

i gyflwyno maes astrus a chymhleth mor gyson eglur – ond gellir galw sylw at arwyddocâd ehangach rhai o'r casgliadau.

Un nodwedd a amlygir yn gyson yn y trafodaethau hyn yw fod cyswllt rhwng amryw o'r fersiynau (a gellid ychwanegu nifer o lawysgrifau hefyd) a'i gilydd. Ambell dro mae'r naill yn benthg rhan(nau) yn uniongyrchol gan y llall ond droeon eraill mae'r cyswllt heb fod mor gyfatebol ac y mae dau destun, efallai, yn tarddu o'r un ffynhonnell; ar dro bydd y cyswllt yn fwy annelwig fyth a rhaid bodloni ar ddisgrifiadau megis 'adleisio', benthg 'trwy gyfrwng testun arall', a'r tebyg. Fel y noda Patrick Sims-Williams, gan gofio natur llawer o ryddiaith Gymraeg Canol, rhaid bod yn ofalus a cheisio adnabod ymadroddion ystrydebol a chonfensiynau arddull, a chyfyngiadau dulliau o drosi, yn hytrach na benthgyiadau; a derbyn hyn, y mae'r croesffrwythloni rhwng fersiynau a chopïau yn elfen drawiadol a ddaw yn amlwg yma. Y mae'n rhaid i'r dadansoddiad testunol weithredu ar ddwy lefel o leiaf, uwch-lefel y fersiwn i ganfod cyswllt â fersiynau eraill (a'r angen, felly, i ddiffinio beth a olygir wrth 'fersiwn'), a lefel copïau unigol o fersiwn i'w trafod yn y dull traddodiadol o sefydlu testun beirniadol. Gall pwysu a mesur beth yw'r 'testun' fod yn dasg gymhleth, a cheisio cyfleu hynny wrth gyhoeddi greu cryn ddryswch. 'Dyma sefyllfa i herio'r golygydd dewrafi', meddir ar dudalen 46. Ond y mae arwyddocâd lletach i ddadansoddiad testunol fel hyn wrth inni geisio troi'r benthg uniongyrchol, y tarddu o'r un ffynhonnell, yr 'adleisio', yn weithgarwch ysgrifwyr a scriptoria. Y mae yma ddarlun cyffrous o ymwneud canolfannau dysg â'i gilydd ac o drafndiaeth lawysgrifol brysur ond ni ellir osgoi holi ychwaith ba nifer o lawysgrifau coll y mae'n rhaid inni ddamcaniaethu yn eu cylch dros ba gyfnod, a faint o lawysgrifau y mae'n rhesymol tybio y gellid eu cynhyrchu mewn cyfnod a chymdeithas ddigon prin ei hadnoddau. Yn y fan hon try dadansoddiad testunol yn wedd ar hanes diwylliant Cymraeg y Canol Oesoedd.

Dywed yr awdur mai ystyried Peniarth 21/Peniarth 23 oedd man cychwyn ei ddiddordeb ym mhwn y ddarlith. Talodd yr ystyried hwnnw ar ei ganfed inni oherwydd un o brif gymwynasau'r ddarlith gyfoethog hon yw adfer y fersiwn hwn, 'Sindarella' y brutiau, a'i gyflwyno o'r newydd yn destun cynharach nag a fuwyd yn ei dybied ac yn sail i fersiynau eraill, yn hytrach nag yn fenthgyiwr ganddynt. Ac nid dyma'r unig destun y gwahoddir ni i'w ystyried o'r newydd; bydd rhaid troi eto at Peniarth 24 er gwaethaf ei chyflwr, a'i gweld yn gyfieithiad cynnar arall o'r *Historia*. Dyma ddau destun 'newydd' i gorff rhyddiaith Cymraeg Canol sy'n disgwyl eu golygydd.

*Aberystwyth*

BRYNLEY F. ROBERTS

Charles Doherty, Linda Doran and Mary Kelly (eds), *Glendalough: City of God* (Four Courts Press, Dublin, 2011). Pp. 448; €50 (hbk). ISBN 978-1-84682-170-7.

This volume results from the drawing together of a number of different strands: the one-day seminar on Glendalough, held in 2008 under the auspices of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland; some of the Lectures for the Curious series, delivered at Glendalough, and papers presented at the International Medieval Congress in Leeds. Despite the disparate origins of the contributions, they come together nicely as a unified collection: the focus on a single ecclesiastical site gives coherence to a volume which ranges widely across chronological and disciplinary boundaries. Various chapters focus on

the archaeology, art history, liturgy, hagiography and history of Glendalough, and there is far more contained within the volume than can be addressed in one brief review.

