library of Trinity College). The Royal Irish Academy was

made by Hardiman's son, who stayed at Middle Hill in 1841 and whose diligence was remarked on by Phillipps in a letter.¹⁹⁸

This is one of a series of descriptions, most of them concerned with whole counties, commissioned by William Molyneux for an atlas of Ireland, projected by the bookseller Moses Pitt (1631–1697) (Introduction, 81–3). The originals for the most part remain among the Molyneux papers along with the copies made by his son. This, however, is one of several originals that Phillipps bought from the Southwell papers.

Published by Hardiman, *Iar-Connaught* (1846), 1–122. On the title-page of Hardiman's edition, the source is given as 'from a manuscript in the library of Trinity College, Dublin'; at the end of his preface, at p. vi, he refers to the descriptions of other counties, which 'still remain in manuscript in the library of Trinity College, Dublin'.¹⁹⁹ At p. ix, however, he thanks 'Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart, of Middlehill, Broadway, Worcestershire, for the kindness and liberality with which that gentleman has permitted access to his valuable collection of manuscripts, among which is preserved our author's autograph copy of the following treatise'; one footnote, 118 n. y, tells us that words have been supplied in the text from 'O'Flaherty's autograph copy, now in the possession of Sir Thomas Philipps, Bart'.

In an undated draft letter to the earl of Leitrim, returning manuscripts to him in 1845, Hardiman mentions his own 'anxiety to edit his [O'Flaherty's] work as well as I possibly can' (RIA MS 12 N. 20/135). Lying behind the edition there is no doubt a story. Before its publication the manuscript was much quoted by John O'Donovan in his Ordnance Survey letters concerning the area; on the parish of Kilcummin, for example, 'I here transcribe what O'Flaherty wrote on the places of this parish and become his scholiast' (OS Galway, iii. 141). During his work in this area O'Donovan lodged for some weeks in Hardiman's house, Ardmore, on Taylor's Hill Road, Galway, an experience recalled with pleasure many years afterwards by O'Donovan's youthful draftsman, William Wakeman.²⁰⁰ Here O'Donovan is said to have as-

the major purchaser at the sale, and lot 526 is now RIA MS 24 M. 45, a transcript of *Ogygia* from a manuscript then in the hands of Sir Thomas Phillipps, but I have not found the two transcripts of *Iar-Connaught* in the Academy. One might hazard that they would have been copies from the original in Phillipps's library and from the Molyneux copy at Trinity.

¹⁹⁸ Sir Thomas Phillipps to James Hardiman, dated at Middle Hill, 30 October 1841 (RIA MS 12 N. 21/233a).

¹⁹⁹ Introduction, 83 and n. 248.

²⁰⁰ W. F. Wakeman, 'Aran—pagan and Christian', *Duffy's Hibernian Magazine* [new ser.] 1, nos. 5–6 (May–June 1862), 460–71, 567–77, at p. 465, describes Hardiman, 'like an old Irish chieftain', presiding over dinner, during which his piper played. Hardiman dates his letters 'Taylor's Hill', where in 1832 he occupied a new house with eight acres of land (C. Túinléigh, 'Séamas Ó hArgadáin (1782–1855)', *Galvia* 3 (1956), 47–62, at p. 55). The house was named Ardmore, marked on the historic 25-inch map, just to the west of Glenarde House (now the Ardilaun Hotel); a cul-de-sac of houses on the south side of Taylor's Hill Road preserves the name close to the site.

sembled his materials. He knew Hardiman well, having worked as his transcriber in Dublin between 1828 and 1830, and he was all too aware of his limitations in Irish antiquities.²⁰¹ From 1830 O'Donovan was employed by the topographical department of the Ordnance Survey, where his work had included transcription from manuscripts in Trinity College and elsewhere before any fieldwork was undertaken. Whether *Iar-Connaught* was first transcribed from the copy in Trinity by O'Donovan or Hardiman is not apparent; they may, indeed, have copied it independently. It was certainly Hardiman who sought a copy of the autograph at Middle Hill in 1841. The material brought together to illuminate O'Flaherty's life and the text itself reflect Hardiman's experience more than O'Donovan's. While the edition was in progress the topographical department, which had underpinned O'Donovan's research, was disbanded and most of the results were never published. O'Donovan, however, was engaged by the Irish Archaeological Society and embarked on publications in his area of expertise, leaving O'Flaherty's work to his former patron and host, who prepared his edition for the same Society. They had in common a keen sympathy for the dispossessed chief of Gnó Beag.

'Confutation of the Chinese Chronology', an essay responding to points made by Edward Stillingfleet in 1685.

No independent manuscript known.

Some, perhaps most, of the piece is known, because it was recopied by O'Flaherty in a letter to William Molyneux (letter 1).

'The Ogygia Vindicated, against the objections of Sir George Mackenzie', with a letter to the Scottish nation, dated 'From nigh Galway in Ireland by the seaside Westward', 10 December 1686 (as we learn from letter 23), with a dedication (no longer extant) to King James II (mentioned in letter 23 to Edward Lhwyd, dated 29 August 1705, and letter 44 to Samuel Molyneux, dated 17 December 1708); O'Flaherty reluctantly replaced the dedication with another addressed to Randall MacDonnell (1680–1721), 4th earl of Antrim, composed in January 1709 (letter 51) and later polished in the light of advice from Dr Fielding Shaw (letter 57); his own preface was written after the new dedication (letter 52).

MS in O'Flaherty's hand, finished on 17 September 1704 (p. 166), among Samuel Molyneux's papers, Southampton City Archives, D/M 4/14; 240 × 180 mm, in contemporary binding, pages numbered from 13 to 167, pp. 1–12 torn out leaving stump towards lower part of page. The text at p. 13 begins, 'aside therefore the idea that people conceive of

²⁰¹ Telling remarks appear in some of his letters from the field, e.g. from Portarlinton (Co. Laois), 19 December 1837 (OS Kildare, ii. 239–40), and from Westport, 9 July 1838 (OS Mayo, i. 442–4).

Roman antiquities' [p. 19 in the printed text]; it ends at p. 166, 'not to contradict Wardaeus' [p. 279 in the printed text], where the end is signalled by a Latin proverb.²⁰² Twenty chapters (as in letter 14). The date suggests that this may be the copy in twenty-two sheets (which would produce 176 pages in quarto) made by O'Flaherty and sent to England towards the end of 1704. It was apparently sent back via Jeremiah Pepyat during March and April 1708 (as we learn from letters 28 and 29), though it had not arrived at the date of O'Flaherty's last letter to Lhwyd. In December 1708 it was again sent to Dublin, delivered by Capt James Blake to Samuel Molyneux, in whose possession it presumably remained. The preface (as it appears in the printed text) was a late addition, sent to Samuel Molyneux on 25 January 1708/9 (letter 51).

The year of composition is spelt out in letter 23 to Edward Lhwyd, which alone provides the precise date, 10 December 1686, which O'Flaherty wished to be printed with his address to the Scottish nation; this does not appear in the printed text.

O'Flaherty appears to have sent a copy of this work to Dr Edward Stillingfleet soon after it was composed (letter 18 and n. 169), and he tells Samuel Molyneux that it went through his father's hands at some point (letter 43). It is likely that this is the work he was copying, with a view to sending two sheets per post, for Bishop Anthony Dopping in the winter of 1696–7 (letter 2). Through all these years, he presumably retained his master copy, whose fate is unknown.²⁰³

The copy made for Lhwyd in 1704 and sent to Samuel Molyneux in 1708, now surviving, contained the original address to King James, now torn out by Molyneux. The new address and the new preface, both sent to Molyneux in January 1709, do not survive among his papers. The preface, we are told in letter 51, filled 1½ sheets. It appears from letter 57 that O'Flaherty believed the manuscript was already in the hands of Aaron Rhames, the printer, and he was still revising the text: 'I sent some corrections and additions to be inserted in my book'.

A manuscript was offered for sale, perhaps as late as the 1730s, by a bookseller in Dublin, where it was seen by Walter Harris (1686–1761).²⁰⁴

²⁰² 'Sperne repugnando tibi tu contrarius esse: / Conveniet nulli, qui secum dixisset [I. dissidet] ipse. Ex Catonis Consiliis' (*Disticha Catonis*, I 4), popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and echoed by Polonius in Hamlet, 'To thine own self be true'.

²⁰³ Catherine A. Sheehan states as fact, 'The manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated* was owned by James Fitzpatrick' ('The contribution of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare to Gaelic scholarship in eighteenth-century Ireland', *Journal of Celtic Studies* 2 (1955–8), 219–37, at p. 231). Her evidence, a letter dated 20 February 1772, refers more vaguely to 'manuscripts etc. of the late learned Mr Roderick O Flaherty, now in your possession' (Introduction, 180).

²⁰⁴ 'I have seen not long since in the custody of Mr Luke Dooling, Bookseller in High Street, Dublin, a treatise in MS written by our author in Vindication of his *Ogygia*, against the Objections of Sir George Mackenzie, and others, which I was in-

INTRODUCTION

A further copy, apparently not in O'Flaherty's handwriting, emerged in March 1772 in the hands of Mr Morris, Galway (Introduction, 180–82). This had the text in twenty-one chapters (splitting the original Chapter 6 into two). It also included orderly preliminaries, ready for the press, beginning with the address to the earl of Antrim, then the address to the Scottish Nation, then the author's preface, a short Latin poem, the commendations gathered from Lhwyd's letters, and a genealogy from King Conaire, AD 60, to King James II. Given O'Flaherty's addiction to dates, their absence from the addresses is presumably editorial. In the commendations here O'Flaherty refers to Edward Lhwyd as 'deceased, 1711', and in the preface he says that his treatise lingered in manuscript twenty-eight years after it was composed. The implied date is 1714 (Introduction, 184). O'Flaherty had recopied the work, in circumstances not now known, five years later than any extant correspondence. The fact of its not being in his own hand may be explained: either someone at a late date had transcribed it, or, in 1714, O'Flaherty had relied on an amanuensis.

Published from this last by Charles O'Connor, Dublin: printed for G. Faulkner, 1775. At the end, O'Connor mistakenly presumed the text to be incomplete, owing to its abrupt termination. He noted, '*N.B.* The copy before me goes no further, though it is not to be doubted, but that the author finished it in another'. O'Flaherty wrote his source-notes in Latin, O'Connor adds observations in English but without typographical distinction.

De Hibernorum per Europam fidei propagatione centones e variis Autoribus ('Lines from various writers concerning the preaching of the faith across Europe by the Irish'), 13 lines in hexameters, beginning, 'Legibus alma tuis subjecit Hibernia sacris, / Christe potens, Italos, Francos, cum Teutone, Belgas' ('It was kindly Ireland, O mighty Christ, that subjected to your sacred laws the people of Italy, France, Germany, and the Netherlands').

No independent manuscript known.

These lines conclude the author's preface to *Ogygia Vindicated* and were printed in O'Connor's edition, p. lxxv. It is not apparent whether they were composed with the body of that work or only when the preface was last revised and concluded in 1714.

'Animadversions on Dr Chamberlain's subjection of the bishops of Ireland to the archbishop of Canterbury' (probably 1687–8).

MS in O'Flaherty's hand now untraced. It was item 432 in Thorpe's 1834 sale-catalogue of the Southwell papers (see Appendix 4). The catalogue, said to have been drafted by T. Crofton Croker, comments, 'The

formed was intended for the press' (Harris, *Writers of Ireland*, 272). How Dooling may have got it is considered below, 178.

publication of this letter would be a delicious morceau to the Irish ecclesiastical antiquary'. Hardiman, 424, records that it was bought by Nathaniel Clements (1768–1854), 2nd earl of Leitrim, who loaned it to Hardiman for copying along with his 'Observations on Dr Borlace's Reduction of Ireland' (1682). In returning the two autographs to Lord Leitrim, Hardiman commented, 'They are both curious, but that on the consecration of the ancient bishops of Ireland is particularly valuable' (RIA MS 12 N. 20/136). In the manuscript the essay was dated 'Prid. Cal. Maij. 1709. h̄ in albis'. Although Hardiman prints h̄: in an Irish fount, what O'Flaherty wrote was the sign for Saturn and Saturday; 30 April was the Saturday after Easter in 1709, a day known liturgically as 'Sabbatum in albis' ('Saturday in white clothes').²⁰⁵ The date of composition is less straightforward. Already in a letter to Samuel Molyneux, dated 9 April 1708, O'Flaherty mentions that he had written 'against Dr Chamberlains Canterbury jurisdiction over the Bishops of Ireland in his Notitia Angliae' (letter 33), and for reasons given below he may have done so years before. The date 30 April 1709 can be no more than the date of copying.

Published from this autograph by Hardiman, *Iar-Connaught* (1846), 437–40.

Dr Edward Chamberlayne (1616–1703) had first published his successful handbook, *Angliae notitia: or, The Present State of England*, in 1669; it went through twenty editions in his lifetime, and his son John Chamberlayne continued to update and reissue the work from 1704. Every edition was reset, and there were extensive revisions and reorganization between editions, both to keep it up to date and to encourage buyers to add the newest edition to their shelf. O'Flaherty begins, 'I happ'ned cursorily to run over Dr Chamberlain's complete work of Notitia Angliae, a rare epitome of singular ancient and modern observations'. Here, he found the offensive statement that 'the archbishop of Canterbury anciently had primacy as well over Ireland as England, and the Irish bishops received consecration from him', and a reply was composed; nor was he slow to find other errors. The passage in question can be found in many editions, but O'Flaherty cites 'the first part, chap. 18, pag. 224', which leads only to the sixteenth edition, produced in 1687.²⁰⁶ In the next edition from 1692 part, chapter, and heading remain the same, but the passage is found at p. 190. Given the ephemeral character of the book, he surely came across it during James II's reign

²⁰⁵ The Sunday after Easter, Ir. *Mioncháisc* 'little Easter', was similarly known as *Dominica in albis deponendis* or *Dominica post albas*, when the surplices worn for baptism on Easter Sunday were taken off. O'Flaherty uses the astrological signs for the days of the week in dating sheets of Lhwyd's dictionary in September and October 1705 (TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 8). *Sabbatum in albis* had fallen on 30 April in 1603, 1614, and 1698, and after 1709 it would next do so in the new calendar in 1791, 1859, and 2011.

²⁰⁶ I have checked every edition from the 14th (1682) to the 22nd (1707), and this is the only fit.

and must, therefore, have drafted the essay many years before the date on the extant copy.

Serenissimi Walliae principis Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae cum appendicibus dominiis haeredis conspicui Genethliacon ('A poem on the birth of the most serene Prince of Wales, heir apparent of Great Britain and Ireland and associated territories'), 470 lines in hexameters, beginning, 'Salve infans dilecte' ('Hail, beloved child'). Published at Dublin: Andrew Crook and Samuel Helsham, 1688 (Wing O161, Sweeney 3258).

MS copy, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS fr. 12160 (along with poems by other writers on the same occasion) [microfilm in NLI, P104], no doubt from the Stuart court circle at Saint-Germain and most likely copied from the printed edition.

The printed edition is similar in format to *Ogygia*, though only two quarto sheets, 16pp, with notes running along the right-hand margins of the poem. Copies exceedingly scarce: ESTC records only one in the National Library, LO 1136. It is lavishly bound with the monogram EPS on both covers and the book-plate of Lough Fea; the owner, Evelyn Philip Shirley (1812–1882), of Lough Fea Castle, Co. Monaghan, set his initials to this note, 'A Tract of the *very greatest Rarity*, if not *unique*. I shewed it to Dr O'Donovan & Mr Eugene O'Curry in the British Museum, June 1855. Neither of them had ever *seen* or *heard* of another copy. Ev. Ph. Sh. Sep^r 1855'. He later published *Catalogue of the Library at Lough Fea, in illustration of the history and antiquities of Ireland*, [drawn up by W. Reeves] (London, 1872), which says that this copy is 'believed to be unique' (p. 221). No other copy was known to Sweeney.

No doubt written in 1688, though on the title-page O'Flaherty says of the poem, 'antequam in lucem editus, exceptis quae ad diem nativitatis spectant insertis, praemeditatum' ('planned before he was born except for what is included about the date of birth').

A large part of the poem is a versified Stuart genealogy. His interest in chronology is reflected in a link made between King James II's first public mass in 1685 and his great-grandmother Queen Mary Stuart's execution in 1587, both on 8 February (p. 13). Towards the end of the poem, he draws the injustice he has suffered to the king's attention.

In letter 22 he mentions the work to Lhwyd simply as 'Genethliacon P(rincipis) W(alliae)'.

'Ardmachae metropolis Primatum catalogus cum annis Christi', a list of the coarbs of St Patrick, based on Colgan, *Trias*, 292–311, supplemented by O'Flaherty's own chronological work, dated '22 Apr: h̃ in albis A^o MDCCIV scriptum'.

MS in O'Flaherty's hand, written on the blank p. 318 in his copy of Colgan's *Trias*, now NLI LO 1929 (2).

The fact that this single-page listing was dated suggests that O'Flaherty saw it as some kind of finished compilation rather than merely notes. It provides evidence that he continued to work on topics that must have first engaged him years earlier. He used the same dating formula in 1709, when recopying his essay against the primacy of Canterbury over Irish bishops (Introduction, 71).

'En novus interpres Scotorum idiomate et Anglo' ('Here is a new interpreter of the Irish people, and he does it in English'), a poem in elegiac couplets in honour of Edward Lhwyd, apparently first composed in October 1704, revised and extended in December 1707.

MS in O'Flaherty's hand in letters 14 and 29, printed below; see also Appendix 1 for translation and commentary.

This is quite distinct from the poem printed by Edward Lhwyd as the last of the commendatory verses at the start of *Archaeologia Britannica*, 'Nunc Anglum elinguem, Scotum nunc luget Ierna', which represents a rewriting of O'Flaherty's lines by Lhwyd and friends. A first attempt at revision, in Lhwyd's hand, is now Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817A, fol. 60r (D. Evans & B. F. Roberts, *Archaeologia Britannica. Texts and Translations* (Aberystwyth, 2009), 104). It was, however, O'Flaherty's name that ensured that this alone of the commendations was retained in a copy of the Irish-English Dictionary made in 1743 by Seán Ó Murchadha na Ráithíneach (1700-1762), now RIA MS 12 K. 23 (cat. 1108).

It may be mentioned here that Seán Ó Murchadha himself composed an Irish rendering of the verses after seeing the dictionary in 1741, 'Bíodh nár Ghaedheal Éadbhard glan eagnaíde Lúid'. It is so dated in an early-nineteenth-century copy made by Mícheál Ó Longáin, now RIA MS 23 N. 32 (cat. 259), p. 264. Printed by Tadhg Ó Donnchadha, *Dánta Seáin Uí Mhurchadha na Ráithíneach* (Dublin, 1907), 79-80 (no. 25), 148 (notes), 218 (manuscripts). The editor used this copy and three others, RIA MS 23 G. 24 (cat. 257), p. 179, and Maynooth, MS M. 4, p. 28, both written by Ó Longáin. His fourth copy is cited as BL MS Add. 29614 (O'Grady, i. 515-63), written by Seán Ó Murchadha which does not include these verses; he perhaps intended to refer to BL MS Add. 33567, fol. 5 (O'Grady, i. 563-4), where it is among preliminaries to a volume written in 1806 by Donnchadh Ó Floinn for John Fiott, of St John's College, Cambridge, who came to Cork to learn Irish.

'Accipe pro numeris numeros mi chare Ioannes / O Gara, qui mihi das carmina digna cedro' ('Receive verses in exchange for verses, my dear Seán Ó Gadhra, who give me poems worth their oil of cedar'), 18 lines of elegiacs, signed 'Redoricus Flaherty cecinit', incorporated in one copy of Seán Ó Gadhra's poem, 'Mór a gcomaoín ar Chrích Chuinn'.

MS RIA 23 G. 4 (cat. 679) (copied in the 1720s), p. 22, is the only

manuscript to include these Latin verses out of half a dozen copies of Ó Gadhra's poem, which is dated 1713; O'Flaherty's lines must have been written soon afterwards. He reused three couplets from his final poem in honour of Edward Lhwyd, sent in December 1707 (letter 29), and he also repeated from there the classical allusion to verses 'worth their oil of cedar' (see Appendix 1).

Published by Séamus Mac Domhnaill, *Dánta is Amhráin Sheáin Uí Ghadhra* (Dublin, 1955), 27–8, with notes, 78–9.

This list of writings has taken a lenient definition of 'work', including essays that may have been written only for the eyes of friends to whom they were sent and Latin verses composed only for their author's pleasure. The surviving notes by O'Flaherty in the margins of books are reported in Appendix 2. It is a testimony to his reputation that in different generations his handwriting continued to be recognized by Charles O'Connor of Belanagare, his grandson the Revd Charles O'Connor, John O'Donovan, James Hardiman, and John O'Hanlon. Hardiman first saw an autograph work as late as 1845.²⁰⁷ One may wonder how this recognition was learnt and passed on.

Letters in Roderick O'Flaherty's Time

Besides these works we know Roderick O'Flaherty as a writer and recipient of letters. In the summer of 1683 he exchanged many letters with William Molyneux.²⁰⁸ Their correspondence lasted, however fitfully, until 1697, during which time, as O'Flaherty says, Molyneux 'honoured me many years with continual correspondence of free postage, having regard to my low ebb of fortune'.²⁰⁹ He exchanged letters with Edward Lhwyd over a period of seven years and with Samuel Molyneux for a single year. This book presents the letters that survive from these exchanges. He also wrote letters to Dr Thomas Molyneux, though the only one extant, included here as 13*, accompanied a letter for forwarding to Lhwyd.²¹⁰ Dr Molyneux was not keen to correspond with O'Flaherty.²¹¹

A tally of those contacts who franked letters to or from O'Flaherty

²⁰⁷ This is when he was loaned autograph papers by the earl of Leitrim. Hardiman used his son's transcripts from the autographs at Middle Hill.

²⁰⁸ Introduction, 86.

²⁰⁹ Letter 33. This may refer particularly to the years of crisis between O'Flaherty's removal from Moycullen in the 1690s and William's death in October 1698.

²¹⁰ It notified Dr Molyneux that Collector Arkwright had been substantially out of pocket on a packet forwarded by him.

²¹¹ 'I find all my letters by Dr Molyneux come safe to you but I never saw a letter from himself' (letter 7), though O'Flaherty occasionally included a letter to him, as when sending ten sheets of Lhwyd's dictionary (letter 8). In 1697 Thomas Moly-

would also include Edward Southwell, chief secretary, and his clerk William Wogan, who wrote back to confirm despatch; three members of the episcopal bench, Lhwyd's friends Humphrey Humphreys, John Evans, and William Nicolson; two members of the House of Commons at Westminster, John Anstis MP and John Pugh MP, both brought into service by Lhwyd; the Irish MP Samuel Dopping; and the local revenue collector in Galway, Henry Arkwright.

Piecemeal evidence exists of O'Flaherty's lost correspondence. The first in date is his reference to a letter received from Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh at Lackan in February 1669/70, and one may suppose that this indicates a correspondence between friends.²¹² Not later than 1675 letters are said to have passed in both directions between O'Flaherty and Dr John Lynch, then living in Brittany.²¹³ O'Flaherty quotes a letter he had received from Richard Bellings, probably written between 1675 and his death in 1677.²¹⁴ A brief note addressed by O'Flaherty to Robert Downing, dated 17 January 1681/2, at the head of an essay against Edmund Borlase has been referred to.²¹⁵ The first letter from Lhwyd to O'Flaherty in June 1700 was sent locally, as Lhwyd travelled round Ireland.²¹⁶ Here he had already met the antiquary Tadhg Ó Rodaighe (1614–1706), of Crossfield, Co. Leitrim. From what Ó Rodaighe wrote for Lhwyd, we learn of some friendship and correspondence between Ó Rodaighe and O'Flaherty.²¹⁷ There must have been written contact too between O'Flaherty and the poet Seán Ó Gadhra in Co. Sligo, lasting at least as late as 1713, though there is no explicit evidence for this. Locally he proposed to write to Mrs Treharn in Aran in 1702, and he tells us on more than one occasion that he wrote to David and Stephen Parry at Trinity College, and he even received answers.²¹⁸ In December 1707 O'Flaherty received a letter from 'Mr Giles Eyres from Eyres Court', enclosing Samuel

neux acknowledged receiving information from O'Flaherty (Introduction, 85 n. 253); at that date it was not likely to have been communicated *viva voce*, and therefore a letter is implied.

²¹² Introduction, 58.

²¹³ Introduction, 33–4. It is not without interest that a letter from John Lynch to Fr Francis Harold OFM, in Rome, dated at Saint-Malo, 21 July 1670, says that he would enjoy more frequent correspondence and that letters brought to Paris addressed 'a Monsieur Linche, archidiacre de Tuam' would be safely transmitted by the verger to Saint-Malo (B. Jennings, 'Documents from the archives of St Isidore's College, Rome, Part IV', *Analecta Hibernica* 6 (1934), 203–247, at pp. 244–6, with the year rather seriously misprinted as 1660).

²¹⁴ Introduction, 41, 57, from *Ogygia*.

²¹⁵ Introduction, 64–5.

²¹⁶ O'Flaherty's reply, 14 June 1700, is acknowledged by letter 3.

²¹⁷ Introduction, 97. In a marginal note in RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), O'Flaherty cites Tadhg Ó Rodaighe as confirming the attribution of a poem to Gilla Cóemáin (Appendix 2, p. 414).

²¹⁸ Letters 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Molyneux's queries.²¹⁹ In February 1708, he tells us, 'I writt to a kinsman of mine Mr Francis Lynch, Merchant in Dublin', asking him to approach Molyneux about payment for a literary contribution from O'Flaherty to the revived Philosophical Society.²²⁰ He communicated by letter with his kinsman Capt James Blake and looked to him also to carry letters.²²¹ When he learnt in May 1705 that Dr Molyneux had lent Sir Henry Bingham the copy of Nicolson's book that was meant for himself, he promptly sent off a letter to Sir Henry.²²² In June or July 1708, he wrote to his 'intimate friend', Sir Thomas Southwell, a commissioner of the revenue, seeking an appointment for his son-in-law, Edward Tyrrell.²²³ He was used to sending letters through the bookseller Jeremiah Pepyat in 1705–6, who would sometimes acknowledge his with an answer.²²⁴ Between October and December 1708 it appears that he exchanged letters with the printer Cornelius Carter in Dublin, and on 8 March 1708/9 we also learn that he had written on his own account to another printer, Aaron Rhames.²²⁵

We have only a small part of O'Flaherty's letters, and we cannot assume that further letters referred to in this small part provide more than a hint of the scope of his correspondence. In spite of his urgency in avoiding the pence it cost to receive a letter, and his desire to save others from what was obviously an avoidable charge, O'Flaherty appears to have been an inveterate writer of letters, and only some of his correspondence can be understood as compensating for his remoteness from scholarly company.

Letters can allow one to hear a tone of voice, though a modern reader must make allowances for the conventions of the time. Formal politeness, even deference, may disguise the closeness of a friendly relationship. In these letters there was also some uncertainty about how the participants should perceive their relative positions in society. Letters are usually a two-way conversation, but the other side of O'Flaherty's correspondence has survived in only one case, and that is because young Samuel Molyneux copied most of the letters he sent as well as those he received. How the letters have come to survive is discussed in notes at the head of the three chapters that follow. The markedly learned content of O'Flaherty's letters to Lhwyd makes them quite arduous reading, and there are hints that Lhwyd was not always as attentive as O'Flaherty expected. By comparison the

²¹⁹ Letter 33.

²²⁰ Letter 33. The letter was not answered.

²²¹ Letters 43 and 53.

²²² Letter 21.

²²³ Letter 38; letter 7 and n. 47. The basis of his claim to Southwell's friendship is unknown.

²²⁴ Letters 26 and 30 refer to word from Mr Pepyat.

²²⁵ Letter 52.

much more personal content of the letters to young Samuel Molyneux comes as a surprise, and one wonders why O'Flaherty is so much less reserved with this young man. In this last case, where we have most of the letters sent to O'Flaherty, it becomes clear that Molyneux's silence is almost as significant as what he says.

The writing of letters had become far more widely practised during the seventeenth century than earlier, and the latter part of the century saw still greater increase.²²⁶ An act of the Commonwealth government in 1657, retained by the English parliament after the Restoration, established the general letter office to carry letters at fixed rates of charge.²²⁷ Its operation connected the three kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland. Packet boats sailed from Dublin to Holyhead twice a week, increasing in the 1680s to three times a week, and the post was carried by fixed stages from there across north Wales to Chester and on to London. Between 1660 and 1711 the rate for a single-sheet letter between London and Dublin was 6d, i.e. 4d to Holyhead and 2d for the sea-crossing.²²⁸ A letter between Oxford and Galway would incur three charges, 2d from Oxford to London, 6d from London to Dublin, and a further 4d from Dublin to Galway, a total of 1/-.²²⁹ Two sheets of paper incurred a double charge, even if

²²⁶ A wide-ranging but practical survey of letter-writing in England is P. O. Beale, *England's Mail: Two Millennia of Letter-Writing* (Stroud, Glos, 2005).

²²⁷ An Act for settling the Postage in England, Scotland, and Ireland was passed on 9 June 1657 (C. H. Firth & R. S. Rait, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum 1642–1660* (1911), p. ci), but it was made void at the restoration of the monarchy; An Act for erecting and establishing a Post Office (12 Charles II, c. 35, 1660; *The Statutes of the Realm* (London, 1810–28), v. 297–301; abridged in *English Historical Documents*, viii. 475–6, no. 176) likewise provided for a general letter office in London, for the receiving and returning of letters and packets from all parts of the kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. All routes operated through London, and the crossing between Ireland and Scotland, from Donaghadee to Portpatrick, was little used. Edward Watson, *The Royal Mail to Ireland* (London, 1917), 43, refers to the Post Office Act of 1660 as 'the charter of the Post Office'. His chapters 4 ('The Restoration and the more general use of the Holyhead route') and 5 ('A century of development') provide much background information on the post between London and Dublin. A series of letters written by the newly appointed lord lieutenant, Henry Hyde, 2nd earl of Clarendon, to his brother Lawrence Hyde, 1st earl of Rochester, vividly describes his journey from London to Dublin via Holyhead and Dún Laoghaire in December 1685–January 1685/6 (S. W. Singer, *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, earl of Clarendon* (London, 1828), i. 190–206, nos. 4–15). At Beaumaris Lord Bulkeley's house provided a brief refuge in adverse weather, but the party was detained for a full week at Holyhead.

²²⁸ Watson, *Royal Mail to Ireland*, 69.

²²⁹ Charges were laid down in sect. 3 of the Post Office Act 1660. A. D. Smith, *The Development of Rates of Postage*, Studies in Economics and Political Science 50 (London, 1917); Howard Robinson, *The British Post Office. A History* (Princeton, NJ, 1948), 49; id. *Britain's Post Office. A History of Development from the beginnings to the present day* (Oxford, 1953); F. E. Dixon, *Die irischen Postgebühren vor 1840* (1986).

one was no more than a cover, and heavier letters were charged by the ounce. Letters on government business were carried free of charge, 'frank', as it was called at the time, to and from the person who had the privilege.²³⁰ Others were paid for by the recipient. While it may appear an abuse of privilege to receive and forward letters in this way on behalf of others for their private correspondence, this was widespread practice. In the eighteenth century the person would usually sign letters on the outside to enfranchise them, and it was jokingly said that the forgery of signatures for this purpose was a custom in Ireland.²³¹ Free carriage between Galway and Oxford could be more complicated, since a person's privilege did not always extend through both kingdoms. Bishop William Nicolson wrote to Lhwyd, saying that 'my privilege' [as a member of the house of lords in England] 'will not Frank a Letter beyond Dublin'.²³² Conversely, the collector of customs and excise in Galway had free postage only in Ireland, 'The Collector Capt Arkwright answers my letter that he is ready to inclose any letters from me to Dublin, & that that is all he can doe' (letter 12). His office under the crown would require the carriage of money from Galway to Dublin, for which provision would be made outside the postal service. He was hardly an officer of state, and yet it is clear that even the legitimate use of the privilege had considerable elasticity. The limit on this occasion was attributed to a particular effort by the commissioners to control costs.

²³⁰ In 1660 the bill in the house of commons provided for free carriage of MPs' letters, but this clause was struck out by the house of lords. The letters patent appointing Henry Bishop as first postmaster general, however, provided for the free carriage of letters to and from the king, to and from officers of state, and during a session of parliament to and from peers and MPs; until 1764 the person had only to sign the outside of the letter to exercise the privilege (J. G. Hendy, *The History of the Early Postmarks of the British Isles from their introduction down to 1840* (London, 1905), 29–31). D. Feldman & W. Kane, *Handbook of Irish Postal History* (Dublin, 1975), 33, say that a stamp reading 'FREE' was in use in Ireland by 1707, in England only from 1764, but there is no example of it among these letters. In some instances John Anstis MP in London wrote the word (letters 14, 16, 17).

²³¹ Richard Twiss (1747–1821), traveller and writer, in his *Tour in Ireland in 1775* (London, 1777), 40–42, mentions three customs 'peculiar to the Irish gentry', eating boiled eggs for breakfast, 'the universal use of potatoes', and forging franks, 'which is pretty universal'. He had seen 'more than one lady of rank counterfeit the signature of many persons, with so perfect an imitation, that I must do them the justice to say that they could scarce be distinguished from the originals'. He had also heard that 'all the inhabitants of a town have sometimes had leave to frank letters' in the name of their MP. Feldman & Kane, *Irish Postal History*, 33–4, refer to a survey carried out by the post office in Ireland in 1773, which revealed that nearly half the frank signatures in that year, 1755 out of 3715, 47%, were forged; in some towns the ratio was more than 60%.

²³² William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Westminster, 2 January 1705[/6] (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 536v); Introduction, 156.

Postmarks have been noted when present on the letters printed here. Most interesting is the Bishop mark, a hand-struck stamp on the outside of the letter, indicating the date on which the letter was received at the post office. The mark is a 14mm circle divided by a line with the two letters of the month in one half and the day of the month in the other.²³³ The first such stamp was introduced in the London post office on 19 April 1661 by Henry Bishop (1611–1691), postmaster general from 1660 to 1663. The earliest known example of such a stamp in use in Dublin dates from 1670.²³⁴ Another mark to be found here is the name of the postal town, GALLWAY or GALWAY, both of which are used.²³⁵ I am not aware of any enumerative study of surviving postmarks in this period, such as might have allowed one to estimate how much or how little postal traffic there was out of Galway.

The practicalities of correspondence occupy a regular spot in O'Flaherty's letters, much more so, it may be said, than in Lhwyd's other correspondence.

Both were careful with money and used to finding contacts who had the privilege of franking letters for free carriage, but this was apparently already more widespread in Ireland than in England. In 1702, Lhwyd wrote to his friend Dr Thomas Molyneux sending a letter to 'old O'Flaherty', adding, 'who, unless it comes franck, will, I fear, be scarce able to pay postage'.²³⁶ This sentence was quoted, with an exclamation mark, by Hardiman, as evidence of destitution.²³⁷ In con-

²³³ The two-letter abbreviations are mostly perspicuous; note MR for March and MA for May, IV for June and IY for July.

²³⁴ Feldman & Kane, *Irish Postal History*, 7, refer to a letter from Dublin to Donaghadee, dated 13 August 1670. Their discussion, pp. 6–11, is the most detailed treatment of stamps in Ireland in this period. This antedates by many years the example from 1704, which was the earliest Dublin stamp known to Hendy, *Early Postmarks*, 152. The earliest example I have seen is on the letter from William Molyneux to John Keogh of Strokestown, dated at Dublin, 22 March 1684/5, to acknowledge receipt of his description of Co. Roscommon; this is preserved with the description, RIA MS 12 W. 22; the letter is fol. 15, the cover (fol. 17) has the postmark MR/22, 22 March, when it was handed in at the post office in Dublin.

²³⁵ Feldman & Kane, *Irish Postal History*, 73, note that the earliest such stamps show Strabane in 1698, Waterford in 1699, Cork and Lochrea (*sic*) in 1703, Kinsale and Clonmel in 1704. To these examples Galway 1704 can now be added. They were in general use by 1713, but Dublin itself is not exemplified until 1720 (*ib.* 23).

²³⁶ Edward Lhwyd to [Thomas Molyneux], dated at Oxford, 22 May 1702 (copy in Cardiff Central Library, MS 4. 120, p. 10).

²³⁷ James Hardiman, 427, citing *Thorpe's Sale Catalogue*, p. 287. This 1834 sale catalogue says, with reference to the letter dated 22 May 1702, 'Communicates some book, with a letter, "to old Flaherty, who, unless it comes frank, will, I fear, be scarce able to pay postage". Such was the extreme poverty of the Irish historian' (item 496). The inference originated with the compiler of the sale catalogue, reportedly Thomas Crofton Croker, a Cork man based in London (see Appendix 4). This quotation from

text it does not signify that. Talk of franks is almost as prevalent in the letters between O'Flaherty and Molyneux, though Molyneux certainly had no anxieties about the pence it cost to receive a letter.

Delivery was slow and erratic, letters are often out of synch, so that a further letter is on its way before the first has been answered or sometimes even received. At times there could be several in the post.²³⁸ O'Flaherty is conscientious in observing the conventions of referring to letters received by their date and mentioning when he received them. This allowed the sender to know when a letter had reached its destination. And it is clear that some letters went astray and were never received. The incidence of letters going astray in carriage is not very great, and one only occasionally hears of damage.

An alternative to the post office was to request friends or contacts who were travelling in the appropriate direction to carry a letter for at least a part of its route.²³⁹ O'Flaherty's kinsman James Blake is mentioned as such a carrier, but even a stranger might be asked. For O'Flaherty the few miles between Park and Galway could require assistance, though this is rarely mentioned. In one instance he tells Samuel Molyneux, 'I met with a stranger here I never saw before and after a night's lodging on Fryday last deliver'd 'im my packquett under Mr Dopping's cover as you directed to be left at the post office in Gallway'.²⁴⁰ He was dismayed when it appeared that the packet was not delivered, but more than two months later Molyneux indicated that he had received it. Some of the correspondence between

the sale catalogue was also supplied by William O'Sullivan, keeper of manuscripts at Trinity College, to Dr John Lorne Campbell, and appears in the latter's paper, 'The tour of Edward Lhuyd in Ireland in 1699 and 1700', *Celtica* 5 (1960), 218–28 (at 226). O'Sullivan refers to the letter as 'now lost', but its text is known from a near-contemporary copy (Introduction, 115). It says nothing of sending a book, though from other letters we know that Lhwyd did send a copy of Nicolson's *Scottish Historical Library* at this time as a gift to O'Flaherty. The post was not intended as a parcel service, for which a carrier would be used, and the cost of postage escalates steeply by weight. The rate per ounce was 3/8, made up of 8d from Oxford to London, 2/- from London to Dublin and 1/- from Dublin to Galway. In a contemporary binding Nicolson's book weighs a little over 500g (18oz), but a new book would be sent without boards in order to avoid customs duty. If we deduct as much as 4oz for the covers and calculate on 14oz, the sum is £2 11s 4d. No one would choose to pay postage at this rate, but the book was sent by carrier to Lhwyd's kinsman, David Parry, at Trinity, and did not reach O'Flaherty (letters 4, 5, 7, &c.).

²³⁸ For example, a letter from Lhwyd dated 6 May 1704 reached O'Flaherty 31 May 1704. His long reply, letter 10, was not sent until 21 July 1704 and was answered by Lhwyd on 26 or 27 August. O'Flaherty's response to that letter was letter 14. In the meanwhile three letters and a packet of sheets were on their way. Below, 204.

²³⁹ This method of carriage may be referred to in the letter; it can sometimes be inferred (see, e.g. the letter cited in the next note). ²⁴⁰ Letter 37.

O'Flaherty and friends in the west of Ireland may have been carried in this way rather than being handled by the postman.

Correspondence with William Molyneux

By Roderick O'Flaherty's own statement his connexion with William Molyneux began when the latter wrote to him on Saturday, 5 May 1683. In 1683 Molyneux was just twenty-seven and a private scholar, well connected in the protestant establishment, and trained in the law. After graduating from Trinity College in 1674, he had studied law in London at the Middle Temple. He returned to Dublin in 1678, where he completed a translation of René Descartes' *Meditationes de prima philosophia* (published in London in 1680), attempted a translation of Galileo's *Discorsi*, and devoted himself to the study of optics, on which Descartes had also written. His father Samuel Molyneux was a wealthy establishment figure, and William, the elder son, had no need of a career.

The reason for Molyneux's writing to O'Flaherty is likely to have been this. During 1682 he had begun to collect material for a county-by-county description of Ireland to be published along with maps as part of a multi-volume atlas, promoted by the London bookseller Moses Pitt (1639–1697) with the advice of Robert Hooke and the support of the Royal Society.²⁴¹ As Molyneux himself expressed it in a brief autobiography, written in 1694:²⁴²

²⁴¹ This atlas, projected in eleven volumes but never completed, was a major undertaking for which patronage was essential. Papers from the recruitment of subscribers, including the king and other members of the royal family, survive (E. G. R. Taylor, 'The English Atlas of Moses Pitt, 1680–83', *Geographical Journal* 95 (1940), 292–9). The first volume by various hands dealt with Muscovy, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Greenland; the second and third covered Germany with text by William Nicolson, and the fourth the Netherlands with text by Richard Peers. Who wrote what is derived from a letter of William Nicolson to Ralph Thoresby, dated 6 March 1692/3 (J. Hunter, *Letters of Eminent Men addressed to Ralph Thoresby FRS* (London, 1832), 120–122). Financial difficulties held up the fifth volume, whose text alone appeared in 1682.

²⁴² The account of his own life is dated July 1694 and presented as a continuation of the history of the family written in April 1694. This important source was to have formed part of an intended work by Dr Thomas Molyneux's son, Sir Capel Molyneux (1717–1797), 3rd Bt, of Castle Dillon, who wrote an introductory essay. It was published with added notes, dated 1803, by his son Sir Capel Molyneux (1750–1832), 4th Bt., *Anecdotes of the Life of that celebrated patriot and philosopher William Molyneux, author of the Case of Ireland, published from a manuscript written by himself* (Dublin, 1803). The edition was reprinted by Sir Thomas Phillipps as *An Account of the Family and Descendants of Sir Thomas Molyneux* (Evesham: John Agg, 1820), 53–78; quotation at pp. 60–61. In 1819 Phillipps had married Henrietta Molyneux, third daughter of Thomas Molyneux (1767–1841), son of the third baronet, half-brother of the

In the summer 1682, I printed and published some Queries relating to the Description of Ireland, which I then designed to write in order to have it inserted in the great English Atlas undertaken in London by Moses Pitt. On this occasion I was soon engaged in a large correspondence with many ingenious men in all parts of this kingdom; whereby I had collected together a heap of rude materials, which I thought in time to have shaped and modelled into some sort of order and form.

At the same date Sir Robert Sibbald (1641–1722), in Edinburgh, was preparing a similar work for Scotland with maps surveyed by John Adair (1660–1718).²⁴³ In Ireland this undertaking had the recommendation of the Provost of Trinity, Dr Narcissus Marsh, who wrote:²⁴⁴

We are now (a club of us who meet every week in the college) upon the design of giving an account of Ireland to be printed in the new atlas. There are some sheets already finisht, and the work goes on successfully. Exact maps also I

fourth, from 1832 himself 5th baronet; following the marriage Philipps printed as a single sheet *The Pedigree of the family of the Molyneuxs of Castle Dillon* [1819; copy in BL, L.23.e.4.(12)]. The other parts of Sir Capel's intended work appear now to be lost (below, 192–3).