Some of the contributions to the volume are excellent: for example, Colmán Etchingham's chapter on the organization and function of Glendalough (chapter 2) provides an incisive summary of the current state of scholarship on medieval Irish ecclesiastical sites in general, as well as considering the implications of that scholarship for Glendalough itself, and his chapter will undoubtedly be required reading for all students of church organization in medieval Ireland. However, Etchingham rightly berates scholars for the continued use of the term 'monastic' to describe sites that were clearly multifunctional – episcopal seats, for example, and/or churches providing pastoral care to the laity – and it is therefore disappointing that a number of the other contributors to the volume have failed to absorb the implications of the paradigm shift necessitated by the scholarship of Etchingham (and Richard Sharpe and others) over the past few decades.

It is also disappointing that the opening chapter of the volume, by Melanie C. Maddox, is rather problematic. Quite aside from Maddox's apparent unfamiliarity with either Latin or Old Irish (and her mangling of both English and Irish to come up with phrases like 'the proper use of a *cathair's* [sic] *faithche*', p. 5), and therefore her reliance on antiquated translations of dubious accuracy, there are serious problems with a work that uses sources spanning some six hundred years in order to produce a static, ahistorical view of the *civitas* in medieval Ireland. Maddox notes – with an air of surprise – that early medieval texts containing the standard Christian topos of the heavenly city are 'remarkably similar' (p. 7), and she appears not to understand the difference between a scribe and an author (p. 3), or the workings of medieval Irish law (p. 15). As for her observation that 'the question that needs to be considered is what made Rome an important site to emulate in order for Irish ecclesiastical *civitates* to convey their high status?' (p. 17), one can only reflect that it would be preferable to confine scholarly enquiry to questions whose answers are not so blindingly obvious.

Serious problems, in particular a curious disengagement from modern scholarship, are evidenced in the contribution by one of the volume's editors, Charles Doherty (chapter 16). Doherty attempts to address the question of where in Ireland Sulien, the eleventh-century bishop of St David's, was educated. However, Doherty appears to be entirely unfamiliar with modern scholarship (by which I mean anything published since the mid-1990s) on medieval Wales or on the intellectual culture of eleventh- and twelfth-century Ireland. He does not cite a number of works that should have substantially informed his argument, such as Paul Russell's groundbreaking *Vita Griffini filii Conani: The Medieval Latin Life of Gruffudd ap Cynan* (Cardiff, 2005) and the relevant contributions in J. Wyn Evans and Jonathan M. Wooding's important co-edited volume on *St David of Wales: Cult, Church, Nation* (Woodbridge, 2007), amongst many others. Perhaps most significantly, his comments on Oxford, Bodleian MS Auct. F. 3 15 make no reference at all to the seminal discussion of that manuscript, namely Pádraig Ó Néill's 'An Irishman at Chartres in the twelfth century – the evidence of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. F. III. 15', *Ériu*, 48 (1997), 1–35. Ó Néill's analyses of the gloss 'i Cúalge rosribus in duilind-sea for tír gid eter ón 7 ní i cill' (at p. 31), the scribe Salmon/Solamh (p. 30) and the possible Glendalough connections of the manuscript (p. 30) are superior to Doherty's, and the latter offers nothing new to the consideration of these issues. Of course one can forgive the omission of items of scholarship which might have appeared in the final stages of preparation, or which are hidden in hard-to-access journals; however, these are

important, well-established works that are fundamental to Doherty's topic. His failure to engage with their findings, or even notice their existence, renders his contribution redundant. Doherty tells us in the conclusion to his chapter that 'speculation, allusions and coincidences are the order of the day' (p. 277), but 'speculation, allusions and coincidences' are not the business of historians and, had he turned to the recent scholarship on the subject of Irish and Welsh relations in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, or on Irish philosophical manuscripts of the twelfth century, he might have discovered firmer foundations on which to base his discussion.