²⁴³ An advertisement was printed in 1683, *An Account of the Scottish Atlas; or, The Description of Scotland ancient and modern, to be published presently by Sir Robert Sibbald* (Edinburgh, 1683) (Wing S3720); drafts towards this work are now NLS MS Adv. 15.1.1 (in English) and MS Adv. 15.1.2 (in Latin); Pitt intended to publish county maps for Scotland, as may be seen from that for Angus (H. R. G. Inglis & others, *The Early Maps of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1936), 92). William Molyneux would present a copy of Sibbald's *Scotia illustrata* (Edinburgh, 1684) to the Dublin Philosophical Society on 1 December 1684 (Hoppen, i. 45, no. 42). Sibbald was the leading figure in Scottish antiquarian scholarship at this time. John Maidment printed only thirty-five copies of his *Remains of Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt, MD, containing his autobiography, memoirs of the Royal College of Physicians, portions of his literary correspondence, and an account of his manuscripts* (Edinburgh, 1837). Two modern studies are R. L. Emerson, 'Sir Robert Sibbald, Kt, the Royal Society of Scotland, and the origins of the Scottish Enlightenment', *Annals of Science* 45 (1988), 41–72, and C. W. J. Withers, 'Geography, science, and national identity in early modern Britain: the case of Scotland and the work of Sir Robert Sibbald, 1641–1722', *Annals of Science* 53 (1996), 29–73.

²⁴⁴ Narcissus Marsh to 'My Lord', dated at Dublin, 18 May 1682 (Bodl. MS Rawlinson Letters 45, fol. 51 (no. 14)). There is no address, and the letter indicates that it would be delivered by the bishop of Kildare. The Bodleian catalogue of letters identifies the recipient tentatively as Michael Boyle (1609/10–1702), archbishop of Armagh from 1679 to his death, but I think this is not likely. At this date, Marsh is still provost of Trinity, the new bishop of Kildare is William Moreton (1640/41–1715), dean of Christ Church and newly consecrated bishop on 19 February 1681/2. Archbishop Boyle was hostile to Moreton, and it is unlikely that Marsh would send a letter to Boyle by Moreton's hand. And in any case Marsh would have addressed the archbishop as 'Your Grace'. The only clue may be the enclosure with the letter of a transcript of a letter from Faustinus to Paulinus, inc. 'Admiranda mihi semper' (i.e. Faustus of Riez, *Ep.* 5), but I find no evidence of such interests among the bench of bishops at this date. Even so, a bishop is more likely than a lay peer.

have of all Ireland, about 36 in number made by Sir William Petty, when he survey'd it. If I can obtain it from Sir William, leav shall be gotten for Mr Pitts to print them. We contrive it that the Description which we hear is drawing up in Scotland and ours of Ireland may make up one just volume.

Molyneux's sixteen queries were circulated as a broadside; one of the few surviving copies was preserved among the papers of Edward Lhwyd.²⁴⁵ The engraving of five maps was commissioned in 1683, presumably one of Ireland and more detailed maps of each province.²⁴⁶ Accounts for all or part of twenty-two Irish counties were received, but the project collapsed. In reaction to this, Molyneux destroyed whatever he had written himself but retained the descriptions sent him by others.²⁴⁷ Many of these have survived.²⁴⁸ Pitt's failure encouraged Sir William Petty to publish his maps in 1685.²⁴⁹

O'Flaherty may have been recommended to Molyneux as a suit-

²⁴⁵ Hoppen, *The Common Scientist*, 234 n. 91, notes two copies: Bodl. MS Ashm. 1820a, fol. 221 (with added date July 1682), has come down with other similar queries of the 1670s among the papers of Edward Lhwyd, who only arrived in Oxford in 1682; Bodl. MS Aubrey 4, fol. 245, belonged to the English antiquary John Aubrey (1626–1697), a close friend of Sir William Petty. A note at the foot of the broadside indicates that the queries were available *gratis* from the Dublin bookseller Dudley Davis. The broadside is reproduced from Lhwyd's copy by K. T. Hoppen, 'Queries for a seventeenth-century natural history of Ireland', *The Irish Book* 2 (1963), 61; the queries are printed in *The Common Scientist*, 200–201. A third copy in the Bodleian was kept by Aubrey's friend and collaborator, Anthony Wood (1632–1695), Bodl. Wood 658, fol. 787. ESTC R214213 records no copies elsewhere.

²⁴⁶ 'We have settled the business of the maps of Ireland, and Sandys is now engraving them, five in number' (William Molyneux to Thomas Molyneux, dated at Dublin, 20/30 October 1683; Wilde, 'Sir Thomas Molyneux', 472; Hoppen, ii. 479, no. 212). Edwin Sandys was an artist and engraver working in Dublin. Molyneux's directions to him concerning Ulster are printed from TCD MS 888/1, fols. 16–18, by J. H. Andrews, 'Science and cartography in the Ireland of William and Samuel Molyneux', *PRIA* 80C (1980), 231–50, at 248–9.

²⁴⁷ 'The main design failing in London, through the carelessness or inabilities of the undertaker, I was diverted from my purpose in this business, and wholly laid by the design; insomuch that I burnt all I had written myself on that subject; but I have still by me the rough papers of many other persons, who, from time to time, sent me their informations' (Molyneux, *An Account*, 61).

²⁴⁸ Some originals remain in TCD MS 888/1–2, which arrived at Trinity around 1742; others were lost from the Molyneux papers, though not before they were copied in or near 1708 by Samuel Molyneux, now TCD MS 883/1–2. For context and a list of those that survive, whether published or still only in manuscript, see N. Ó Muraíle, 'A description of County Mayo c. 1684 by R. Downing', in *A Miracle of Learning: Studies in manuscripts and Irish learning. Essays in honour of William O'Sullivan* (Aldershot, Hants, 1998), 236–65 (at pp. 240–42), and more briefly, 'Downing's Description of County Sligo, c. 1684', in *A Celebration of Sligo*, edited by Martin A. Timoney (Sligo, 2002), 231–42 (at p. 233). Further originals are noted in Appendix 4, below, 464. Coverage is mapped by J. H. Andrews, 'Land and people, c. 1685', *A New History of Ireland* iii (Oxford, 1976), 456.

²⁴⁹ Sir William Petty, *Hiberniae delineatio* ([London, 1685]). This includes thirty-

able person to draft an account of his own district, and we may guess that the recommendation could have come from Robert Downing, with whom O'Flaherty had already corresponded and who was much involved in the project. Molyneux wrote the first letter on 5 May 1683, which O'Flaherty was to recall in Galway gaol years afterwards.²⁵⁰ What O'Flaherty provided in 1684 was a description of Iar-Connaught rather than all of Co. Galway, but it is much fuller than other descriptions drawn up for this undertaking. James Hardiman judged it the most interesting of them all and approached in interest only by Tadhg Ó Rodaighe on Leitrim.²⁵¹

Meanwhile, by October 1683, Molyneux had begun to organize the Dublin Philosophical Society, which first met formally on 28 January 1683/4. Out of the fourteen members who attended that meeting, seven are mentioned in these pages.²⁵² It flourished for a few years,

five plates covering two provinces and twenty-five counties (some divided over two sheets). Note that Marsh (Introduction, 83) mentioned 'all Ireland' in thirty-six sheets.

²⁵⁰ The excerpt he gives in letter 1 shows Molyneux as contemplating the implications for western chronology of the discovery that the Chinese had detailed chronological records, a topic then of current interest.

²⁵¹ 'In this work Mr O'Flaherty has given additional proofs of his discrimination, judgment, and learning. That he far exceeded his contemporary contributors, will appear from a comparison of his treatise with the others produced at the same time, and for the same purpose. [. . .] Some of the other treatises alluded to still remain in MS in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. Among them is a short description of the County of Leitrim, compiled by Thady Roddy, which appears deserving of preservation; it is, indeed, the only one of the entire worthy of being classed with the description of West-Connaught' (Hardiman, p. vi). Tadhg Ó Rodaighe's account is now part of RIA MS 12 W. 22 [copy in TCD MS 883/1, pp. 138–44]; printed by J. Logan, 'Tadhg Ó Roddy and two surveys of Co. Leitrim', *Bréifne* 4 (1970–75), 318–34 (text, 325–31). The only other large-scale offering is the chorographical description of Westmeath by Sir Henry Piers (1628–1691), 1st Bt, nephew of Sir James Ware and son-in-law of Henry Jones, bishop of Meath; this survives in TCD MS 888/2, fols. 71r–88v (Piers's fair copy, received 1 September 1682), 97r–104r (William Molyneux's edited transcript, which reaches only to fol. 84v); copies in TCD MS 883/1, pp. 298–343, 344–5 (Piers), and MS 883/2, pp. 23–47 (Molyneux). Piers's text begins with a letter to Anthony Dopping, bishop of Meath and William Molyneux's brother-in-law, who is said to have commanded the work. There is a revised text with a different dedicatory letter to Bishop Dopping in BL MS Add. 28796; printed by Charles Vallancey in *Collectanea de rebus Hibernicis* i (Dublin, 1774; 2nd edn, 1786), xiii–xvi, 1–126, and reprinted by the Meath Archaeological and Historical Society (1981).

²⁵² The fundamental study is K. T. Hoppen, *The Common Scientist in the Seventeenth Century. A Study of the Dublin Philosophical Society 1683–1708* (1970), with supporting documents now printed as *Papers of the Dublin Philosophical Society 1683–1709*, 2 vols (Dublin, 2008). The idea is first alluded to in a letter from William Molyneux to Thomas Molyneux, then in Leiden, dated 20/30 October 1683 (Wilde, 'Sir Thomas Molyneux', 472; Hoppen, ii. 479, no. 212). The minutes of the initial meeting are printed by Hoppen, i. 14 (no. 8). Those members mentioned in this introduction are, besides William Molyneux himself, Narcissus March, bishop of Ferns and Leigh-

but meetings ceased after April 1687. O'Flaherty took no part in the meetings of the Society, and there is no evidence that he had anything of scientific interest to contribute.²⁵³ None the less he somehow made an impression on Molyneux. It may have been the detail and vitality of O'Flaherty's *Iar-Connaught* in comparison with the accounts written for other counties. O'Flaherty derived considerable benefit from their contact.

In the first place, it was due to William Molyneux's connexions that *Ogygia* was published. Knowing this, and knowing also the long and fruitless attempts to find a similar supporter for the publication of *Ogygia Vindicated*, we may probably say that it was due to Molyneux that it was published at all. The subject of printing *Ogygia* entered their correspondence as soon as it had begun, and one suspects that O'Flaherty may have raised it in response to his first letter from William Molyneux. We glimpse William's side of this through letters to his younger brother Thomas Molyneux. On the same day as he wrote to O'Flaherty, he wrote the first of a series of letters to Thomas, who was at that time on his way to London and heading for a period of study in Leiden. It is frustrating that this rich series of letters has disappeared, but they were used extensively in a paper by the young Dr William Wilde.²⁵⁴ Two weeks later William's third letter to Thomas (in Wilde's summary) 'contains some critical notices of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia*, just then published, and with whom he had entered into a correspondence on the subject. He says, he finds him a "learned and

lin; Sir William Petty; Dr Robert Huntington, provost of Trinity College; Richard Bulkeley; St George Ashe; and John Keogh of Strokestown.

²⁵³ During the first revival of the Society between 1693 and 1697, he is acknowledged by Dr Thomas Molyneux for information about the antlers of a giant deer (letter 2 to William Molyneux, dated 29 January 1696/7, and n. 20). When Samuel Molyneux sought to revive the society in 1708–9, O'Flaherty's offers of help concern only oddities or wonders (Introduction, 161–2).

²⁵⁴ [Sir William Wilde MD, 1815–1876], 'Sir Thomas Molyneux MD', *Dublin University Magazine* 18 (1841), 305–327, 470–90, 604–619, 744–63. Wilde says, 'There is scarcely a letter of either of the Molyneuxes (of a large collection now in our possession) that would not bear printing from an uncorrected copy' (p. 316n). Hoppen was unable to find the manuscript source, but it is evident that the letters were in the hands of Thomas's son, Sir Capel Molyneux, before 1797 (below, 192–3). A single original letter from William, addressed to Thomas in Leiden, survives among the Molyneux papers, TCD 888/2 (I. 4. 19), fol. 260–261; it is dated at Dublin, 27 September O.S. 1684, with the postmark OC/3 (3 October), and a memo by Thomas to say that he replied on 20 October N.S. This letter was not used by Wilde and had presumably been separated from the rest at an early date. Note that William uses old style in Dublin, Thomas uses new style in Leiden, where the Gregorian calendar was already in use. The postmark, to judge from the date, is that of the London post office, suggesting that the letter was carried by a personal contact rather than by the post office between Dublin and London.

rational man from whose endeavours (if possible) we may expect some light into our profound antiquities”'.²⁵⁵ Obviously Wilde had inferred that *Ogygia* was published, but at this date it was not, and William cannot have initiated the exchange to discuss it. *Ogygia*, however, has evidently been mentioned in O'Flaherty's first letters to him. The first indication that William was taking a positive interest comes from another letter in October 1683, the month when the Philosophical Society was formed. William in Dublin writes to Thomas, who was then studying medicine in Leiden, and announces that he has drawn up rules for a new society, talks about arrangements with Moses Pitt, visiting Dublin for three months, and the engraving of five maps of Ireland for the atlas, and he concludes:²⁵⁶

I have in my hands, and do suddenly [*at once*] intend to send them over, the first part of the *Ogygia*. I think, indeed, 'tis not contemptible, and that is enough to be said of any thing relating to the profound antiquities of our country, concerning which little has yet been said that would not raise scorn in a reader.

It is tempting to think that this explains the existence of a copy of *Ogygia* in William's hand. Here he refers only to 'the first part', which is ambiguous: the work as it exists is *Liber I*, divided into three parts by the time Molyneux made his copy, and it seems likely that he refers to the first and only book rather than the first of its subdivisions. Molyneux made the arrangements for the publication of *Ogygia* in London. We may repeat his own words about this. In the context of his work on the natural history, he singled out two correspondents 'of more public note', the Franciscan Peter Walsh and O'Flaherty:²⁵⁷

The other was Mr Roger O Flaherty, author of the *Ogygia seu Rerum Hibernicarum Chronologia*; a man the most learned of any of the native Irish, that ever undertook the Irish Antiquities; but he wants not a sufficient stock of credulity such as suits not with a solid historian. Between these two, more especially the latter, and me, there passed many letters in the summer, 1683,

(we may now lament that these letters have not survived)

²⁵⁵ William Molyneux to Dr Thomas Molyneux, dated at Dublin, 19 May 1683 (Wilde, 315–16). Wilde reports that the letter was carried by St George Ashe, who was presumably heading for London.

²⁵⁶ William Molyneux to Thomas Molyneux, dated 20/30 October 1683; quoted by [Wilde], 'Thomas Molyneux' (part 2), 472. An editorial note on p. 470 explains that Thomas dated his letters by both old and new styles and implies that William followed suit; the evidence referred to in the previous note does not bear this out. The date is here printed as 30 October (new style), when one would have expected William to write 20 October in Dublin.

²⁵⁷ Molyneux, *An Account of the Family*, 61–2.

relating to the Irish History; concerning the antiquity thereof and its motives of credibility; concerning their ancient Literature, Politure, Government, &c. wherein I must confess he could never persuade me otherwise, but that they were anciently a rude, barbarous, illiterate nation; having nothing of history, and very little of the chronology of their Kings, or genealogy of family more ancient than St Patrick's time, Anno 432. Notwithstanding this, I thought it might not be unworthy of my pains, to help forward the publication of his *Ogygia*, which I did at his request; for he constantly sent me, from his dwelling nigh Galway, his sheets, as he transcribed them fair, and I remitted them to the Bookseller that printed his work in London.

Transcription in Galway, postage via Dublin to London, composing and working off there as copy reached the printer, all adds up to a slow and easily interrupted procedure. The work of production was undertaken by Benjamin Tooke, based in London but also licensed as the king's printer in Dublin, who had printed and sold Molyneux's translation of Descartes. The printing was contracted to Robert Everingham in London, whose shop was equipped with a recently made Irish type.²⁵⁸ This type was commissioned and paid for by the scientist Robert Boyle (1627–1691), son of the 1st earl of Cork, in order to print the bible and prayer book in Irish. The New Testament was printed in 1681, but work on the first printing of the Old Testament took several years.²⁵⁹ Boyle's letters provide a remarkable insight into the work involved in printing the Old Testament in Irish between 1680 and 1685.²⁶⁰ Remarkably some of the punches made by Joseph Moxon and used to make the moulds for casting the types have survived.²⁶¹ Proof-correction demanded work in the printing shop, and during the printing of the Irish Old Testament Robert Boyle paid an Irishman

²⁵⁸ One leaf showing a set of specimens of this type is now BL MS Harley 1921, fol. 51, among a collection of alphabets put together by Randle Holme (c. 1659–1707).

²⁵⁹ *Tiomna nuadh ar dtighearna agus ar slanuigheora Iósa Críod* (London: Robert Everingham, 1681) [ESTC R211460]; *Leabhuir na seintiomna. The Books of the Old Testament, translated into Irish by the care and diligence of Doctor William Bedell* (London: Robert Everingham, 1685) [ESTC R23375].

²⁶⁰ R. E. W. Maddison, 'Robert Boyle and the Irish bible', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 41 (1958), 81–101. Maddison used the letters in the edition by Thomas Birch, *The Works of the Honourable Robert Boyle* (London, 1772); I have referred to the fuller collection edited by Michael Hunter and others, *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle* (London, 2001). Dublin, Marsh's Library, MS Z4. 4. 8, comprises a collection of Boyle's letters to Marsh. Eighteen letters were copied by D. H. Kelly (1797–1877), now Manchester, John Rylands University Library, MS Eng. 502 (formerly Ir. 96).

²⁶¹ D. McGuinne, *Irish Type Design* (Dublin, 1992), 51–63. The punches were at that date in the archive of the Stephenson Blake type-foundry in Sheffield; they were acquired by the Type Museum in Stockwell, London, with the aid of a grant from the National Heritage Memorial Fund. In 2006 the museum closed, and the future of the collection remains uncertain, but under the terms of the grant the Victoria and Albert Museum is the long-stop beneficiary.

in London, one Hugh Reilly, to correct the print.²⁶² There is no evidence as to who corrected proofs of *Ogygia*, but it must be certain that O'Flaherty himself had no part in seeing it through the press. One might think it a plausible guess that Reilly may have had a hand in it, at least for the quotations in Irish, but O'Flaherty appears to have been unaware that the Old Testament had been printed in Irish.²⁶³ Having to leave correction to others may account for O'Flaherty's ready mention of print errors in the book.²⁶⁴ Its publication made a lasting difference to him: after 1685 he could look on himself as a published authority on the antiquity of Ireland. By this measure his views, 'expos'd to publick view in print', carried more weight than writers such as Keating in the Irish manuscript tradition.²⁶⁵

The impact of *Ogygia*, however, was not what O'Flaherty hoped for. We shall see that he soon found himself the object of hostile criticism from Scottish antiquaries, particularly Sir George Mackenzie, though he was not their chief target.²⁶⁶ Even Thomas Molyneux did not attribute any credibility to O'Flaherty's work, referring to the writer as 'that most laborious enquirer in the pretended ancient,

²⁶² The proofs of the New Testament had been read in London by 'Mr Rely', who is evidently a catholic (Dr Andrew Sall to Robert Boyle, 20 May 1680; Hunter, v. 203–5); Sall persuaded him to resume the task, 'I write to Mr Rely the letter [. . .] in which I endeavour to encourage him for continuing the work of correcting the print [. . .] (I know non more able as he to do the work)' (Sall to Boyle, dated at Dublin, 7 February 1681/2; Hunter, v. 287–8); Boyle paid him well, 'Mr Reilly is to have ten shillings for each sheet he corrects' (Boyle to Dr Narcissus Marsh, dated 12 August 1682; Hunter, v. 321–2). Three letters survive in which he signs himself in his own name, Hugh Reilly to Dr Andrew Sall, dated at London, 24 September 1681 and 28 February 1681/2, Armagh Public Library, MS G. II. 22–24, nos. 15, 18 (unpublished); Hugh Reilly to Boyle, 18 September 1682, where he complains that the translation follows the English too closely for Irish idiom, adding, 'I take more pains in mending these faults, tho not obliged, than in correcting the print' (Hunter, v. 338–9). Hunter, v. 204n, suggests that he may be identified with Hugh Reilly, who was appointed to office in Dublin under James II and later published abroad *Ireland's Case briefly stated* ([no place], 1695) (much reprinted and even translated into Irish in the eighteenth century); his career is briefly visible between c. 1686 and 1695 (*ODNB* but not *DIB*), and there is not enough information to confirm the identification.

²⁶³ Reilly was going into Everingham's printing-shop regularly still in 1685 to correct the proofs of the Old Testament. In 1681 it was said that Reilly was 'the only one in London can see it through the press' (Robert Boyle to Bishop Henry Jones, [27 September 1681]; Hunter, v. 268–70). He may have been commended to Molyneux by Everingham or even by Molyneux's brother-in-law, Bishop Dopping, who had proposed Reilly to the provost of Trinity for translating a preface into Irish (Dopping to Robert Huntington, 14 December 1685; Hunter, vi. 451). As far as Irish type-setting was concerned, the situation had not changed, though obviously it would not have been difficult to find someone to correct proofs in Latin. On O'Flaherty's apparent ignorance of the printed Old Testament, see letter 5 and n. 38.

²⁶⁴ Letters 5, 27.

²⁶⁶ Introduction, 145–8.

²⁶⁵ Quotation from letter 28.

but certainly fabulous, history of this country, Mr Roger O'Flaherty, author of *Ogygia*'.²⁶⁷ Richard Cox—a protestant exile, who published in London during the crisis of 1689 and returned to Ireland with William III's army—described Keating's history as 'no more than an ill-digested heap of very silly fictions'; Walsh's *Prospect* he saw as an English epitome of Keating, which 'will never pass for more than a Utopian atchievement', and 'Mr Flaherty's *Ogygia* must expect the same fate, tho' he has shown a great deal of learning and industry in methodizing the story, and fitting a table of synchronisms to it'.²⁶⁸ The work was reviewed in continental journals. O'Flaherty was aware of the notice that appeared in the *Journal des sçavans* in Paris, and he tells Lhwyd that he responded.²⁶⁹ It was noticed also in the Leipzig *Acta eruditorum*; the reviewer outlined the book, noting the precise dates assigned to events very remote in time, but left it to the prudent reader to judge.²⁷⁰ Among Irish exiles it appears to have been more warmly received. A deposition made in 1712 said that O'Flaherty was much esteemed among Irish convents in the Low Countries.²⁷¹ And in Vienna William O'Kelly, of Aughrim, an expert on heraldry under Joseph I and Charles VI, reprinted O'Flaherty's chronological poem from *Ogygia*.²⁷² In petitioning the emperor for the ennoblement of the Irishmen George and Ulysses Browne in 1716, O'Kelly drew up a lengthy pedigree for them and invoked the name of O'Flaherty as his authority.²⁷³ He would perhaps have accepted the description

²⁶⁷ Thomas Molyneux, 'A discourse concerning the large horns frequently found underground in Ireland', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 19 (1697), 489–512, reprinted from the submitted manuscript by Hoppen, i. 267–82 (no. 157), at p. 267. For similar remarks about O'Flaherty's 'fabulous history and genealogies', see his letter to Edward Lhwyd, dated 4 May 1699 (Introduction, 95–6).

²⁶⁸ Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana; or, The History of Ireland, from the conquest thereof by the English, to this present time* (London, 1689–90), i. 1–2. Like O'Flaherty Cox had contributed to William Molyneux's Irish atlas in 1684, writing an account of Co. Cork. Tadhg Ó Rodaighe used the same expression, 'my honoured friend', with reference to both Cox and O'Flaherty in his letter to Lhwyd (Introduction, 97).

²⁶⁹ In letter 5, dated 6 November 1702, he said, 'I have occasion to write against one of them French journalls, that censured *Ogygia*'. The only French review I have found appeared in *Journal des sçavans* (Paris, 1685), 243–4, which mentions that the book could be had in Paris 'chez J. Boudot'. Nothing is said that could give offence except, perhaps, questioning whether Plutarch's *Ogygia* was rightly identified with Ireland. The *Journal* was read by William Molyneux, who cited it, for example, in his first lecture to the Philosophical Society on 15 October 1683 (Hoppen, i. 9, no. 1), and in a letter to William Petty, dated at Dublin, 6 November 1686, which cites the Amsterdam printing by volume and page (BL MS Add. 72850, fol. 306).

²⁷⁰ A. Rechenberg in *Acta eruditorum* (May 1686), 249–51. I owe this reference to Diarmaid Ó Catháin.

²⁷² Introduction, 59.

²⁷³ C. Duffy, *The Wild Goose and the Eagle. A Life of Marshal von Browne 1705–*

²⁷¹ Letter 38 and n. 39.

accorded to him by a protestant preacher in 1715, ‘Ruairidh o Flaiheartuidh, an Seanncuidhe dob fheidir as fóghlumtha mhairios anois do Ghaoidhealuibh’, though he would presumably have shunned the conversion sermon in which he was cited.²⁷⁴

We do not know whether any continuous connexion or correspondence was maintained, though O’Flaherty’s reference to William Molyneux’s providing him with franks for many years hints that it was. In his autobiography Molyneux named the friends who were important to him and with whom he corresponded.²⁷⁵ What survives of his correspondence is chiefly the letters he exchanged between 1681 and 1691 with the astronomer John Flamsteed (1646–1719) and between 1692 and 1698 with the philosopher John Locke (1632–1704).²⁷⁶ During the 1690s William Molyneux became much more a public figure than previously. This appears to have been initiated even before his return to Dublin. By patents dated 9 December 1690 and 12 February 1690/91 he was appointed to the commission for the accounts of King William’s army, which for several years brought

1757 (London, 1964), 13–14, 262. The successful petition and the resulting patent of nobility, dated (new style) 13 March 1716, are in the Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv at the Staatsarchiv Wien. The brothers Browne were rewarded with a grant of land, in eastern Bohemia, in the emperor’s hands since the dispossession of the Bohemian nobility in the seventeenth century. I owe this reference to Diarmaid Ó Catháin.

²⁷⁴ Revd John Richardson [*al.* Séon Mac Ristard] (1664–1747), *Fiorthairbhe na Ngaoidheal. The True Interest of the Irish Nation: in a sermon preached in the church of Belturbet, on Sunday the 23d of October, 1715* (Dublin: Jeremiah Pepyat, 1716), 10–11. The facing English version reads, ‘Mr O Flaharty, a Native of Ireland, still living, and perhaps the most learned Searcher into the Antiquities of his Country of any of his Nation’. I owe this reference to Dr Marc Caball.

²⁷⁵ He names as friends Bartholomew van Homrigh, St George Ashe, John Flamsteed, Robert Plot, Henry Dodwell (‘my particular friend and correspondent’), George Tollet, Sir Robert Southwell (whom he never met in person), Capt Joseph Glover of Chester, Dr Narcissus Marsh, Dr William King, Francis Robartes, Dr John Wallis, Mr Edmund Halley, and Mr John Locke (Molyneux, *An Account*, 76–8). Peter Walsh and Roderick O’Flaherty had already been named as correspondents ‘of more public note’ (ib. 61–2; above, 86).

²⁷⁶ The Molyneux–Flamsteed correspondence (2 September 1681–7 January 1690/91) survives principally as copied in Southampton RO, MS D/M 1/1; some eighty-four letters between them are edited by E. G. Forbes and others as part of *The Correspondence of John Flamsteed, the first astronomer royal* (Bristol, 1995–2002). The correspondence with Locke opened with a letter from Locke, 16 July 1692, and ended with Locke’s reply to Thomas Molyneux’s report of his brother’s death, 29 January 1698/9; it was published by Awnsham Churchill by agreement with Samuel Molyneux in *Some Familiar Letters between Mr Locke and several of his friends* (London, 1708), 1–296, and reprinted from there with notes by E. S. de Beer among *The Correspondence of John Locke* (Oxford, 1976–89), with a note, vol. iv, p. viii. On the agreement see letters between Churchill and Samuel Molyneux during March–June 1707 (Hoppen, ii. 739–41, nos. 420, 422–3, &c.).

him a fee of £500 per annum.²⁷⁷ In October and November 1692 he sat in the Irish parliament for the first time as a member for the university of Dublin.²⁷⁸ Although the session was 'troublesome and short', as he recorded for his brother:²⁷⁹

I had the good fortune to please both the Government and the University by my temper and moderation in the proceedings of the house; for his excellency [*Viscount Sydney as Lord Lieutenant*] was pleased, a little before the breaking up of the Parliament, to nominate me as one of the Commissioners of the Forfeitures in Ireland, with a salary of four hundred pounds per annum to each. But I thought it convenient to decline the place of Commissioner, how profitable soever, chiefly on account of the ill reputation of the other commissioners named; amongst whom I knew the untainted credit I had hitherto borne in the world might be apt to suffer, and I had rather decline ten times that profit than that my good name should be the least hazarded; and partly out of other considerations, which you had already from me by word of mouth and which is needless to repeat. My declining this commission made a great noise, and I think redounded much to my honour.

Molyneux was one of three commissioners appointed by patent dated 12 November 1692 to recover forfeited goods and chattels, embezzled stores of war, and unpaid rents. When a new commission was appointed on 4 April 1693, he declined to continue, excusing himself to the government on grounds of ill health.²⁸⁰ Molyneux's father died in 1693, and his estate was enough that he had no financial need of these offices. Indeed, it is far from clear how active he was in public office.

²⁷⁷ William Molyneux retained copies of printed proclamations by the Lords Justices concerning the payment of the army (27 January 1690/91, one copy) and by the Commissioners for stating the accounts of the army (17 February 1690/91, three copies), in both of which he is named as one of the commissioners, now TCD MS 889 (I. 4. 18), fols. 1–6; also a copy of the oath taken by commissioners, fol. 27. With them are the handwritten draft, a fair copy with corrections, and a second fair copy of a proclamation by the Lords Justices of terms to the Irish army for laying down their arms, dated 7 July 1691, ib. fols. 7–11. In his autobiography William mentions that he had received £500 for this service in July 1693 and at the time of writing a further payment was expected (Molyneux, *An Account*, 74). P. H. Kelly in *DIB* says that this was still being paid in October 1695.

²⁷⁸ *Irish Parliament*, v. 266–8.

²⁷⁹ Molyneux, *An Account*, 73–4.

²⁸⁰ The royal warrant for the second commission was dated 25 February 1692/3 (*Calendar of State Papers Domestic, William III, 1693* (1904), 45; on 8 May 1693 John Davis was appointed in place of William Molyneux 'who is under a great indisposition of body' (ib. 128). A report from the commissioners appears in July (ib. 241). This refers to the first commission of 12 November 1692 as comprising John Weaver, William Molyneux, and John Nelmes; the second commission, appointed on 4 April 1693, comprised Sir Michael Mitchel (at the time mayor of Dublin), Charles Dering, John Weaver, William Molyneux, and John Nelmes, with John Davis taking Molyneux's place. Did an ill reputation attach chiefly to Mitchel and Dering that Molyneux only at this date declined the commission?

After the period covered by his own account, in 1695, he was returned again as MP for the University and sat in sessions that year and again in 1698. In the extant letters O'Flaherty addresses him as a master in chancery, to which office he was appointed in the place of Dr Dudley Loftus by patent dated 6 November 1695. There were four masters in the court of chancery in Dublin at this date, and each received the insignificant stipend of £20 per annum.²⁸¹ Legal business does not feature at all in Molyneux's account of his life before 1694, though he was pleased to be made a doctor of laws by the university in 1693 and he owned, as he recorded, some common legal books.

Towards the end of 1696 Molyneux was again the agent of a material benefit to O'Flaherty. He had been made aware of O'Flaherty's circumstances at a time when O'Flaherty was in Galway gaol and sought to provide some help through his brother-in-law. As O'Flaherty expresses it in a letter to Molyneux's son, 'your Father [. . .] was a means (perhaps not unknown to you) of the good Bishop of Meath's bounty to me, which would prove more bountifull had not he been prevented by death at thy Father's house'.²⁸² Molyneux's older sister Jane had married, in 1669, Anthony Dopping (1643–1697), who was nominated bishop of Kildare in 1679 and translated to the much richer see of Meath in 1682, worth nearly £1,800 per year in this period.²⁸³ From the reference to Bishop Dopping's death, which befell on 25 April 1697,²⁸⁴ we must infer that the help provided was recent. The only evidence about what had passed between Molyneux and Dop-

²⁸¹ *Establishments of Ireland*, ii. 21–2. In 1698 John Dunton names 'William Molyneux LID' as one of the four masters sitting with the lord chancellor in his description of the High Court of Chancery (*Teague Land*, 153). Molyneux kept a note in his own hand, describing the responsibilities of the office, TCD MS 889 (I. 4. 18), fols. 66r–68r. As Simms puts it, 'The salary of a master in chancery was only £20 a year, but it was a position of prestige and would attract legal business' (*William Molyneux*, 95). A master would earn fees from beneficiaries in respect of any document he prepared to pass the seal, but it is not likely that Molyneux wished to practise law.

²⁸² Letter 33.

²⁸³ R. Mant, *History of the Church of Ireland* (London, 1840), i. 698–9, reports the approximate values of four bishoprics in 1687, Dublin (£1,800), Derry (£2,000), Kildare (£1,000), and Ferns (£900). Dopping reckoned the total revenues of the bishopric of Meath at £1784 6s 8d in the year 1692 ('State of the revenues belonging to the bishopric of Meath in 1692', Armagh Public Library, MS G. III. 13). As for its status, William King, bishop of Derry, expressed it thus to Sir Robert Southwell in 1697, 'The Bishopric of Meath is the first in the kingdom, as London is in England, and takes place next to the archbishops, but is much inferior in value to many'.

²⁸⁴ O'Flaherty says that Dopping died in Molyneux's house, which I have not found in any other source. The news travelled quickly: on 29 April 1697 Bishop King wrote from Derry to Sir Robert Southwell and to the archbishop of Canterbury, emphasising the importance of nominating the right person to succeed (copy in King's letter-book for 1696–8, TCD MS 750/1, pp. 65–6, 67–8; Mant, *Church of Ireland*, ii. 91–3).

ping is unhelpful. They were so often in one another's company that letters between them are rare, and the only one to refer to O'Flaherty merely reports his gratitude to the bishop for his charity and his desire that Molyneux supply him with paper in gaol.²⁸⁵ A simple reading of this situation would be to assume that the bounty was financial. Yet the fact that O'Flaherty was still in gaol more than six weeks after this expression of profuse thanks suggests that his difficulties were not only financial. But despite his experiencing a major setback in his personal circumstances, O'Flaherty was dauntlessly pursuing his goals as a scholar. His hope of future bounty rested in the prospect of Dopping's supporting the publication of *Ogygia Vindicated*, which he was recopying for him while in gaol.

William Molyneux himself died suddenly on 11 October 1698 at the age of 42.²⁸⁶ His brother Thomas had not shown himself so well disposed to O'Flaherty, but both brothers had met and corresponded with Edward Lhwyd, and it seems likely that Thomas Molyneux was the means of introducing Lhwyd to O'Flaherty.

Correspondence with Edward Lhwyd

Roderick O'Flaherty was already 70 when he first met Edward Lhwyd in Galway in 1700. How long they spent together and what they did is not well evidenced. Their correspondence extends over a six-year period between 1702 and 1708. O'Flaherty was approaching 80 at the time of his last letter to reach Lhwyd, which was dated April 1708, and his age and infirmity show in the deterioration of his handwriting over the period.

How Lhwyd first heard of O'Flaherty is not clear. He had used *Ogygia* at least as early as 1694, for he cites the book in his additional notes on the Welsh counties of Camden's *Britannia*.²⁸⁷ He would later identify O'Flaherty to others as 'author of the *Ogygia*', but there is no sign that he ever read the book closely.²⁸⁸ It is only from 1698 that we

²⁸⁵ William Molyneux to Bishop Anthony Dopping, dated 14 December 1696 (Armagh Public Library, G. II. 22–24, no. 325; see n. 17 on letter 1).

²⁸⁶ Molyneux, *An Account of the Family*, 35.

²⁸⁷ *Camden's Britannia, newly translated into English with large additions and improvements*, edited by Edmund Gibson (London, 1695), col. 636 (among Lhwyd's additions to Pembrokeshire). On Lhwyd's contribution to this work see G. Walters & F. V. Emery, 'Edward Lhwyd, Edmund Gibson, and the printing of Camden's *Britannia*, 1695', *The Library* 5th ser. 32 (1977), 109–37. Lhwyd cites a passage from *Ogygia*, 196, and also uses *Ogygia*, 198, as quoting two Lives of St Patrick from Colgan's *Trias*.

²⁸⁸ There are only a half-dozen direct references to *Ogygia* in the dictionary, in the entries for *Lochlommach* (citing *Ogygia*, 433), *Mianach* (195), *Queirt* (236), *Tabhal*

have evidence of his seeking information about O'Flaherty from William Molyneux's brother, Dr Thomas Molyneux, of Dublin.

Lhwyd had met Dr Molyneux when he visited Dublin as early as 1688. The first extant letter between them, written in the spring of 1689 at Chester, where William and Thomas lodged to avoid the turmoil in Jacobite Ireland, refers to their meeting in Ireland during the previous summer.²⁸⁹ One undated letter, written by Lhwyd to a friend in Wales shortly after this visit in 1688, reports his first experience of Ireland and specifically refers to discussion with Dr Molyneux and meeting Bishop Marsh. Lhwyd and Molyneux discussed collaboration on the natural history of Ireland:²⁹⁰

One Dr Mollyneux, MD, shewed me the best collection of books relating to natural history that I have seen, which he has purchased all himself, in order to write a *Pinax rerum naturalium* of that island. He was treating with me about my assistance therein; and, if no disturbance intervene, we are likely to begin next spring.

These letters explain later indications that Lhwyd had visited Ireland before the revolution.²⁹¹ (A visit planned for 1686 seems not to have happened.²⁹²) Thomas's next known letter from Chester apologizes

(177), *Uais*, *Uasal* (359), *Ullamh* (213), and *Una* (313), with some additional references in the appendix.

²⁸⁹ Dr Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Chester, 6 May [1689], now torn, with only the ascenders visible from the signature, and therefore bound among the fragments at the end of the Ashmolean series, Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817b, fol. 421 (not in Hoppen). William and his wife, together with Thomas, left Dublin on 31 January 1688/9 (Molyneux, *An Account*, 69); for most of two years a rented house in Chester was their base, where William's son Samuel Molyneux was born.

²⁹⁰ Edward Lhwyd to Richard Jones, Wrexham, undated but two days after his return to Oxford from Ireland, [October 1688] (*Archaeologia Cambrensis* 3rd ser. 7 (1861), 130–32). Among other things he writes about a botanical expedition to Co. Tipperary and conversation with an apothecary in Kilkenny. He refers to information he received from 'Dr Marsh, bishop of Fierns and Loighlyn'. A century later Dr Molyneux's library remained in the hands of his son, Sir Capel Molyneux, who refers to its formation out of the allowance Thomas had from his father during his studies abroad in 1683–6 (Molyneux, *An Account of the Family*, 40). Another letter from Jacob Bobart, dated at Oxford, 23 September 1688, addressed to Lhwyd, staying at Capel Curig in Snowdonia, says that he is 'heartily sorry that your crossing the water proved soe unsuccessful' (Gunther, 85–7), which probably signifies that Lhwyd lingered in north Wales after arriving at Holyhead from Dublin. There is no reference to Ireland in the letter.

²⁹¹ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Martin Lister, datable to [?October 1694]: 'I told you formerly Dr Molyneux and his brother had discoursed with me at Dublin about a Natural History of Ireland' (Gunther, 255–6, no. 119). Archbishop Marsh would himself recall that he had met Lhwyd in Ireland at a time when he was bishop of Leighlin, 'where you found me, when in Ireland' (Marsh to Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 4 October 1707, Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 323; Hoppen, ii. 777–9, no. 440). Marsh's houses in his two dioceses were at Staplestown, Co. Carlow, for Leighlin and at Cooperstown,

[See *opposite* for n. 291 cont. and n. 292

for his delay in responding to Lhwyd's latest to him.²⁹³ In October 1694 the reformed Dublin Philosophical Society invited Lhwyd to correspond with them 'in all the chapters of natural history'.²⁹⁴ A plan to find him a stipend to write a natural history of Ireland in Dublin had failed by the first weeks of 1695.²⁹⁵ His tour of the Celtic countries began in May 1697, and he arrived in Ireland at Dublin in August 1699. While he was still in Wales, he kept up his contacts in Ireland and made plans for the Irish stage of his journey. He wrote to Dr Thomas Molyneux on 18 October 1698, mentioning in a postscript, 'I should be glad of a correspondence with O Flaherty or any other ingenious Irish antiquary if they may trust a heretick in matters forreign to religion'.²⁹⁶ He wrote again on 19 March 1698/9, but that letter is untraced. During this period Thomas Molyneux was distracted by his brother's recent death, as he explained when he responded to the two letters together on 4 May 1699. The answer mentions O'Flaherty:²⁹⁷

I very rarely hear from Mr o'Flaherty, and can not [[say certain]]ly whether he be now alive, but if he be I can no[[t assure]] you that you would receive much satisfaction in a Cor[[respondence]] with him for he seems to have busied himself little in [[studying the]] real Antiquities of this Country, but

Co. Wexford, for Ferns. The implication is that Lhwyd, on his journey to Tipperary and Kilkenny, met Marsh at Staplestown, where he moved in 1684. Marsh left Ireland in March 1688/9, spending four months in London and nine months in Oxford; he returned to Dublin in August 1690. We learn also that Lhwyd had at some unspecified time lodged in the house of Mr Richard Bulkeley on Blind Quay from a letter from John Davies to Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 2 November 1703 (see letter 7 and n. 42).

²⁹² Philip Matthews to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Trinity College, Dublin, 3 November 1685 (Bodl. MS Aubrey 12, fol. 321), mentions two recent letters from Lhwyd and plans for a 'philosophical progress' around Ireland intended by Lhwyd and Dr Robert Plot in spring 1686. Matthews, from Reynoldstown, Glamorgan, entered Jesus College, Oxford, aged 16 in July 1681 (Foster, iii. 988); he transferred to Dublin and graduated MA in 1687 (*Alumni Dublinenses*, 563).

²⁹³ Dr Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Chester, 27 July 1689 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 359; Hoppen, ii. 658–9, no. 365).

²⁹⁴ Dr Owen Lloyd to [Edward Lhwyd], dated at Dublin, 6 October [1694] (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 254; Hoppen, ii. 682–3, no. 383, restoring the year, which has been lost due to a tear in the letter); referred to by Lhwyd to Dr Martin Lister, [? October 1694] (Bodl. MS Lister 3, fol. 168; Gunther, 255–6, no. 119).

²⁹⁵ William Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 7 February 1694/5 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 370; Gunther, 258n; Hoppen, ii. 683–4, no. 385). The idea is alluded to in a letter from Lhwyd to Dr Martin Lister, dated at Oxford, 1 January 1694/5 (Bodl. MS Lister 36, lvii; Gunther, 256–7, no. 120).

²⁹⁶ Edward Lhwyd to [Dr Thomas Molyneux], dated at Llanbadarn Fynydd (Radnorshire), 18 October 1698 (copy in Cardiff Central Library, MS 4. 120, p. 6).

²⁹⁷ Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 4 May 1699, but with no address for Lhwyd (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 363; Hoppen, ii. 698–9 (no. 402), fills the gaps differently and with less regard to the space). The delay in replying was occasioned by the death of his brother William Molyneux on 11 October 1698.

has chiefly spe[[nt his time]] in the inquiry into their fabulous History and Gene[[alogies]].

After arriving in Ireland in August 1699, Lhwyd stayed only three days in Dublin before travelling north. The detailed record of his tour was lost when his notebooks were destroyed by fire in a book-binder's workshop in London in 1810, but the outline can be reconstructed.²⁹⁸ He visited Newgrange, about which he would correspond with Thomas Molyneux; he called on Arthur Brownlow, at Lurgan, in whose possession he saw the ancient Book of Armagh; near Larne he met Eóin Ó Gnínih, 'whose ancestors had been hereditary poets, for many generations, to the family of the O Neals', from whom he purchased 'about a dozen ancient manuscripts on parchment'; and he visited the Giant's Causeway before crossing to Scotland from Ballycastle or Cushendun.²⁹⁹ He returned to Ireland in January, and three letters written to Thomas Molyneux at this time have survived.³⁰⁰ During this period, in May 1700, he called on the antiquary Tadhg Ó Rodaighe at Crossfield near Fenagh in Co. Leitrim, a meeting reported by Lhwyd to Molyneux: 'the gentleman received us civilly and promised his solution of some queries I left with him by the time we return'.³⁰¹ Ó Rodaighe's undated reply was kept by

²⁹⁸ An article in *The Cambro-Britain* 2 (1821), 200–204, reprinted by Gunther, *Life and Letters of Edward Lhwyd*, 554–7, includes a report by the Revd Peter Roberts on Lhwyd notebooks lost in the fire at Covent Garden; he mentions among other things eleven volumes of notes taken in Ireland and Scotland as well as eight volumes from Wales and a further eight volumes of drawings. Lhwyd's notes on the Book of Armagh had been communicated before the fire to the Revd Charles O'Connor, who published them in 1814 (n. 93 on letter 10). His itinerary is sketched out so far as possible from scattered indications by J. L. Campbell, 'The tour of Edward Lhuyd in Ireland in 1699 and 1700', *Celtica* 5 (1960), 218–28. Campbell makes the mistake of assuming that everything in the appendix to *Archaeologia Britannica* derived from Lhwyd's own experience, when the contrary is likely to be the case: his experience was available when compiling the dictionary, but information in the appendix generally came later from O'Flaherty's comments on the dictionary.

²⁹⁹ Lhwyd's own account of this route is given in a letter to Dr Tancred Robinson, dated at Bathgate near Linlithgow, 15 December 1699 (copies in Royal Society, LBO/14, pp. 293–5, LBC/14, pp. 344–8; *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 27 (1710–12), 503–6; Gunther, 421–3, no. 214).

³⁰⁰ Three surviving letters from Lhwyd to Dr Thomas Molyneux in this period are dated at Ballymoney, 29 January 1699/1700 (Hoppen, no. 404); at Sligo, 7 May 1700 (no. 408), and at Longford, 15 May 1700 (no. 410), when Lhwyd was obviously reporting on what he saw in Ireland. Others not known to Hoppen have since come to light in a near contemporary transcript now in Cardiff. Their route to survival appears to be that they were given to Samuel Molyneux in 1708, when he was going through his father's papers on the natural history of Ireland and making copies (see Appendix 4).

³⁰¹ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Thomas Molyneux, dated at Longford, 15 May 1700 (RIA

Lhwyd, apparently tucked into a medieval manuscript; in it he too mentions O'Flaherty:³⁰²

For old Irish manuscripts, I, Thady Roddy, of Crossefield, in the province of Conaught, and county of Leytrim, Esquire, have as many Irish books of Philosophy, Physicke, Poetry, Genealogys, Mathematicke, Invasions, Law, Romances, etc., and as ancient as any in Ireland, and so has several others in all partes of the kingdom. My honored friend Mr Roger Flaherty lost a curious volume of the Mathematics in the last warre, in Gallway, which I lent him, the losse whereof he wonderfully condoles in a letter to me.

After arriving in Galway, where the Welshman and his assistant lodged in the house of Peter Heine, Lhwyd wrote to O'Flaherty, who replied from Park next day, and they met soon afterwards.³⁰³

Lhwyd found him 'affable and learned', as he reported to William Nicolson.³⁰⁴ It is possible that they spent days together. They must have spoken about Newgrange, *Brugh na Bóinne*, for O'Flaherty mentions, 'I saw the description thereof with you'.³⁰⁵ We hear nothing of antiquities visited in the west. Although Lhwyd writes as if O'Flaherty was familiar with his botanical interests—in particular with regard to a rare plant brought from Aran—it is not apparent whether O'Flaherty accompanied Lhwyd in any explorations. O'Flaherty later mentions that he had given Lhwyd a copy of Hugh Ward's *Sancti Rumoldi acta* (1662), and it may be safer to infer that

MS 12 W. 22a, formerly Phillipp's 17726; Hoppen, ii. 713–14, no. 410). Crossfield was identified by John O'Donovan with Aroddy, two miles south-west of Fenagh, Co. Leitrim (O'Sullivan, 'Book of Domhnall Ó Dubhdábhóireann', *Celtica* 23 (1999), 281).

³⁰² Tadhg Ó Rodaighe to Edward Lhwyd, [1700] (nine small leaves of paper inserted in TCD MS 1318 (H. 2. 16), which was then in Lhwyd's hands, and now bound as cols. 369a–r, the quotation from 3690; the letter was printed by J. H. Todd, *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (Dublin, 1846), 112–25). These paper leaves were not included in the facsimile of the host manuscript by Robert Atkinson, *The Yellow Book of Lecan* (Dublin, 1896). John O'Donovan reprinted and commented on this part of Ó Rodaighe's letter in 'The lost and missing Irish manuscripts', *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 9 (1861–2), 16–28 (at p. 20–21), noting that only two from Ó Rodaighe's collection were known to him. On Ó Rodaighe's manuscripts, see P. P. Ó Ciadhra, 'Tadhg Ó Rodaighe', *Bréifne* 5 (1976–81), 266–77 (at pp. 269–71).

³⁰³ We infer this from the address of O'Flaherty's first letter to Lhwyd, letter 3. Other letters show that he intended to lodge with the Revd Fielding Shaw (letter 3 and n. 9).

³⁰⁴ Lost letter of Lhwyd to William Nicolson, dated at Helston, 20 October 1700, as reported by Nicolson to Arthur Charlett, dated at Salkeld, 14 November 1700 (John Nicholls (1745–1826), *Letters on various subjects to and from William Nicolson* (London, 1809), ii. 637–40).

³⁰⁵ Letter 30. The letter adds references to *Ogygia* and a story related by 'one Mr O'Neill' about 'Druid enchantments'.

this was a gift at the time of their meeting than something sent later.³⁰⁶ It is not a book that Lhwyd would have derived much profit from. These are the references to what passed between them.

Among Lhwyd's papers, there is a cover addressed thus: 'For E. Lhwyd at the Revd Mr Shaw's in Galloway. Any time these six weeks'.³⁰⁷ We know that Lhwyd intended to lodge with the Revd Fielding Shaw, minister in Galway, and gave instructions that he could be contacted there. Another cover survives similarly addressed.³⁰⁸ These show that some correspondents acted on those instructions, and obviously the letters reached Lhwyd even though he stayed with Mr Heine rather than Mr Shaw when he visited Galway. The address on the first of these covers was crossed out and the paper used to take notes; they appear to set out the agenda for discussion with someone, surely Roderick O'Flaherty:

- +1. Interpretation of old inscriptions.
- +2. Information where any more may be seen in Connacht or Munster.
- +3. Where any old coyns may be seen (Gold, Silver, or Brasse).
- +4. Where may be seen the oldest Irish manuscripts (viz. those which have been longest since written), what they contain and about what time written.
- +5. His judgement on the old fragment attributed to Carbri Liphechair &c.
- +6. Whether there be any Irish manuscripts extant, so ancient as not to be intelligible to the best critics, surviving.
- +7. Whether there be extant any ancient writings in that language, upon boards, such as ~~Mr Flaherty~~ (those/ mentioned in his Ogygia to have been seen by Dualdus Firbisius.³⁰⁹
- +8. Whether any Welsh manuscripts seen or heard of in Ireland.
- +9. Whether there be any of the ancient Irish law books extant in that language. By whom and at what time period, & where preserved at present.
- +10. The names of the five ancientest authors in the Irish language, whereof there are any works or fragments stil preservd. How those writings were entitld and when the authors flourishd.
- +11. Is there anything extant of the discipline of the druids? Or are there any places in Ireland where they have been more particularly conversant, or denominated from them?
12. Whether it be anywhere recorded on what purpose or design the great cairns were made, or the great stones pitchd on end in a circular order,

³⁰⁶ The gift is mentioned only in letter 5. If it had been sent, it is hard to imagine that there would have been no remarks about its carriage and safe receipt.

³⁰⁷ Bodl. MS Ashm. 1820a, fols. 263–4. For Mr Shaw, see letter 3 and n. 9.

³⁰⁸ 'For Mr Edward Lhwyd att the Reverend Mr Fielding Shaw's house in Galloway in the Kingdome of Ireland' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817b, fol. 447). I have not identified the writer from his hand.

³⁰⁹ *Ogygia*, 233. The subject of these *taibhle fileadh* comes up in letter 14 and n. 125.

or those other huge stones supported by pillars commonly call'd Diermit & Grana's Lodging, &c.

13. Whether we may be satisfy'd these entrenchments commonly called Danes Rathes were the works of that Nation, or whether many of them at least were not Irish. The reason of this question is because some Danish Antiquaries I consulted could not inform me of any such in their country.
14. Whether there be anything \anciently/ recorded concerning a large mound with great stones pitchd on end round about it, and a remarkable cave within it. It stands at a place now called New Grange near the River Boyne about 3 miles from Drogheda.

[*At this point intervenes the crossed-out address on the cover. Below it Lhwyt takes over the writing from his assistant.*]

15. An interpretation of the Irish names of ~~Towns~~, \Villages/, Rivers, \Bridges, Foards/, ~~Hills~~, Mountains, Hills, Towns, Villages, Forts, Houses of note, Woods, Cairns, &c.
16. An alphabetical catalogue of the ancient Irish names of men and women, with an interpretation of such as will admit of it, & a note of distinction to those still in use.
17. An alphabeticall catalogue \as well/ of the Irish authors who have written in their native language \Tongue/ til the beginning of the last century; as also of the anonymous pieces in the same language; what they writ, when they flourishd, & where their works may be seen at present.
18. An account of the peculiar games and customes among the ancient Irish.
A catalogue of the Mountains, Rocks, Lochs, & Rivers you know; with an interpretation of such names as are intelligible.

Questions 15–18 had been first drafted more concisely in Welsh on fol. 264, but the Welsh notes go on to include two questions not expressed in English:

Dehongiad ltheoedh yn y Werdhon. Trevydh, Brynniau, Avonydh, Caerau, Fysydh, Tai, &c. ['Interpretation of places in Ireland. Towns, Hills, Rivers, Forts, Rathes, Houses, &c.'].³¹⁰

Rhestr o'r enwae Gwydhelig ar Wŷr a Gwragedh ai harwydhocôad ['List of Irish names of Men and Women and their interpretation'].

Rhester o'r holh scrivenydhion yn y iaith honno yn ôl y lhythrennae, i hamser, i gwaith, i gwlâd, ai odirdod ['List of all the writers in this language according to their letters, their period, their works, their country, and their authority'].

Pop Gwarae a Chydnedhhuae'r hen wydhelod ['All the Games and Customs of the old Irish'].

³¹⁰ The Welsh word *ffos* 'ditch', pl. *ffysydd*, appears to be used as equivalent to Latin *fossa*, which is the word used in Latin to refer to an Irish ringfort or *rath*.

Gramadeg ne eirlyvr ne riw hen lyvrae ereill ['Grammar or wordbook or some other old books'].

Oes drioedh yn y byd yn y Gwydhelig ['Are there triads anywhere in Irish?'].

Some of these questions are undoubtedly intended for O'Flaherty. In the seventh question his name was first written and then struck out, as if Lhwyd wanted to avoid addressing him in the third person. And the fifth question points precisely to O'Flaherty: 'his judgement' on a text associated with Cairbre Lifechair connects with other evidence for their discussion. The first eleven points are marked with a plus sign, though whether that signifies that these questions had been discussed is beyond knowing. The fourteenth point was covered, for we have already seen that O'Flaherty was shown the drawing of Newgrange, mentioned in letter 30. Nothing else is reflected in the letters written in later years, but on a favourable interpretation all these matters would have been aired *viva voce* and did not need repeating in correspondence. It would probably be unduly optimistic, however, to assume that Lhwyd's expectations were entirely fulfilled by his conversation with O'Flaherty.

The manuscript referred to in these notes as 'the old fragment attributed to Carbri Liphechair' affords the most direct contact with what they actually talked about. References to it are brief and scattered, but they add up to an unexpected if incomplete sense of their discussion. The attribution derives from the ninth-century treatise, *Tecosca Cormaic*, 'Cormac's Guidance', in which Cairbre Lifechair puts questions to his father, Cormac mac Airt, and Cormac responds at length.³¹¹ O'Flaherty had encountered this text years earlier, but he did not associate it with the manuscript now in question.³¹² And it was the manuscript, not the text, that was under discussion, assigned to the second century by Lhwyd, as if dating from the supposed age of Cairbre himself. We first hear of this manuscript in 1685, when Sir George Mackenzie says that he had seen 'a very old Manuscript brought from Icolm-kill, written by Carbri Lifachair'.³¹³ It was the very same

³¹¹ It is edited by Kuno Meyer, *The Instructions of King Cormac mac Airt* (Dublin, 1909). Cairbre Lifechair's name stands at the beginning of the first sentence and in the heading in the copy in the Book of Ballymote, RIA MS 23 P. 12 (AD 1391) (Meyer, *Instructions*, 2n). Fergus Kelly has characterized the text as an early example of court literature, dating from the ninth century ('Thinking in threes: the triad in early Irish literature', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 125 (2004), 1–18, at pp. 16–17).

³¹² O'Flaherty, *Ogygia*, 337, had cited *Tecosca Cormaic* from the Book of Uí Mhaine; at *Ogygia*, 217, he assigned it to the year AD 278.

³¹³ This features in two pages headed 'Advertisement', added to the preface of G. Mackenzie, *A Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line* (Edinburgh, 1685), 'since the writing of these Sheets'; the London reprints later in the year followed this ex-

manuscript that Lhwyd saw in the hands of the Revd John Beaton, sometime minister of Kilninian and Kilmore in the Isle of Mull, when they met at Coleraine in February 1700.³¹⁴ What they saw still exists, at least in part, now NLS MS 72. 1. 1, pt 2, and known from Lhwyd's designation as John Beaton's broad book ('lhyvyr lhydan'). This connexion was established by John Lorne Campbell, who was also the first to show that Lhwyd and Beaton had met.³¹⁵ Beaton was still at Coleraine on 22 April 1700.³¹⁶ His long sojourn in Ireland has been taken as evidence that he had already left his parish in Mull and hoped for preferment in the Church of Ireland.³¹⁷ The broad book now comprises fifteen leaves in a large format (300 × 260 mm). The handwriting is that of a recognized copyist, Adhamh Ó Cuirnín, from Co. Sligo in the early fifteenth century.³¹⁸ The exemplar was

actly. Mackenzie's sight of the manuscript must have happened during 1685. His dating it six generations before St Patrick was ridiculed by Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicae*, p. xlv. After that Mackenzie renounced 'that argument from Carbre Lifachair' in his later essay, *The Antiquity of the Royal Line farther cleared and defended* (London, 1686), 154.

³¹⁴ Revd John Beaton (d. 1714) graduated from Glasgow in 1669 and was already parish minister in 1679 (H. Scott & others, *Fasti ecclesiae Scoticae. The succession of ministers in the Church of Scotland from the reformation*, new edn (Edinburgh, 1915–28), iv. 114). Scott records that he was still in charge on 18 October 1700 but was 'outed'—because he remained an episcopalian rather than a presbyterian—not later than September 1702. Evidence presented here suggests that he was outed rather sooner than October 1700. He belonged to the long-established family of physicians in Mull (J. W. M. Bannerman, *The Beatons. A medical kindred in the classical Gaelic tradition* (Edinburgh, 1986), see index under Beaton, John, minister of Kilninian).

³¹⁵ J. L. Campbell & Derick Thomson, *Edward Lhuyd in the Scottish Highlands* (Oxford, 1963), 12–14 (on their meeting), 47–51 (on the identity of the 'lhyvyr lhydan' with the second part of MS Adv. 72. 1. 1). The evidence for this meeting was earlier referred to by Campbell, 'Tour of Edward Lhuyd in Ireland', 223–4.

³¹⁶ Bannerman, *The Beatons*, 38, citing his dated signature in NLS MS Adv. 72. 1. 33 (Mackinnon XXXIII), section a, fol. 1r.

³¹⁷ Bannerman, *The Beatons*, 39. He leaves open the question whether Beaton abandoned or was removed from his benefice. Nicolson (quoted below, 104), relying on Lhwyd, refers to Beaton as 'a poor sojourning Clergyman', a further indication that he no longer had a parish (Campbell & Thomson, *Lhuyd in the Highlands*, 22). Bannerman supports his conjecture by reference to his bringing 'a considerable portion of his library of manuscripts', indicating that he intended residence. Campbell appears rather to assume that he brought these books to show Lhwyd. He may be correct in this, since Lhwyd himself noted that Beaton's books were 'in the isle of Tiree with the father of Mr Maclean of Salchur' (TCD MS 1369 (H. 4. 28), fol. 60v; Campbell & Thomson, *Lhuyd in the Highlands*, 37). After Maclean met Beaton in Mull in 1701 or 1702, his report to Wodrow speaks of Beaton's 'not having his bookes beside him' (ibid. 24; M. C. W. Hunter, *Magic, Science, and Second Sight in Late 17th-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge, 2000), 209). Still in Tiree?

³¹⁸ NLS MS Adv. 72. 1. 1 (Mackinnon I), pt 2 (s. xv^{1/4}) (D. Mackinnon, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Gaelic Manuscripts in the Advocates' Library*, Edinburgh (Edinburgh, 1912), 186–7). This manuscript is textually close to the Book of Ballymote and is now

very likely the Book of Ballymote, RIA MS 23 P. 12 (cat. 536), itself very large though less broad (385 × 250 mm), once comprising some 286 leaves. In the fragment of the broad book, leaves are reversed, out of sequence, and missing.³¹⁹ If put into their likely sequence, the contents begin with *Tecosca Cormaic* and continue (as other copies do) with *Senbriathra Fithil*, Irish triads, and other texts. The format suggests that a volume of proportionate content was planned, and perhaps achieved; what remains is a mere stub. Another manuscript fragment, now MS Adv. 72. 1. 1, pt 1, was already in John Beaton's hands and perhaps already paired with the second part.³²⁰ Both parts passed, directly or indirectly, to the Revd David Malcolm who gave them to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society in 1738, from where they passed to the Advocates' Library.³²¹ So far as we can tell, the manuscript returned to Scotland with Beaton. Our difficulty is relating all this to 'the old fragment attributed to Carbri Liphechair' which Lhwyd discussed with O'Flaherty.

That they examined such a manuscript together is clear. O'Flaherty would himself later recall seeing this 'manuscript vellum' in Lhwyd's hands, and he explicitly linked it to the manuscript seen by George Mackenzie:³²²

But Sir George, that he might not be behindhand with his forerunners, in bringing the like records out of darkness, makes use (in his first book of the royal line) of Carbre Liffechair (anno two hundred and seventy-nine King of Ireland) his name for a warrant of I-Colm-Kill-Abby, upon no other ground,

recognized as having been produced in Co. Sligo (T. Ó Concheanainn, 'A feature of the poetry of Fearghal Óg Mac an Bhaird', *Éigse* 15 (1974), 235–251 (at pp. 250–51); id. 'The scribe of John Beaton's Broad Book', *Ériu* 26 (1975), 99–101).

³¹⁹ Mackinnon, 106–107. A more intelligible description by Ronald Black is available in the manuscripts reading room at the National Library of Scotland.

³²⁰ Mackinnon, 73. This fragment, now of nine leaves in a smaller format, 230 × 190 mm, written in Argyll, AD 1467, by Dubhghall Albanach mac mhic Cathail, begins with genealogies of those highland clans that accepted the authority of Domnall of Islay as lord of the Isles, c. 1400.

³²¹ The same David Malcolm, minister of Duddingston, in November 1732, proposed 'to reprint the only printed Dictionary of that Language [*Irish*], published by Mr Edward Lhuyd, to do Justice to the Memory of that excellent Person, to whom he acknowledges himself highly obliged, and was to add to this, Collections of his own' ([D. Malcolm], *A Collection of letters, in which the imperfection of learning, even among Christians, and a remedy for it, are hinted. The Usefulness of the Celtick is instanced* [. . .] *As also, A Collection of Papers, in which the Proceedings of the Honourable Society of Improvers* [. . .] *are represented* (Edinburgh, 1739), *Papers*, no. ii (at p. 4). John Beaton was one of five highland ministers who signed a paper applauding this proposal at Edinburgh in 1736 (*Papers*, no. xii, p. 25). This medley volume, with its multiple paginations, also reprinted the English translations of Lhwyd's Welsh and Irish prefaces.

³²² O'Flaherty, *Ogygia Vindicated*, 70–71. Both paragraphs appear in the edition.

but that Mr John Beaton, a minister, who lived in that island some time, brought him an old Irish parchment, that had Carbre Liffechair's name in its first page, much to his purpose, as he thought.

/But finding his drift discovered by Doctor Stillingfleet, //in his *Origines Britannicae*, he, \in his second book, p. 154, thus recants:// 'I acknowledge my own argument, from that book, was of no moment; and, to shew my ingenuity, I pass from it;' \which manuscript vellum I saw// with Mr Edward Lhuid\, and is now extant in the Ashmolean Musaeum of the University of Oxford.\

This goes beyond anything he could have read in Mackenzie's work, especially since he never saw that 'first book of the royal line', here referred to.³²³ Mackenzie mentions Icolmille, that is Iona, but he says nothing of Beaton. The connexion with Beaton must have been remembered by O'Flaherty from his conversation with Lhwyd. O'Flaherty's recall is good, and he has found the relevant passage in Mackenzie's second book, *Antiquity of the Royal Line farther cleared and defended*, which he had still to hand. The passage quoted above from *Ogygia Vindicated*, first composed in 1686, was obviously modified after he met Lhwyd in 1700.³²⁴

In letters from his Irish tour Lhwyd referred to this manuscript several times, though we have only secondhand evidence. His correspondent in Glasgow, Robert Wodrow, made some effort to pursue Lhwyd's queries; learning that John Beaton had returned to Scotland, in April 1701 he wrote to John Maclean, a student in the university, 'when going home to Mull':³²⁵

I had in Summer last, ane account of a very ancient MSS, by a line from Mr Ed: Lhuyd in Ireland, That was then in the hands of Mr Beaton, he told me he supposed it was writt in the 2d Century, and that there was a Copy of it sent up to Ophalarti. The author is Carlrile Fachaire [*i.e.* Carbre Lefachaire], a heathen. Pray get accompt of this from the learned Mr Beaton, of its subject, Bigness, and what advances are to be made out of it, in our History, or the Maners of our ancient Druids.

³²³ Introduction, 148 and n. 481.

³²⁴ In the extant autograph of *Ogygia Vindicated*, Southampton City Archives, D/M 4/14, p. 44, continued at p. 167, O'Flaherty added the second paragraph, shown between / \, ending, 'which MS Book I have seen, & is now extant in the Ashmolean Museum of the University of Oxford'. The wording shown between // \ was added between the 1704 copy and the final state. None the less, the inclusion of Beaton's name in the first paragraph must have been a change made between 1700 and 1704.

³²⁵ Robert Wodrow to John Maclean, dated 13 April 1701 (Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 159–62, no. 81; Campbell & Thomson, *Lhwyd in the Highlands*, 23–4; M. C. W. Hunter, *Magic, Science, and Second Sight in Late Seventeenth-Century Scotland* (Woodbridge, 2001), 206–8). It is tantalizing not to find this letter from Lhwyd among the many letters to Wodrow in NLS.

Maclean's reply, sent a year later in April 1702, was based on conversations with Beaton.³²⁶ This young man from Mull, not yet ordained, would take Beaton's place as minister of Kilninian and Kilmore in September 1702.³²⁷ Wodrow speaks of a *copy* of the manuscript *sent* to O'Flaherty, but has he misunderstood? There is no hint of this in O'Flaherty's letter 3, dated 15 June, and in any case Lhwyd wanted his judgement on 'the old fragment', not a modern copy. It might appear that Lhwyd had borrowed Beaton's book, whose fifteen discontinuous leaves could properly be referred to as 'the old fragment' and shown it to O'Flaherty, wanting his judgement on it when they met. A different slant is provided by another letter from Lhwyd, also lost, to William Nicolson, who reported what Lhwyd had said in these terms:³²⁸

Mr Lhwyd tells me that (in his last years Travels in Ireland) he met with one Beaton, a poor sojourning Clergyman, who had pick'd up several Fragments of old Irish Manuscripts in the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland: Amongst which he had three large leaves of the Works of Carbri lefachair M. Cormac Mc Arteonfhaor [*i.e.* Cairbre Lifechair mac Cormaic meic Art Aoinfhear], who was a Heathen, and lived about the Year 200. Mr Lhwyd's own Skill in the Language would not enable him to make anything of 'em; nor was he enlightened by any Assistance he could get, tho' he desir'd (and had) the best helps the Kingdom of Ireland could afford him. I am well assur'd that Sir George had his Tidings from the same hand.

The last line tells us that Lhwyd knew and passed on to Nicolson the information that Mackenzie learnt what little he knew of this manuscript from Beaton; Lhwyd must also have been the source of this

³²⁶ Lhwyd's interest had been followed up by Robert Wodrow in Glasgow, who made inquiries about the manuscript with John Maclean. Maclean's answer provides more detail about the work attributed to Cairbre Lifechair. Addressing Wodrow by letter dated at Inverary, 20 April 1702, he says, '5. The Manuscript of which Mr Luyd informed you, whose author was Carbre Liabhachaire, the heathen, I have given you a hint of in the answer to the 2d Querie concerning Gathelus. The bigness of it, is a large sheet in everie leaf, the subject is various, chiefly the genealogie and origine of the Kings of Ireland, from Gathelus and upwards from the Creation' (NLS Wodrow Letters Q^o II, fol. 12 (no. 6); Maidment, *Analecta Scotica*, i. 121–5; Campbell & Thomson, *Lhwyd in the Highlands*, 25–6, 31–2; Hunter, *Second Sight*, 209–11).

³²⁷ Scott, *Fasti*, iv. 114. John Maclean was born *c.* 1680 and ordained to the parish of Kilninian and Kilmore 13 September 1702, where he remained minister for the rest of his life, dying 12 March 1756.

³²⁸ W. Nicolson, *Scottish Historical Library* (London, 1702), 67–8. The passage is cited by Campbell & Thomson, *Lhwyd in the Highlands*, 12–13, but in spite of the specification of 'three large leaves' they insist that the Broad Book in Beaton's possession was 'identical with the manuscript which Lhuyd, Wodrow, and Nicolson discussed and attributed to Cairbre Lifechair' (p. 47).

information in O'Flaherty's *Ogygia Vindicated*, and Lhwyd no doubt had it at first hand from Beaton in 1700. The remark about 'the best helps the Kingdom of Ireland could afford him' can be linked directly with something reported by Lhwyd to other friends, that he showed manuscripts to O'Flaherty and was disappointed to find that the chief antiquary of Ireland (as he calls him) could read little of the older Irish texts.³²⁹ Foremost among the manuscripts shown to O'Flaherty was this fragment of Cairbre Lifechair. But can we take at face value what Nicolson says, that it was Beaton who had just three leaves? Or did he rather mean that Lhwyd now had three leaves? This seems more plausible. In other words, Lhwyd did not borrow the book, and return it after he had been in Galway, but was allowed by Beaton to take leaves from it, which O'Flaherty assumed went to Oxford with him. Obviously these did not include the leaf, still in Edinburgh, where Cairbre Lifechair is prominently named. If the 'three large leaves' had remained in Lhwyd's hands, they might have still existed among his Irish manuscripts given to Trinity College in the 1780s.³³⁰

The absence of reference to Ó Rodaighe from these letters may indicate that Lhwyd had not put him to a similar test, since, one way or the other, it would have changed what he had to report on the matter. What makes this business all the more puzzling is the fact that, whatever O'Flaherty's difficulties, John Beaton provided Lhwyd with a transcript of part of the manuscript, which still exists.³³¹ No

³²⁹ Nearly two months after his meeting with O'Flaherty, Lhwyd wrote to the secretary of the Royal Society: 'I have in divers Parts of the Kingdom picked up about 20 or 30 Irish Manuscripts on Parchment: But the Ignorance of their criticks is such, that tho' I consulted the chieftest of them, as O'Flaherty (author of the *Ogygia*) and several others, they could scarce interpret one Page of all my Manuscripts' (Lhwyd to Tancred Robinson, dated at Penzance, 25 August 1700; copies in Royal Society, LBO/14, p. 298, and LBC/14, pp. 351-2; *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 27 (1710-12), 524-6; Gunther, 431-3, no. 218). To another friend he reported that he had acquired 'about thirty Irish manuscripts all upon parchment and so ancient that the chief antiquary Mr O'Flaherty [...] could hardly interpret one sentence of them' (Lhwyd to Dr Richard Richardson (1663-1741), dated at Helston, 21 October 1700; BL MS Sloane 4063, fol. 48r-v; noted only from Sir Robert Sibbald's copy by John L. Campbell, 'Unpublished letters by Edward Lhwyd in the National Library of Scotland', *Celtica* 11 (1976), 34-42, at p. 38). On the strength of these two letters, we may guess that the letter from which Nicolson drew his information was the one that mentioned 'above thirty parchment MSS in the language of the natives' (Lhwyd to William Nicolson, dated at Helston, 20 October 1700, as reported by Nicolson to Arthur Charlett, dated at Salkeld, 14 November 1700; Nicholls, *Letters to and from William Nicolson*, ii. 637-40).

³³⁰ One would expect them to be among Lhwyd's other Irish manuscripts. If they were, Mr O'Sullivan would surely have found them and brought them to the attention of Dr Campbell, whom he assisted a good deal in his work on Lhwyd.

³³¹ The copy of *Tecosca Cormaic* and Irish triads made for Lhwyd by John Beaton

one has sought to establish how good a transcript Beaton made, but Lhwyd—whose remarks emphasise the difficulty of interpreting older texts rather than reading older hands—was surely less than reasonable in making out to his friends that no one, not even O’Flaherty, could make use of his old manuscripts.³³² Ó Rodaighe had very clearly advised him that some texts were so difficult that no one could now interpret them: ‘I have several volumes that none in the world can now peruse, though within twenty years there lived three or four who could read and understand them all’.³³³ He was aware that the problem was in the language, not the script, though he had not the understanding to articulate the different difficulties arising from the age of the language and the register in which a text was composed. In one of his own poems Ó Rodaighe actually mentioned *Tecosca Cormaic* as a text he could not read without error.³³⁴ Whatever the precise nature of his problems, Lhwyd’s repeated comments show that he felt defeated by medieval Irish manuscripts, though he gathered an impressive collection.³³⁵ He would later ex-

himself is now part of TCD MS 1349 (H. 4. 8) (Campbell & Thomson, *Lhwyd in the Highlands*, 12–14). The remainder of this booklet is largely notes by Lhwyd on books in Beaton’s possession, including notes on the other contents of this manuscript (ibid. 47–51). About the same time, Beaton supplied a partial transcript of the other fragment now bound as part 1 of MS Adv. 72. 1. 1; his copy is now TCD MS 1363 (H. 4. 22), no. 16 (Campbell & Thomson, 51, express the identification in cautious terms, owing to the inadequacy of available descriptions in both cases, Mackinnon, 73, and Abbott & Gwynn, 211). This copy is signed by ‘Eoin Maigbheatha’ (John Beaton) and dated 14 March 1700 (Scottish style). By then Lhwyd was in Sligo, so the copy must have been sent to him.

³³² Lhwyd’s own attempts at transcribing older Irish can be examined (below, 141 n. 449, and note 93 on letter 10); he attempted no translations.

³³³ Tadhg Ó Rodaighe to Edward Lhwyd, [1700] (quoted by J. O’Donovan, *A Grammar of the Irish Language* (Dublin, 1845), p. lxxii; printed in full by J. H. Todd, *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (Dublin, 1846), 123). He goes on to speak about the difficulty of the five registers of Irish as then perceived.

³³⁴ ‘Udhacht Mhorain, Tréigean breatha, / Teagasg Rígh Chormaic ard-fhlatha, / gidh shílím go léighim uile, / ní léighim gan mearbhuile’ (‘Morann’s Testament, Tregean Breatha, / The royal Precepts of the monarch Cormac, / Although I think I read them all, / I read them not without errors’), quoted by Todd, ib. 116, who names O’Donovan as his source. The quatrain comes from Ó Rodaighe’s poem, ‘Binn le neach a mholadh féin’ (‘Sweet to a man is his own praise’) (T. Ó Raghallaigh, *Filí agus Filidheacht Chomacht* (Dublin, 1938), xvii–xix), composed in reply to Seán Ballagh Ó Duigeanain’s ‘Beannacht raim ó run chroidhe’ (‘Blessing from me from the heart’s intention’).

³³⁵ The parchment manuscripts collected by Lhwyd during his visit to Ireland were reckoned as thirty or more. A dozen parchment manuscripts were purchased at one time from Eóin Ó Gnimh [*al. Agnew*], of Headwood, near Larne (Lhwyd to Tancred Robinson (1657/8–1748), dated at Bathgate, 15 December 1699; *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 27 (1710–12), 503–6; Gunther, 421–3, no. 214), among them two items now bound as parts of Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1337

press the hope that someone in the future would be able to interpret them.³³⁶

The evidence of O'Flaherty's use of the Book of Lecan and the Book of Uí Mhaine puts it beyond question that he had in the past worked with manuscripts of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. He says that he formerly owned some 'MSS veloms', material replaced by paper in the sixteenth century, so that we must allow that he had some familiarity with medieval books. Already in 1700 Lhwyd also reported that 'the late revolutions in that kingdom have reduced him [O'Flaherty] to a great poverty and destroyed his books and papers'.³³⁷ From the letters printed here and from the Irish manuscripts identified as having been acquired by Lhwyd, there is no evidence to justify the supposition that O'Flaherty sold his Irish manuscripts to Lhwyd.³³⁸ This might have brought Lhwyd

(H. 3. 18). He mentioned 'over 30 Irish MSS' in a lost letter to James Sutherland (reported in James Sutherland to Robert Wodrow, dated 22 January [1699/1700; NLS MS Wodrow Letters Q^o I, fol. 108, noted in L. W. Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709*, Scottish History Society 3rd ser. 24 (1937), 133n). The survival of Lhwyd's collection of Irish manuscripts and their gift to the library of Trinity College in 1786 have been of enormous importance for the preservation of early Irish texts. At the time of the gift the older, parchment, manuscripts were counted as twenty items, besides twenty-six later manuscripts on paper, some of which are Lhwyd's notebooks or transcripts commissioned by him. These are indexed in Abbott & Gwynn's catalogue, and the collection is discussed by Anne and William O'Sullivan, 'Edward Lhwyd's collection of Irish manuscripts', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* (1962), 57-76.

³³⁶ Edward Lhwyd to William Baxter, dated at Oxford, 7 September 1708: 'There is still a considerable number of Irish manuscripts; tho' no man living understands them, and no care is taken to get them nor copies of them into libraries. I have myself ten times more Irish manuscripts on parchment than all Wales can shew of British; but must leave the perusal of them to posterity' (NLW MS Llanstephan 33, copied at the end, following Moses Williams's transcript of the Red Book of Hergest; Gunther, 545, no. 285).

³³⁷ Lhwyd to William Nicolson, dated at Helston, 20 October 1700, as reported by Nicolson to Arthur Charlett, dated at Salkeld, 14 November 1700; Nicholls, *Letters to and from William Nicolson*, ii. 637-40.

³³⁸ The idea that O'Flaherty was driven by poverty to sell his manuscripts can be found, as supposition arising from Molyneux's journal (Introduction, 47), in Paul Walsh's *Irish Men of Learning* (Dublin, 1947), 21. This notion was perhaps in the background, when it was observed that Lhwyd came to possess manuscripts that had once belonged to Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh, something one finds juxtaposed with Lhwyd's meeting with O'Flaherty in O'Sullivan, 'Edward Lhwyd's collection of Irish manuscripts', 62-3, and Ó Muraíle, 303. It is spelled out, for example, by Nessa Ní Shéaghda, 'Collectors of Irish manuscripts: motives and methods', *Celtica* 17 (1985), 1-28, at 7, with reference to books of Brehon law; and by Tony Crowley, *Wars of Words: The Politics of Language in Ireland 1537-2004* (Oxford, 2005), 88, who says without any justification that Lhwyd 'purchased most of O'Flaherty's library'. O'Sullivan made clear that these books were not acquired from O'Flaherty in his later paper, 'The manuscript collection of Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh', *Seanchas. Studies*

more satisfaction than he seems to have derived from his meeting with O'Flaherty. All the evidence indicates that Lhwyd learnt less than he had hoped to learn from the old man.

Lhwyd remained in the west of Ireland for some time. He attempted to visit the Aran islands, where his assistant Will Jones had already been, but the July weather proved unfavourable.³³⁹ There is little evidence of what else he saw in Co. Galway. He remained in Galway until 9 July, expecting to be in Cork a fortnight later.³⁴⁰ He was in Killarney on 22 July, when he bought a copy of Keating in English from one Tadhg Ó Muimhneacháin ('Têg Moynihan').³⁴¹

Correspondence did not begin again until nearly two years after their meeting. Lhwyd retained the letter of O'Flaherty expressing his readiness to meet him in Galway, letter 3, which he received at Peter Heine's house. In May 1702 he sent a letter to O'Flaherty along with one to Dr Molyneux, given *in extenso* below. O'Flaherty responded, and his answer, from July 1702, refers to two previous letters he had sent to Lhwyd in Oxford since their meeting. Their absence from Lhwyd's archive can in this case probably be taken as evidence that they were never received. From two more letters in July and November 1702 we can see one side of a friendly exchange of news on a range of subjects. After this, however, Lhwyd did not reply, and O'Flaherty's apologetic letter 6 was given away in the latter part of 1703 to a friend who collected autograph signatures.³⁴² It looks very much as if their active correspondence had already come to an end.

It resumed in 1704, with letter 7, from which it is clear that Lhwyd has reopened correspondence after a long lapse. From now their ex-

in Early and Medieval Irish Archaeology, History, and Literature in honour of Francis J. Byrne (Dublin, 2000), 439–47, at p. 439, where he admits to having unintentionally misled Ó Muraíle.

³³⁹ This is my interpretation of what is said in a letter from Lhwyd to Dr Tancred Robinson, dated at Penzance, 25 August 1700 (quoted in n. 10 on letter 4).

³⁴⁰ Edward Lhwyd to [Dr Thomas Molyneux], dated at Galway, 8 July 1700, announcing his intentions (copy in Cardiff Central Library, MS 4. 120, p. 10).

³⁴¹ The purchase is noted at the top of the first page of text in the manuscript, a copy of Keating's *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* as translated into English anonymously in the 1680s, now TCD MS 1443 (H. 2. 14): 'Edw. Lhwyd a brynodh hwn gan Têg Moynihan yn agos i Dre Kil-Arni yn Swydh Keri 22 o vís Gorphennav A° 1700' ('Edward Lhwyd bought this from Tadhg Ó Muimhneacháin near the town of Killarney in Co. Kerry, 22 July 1700') (Campbell, 'Tour of Edward Lhuyd', 227). The copy was recent, for it begins, 'In nomine Trinitatis hoc opus incipio 4° die 8bris 1697 annoque aetatis meae 15° Humfry Moynihane'; it ends, 'Finis libri secundi 29° die Martis 1699 per me Tha: Moynihan' (fol. 303r).

³⁴² The date may be inferred from the fact that two letters, the other signed by Robert Sibbald, went the same way; O'Flaherty's dated from June 1702 and Sibbald's from July 1703. The friend and collector to whom they were given was Ralph Thoresby (1658–1725), FRS.

change of letters is both more frequent and more fully taken up with discussion of Lhwyd's Irish-English dictionary and of O'Flaherty's unpublished *Ogygia Vindicated*. In this period, the relationship was practical in the sense that each was looking for particular help from the other. Lhwyd wanted a literate native speaker of Irish to vet his own Irish dictionary, and he saw O'Flaherty as being that, even if he was disappointed in his lack of knowledge of older manuscripts. O'Flaherty treated Lhwyd as someone who understood and would appreciate his own antiquarian learning, and he looked for his help to publish *Ogygia Vindicated* and to mend his scholarly reputation by seeing off his critics and promoting the truth as he saw it.

Reading the letters to Lhwyd is considerably more difficult than reading many letters of the period, because, rather than conveying news and personal information, much of the space is devoted to the discussion of books, and it takes some effort to gather or infer enough information to make sense of what O'Flaherty alludes to. Much of this introduction and the somewhat extensive annotation on the letters themselves serve to fill in background to what was in O'Flaherty's mind as he wrote. We must also infer from his side of the correspondence how far his interlocutor Lhwyd was able to understand the letters. It is an open question whether Lhwyd followed O'Flaherty's directions and looked up this book or that book, turning to the pages often cited by number. My impression is that he rarely did. To take the example of a passage in Colgan's *Acta*, O'Flaherty directs Lhwyd to the work no fewer than three times; it appears that in reply Lhwyd has said that the book could not be found in Oxford, though we know there was a copy in the Bodleian Library; eventually he admits to having seen it.³⁴³ More often than not, one gets no sense at all that Lhwyd is actually engaging with O'Flaherty's concerns. There is also a sense of growing frustration on O'Flaherty's part that the correspondence was not delivering the fruits he sought for himself.

We may consider the themes around three books that become successively central topics in O'Flaherty's letters: the Irish dictionary forming part of Lhwyd's *Archaeologia Britannica*, which O'Flaherty saw in sheets during 1704 and 1705; a bibliographical essay on Scottish historical writing, *The Scottish Historical Library*, by William Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle, a copy of which Lhwyd gave to O'Flaherty; and O'Flaherty's own work, *Ogygia Vindicated*, for which he hoped Lhwyd might arrange publication, a question about which Lhwyd in turn consulted Nicolson. This discussion will stray

³⁴³ Letters 9 (which refers to an earlier lost mention) and 13.

somewhat from the subject of O'Flaherty and his correspondents in order to fill in more of the background necessary to understand the letters.

Lhwyd's 'Archaeologia Britannica'

We have seen that there is some slight evidence that the correspondence began because Lhwyd was keen to have contact with a native speaker of Irish, who could both read and write Irish, and who could provide criticism of his work on the language. In the early part of 1700 he was inquiring after just such a person, and he was advised by Dr Owen Lloyd, of Trinity College, that 'the county of Leitrim is as likely a place as any where you may meet with men who are able to read and write Irish'.³⁴⁴ In that county he had met Tadhg Ó Rodaighe, but no continuing correspondence ensued. O'Flaherty's name was already known to him, and having met him in 1700, he would have known that the old man was both a fluent speaker of the language, capable of reading and writing it, and also capable of conducting a correspondence. This combination may have determined Lhwyd's decision to ask O'Flaherty to read his Irish-English dictionary, though he also sought advice from others. That business, however, did not begin until 1704, and it is first mentioned in letter 7.