Ailbhe MacShamhráin's chapter, 'Uí Máil and Glendalough' (chapter 12), must surely have been one of his final publications before his untimely death in 2011. His unrivalled mastery of the history of Glendalough is evidenced throughout this volume, in the innumerable references to his work, and in the new findings – such as in Etchingham's second contribution to the volume, an article on 'The Viking impact on Glendalough' (chapter 13) – which support, and build on, his earlier conclusions. MacShamhráin's approach to the hagiography of St Kevin could not be more different from that of Pádraig Ó Riain (chapter 7) and Dagmar Ó Riain-Raedel (chapter 8). MacShamhráin, following a line of thought established by Richard Sharpe in relation to other Irish hagiographical texts composed in Latin, considers the Latin Life of St Kevin to possess an early core (c. 800 AD) which, despite later reworking and adaptation, is still present, and identifiable, in the text as it has come down to us today. By contrast, Ó Riain and Ó Riain-Raedel both argue that there was, in effect, no hagiographical tradition in Ireland – with the exception of the Lives of the 'national' saints, that is, Patrick, Brigit and Colum Cille – until the twelfth century, and that the impetus for this late creation of hagiographical texts celebrating more minor saints came from the reformed ecclesiastical orders (Ó Riain) and/or the Continental *Schottenklöster* (Ó Riain-Raedel). There seems to me to be a number of fundamental issues that are not addressed by either author: how do we account for the gradual accretion of commentaries on texts such as *Féilire Óenguso* if we do not suppose that the material found in such commentaries derives from pre-existing hagiographical texts? From where are hagiographical episodes in earlier vernacular prose literature derived? Given the low rate of textual survival from medieval Ireland, and the fact that most of our extant medieval Irish texts survive in manuscripts which are much later than their date of composition, why should we suppose that hagiographical texts are anomalous in appearing, shortly before the earliest extant manuscript witnesses, from a textual vacuum? How did the cults of minor, local (or regional) saints survive and grow before the twelfth century without the support of a hagiographical corpus? All this is not to say that I think Ó Riain and Ó Riain-Raedel are wrong: undoubtedly, the corpus of Irish saints' Lives – Latin and vernacular – has been too often used without hesitation as an historical source for a period far earlier than the date of the earliest extant copies. But there is much more research to be done on this issue before firm conclusions can be drawn either way. Regarding Ó Riain-Raedel's edition of the earliest manuscript of the Latin Life of St Kevin, however, one wonders why she expends so much energy discussing the creation, transmission and purported Regensburg connections of the *Magnum Legendarium Austriacum*, only to produce an edition based on what seems to be (as Bieler noted) a separate recension of the text, namely that in the *Codex Biburgensis*. Ó Riain-Raedel's discussion shows, at least, that a great deal of work is still to be done on the continental transmission of medieval Irish hagiography, and it is exciting to see such a

significant debate about scholarly approaches to hagiography taking place within the pages of this volume.

Supplemented by numerous illustrations and diagrams, the art historical and archaeological contributions are rich and varied. Particularly noteworthy is Tomás Ó Carragáin's reinterpretation of St Kevin's House (chapter 4), which suggests that the function of the upper chamber of the double-vaulted church may have been to house a recluse. The volume ends with a number of fascinating contributions on the modern history of Glendalough as a site of historical, political and creative significance. Of exceptional interest are the wonderful studies by Peter Harbison (chapter 18) and Máirín Ní Cheallaigh (chapter 19). Harbison's chapter on 'Little-known drawings of Glendalough, c.1777–1850' traces the art historical significance of Glendalough as the subject of landscape drawing, painting and lithography, while also elucidating the wider cultural and religious contexts for the production of these works. Ní Cheallaigh's chapter on the development of Glendalough as a tourist attraction in the nineteenth century elegantly draws on the Classicizing vocabulary of the 'Grand Tour' and the landscape aesthetics of nineteenth-century travel-writing, but also draws attention to political and religious concerns, particularly demonstrating the effect that denominational polarization had on the views of ecclesiastical writers such as John O'Hanlon. The influence of Gaelic, Catholic nationalism on the scholarship of O'Hanlon, as shown by Ní Cheallaigh, makes the extensive and unquestioning reliance on O'Hanlon's translations of *Lives of the Irish saints* (6 vols, 1865) by other contributors to the volume all the more worrying.

The editors of *Glendalough: City of God*, along with Four Courts Press, are to be congratulated on having produced such a sumptuous volume, with many colour plates, maps, genealogical tables and other illustrations. The book is largely free from typographical errors (although there are some inconsistencies of style), and it has been printed on high-quality paper. There are nineteen scholarly articles in this substantial volume, in addition to one non-academic 'photographic essay', and the weight of this book – both physical and intellectual – makes it well worth its retail price, for individual readers as well as institutional libraries.

*University of Cambridge*

ELIZABETH BOYLE

Sara Elin Roberts (ed.), *Llawysgrif Pomffred: An Edition and Study of Peniarth MS 259B* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011). Pp. x + 378; €130. ISBN 978–90–04–19137–2.

This is an edition of a text of the laws of Hywel Dda written by Richard Longford and his assistant in north-east Wales in the second half of the sixteenth century. The edited Welsh text is printed with facing English translation, notes focusing mainly on explication of legal concepts and procedures, and an introduction discussing the provenance of the text and its relationship to other versions of the Welsh laws.

The title *Llawysgrif Pomffred* ('the Pontefract Manuscript') refers to a note by Longford stating that the exemplar of his copy was a book which a certain Einion ab Adda received from the constable of Pontefract Castle when he was a prisoner there, and that the constable in turn had obtained it from the prior of the monastery who came from south Wales. With this tantalizing information it is frustrating that nothing definite can be established about the date of the lost exemplar. More attention should perhaps be