Lhwyd is likely to have decided quite early that his study of Irish demanded a list of words that would serve as the base for comparison with other Celtic languages. It became a dictionary of well in excess of 10,000 entries. The evidence available to date the stages of Lhwyd's work on his Irish dictionary is sparse. When he was in Ireland, during 1699-1700, he says, 'I learned but very little Irish in that progress, and therefore it is from books, for the most part, that I have acquired the little knowledge I have in that language'.³⁴⁵ In 1699 he wrote down a brief conversation with a boatman in Irish but using Welsh orthography, which shows that he was still in the early stages.³⁴⁶ It would

³⁴⁴ Dr Owen Lloyd to Edward Lhwyd, then in Londonderry, dated at Dublin, 17 February 1699/1700 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 262; Hoppen, ii. 707, no. 405).

³⁴⁵ 'Bi ro bheag an chuid Ghaoidheilg ghnóthuigh me sa n-aistreibh sin. Agus uime sin is beag nach amach as an leabhruibh, thainig go huilidhe an bheigeolus do na Sguibearla ata agum' (Lhwyd, *Archaeologia Britannica*, 310). For more detail on the writing of this Irish preface, see below, 141. An English version was published by William Nicolson, *Irish Historical Library* (Dublin, 1724), 191-215. Alan Harrison has made a persuasive case that the translator was Anthony Raymond (1675-1726), whose proposed work *Scotia Antiqua* was first advertised in 1724 but was never published ('Who wrote to Edward Lhwyd?', *Celtica* 16 (1984), 175-8, at p. 178n).

³⁴⁶ This is in a little note-book, now TCD MS 1368 (H. 4. 27), p. 170; quoted in part by Campbell, 'Lhuyd in Ireland', 221.

seem that he had tried some years earlier, for in a letter to his close friend Dr Martin Lister (1639–1712), assigned with some probability to 1694, he wrote, 'I am now at some spare hours learning Irish, that I may be the better critic in the British, in case I should ever be concerned in the History of Wales. But I can not learn that there is any Dictionary, Vocabulary or Grammar of that language extant, nor one man in this town that can read it; which makes the task somewhat difficult'.³⁴⁷ His English preface acknowledges the help of Dr John Mill (1645–1707), principal of Edmund Hall, Oxford, for 'the first helps and encouragement I ever had in the study of the Irish'. It would be interesting to know what help and when.³⁴⁸

In his Irish preface, printed in *Archaeologia Britannica*, Lhwyd explains his approach to learning the language. He set himself first to read the Irish bible, or at least the printed Old Testament, and Keating's *Forus Feasa ar Éirinn*, 'with a few other modern books that occasionally fell into my hand'. A copy of the Old Testament in Irish was sent him by John Woodward in the early part of 1692.³⁴⁹ His manuscript copies of Keating in Irish and English survive, and two dated notes show that he was using the Irish text in 1703.³⁵⁰ He used the printed grammar compiled by Fr Francis O'Molloy, borrowing a copy of the book from Dr Hans Sloane in December 1701, through the intermediary Martin Martin, a Skyeman then in London.³⁵¹ Sloane had

³⁴⁷ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Martin Lister, undated [c. October 1694] (Bodl. MS Lister 3, fol. 151; Gunther, 248–9, no. 115).

³⁴⁸ BL MS Add. 15066, fols. 70r–86r, is a Latin–Irish vocabulary, 'communicated by Dr Mills' to Edward Lhwyd. The first leaf has body parts in Latin or English, glossed in phonetic Irish; from fol. 71r the glossary begins with A but quickly fades, so that D is very brief and there are no words beyond L.

³⁴⁹ John Woodward to Edward Lhwyd, dated 19 January 1691/2 (Bodl. MS. Eng. hist. c. 11, fol. 104), who writes, 'I have now at length met with an Irish Testament, the same that Mr Boyle (whom I suppose you have heard to be lately dead) was at the charge of publishing, being the only edition that I can hear of in print, if you please I will buy it & send it to you'. Woodward sent the book on and later acknowledged the receipt of 2/6 to pay for it, 2 March 1691/2 (Bodl. MS. Eng. hist. c. 11, fol. 107). Robert Boyle had died on 31 December 1691. On the edition, see above, 87–8.

³⁵⁰ NLI MS G17 (Phillipps 6461) (AD 1696) in Irish; TCD MS 1443 (H. 2. 14) (AD 1697–9), in English (Cunningham, *World of Geoffrey Keating*, 190–91, 199n). The English manuscript was expressly bought in 1700 from one of those who had copied the text, Tadhg Ó Muimhneacháin, near Killarney (above, n. 341). In NLI MS G17, at pp. 122–3, he noted that certain usages were current in Scottish Gaelic, presumably on the testimony of his highland assistant Giolla Choluim (below, 123 and n. 386). The manuscript was later in the hands of Charles Vallancey, who wrote at the front, 'This is the original Keating by which I detected many interpolations in O'Connor's translation. C.V.' (Cunningham, *World of Geoffrey Keating*, 199n). It passed from Vallancey to Austin Cooper, and at his sale in 1831 was bought for Phillipps.

³⁵¹ Martin Martin to Edward Lhwyd, dated at London, 17 November 1701 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 328): 'I have made strict enquiry after the books you want; Dr

himself grown up in Co. Down, but his book-buying was so extensive that one may not impute any particular interest to his possessing an Irish grammar.³⁵² Two years later there is evidence that Lhwyd also had the loan of another copy of this work from William Stonestreet, a botanist living in London, who was interested in languages.³⁵³ Collecting words would assist Lhwyd, so he drew up a *Foclóir* for his own use, which in time swelled to the size of that printed.

An early stage in the drafting is represented by the survival of a remarkable tabulation, now TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 9. This is made up from several pieces of paper pasted together; it was ruled in columns; and Irish–English or Irish–Latin entries have been written out at spaced intervals, allowing the process of alphabetization to be

Sloane tells me he has one, if not both of them'; Hans Sloane to Edward Lhwyd, dated at London, 19 December 1701, 'The other day Mr Martin came to me in your name to desire the loan of Molloy's Irish grammar & told me that you wanted it very much. I looked it immediately out & sent it you by Dr Sherard who had an acquaintance going to Oxford who promised to deliver it to you safe' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 460), and in a postscript he adds, 'If you want any other Irish grammars perhaps I may have them'; then again Martin to Lhwyd, dated at London, 22 December 1701 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 30): 'Dr Sloan has delivered Molloy's Grammar to a friend of yours, who went to Oxford three days ago'. Sloane's copy of O'Molloy's grammar is now BL 628 a. 22; it has two earlier ownership marks, first, 'Ad usum Fratris Antonii o'Donnell cum licentia superiorum anno millesimo sexcentesimo octuagesimo sexto' [1686]; second, 'Fr Bernardus Geraldinus Kildariensis Hibernus ex Provincia Lageniensi hunc librum recepit a venerabili P. Antonio o'Donnell et tenet in memoria eiusdem Patris 1688'.

³⁵² Hans Sloane (1660–1753), MD, FRS, was born at Killyleagh on Strangford Lough (Co. Down); his father's family had settled in Ireland early in the century. In his teens he developed his interest in natural history, of which a reflection appears in a much later letter: 'I have been on many small uninhabited islands on the coast of Ireland where the ordinary sea mews have laid their eggs often on the ground, even without nests, so thick that it is difficult not to tread on them, while the birds made a terrible noise over our heads, but they were only ordinary gulls' (Sloane to Dr Richard Richardson, 20 November 1725, Bodl. MS Radcliffe Trust c. 5, fols. 114–115). He left Ireland in 1679, studying abroad and making his career as a physician in London. After his death his huge library was acquired by the British Parliament and became one of the foundation collections of the British Museum.

³⁵³ The copy of O'Molloy's *Grammatica* now in the Bodleian, shelfmark 8° V. 104 Art., has some notes in Lhwyd's hand at the back. On the front flyleaf, however, is the name of William Stonestreet (1659–1716), vicar of St Stephen Walbrook in London, botanist and collector of shells and fossils, who was acquainted with Lhwyd and with both Sloane and Sherard. A letter from Stonestreet to Lhwyd, dated at London, 4 November 1703, thanks Lhwyd for the return of loaned books and goes on to talk about the Irish dictionary (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 482); the following letter shows Stonestreet as a collector of dictionaries and includes mention of O'Molloy's grammar (Stonestreet to Lhwyd, dated 7 December [1703], Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 484). This evidence does not allow one to date when Lhwyd used Stonestreet's copy, nor how it reached the Bodleian. The glossary at the back appears to be in Stonestreet's hand.

carried out without constant rewriting. This draft was superseded and the sheet of paper was reduced to its present size, 800 mm × 1515 mm, when the verso was reused.³⁵⁴ The whole work must have been transcribed again on to ordinary sheets of paper, and at this stage, so he said, Lhwyd wanted a critic to read the draft. He made inquiries, looking for³⁵⁵

a person well-versed and learned in Irish manuscripts [*sgriobhtha*], to correct and amend this Dictionary before it went to the press, but as it was very difficult to find such a person (which I have not hitherto met with) by whom these sheets might be corrected; I could do no better than to send three printed copies of this Dictionary to Ireland, and three more to Scotland, with letters to some of my acquaintance in each kingdom, to correct and enlarge the work. Two only of my friends returned answers, one from Ireland, and the other from Scotland; whose corrections and amendments are printed by way of supplement or appendix at the end of this work.

He goes on to say that he was not at liberty to attach their names without their approval. O'Flaherty is, however, mentioned in the context of the quotations from Dr Keating; Lhwyd explains that he is not concerned with chronology, a matter on which Keating's dates are not accepted by 'an dunusal [*duine uasal*] foghlumtha ⁊ intleachdach Maighistir R. O Flaithbheartuigh' ('the learned and ingenious gentleman Master R. O'Flaherty'). This was a point on which O'Flaherty had taxed him.³⁵⁶ He goes on to explain that he had begun entering obsolete words in his dictionary from an old manuscript glossary ('amach as seanchlár focal Ghaoidheilg laimhsgríobhthe'), marked with a dagger, but upon finding in the Bodleian a copy of Mícheál Ó Cléirigh's *Foclóir nó Sanasán Nua*, printed at Louvain in 1643, he incorporated this entirely, preserving also O'Clery's Irish explanations of older words.³⁵⁷ He also employed the Latin-Irish dictio-

³⁵⁴ The recto is ruled into columns; words beginning with A–P remain in twenty-six columns, and the remnant of the twenty-seventh, through which the paper appears to have been carefully torn against a sharp edge. On the verso is a similar, but complete, attempt at a Latin–English–Basque glossary arranged in nineteen columns (see letter 11 and n. 107).

³⁵⁵ Lhwyd, *Archaeologia Britannica*, 311; Nicolson, *Irish Historical Library*, 193–4; Evans & Roberts, 176–9. The same point is made in the English preface, 'When I had transcribed this part for the press, I was very desirous the sheets should have been perused before printing, by some native of Ireland or Scotland, well acquainted with the language; but not hearing after long enquiry there was any person so qualified in England; all that could be done was the sending some copies of the Dictionary when printed, into each kingdom. What additions and corrections have been thereupon returned, are all printed in the order of the alphabet, at the end, as a supplement or appendix' (sig. c1r–v).

³⁵⁶ Letter 23 and nn. 233, 234; again letter 28.

³⁵⁷ Edward Lhwyd to Humfrey Wanley, dated at Appleton (Oxon), 8 February

nary of Richard Plunket, of which he gives a more precise explanation in the English preface, thanking Archbishop Narcissus Marsh for the loan of this work and indicating that it came to hand only after he had begun printing; none the less it had been of great use to him.³⁵⁸

At this point, we may bring in parallel and more exactly contemporary evidence. This will provide some dates to measure his progress. Until all that survives of Lhwyd's correspondence is collected, we shall not be sure of having found every letter that may shed light on the subject. Six letters from William Baxter (1649–1723), a schoolmaster in Tottenham, who was devoted to comparing words in various languages, transmit comments on Irish words but do not reveal the state of the draft nor how much he saw of it. Baxter commented on words beginning A to D in May, June, and July 1703, and in December, January, and February on words beginning E to R.³⁵⁹ We shall see that this is many months ahead of any printing, so whatever Baxter saw had been copied out for him. The words commented on represent a small sample, and the comments, entirely comparative, were not used in the Irish dictionary. Setting these aside, therefore, I have used three groups of letters here: first, letters from friends in Dublin; second, letters from contacts in Scotland; and third, O'Flaherty's letters and other papers that passed between him and Lhwyd.

1702/3, reports that a copy of this rare book had been given to the Bodleian by Dr Thomas Hyde, librarian, in 1674; Lhwyd took this information from the copy still in the Bodleian (see letter 14 and n. 122). We know that he had already encountered the work in Ireland, where he was shown a manuscript copy by Arthur Brownlow: 'I must confess I never saw any of that kind in print but a small dictionary set out by on Clerii at Lovain in the year 1643, of which I showed you a manuscript copy when you were here' (Arthur Brownlow to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Lurgan, 10 June 1704; Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 285).

³⁵⁸ On this dictionary and its sources, see letter 9 and n. 67, letter 13 and n. 114, and remarks in letter 18.

³⁵⁹ Baxter's fifty or so letters to Lhwyd are peculiarly lacking in circumstantial information, but the first to comment on words from the Irish dictionary begins by saying, 'I have carefully perused your Irish Dictionary, so far as you have been pleased to communicate it to me' (postmark 21 May, and dated in Lhwyd's hand to 1703; Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fols. 168–170) [A–Caban]. The other letters in this sequence, all undated, deal with words in C (postmark 14 June [1703]; fols. 171–174), D ([July–August 1703]; fols. 175–177), E–I (postmark 16 December [1703]; MS Ashm. 1820A, fols. 265–266), I–L (postmark 22 January [1703/4]; MS Ashm. 1820A, fol. 271, Ashm. 1814, fol. 253), L–R (postmark 8 February [1703/4]; MS Ashm. 1814, fols. 186–193). How much was copied out for Baxter is impossible to guess. In the last of these letters he refers to his own copyist's transcript of Mr Lhwyd's dictionary. Baxter's ideas were once mentioned to O'Flaherty but only some considerable time later (letter 19 and n. 172).

First, then, to Lhwyd's negotiations in Dublin. A letter to Dr Thomas Molyneux, dated 22 May 1702 in the extant copy, which refers to Lhwyd's reopening contact with O'Flaherty and has several points of contact with their correspondence, also shows exactly how Lhwyd came to know of Plunket's Dictionary:³⁶⁰

Oxford, May 22^d 1702

Honoured Sir

This hopes to find you in perfect Health and (tho late) begs pardon for so long neglect of Writing. We have indeed little or nothing done here, since the Dissolution of our Philosophical Society, worthy the notice of the Curious, but what you have from the publick Accounts.³⁶¹ However because you may sometimes want them, I send you the inclosed: together with this Letter to Old Flaherty who unless it comes Franck will I fear be scarce able to pay Postage. I troubled you with a few Plants from Galloway whereof if one half grow with you you have more than our English Gardens can yet shew. {There is yet one plant in the Isle of Arran by Galloway that probably would bear cultivating beyond most I sent you, and is so great a Rarity that it hath not been observed elsewhere in these three Kingdoms. I saw one sprig of it brought thence by Will Jones, and I waited three days for weather to get into the Island but faild. Tis a small shrubby Cistus or Holyrose with a white Flower. I writt to Flaherty who lives just opposite to the Island to send me some patterns [*specimens*] of it, directing 'em to your hands, so if they come you may if you please open the parcel and take a specimen or more for yourself, directing the rest for me to be left with Mr Maurice Owen at Holyhead, who will send me anything by the Oxford carrier of Anglesay.}³⁶²

I find in the late great Catalogue of Manuscripts mention of a large Irish-Latin Dictionary amongst Dr Loftus's Books and a Note at the End of the Book that my Lord Arch Bishop of Dublin had purchasd Dr Loftus's MSS from his Executors. Such a Book would be of singular use to me in my *Archaeologia Brittanica* and British Dictionary (the former whereof I hope to begin to print next Spring) but that the Borrowing of it would be too great a Request to propose to his Grace at this Distance.

³⁶⁰ Edward Lhwyd to [Dr Thomas Molyneux], dated 22 May 1702 (copy in Cardiff Central Library, MS 4. 120, p. 10, complemented by p. 16). This letter has hitherto been unknown apart from the references to it in Thorpe's 1834 Southwell catalogue (Introduction, 79; Appendix 4, 467). Dr Molyneux's reply (below) gives the date of Lhwyd's letter as 24 May, which may be correct.

³⁶¹ If this remark was prompted by no more than lapse of time, it is odd, for there is nothing in their earlier correspondence from 1700 touching on the Oxford Philosophical Society, which had, in any case, been active only in the period 1683-7, when its secretary William Musgrave corresponded with the Dublin Philosophical Society. It is referred to as 'the quondam Society' by Dr Robert Plot in a letter to Lhwyd, dated at London, 1 December 1692 (Gunther, *Dr Plot and the Correspondence of the Philosophical Society*, 394-5, no. 36).

³⁶² The passage in braces is introduced from a second and incomplete copy of the letter at p. 16. I infer that it was omitted when the letter was first copied at pp. 10-11; the second copy ends as soon the omitted text had been copied.

INTRODUCTION

I find also in the same Collection a Manuscript Entitled *Cambria Triumphans* which I should be glad to know whether different from Piercy Enderbys Printed Book under that Title. There are also divers MSS in the College Library, which I should have been glad to have perusd had I been aware of their being there; for Mr Jones (whom I entrusted) had not the good Fortune to take Notice of 'em in the Account he sent me.³⁶³ I should therefore be glad to know whether there be any Youth amongst the Siziers, that understands the Irish so well as to be able to write it, and to read old Manuscripts, that (with the permission of the Provost &c.) I might sometimes employ him to Coppy a few things that seem by their Titles pertinent to the undertaking I have engagd in. Dr Lloyd calld here last summer on his Journey to London, and told me he designd to take Oxford in his Return but I suppose he is come to you long since, another way. If it may lye in my way, to serve either of you here; Assure yourselves there can be none more Ready to do it to his power than (most Honoured Sir)

Your ever obligd Humble Servant
Edw. Lhwyd

I presumd to write to Dr Lloyd in behalf of a young Kinsman of mine, one David (Parry), now a Pensioner I suppose in the College, but it was with a proviso of his proving Industrious & of good Behaviour. I suppose he never had the Letter, for he came over about the time the Youth was to be Enterd, and I had no Opportunity of mentioning it here.³⁶⁴

It was the letter to O'Flaherty, carried with this one, that reopened communication from Lhwyd's side and was answered by letter 4. This was carried in turn along with Molyneux's reply, written some weeks later.³⁶⁵ Here Molyneux carefully answers every point:³⁶⁶

Dublin, Aug. 10th 1702

Sir,

I am obliged to you for yours of the 24 [*sic*] of May last, which I had answered sooner had I not waited some time for a return from Mr Flaherty and an opportunity of sending you the inclosd Bundle of Letters Post Free.

³⁶³ Will Jones had called on Dr Owen Lloyd at Trinity College, but had not been able to see the library, as he reported by letter to Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 6 February 1699/1700 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 295).

³⁶⁴ This passage on p. 11 in the transcript is likely to be a postscript to the letter, since Dr Molyneux's reply picks up the point of discussing Mr Parry's position with Dr Lloyd as and when he returned to Dublin. The transcriber misread the surname as 'Tany'.

³⁶⁵ O'Flaherty's letter 4 was written on 18 July 1702; Molyneux's letter is dated 10 August, after receiving O'Flaherty's letter in Dublin; neither has any Bishop mark, because O'Flaherty's letter was carried by hand to Dublin and Molyneux's packet would have been sent on under a cover.

³⁶⁶ Dr Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 10 August 1702 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 365; cited by Hoppen, *The Common Scientist*, 190 and n. 112; Hoppen, ii. 715–71, no. 412). Until the recent discovery of Lhwyd's letter, one had only these answers.

By them you'll find I took care to forward yours to Flaherty, and that the receipt of it putt him to no charge. I thank you for the plants you sent me from Galloway [*Galway*]. They came safe in my hands and I immediately set them in the ground in a convenient shady place where I hoped they would have thriven. But in a year's time I found they all died except the *sedum serratum latifolium*, which is a hardy plant and will grow everywhere.³⁶⁷

I was to waite upon my Lord Arche B^p of Dublin and discoursd with him about the large Irish Latin Dictionary you mention. Tis a manuscript in folio of about 600 pages, writt in a small close hand, the Latin before the Irish, the author was one Richard Plunket, a friar, this copie was writt in the year 1662, and if this be not the original I am apt to believe it was not much antienter. Tho my Lord values the book much, and esteems it worth 10 pound, yet he was so generous as to profer the loan of it on condition it should be but for a certain time, and that it should be carryd and brought back by a very safe hand.³⁶⁸ He says that he is old and he may die and his book be lost in a very few months. He searched among his MSS for *Cambria Triumphans* that is mentioned in Dr Loftus his Catalogue, but can find no such Book, so that he concludes that it was some way disposd of before the Drs Books came into his possession. There is not any of the youth in our Colledge that I can hear of that understands writing the Irish character, so that I fear you must not expect any assistance towards forwarding your work from copying passages out of those Irish MSS that belong to our library.

Dr Lloyd is not yet returned hither but as I am told is gon forward into Holland. I cannot tell you whether ever your letter reached him, but when he comes over I will discourse with him about your kinsman Mr Parry.³⁶⁹

I was lately presented with a figur'd stone that I take to be rare and curious. Its substance is of a brown colour and a sandy grit somewhat resembling a

³⁶⁷ The plants in question were despatched with a letter on 8 July 1700, where a postscript lists the thirteen species sent, including 'Sedum serratum foliis pediculis oblongis insidentibus' (copy in Cardiff Central Library, MS 4. 120, pp. 9–10).

³⁶⁸ Among the copies of Lhwyd's letters to Dr Molyneux, Cardiff Central Library, MS 4. 120, p. 11, there is a cancelled paragraph closely related to this passage: 'June the 13th 1702 His Grace Narcissus Lord Arch Bishop of Dublin shewd me a MS he had among those of Dr Dudley Loftus's of about 600 Pages in folio writt in a small close hand 'twas a Lattin and Irish Dictionary the Latin before the Irish the Author was Richard Plunkett a Friar his Copie was writt in the year 1662 and I believe the Original was not much ancienter', followed by a line drawn across the page, and then, 'He promised to lend it to Mr Lloyd for some months if he would engage it should be carryd to him and deliver'd back again by a safe hand for he much valued the Book and esteemd it worth 10^{li}'. This must have been a paper in Thomas's hand, which Samuel copied before striking it out. The best guess I can hazard is that Thomas had begun a letter to Lhwyd on 13 June after his meeting with the archbishop, abandoned it, and simply wrote a memorandum where the draft came to an end. Thomas used this when he at last came to write his letter to Lhwyd on 10 August.

³⁶⁹ This is 'Cousin' Parry, that is David Parry, of Carmarthen, who arrived in Dublin with letters to Dr Molyneux and Dr Lloyd, and who matriculated in the university there. See letters 4 and 5 ('your cousin Parry'), 6 ('your kinsman Mr Parry'), 7 ('Mr Parry'), and nn. 15, 43. Hoppen's note mistakenly presumes that he is Lhwyd's assistant, also named David Parry, who did not return to Ireland at this time.

INTRODUCTION

sort of freestone. It was found underground between the crevice of two large rocks in a stone quarry in the north of Ireland near Dungannon. It consists of a number of hollow cells, of the shape, size and contrivance of those of a honeycomb, and I have reason to believe it the piece of a honeycomb petrified. I had a sketch taken of it by a good hand, which I here send you that you may be the better able to judge of it. I should be glad to know whether in your searches after formed stones you have met with anything of this kind, and what your opinion is of it. I desire you would give my humble service to Mr William Percivale of Christ Church, and take care to deliver him the enclosed.³⁷⁰

I long to see your *Archaeologia Brittanica*. I am every day more convinced that the Irish Tongue is but a Dialect or Corruption of the old British or Walsh and that this was the ancient Gaulish language in and before Julius Caesar's time, and this I doubt not but you will make clearly appear to the full satisfaction of the world, and of, Sir,

Your truly faithful friend and humble servant,

T. Molyneux

From this exchange we can see how Lhwyd came to be able to use this Latin-Irish dictionary drawn up by Richard Plunket, whose name comes up in correspondence with O'Flaherty only in letter 9, dated 6 June 1704. Lhwyd had been reading the catalogues of manuscripts collected by a group of Oxford masters and published in 1698 under the title *Catalogi manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae*. This had appeared while he was touring Wales, so that he had not seen it before his visit to Dublin. Although many sheets had been available in Oxford for a considerable time before the volume was complete, the Irish catalogues belong to the final part, almost certainly printed only after Lhwyd had set off into Wales. Among the manuscripts of Dr Dudley Loftus (1618–1695), listed here, he found two books in particular to interest him. First, under the heading 'Cambro-Britannicum' there was a work entered as 'MS cui titulus praefigitur Cambria Triumphans', which he asks after.³⁷¹ A few lines below in Dr Loftus's

³⁷⁰ William Perceval (1671–1734), of Christ Church, had been in Oxford since 1689 and had graduated MA in 1695. His father was George Perceval (1635–1675), registrar of the Prerogative Court in Dublin, who was the younger brother of Sir John Perceval (1629–1655), Bt, of Co. Cork. His mother was Mary Crofton, heiress of Temple House, Co. Sligo, which he would in time inherit; she was married for a second time, in 1677, to Richard Aldworth, of Stanlake Park, Berks, and died in 1705. Foster, iii. 1146, says that William became a prebendary of Killaloe in 1701, but he appears still to have been in Oxford in 1702; he offered help from Dublin in 1704 (see n. 42 on letter 7); he was archdeacon of Cashel 1703–25 and dean of Emly 1714–34. Perceval's marriage was reported by Dr Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd by letter, dated 29 April 1708 (Hoppen, ii. 835, no. 478).

³⁷¹ *Catalogi manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1697 [recte 1698]), vol. ii, pt 2, pp. 49–51 (nos. 851–977), at p. 50 (no. 873). As Lhwyd suspected, this is a prin-

catalogue, no. 878 is described as 'Focloir Hibernicum, id est, Vocabularium Hibernicum et Latinum, in folio, magnum et copiosissimum'. Lhwyd naturally wanted to see this. He knew from an earlier letter from Dr Molyneux that Dr Loftus was dead.³⁷² The note to which he refers, printed on the last page of the catalogues, told him that the manuscripts had been purchased by Archbishop Narcissus Marsh.³⁷³ Soon after he received this letter, Molyneux approached Marsh and was shown the dictionary on 13 June 1702.³⁷⁴ Some weeks passed before Molyneux replied to Lhwyd—waiting on an answer from O'Flaherty, he said—but months more were to pass before he was able to tell Lhwyd that he had agreed terms with the archbishop for the loan of Plunket's manuscript:³⁷⁵

Dublin, November 10th 1702

Sir,

I have at length, not without some difficulty, prevailed on the Arche B^p of Dublin, to afford you the lone of his MS Latin Irish Dictionary. I finde he values it much and was therefore very cautious how he ventured it so far as to go out of the Kingdom. I send it with this, & I hope you'll receive them safe; before I could procure the lone of it, he obliged me to signe a Receipt before witness, that it was deposited in my hands for your use, and under a penalty

ted work by Percy Enderbie (c. 1606–1670), *Cambria Triumphans; or, Britain in its perfect lustre, shewing the origin and antiquity of that nation* (London, 1661); the writer was English but married the sister of Sir Edward Morgan, lived many years in Wales, and learnt to speak the language. An error in drawing up the list of Dr Loftus's books had caused it to be entered as a manuscript in Welsh. Marsh was correct to say that 'it was some way disposd of before the Drs Books came into his possession': Hoppen, ii. 716n, notes the evidence from Marsh's Library, MS Z4. 4. 12 (s. xvi/xvii). This is a copy of Recension E of the Latin version of the Laws of Hywel Da (H. D. Emanuel, *The Latin Text of the Welsh Laws* (Cardiff, 1967), 413–14). At the front is a memorandum by Loftus, 'I lent to Mr John Griffith of Bloxham, Enderby's *Cambria triumphans*, which cost me 10s., and this MS I took after his death in lieu of it'. John Griffith of Bloxham died in 1662 (VCH *Oxfordshire*, ix. 56, 60), so this whole transaction must belong to 1661–2.

³⁷² Dr Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 4 May 1699 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 363; Hoppen, ii. 697–9, no. 402): 'Dr Loftus is dead some year[ss] now]] and I don't know any linguist here at present can [[promise]] to interpret the meaning of the writing' (see above, n. 297).

³⁷³ The note was printed across the end of the listing of Marsh's manuscripts as they were known before this acquisition, *CMAH*, vol. ii, pt 2, 61–5 (at p. 65).

³⁷⁴ This I infer from what appears to be a note of the meeting, subsequently used in drafting the reply dated 10 August (above, n. 368).

³⁷⁵ Thomas Molyneux to [Edward Lhwyd], dated at Dublin, 10 November 1702 (BL MS Stowe 747, fol. 157; Hoppen, ii. 719, no. 414). This letter was separated from Lhwyd's archive, apparently for the sake of Thomas Molyneux's signature, for this volume forms part of an extended autograph collection. There is no address, but its context was correctly identified by O'Sullivan, 'Edward Lhuyd's Irish manuscripts', 70 n. 49.

INTRODUCTION

of ten pound that it should be restored in 6 moneths, yet if you should want it a moneth longer I know the B^p would not be so rigorous as to exact the forfeiture. But to prevent accidents that may happen upon his or your death, he ingaged me to require of you, that as soon as you received the book you would acknowledge 'twas in your possession, by a Receipt in a letter to me, signed by you before some known witness present, he named Mr Persival or Dr Hide,³⁷⁶ and pray take great care of the manner you convey it back again to me, for tho it gett safe to your hands, it has but gon through halfe the hazard, and should it any way miscarry, besides the disappointment, I should wholly forfeit my credit with his Grace.

After all this trouble, I hope 'twill be of some help to you towards the perfecting your worke, if it is, I think it would not be amiss, that you made some publick acknowledgement in your Preface of your Benefactor for the use of it, for I am persuaded this would not be unacceptable. Pray give my service to Mr Persival, and deliver him the inclosed, and assure yourself as I have been in this, I shall be allways in anything that lyes in my power.

Sir, your faithfull friend & humble servant,

T. Molyneux

Marsh's lending the manuscript on these terms struck a balance between preservation and informed use. He was himself well connected in Oxford and had met Lhwyd in person. How long it took for the manuscript to reach Oxford we do not know, but another letter from Dr Molyneux, dated 22 June 1703, indicates that it may have taken longer than expected. He acknowledged a letter from Lhwyd, dated 27 May 1703, and had reported to Marsh, by now archbishop of Armagh, 'the disappointment you have met with in the conveyance of his Irish dictionary from hence'.³⁷⁷ Whether true or merely an excuse, he was allowed to retain the manuscript for a further six months. A copy made by Lhwyd's assistants is now TCD MS 1320 (H. 3. 1).³⁷⁸ Assistants also had the task of abstracting useful words, which involved reversing the direction of the dictionary from Latin-Irish to Irish-English; Lhwyd was aware of mistakes in this process but did not correct them.³⁷⁹ The exemplar was safely

³⁷⁶ On William Perceval, Christ Church, see above, 118. Dr Thomas Hyde (1636–1703), Queen's College, Oxford, was well known for his expertise in oriental languages; he was Bodley's Librarian from 1665 to 1701 and also held the chairs in Arabic and Hebrew. Marsh had earlier pursued his own oriental interests in Oxford, where he may have become friendly with Hyde.

³⁷⁷ Dr Thomas Molyneux to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 22 June 1703 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 367; Hoppen, ii. 720, no. 415). Marsh was nominated to Armagh on 26 January 1702/3 and was translated on 18 February.

³⁷⁸ The copy is in several hands, none of them Irish.

³⁷⁹ As he remarks in his Irish preface, *Archaeologia Britannica*, 312; Nicolson, *Irish Historical Library*, 197–8; Evans & Roberts, 182–3.

returned, for it remains in Marsh's Library today, MS Z4. 2. 5.³⁸⁰ The same letter from Dr Molyneux enclosed letter 6 from Roderick O'Flaherty, which gives no hint that he had at this date been asked to read over the dictionary in line with Lhwyd's expressed plans. When Lhwyd came to acknowledge the archbishop's loan, as recommended by Dr Molyneux, in his English preface to *Archaeologia Britannica*, he adds:³⁸¹

The great use that manuscript has been of, is particularly mention'd in the Preface to the Irish Dictionary. For tho' it be true that I had written and begun printing that part, before my receiving the vocabulary, yet the progress of the printer on account of other business in hand, was so slow, that, besides its use in the Comparative Vocabulary, it gave me time enough to insert therein, what additions seem'd necessary to the design propos'd.

At face value, this should signify that printing the Irish dictionary had begun at the latest by May 1703, which evidence shows was not the reality. Yet it is correct that Plunket is not cited in the very first sheet of the dictionary. The abbreviation Pl. for Plunket (as distinct from Pl. for Plural) first appears at sig. B1ra against the lemma 'Aoireagradh, *Restipulation*. Pl.', and it is used several times in each column thereafter.³⁸² It appears, therefore, that just one sheet had been printed off before Lhwyd was ready to make use of Plunket's dictionary. The arrival of the manuscript was a material gain to the dictionary and, though it may have involved alterations to the growing handwritten copy, its use was not impeded by any rapid progress in printing. We shall return to the question of when the first sheet may in fact have been printed.

³⁸⁰ M. McCarthy and C. Sherwood-Smith, *Hibernia Resurgens: Marsh's Irish Books* (Dublin, 1994), 36. Over time, other copies were made from this book, TCD MS 1425 (L. 5. 18), made for the lexicographer Edward O'Reilly (c. 1765–1830), and Waterford, St John's College, MS G 33, copied by Tomás Ó hCaidhe, 1837.

³⁸¹ Lhwyd, *Archaeologia Britannica*, sig. civ. Lhwyd sent a copy of the finished book to the archbishop, which is acknowledged by letter, Narcissus Marsh to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Dublin, 4 October 1707 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 323; Hoppen, ii. 777–9, no. 440). That copy remains in Marsh's Library (N. B. White in *Irish Book Lover* 23 (1935), 73; McCarthy & Sherwood-Smith, *Marsh's Irish Books*, 35); it is an imperfect one, lacking one sheet, sig. lll, pp. 225–8, the beginning of the grammar of Cornish.

³⁸² The entry in Plunket's dictionary, Marsh's Library, MS Z4. 2. 5, s.v., reads, 'Restipulatio f. o. Δοίρεδζιαδ, βαππρεδζιαδ, no ζειλλρεδζιαδ. πρεδζιαδ no τλδαιρε πρεδζιαρε Δι κύη δλιζιό no κυη ζειλλ εα κύη δλιζιό ορεδζιαδ' ('honour-response, bond-response, or surety-response, a response or giving of a response to a lawsuit [*cúis dligid*], or giving a surety under a lawsuit as a response'); entries for *Restipulator* and the verb *restipulo* follow. The same word, 'Restipulation', occurs as the gloss on another compound of *freagradh*, *Geilfhreagradh* (sig. Ozva), without reference to Plunket, but no doubt deriving from the same passage.

Second, alongside this, we should consider the arrangements Lhwyd sought to put in place to gather information on Scottish Gaelic, which he recognized was a necessary parallel to his work on the Irish language. We have already quoted from his English preface where he referred to having sent three copies of the dictionary to Ireland, three more to Scotland, asking 'some of my acquaintance in each kingdom to correct and enlarge the work'.³⁸³ His surviving Scottish correspondence shows that the process of consultation there began before there were any specimens of the dictionary to send. In this context it is worth introducing a very important letter from James Sutherland, curator of the botanical garden in Edinburgh, to Robert Wodrow, in charge of the university museum in Glasgow. It must be read as a proxy for Lhwyd's lost letters to Sutherland and to Sir Robert Sibbald:³⁸⁴

Edinburgh, Dec. 24: 1702

Sir,

I hade yours of Nov. 13 and a pretty while before the packet ye wrote of (sent me by the Bishop of Carloli) came to my hand. Sir Robert Sibbald and I had lately letters from Mr Lhwyd wherein he shewes us he is very busie about his *Archaeologia Britannica*, and therefore desires ye would do him the favour to procure him a correspondence with any curious gentlemen of your acquaintance in the Highlands conversant in Irish manuscripts, who might by degrees satisfie him in the following particulars, viz.

1. A catalogue of the Irish manuscripts he has perused or seen, or may have easie accesse to, the first and last words of each, with the number of pages each tract consists of, and in whose possession at present. This he would, with permission, print in his *Archaeologia Britannica* (together with his catalogue of British manuscripts) as received from such a person.
2. He would be glade to know whether there be two or more chief Dialects of the Irish in Scotland, and what extent these are of, with a specimen of about 40 or 50 words wherein they differ.
3. Ane interpretation of about 40 or 50 names of Rivers or Brooks, if they are agreed on in their signification. If not, a distribution between what they are satisfied in, and conclude, and what they only conjecture.

³⁸³ This procedure is referred to by the O'Sullivans in their introduction, pp. x–xi, but in a manner that confuses proofs and the premature despatch of copies to the bookseller in Dublin: 'Besides the proofs he sent to lie in Pepyat's bookshop in Dublin' [citing Gunther, 535] 'Lhwyd sent other sets to a Scottish scholar and to Roderick O'Flaherty, then already sunk in poverty and age. O'Flaherty is the Irish correspondent mentioned in the heading' [to the Appendix] 'and the proofs he corrected survive in MS H. 5. 20, vol. 8 (except fols. 25–26).' See Introduction, 129–36.

³⁸⁴ James Sutherland to Robert Wodrow, dated at Edinburgh, 24 December 1702 (NLS MS Wodrow Letters Q^o II, fol. 76 (no. 54)). The letter was printed (with some inaccuracies) by John Maidment, *Analecta Scotica* (Edinburgh, 1834–7), ii. 359–61.

4. The like of their Mountains, Woods, Fountains, and Rocks, and somewhat of their Towns and villages also.
5. Ane interpretation of such names as are purely Scottish, whether the nomina or agnomina, with a catalogue of such old Scottish proper names as are now obsolete or rarely used.
6. A Catalogue of the Irish names of Trees, Common Herbs, Birds, Beasts, Fishes and Insects of the Highlands with their English or rather Latin interpretations, where they can be positive, and some short hints of the others.

He says, Mr Collin Campbell, minister of Muccarn in Lorn promised he would resolve these Queries the best he could, and he sent him afterwards the Queries by your direction from Glasgow and desired to send the Answer of them to Mr Paterson, but it seems Mr Paterson never heard from him.³⁸⁵ Mr Lhwyd hopes you will take some pains in these particulars, and he presumes the minister of Kilmichael an Lus, one of whose parishioners he took from Scotland, and has yet with him, would not scruple to do his part.³⁸⁶ He desires such returns as may be procured with all possible speed, because the Irish Vocabulary and Catalogue of Manuscripts are some of the first things he puts into the presse. He tels me also that Mr Martin Mc Martine is at present in London and says he intends the publishing a Naturall and Morall

³⁸⁵ Colin Campbell (1644–1726), of Achnaba, was minister of the parish of Ardchatan and Muckairn from 1667 until his death almost sixty years later (Scott, *Fasti*, iv. 81; *ODNB*). The letter with which Lhwyd sent his queries survives among his papers, personal, religious, and mathematical, given to Edinburgh University in 1827; Edward Lhwyd to Colin Campbell, dated at Glasgow, 20 December 1699 (EUL MS 3099. 14; Campbell & Thomson, 4–5). James Paterson (?c. 1680–1705), who had studied with James Sutherland, was at this date keeper of the university museum in Edinburgh; he met Edward Lhwyd along with Sir Robert Sibbald in December 1699 and in turn he introduced Lhwyd to Robert Wodrow, with whom a correspondence began (Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 34n and see index). Paterson carried letters from Wodrow to Lhwyd in 1702 (ib. 188, 225), and appears also to have been on friendly terms with Lachlan Campbell. There are no surviving letters between Paterson and Lhwyd, but see below, n. 390.

³⁸⁶ The minister in question was Duncan Campbell (d. 1711), minister of North Knapdale, whose manse was at Kilmichael Inverlussa (Scott, *Fasti*, iv. 15). As for his parishioner, Campbell & Thomson, *Lhwyd in the Highlands*, xviii, equate him with the person referred to by Gunther as ‘the raw Scottish lad whom he picked up in the Highlands and took back to the Ashmolean, but failed to train as an efficient servant’ (Gunther, 330). Gunther gives neither name nor reference, but he must have known the evidence of an Ashmolean account book, set out by R. F. Ovenell, *The Ashmolean Museum, 1683–1894* (Oxford, 1986), 102–3, which shows that Giolla Choluim Mac Mullen was a likeable assistant whose delinquencies led to his having his pay docked more than eighty times during the years 1703–5. He writes his name ‘Giliecholum M^c Mullen his book Ogust 1702’ among various pen-trials in BL MS Add. 15072, fol. 2r, 22v, 58v (B. F. Roberts, ‘Edward Lhwyd’s protégés’, *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmordorion* 2007, new ser. 14 (2008), 21–57, at p. 49). He appears to have hung on and was still with Lhwyd in 1707. He is mentioned in letters 12 and 16, where he was consulted on colloquial Gaelic.

History of the Western Isles of Scotland, but it is not yet in the presse.³⁸⁷ Mr Rays *Methodus plantarum reformata* is lately printed in Holland. Dr Woodward has newly published a second edition of his book, but he cannot yet find that he has made any additions or alterations. He is told, Ane other piece of his is intended against all that ever yet medled with Figured Fossils, but he knows not as yet how foreward that may be, or whether in the presse or not. He desires I may tell you that he received, about half a year after the date, your oblidging letter, but had not the good fortune of seeing Mr Lachlyn Campbell, but received a kind present of ane Irish Manuscript from him.³⁸⁸ Sir Robert Sibbald gives you his service and says he longs exceedingly to hear from you. I have got some small addition to my Coyns since ye was here. A gold Nero weighing an Unce and a drop, ane other gold Nero ploughed up in the south of Scotland weighing near 4 drop, a dozen Roman pieces six silver and six copper from Dr Richardson in Yorkshire and a small box of Fossils, three Roman *Denarii* found near Dundee, some brasse pieces of Antoninus

³⁸⁷ Martin Martin (d. 1718), a native of Skye and a student of medicine, was indeed in London and had helped Lhwyd to borrow a copy of O'Molloy's Irish grammar from Dr Sloane (Introduction, 111). Lhwyd had been referred to him by John MacQueen, a highlander in London, in letters dated 21 February 1697/8 and 14 April 1698 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fols. 281, 283). He attempted contact with him at the end of 1699, when he wrote from Kintyre, but this letter was never received. Lhwyd wrote to him in London on 25 October 1702, and the reply is the first of seven extant letters from Martin in London to Lhwyd in Oxford from the period November 1702 to August 1703 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fols. 328–41). In the first of these, dated 17 November 1702, Martin says, 'I have nothing now at the press; that which I intended was the Natural and Morall History of our Western Isles' (fol. 329r). He would publish the first edition of *A Description of the Western Islands of Scotland* (London, 1703) in February 1703/4 (Arber, *Term Catalogues*, iii. 391). Lhwyd's copies of this ('ex dono authoris') and of Martin's earlier work, *A late Voyage to St Kilda* (London, 1698), are now bound together in the Bodleian, shelfmark Ashm. 1647. Dr John Ray's *Methodus plantarum emendata et aucta* bears the imprint London 1703, though it was sold in Amsterdam; other evidence suggests that it was actually printed in Leiden. In view of the date, and his error in reporting the title, it is likely that Lhwyd was passing on report of the book. Dr John Woodward had brought out a second edition of his *An Essay toward a natural history of the earth and terrestrial bodies* in London in November 1702 (Arber, *Term Catalogues*, iii. 326); the further work, about which Lhwyd repeated rumours, appears not to have been printed.

³⁸⁸ The manuscript survives among Lhwyd's Irish collection, TCD MS 1307 (H. 2. 12, no. 6), just eight leaves; it contains two short metrical glossaries, copied at Campbeltown for Lachlan Campbell by Eóghan Mac Gilleóin in September and October 1698; it has Lhwyd's seal and the number 101. Another manuscript written by Eóghan Mac Gilleóin, from Kilchenzie, was also acquired by Lhwyd at the beginning of 1700, now TCD MS 1362 (H. 4. 21) (AD 1691). (For other manuscripts made by him, see R. Black in D. S. Thomson's *The Companion to Gaelic Scotland* (Oxford, 1983), s.n. Maclean, Hugh). One letter from Mac Gilleóin to Lhwyd survives, dated at Campbeltown, 3 January 1700 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 277), and addressed to Lhwyd at Machrimore, where he was waiting for a boat to Ireland; in this he indicates that Lachlan Campbell had shown him Lhwyd's queries, but there is also a hint that he and Lhwyd had met, 'yow know, Sir, I spoke to yow something anent the old alphabets, if your time or laizure permitt yow there'.

Pius, Alexander Severus, and Gordianus Pius from a friend lately return'd from his travels, and I expect thirty six pieces more with a ship waiting a fair wind from London. When ye think convenient, let me hear from you and ye may always be assured of a return from,

Sir,

Your most humble oblidged servant,

Ja. Sutherland

Sutherland's reply to Lhwyd is not known to survive, but one from Sibbald, dated 16 July 1703, does survive: it says that had had sent Lhwyd's queries concerning the language of the highlanders to Mr Archibald Campbell, son of Lord Neill Campbell, but there the trail goes cold.³⁸⁹ It is not apparent why Lhwyd approached Sutherland and Sibbald without writing also directly to Wodrow, whom he had met in Glasgow in December 1699.³⁹⁰ Wodrow's response to either Sutherland or Lhwyd has not been found either in Wodrow's well organized archive or among Lhwyd's correspondence. Wodrow's next letter to Lhwyd, dated 10 September 1703, does not refer to these points at all.³⁹¹ When Lhwyd replied, however, on 10 December, he shows that he assumed that his queries had never reached Wodrow, though he refers to having had an answer from Sibbald. The last paragraph of this letter provides evidence that printing had begun:³⁹²

I send you inclosed the first sheet of my Irish–English Dictionary, for that being ready, and requiering no distinction of pages, we begin with it. I am very sensible a native of Scotland or Ireland could have done it much better; but this can be no hindrance to a better performance, and may, I hope, rather afford some help to anyone that shall hereafter print an Irish Dictionary apart. I venture to print two hundred copies more than are yet subscribed for, in hopes that your kingdome and Ireland may take them off. I should therefore be glad of parole subscriptions, viz. onely the subscribing to take off a book

³⁸⁹ Sir Robert Sibbald to Edward Lhwyd, dated 16 July 1703 (BL MS Add. 78685, no. 26; see source note on letter 6).

³⁹⁰ As we learn from a letter of Robert Wodrow to James Paterson, dated at Glasgow, 21 December 1699 (Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 34–5, no. 17). Lhwyd's earliest letter to Wodrow appears to be one dated 24 June 1701, carried by Matthew Connell and acknowledged belatedly on 12 January 1702 (ib. 187–8, no. 94). The Ashmolean collection has no letters from Wodrow to Lhwyd nor any from Paterson, and only one each from Sibbald and Sutherland; a second letter from Sibbald survives among John Evelyn's papers (see source-note on letter 6).

³⁹¹ Robert Wodrow to Edward Lhwyd, dated 10 September 1703 (Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 263–4, no. 131).

³⁹² Edward Lhwyd to Robert Wodrow, dated at Oxford, 10 December 1703 (NLS MS Wodrow Letters Q^o II, fol. 101 (no. 69); Maidment, *Analecta Scotica*, i. 339–41). The letter was sent under the frank of John Anstis MP, but it appears from the note, 'Scots post 6d', that a charge was still made for its carriage in Scotland.

INTRODUCTION

when finishd, paying no money at all in the interim, but only naming a person at London to receive the book and pay the money.

Another letter from Lhwyd followed swiftly:³⁹³

Oxford, Dec. 22. 1703

Dear Sir,

I lately answered your kind letter by post, which I hope came safe to hand. We have very seldome occasions of sending hence to Glasgow, & this for that reason I venture to send to you at present by one who tells me he is a seaman, and that his name is David Watson of Glasgow, &c.³⁹⁴

I make bold to trouble you by him with half a dozen specimens of the Irish Dictionary, which I desire you would please to communicate to some candid ingenuous gentlemen of your acquaintance that are conversant in that language. As for the five shillings in hand, 'twas meant only for these parts I shall not at all insist upon't in Scotland, but should be glad however of subscriptions upon parole.³⁹⁵ But English booksellers have a method of setting persons in the coffee houses to decry any book that an author prints at his own charges, that so all may fall to their own hands for little or no consideration. This they call damming a book, and 'tis so common that very few ever escape it. For this reason I should be very glad if that some quantity of these copies were taken off in your kingdom and Ireland where 'twill be much more use than in these parts. I detain the bearer and so adde no more but my hearty service as in my last from,

Kind Sir,

Your much obliged friend and servant,

Edw. Lhwyd

Mr Paterson seems now
in a fair way of recovering.

The specimens sent at this date are likely to have comprised only the same first sheet of the dictionary as was sent by post on 10 December. The opportunity of a personal carrier allowed him to send more copies without the burden of charge falling on Wodrow.

In his preface Lhwyd had said that, out of three written to in each country, only one friend in Ireland and one in Scotland had responded to his request for help by commenting on the dictionary.

³⁹³ Edward Lhwyd to Robert Wodrow, dated at Oxford, 22 December 1703 (NLS MS Wodrow Letters Q^o II, fol. 102 (no. 70)).

³⁹⁴ There is one letter from David Watson to Lhwyd, dated at London, 4 September 1708 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817b, fol. 207). In October 1708 we find Watson arranging for a letter to go to Sweden (David Lewes to Edward Lhwyd, 19 October 1708, Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 34).

³⁹⁵ Lhwyd's Proposal for *Archaeologia Britannica*, circulated in 1703 (see letter 7 and n. 44), asked subscribers to make a downpayment of 5s.

O'Flaherty was that one in Ireland, and we now pick up his letters on this subject.

The postscript to letter 25, dated 7 February 1705/6, provides clues to his other correspondents: 'Let me know what return you had from Mr Brownlow: & if any from Mr Campbell'. Arthur Brownlow (1645–1711), of Lurgan, had a collection of Irish manuscripts.³⁹⁶ Lhwyd had met him in 1699 and been shown in his house the early-ninth-century Book of Armagh.³⁹⁷ He was one of the three in Ireland who were asked to comment on the sheets. From the only extant letter from Brownlow to Lhwyd, we learn who was the third Irish recipient of sheets:³⁹⁸

I could not conveniently have the view of those sheets of your Irish dictionary which you sent to Mr Lloyd's hands, but saw only the 1st sheet which Mr Davis showed me, & although there are several words therein that are now obsolete & some few mistakes of letters & other small errors, which perhaps were faults of the transcribers or the press, yett I conceive the work will bee of use to any that are studious in that language.

Mr Lloyd must surely be Dr Owen Lloyd, who, we have already seen, had assisted Lhwyd in his efforts with Irish as early as February 1700. 'Mr Davis' is probably John Davies, who had certainly been in Ireland in the latter part of 1703, but he was no Irish-speaker.³⁹⁹ Brownlow expresses his appreciation for Lhwyd's work—'your intended dictionary being Irish and English will bee of farr more universall use', he says, than O'Clery's—and he reflects on the difficulty of getting such a book printed. The other person named in O'Flaherty's question can be identified as Lachlan Campbell (1675–1707), minister of Campbeltown from 1703 to 1707, who was also named in Lhwyd's letter to Wodrow. His name had come up in O'Flaherty's correspondence as early as 21 July 1704, when O'Flaherty wrote, 'I am very glad of your commerce with Mr Campbell, whom I understand by you to be vers'd in Irish manuscripts'.⁴⁰⁰ Lhwyd had been put in touch with Campbell by Robert Wodrow in Glasgow, and five letters from Campbell to Lhwyd are preserved. The first of these, dated 11 July 1704, reflects on the difficulty of compiling a dictionary of Irish; the third, dated 16 April 1705, mentions that he had again read through the sheets of the dictionary, and the fourth, dated 17 July 1705, men-

³⁹⁶ B. Cunningham & R. Gillespie, 'An Ulster settler and his Irish manuscripts', *Éigse* 21 (1986), 27–37, examine his interests in collecting.

³⁹⁷ Letter 10 and n. 93.

³⁹⁸ Arthur Brownlow to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Lurgan, 10 June 1704 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 285).

³⁹⁹ On John Davies, see letter 7 and n. 42. He was in Ireland in November 1703 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 390); in view of the date of Brownlow's letter, it is uncertain when they met.

⁴⁰⁰ Letter 10 and n. 92.

tions returning the sheets to Lhwyd in Oxford.⁴⁰¹ Lachlan Campbell was without doubt the one Scottish critic who read the dictionary and provided information on Scottish parallels. The identities of the two who failed to respond are not so clear. By the time O'Flaherty asked Lhwyd what return he had had from Campbell, both of them had finished their critical reading and the dictionary, as we shall see, was printed.

One specimen of particular interest survives among Campbell's letters. On 17 January 1705 Campbell sent to Lhwyd a folded sheet, ending with a letter, in which he says, 'I have sent you hear enclosed the few remarques I have made upon the 22 sheets you sent me of your dictionary'. Campbell had been sent the whole dictionary as far as words beginning with SA- in one batch about August 1704; he received them in November and read them quickly. This is now MS Ashm. 1814, fols. 294r–295v, and next to it is a copy in the same format, made by one of Lhwyd's assistants. It must have been made for O'Flaherty, who has annotated a good deal in the copy, signing off with these words: 'What I approve of Mr Campbell's notes, I mark with X; where I add to his sense, you may add Scot. to his word. Where otherwise correct, you shall find so corrected. What is beyond my knowledge, I [[pass]] by [[without any]] mark'. When the letters were set in order for binding, in the nineteenth century, the arranger placed this with Campbell's letters since it bears his name; in so doing he separated it from O'Flaherty's letters. It is not clear from the letters exactly when he saw these comments, but it can be worked out from his own markings on Lhwyd's sheets, of which twelve survive among his Irish papers in Dublin.⁴⁰² On sheet T, which O'Flaherty marked with the date 12 September 1705, there are two comments in the lower margin of sig. T2v introduced with the words 'Ex Campbell'. Putting the known dates into sequence, Lhwyd must have received these comments from Campbell early in the year; he had several months to copy them to send to O'Flaherty with his letter dated 1 August 1705, which was received at Park on 18 August and acknowledged by O'Flaherty in letter 23 on 29 August. This letter mentions Campbell but does not

⁴⁰¹ Lachlan Campbell to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Campbeltown, 11 July 1704 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 288); (2) dated at Belfast, 30 October 1704 (fol. 290); (3) dated at Campbeltown, 17 January 1705 (fol. 294); (4) dated at Campbeltown, 16 April 1705 (fol. 292); and (5) dated at Campbeltown, 3 January 1707 (Scottish style begins the year at 1 January) (fol. 298). Campbell's letters concern the variation between Irish and Scottish Gaelic, and there are two lists of words among his letters. An early letter from Campbell, dated at Belfast, 30 October 1704 (fol. 290), mentions his sight of Colgan's two volumes and asks when Lhwyd's book will be available.

⁴⁰² Introduction, 129–36.

explain the circumstances. Having finished sheet T on 12 September, it was returned on 14 September, and we may presume that the annotated copy of Campbell's notes went back to Oxford at the same time.

The process of printing was directly linked to the business of consultation, which depended almost entirely on the despatch of printed sheets. The text of the dictionary was set in type one sheet at a time, corrected for the press, and then printed off. The printing was done in the university press next to the Sheldonian Theatre, but Lhwyd paid the printer as he worked; we know that the printer was Edmund Bush, who relied on continuity of work.⁴⁰³ It is likely that the compositor had not enough types to preserve more than one or two sheets in type for correction and at the same time go on with the composing; he needed to work off the sheets and distribute the type to continue. Lhwyd indicates in a letter that he was working off one sheet per week.⁴⁰⁴ Lhwyd had to be on hand at the printing house, where the compositor worked, on the other side of the Sheldonian from the Museum, and he would have checked the proofs from each of the two formes for every sheet. Once corrected, the sheets would have been worked off and the type distributed. An inevitable consequence was that Lhwyd could not revise the sheets once printed to take account of the comments he received from O'Flaherty and from Campbell. The sheets they read were not in any real sense proofs, but, by a happy chance, Lhwyd kept a number of the sheets returned to him with comments by O'Flaherty. Besides these, two actual proofs survive (to my knowledge). John Bagford kept a half of one proof from sheet Aa, which he must have been given by Lhwyd for his collections.⁴⁰⁵ Among Lhwyd's papers there is one side of the sheet with the signature Ee—the inner side when folded—comprising words beginning

⁴⁰³ A contract for printing survives, dated 14 September 1705, between Edward Lhwyd on the one hand and Edmund Bush and Pieter la Mouche on the other (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1820a, fol. 231; Gunther, 507; H. G. Carter, *A History of the Oxford University Press i To the year 1780* (Oxford, 1975), 191). Mr Bush is named frequently in the correspondence of George Hickes, whose *Thesaurus* he was printing at the same time as Lhwyd's Irish dictionary (Introduction, 132–3).

⁴⁰⁴ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Thomas Smith, dated at Oxford, 5 March 1703/4 (Bodl. MS Smith 51, fol. 19; Gunther, 499–500 (no. 256), with the date misprinted as 'March 35 170-4').

⁴⁰⁵ BL Harley 5932, no. 114, is a proof of the words *Sochasta–Sothaire*, i.e. the page equivalent to sig. Aa2v, with more than twenty corrections marked by Lhwyd; once the corrections were made, the page was longer and four lemmata were carried over to Bb1r. John Bagford (1650/51–1716) was an eager collector of specimens of printing; his collections among the Harleian collection in the British Library run to almost two hundred volumes. He corresponded with Lhwyd.

TU-UA. Lhwyd has marked a dozen or so small literal corrections, and the corrections so marked have already been made in the copy of this sheet sent to O'Flaherty.⁴⁰⁶

Lhwyd was naturally reluctant to circulate draft before it was printed, which would have entailed writing out a copy for every reader who was to be consulted. Sheets, on the other hand, were available in numbers, and if any were lost, it was only the annotations that went astray and not the basic work. None the less on two occasions, it appears, draft was sent out in manuscript. First, O'Flaherty refers to '3 MS sheets', which he returned to Lhwyd with his annotations on 20 October 1704, though he gives no indication of where they came in the alphabet.⁴⁰⁷ The timing of this is perplexing, because October 1704 falls squarely into a period when he had printed sheets to work through. Several months later he saw a handwritten draft of the letter U, which is the last letter of the alphabet in Irish; in a letter written on 23 January 1704/5 O'Flaherty refers to having already returned comments on the handwritten draft of U, though it is not obvious when he saw it.⁴⁰⁸ This was the first he had seen of the dictionary in several months, and the only thing he had seen since reading as far as the end of letter G. It appears that rather than bringing O'Flaherty up to date, Lhwyd had sent his latest draft before it was printed; and we know that sheet Ee was worked off that January.

Between the correspondence and the marked sheets, we have enough evidence to follow in tandem the work of printing the dictionary and the process of critical reading. We know that typesetting of the Irish dictionary began earlier than any other part of *Archaeologia Britannica*. Despite what was said in the preface about its starting before Plunket's dictionary had been received, we can be fairly sure that it had not begun before the end of September 1703, when Edmund Gibson gave Lhwyd by letter the benefit of his experience with booksellers and printers.⁴⁰⁹ In October 1703 William Nicolson

⁴⁰⁶ TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 8, fols. 25v–26r. The back of the sheet was subsequently used for part of a table of Welsh place- and personal names (fol. 25r) and other notes (fol. 26v). O'Flaherty's marked sheet sig. Ee is fols. 23r–24v.

⁴⁰⁷ Letters 14, 15.

⁴⁰⁸ Letters 18, 23. Some notes on words from this section survive (see n. 161 on letter 18).

⁴⁰⁹ Edmund Gibson to Edward Lhwyd, undated but postmarked 26 September [?1703] (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 97); Edmund Gibson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Lambeth, 30 September 1703 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 85; Percy Simpson, *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1935), 203–4). During the printing of his edition of Camden's *Britannia* in 1694–5, Gibson had moved into the house of his publisher, Awnsham Churchill, and wrote to contributors, Edward Lhwyd among them, from there. In a letter to Humphrey Humphreys,

received a specimen of the Irish dictionary, which, he said, 'will put new spirit into some of us' in the business of raising subscriptions.⁴¹⁰ It is tempting to read this as signifying that printing had begun. Against that is a letter from William Stonestreet, known to Lhwyd for his botanical rather than his linguistic skills; from this it appears that Lhwyd had sent him 'a transcript of part of your Irish Dictionary' in October 1703, on which Stonestreet felt unqualified to comment.⁴¹¹ The first confirmation that printing had started comes in December. A copy of the first printed sheet was posted to Robert Wodrow in Glasgow on 10 December 1703 with further sheets a few days later by carrier.⁴¹² At this stage Lhwyd was becoming anxious with his desire to find an Irish reader. He wrote to Dr Hans Sloane again in February 1703/4:⁴¹³

I want very much a correspondence with some Irish Gentleman, conversant in ye old MSS of that Language; but can hear of none in England, & if times do not favour a forreign correspondence I am at a loss for Directions.

The times were not so unfavourable, and O'Flaherty's reading of sheets began a few weeks later, when his letter 7, dated 27 March 1704, acknowledges receipt of a specimen. He quotes the words *crúinnioc*, *cuan*, and *cuirim*, revealing that this specimen was the sheet with the signature H, that is, the eighth sheet of the dictionary. At the time of posting this was probably the latest sheet to have come from the printer. We know from a letter to Dr Thomas Smith in London, dated 5 March 1703/4, that the compositor was at that point 'on the eleventh sheet of my book' and that 'he does but one sheet a week'.⁴¹⁴ The specimen was followed by a batch of ten sheets, one third of the dic-

dated 12 September 1703, Lhwyd said, 'I shall put it in the presse God willing this week' (Bangor University Library, MS Penrhos V, no. 238; Jones, 'Family papers of Owen and Stanley', 112); another letter to Bishop Humphreys, dated 14 January 1704/5, says that he put it into the press 'about a twelvemonth since' (MS Penrhos V, no. 239; *ib.* 112).

⁴¹⁰ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Rose, 21 October 1703 (NLW MS 309E, fol. 167).

⁴¹¹ William Stonestreet to Edward Lhwyd, dated at London, 4 November 1703 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 482), acknowledging a letter 'dated about a month ago', mentioning the despatch of 'a transcript of part of your Irish Dictionary', which arrived by carrier a week after the letter. Stonestreet appears to have loaned a copy of O'Molloy's Irish grammar to Lhwyd (Introduction, 112 and n. 353).

⁴¹² Introduction, 125–6.

⁴¹³ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Hans Sloane, dated at Oxford 20 February 1703/4 (BL MS Sloane 4039, fol. 248).

⁴¹⁴ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Thomas Smith, dated at Oxford, 5 March 1703/4 (Bodl. MS Smith 51, fol. 19; Gunther, 499–500 (no. 256), with the date misprinted as 'March 35 170-4').

tionary, despatched from Oxford on 20 March 1703/4 and received by O'Flaherty after a slow journey on 7 May. The sheets had been detained a little while at least by Henry Rowlands in Anglesey, who studied them with interest.⁴¹⁵ Serious reading began as soon as the sheets arrived. The long letter commenting on these ten sheets, and on much else, was some time in the writing and was not dated until finished on 21 July 1704. A sheet of notes also survives which was folded and enclosed with the letter.⁴¹⁶

The letters from Brownlow and Campbell, dated in June and July 1704, suggest that the first sheet may have been sent out as a specimen even at a time when at least eleven sheets were available. It is possible, however, that the first sheet had gone several months before but that replies were not sent until the printer had made considerable progress.

How quickly other sheets were printed and circulated is not so clear, for we do not find comments of this kind made by letter on any later batch of sheets. This is because O'Flaherty changed his practice and wrote his comments on the actual sheets, which were returned to Lhwyd. Twelve of these annotated sheets survive—marked with an asterisk in the table below—allowing a direct insight into the extent and character of O'Flaherty's comments. The first five to survive are the eleventh to fifteenth sheets, sig. LMNOP, covering words beginning EA to GU, and we have seen that the eleventh sheet was worked off in March 1704. A letter tells us that sig. V—the twentieth sheet, covering words beginning NA to PA—arrived on 7 November 1704.⁴¹⁷ Why there was this delay is not apparent. The sheet had been available since July at least, for a letter to Dr Smith, written on 2 August, mentions that twenty-two sheets were finished, 'which brings it to the beginning of the letter S', but the printer had had to divert his attention to work on another book, Dr George Hickes's *Anglo-Saxon Thesaurus*.⁴¹⁸ The two further sheets that were available, sig. XY, co-

⁴¹⁵ Henry Rowlands to Edward Lhwyd, dated 29 June 1704: 'I shall rather proceed to let you know what your friend and mine Mr FitzGerald, with whom I examined closely word by word more than one sheet of your Irish lexicon, said in general of it. He thinks it little less than impossible for one not a native Irish man, or at least one extraordinarily well versed in all the proprieties and acceptations of the Irish language, to be able to give every one satisfaction in such an undertaking, for the same words are observed not seldom to express different proprieties of things, and sometimes are differently pronounced, in different parts of the kingdom' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 385). He goes on to give examples from Mr FitzGerald's county of Meath. Although some two months had passed since the packet had crossed Anglesey, the next batch had not yet left Oxford.

⁴¹⁶ TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 8, fols. 27r–28v, a single sheet folded to give four pages, 215 × 325 mm. See letter 10.

⁴¹⁷ Letter 15.

⁴¹⁸ Edward Lhwyd to Dr Thomas Smith, dated at Oxford, 2 August 1704 (Bodl.

vering words beginning PA to SA, were either not despatched or not delivered; O'Flaherty at a later date could not remember having seen these sheets, which may probably be taken as a sign that he had not seen them.⁴¹⁹ The printing of the thirty-one sheets down to sig. Ee was complete by 14 January 1704/5, but the steady sending of sheets to Ireland did not continue. We hear on 29 August 1705 that O'Flaherty was then promising to deal with ten outstanding sheets, sig. QRST, which we should have supposed he had already seen long before, as well as the last six sheets, sig. Z to Ee, which had been worked off months earlier.⁴²⁰ This letter is addressed to Lhwyd through his Dublin bookseller Jeremiah Pepyat.⁴²¹ We know that O'Flaherty read sig. Z on 15 September 1705 and five more sheets over the following three weeks. And we know it because the last seven of O'Flaherty's marked sheets are dated in his own hand. He was reading sig. Ee on 4 October 1705.⁴²² The last letter to mention the return of sheets is dated 1 October 1705, but one more packet followed. As late as 7 February 1705/6 it appears that four packets were still held up in Dublin

MS Smith 51, fol. 23; Gunther, 501, no. 258). On Hickee and the production of his book, J. A. W. Bennett, 'Hickee's *Thesaurus*: a study in Oxford book-production', *English Studies* 1948, *Essays and Studies* new ser. 1 (1948), 28–45. The same printer had undertaken work on both; Hickee's book had largely been worked off before he started on Lhwyd's, but as Hickee's drew near to completion he was rather cross to find that the printer was engaged on another task, writing to Lhwyd to complain (Hickee to Lhwyd, 29 April 1704; Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 184; Harris, *Correspondence of George Hickee*, 401, no. 267). On Monday, 29 May 1704, Lhwyd told Dr Thomas Smith that Hickee's book would be 'completely printed off next Wednesday' [presumably meaning 7 June] (Bodl. MS Smith 51, fol. 21; Gunther, 500–501, no. 267), but it was not. Lhwyd put the blame on 'the many unexpected additions made by Dr Hickee to his *Thesaurus Linguarum veterum Septentrionalium*, which my compositor apprehended almost finished when he undertook myne' (Lhwyd to Humphrey Humphreys, 14 January 1704/5; MS Penrhos V, no. 239; Jones, 'Owen and Stanley papers', 112). The printer must have continued to work for Lhwyd much of the time if, by 2 August 1704, twenty-two sheets had been printed, that is eleven more than on 5 March, during a period of sixteen weeks. Work on Hickee's book was down to the list of errata by 20 November (Hickee to Wanley, 20 November 1704; Harris, *Correspondence of George Hickee*, 407, no. 277).

⁴¹⁹ Letter 29 and n. 306.

⁴²⁰ Letter 23.

⁴²¹ Jeremiah Pepyat was active as a bookseller in Skinner Row, Dublin, from 1704 to 1724, when he moved to London; his brother Sylvanus Pepyat worked with him and continued to trade in Skinner Row until 1739, and Sylvanus's widow Mary Pepyat traded at Silver Court, Castle Street, from 1740 until 1759 (Pollard, *Dublin Book-Trade*, 454–7).

⁴²² Sig. Z (SB–SG), dated at top left corner, 15 September (with sign for Saturday); Aa (SG–SO), 20 September 1705 (the only one to specify year); Bb (SO–TA), 25 September; Cc (TA–TI), 28 September (with sign for Friday); Dd (TI–TR), 1 October (with sign for Monday), and Ee (TR–UI), 4 October (with sign for Thursday). Abbott & Gwynn, 260, refer to just one date, 24 October 1704, which has escaped my eye.

with the bookseller and had not been forwarded to Lhwyd. While many letters mention the number of accompanying sheets, they do not identify the sheets, and there is usually no sure means of inferring which sheets are referred to. There is no sign that O'Flaherty saw the final sheet of the dictionary, sig. Ff, which includes the beginning of the appendix, in which his additions and corrections were meant to appear. The last entry in the appendix takes up a suggestion made by O'Flaherty on the last page of sig. Ee.⁴²³

The involvement of Jeremiah Pepyat between August 1705 and February 1705/6 may be a sign that Lhwyd had already moved nearer to distributing the dictionary before the appendix was finished. A later statement by Lhwyd indicates that the finished sheets of the dictionary had been sent to Mr Pepyat, the bookseller in Dublin, long before the completion of the book—and therefore, we must suppose, without the Irish preface and the appendix to the dictionary. In a letter dated 2 November 1707, six months after the publication of *Archaeologia Britannica*, Lhwyd told Richard Mostyn of Penbedw that one hundred copies had been shipped to Dublin, where Dr Thomas Molyneux had previously secured forty pledges from Irish bishops and gentry, 'several of them having seen the Irish-English Dictionary, which being 1st printed had layn at a Bookseller's shop two years before the whole book was publish'd'.⁴²⁴ If he had intended that the dictionary should be distributed in Ireland before the rest of the book, nothing was done to achieve this. These unpaginated copies had simply lain in Dublin.⁴²⁵ Publication took place in May 1707.⁴²⁶

⁴²³ O'Flaherty's reading reached the entry *Uisgeamhuil* (sig. Ee2v). While his comments on words beginning with T were generally used, including four lines of verse to illustrate the word *teaglach*, less than one third of his comments on words beginning with U (sig. Ee2r-v) made their way into the appendix.

⁴²⁴ Edward Lhwyd to Richard Mostyn, dated at Oxford, 2 November 1707 (NLW MS Peniarth 427, fol. 62; *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 3rd ser. 6 (1860), 15-16; Gunther, 534-5, no. 277).

⁴²⁵ If they were not meant for early distribution, why should they have been sent at all? Were they discarded when copies of the complete book arrived? Or were complementary sheets sent so that volumes could be made up and sewn in Dublin? There is no means of knowing.

⁴²⁶ The licence, signed by Dr Arthur Charlett as Pro-Vice-Chancellor is dated 9 April 1707 (sig. a1v). A letter of the same Dr Charlett to Dr Martin Lister, dated at University College, 21 April 1707, announced that 'Mr Lloyd's dictionary is at last finished' (Bodl. MS Lister 37, fol. 99). It was still advertised as 'sub prelo' in the Oxford press sale catalogue dated 2 May 1707 (Lambeth Palace Library, PA 636.5. 1.16). A letter of Lhwyd's with no address and dated simply 'Oxford May' says that the book is printed and will be sent to subscribers next week (Gunther, 510-11, no. 266). The first acknowledgements of receipt are those from Dr George Hickes, dated 2 June 1707 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 188); Edmund Gibson, dated at Lambeth, 7 June 1707 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fol. 89); perhaps also William Baxter, dated 1 June 1707 (not

TABLE 4

Sheet	Words	Worked off	Sent to Ireland	Sent to Scotland
A	AB-AN	Oct 1703	sent to Brownlow perhaps in December 1703, at the same time as specimens went to Scotland, but in any case before June 1704	one copy sent to Wodrow, 10 December 1703; six copies on 22 December
B	AN-BA			
C	BA-BR			
D	BR-CA			
E	CA-CI			
F	CI-CO			
G	CO-CR			
H	CR-DA		sent as sample, 2 Mar 1703/4, rec'd 26 Mar 1704 (7); comments sent in April and forwarded by Molyneux (8); Lhwyd's response received, 31 May (9)	
I	DE-DL			
K	DL-EA		sheets A-K sent, 20 March 1703/4 (8), rec'd 7 May 1704 (8); sheets A-G and I returned (10) 21 July 1704	
L*	EA-FA	Mar 1704	sheets L-S sent, 10 July, but only L-P rec'd, 25 Aug 1704 (13)	
M*	FA-FI		sheets KLM returned 17 Nov 1704 (15)	
N*	FI-FU		returned 8 Dec 1704 (16) through Anstis	
O*	FU-GI		returned 15 Dec 1704 (17) through Nicolson, who received it 25 Dec 1704 and sent it on 2 Jan 1705/6	
P*	GI-GU		returned before 23 Jan 1704/5 (18) through Humphreys	
Q	GU-LA		sheets QRST sent 1 Aug 1705, along with a copy of Campbell's comments, rec'd 18 Aug 1705 (23); returned 14 Sept 1705 (24)	
R	LA-LO			
S	LO-ME			
T*	ME-NA		dated at end 12 Sept 1705	
V	NA-PA		rec'd 7 Nov 1704 (15)	
X	PA-RI		not seen (29)	
Y	RI-SA	before July 1704	not seen (29)	twenty-two sheets sent to Campbell Aug 1704; comments sent to Lhwyd 17 Jan 1705
Z*	SB-SG		sheets Z-Ee, sent 1 Aug 1705, rec'd 18 Aug 1705 (23); dated 15 Sept 1705	
Aa*	SG-SO		dated 20 Sept 1705	
Bb*	SO-TA		dated 25 Sept 1705; sheets Z-Bb, returned 1 Oct 1705 (24)	
Cc*	TA-TI		dated 28 Sept 1705	
Dd*	TI-TR		dated 1 Oct 1705	
Ee*	TR-UI	by 14 Jan 1705	dated 4 Oct 1705; sheets Cc-Ee returned without a letter soon after	some sheets sent to Martin, Nov 1705
Ff	UI-App			

Two years before that would mean that finished sheets were sent to Pepyat in May 1705, yet we know that O'Flaherty's reading continued until October 1705. We also know that these last sheets were returned to Lhwyd through Pepyat and that four batches of marked sheets were still in Pepyat's hands, on their way to Oxford, in January 1705/6—when Lhwyd wrote to O'Flaherty—as we learn from O'Flaherty's letter of 7 February 1705/6. O'Flaherty was commenting on sheets at a time when Lhwyd had already let the dictionary out of his hands. This made no practical difference: O'Flaherty's suggestions could not be incorporated in the body of the work anyway, and Lhwyd continued to absorb his comments on words beginning with S and T into the appendix, which cannot therefore have been finished until well into 1706.

As late as November 1705 Lhwyd appears to have sent some sheets to Martin Martin, who at that date was living at his family home at Duntulm in Skye. A letter from Martin, dated 12 March 1706 (assuming he observes Scottish convention), acknowledges one from Lhwyd dated 14 November, which had not reached its destination until 26 February. In this Martin answers questions arising from his *Description of the Western Islands of Scotland*. At the end he says, 'I return you hearty thanks for the account of the progress of learning, & likewise for the remaining sheets of the Irish Dictionary'.⁴²⁷ If Martin had seen parts of the dictionary at an earlier date, we have no evidence of the fact and certainly none of his comments.

Even after the printing of the dictionary proper was completed, and before the last of O'Flaherty's comments were received, Lhwyd appears still to have wanted further consultation. He must have put out inquiries to both Edmund Gibson and William Nicolson, for in a letter dated 22 November 1705, Nicolson responds, 'Dr Gibson is now at Chichester, but will return next week, when I shall remind him of your fresh inquiry after an Irish scholar'.⁴²⁸ There is no extant letter from Gibson around this time, and the next two letters from Nicolson are concerned with the manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated*. We know

now among Lhwyd's correspondence but printed with Baxter's book in 1719). Their approval was referred to by Lhwyd in a letter to Richard Mostyn, dated at Oxford, 22 June 1707 (Gunther, 526–7, no. 268). The printer, Edmund Bush, had died shortly before; 'the ill newes of Mr Bushes death' is mentioned in a letter from George Hickes to Thomas Hearne, 5 April 1707 (Harris, *Correspondence of George Hickes*, 414–15, no. 290).

⁴²⁷ Martin Martin to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Duntulm, 12 March 1706 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 342). It is the last of the nine extant letters from Martin to Lhwyd.

⁴²⁸ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Westminster, 22 November 1705 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 541v).

that no further help was acknowledged, and we may suppose that no further source of help was found.

The appendix itself was probably not printed until very late in the production of the book and never lay with the previous sheets in Pepyat's shop.⁴²⁹ The completion of the Irish dictionary and its appendix slotted into the printer's work on the rest of the volume, and it is not possible to say when these sheets were finalized. The want of page-numbers in the dictionary is a by-product of its separate production: as Lhwyd said to Sir Robert Sibbald, a dictionary required 'no distinction of pages'.⁴³⁰ The first nine sections of the book are paginated 1–309; the tenth is the Irish dictionary. Lhwyd's Irish preface begins on a verso, p. 310, and continues on the second leaf of that sheet (sig. Iiii) with pp. 311–12; the sheets (sig. Ff–Ii) with the end of the dictionary, the appendix, the catalogue of Irish manuscript, and the index continue the quire-signatures of the dictionary, but (apart from the index) they are also paginated, 425–36. This was based on counting the unnumbered pages of the dictionary on the assumption that the opening page (sig. A1r) was p. 313. Insufficient space had been allowed for the Irish preface, which required an inserted sheet (sig. Kkkk), paginated 1–iv. Lhwyd was aware that it was longer than anticipated even as he sent it to the compositor: his copy-text survives, marked with a direction, 'The following Irish is to be added to the end of the Grammar, & will make about seven pages, which is a sheet more than was intended. Let the scored [*i.e. underlined*] words be *Italic*. 2 columns'.⁴³¹ The pages of the Irish dictionary had been printed off long before and the type distributed, and no attempt was made to add page-numbers retrospectively. It would be assumed that any reader could do that for himself with a pen.⁴³²

⁴²⁹ TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 10, comprises various leaves identified as jottings towards the appendix. These are a mixture of wide pages divided into columns (on their dorse are notes on Old English words) and long pages in Lhwyd's hand. He was evidently attempting to use spacing to reduce the grief of alphabetization, but in places the additions cluster awkwardly. A headnote was drafted on letter 15.

⁴³⁰ Introduction, 125. The leaves of the Irish dictionary bear no page-numbers until the last two pages, numbered 425–6, where the appendix begins, 426–34. The sheets in folio, however, have a distinct set of signatures A to Ff, a total of twenty-nine sheets (the letters J, U, and W were not used); each sheet was folded once, producing two leaves, A1, A2, B1, B2, &c., and each sheet comprised four pages of print, each page with three columns, sig. A1ra to A1vc, A2ra to A2vc, &c.

⁴³¹ TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 7, fols. 1r. The compositor ignored the request to set the preface in two columns.

⁴³² Lhwyd exploited the fact that the alphabetical arrangement made page-numbers unnecessary, but his choosing to continue the numbering after the dictionary suggests he expected the numbers to be written in by readers, just as in the introduction to his appendix he invited readers to add a sign to refer themselves to the additional notes.

Late in the process of assembling the book, Lhwyd gave some attention to the inclusion of commendatory verses at the front. How soon he did this is not known, but it may have been stimulated by O'Flaherty.⁴³³ A secondary witness provides an interesting insight. A writer identified as Lhwyd's Scottish adviser, Lachlan Campell, in an undated letter to Colin Campbell of Achnaba (1644–1726), minister of Ardchattan, reports receiving a letter from Lhwyd:⁴³⁴

He tells me in a letter I had lately from him, that Dr Roderick O Flaherty (author of the History of Ireland published from Dr Keting & other Irish MSS in Latine under the title of Ogygia 4^{to} Lond. 1684 which I perused) has signifyd his approbation thereof by a fine copy of Latine verses in its commendation he sent him to be prefixed thereto. He tells me also that there will be a page or two vacant that shall be sent him & if any here will favour the work so far as to send him an short Epigram either in Latine but especially in Irish it would be very acceptable.

O'Flaherty's verses were first sent to Lhwyd in October 1704, but there is no statement from O'Flaherty that he intended their publication. By January 1705, Lhwyd had contemplated publishing them, hesitated over their quality, been urged by the Principal of Jesus College, Dr Jonathan Edwards, that he should print them because of O'Flaherty's reputation in Ireland, and reported this conclusion to Bishop Humphreys:⁴³⁵

[Mr O'Flaherty] is pleased to honour me with some Latin Distichs in praise of the Dictionary, which thô they are not extraordinary elegant our Principal advises me to print, on account of the name he has in that kingdome.

Lhwyd rewrote the verses for publication, thereby offending O'Flaherty. He received jocular verses in Welsh, urging him to finish his task, which may be dated from a letter of Humphrey Foulkes, written on 24 April 1706.⁴³⁶ These verses too were modified before being printed. By the time the leading pages were printed Lhwyd had rounded up eleven pieces of commendatory verse in Latin, Scottish Gaelic, and Welsh.⁴³⁷ Among them are thirty Latin

⁴³³ As suggested by Evans & Roberts, 26.

⁴³⁴ Lachlan Campell to Colin Campbell, undated (EUL MS 3097.6). The passage is quoted by Evans & Roberts, 26, whose identification of the writer I can confirm by a comparison of the hand here with Lachlan Campell's autograph letters to Lhwyd.

⁴³⁵ Edward Lhwyd to Humphrey Humphreys, dated at Oxford, 14 January 1704/5 (Bangor University Library, MS Penrhos V, no. 239; E. G. Jones, 'The family papers of Owen and Stanley of Penrhos, Holyhead', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 17 (1956–8), 99–115, at p. 113).

⁴³⁶ Humphrey Foulkes to Edward Lhwyd, dated 24 April 1706 (quoted by Evans & Roberts, 86).

⁴³⁷ These eleven are printed with translation and notes in Evans & Roberts, 65–

hexameters from Colin Campbell himself.⁴³⁸ A letter from Lhwyd to John Urry (1666–1715), at Christ Church, Oxford, provides his last reflections on this exercise:⁴³⁹

I formerly sent you Mr Collin Cambels Verses, which perhaps you have not thought worth keeping and harrowing over a litle as he desir'd. There have been some other such compliments sent last Summer out of the Highlands together with a collection of Scottish-Irish words to be added to the Irish-English Dictionary. I writ to Mr Lachlyn Campbel who sent them that I would thankfully print any Irish Verses but that Latin and English are now out of Fashion, before Books. Of what sort those he sent were, I know not; [-all] the Verses & Words having [[all]] miscarried. The Irish Dictionary coming in at the Latter \Part/ of this Volume with a Short Irish Preface before it; I shall insert \after the/ Pre[[face]] Mr Col. Campbell & Mr Flaherty's Verses (with some small Alterations) least the omitting of them should give any offence to persons so much respected in their Countreys.

These commendations would have carried little weight in London or Oxford, but they represented the goodwill of friends in Wales, Scotland, and in O'Flaherty's case Ireland. Lhwyd felt the need to display this evidence of approval from natives who spoke the languages treated in *Archaeologia Britannica*, and we should take note of the weight he attached to O'Flaherty's name.

O'Flaherty was impressed by the dictionary, realising at an early stage that it would make Irish literature more accessible to the world than ever before: it was 'still in the dark to other nations till you began to break the ice', and he marvelled that someone with no native Irish education should achieve this.⁴⁴⁰ His detailed comments often seem rather carping, but he did not underestimate the work. The value of

104. Lhwyd's version of O'Flaherty's verses is found in Lhwyd's own hand in Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 60; the poems in Gaelic by Robert Campbell of Cowal and by Séamus Mac Mhuir are found in TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 2, along with a quatrain in Irish by John Balfe (Evans & Roberts, 253).

⁴³⁸ Acknowledged by letter only after publication, Edward Lhwyd to Colin Campbell, 22 August 1707: 'My hearty thanks for the favour and kindness you have shewd me by your Latin Verses, which are several months since printed and publishd before the 1st Tome of my *Archæologia Britannica*. You'll find a Few others premis'd to them and added, by a Countreyman and Friend of myne, but such as are to the same sense or purpose, and in the same style' (EUL MS 3099. 14). There is a good deal of Latin verse among Campbell's papers. Colm Ó Baoill, 'Gaelic manuscripts in the Colin Campbell collection', *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 14 (1983–6), 83–99, provides a first exploration.

⁴³⁹ Edward Lhwyd to John Urry, dated at Eynsham, 21 December 1706 (NLW MS 15544D, pp. 104–106). Urry came of a Scottish family but was born in Dublin. He was a non-juror and a great friend of Thomas Hearne.

⁴⁴⁰ Letter 10.

O'Flaherty's comments as they are preserved deserves a fair assessment. His knowledge of Irish is not in question, but he has little sense of lexicographical evidence. This shows, for example, in his attitude to obsolete words.⁴⁴¹ Lhwyd had wanted someone who could read and write the language; he had thought O'Flaherty could do both. While the Irishman writes about the conventions of orthography, for example,⁴⁴² yet he plainly admitted:⁴⁴³

I have none within reach about me so literat in Irish, as to have occasion of discourse with. As for Irish composition I am, as far to seek, as you are, having never practis'd as much, as to write an Irish letter to a friend. [. . .] I do not profess myself a master of the language at all, whereof there were many in my time able professors.

When shown a sample from Plunket's Latin-Irish dictionary, O'Flaherty admitted, 'I find he far exceeds my knowledg in Irish, & doubt not, but that he had other good helps of men living'.⁴⁴⁴ A few months later, writing to Bishop Humphreys, Lhwyd expressed his reactions:⁴⁴⁵

I have sent printed copies of the Dictionary to three Gentlemen in Ireland & three others in the Highlands of Scotland for their corrections and additions for an Appendix, one whereof was Mr Flaherty, Author of the Ogygia; but he tells me he never writ any thing of his own composing in the Irish; and indeed by his correction one would gather he never read much in that language, seeing he makes several things to be erroneous which yet are true

⁴⁴¹ In letter 10, he says, 'I would have advised you never to mark any Irish word obsolete; for what is practis'd in one countrey is strange in another', citing Mac Fhirbhisigh's authority; and he restates the view in letter 31. While Mac Fhirbhisigh was certainly sensitive to dialectal variation in both pronunciation and vocabulary, he was surely aware also of obsolete vocabulary, for example, in *Dúil Laithne* ('Collection of Latin'), with many obscure words, which he copied in TCD MS 1317 (H. 2. 15), p. 116 (dated by him 5 May 1643) (Ó Muraile, 78–80); this manuscript had come into Lhwyd's hands in 1700. Others who read older texts certainly recognized a vocabulary that had fallen out of use. So, for example, Tadhg Ó Rodaighe glossed the obscure words in two stanzas of a sixteenth-century bardic poem by Seán Mac Torna Uí Mhaoil Chonaire in honour of Brian na Murtha Ó Ruairc (1566 × 1591), 'Fuair Bréifne a diol do shaoghlong', in RIA MS 24 P. 25 (cat. 475) ('Leabhar Chlainne Suibhne'), fol. 81v; printed by Hardiman, *Bardic Remains*, ii. 286–305; described as being in 'Bearla Féine' by J. H. Todd, *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (1846), 115. Arthur Brownlow, who had a handwritten copy of O'Clery's printed glossary, mentioned to Lhwyd, 'I have not attaine'd to that depth of skill in the Irish as to understand all those obsolete words now so much out of use' (Brownlow to Lhwyd, dated at Lurgan, 10 June 1704; Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 285).

⁴⁴² Letters 10, 14, and especially 27, for example, on the concord of broad or slender vowels.

⁴⁴³ Letter 10.

⁴⁴⁴ Letter 14.

⁴⁴⁵ Edward Lhwyd to Humphrey Humphreys, dated at Oxford, 14 January 1704/5 (MS Penrhos V, no. 239; Jones, 'Owen and Stanley papers', 112–13).

according to the whole course of the Irish Bible; which (being prohibited to the Roman laity) he owns he never saw.

In reading and writing Irish O'Flaherty was self-taught.⁴⁴⁶ In a comment already quoted he insisted that he should not be cited on points of language.⁴⁴⁷ Noting this remark, Mr and Mrs O'Sullivan concluded that 'Lhuyd's critical judgement of the suggestions is sound, though he is occasionally led to accept a ghost-word and to reject a sound one'.⁴⁴⁸

It is a striking testimony to Lhwyd's boldness that he composed a preface in Irish despite having very limited experience of the language. There is manuscript evidence that it had been some time in drafting and revision before it was given to the compositor.⁴⁴⁹ The prose contains many learner's mistakes and the odd archaism.⁴⁵⁰ Lhwyd laments his difficulty in a letter sent soon after publication

⁴⁴⁶ In his last letter to Lhwyd, he admits, 'myself never frequented an Irish schoole but learnt by pastime whatever smack of Irish reading I have' (letter 31).

⁴⁴⁷ Introduction, 45.

⁴⁴⁸ O'Sullivan & O'Sullivan, Introduction, p. xi, where the interest of O'Flaherty's comments is understated. O'Donovan shows a higher opinion of O'Flaherty's readings (below, Appendix 2, p. 402, on TCD MS 1301 (H. 2. 11)).

⁴⁴⁹ The manuscript evidence showing the process of drafting and revising the preface is discussed by Anne and William O'Sullivan in their introduction, pp. v–xiii, to the reprint of *Archaeologia Britannica* undertaken by Irish Academic Press in 1971. TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 7, pp. 1–21 (now fols. 1r–7r), preserves the final version of the Irish preface, incomplete due to the loss of pp. 5–8, 15–20. At the end of this are twelve excerpts from medieval manuscripts (pp. 21–2, now fol. 7r–v), the sources of which can surely be identified; this would serve as an interesting test of Lhwyd's capacity to read—if not to understand—the older language. Only three of these excerpts, the 4th, 12th, and 3rd, were printed, a decision probably based on the space available at the end of the added sheet (p. iv). (For another example of Lhwyd's copying Old Irish from the Book of Armagh (AD 808), fols. 17r–18r, see n. 93 on letter 10.) The remainder of MS 1392, no. 7, comprises earlier versions of the Irish preface: a first draft in Lhwyd's Irish hand (fols. 13r–16v); a version in roman script by one of his assistants with revisions by Lhwyd (fols. 17r–21r) [the same hand is found in MS 1392, no. 10, fols. 7–11]; a short sketch in a regular Irish hand (fols. 22r–23v, with a direction to the printer concerning the imprint for the title-page, suggesting that this had been used as scrap but retained), which is interpreted by the O'Sullivans to be a sample version of the opening as supplied by the unnamed 'professor of the language at Dublin' (see next note); and a fuller and cleaner form of the same draft in the same regular Irish hand, with some flourished initials, again revised by Lhwyd (fols. 8r–12v). One manuscript sheet survives with the page-numbers 13–16 from Lhwyd's primary draft of this introduction in English (MS 1392, no. 6, fols. 10–11); they correspond to part of pp. 1–11 in the printed text, one paragraph of p. 11 being already drafted in Irish).

⁴⁵⁰ John O'Donovan would observe: 'From the preface to his Dictionary, written in Irish, it appears that this great philologist knew almost nothing of the idioms of the Irish language, for he uses the English collocation in most of his sentences, which gives his composition a strange, if not ridiculous, appearance' (*A Grammar of the Irish Language* (Dublin, 1845), p. lvi).

to one Mr Roche, evidently an Irishman based in London, who had subscribed to take a copy of the book.⁴⁵¹ The printing of the preface was done in a mixed fount, using Anglo-Saxon types for some letters.⁴⁵² O'Flaherty complains about the closeness of the print, but his eyesight was not as bad as this might suggest.⁴⁵³ The long lines make for difficult reading, which would have been mitigated if the compositor had followed Lhwyd's instructions on the setting copy to set in two columns.⁴⁵⁴ Lhwyd used this preface, and also his Welsh preface, as a vehicle to say what he might not have said in English about the conduct of booksellers, who would have talked down books not printed for their profit. He appears to have drawn O'Flaherty's attention to this, and he certainly mentioned it in his letter to Mr Roche.⁴⁵⁵ His purpose in so doing was to forewarn Welsh and Irish readers that adverse criticism of his book might have come from base motives. O'Flaherty himself had a less than positive view of the Dublin printers and would surely have sympathized.

⁴⁵¹ This letter, dated at Oxford, 27 July 1707, bears an address to Mr Roche at Gray's Inn, though the place is struck out and the letter remains among Lhwyd's papers as if never delivered (Bodl. MS. Ashm. 1816, fol. 74). Mr Roche appears to have been an Irishman in London. Here Lhwyd writes: 'I heartily wish the Irish Preface may prove intelligent. I could get none in England to correct it, so I sent some part of it to a professor of the language at Dublin, who made it more obscure to me than 'twas; however I have often complied with his correction because I hoped 'twould be the clearer to others' (Gunther, 529–30, no. 271–2, treated as two items, the second with an erroneous direction to Dr Richard Richardson). By 1708 Charles Lynegar, *al.* Cormac Ó Luinín, was providing Irish classes to students preparing for ordination at Trinity, in which capacity he styled himself 'Professor of Irish at Trinity College Dublin' (K. Simms, 'Charles Lynegar, the Ó Luinín family and the study of Seanchas', in *A miracle of learning: Studies in manuscripts and Irish learning. Essays in honour of William O'Sullivan* (Aldershot, Hants, 1998), 266–83). If the practised Irish hand of fols. 22r–23v is his, his role can be extended a year or two earlier.

⁴⁵² The lower-case types for the letters d f g i r s t are drawn from the fount used to set Old English in Hickes's *Thesaurus*. The effect does not make for easy reading, but it is no worse than the admixture of Greek and Saxon letters used for phonetic reasons by Lhwyd in writing and printing Welsh.

⁴⁵³ 'I have not as yet read over your Irish preface, my old eyes loathing so crabbed a reading' (letter 29); 'I pray let me know the exceptions of the Booksellers you conceal'd in the Ir: preface; which is so long that my old eyes serve not for reading' (letter 31). Letter 29 also provides evidence of O'Flaherty's close attention to reading the appendix, his spotting a printing error in the date AD 1590 for AD 590 (see n. 307).

⁴⁵⁴ Above, 137, from TCD MS 1392 (H. 5. 20), no. 7, p. 1 (now fol. 1r).

⁴⁵⁵ Above, n. 451. 'The [London/ booksellers, as you know I presume much better than I, make it their business to run down or damn (as they term it) such books as they have not themselves a hand in, notwithstanding the impression has been 1st offered them. But (under the rose) I have given such hints thereof in the Irish as also in the Welsh Preface that I believe their artifice will prevail but little with those Nations and I am sure none else can be judges' (Lhwyd to Roche, dated at Oxford, 27 July 1707, Gunther, 529–30, no. 271–2).

Nicolson's 'Scottish Historical Library'

Early in their correspondence Lhwyd sent to O'Flaherty as a present a copy of *The Scottish Historical Library*, the work of his friend and frequent correspondent, William Nicolson (1656–1727), archdeacon of Carlisle since 1682, promoted to bishop in May 1702. It was both a timely and a useful book, providing a moderate but often sceptical view of the evidence and issues in the earlier history of Scotland. While Nicolson always sought to take a reasonable, even impartial line, on sensitive issues, such as the relationship of the Scottish and English crowns, the subject was controversial as the Union debate became increasingly active.⁴⁵⁶ Lhwyd had himself contributed to the book what are referred to as British cognates to Gaelic words (pp. 334–46).⁴⁵⁷ The book appeared in the term catalogue for Hilary term 1701/2 and bears the year 1702 on the title-page. Just before leaving London for the north on 25 February 1701/2, Nicolson sent a copy to Lhwyd, saying by letter, 'I desire you'll judge impartially and sentence honestly'.⁴⁵⁸ Lhwyd sent a copy to O'Flaherty in 1702, and we first hear of it in letter 4, dated 18 July, but it must also have been mentioned in Lhwyd's initial letter to O'Flaherty in May 1702. It was not sent through the letter post but rather must have been despatched by carrier to Dublin. The addressee was David Parry, a Welsh undergraduate in Dublin, whom O'Flaherty contacted about the delivery, but this copy never reached Galway.⁴⁵⁹ Lhwyd eventually sent a second copy through the safer hands of Dr Molyneux, which finally arrived at Park on 2 June 1705.⁴⁶⁰

Over the next ten days O'Flaherty read Nicolson's book, which he had waited three years to see. His letter 22 offers a long and detailed reaction to it, which continues in letter 23. A passing allu-

⁴⁵⁶ E. J. Whittaker, *William Nicolson and the Making of Scottish History* ([Tobermory], 2005), builds a study of Nicolson's research and his three visits to Scotland around an edition of twenty letters, written between June 1699 and September 1703, to Robert Wodrow at the University Museum in Glasgow.

⁴⁵⁷ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at London, 13 December 1701, thanks Lhwyd for permission to print 'your notes on the Highland vocabulary in the Appendix to my Scotch Library' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 521).

⁴⁵⁸ His diary shows that he left London on 25 February, spending that night in Bishops Stortford (Herts); 'Bishop Nicolson's diaries', *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* 2nd ser. 1 (1901), 43. Quotation from William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at London, 25 February 1701/2 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 523). There are no extant letters from Lhwyd to Nicolson from the following weeks.

⁴⁵⁹ Letter 7 and n. 43.
⁴⁶⁰ Letter 22 acknowledges receipt. Letter 21, however, shows that O'Flaherty feared losing this copy too, because Dr Molyneux had lent it to Sir Henry Bingham 'on his honour to send it to me'.

sion to the 'even balance' of Nicolson's treatment of Queen Mary Stuart gives a nod towards Lhwyd's commendation of the bishop's moderate stance. Within a few lines, however, O'Flaherty picks on 'his notorious partiality' in taking the wrong side in the dispute over the antiquity of the Scottish royal line, and he is soon rehearsing matters treated at length in *Ogygia Vindicated*, including the importance of the eleventh-century Gaelic poem about Scottish kings, *Duan Albanach*. Much is said to defend the work of Ward and Colgan, whom he thought Nicolson disparaged. The letter ends with a narrow and detailed engagement with dates in the Melrose chronicle, printed in 1684 and used by the Scottish historian Sir George Mackenzie in 1686.

Without seeing Lhwyd's side of the correspondence, we can only guess at what he wrote to O'Flaherty about Nicolson. He had told him that the bishop was 'candid, sincere, and of a publique spirit', and he appears to have emphasised Nicolson's moderation.⁴⁶¹ Yet it is worth noting that O'Flaherty never shows any indication that he was aware of the long and continuing friendship between Lhwyd and Nicolson. We may guess that Lhwyd had, for whatever reason, referred to the bishop in terms that did not give away that he regarded him as a valued friend. O'Flaherty is accordingly more frank—and aware of it, for he realised that he might have said too much.⁴⁶² He is impatient with Nicolson's work and appears only to be interested in those Irish questions on which he had already published his own views some twenty years earlier. In this sense his reading of Nicolson was already charged with the intense feelings associated with the criticisms made of his *Ogygia* by Sir George Mackenzie. During the three years of waiting for sight of Nicolson's book, O'Flaherty several times referred to it in close association with his own *Ogygia Vindicated*. In June 1704 he wrote that, 'it would be very necessary for me, if I did fall upon transcribing Mackenzy, to have that book you kindly bestowed on me; for I remember you writ to me there was som reflection on my book therein'.⁴⁶³ He strengthened this remark in July, 'I'll just now fall upon transcribing Ogy: Vindicated against S^r G. Mackenzy, & the book you bestowed me would be very necessary thereunto. I am not able to follow it, nor could not of right challenge it, as being never in my possession'.⁴⁶⁴ In the end he received his copy of *The Scottish*

⁴⁶¹ Quotation from letter 13; compare also letter 22, 'the commendation before hand you gave me of his deale of temper, and innate moderation, taking notice of his unbyassed judgement and candour', especially in areas of confessional prejudice.

⁴⁶² In letter 25 he mentions his 'fear, that you should have taken a kind of disgust on my animadversions on the Bishop of Caerlisle's book'.

⁴⁶³ Letter 9. Nicolson says nothing of *Ogygia* in this work.

⁴⁶⁴ Letter 11.

Historical Library on 2 June, only after the same carrier had taken the transcript of his own work to Dublin on its way to England.⁴⁶⁵ After his long reactive letter about Nicolson's book O'Flaherty's next, written some ten weeks later, was already focused on what Lhwyd would think of his manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated*.

O'Flaherty's 'Ogygia Vindicated'

The misfortunes of *Ogygia Vindicated* weighed heavily on the author. This essay had been composed in English in 1686 to defend the Latin *Ogygia* from slighting remarks made in another short and controversial work in English by Sir George Mackenzie. By the time O'Flaherty was writing the letters we have on this subject, between 1705 and 1709, Mackenzie was long dead, and the controversy he had been engaged in no longer stirred potential readers. What attempts and disappointments had passed meanwhile we do not fully know, but over the twenty years since O'Flaherty was first goaded into vindicating his book the ardour he felt over the matter had not dimmed. His mind was strangely locked into an argument with an opponent who was never aware of the reaction he had provoked. Let us go back to the start of it.

Sir George Mackenzie, of Rosehaugh (1636/8–1691), was a distinguished Scottish lawyer and politician, an episcopalian and staunch partisan of the Stuart cause.⁴⁶⁶ Appointed Lord Advocate by King Charles II, he retained his office under King James VII until 17 May 1686, when he was dismissed for his reluctance to remove legal disabilities from catholics in Scotland. James reinstated him, however, on 31 January 1687/8, but he did not remain in office after the accession of William II and Mary II. From 1689 until his death he divided his time between London and Oxford, where he became a reader in the Bodleian Library.⁴⁶⁷ He died in London on 8 May 1691.⁴⁶⁸ It is en-

⁴⁶⁵ Letter 20.

⁴⁶⁶ He is the subject of a biography by the popular London–Scottish author Andrew Lang (1844–1912), *Sir George Mackenzie, King's Advocate, of Rosehaugh: his life and times* (London, 1909), and his career emerges in context in Clare Jackson, *Restoration Scotland, 1660–1690. Royalist Politics, Religion, and Ideas* (Woodbridge, 2003).

⁴⁶⁷ In Oxford Mackenzie left to his friend, Dr Arthur Charlett, then fellow of Trinity College, the version he had of his portrait made by Godfrey Kneller for the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh; while one hangs in the Parliament Hall there, the other now hangs in the Bodleian Library (Mrs R. L. Poole, *Catalogue of Portraits in the possession of the University of Oxford* (Oxford, 1912–26), i. 68 (no. 168), with reduced text and better illustrations in K. Garlick, *Catalogue of Portraits in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 2004)).

⁴⁶⁸ William Strachan to Dr Arthur Charlett, dated at London, 9 May 1691; Bodl. MS Ballard 27, fol. 106.

tirely possible that the young Edward Lhwyd had encountered Mackenzie at the Ashmolean Museum, but we never hear of it.⁴⁶⁹

In 1685 he was drawn into historical controversy because the arguments of William Lloyd (1627–1717), bishop of St Asaph from 1680 to 1692, undermined the vaunted antiquity of the Scottish monarchy.⁴⁷⁰ This was what O’Flaherty refers to, quoting from Nicolson, as ‘the Grand controversy, that alarmed [. . .] all the Antiquaries of Scotland, by the noise of the Bishop of St Asaphs book’.⁴⁷¹ Bishop Lloyd’s book, *An Historical Account of Church-Government as it was in Great-Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion*, dedicated to Dr Edward Stillingfleet and Mr Henry Dodwell (to whom he had shown a draft of the book ‘some years since’), was published in November 1684 and proved controversial in several ways.⁴⁷² What concerned the Scottish antiquaries was Lloyd’s disputing the historicity of the long line of Scottish kings derived by the sixteenth-century historians Hector Boece and George Buchanan from the *Scotichronicon* and, ultimately, from early medieval king-lists. Sir Robert Sibbald composed a reply, which was made ready for the press but never printed; William Nicolson had sight of the manuscript.⁴⁷³ Mackenzie’s first response, *A Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland*, was published at Edinburgh in March 1685 and twice reprinted in London during the following months.⁴⁷⁴ Mackenzie and Lloyd had not met before the controversy; after it they got to know one another, and we find them dining together in London on 9 March 1689/90.⁴⁷⁵ Within a year of the appearance of

⁴⁶⁹ Mackenzie visited Dr Robert Plot, the first keeper of the Ashmolean, at the Museum on 21 September 1689 (Wood, *Life and Times*, iii. 311), and he was there again on 7 July 1690 (ib. 333). Lhwyd had been Plot’s assistant at the Museum since at least 1687.

⁴⁷⁰ The controversial opinions of Lloyd, Mackenzie, Stillingfleet, and O’Flaherty are discussed by W. Ferguson, *The Identity of the Scottish Nation. An historic quest* (Edinburgh, 1998), 157–69, with endnotes, 171–2.

⁴⁷¹ Letter 22 and n. 182.

⁴⁷² Arber, *Term Catalogues*, ii. 107. The controversy over episcopal governance does not concern us.

⁴⁷³ Now NLS MS Adv. 15. 1. 3, cited in *Scottish Historical Library*, 134, ‘MS Fol. p(er) Auctorem’; see letter 22 and n. 182.

⁴⁷⁴ F. S. Ferguson, ‘A bibliography of the works of Sir George Mackenzie’, *Edinburgh Bibliographical Society Transactions* 1 (1935–8), 1–60 (at pp. 36–8, nos. 36–9); he notes two independent reprints, the first of them datable to June 1685 (Arber, *Term Catalogues*, ii. 138), the second (his no. 38) not entered in the term catalogues but dated on its title-page 1685.

⁴⁷⁵ John Evelyn recorded in his diary, ‘I dined at the Bishop of St Asaph’s’ [sc. William Lloyd], Almoner to the new Queen, where dined also the famous lawyer Sir George Mackenzie (late Lord Advocate of Scotland) against whom both the Bishop and myself had written and published books, both now most friendly reconciled’ (E. S.

Lloyd's book, his friend Dr Edward Stillingfleet (1635–1699) brought out his long-ripened work, *Origines Britannicae; or, The Antiquities of the British Churches*, adding in haste what the title-page calls 'a preface concerning some pretended antiquities relating to Britain, in vindication of the Bishop of St Asaph'; this was published at the beginning of June 1685.⁴⁷⁶ Its title was no doubt meant to echo that of his very successful *Origines sacrae* (1662). As well as attacking Mackenzie, this preface referred slightly to *Ogygia*, which had been published as recently as May 1685.⁴⁷⁷ The speed of this response is such that one may suppose that Stillingfleet had seen sheets of both Mackenzie's book and of *Ogygia* in London before the printing was finished.⁴⁷⁸

Now, *Ogygia* had been composed ten years earlier. It was not a controversial book. Yet to Scottish historians assaulted by Lloyd and Stillingfleet it was another salvo in the fight, appearing to them as a renewed attack on the credibility of their ancient history. One riposte was directed specifically against *Ogygia*, by Sir James Turner (c. 1616–in or after 1689), but this was never printed and must have been unknown to O'Flaherty.⁴⁷⁹ It was Stillingfleet's preface, not

de Beer, *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford, 1955), v. 12–13). Evelyn's *Public employment and an active life preferred to solitude* (London, 1667), was a reply to Sir George's *A moral essay, preferring solitude to public employment* (Edinburgh, 1665) (Ferguson, 'Bibliography of Sir George Mackenzie', 15–17, nos. 8–9a); the two works have been reprinted with introduction by B. Vickers, *Public and Private Life in the Seventeenth Century: the Mackenzie–Evelyn Debate* (Delmar, NY, 1986). From the diary, we also learn that on 15 January 1688/9 Mackenzie was seeking that Archbishop Sancroft should use his influence with Prince William of Orange (not yet king) to maintain the episcopal church in Scotland (*Diary of John Evelyn*, iv. 613–15).

⁴⁷⁶ Arber, *Term Catalogues*, ii. 134.

⁴⁷⁷ Stillingfleet names O'Flaherty once, *Origines Britannicae*, xxxviii, in a sidenote citing *Ogygia*, 67; at p. xlv he refers to him as 'their present antiquary', questioning his trust in the antiquity of Irish letters. See letter 11 and n. 105.

⁴⁷⁸ The Oxford antiquary Anthony Wood (1632–1695) bound together his copies of Lloyd's book and both of Mackenzie's ripostes, with notes on their dates of publication (see n. 182 on letter 22). He says that Stillingfleet had seen Mackenzie's manuscript, a deduction from dates; he did not know that the two London editions were reprinted from the Edinburgh edition, which Stillingfleet may have seen. There is no such way out of Stillingfleet's apparent foreknowledge of O'Flaherty's work.

⁴⁷⁹ [James Turner], *Ogygia, or the late Irish chronologie*, NLS MS Adv. 31. 1. 14, fols. 100–[115], 16 leaves, including title and pp. 1–25: 'Man by a strange instinct of nature is more delighted to have fables [...] This Irish author is a vast historian and well seene in all the Antiquities of the whole world' (p. 1); noting the attacks on the long succession of Scottish kings, Turner says it is 'well defended by Sir George Mackenzie in his book printed Anno 1685. But in comes this gentleman Roderick Oflahertie Esquire who printed his buke the same year' (p. 11). Turner sides firmly with Mackenzie against English and Irish writers. This manuscript was Turner's original. Robert Wodrow came across the work and had a copy made for Sir Robert Sibbald (Robert

Ogygia, that made Mackenzie return to the lists for a second charge with *The Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland farther cleared and defended against the exceptions lately offered by Dr Stillingfleet in his vindication of the bishop of St Asaph*. With this book there was no Edinburgh edition; it was written quickly, 'licensed Nov. 2. 1685' (as the title-page says), and published at London in February 1685/6.⁴⁸⁰ Here he devoted much of his final chapter to criticism of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia*. How and when this book came to O'Flaherty's hands is not known, but he was not following the controversy and had not seen Mackenzie's first *Defence*.⁴⁸¹ Stillingfleet's book was on sale in Dublin—William Molyneux and Dr John Worth, dean of St Patrick's, both owned copies⁴⁸²—and Mackenzie's reply was no doubt available too.⁴⁸³ At this date O'Flaherty still visited the capital from time to time and had the opportunity to buy books. In 1709 it took Samuel Molyneux a matter of days to find a copy of Mackenzie's book in Dublin.⁴⁸⁴

Although in reality O'Flaherty's book was only caught in the cross-fire, snubbed by both Stillingfleet and Mackenzie, he was affronted by the slight, and in an atmosphere of controversy he quickly composed a response, which he titled 'The *Ogygia Vindicated*, against the objections of Sir George Mackenzie'. The address to the Scottish nation at the start of the book was dated 10 December 1686, and O'Flaherty in letter 23 mentions that he wrote the book in that year, when he also composed a dedication to King James II. What had pro-

Wodrow to Sir Robert Sibbald, dated 13 November 1702 and 19 April 1703; Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 238–9, 261–2, nos. 122, 130; that copy is now NLS MS Adv. 31.1.15. The two manuscripts are very summarily treated under no. 785 in E. D. Yeo & I. C. Cunningham, *Summary Catalogue of the Advocates' Manuscripts* (Edinburgh, 1971), 64. A collection of Turner's papers, including a copy of his critique of O'Flaherty, possibly one of the above, was offered for sale by Thomas Thorpe (*Catalogue of Manuscripts for 1830*, 239 (item 14541), and again in 1831 (item 12714), 1833 (item 1127)).

⁴⁸⁰ Ferguson, 'Bibliography of Sir George Mackenzie', 38–9 (no. 40); Arber, *Term Catalogues*, ii. 157. The haste of its production is reflected in the extensive corrections towards the end (pp. 200–212), 'occasion'd by the Authour's great distance from the Press'.

⁴⁸¹ Preface to *Ogygia Vindicated*, lxxiv ('His defence of the royal line of Scotland, which I never saw').

⁴⁸² Worth's copy is still in the Worth Library, founded by his son in Dr Steevens's Hospital in Dublin; Molyneux's copy is in the Pitt Collection at Southampton city library (L. A. Burgess, *A Catalogue of the Pitt Collection* (Southampton, 1964), no. 659).

⁴⁸³ The copies now in Marsh's Library came from Stillingfleet (below, n. 488).

⁴⁸⁴ 'I have enquired for Sir George's book but cannot find it any where' (letter 49), but one week later his printer has costed producing *Ogygia Vindicated* in the same type and format as Mackenzie's, which he must by then have seen (letter 50).

voked O'Flaherty more than the objections to his argument was the fact that Mackenzie had derided him in his preface addressed to King James.⁴⁸⁵ O'Flaherty felt that he had been misrepresented before the throne itself, and he had to vindicate himself to the king.⁴⁸⁶

In the heat of argument he perhaps gave no thought to the delay that had attended the publication of *Ogygia* itself. If he had assumed that Molyneux would ensure publication of the second work to defend the first, he was disappointed. O'Flaherty appears to indicate that he had sent a copy of the work to Stillingfleet himself, as if to enlist him against Mackenzie. In letter 18 he says that he composed his response at the suggestion of the Irish divine, Henry Dodwell—who had shared the dedication of Lloyd's book and who knew both Stillingfleet and O'Flaherty—and he asks after the copy in Stillingfleet's hands.⁴⁸⁷ What became of that copy is not known: we hear no answer from Lhwyd, and it is not now among the manuscripts once owned by Stillingfleet.⁴⁸⁸ In the winter of 1696–7, confined to Gal-

⁴⁸⁵ The offensive naming of O'Flaherty in the preface was in a sense at second hand, referring to Stillingfleet, 'since the Doctor in the same book, does but make himself merrie with Offlahertie, the assertor of this pretended antiquity' (sig. A4r). See letter 23 and n. 226 for more detail. Mackenzie expresses himself more offensively, *Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland farther defended*, 165–6, 'I cannot here omit to laugh at good O Flahertie for asserting, that our kings, even till the (year) 590, were but Dynasties, Tributaries and Subjects to the Kings of Ireland, and that Aidanus got an Exemption from paying Tribute at the Parliament of Dromcheat; where he appeared' (citing *Ogygia*, 475). Although this was a matter firmly fixed in O'Flaherty's mind (see long note on letter 29 n. 307), he does not react to Mackenzie's wording on this point.

⁴⁸⁶ 'I take it an essential point not onely to make my address to the Throne, before which I was misrepresented' (letter 23); 'for I will not omitt by any means my address to K. James, being the person my antagonist chose for patron, in whose time I writt it' (letter 45).

⁴⁸⁷ The wording in letter 18 is obscure. Having mentioned Mr Dodwell, he says to Lhwyd, 'If he be living there, I pray give 'im my service, & know of 'im, whether he has seen my Ogygia vindicated with Dr Stillingfleet, for it was by Mr Dodwells letter I writ it'. Are we to understand that by his letter Dodwell urged O'Flaherty to respond to Mackenzie? That does not directly explain why Stillingfleet should be expected to have the manuscript unless O'Flaherty had sent him a copy. It does help to date the occasion, however, since after 1689, certainly after 1691, Stillingfleet, by then bishop of Worcester, would have been wary of contact with the non-juror Dodwell. This may also explain an obscure passage near the start of letter 5. It is hard to imagine that Stillingfleet would have thought much of O'Flaherty's book, but perhaps it was thought that they had common ground against Mackenzie.

⁴⁸⁸ Stillingfleet's personal library was well known to be particularly good. After his death influential figures wanted the king to buy it in 1699, part of a campaign by John Evelyn to persuade William III to develop the royal manuscript collection into a national library (de Beer, *Diary of John Evelyn*, v. 323–4; *The London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle 1702–1718*, edited by Clyve Jones and Geoffrey Holmes (Oxford, 1985), 224). Evelyn's high opinion of the library had no doubt been influ-

way gaol, he was preparing a copy of the work for Bishop Anthony Dopping, though by then the address to King James would have been politically impossible for Dopping even to acknowledge.⁴⁸⁹ With the bishop's early death he lost another prospective patron. In the later correspondence available to us O'Flaherty says that had chosen not to seek publication in Dublin, where he mistrusted the booksellers.⁴⁹⁰ This is probably disingenuous.

Allusions to *Ogygia Vindicated* are spread throughout the letters of O'Flaherty to Lhwyd, starting with a lost letter, 'My first letter to you was about Ogygia vindicated', mentioned in letter 5, and persisting to the last, in which he says, 'I expected by your Irish atchievements that you would vindicat its antiquity of letters against Dr Stillingfleet'.⁴⁹¹ The reason stated for his hope that Lhwyd would help bring the book to the public is surely informed by hindsight. Both sides perhaps knew that their correspondence was coming to an end. By then, however, O'Flaherty was already taking up the subject with a new friend, Samuel Molyneux.

Before following this evidence in more detail, I present a remarkable paper, one copy of which survives in O'Flaherty's own hand though in an unexpected context. In it he has copied extracts from three letters received from Lhwyd, in which he has underlined passages quoted for O'Flaherty's benefit by Lhwyd from letters to him about the manuscript. I have introduced numbers according to their three sources. Against the final passage O'Flaherty has added a number of responses in the margin:⁴⁹²

enced by his friend, Stillingfleet's former chaplain, Dr Richard Bentley (1662–1742), who had worked among Stillingfleet's books and who in a letter dated 3 May 1699 urged Evelyn to persuade the Royal Society to buy it (C. Wordsworth, *The Correspondence of Richard Bentley* (London, 1842), 181–2, no. 84). It was not until 1705, however, that Narcissus Marsh, by then archbishop of Armagh, bought Stillingfleet's printed books, nearly 10,000 in number, for the sum of £2,500; they form the core collection of Marsh's Library. Stillingfleet's manuscripts, some hundreds of them, were eventually sold for £175 in the spring of 1708 to Robert Harley, recently dismissed as one of Queen Anne's secretaries of state. It was Harley's second major purchase—he bought the manuscripts of Sir Simonds D'Ewes in 1705—and marked the beginning of his continuous collecting. Robert Harley's manuscripts were one of the foundation collections of the British Museum, and they remain in the British Library. O'Flaherty's manuscript is not to be found there or in Marsh's Library.

⁴⁸⁹ Letter 1 and n. 17.

⁴⁹⁰ 'I might have it don in Dublin with gain, but had none there to trust for fear of omissions, or alterations' (letter 9); 'my above letter of June the 6th wherein I was pleas'd to have mine against MacKenzy printed according to my confidence in your trust, rather than have it with profit printed in Dubl: (where I was advis'd they would not be just to me for several reasons)' (letter 10).

⁴⁹¹ Letter 31 and n. 344.

⁴⁹² Sheet of paper, folded to give two leaves 200 × 150 mm, pasted at the front of

A worthy member of the University of Oxford his account of certain learned persons of note &/ their several sentiments on this book communicated by letters at several times to his friend the Author, as following:

[1] Oxford, 24 Decembris 1704. I read the contents of your chapters to doctor Hicks a very learned \man/ & Author of the Thesaurus linguarum veterum septentrionalium, which he well approved of.

[2] Another learned person much versed in profound Antiquities in his letter to 'im from London of the 2d of January 1704/5 bears as following:

[2a] *I think Mr Flaherty in his Ogygia has been rather too gentile to the Scots, & allowed them more antiquity than they can pretend to. Their succession to the kingdom of the Picts has no foundation: & their barbarous excision of their race is a mere fable; they having been saxonized as well as other Britans some ages before the name of Scotia was known in Britan. I doubt not but you have weighed Dr Gibsons Saxon Chronicon. Haddius in the Life of S. Wilfrid mentions Egfrid's reducing the rebelling Picts. Mr Flaherty's Titles are very promising, & he has a contemptible adversary in Sir G. Mackenzy.*

[3] Oxford, January 24. 1705/6 Two persons of learning & reputation have had the perusal of your MS, some time since, and I shall here fairly send you the censures of each of them, verbatim without distinction of their names, which you'll owne would be needless.

[3a] *Mr Flaherty's MS I was sensible came from you, tho' I knew not by what hand; and now I thank you for the kind lone. I think it may well bear an Impression; the subject so various, & the manner of handling being very impartial, candid, & learned. I doe not find that himself layes as much stress upon the first account of things in Ireland, or their most ancient genealogies, since he excuses them by parallell fabulous accounts in all Nations. Antiquissima omnia fabulosa, saith the learned Varro. He is most learned, & clear, where he combats the Scottish historians. Sir G Mackenzy is but a scaramouche. I myself have seen \all/ his collection of Roman quotations relating to Scotland, under the Duke of Lauderdale's own hand long before his book came out.*

[3] The other gentleman writes thus:

[3b] *The other night Mr Flaherty's Vindication of his Ogygia against Sir G M was left for me at my lodgings. I read it very greedily, and was several wayes surprised by the perusal of it. I could easily be brought to believe, that his Ecclesiastical Historians (Colganus, &c.) have a great many strange reports [marg: This is answered in the preface] that are as well grounded, as several more modern in the story of Scotland. A sample of S Columbs own handwriting is*

NLI MS 665 (formerly Phillipps 6677, from the Southwell manuscripts). The association of this sheet with the manuscript is not easy to explain, since the main text is a copy of an early stage in the evolution of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* in the 1670s, while the inserted paper dates from 1708 (letter 45 and Introduction, 154). There is a copy of both in RIA MS 24 M. 45 (made after Phillipps bought the manuscript in or soon after 1834), where the comments follow a transcript of the *Ogygia* text of MS 665; the copy incorporates O'Flaherty's marginal comments in brackets.

certainly a valuable Relick [marg: this is extant in Dublin College]. I do not well understand what he means by the Scots using the ancient letters (as well as the language) of the Gaidelians [marg: Scots and Gaidelians are synonymous: their language, letters, and hand-character the same: but the Roman print-character is for want \of/ their print-character, yet to be had in Rome, Lovan, & London, as in Ogygia from London.] for the Bible, and Books of psalms of the several Glasgow editions, which he refers to, are printed in the common Roman Pica. What he says in defence of the old Genealogical poetry of his country; & of the folly of Fordon, Major, Boethius, Dempster, and Camerarius; of the particulars, wherein Buchanan is ashamed to follow his leader, the signification of Bede's Dalreudini, etc. is very entertaining. Upon the whole there are a great many things in it, that (in my judgement) would be acceptable from the press: thô on the other hand som corrections ought to be made on the book, before 'tis sent thither. I should not so much insist upon the altering of those passages, wherein he favours the men of his own persuasion in Religious points: but many course [sic] compliments he bestows on his Adversary (a person of good quality, & education, as well as eminent learning) which seem to want a little polishing [marg: This is answered in the preface].^a If some corrections of this kind were made, I know not but the publishing may be undertaken.^a

[3] ^bThus, Sir, I have faithfully transcrib'd the sentiments of these two gentlemen, who are both men of character not only among our scholars, but (which is all in all in recommending a book to the press) amongst our booksellers.^b

^{a-a} omitted from the autograph

^{b-b} omitted from O'Connor's copy

It is not easy to understand the layering of voices in this paper. The heading was composed by O'Flaherty, who refers to himself as 'the Author'. The 'worthy member of the University of Oxford' is Edward Lhwyd; his name was given in the later text followed by O'Connor. O'Flaherty has then copied out favourable excerpts from three letters he had received from Edward Lhwyd, the only surviving elements from that side of their correspondence.⁴⁹³ From the first letter dated 24 December 1704, in Lhwyd's words [1], we learn that Lhwyd has discussed O'Flaherty's list of chapters with Dr George Hickes (1642–1715), an important figure, whose major work of antiquarian scholarship is referred to, *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus*, published in 1705; it was this book that had interrupted the typesetting of Lhwyd's dictionary. Lhwyd's letter of this date is acknowledged by O'Flaherty in letter 18. The exchange between Lhwyd and Hickes was evidently *viva voce*, and there is no mention of it in Hickes's surviving letters.⁴⁹⁴

The second extract is difficult: we begin in O'Flaherty's voice [2],

⁴⁹³ O'Flaherty responds to some points made by the readers in letter 25.

⁴⁹⁴ Hickes's letters to friends involved with the *Thesaurus* were edited by R. L. Har-

where 'im' refers again to Lhwyd. This time, however, instead of giving the date of the letter *from* Lhwyd, he gives the date of the letter *to* Lhwyd, who has written to him quoting the words of the unnamed person underlined in the manuscript [2a]. The passage can be traced to a letter from Lhwyd's regular correspondent, the Tottenham schoolmaster William Baxter, dated 2 January but without year.⁴⁹⁵ In consulting him, Lhwyd was well aware that Baxter had already studied *Ogygia* and was therefore at least aware of the subject under discussion.⁴⁹⁶ Both Hickes and Baxter made their comments before Lhwyd himself had received the manuscript; they commented only on the chapter-titles. We know of a letter from Baxter himself to O'Flaherty, forwarded by Lhwyd on 8 February 1704/5.⁴⁹⁷

In the third extract, from a letter dated 24 January 1705/6, Lhwyd has 'faithfully transcribed' the opinions expressed by two scholars to whom he has now, a year later, shown the manuscript of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia Vindicated*. O'Flaherty again has underlined their words [3a, 3b], perhaps following Lhwyd's own presentation of the extracts; the words preceding and following are Lhwyd's [3], and so presumably is the intervening line, 'the other gentleman writes thus'. Lhwyd's letter of this date to O'Flaherty is acknowledged in letter 25, dated 7 February 1705/6; these two learned readers are referred to there, confirming the implied procedure.

The reader quoted first [3a] is William Baxter once again, and the passage comes from a letter datable to November 1705.⁴⁹⁸ A year earlier he had referred to Sir George Mackenzie as 'a contemptible adversary', and he now calls him *scaramouche*, a character in the Ita-

ris, *The Correspondence of George Hickes and his Collaborators on the Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium* (Toronto, 1992); none of them mentions O'Flaherty or his manuscript. Harris's selection includes three letters from Hickes to Lhwyd, dated 29 April 1704 (no. 267), 20 May 1707 (no. 290), and 23 September 1707 (no. 291); he omits two others from the same source, which do not concern the *Thesaurus*, one dated 2 June 1707, in which Hickes acknowledges his pleasure on first opening *Archaeologia Britannica*, the other dated 17 March 1708/9 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1815, fols. 188–189, 191).

⁴⁹⁵ William Baxter to Edward Lhwyd, dated 2 January [1704/5]; known only from a copy, apparently in the hand of Dafydd Parry, Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 270. Baxter was at this date a schoolmaster in Tottenham. Most of his correspondence with Lhwyd comprises philological speculation, but a soberer picture can be had from A. Percival, 'William Baxter (1649–1723)', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion* (1957), 58–86.

⁴⁹⁶ Baxter had cited O'Flaherty briefly but by name in letters to Lhwyd, for example, one received on 4 March 1702/3 and another received on 18 March 1702/3 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fols. 151, 155).

⁴⁹⁷ Acknowledged in letter 19.
⁴⁹⁸ William Baxter to Edward Lhwyd, undated but postmarked NO/15 (15 November), between Lhwyd's receiving O'Flaherty's manuscript in June 1705 and his writing to O'Flaherty in January 1706; Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 249.

lian farce, 'a cowardly and foolish boaster of his own prowess'.⁴⁹⁹ The second reader can be identified as William Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle, for this last excerpt [3b] comes out of a letter from him to Lhwyd, which will be quoted more fully in due course. O'Flaherty did not know this, and his reply continues to question why there has been no response from Nicolson. Lhwyd was in effect reporting to O'Flaherty the outcome of a refereeing procedure. It is in this context alone that O'Flaherty briefly answered points made in marginal comments found only in the autograph of this paper. The first and last of these say simply, 'This is answered in the preface', referring to the 'late written preface', sent to Samuel Molyneux on 29 Janaury 1709 and received in March.⁵⁰⁰ The other points he aired with Lhwyd in letter 25.⁵⁰¹

The three letters from Lhwyd had been kept by O'Flaherty, who prepared this paper by copying passages from them as favourable reports. The circumstances in which he did this emerge from his correspondence with Samuel Molyneux: O'Flaherty states his intention in December 1708, 'The MS had the applaus of divers men in England, whose sentiments I le prefix in the work' (letter 45); the paper was requested by Samuel in the following March, 'I desire you to send me the sentiments you speak off of the learned in England that they may be prefixed' (letter 52). There are no later letters from Samuel to confirm receipt. If the paper was ever sent to Samuel, it was not preserved with the manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated*. Its text was, however, included as part of O'Flaherty's preliminaries to *Ogygia Vindicated* in the source from which Charles O'Connor printed the work. That copy differed from this autograph in several ways and was generally inferior or, rather, edited.⁵⁰² Some of the remarks that might have been

⁴⁹⁹ The *OED* tells us, 'The clever impersonation of the part by Tiberio Fiurelli, who brought his company of Italian players to London in 1673, rendered the word very popular in England during the last quarter of the 17th century'.

⁵⁰⁰ The date of despatch is mentioned in letter 51, receipt acknowledged in letter 52. In this preface, *Ogygia Vindicated*, lxxvii, O'Flaherty refers to Nicolson in one paragraph and then in the next defends Colgan against remarks by 'a certain learned person, voting with me against the Scottish historians', still unaware that they were one and the same; at p. lxxiii, he picks another phrase from the report, saying, 'I am taxed by some to have bestowed coarse compliments in this treatise on Sir George Mackenzie, which I would be very loth to deserve, having a great esteem and value for his dignity, quality, learning, and noble blood'.

⁵⁰¹ One of the other two marginal points concerns the Book of Durrow, which O'Flaherty believed to have been written by St Columba, the other concerns the type used in editions of the psalms in Gaelic, both of them raised with Lhwyd in letter 25 (see nn. 255, 257).

⁵⁰² *Ogygia Vindicated*, lxxvi-lxxix ('Commendations on *Ogygia Vindicated*'). These commendations were deliberately placed between O'Flaherty's Preface (pp.

thought less than positive are omitted, and so too are O'Flaherty's marginal comments. The obvious deduction is that O'Flaherty wrote out this paper more than once.

Now, we can reconstruct the steps that produced these readers' reports. On 27 March 1704 O'Flaherty writes, 'I am sorry you missed my Mackenzy MS. I would wish to have it printed and if so you would command a copy'; and on 6 June, 'I am willing you should procure the printing of my book against Mackenzy upon whatever score you can'. He transcribed his manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated* for Lhwyd between July and October 1704, and he reports progress in his letters.⁵⁰³ In one letter he included the chapter-headings and at the same time announced that the copy was complete in twenty-two sheets of paper. This is letter 14, dated 24 October 1704, which reached Lhwyd in time for his acknowledgement to be answered by O'Flaherty in letter 16, dated 8 December 1704. It was around this time, when Lhwyd had seen only the chapter-headings, that he discussed the book in outline with Dr Hickes and Mr Baxter. The complete manuscript was not quickly despatched, for it had still not been sent in February 1705 (letter 19). It was carried 'by a trusty friend' from Galway to Dublin at the end of April (letter 20), 'in April last left with Mr Bulkeley in Dublin' (letter 22), and on 8 May O'Flaherty wrote to say that he knew it had reached Dublin (letter 21). More than a week before that, Lhwyd's friend Henry Rowlands in Anglesey had already taken receipt of it at Plas Gwyn: 'I have lately received a packet to you from old Flaherty. I made bold to open it. It is his vindication of his *Ogygia*, which I'll dispatch to you as soon as the first conveniency presents'.⁵⁰⁴ It waited a month in Anglesey until Rowlands's next letter shows its onward journey: 'You'll receive by this carrier the papers I mentioned in my last. They were half opened when I first received them, and are now tyed up by me. I saw no letter with them'.⁵⁰⁵

Meanwhile, even before the manuscript was despatched, O'Flaherty came close to making contact with William Nicolson. Among

lxxv–lxxv) and 'King James II his Genealogy' (pp. lxxx–lxxxii), which itself precedes the table of chapters (pp. lxxxiii–lxxxiv).

⁵⁰³ Letters 9 ('if I did fall upon transcribing', 6 June), 10, 11 ('I'll just now fall upon transcribing', 28 July), and 13 (twelve sheets done, 29 August).

⁵⁰⁴ Henry Rowlands to Edward Lhwyd, dated 27 April 1705, postmarked at London 'MA/2' (2 May) (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 388). Letter 20 suggests that the packet would be given to Mr Bulkeley in Dublin, and Rowlands's letter mentions greetings from Mr Bulkeley in Anglesey. These are perhaps Richard and Francis Bulkeley (see letter 9 and n. 58).

⁵⁰⁵ Henry Rowlands to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Plas Gwyn, 24 May 1705 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1817a, fol. 389).

Lhwyd's letters is one from Nicolson, now torn down the left-hand side, and dated 26 December:⁵⁰⁶

[[Last nig]]ht I had one of your printed sheets cor[[rected]] by Mr Flaherty, with a kind offer of [[sending]] me something else of his own composure. [[]] you have sent me these papers, and [[]]t likewise let me know where my [[acknow]]ldgements may attend him: For I [[know n]]othing of Park, whence his letter is [[dated, w]]hether 'tis in England or Ireland.

There is scope for confusion here, for, as we shall see, the time of year is very close to that on which Nicolson would receive O'Flaherty's manuscript, 29 December 1705. There are strong reasons, however, for dating this letter to the end of 1704.⁵⁰⁷ And this coincides with what O'Flaherty wrote in two letters dated 15 December 1704 and 23 January 1704/5, that he wanted Nicolson to see the list of chapters and that he had sent one of Lhwyd's printed sheets under Nicolson's cover.⁵⁰⁸ One can infer that letter 17, dated 15 December, was sent to Lhwyd through Nicolson, who received it in Westminster at Christmas. This letter reports receipt of that sheet, but no letter to Nicolson was enclosed; rather, Nicolson has read what O'Flaherty wrote to Lhwyd. Within days the bishop received something else of O'Flaherty, as we learn from a letter to Lhwyd dated 2 January 1704/5.⁵⁰⁹

Here you have Mr Flaherty's papers, in the same condition I rec^d them saving that the penny-post brought them under a cover directed to me at Westminster. [. . .] I shall this night send off your Shropshire letter; but am in some dispute whether I should give Mr Flaherty any trouble, since my privilege will not Frank a Letter beyond Dublin.

He is not referring here to the sheet of dictionary. Neither O'Flaherty nor Lhwyd could not have despatched anything by the penny post, which was a service within the immediate area of London.⁵¹⁰ The ex-

⁵⁰⁶ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Old Palace Yard, Westminster, 26 December, but with no year given (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 543). Damage to the paper has left a few words illegible as indicated by the brackets; in some cases conjecture is possible.

⁵⁰⁷ A note at the bottom left-hand corner, not fully legible, refers to the bishop of St Asaph and the next day; and in Nicolson's journal, we find that he called on Dr William Beveridge, the new bishop of St Asaph, on Wednesday, 27 December 1704, finding him 'very much indisposed' (*London Diaries of William Nicolson, Bishop of Carlisle 1702-1718*, 260). In 1704 Nicolson lodged at Mrs Beal's in Old Palace Yard, while in December 1705 he stayed at Mr Hallet's in Manchester Court (ib. 214, 293).

⁵⁰⁸ Letters 17, 18 and n. 159.

⁵⁰⁹ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Westminster, 2 January 1705[/6] (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 536v).

⁵¹⁰ The London Penny Post, launched by private enterprise in 1680, taken over by

planation lies in what we have already seen in unravelling the sources of the readers' reports. William Baxter had seen O'Flaherty's chapter-headings at precisely this time; he sent this on by penny post between Tottenham and Westminster, and Nicolson now returns that paper to Lhwyd.

The manuscript of O'Flaherty's book arrived at last in Oxford in June 1705, and at this stage Lhwyd reported its arrival by letter to William Nicolson, who acknowledged this news.⁵¹¹ Once the book had arrived, it becomes clear that Lhwyd intended to consult Nicolson directly, though O'Flaherty has misgivings about this, as he wrote in letter 23 on 29 August 1705: 'I cannot apprehend how much you depend on the Bishop of Carlisle's approbation in relation to my MS whereas you have a whole university of learned men by you to choose as many as you pleas of 'em to examin such an unwonted historical treatise of a subject, wherein both English, & Scotch (*Absit verbo invidia*) are verie unexpert, by what I see they erroneously deliver'. He went on to show his many disagreements with Nicolson. In letter 25 O'Flaherty gives Lhwyd leave to make alterations to the wording of his manuscript, and he is still awaiting with some apprehension the response of Bishop Nicolson. That was in October 1705. In November Nicolson is still looking forward to seeing the manuscript; he writes to Lhwyd:⁵¹²

the post office from December 1682, had receiving offices in shops and coffee houses all over London, Westminster, and Southwark. It would carry packets up to 16oz in weight within this area and for an additional 1d into suburban areas. I have consulted G. Brumell, *The Local Posts of London 1680-1840* (Cheltenham, Glos, 1938), and F. Bagust, *Some Notes on the Small Post Offices of London in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (1937).

⁵¹¹ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated 18 June 1705 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 540): 'I am glad to hear that Mr Flaherty's Vindication is arrived; and I shall heartily hope to meet that manuscript and your printed book together in London about Christmas next, at the farthest'.

⁵¹² William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Westminster, 22 November 1705 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 541v). The text is damaged in part, and I provide conjectures within brackets. Nicolson's journal does not mention the Cotton Library at any point between his arrival in London on 26 October 1705 for the new session of Parliament and the date of this letter, but he had noted a year earlier 'that there's no coming at the Cotton-Library; nor has there been any access in five months past' (11 November 1711; *London Diaries of William Nicolson*, 224). His frustration in this matter, however, must have been the reason why, on 15 December 1705, he moved 'that the Committee for Inspecting the Records [...] might be empowered likewise to inquire into the present state of the Cotton-Library' (*London Diaries of William Nicolson*, 329); the first action in this matter was taken on 22 December (ib. 334), when a report was requested; it was delivered on 28 December (ib. 338), with 'the two Mr Cottons' in attendance. The 'late Act of Parliament' referred to must be An Act for the better settling and preserving the Library kept in the House at Westminster,

I shall be mightily pleas'd with the perusal of Mr O'Flaherty's book. 'Twill come the more opportunely to me; because I am much at leisure, being disappointed of what I promis'd myself for the entertainment of my spare (morning) hours in this place. I brought up with me a great many references to several treatises in the Cotton-Library: But [[I find]] this is a Treasure not to be come at. [[For the]] late Act of Parliament, instead of [[making]] that Library more publick, has en[[tirely loc]]k'd it up, and I heartily wish that [[it be not]] wholly lost by the hasty measures that [[have]] been taken for its preservation. To[[morrow]] I shall have Mons^r Pezron's book; the B^p of Hereford having kindly secur'd a copy for me.

Neither Nicolson nor O'Flaherty was told what we know, that the manuscript had been to William Baxter, who reported by letter to Lhwyd in November 1705. O'Flaherty's manuscript was delivered to Nicolson in London only after Christmas. Nicolson's own journal provides further detail, recording that 'Mr Flaherty's MS Ogygia Vindicated, against Sir George Mackenzie' was left at his lodgings by 'an unknown bookseller' on Saturday, 29 December 1705. The bearer, who called himself a bookseller but gave no name, must have brought the manuscript from Baxter. Nicolson copied out the titles of the twenty chapters, adding very concise summaries.⁵¹³ At this point, he wrote the letter to Lhwyd that we have already seen reported to O'Flaherty and quoted by him:⁵¹⁴

Westm^r. Jan. 3. 1705[/6]

Dear S^r,

Th'other night Mr Flaherty's Vindication of his Ogygia against the late S^r George Mackenzie was left for me at my lodgeings by one who call'd himself a Bookseller. I read it very greedily; and was (several wayes) surprized in the perusal of it. I could easily be brought to believe, that his Ecclesiastical Historians (Colganus, &c.) have a great many strange Reports that

called Cotton House, in the Name and Family of the Cottons, for the Benefit of the Public (*Journals of the House of Lords* xvi (1696–1701) (London, 1774), 711, dated 29 May 1701), to which Sir John Cotton had consented. His death in 1702 had allowed his librarian, Dr Thomas Smith, in effect to admit readers rarely and only at his own discretion. This situation continued even after the House of Lords voted to buy out 'the two Mr Cottons', Sir John's heirs, on 15 March 1705/6 (after Nicolson had left London; *London Diaries of William Nicolson*, 43). Nicolson himself gained entry on 10 and 12 December 1706. In November and December 1705 the bishop of Hereford was in London for Parliament; Bishop Humphrey Humphreys was Welsh, a friend of Edward Lhwyd, and much interested in questions of the relationship of Welsh and Irish, but Nicolson's diary makes no mention of Pezron's book.

⁵¹³ *London Diaries of William Nicolson*, 340–42.

⁵¹⁴ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated 3 January 1705/6 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 544). I have omitted a second paragraph about finding preferment in Carlisle diocese for Lhwyd's friend David Jones, who would later translate Pezron's book from French into English. There is a copy of this letter in Bodl. MS Ballard 62, fol. 173.

are as well grounded as several more modern in the story of Scotland: But I am somewhat too slow in the Particulars. A sample of St Columba's own handwriting is certainly a valuable Relick: but an Irish manuscript a thousand years elder than that, which he supposes to be procurable, would be a Treasure more inestimable. I do not well understand what he means by the Scots using the antient Letters (as well as the Language) of the Gaidelians; unless perhaps the Highlanders write the Irish Alphabet: For the books of psalms (of the several Glasgow-editions, which he refers to) are printed in the common Roman pica. What he says in defence of the old Genealogical poetry of his countrey; and of the follies of Fordun, Major, Boethius, Dempster and Camerarius; as also of the particulars wherein Buchanan is ashamed to follow his Leaders, the signification of Bede's Dalreudini, &c. is very entertaining. Upon the whole, there are a great many things in it, that (in my poor thoughts) would be acceptable from the press: Tho', on the other hand, some corrections ought to be made on the book, before 'tis sent thither. I should not so much insist upon the altering of the passages, wherein he favours the men of his own persuasion in Religious points; because, I think, there's nothing in any of 'em that can be of pernicious consequence to the Reformation: But many coarse compliments he bestowes on his Adversary (a person of good quality & education, as well as eminent learning) which seem to want a little polishing. If some corrections of this kind were made, and another sort of introduction prefix'd instead of his two Dedicatory Addresses, I know not but the publishing might be undertaken: and (some way or other) the Author's pains a little consider'd. As I remember, you told me that his circumstances would not refuse a small Gratification. Whether his Temper will as readily admit of a few necessary Amendments of the Text, you can also best inform me. [. . .]

Your ever affectionate friend to serve you,
W. Carliol.

Some specific points here had evidently also been aired by letter, and O'Flaherty responds to them in letter 25.

Before the manuscript had reached England, O'Flaherty had been hopeful. By the time it did so, his reading of Nicolson's *Scottish Historical Library* had brought a certain tension into the business. In his first reading of the book he had fixed on the Melrose Chronicle, which Mackenzie had used to attack *Ogygia*. O'Flaherty's anxiety was very much associated with Nicolson. He knew by now that his argument was one not accepted by Nicolson, so that in writing, 'I cannot apprehend how much you depend on the B^p of Carlisle's approbation in relation to my manuscript' (letter 23), he was in fear of rejection. Some of this tension concerning Nicolson is on the surface, but some is hidden, because Lhwyd only shared Nicolson's comments with O'Flaherty under the guise of an anonymous reader. On 7 February 1705/6 he wrote, 'I cannot but admire that you give me no account of

the B^p of Caerlisle's opinion of my MS, which he was very desirous to see: certainly he can not censur it well, unles he retracts his own writing to the contrary' (letter 25), and then in the next sentence, 'I heartly thank your two learned friends for their civil character of me, & their impartial censur of my work'. He never guessed that the bishop was one of these two.

The manuscript remained with Nicolson longer than he wanted it, for in another letter from Nicolson to Lhwyd, written six weeks later, he laments that the book has not been collected.⁵¹⁵ A few more weeks later, on 25 March 1706, we find a letter from Nicolson to Lhwyd, written after he was parted from the manuscript, reporting that Humphrey Humphreys hoped to have sight of O'Flaherty's book.⁵¹⁶

Eighteen months later, and with no sign that anyone would take on the publication, O'Flaherty more than once asks for the return of the manuscript and is continually disappointed. Lhwyd had evidently made an excuse about the delay in getting it back to Oxford from London, leading O'Flaherty to remark, 'when you cannot command my manuscript from London to Oxford in more than a twelve-months time, I despair its coming over sea, while I live, to my great loss, and resentment' (letter 29). From the very end of the correspondence it appears that it was at last sent to Jeremiah Pepyat in 1708, and we may guess that it was the same copy, dated September 1704, that was sent to Samuel Molyneux and survives in Southampton. As we shall see, the search for a patron to get *Ogygia Vindicated* into print went on in 1708 and 1709.

Correspondence with Samuel Molyneux

In 1707 William Molyneux's young son, Samuel Molyneux, sought to relaunch his father's Dublin Philosophical Society.⁵¹⁷ He was eighteen years old at the time, an undergraduate at Trinity College. Since his father's death, when he was only nine, he had grown up in the family home in New Row, still occupied by his uncle Dr Thomas Molyneux. Here he had his father's papers to hand, which

⁵¹⁵ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Westminster, 12 February 1705/6 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 546).

⁵¹⁶ William Nicolson to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Rose, 25 March 1706, 'I hope you have order'd the Bishop of Hereford a sight of Mr Flaherty's MS. which I had just parted with before I had any knowledge of his Lordship's desires to see it' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 548).

⁵¹⁷ Hoppen, *The Common Scientist*, 192–4, who refers to the letters between Molyneux and O'Flaherty as 'the most extensive correspondence of this period'.

may well have included letters from Roderick O'Flaherty as well as O'Flaherty's account of Iar-Connaught. Samuel refers to 'the usefull communications of this nature which among his papers I find you favour'd him with' (letter 32). He opened a correspondence with the old man, which has survived almost complete for the years 1708 and 1709 through a letter-book in which Samuel copied letters written and letters received. Twenty-two letters are printed below, fourteen from O'Flaherty, eight from Samuel, together with one letter from Samuel to Thomas Molyneux and three letters between Samuel and Edward Lhwyd.

Samuel began the correspondence on 13 March 1707/8 with a packet inclosing a page of queries, 'natural enquirys', reprinted from those drawn up by his father for the Society. The rather formal politeness with which the young man writes to the old man is conspicuous, but O'Flaherty immediately responded as if they were old friends, 'as tis said that hereditary friendship ought not to be less valued than hereditary chattels'.⁵¹⁸ Samuel's first letter was released from the post office in Galway on 8 or 9 April, where its bulk and want of frank made it wait until someone came to authorize its free carriage. Lhwyd's last letter had been held up with it and was released at the same time, but O'Flaherty answered Samuel's first. He has more to say about himself in these letters than in those to Lhwyd, and it appears that he is rather more at ease in writing to the young Molyneux.

The reason for Samuel's beginning the correspondence was to have O'Flaherty's contribution to the deliberations of the refounded Dublin Philosophical Society. Giles Eyre, Samuel's friend at Trinity College, had already sent O'Flaherty the reprinted Queries, first drawn up by William Molyneux, and between December and February O'Flaherty had taken time to draw together a response comprising one hundred points. He mentioned this fact to Lhwyd even before he heard from Samuel.⁵¹⁹ These have not been found, which may in itself be telling, since Samuel tended to keep papers. Whenever O'Flaherty refers to the Queries or his notes on them, he deals with some prodigy.⁵²⁰ Such tales interested him. He had

⁵¹⁸ Letter 33.

⁵¹⁹ 'I had printed enquiries com to me (as to severall others thrô out Ir: I believe) from a late Society erected in Dublin College (Mr Sam Molyneux secretary to 'em) in order of compiling a History of Natur, & Arts. I doe not know, whether is there any com to you to that purpos. I writ a 100. annotations in answer of their Queryes, but sent them none as yet' (letter 30).

⁵²⁰ In letter 34 it is a swarm of bees at Moycullen; in letter 40 an addition to § 73 in his notes, about an experiment with birds' eggs; in letter 43 'a resplendent Starr in

been taking notice of them for sixty years, recording, for example, an incident in Galway within his own memory, dated to Tuesday, 7 September 1647, or filling up with prodigies the blank space in a letter to Lhwyd.⁵²¹ He says enough of his own views to show that his interest would probably be judged unscientific, though in such matters the boundaries would have been hard to define.

The one technical topic on which O'Flaherty writes with skill was chronology, and here one sometimes feels that Samuel understood him, even if their ends were different. Calculating the date of Easter appears to have been for O'Flaherty almost as important as it was to early medieval computists, because entry into eternal life depended on the true observance of the anniversary. He states this in forcible language but declines to argue the point, allowing that modern believers did not all share his stern view. The correct date, he says,⁵²²

is of that consequence by the precepts of our church, that any person who receives not communion within the time limited before or after Easter is to be cut off as a putrified limb from the body of the faithfull. About this point on which in my opinion depends eternal salvation I doe not dispute, since people in our age are lead by the dictates of their own conscience.

The technicalities of chronology in this way connect his conservative faith and his absorption in the ancient past of Ireland. Yet it may be doubted whether spotting errors in almanacs, as in the postscript to letter 42, would actually serve the Dublin Society's purpose.

Antiquarian subjects would have interested Samuel, who perhaps thought O'Flaherty could contribute here, and he must have mentioned this in a letter now missing from the series—but O'Flaherty kept off such matters: 'I have not in what I send you any account in particular of monasterys, crosses, or ancient inscriptions, as having no hint of the like in your enquiries, nor time at present to come by, if any such I can give' (letter 36). His reading of *Iar-Connaught* may have raised Samuel's expectations here—he transcribed the whole text—and we know that O'Flaherty had notes from long before on, for example, the inscriptions from the Cross of Cong, taken down by him in 1680.⁵²³ Yet Samuel none the less put an antiquarian question to

the middle of the moon', seen in Antrim; in letter 48 a cow that swallowed a needle; in letter 51 light during a January night in Galway; and in letter 53 birds that speak prophecies.

⁵²¹ *Iar-Connaught*, 29 (and Ó Muraíle, 129), on the drying of the Galway river in 1178, 1190, and 1647; letter 19, where he offers several recent prodigies, from the un-hinging of the town gate in Galway to showers of blood in Loughrea and stones that sweat blood in Athenry.

⁵²³ Introduction, 40.

⁵²² Letter 45.

him about the use of money and coins in ancient Ireland, eliciting a learned and referenced response, the only letter here in any way akin to what we find in his letters to Lhwyd. The answers are all derived from books.⁵²⁴ Samuel, with a modern approach wants more: 'I desire to know whether you have by you or ever have seen any of O'Connor or his Rodericks money, coind as tis said at Clonmacknoise' (letter 52), he asks, and we can guess the answer.

If intellectual connexion is missing, the correspondence is kept going by a sense of hereditary friendship, something mentioned by O'Flaherty in his first answer to his old patron's son. In both cases, friendship was surely a one-sided view, but both William and Samuel were considerate of O'Flaherty's difficulties over ready money. In the context of the Society's Queries, O'Flaherty was blunt about seeking payment, and Samuel took this well.⁵²⁵ It is a sign of the strange intimacy between them that O'Flaherty will ask favours beyond the routine of frank postage. The request to help find paid employment for his son-in-law Edward Tyrrell forms a theme that extends through many letters.⁵²⁶ They relate as friends and family, though they do not know one another, each understanding that the other has a very different perspective on the situation. Yet at one point Samuel's real insensitivity shows through. O'Flaherty had a pressing need for the unreachable sum of £5, and yet, when Samuel nonchalantly mentions that he has subscribed £5 towards the publication of *Ogygia Vindicated*, he saw this cost-free pledge as gracious generosity, not thinking how much it highlighted the difference between the two men without bridging it.

The publication of *Ogygia Vindicated*, however, was what O'Flaherty wanted out of this correspondence, which began exactly as his correspondence with Lhwyd faded out, leaving him with no more than the late return of his manuscript. The way he first introduces the subject with Samuel is curious. 'There is a pamphlet of mine promis'd to be publish'd there of *Ogygia Vindicated*', he writes in letter 42, 'I desire your help for procuring subscribers, when you see the advertisement to that end come forth from Mr Carter the printer'. He had been in contact with Cornelius Carter, printer, in Fishamble Street, Dublin, but he had not the means to pay him. Samuel's response is lost, but it evidently contained

⁵²⁴ Letter 51 and notes.

⁵²⁵ O'Flaherty raises the question of 'a reasonable recompense' in letter 33, and Samuel repeats the expression in letter 34, asking what he would consider appropriate.

⁵²⁶ A place as queen's boatman, in the gift of the revenue commissioners and answerable to the revenue collector in Galway, appears in almost every letter from letter 38 to letter 48.

what O'Flaherty could refer to as 'your free overture', now asking Samuel to draft the proposal to subscribers. And before long he has got Samuel negotiating with another, cheaper, printer and actually getting a subscription proposal printed, some copies of which were despatched to Galway. O'Flaherty's final letter refers to it, 'The proposalls you drew were drawn to my heart's content, only the print error of unhappy author', leaving us to wonder what error had caused this unhappiness. No example survives. In the interim Samuel had received the manuscript but made little progress with reading. He said he had begun on Christmas Day 1708 (letter 47); a month later, he writes, 'One thing or another has intervend that I have not yet finishd your manuscripts' (letter 49). We get no sense that he ever did, but in letter 52 he becomes businesslike, having spoken to a printer, and his letter makes a whole series of points about the dedication, the need to remove the address to King James II, his desire to see the assessments obtained from England, and his approval of a newly written preface that formed no part of the manuscript already sent. Despite little success in raising subscriptions, in March 1709 it must have seemed possible that *Ogygia Vindicated* would at last be printed. All that was needed was money to pay the printer, and O'Flaherty's solution to that problem is to propose—an offer not taken up—that the Dublin Society reward his notes in relation to their Queries with a sum sufficient to advance the printer £26 in costs and to meet his own pressing need of £5.⁵²⁷

Only at this stage did O'Flaherty bend to the inevitable and abandon his address to King James II, which he had told Lhwyd he would not do.⁵²⁸ He cannot have been unaware of the risk it carried. His choice for a new dedication fell on the young Randall Mac Donnell (1680–1721), 4th earl of Antrim, whose uncle Randall, 2nd earl and only marquess of Antrim, and father, Alexander, 3rd earl—catholics all—had successfully used their political skills to retain their estates through the upheavals of the past sixty years.⁵²⁹ How far this dedication differs from that intended for King James cannot be known, but he at least gives his reasons for the choice and incorporates references to the earl's grandfather, Randall, 1st earl, so invested in Dublin on 29 June 1617. He also includes his immediate ancestors on both father's and mother's side, nicely concluding:⁵³⁰

⁵²⁷ Letter 51.

⁵²⁸ Letters 23, 25.

⁵²⁹ J. H. Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms. The career of Randal MacDonnell, marquis of Antrim, 1609–1683* (Cambridge, 1993), 278; in the *ODNB* she described the marquess as 'Caroline loyalist, Catholic confederate, Cromwellian collaborator, and Restoration pragmatist'.

⁵³⁰ Dedication in *Ogygia Vindicated*, lix. As O'Flaherty says (p. lviii), Randall's

The honour I have also of relation to my Lady, your right honourable mother, I persuade myself, will not the less ingratiate me to your Lordship's favourable reception of my dedication, which I opportunely present in your flourishing days, that in your riper years of perfection, when I am laid in dust, the lustre of your most illustrious name in the frontispiece of the book might dazzle the eyes of all unjust and envious detractors.

Whether the earl ever saw the manuscript is unknown, but the choice was a thoughtful one. The new preface too—by comparison with some of the letters—is straightforward and well written. What we see now in O'Connor's edition comes from a later draft than the one sent to Samuel, and we know too that O'Flaherty had had some help from Dr Fielding Shaw in Galway, who, besides promising 'some prodigious rarity of nature out of Mayo county in reference to your Society', also gave O'Flaherty 'a very friendly admonition of my Preface he perused, that it might be put as for some expressions therein into a more modern and fashionable stile' (letter 57). He adds, 'I wish I had many such friends', but by now Samuel was receding from inclusion in that category.

The businesslike letter 52 was the last Samuel wrote to O'Flaherty. It offered both approval and practical help, and it even tends towards enthusiasm. Samuel had resolved soon to visit the old man at Park:

I shall not fail to make myself happy in your conversation in turning over by your permission your excellent collection of manuscripts and seeing what other antiquitys you will be so kind as to shew me. I shall then discourse you at length in relation to your book and the designs, progress &c. of our Dublin Society. In short I propose to myself a great deal of pleasure in seeing you in your own closett.

O'Flaherty's reply asked Samuel to write again as he was leaving Dublin, but there was no further letter to announce the imminent visit. He filled the rest of the letter with technical chronology and a story of prophetic cocks' crowing 'in plain English', but whether it reached Dublin before Samuel set off we do not know. It was at least copied into his letter book. While crossing Ireland in April, he mentioned

mother, Helen Burke (d. 1710), second wife of the 3rd earl of Antrim, was daughter of Sir John Burke (d. 1667), of DerrymacLaughna (Co. Galway), by Lady Mary Bourke (d. 1685), daughter of Richard Bourke (d. 1664/5), 6th earl of Clanricarde, by Lady Elizabeth Butler (d. 1668), daughter of Walter Butler (1559–1633), 11th earl of Ormond. Lady Mary Bourke's second husband was Edward Bermingham (d. 1709), Lord Athenry, whose father Francis Bermingham (d. 1677), Lord Athenry, was the nephew of Roderick's stepfather John Bermingham. Moreover, the 6th earl's mother Siobhán (Susanna, Jane) O'Shaughnessy was half-sister to the same John Bermingham.

in a letter to his uncle Thomas the expectation of viewing the sights with O'Flaherty: 'I expect he will show me the curiosities, or at least the antiquities, of his country, and perhaps of the Isles of Aran' (letter 53*). Twenty letters had passed between them in a year, but now O'Flaherty would meet his correspondent.

Samuel Molyneux and his older cousin Samuel Dopping had made a journey to the north of Ireland in the previous summer, and now they travelled as far as Galway and Park. During four such Irish journeys Samuel Molyneux kept a log, which has survived. He recorded his visit to O'Flaherty:⁵³¹

Wednesday, 21st [*recte* 20th April, 1709], I went to vizit old Flaherty, who lives very old, in a miserable condition at Park, some 3 hours west of Gallway, in Hiar or West-Connaught. I expected to have seen here some old Irish manuscripts, but his ill fortune has strippd him of these as well as his other

⁵³¹ 'Journey to Connacht, April 1709', edited from TCD MS 884 (I. 4. 12), at pp. 16–17 [copy in MS 883/2 (I. 1. 3), pp. 71–85], by Aquilla Smith in *Miscellany of the Irish Archaeological Society* (Dublin, 1846), 161–178 (at p. 171). This passage is quoted by Hardiman, 428, who reads 'some few pieces of his own writing' and adds a reading from the fair copy, MS 883/2, p. 79, 'a few old Romish books'. These are not improvements. Both appear in this passage as quoted by John O'Donovan in his letter on the barony of Moycullen, 27 July 1839 (OS Galway, iii. 162), confirming that he and Hardiman shared their text. In the first case the implied noun is 'manuscripts'. In the second 'rummish' is surely no more than a colloquialism, 'somewhat rum', 'rather peculiar', i.e. of questionable value in Samuel's opinion; at the time of writing could he really have intended 'Romish'? The diary was attributed by its editor to Dr Thomas Molyneux but was re-assigned on the evidence of handwriting to his nephew, Samuel Molyneux, by Hoppen, *The Common Scientist*, 272 n. 133. The dates in the journal slip from Sunday, 17 April (MS 884, p. 8), to Monday, 19 April (p. 11), and the date should be corrected here to Wednesday, 20 April. This was the Wednesday in Holy Week, since Easter fell unusually late in that year, on 24 April, but the feast is not mentioned by Molyneux. O'Flaherty's last letter confirms the date by referring to the time of the visit as 'Passion week' (letter 57), and in another letter, dated 17 December 1708 (letter 45), he comments on the date of Easter 1709.

Samuel's logs record three other journeys:— A journey to the north of Ireland in August 1708 (TCD MS 888/2 (I. 4. 19), fols. 183r–188v [copy in MS 883/2 (I. 1. 3), pp. 130–49]; W. H. Patterson, 'Manuscript notes of tour made in the north of Ireland by Dr Thomas Molyneux in August 1708', *Report and proceedings of the Belfast Natural History and Philosophical Society* (1874–5), 35–41; R. M. Young, *Historical Notices of Old Belfast and its vicinity* (Belfast, 1896), 152–60, also attributed by the editor to Thomas Molyneux). — A journey to Kerry in July 1709 (TCD 885 (I. 4. 19) [copy in MS 883/2 (I. 1. 3), pp. 107–130]; K. T. Hoppen, 'Samuel Molyneux's tour of Kerry, 1709', *Journal of the Kerry Archaeological and Historical Society* 3 (1970), 59–80). — A journey in November and December 1709 that took in Kildare, Kilkenny, and chiefly the cave of Dunmore (TCD MS 888/2 (I. 4. 19), fols. 162r–182r [copy in MS 883/2 (I. 1. 3), pp. 86–106] (partly printed by J. Graves, 'A journey to Kilkenny in the year 1709. From the MS notes of Dr Thomas Molyneux', *Journal of the Kilkenny Archaeological Society* new ser. 3 (1861), 296–303) (there is another account of the cave, by George Berkeley, addressed to a meeting on 10 January 1705/6, TCD MS 888/2 (I. 4. 19), fols. 244r–253v [copy in MS 883/2 (I. 1. 3), pp. 292–300]).

goods so that he has nothing now left but some few of his own writing, and a few old rummish books of history, printed. In my life I never saw so stony and wild a country.

This much-quoted passage has fed the notion that O'Flaherty was all but destitute.⁵³² It tells us nothing about their conversation, over which Samuel had expressed such high hopes. It would be easy to imagine that he was sorely disappointed. He was evidently shocked by his sight of life in Cois Fhairrge in a way that irritated John O'Donovan. Where O'Donovan—with a touch of nineteenth-century sensibility—had depicted Roderick's sitting outside in the summer months to study and to enjoy the view, the reality, as O'Donovan surely knew, was that he would rather read outside than in, weather permitting, for the sake of the light. The house was probably without windows and chimney. Samuel was not used to such dwellings. The 'miserable condition' in which he found him is more likely one of circumstances than mood, though Roderick was by this date nearly eighty, and perhaps infirmity and disappointment had wrought some change in his demeanour. Moreover, he had had no warning of when to expect his visitor, so he may have been unprepared.

After this visit, only one letter is preserved, dated 21 June 1709, from O'Flaherty to Samuel, 'signifying my jealousy for your long silence since you left Connaught'. This letter was copied into the letter book with no reply and no comment. The copying of letters into the book also tails off, with the remaining pages used to copy only four letters from George Berkeley (1685–1753), then a young fellow of Trinity. We are left not knowing but suspecting that Samuel chose to let their correspondence end. There is no letter from him to O'Flaherty after their meeting, and he did not return O'Flaherty's manuscript to its owner.

During the interval between his visit to Park and O'Flaherty's last letter, Samuel had written to Edward Lhwyd on 21 May 1709, and Lhwyd had responded quickly on 28 May; a last letter from Molyneux to Lhwyd is dated 11 June 1709, which should have arrived in Oxford about two weeks before Lhwyd's death on 30 June. Neither of the original letters from Samuel survive among Lhwyd's correspondence still in Oxford. Here we might have had the start of an interesting correspondence. Samuel had been reading and copying letters that Lhwyd had sent to Dr Thomas Molyneux, among them some written during his Irish tour in 1700.⁵³³ His copies have only recently

⁵³² Introduction, 47.

⁵³³ Postscript to letter 54 and n. 86.

come to light.⁵³⁴ A few years later, when Samuel himself visited the Ashmolean Museum and spoke with Lhwyd's assistant and successor, Dafydd Parry, he referred to 'the promise Mr Lhuyd in his life time made me of giving me copys of all his notes in relation to Ireland', but this overstates anything actually said in Lhwyd's only extant letter to him.⁵³⁵ In approaching Lhwyd he presents his own journeys as if they too had a scientific purpose: 'I have been of late twice call'd to different parts of it [*the country*], and have made it my business to step out of the road whenever I could learn there was any thing remarkable to be seen' (letter 54). He asks for advice ahead of a journey into Louth and Meath, which may never have taken place; at least no journal has been found. Lhwyd's reply expresses a hope for a scientific correspondence 'during the remainder of my days'. One can only wonder whether he realised that they were numbered. With the end of Samuel Molyneux's letter book and Lhwyd's death in the early hours of 30 June 1709, a near silence falls over O'Flaherty's last years.

The Fate of O'Flaherty's Manuscripts

The letters printed here have survived because the recipients kept them and because the papers of those recipients have been handed down for some three hundred years. Their vicissitudes are discussed at the start of each series of letters below.

Papers in O'Flaherty's possession have for the most part perished, with the consequence that we know almost nothing of the letters he received. There are reasons to think that, while he lived, he was as careful with his papers as others were with theirs. In 1696, in Galway gaol, he was able to reread a letter he had received from William Molyneux in 1683. In 1705 he retrieved his notes made in 1680 on the inscriptions from Cong. And in 1708 or '9, when he sent *Ogygia Vindicated* to Samuel Molyneux, he could refer to earlier letters from Lhwyd and copy out excerpts.

Obviously he also kept the working copies of his books. In one case, the manuscript of *Ogygia* had very likely been in existence for ten years before it was printed. Once published—and in view of the importance he attached to its public status—it is likely that O'Flaherty annotated a copy of the edition with any further corrections and ad-

⁵³⁴ Appendix 4.

⁵³⁵ Samuel Molyneux to Dr Thomas Molyneux, dated at London, 28 February 1712/13 (Southampton RO, MS D/M 1/3, fols. 105–146; *London Letters of Samuel Molyneux*, 104–121, at p. 114). Parry apparently spoke of 'the regular journal he himself took in Ireland', but advised Molyneux that 'Mr Lhuyd never made such a one at all and noted down now and then what he met remarkeable'.

ditions. The survival of an early version is particularly difficult to explain.⁵³⁶ In another case, *Ogygia Vindicated* had been drafted in 1686, copied for Stillingfleet, copied for Dopping at the end of 1696, and copied again for Lhwyd in 1704, returned and sent to Molyneux in 1708; this copy survived among the papers of Molyneux. Yet neither of these has reached us directly from O'Flaherty's keeping. Writings that have survived did so because they were delivered to others. So, the autograph of *The Territory of West Connaught*, a work composed for William Molyneux, was delivered to him and kept by him. Molyneux made copies for himself of other works loaned to him: his transcript of *Ogygia* has also survived, though it lacks the passages in Irish; and his copy is the only known witness to the essay 'St Columb Vindicated'. There is a distinct parallel therefore between the external preservation of both works and letters.

None the less, one notebook and more than one manuscript have reached us from O'Flaherty himself. The autograph notebook is now Dublin, RIA, MS [Stowe] E. iv. 4 (cat. 621) pt 3; it is dated 1704 and is very much imperfect through the loss of leaves. Years after O'Flaherty's death it was in the hands of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare, who must have known its origin, since he was able to recognize O'Flaherty's hand. He expressly identified an example in another manuscript that had belonged to O'Flaherty and also came into O'Connor's possession.⁵³⁷ This is now RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), copied by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh and including historical poems that had been very useful in O'Flaherty's work. There are grounds for thinking that this was accessible to O'Connor as early as 1729, when he was only 19 years old, for in that year he made a copy of the poem 'Clann ollamhan uaisle Eamhna', now RIA MS [Stowe] C. i. 1 (cat. 935), fols. 57v–(61v), which matches the version otherwise known only from RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2, fols. 40r–(43v).⁵³⁸ Another manuscript once owned by O'Flaherty and later owned by O'Connor is now RIA MS [Stowe] C. ii. 1 (cat. 1084), written by Cú Choigríche

⁵³⁶ Now NLI MS 665 (Introduction, 57–8). This is a copy in an unknown hand. It is impossible to believe that O'Flaherty circulated an early draft of his book after it was published, so that one can only wonder how it came to be copied. Puzzlement is increased by the pairing of this copy with a paper in O'Flaherty's own hand, containing readers' reports on the manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated*, a paper that cannot date from earlier than 1709, since the marginal comments refer to a preface drafted only in January 1709. This combination defies explanation. Its transmission through the Southwell papers may point to Samuel Molyneux as an intermediate owner.

⁵³⁷ He added a note identifying O'Flaherty's hand in RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fol. 74v, where O'Flaherty entered a note with the date December 1672.

⁵³⁸ These two witnesses 'present what is essentially a different recension' (F. J. Byrne, 'Clann ollamon uaisle Emna', *Studia Hibernica* 4 (1964), 54–94, at p. 55).

Ó Cléirigh and containing two long topographical poems from the late fourteenth century. It is not at all apparent when O'Connor acquired this. How were these books passed down between O'Flaherty's time and their reaching O'Connor's safe hands? An answer to that question may reveal what happened to O'Flaherty's papers.

One line of transmission is attested, but the evidence does not join up tidily. It can be helped with a little conjecture. We hear of a manuscript in O'Flaherty's handwriting in Dublin in 1724. It has not been traced, but other manuscripts in the same person's ownership do survive and one of them at least was annotated by O'Flaherty. The person who had these books then was named John Conry. At least one other manuscript of O'Flaherty's appears in the sale of books belonging to Dr John Fergus in 1766. And we know that Fergus acquired books from Conry. We also know that O'Connor competed with Fergus to acquire manuscripts from Conry and that after Fergus's death he bought manuscripts at the Fergus sale. While it is not possible to prove a continuous transmission of manuscripts in O'Flaherty's hand, we can show that papers of his were in the company of books that passed by this route. I shall trace five distinct lines of evidence that suggest John Conry may have acquired books and papers from Park in the years between O'Flaherty's death and 1723.

The earliest direct reference to any of O'Flaherty's papers after his death is found in Bishop Nicolson's last published work, *Irish Historical Library*, which came out in 1724. Nicolson had been promoted by George I in 1718 from the relative poverty of Carlisle to the diocese of Derry, at this date very rich.⁵³⁹ Nicolson had published his *English Historical Library* as long ago as 1696–9, and his *Scottish Historical Library* in 1702 was swiftly followed by his elevation to the episcopal bench. Now, in 1724, in his *Irish Historical Library* he attempted to approach the records of this kingdom in the same manner. It was limited by his inability to read Irish, but he recognized the

⁵³⁹ He was nominated to Derry on St Patrick's Day, 17 March 1718, and kissed hands the same day (*London Diaries of William Nicolson*, 680). He retained Carlisle and his office of Lord High Almoner until after Easter, becoming bishop of Derry from 21 April (letters patent 2 May). A few days later, on 8 May, the king told Nicolson that he expected him to reside in his diocese, and by 3 June he had reached Dublin (James, *North Country Bishop*, 240–41). This removal from English society had dismayed Nicolson in prospect, but by August he had realised that his increased income meant that in a few months he had already cleared the expenses of his move and 'laid by more money than I could have saved out of this [*Carlisle*] in seven years' (Nicolson to William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, 23 August 1718; quoted by Jones & Holmes, *London Diaries of William Nicolson*, 60). The annual revenues of the bishopric of Derry at this date were around £3000.

existence of important historical sources in the language. A concluding appendix itemizes Irish manuscripts then in the hands of John Conry in Dublin, which had come to the bishop's notice too late to be mentioned in their proper places.⁵⁴⁰ This Conry styled himself 'lord chronologer of the kingdom of Ireland'.⁵⁴¹ Who exactly he was is not known.⁵⁴² William O'Sullivan was surely correct to identify him with the person of the same name who gave assistance to Lhwyd's friend Humfrey Wanley (1672–1726), librarian to Robert Harley.⁵⁴³ He also noted that Nicolson had borrowed 'MSS Annals' from Conry in 1723, though the record does not say how many manuscripts he had the loan of.⁵⁴⁴ I present Nicolson's account in his own words, interspersed with notes on the manuscripts referred to. One needs to bear in mind that Nicolson must have been guided by someone with enough Irish. The guidance was not always reliable, leaving Nicolson open to error in his descriptions.

An Account of several Chronicles and Annals brought to me since the Printing of the foregoing Sheets.

The most valuable Collection of Irish MSS. that I have met with in any private hand here in Dublin, next to that of the Lord Bishop of Clogher [*Dr John Stearne*], was communicated to me by Mr John Conry; who has great numbers of our Historico-Poetical Composures, and (being a perfect Master of their Language and *Prosodia*) knows how to make the best use of them. Amongst these, there's

⁵⁴⁰ Nicolson, *Irish Historical Library*, 243–6.

⁵⁴¹ NLI MS G61, pp. 6–105, 'A Book of the Genealogies of the Principal Families of the Milesian Race, [. . .] compiled by John Conry, lord chronologer of the Kingdom of Ireland [. . .] Dublin, 1710' (as copied by Michael Byrne, 1733); Harrison, *Ag Cruinniú Meala*, 112.

⁵⁴² He was *not* Sean Ó Conaire (1728/9–1773), a priest of the diocese of Cloyne, who transcribed *Chronicum Scotorum* for Bishop Seán Ó Briain in the middle of the eighteenth century, now RIA MS 23 P. 5 (cat. 686), and with whom he has often been confused.

⁵⁴³ N. Ó Muraile, 'The autograph manuscripts of the Annals of the Four Masters', *Celtica* 19 (1987), 75–95 (at pp. 88–9). 'Mr Conry' who helped Humfrey Wanley with BL MS Harley 432 and with the Irish inscriptions in what is now BL MS Harley 1802 was brought into the picture by W. O'Sullivan, 'The Irish manuscripts in Case H in Trinity College', *Celtica* 11 (1976), 229–50, at p. 235, and again with references, 'The Book of Domhnall Ó Dubhdábhoireann: provenance and codicology', *Celtica* 23 (1999), 276–99, at p. 278. Wanley's work on MS Harley 1802 can be dated from his diary to 1713–14, when O'Sullivan infers that Conry was in London. He further suggests that Conry held land at Rathmore near Strokestown in the parish of Kiltrus-tan, Co. Roscommon (ibid. 279n). The basis for this far-fetched match with a name in the Books of Survey and Distribution is that Conry obtained some legal manuscripts from Peter Mahon, dean of Elphin, whose family came from Strokestown.

⁵⁴⁴ O'Sullivan, 'Book of Domhnall Ó Dubhdábhoireann', 279n, citing Nicolson's account book for 1723 in the county library at Carlisle.

INTRODUCTION

- 1 An ancient Copy of the *Annales Senatenses*, written on Vellum and in a fair Character; but imperfect at the beginning and end: For it begins at the Year 454, ten Years later than the Duke of Chandois's, and ends (about 50 Years sooner) at 1492.

TCD MS 1282 (H. 1. 8), saec. xvi. This is the prime witness to the Annals of Ulster, which were not obviously accessible to O'Flaherty. Acquired in 1731 by Dr Fergus. Fergus sale catalogue (1766), lot 2410, 'Annals of Ulster, a very ancient M. SS. on Vellum'; this and lot 2411 were sold for £18 together to Dr Thomas Leland for the library of Trinity College.

- 2 There is also, in the like Letter and Parchment, and the same Folio Volume, a Copy of the Annals of the old Abby of Inch-Maccreen, an Island in the Lake of Loghkea; very different from those of the Holy Trinity, an Abby (in the same Loch) of a much later Foundation. This Book commences at the Year 1013, and ends with 1571.

TCD MS 1293 (H. 1. 19), written c. 1585–90. The Annals of Lough Key, from 1014 to 1571, at which point loss of leaves interrupts the text; discussed in detail by O'Curry, *Manuscript Materials*, 93–104 (and reprinted in Hennessy's edition, *Annals of Loch Cé*, vol. i, pp. xxii–xxx), who quotes Nicolson at length. J. H. Todd identified O'Flaherty's hand in the margin (Appendix 2), but the book is nowhere identifiably cited by him. Acquired in 1731 by Dr Fergus. Fergus sale catalogue (1766), lot 2411, 'Continuation of the Annals of Tigernacht, very ancient, on Vellum'. Sold with the preceding item to Dr Leland for the library Trinity College.

- 3 He has likewise the original Annals of Donegal (or the *Quatuor Magistri*) signed by the proper hands of the four Masters themselves, who were the Compilers of that Chronicle. These were Michael O Clerigh (or Clerk) of whom we have elsewhere made mention upon another occasion; Maurice and Fearfeasa Conry, two near Relations of the same Surname and Family with the present possessor of their Labours; and Cucoigrighe (or Peregrine) O Clerighe. The work is approved, and recommended to the Press, by several of their Superiors: And the Reader will presently have my Conjecture at the reason for its being drop'd, and continuing still in Manuscript. As it now appears, it is drawn up in two thick Volumes in Quarto; whereof the former begins A. M. 2527, and ends A. C. 1171. In the front of this part we have the foremention'd Subscriptions of the Collectors and Licensers; and it seems to be as entire as (in the Year 1636,) when they hop'd to have had it publish'd with those usual Accoutrements. The other Volume, before it reach'd its present Owner, has fallen into worse hands; having been rob'd of the Transactions of more than a whole Century of Years. For, instead of taking its rise where the former breaks off, we find nothing here before 1335, whence the Thread is afterwards spun out to the Year 1609.

The first volume is now RIA MS [Stowe] C. iii. 3 (cat. 1220), which in 1734, according to a note on the flyleaf, was in the hands of Charles O'Connor by gift of Brian Ó Gadhra (d. 1740), archbishop of Tuam. While the RIA catalogue draws attention to his family connexion with Fearghal Ó Gadhra, named in Ó Cléirigh's dedication of 1634, the book cannot have passed through the family to Brian. His role, if more than notional, may have been that of providing O'Connor with the money to buy the book. It was in the hands of one Henry Burke in Galway in

1651–8 and one Brian Mac Gill' in 1700 and 1704. The second volume is now TCD MS 1301 (H. 2. 11), which was acquired in 1731 by Dr Fergus; it is heavily annotated by O'Flaherty (Appendix 2). Fergus sale catalogue (1766), lot 2427, 'Annals of the four Masters, 3 vol., a fine MSS.' Sold for £7 19s 0d to Dr Thomas Leland for the library of Trinity College. These three volumes are now TCD MSS 1300, 1301. The two volumes of MS 1300 (H. 2. 9–10) were copied from MS C. iii. 3 in 1735 by Hugh O'Mulloy to make up a set for Dr Fergus, who paid for the binding of the exemplar. This was no doubt by arrangement with Charles O'Connor. After the Fergus sale, in a letter to George Faulkner, dated at Belanagare, 10 July 1767, O'Connor refers to 'the second volume of the Annals of the Four Masters now in the college library' (BL MS Egerton 201, fol. 49; *Letters of Charles O'Connor*, 195–7, no. 163). He was not moved to reunite the two volumes, which had apparently been divided between himself and Dr Fergus.

- 4 A choice Collection of Flowers, gather'd out of several of the most Authentick Annals of the Kingdom, by the judicious Mr John Lynch; and written with his own hand. They begin at the Year 1200, and are continued to 1513 inclusive. The Collector was a Person of that accuracy of Skill (and niceness of Taste) in the Histories of Ireland, that the Reader may rest assur'd that his Calculations are exact; and that no matters of any great Moment have escaped his notice.

Not traced.

- 5 The same we may promise our selves from the like Abstract of Annals drawn up by (Lynch's great Friend and Admirer) the late learned Mr O Flaherty; whose Minutes begin at 1187, and end with 1327. These are a few loose papers of that Gentleman's own Hand-writing, and ought to be preserv'd with due respect; since we all know with what a scrupulous Zeal he endeavour'd to ascertain its own Time to every Occurrence under the Sun.

Not traced. The last sentence clearly alludes to Ecclesiastes 3:1, 'To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven.' While ironic about O'Flaherty's supposed chronological precision, it is not clear that Nicolson intends to say that the work is worthless.

- 6 I have already had occasion to mention the old *Judicia Coelestia* and other Law-Books of this Island: And Mr Conry can furnish out a very large Addition to this Stock. He has the Decisions or Reports of no fewer than Thirty-three of our ancient *Dempsters*; the oldest whereof are judgements given in the first Century after our Saviour's Incarnation, and the youngest in the Tenth. For some of these he acknowledges himself to be indebted to Mr P. Mahon, the present worthy Dean of *Elphin*.

The title *Judicia Coelestia* is that used by both Lynch and O'Flaherty when referring to the Old Irish *Bretha nemed*, misunderstanding the second element of the name (below, Appendix 2, 407). Peter Mahon, from a protestant family in Strokestown, Co. Roscommon, served as archdeacon of Elphin from 1700 to February 1722/3, when he was collated to the deanery until his death in 1739 (H. Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae* (Dublin, 1847–51), iv. 136, 142). William O'Sullivan connected Mahon's legal manuscripts with a report of two chests of

law codes somewhere in Connacht in 1724 ('Book of Domhnall Ó Dubhdábhoire-ann', *Celtica* 23 (1999), 281).

- 7 He has a pretty Voluminous Book (containing no fewer than 957 pages in *Quarto*) of *Collectanea* out of the famed *Liber Lecanus*; which, as he first inform'd me, had its name from *Lecane* (a noted seat of hereditary Antiquaries) in the County of *Sligoe*. It seems to want few of the Contents of that venerable Repository of our Primitive Records; and the rest appear to be rather transcrib'd than Epitomiz'd: So that this may, in a good measure, supply the deplorable Loss which our Historians have sustain'd by that Robbery which carried off the Original.

Nollaig Ó Muraíle, *The Celebrated Antiquary*, 306, has shown that, far from being an abstract of the Book of Lecan, this was Mac Fhirbhisigh's Book of Genealogies, which has precisely 957 pages. Proof comes from a leaf now bound into a miscellaneous volume, written by Micheál Ó Longáin, 1763, now RIA MS 23 N. 12 (cat. 488), p. 195, where a pedigree of the Comyn family is sourced 'from the Abstract of Lecane Book page 248, 255, and 284—July 24th 1723, by Jn^o Conry' [while this looks like signature and date, the age of the book itself means that it must have been copied]. The page-numbers take one to the revelant material in the Book of Genealogies, which is now UCD MS Add. Ir. 14. The manuscript was acquired by Dr Fergus, and in the sale of his manuscripts it was lot 2424, sold for £7 1s 6d to Robert Jocelyn (1731–1797), 2nd viscount Jocelyn, created in 1771 1st earl of Roden. During 1773–4 it was loaned to the Dublin Society's committee of antiquaries (as appears from their minute-book, RIA MS 24 E. 7), but it remained in the earl's family until 1911. It was bought by Dr Michael Cox (1852–1926), who bequeathed it to University College. The story is told by Ó Muraíle, 306–8, 333–7.

- 8 From this worthy Informer I likewise learn'd that Father Hugh Ward, or Vardaëus (quoted often with respect by Archbishop Ussher), was descended from the house of Bally Ward [. . .].

And he goes into a discussion of the work of the Irish Franciscans at Louvain, unconnected with any particular manuscript in Conry's possession.⁵⁴⁵ It is only the fifth item here that must have come from O'Flaherty's papers, but we may hazard that he was also the person in Ireland most likely to have preserved the fourth item, Lynch's extracts from Irish annals. The third item was certainly used by O'Flaherty, who annotated the second volume, though that is not proof that it was still in his hands at the time of his death. He quotes annals from the first volume, but the lack of annotation in this volume—covering the period in which he was more interested—may indicate that he had access to an intermediary copy, such as it is

⁵⁴⁵ There is one curious aside in this discussion. Referring to the Annals of the Four Masters, he mentions that they were not completed until a year after the death of Hugh Ward, 'their chief patron and supporter'. 'Here was one reason', he says, 'for the failure of those Annals in the honour hoped for by the compilers; and Mr Flaherty has assign'd another, which I need not repeat' (*Irish Historical Library*, 246).

believed Dr Lynch owned. The first item was almost certainly not in O'Flaherty's hands—he would have made more use of it—and doubt hangs over the second. The sixth item is apparently sourced to Peter Mahon (d. 1739), dean of Elphin cathedral, and the seventh is not known to have been in O'Flaherty's possession at any time. How Conry came to assemble this remarkable collection of books is now unknown, but some of it had clearly come from O'Flaherty's house at Park.

Nicolson, however, was not concerned to describe all the manuscripts in Conry's hands, and another source provides further information. By 1731 Conry was perhaps dead. At any rate, his manuscripts were in the keeping of one Charles O'Neale. We learn this from a letter of John Fergus (c. 1700–c. 1761), MD, to Charles O'Connor of Belangare:⁵⁴⁶

I've made some steps to get the books of Conrys that are now in Mr Chas. O'Neale's hands. I believe I shan't be able to resist the temptation of making them mine, tho' he demands too much money for them and I don't think I want any more than one of them.

Fergus bought a fair share of the manuscripts, among them the *Annals of Ulster*, the *Annals of Loch Cé*, the second volume of the *Annals of the Four Masters*, and Mac Fhirbhisigh's *Book of Genealogies*, all of which reappear when his manuscripts were sold by auction in Dublin on 3 February 1766. Our second strand of evidence is the catalogue from the sale of his books, which includes thirty-seven items under the heading 'Irish Manuscripts' and a further thirteen items as 'Printed Books in the Irish Character and Language'; O'Flaherty's abstract of annals is not among them.⁵⁴⁷ However, someone who attended the

⁵⁴⁶ Dr John Fergus to Charles O'Connor of Belangare, postmarked DE/15 [1731] (RIA MS [Stowe] B. i. 1, no. 26; printed by D. Ó Catháin, 'John Fergus, MD, eighteenth-century doctor, book collector, and Irish scholar', *ĴRSAL* 118 (1988), 139–62 (at pp. 142–3). The year may be inferred from the reference to O'Connor's recent marriage (8 December 1731). O'Connor's grandson and biographer handled this letter and wrote on the dorse, 'Dr Fergus to my grandfather on his marriage—no date'. In his biography, published in 1796 and withdrawn, the Revd Charles O'Connor cites a letter as from his grandfather to Dr Fergus, giving the date as 10 October 1731, and quoting O'Connor as asking Fergus 'to take the trouble of purchasing for me Conry's manuscripts now in the hands of Charles O'Neal' (*Memoirs of Charles O'Connor*, 173). Starting from this memoir George Petrie inferred that O'Connor had acquired Conry's manuscripts, as set out in a paper to the Royal Irish Academy, 5 March 1831 (printed by O'Donovan, *Annals of the Four Masters*, vol. i, p. xvii). How such a letter to Fergus could have been known is not revealed: O'Connor did not retain copies of letters sent and his grandson is not known to have had access to any papers from Fergus's own archive. Ó Catháin conjectures 'garbling' by the Revd Charles O'Connor, a judgement he shares with O'Sullivan, 'The Irish manuscripts in Case H in Trinity College', 235.

⁵⁴⁷ *A Catalogue of the libraries of John Fergus MD and his son, both deceased, which*

sale recorded buyers, prices, and, vitally, eighteen additional items. Among these we find a simple entry, 'O'Flaherty's MSS', purchased by Charles O'Connor for 4/-.⁵⁴⁸ The date is a precise fit with that mentioned by O'Connor on extracts concerning the lineage of Uí Chonchobhair 'as lámhsgribhne Ruaidhrí Uí Fhlathbheartaigh fuarasa a nÁth Cliath anno 1766' ('from a manuscript of Roderick O'Flaherty which I obtained in Dublin in the year 1766').⁵⁴⁹ O'Connor's source in this case was possibly MS [Stowe] E. iv. 4 (cat. 621), part 3, in which O'Flaherty traced the descent of the Stuart royal family from their remote Irish ancestors. A note by O'Connor on what is now the first page, though numbered 90, shows that this manuscript was in his hands in 1768 and that it had already lost many leaves.⁵⁵⁰ Now bound together with this, part 1 is a manuscript of genealogies with some notes by O'Flaherty, and part 2 is a collection of synchronisms compiled and annotated by O'Flaherty himself. There is no proven fit here. None the less, assuming that O'Connor bought these items in the Fergus sale, they may be identified with the entry, 'Irish genealogy', for which O'Connor paid a mere 2/-, but the entry does not prove that this item was in O'Flaherty's handwriting. MS E. iv. 4 could easily be the binding together of the two items from the sale.

A picture emerges in which we can see that Fergus acquired from Conry manuscripts that may have been O'Flaherty's, and that he had at least one item that was certainly O'Flaherty's. And Charles O'Connor was looking out for O'Flaherty's papers.

Thirdly, it is very possible that Conry had also very recently acquired O'Flaherty's much used copy of Colgan's *Trias*, writing his own name over that of its former owner.⁵⁵¹ Since the surname is only partially legible, one may say this is only an indistinct possibility.

will begin selling by auction, at their late dwelling-house in Abbey-Street on Monday the 3d of February. (Dublin, 1766) [the only copy recorded by ESTC is San Marino, CA, Huntington Library, 371575; it is available through Eighteenth Century Collections Online]. Eugene O'Curry had access to a copy preserved by the family in Dublin (*Manuscript Materials*, 98).

⁵⁴⁸ RIA MS 24 E. 7 (cat. 1260), among papers of the antiquarian committee of the Dublin Society, 1772-4; printed with notes by Ó Catháin, 'John Fergus MD', 153-7. The item is (h) among the lots outside the printed catalogue; Ó Catháin, 157, does not identify it. It is noticeable that O'Connor was the chief buyer of these additional lots (buying b-e, g-h, l, and p), though he bought only two items from the catalogue (items 2400, 2423); conversely, the main buyer from the catalogue was Mr Blacker on behalf of the earl of Drogheda, who spent over £25 on fourteen manuscript lots and two printed books. Was O'Connor scooping up items at the end of the sale when the main bidders had left?

⁵⁴⁹ Note by Charles O'Connor in RIA MS [Stowe] F. v. 4 (cat. 775) (s. xviii), p. 6.

⁵⁵⁰ Appendix 2, 394.

⁵⁵¹ Introduction, 36.

The fourth piece of evidence is problematic for a different reason, but it is connected with the second element in the argument, and we shall see that it connects also with the fifth. Nicolson told us that Conry 'has great numbers of our Historico-Poetical Composures', though he did not describe the manuscript in question. The historical poems of Gilla Coemáin and others were extremely important sources for O'Flaherty, whose manuscript, now RIA MS B. iv. 2, contains many of them, but we do not know the hands through which it passed between O'Flaherty and O'Conor. We have seen that O'Conor almost certainly had access to this very book as early as 1729. Whether he already owned it is not established.⁵⁵² There was a manuscript that could well fit the description among those in the sale of Dr Fergus's books, 'Chronological and historical poems, very fair', which may have come to him from Conry. The record of the sale says this was sold to Mr Blacker for the earl of Drogheda.⁵⁵³ We should have to suppose error in the record or intervention after the auction to explain how, by 1768, this manuscript was in O'Conor's possession.⁵⁵⁴

The fifth and final element in the argument is particularly striking. In 1723 Conry had issued a proposal to publish a history of Ireland, 'collected from the authentick Annals of Ireland, near an 100 Historical and Chronological Poems', &c. We have raised the possibility that he had O'Flaherty's manuscript of such poems, but the strong connexion brings us closer to O'Flaherty himself. According to his

⁵⁵² O'Conor could, of course, have borrowed this from Conry in 1729.

⁵⁵³ Conry was very likely the former owner of lot 2416 in the Fergus sale, 'Chronological and Historical Poems, very fair', which fetched 25/- from Mr Blacker on behalf of the earl of Drogheda. That book is not likely to have passed into O'Conor's hands. The earl bought fourteen manuscripts in the sale and, so far as we know, retained them. Only one has been traced, and that was lot 2417, Francis Walsh's *Grammatica Anglo-Hibernica* (1713), now NLI MS G332, written by Seán ó hÉideáin, Dublin, dated 3 March 1731/2 (Ó Catháin, 'John Fergus MD', 154). The NLI catalogue does not mention the Fergus provenance, and the library has no record of accession, which might have provided a clue to sales. Some manuscripts were still in the family home at Moore Abbey, Co. Kildare, in the early twentieth century; their fate since the house was leased to Count John McCormack and thereafter sold, in 1938, to the Sisters of Charity is not known (P. de Brún, *Lamhscribhinní Gaeilge. Treoirliosta* (Dublin, 1988), 76).

⁵⁵⁴ Coincidentally—for the hand is not the same—'Conarii' is written in MS B. iv. 2, not as a mark of ownership but as a note of attribution, 'Conarij cecinit' (*sic*), next to the beginning of the poem 'Éist(idh) a eccsi Banba' in RIA MS [Stowe] B. iv. 2 (cat. 1080), fol. 50r. At this point O'Flaherty had written 'Poema 3' at the left and Charles O'Conor added the name of the poet, 'Donnchadh Bacach ua Maoilchonaire'. If it was our Conry who added the Latin ascription, we should have to suppose both that he had read the manuscript and that he knew the authorship of the poem, since he could not have had the benefit of O'Conor's entry. The same Latin hand wrote 'Monasterii Flannus' against the opening of 'Conall cuing(idh) clonnae Neill' (fol. 53r), contradicted by a note in O'Conor's hand.

proposal, Conry's history was to be organized in four parts, of which the first is described thus:⁵⁵⁵

Refuting the calumnies with which the Irish Nation is aspersed particularly by Sir George Mackenzie, whose two books are fully answered, paragraph by paragraph, as far as they contradict the dictates of the learned Primate Ussher, Dr Loyd, Lord Bishop of St Asaph, Dr Stillingworth [*sic*], Mr Cambden, and all the antiquaries of Ireland, and in truth the World; Except the Modern Writers of North Britain.

This proposal survives only as transcribed by the Revd Dr Anthony Raymond, who entertained doubts about Conry's credibility. He questioned him about his knowledge of these authors, and Conry confessed 'he had read them no otherwise than quoted by Sir George Mackenzie'. Dr Raymond was not persuaded that Conry was capable of reading ancient Irish manuscripts, and Mackenzie had never been a cause of concern to Irish antiquaries other than O'Flaherty. One is forced to wonder, therefore, whether the refutation of Sir George Mackenzie, proposed by Conry, was not in fact O'Flaherty's manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated* or something closely based on it. If the author's master-copy had reached Conry along with other manuscripts, it had not far to travel to be seen in Dooling's shop in the High Street by Walter Harris in the 1730s.

From all this it appears that Conry may have come into possession of seventeenth-century manuscripts once owned by O'Flaherty, of working papers in his hand, including an annalistic compilation and genealogical notes, of one or more printed books, and finally of the draft of his last finished work of historical writing. Some of the other items in their company may have come by the same route. It is surely a possible, though not inevitable, inference that Conry had acquired some of the contents of O'Flaherty's study. It is difficult to avoid speculating that, after his father's death, Michael O'Flaherty had no use for them and sold them in Dublin. If he had found a better buyer than Conry—Bishop Stearne might have been a possibility—the books and papers may have had a better fate. But how was Michael O'Flaherty to make contact with a reputable and public-spirited buyer?

At an early age Charles O'Connor knew about Roderick O'Flaherty. His family knew something of his last years, for O'Connor is the source for the story that Counsellor Mac Donagh had supported him. Someone else whom Mac Donagh supported was Bishop Tadhg

⁵⁵⁵ No printed copy of his proposal has been recorded in any catalogued collection, but it was transcribed in 1723 by Anthony Raymond in what is now the first volume of his remaining papers (RIA MS 24 G 11-14 (cat. 1264-8), vol. i, 423; printed by A. Harrison, *Ag Cruinniú Meala* (Dublin, 1988), 102-3).

Ó Ruairc (1659/60–1735), who subsequently lived with the O'Connor family and may have been a bearer of memory. It was Tadhg Ó Ruairc who, at the end of his life, presented O'Connor with the copy of James Ware's *De praesulibus Hiberniae* that Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh had owned and used.⁵⁵⁶ The first visible sign of O'Connor's interest in acquiring O'Flaherty's papers, however, comes in 1766, when he bought some of them at the end of the Fergus sale. If he had been actively seeking O'Flaherty's manuscripts over the years, he has left no account of his search or its result. It was probably after the sale in 1766 that he wrote:⁵⁵⁷

Several of this excellent Antiquarian's Papers have been dispersed into private Hands, since his Death; and some have lately been discovered in Galway, of which the Writer of the following Dissertations has been refused the Perusal. He can therefore pronounce no Judgement on the Contents. He can only express his Apprehensions for the learned Author's Reputation; lest any of his loose Papers (for several such we have seen and possess) should be offered for Publication, without receiving his own last Corrections.

These 'loose papers' are presumably the booklets now among O'Connor's manuscripts in the Royal Irish Academy, and it is evident that they had reached his possession only very recently. No more light appears on the papers 'lately discovered' in Galway, nor on the information or supposition lying behind the words 'dispersed into private hands, since his death'.

What seems to have most attracted O'Connor's interest in and after 1766 was the possibility of finding further historical compositions by O'Flaherty. He knew of the intended sequel to *Ogygia*, 'the annals of the Christian ages, down to the dissolution of the monarchy; but through the many discouragements which intervened, that work never appeared. We have seen but a small part of it, in his own handwriting, and found in the study of Colonel Terence Mac Donagh, of Creevagh'.⁵⁵⁸ This work was surely never written, and what O'Connor had seen long before is now unknown. He allowed that, 'should the whole be still preserved, it would be a valuable acquisition to the public'. He was on safer ground with *Ogygia Vindicated*. A letter written by O'Connor in March 1772 announces the discovery of a copy:⁵⁵⁹

⁵⁵⁶ Ó Muraile, 257–9. The book, with notes by Mac Fhirbhisigh and by O'Connor himself, is now in the library of Trinity College, shelfmark C. 2. 12A.

⁵⁵⁷ Charles O'Connor, of Belanagare, *Dissertations on the history of Ireland; to which is subjoined, A dissertation on the Irish colonies established in Great Britain* (Dublin, 1766), xii.

⁵⁵⁸ O'Connor, *Dissertations* (1766), xii.

⁵⁵⁹ Charles O'Connor to Dr John Curry, dated at the Hermitage, [Belanagare], 25

Perhaps I told you already; if not, I will inform you now that I have met in the hands of one Mr Morris in Galway a manuscript entitled *The Ogygia Vindicated*, &c., by the late Mr O'Flaherty. It is a refutation of the objections of Sir George Mackenzie to that book. It is well written and throws some useful light on our antiquities. The present proprietor offered to make over the work to me but for a sum of money too gross for me to pay as I might rather be a loser by the publication. It wants an illustration by notes which would take up more time than I can well spare; and should I consent to be the editor, it would be chiefly from the view of an appendix to the work in refutation of the two MacPhersons. Thus we should have the latter as well as the former historical hypotheses of the north British writing demolished in one book and under the same cover. I wrote to my friend Dr Leland on the subject. He says (perhaps inconsiderately) that I must publish the manuscript.

It may be coincidental that in February of the same year he had heard that manuscripts of 'the late learned Mr Roderick O Flaherty' were in the hands of one James Fitzpatrick of Newford, but it is not apparent who he was, what manuscripts he had, or whether O'Connor saw any of them.⁵⁶⁰ Nothing resulted from this contact, unless it was a harbinger of the emergence of *Ogygia Vindicated* in Mr Morris's hands. A clear possibility exists that these may both be related to Michael O'Flaherty's stepson Richard Fitzpatrick, who died in 1767.⁵⁶¹

March 1772 (Ward, *Letters of Charles O'Connor*, 269–70, no. 227). Thomas Leland (1722–1785), DD, was a fellow of Trinity College, an expert on Demosthenes and Philip of Macedon, who had written a history of Ireland (W. D. Love, 'Charles O'Connor of Belanagare and Thomas Leland's 'philosophical' history of Ireland', *IHS* 13 (1962), 1–25).

⁵⁶⁰ Myles A. Keon to James Fitzpatrick Esq., Newford, dated at Belanagare, 20 February 1772, which says, 'I have informed Mr O'Connor that you was kindly pleased to promise me for his perusal the loan of all the manuscripts etc. of the late learned Mr Roderick O Flaherty, now in your possession' (RIA MS [Stowe] B. i. 2 (a guard-book of letters, for the most part addressed to O'Connor, arranged by date; printed by Sheehan, 'Contribution of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare', 231). She appears to overread this, writing, 'The manuscript of *Ogygia Vindicated* was owned by James Fitzpatrick', and even, 'While O'Connor was examining the manuscripts and negotiating for them', while producing no evidence that O'Connor saw Mr Fitzpatrick's manuscripts. This letter is not included among those printed by R. E. Ward & others, *The Letters of Charles O'Connor of Belanagare* (Washington, DC, 1988), which shed no light on either correspondent.

⁵⁶¹ Richard Fitzpatrick served as MP for Galway 1761–7 (*Irish Parliament*, iv. 176–7). His father Edmund Fitzpatrick was the son of John Fitzpatrick, who died a wealthy man 'at the house of his son-in-law George Morris, in the west suburbs of Galway' (Hardiman, 430n). The date of John's death, 3 February 1709/10, is given by his monument in Aran (T. Robinson, *Stones of Aran—Labyrinth* (Dublin, 1995), 31). Edmund Fitzpatrick's sister Catherine was married to George Morris, a merchant of Galway, who acquired lands in Spiddal by this marriage. Their son Andrew Morris was the father of two sons, James and George, either of whom would be a good candidate for our Mr Morris. James's son Martin Morris (1784–1862), of Spiddal, continued as a

And despite the reluctance here implied about following Leland's advice, O'Connor was sufficiently keen to publish that he mentioned it without delay to his publisher, the long-established George Faulkner (1699–1775), who was enthusiastic.⁵⁶² At just this time, in May 1772, the Dublin Society set up a committee of antiquaries to promote the understanding of Irish antiquities. O'Connor was elected an honorary member of this committee on 4 January 1773—that is, he did not take part in its deliberations—and at the same meeting, the minutes record that, 'A Manuscript entitled *Ogygia Vindicated*, written by Mr O'Flaherty to expose Sir George Mackenzie's *Defence of Fordun's History of the Royal Line of Scotland*, was laid before the committee from Mr Morrison [*sic*] of the Co. of Galway for their perusal'.⁵⁶³ Four members of the committee were to peruse the manuscript, Dr Richard Stewart, Dr Thomas Leland, Mr Andrew Caldwell, and Major Charles Vallancey, who were to report on the work but to make no abstract without the consent of the owner. Correspondence allows us to see behind the committee's minutes: it fell to O'Connor to discuss a bargain with the owner, which was communicated to Vallancey through a third party, while the matter of publication was on the agenda of the committee.⁵⁶⁴ At its next meeting, 1

merchant in Galway, and his son, Michael Morris (1826–1901) became 1st baron Killanin, whose descendants continued at Spiddal. Hardiman, 430, was in error in giving the date of Richard Fitzpatrick's death as 1761, and he may be incorrect in saying that he died without issue. His residence, according to Johnston-Liik, was Newford House, Athenry, the same property associated with James Fitzpatrick, who was reported to have O'Flaherty's manuscripts in 1772. He may have been a son, or perhaps a brother, and therefore a descendant of Michael O'Flaherty's wife. In 1837 Patrick Fitzpatrick, of Newford, Athenry, and of Dominick Street, Dublin, subscribed to Lewis's *Topographical Dictionary of Ireland*.

⁵⁶² George Faulkner to Charles O'Connor, dated at Dublin, 2 April 1772 (RIA MS [Stowe] B. i. 2, arranged by date): 'I often have heard of O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* as being a piece of great merit and truth; and very glad it is likely to be in your hands, who will make it a masterpiece, to which I should be proud of the honour of being the printer and the publisher' (R. E. Ward, *Prince of Dublin Printers. The Letters of George Faulkner* (Lexington, KY, 1972), 113–14). He asked after it again in another letter dated 3 September 1772 (ib. 114–15), and again Faulkner to O'Connor, dated 11 November 1773: 'I am very glad that O'Flaherty's *Ogygia* has been approved by the committee of antiquarians. No person whatever can be so proper to publish that work as yourself' (ib. 115–18).

⁵⁶³ The early minutes of the committee are now RIA MS 24 E. 7, covering 1772–4; O'Connor's election is recorded at fol. 7v; R. B. MacDowell in *The Royal Irish Academy. A bicentennial history 1785–1985*, edited by T. Ó Raifeartaigh (Dublin, 1985), 6. The secretaries were Dr Leland and Charles Vallancey; George Faulkner was an enthusiastic promoter. Resolutions from successive meetings are summarized by Hardiman, *Iar-Connaught*, 423n.

⁵⁶⁴ Charles Vallancey to Charles O'Connor, dated 23 January 1773 (RIA MS [Stowe] B. i. 2, arranged by date): 'McKeon has given me the pleasing information that you

February 1773, the appointed readers reported that the manuscript was authentic and deserved to be published, and the committee resolved that O'Connor 'be requested to prepare the above manuscript for the press'.⁵⁶⁵ On 9 February O'Connor still reports that 'the Committee is ruminating on *Ogygia Vindicated*'.⁵⁶⁶ Then on 1 March the committee committed its money to the cause.⁵⁶⁷

Resolved that the sum of Twenty Guineas be paid out of the funds of this Committee to Mr Morris of Galway for his Mss. entitled *Ogygia Vindicated*, written by Mr Rog. O'Flaherty, provided Mr Morris will accept of the said sum, three months after publication, and that he will inform the Committee in what manner the Mss. came into his hands, and how long it has been in his possession, as it appears not to be in the handwriting of Mr O'Flaherty.

Twenty guineas was a very high price.⁵⁶⁸ At the next meeting, 6 April 1773, Vallancey produced a letter from Mr Morris of Galway, 'consenting to sell O'Flaherty's Mss. entitled *Ogygia Vindicated* to the committee' for twenty guineas, payable three months after publication. Dr Leland, who had meanwhile had the keeping of the manuscript, was now to hand it over to Charles O'Connor, but he had already made reference to it in his own history.⁵⁶⁹ Vallancey recorded the detail that the manuscript had 182 pages, and he supposed it to be in Mr Morris's own hand.⁵⁷⁰ Now, O'Connor insisted with the committee that he should 'have the liberty of adding notes to the work and

and the proprietor of O'Flaherty's manuscript have closed your agreement. Three of the committee have perused it, their report will be favourable; it is now in Leland's hands, whose opinion I am also acquainted with. After the 1 Feb^y it will be delivered to your order with a request to publish it. [. . .] I find this MS mentioned in Harris ad verb. O Flaherty; he saw it in a bookseller's hands in High Street Dublin, and was told it was intended for the press'. Vallancey may here have supposed that two manuscripts were the same: 'I have seen not long since in the custody of Mr Luke Dooling, Bookseller in High-street Dublin, a Treatise in MS written by our Author in Vindication of his *Ogygia*, against the Objections of Sir George Mackenzie, and others, which I was informed was intended for the Press' (Harris, *Writers of Ireland*, 272).

⁵⁶⁵ RIA MS 24 E. 7, fol. 8.

⁵⁶⁶ Charles O'Connor to Archbishop John Carpenter, dated 9 February 1773 (Ward, *Letters of Charles O'Connor*, 287–9, no. 241).

⁵⁶⁷ RIA MS 24 E. 7, fol. 8v.

⁵⁶⁸ For comparison, in 1766 Dr Leland acquired both the *Annals of Ulster* (MS 1282) and the *Annals of Loch Cé* (MS 1293) for Trinity College for £18 at the auction of Dr John Fergus's books (above, 172).

⁵⁶⁹ Leland quotes from 'a Vindication of his *Ogygia* against Sir George Mackenzie, which I have seen in manuscript' (*The History of Ireland from the invasion of Henry II. With a preliminary discourse on the antient state of that kingdom* (Dublin, 1773), vol. i, p. vi).

⁵⁷⁰ C. Vallancey's 'Irish Historical Library', known as his Green Book, now RIA MS 24 E. 4 (cat. 1273), an alphabetical bibliography: '*Ogygia Vindicated*, or An answer to Sir George Mackenzie's antiquity of the royal line of Scotland. Rog O Fla-

an appendix', and he appears to have made heavy use of *Ogygia* itself precisely in this period, since the many notes in his working copy are dated 1774, but he had already learnt not to trust the work too far.⁵⁷¹ O'Connor's edition of *Ogygia Vindicated* was published in 1775. The undertaking was fully financed by subscription.⁵⁷² And presumably Mr Morris got his money too.

Whatever the source of Mr Morris's copy, O'Connor was confident that it was not in O'Flaherty's hand, with which he was familiar. Even so, the manuscript was manifestly ready for printing, with all its preliminaries in place, so it would appear to have been transcribed, perhaps in Galway, from the author's final fair copy. A comparison with the manuscript in Southampton would show that O'Flaherty had introduced changes since receiving his copy of Nicolson's *Scottish Historical Library*, which is referred to on several occasions.⁵⁷³ A passage from a Scottish writer, provided to him by a friend of Dr Fielding Shaw, protestant minister in Galway, in 1709, was also incorporated.⁵⁷⁴ Certain points in the printed text further reveal that O'Flaherty had retouched his prefaces, apparently as late as 1714. First, the wording at the head of the paper now identifies the worthy member of the University of Oxford by name as Edward Lhwyd, adding that he had died in 1711.⁵⁷⁵ That may have been when the news

herty. now in possession of Mr Morris of Co. Galway, containing 182 pages in that Gentleman's handwriting'.

⁵⁷¹ O'Connor had read *Ogygia* at least as early as 1761, as we learn from a letter to Ferdinando Warner, dated 26 June 1761: 'I took this from Mr O'Flaherty in Ogyg. Insul. p. 14, as he took the account chiefly from the Book of Lecan now in Paris' (*Letters of Charles O'Connor*, 107, no. 87); Charles O'Connor to Dr John Curry, dated 28 January 1772: 'I find that my implicit confidence in Mr O'Flaherty's accuracy plunged me into some mistakes' (ib. 266-7, no. 224). O'Connor's copy of *Ogygia*, with notes dated to 1774, is now in the library of the Royal Irish Academy (see Appendix 3, pp. 451-2).

⁵⁷² A note bound in RIA MS [Stowe] B. i. 2, between letters dated 20 and 24 March 1774, adds up the charges of the edition to £51 19s 3d; 260 subscriptions (if fully paid up) would raise £84 10s od.

⁵⁷³ *Ogygia Vindicated*, lxvii (in the preface). 4, 63, 65-7, 72-73.

⁵⁷⁴ *Ogygia Vindicated*, 73-5. It is introduced thus, 'I here exhibit the censure of a certain knowing Scotch person on their list of kings, from Fergus the First to Fergus the Second, in his notes on *Ogygia*, then newly come forth, which I found handwritten with Doctor Fielding Shaw, in St Nicholas's College of Galway, anno seventeen hundred and nine, thus, *verbatim*'. One wonders how notes on *Ogygia*, newly published in 1685, came to turn up in manuscript at St Nicholas's College. In letter 57 we learn that Dr Shaw was keen to show this—no doubt on O'Flaherty's behalf—to Samuel Molyneux during his visit in April 1709.

⁵⁷⁵ 'Mr Edward Lhuid, MA, of Jesus College, keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford' (wording taken from the title-page of *Archaeologia Britannica*), 'deceased, 1711 [*sic*], his account of certain learned persons of note their sentiments, by letters, of this book, communicated at several times by letters to his friend the author as followeth'.

reached O'Flaherty. Second, the preface, which precedes this, makes a striking point. Mackenzie with his two pamphlets in 1685 and 1686 was easily able to print and publish, but O'Flaherty was not:⁵⁷⁶

This is the sole advantage our antagonists have of us, by their free access to the press for pamphlets and histories; while our writings are kept in private, or worm-eaten, as this treatise is those twenty-eight years, which I wish some true patriot had taken in hand to make Latin and publish.

The same problem, he thought, accounted for the lack of respect for the still-unprinted Irish historical record.⁵⁷⁷ O'Flaherty was someone used to printed books and even in contact with the business of printing, but actually getting his work into print without ready money to pay the printer proved impossible. The evidence is clear enough that *Ogygia Vindicated* was drafted late in 1686, so, adding twenty-eight years, these words must have been written in 1714. This preface was largely drafted in January 1709, including recent points, such as reference to the charge of treating Mackenzie with 'coarse compliments' (which we know came from Nicolson). We must infer that he had copied the book out again after the end of his dealings with Lhwyd and Molyneux, still in the hope of seeing it printed. It is regrettable that we do not know who might have been seen as a potential patron at this date. The copy-text that fell into O'Connor's hands, therefore, represents the last words we have from the pen of Roderick O'Flaherty.

O'Connor's introduction was very much concerned with issues seen as important in 1774, providing little help with understanding either O'Flaherty's argument or the background to his dispute with Stillingfleet and Mackenzie. Indeed, his notes on the text sometimes so miss the point as to bring into relief what a gulf separated O'Flaherty's work from that of the next active generation of Irish antiquaries.⁵⁷⁸ As an appendix O'Connor printed a learned letter in Latin from Dr John

⁵⁷⁶ Preface to *Ogygia Vindicated*, lxxv. He more surprisingly says that both of Mackenzie's essays were printed in Latin at Amsterdam in 1687, which is not corroborated. He must have heard of the Latin translation of *A Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line* by Patrick Sinclair, *Defensio antiquitatis regalis Scotorum prosapiæ* (Utrecht, 1689) (Ferguson, 'Bibliography of Sir George Mackenzie', 38, no. 39); the preface is dated at Utrecht, 2 June 1687.

⁵⁷⁷ The Irish, he said, 'were under such circumstances [. . .] that they could not commit them to public view, whereby their antiquities lay still in private among themselves: so that they are too much suspected for novelties and designed inventions' (*Ogygia Vindicated*, 5). The benefit of printing had given other nations two hundred years' advantage in the understanding of their antiquities.

⁵⁷⁸ O'Connor makes no distinction between O'Flaherty's occasional, brief, source-notes, in Latin, intended, no doubt, to appear as side-notes, and his own longer comments in English. At p. 5, where O'Flaherty wrote, 'The Irish, indeed, faithfully preserved their antiquities, *from age to age*, in vellum manuscripts, of their own lan-

Lynch to the French historian César-Egasse du Boulay (d. 1678), together with a few lines of response: this had been seen by Nicolson, but one can now only wonder where O'Connor found it.⁵⁷⁹

All the leads that might have brought us to the fate of O'Flaherty's papers are cold.

guage and peculiar letters', O'Connor italicizes the words that made no sense to him and adds a note to explain: 'This must be understood of the times succeeding the fourth and fifth centuries. The records of antecedent times were written or inscribed on thin tables of wood, called *Taibhle Filea*'. Again, at p. 242, on reference to 'the Scotie letters and character', he adds a note, 'All this turns upon a mistake, or rather inadvertence of our author. The letters used by the ancient Scots since the reception of Christianity have been evidently borrowed from our first Christian missionaries, as more commodious than the old, uncouth, and virgular forms [i.e. *ogham*] imported into Ireland by the Celto-Scythian colony from Spain'. The long continuity of the tradition of Irish manuscript books from before the introduction of Christianity and Latin was fundamental to O'Flaherty's reasoning in *Ogygia* as in *Ogygia Vindicated*. A man of his times, O'Connor did not pay attention to his author.

⁵⁷⁹ *Ogygia Vindicated*, 281–99. The letter refers to the opening volume of du Boulay's *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, which was published at Paris in 1665, where, in the preface, du Boulay had stumbled by understanding *Scotia* as 'Scotland' and *Scoti* as 'Scots'. It is the third of six items mentioned at the end of the preface to Nicolson's *Irish Historical Library*, xxxvi–xxxviii, as coming to his attention after the text of the book had been printed; 'Tis only', he says, 'an enlargement of the seventeenth chapter of his *Cambrensis Eversus*'.