1. The perception of Roman past in early Medieval Europe

B A R T   J A S K I

Aeneas and Fénius: a classical case of mistaken identity

1. INTRODUCTION

In their attempts to reconstruct the origins of the inhabitants of their island, Irish scholars from the seventh and eighth centuries turned to Scripture, the works of the Church Fathers and highly regarded scholars such as Eusebius, Orosius and Isidore of Seville. From that corpus they extracted direct references to Ireland and the Irish or Scots, combined them with indirect references which could be interpreted as being related to the same subject-matter, and mixed these with their own traditions and insights. It seems that a number of scholars, working in different places and at different times, continued with developing the Irish origin legend or dealing with aspects of it. The extant records reflect a highly dynamic textual tradition, which as a whole contains many contradictions and differences, but also similarities and direct borrowings. This state of affairs was partially due to new elements being introduced while older ones were discarded or obscured. Among these new elements were those rooted in classical literature as mediated through medieval channels of learning, which also influenced medieval Irish literature as a whole.

The present article focuses on one aspect of this influence, namely the introduction of Aeneas in texts of or related to the Irish origin legend. The Trojan forefather of the Romans is in a number of texts rather curiously identified with one of the most important of the Irish ancestors, Fénius Farsaid. This identification does not stand on itself, but is interwoven with apocryphal material and biblical interpretations on matters such as the identity of the wives of Noah and his three sons, the identity and deeds of the eponymous ancestors of the languages of the world, and traditions which have their basis in various stories about the origins of the Latins. All these we find mixed together in various configurations in texts which are usually dated to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, a period in which earlier textual matter was redacted and restructured.

In order to establish the nature of the how, why and when of the association between Aenas and Fénius, and the related textual and chronological intricacies, it is first necessary to discuss the various recensions of Lebor Gabála (Érenn) (Book of the Takings (of Ireland).[1] These recensions can be regarded as attempts of scholars from the period of ca. 975–1075 to arrive at a standardized account of the pre-Christian history of Ireland. They drew on various older sources current in Irish scholarly circles at the time, but were also in tune with contemporary concerns and trends. The four main recensions of Lebor Gabála which are currently distinguished are A, B, C and M (or I, II, III and *Míniugud* "Interpretation").[2] Of these, A and M are closely related and are represented in the earli-

---

[1] Lebor Gabála Érenn (ed. Robert A.S. Macalister, Irish Texts Society 34, 35, 39, 41, 44, Dublin 1938–1956). Although much criticized, this edition is still the standard one. Recension A in the Book of Leinster has been edited separately, see the Book of Leinster 1a1–26b40, 1 (ed. Robert I. Best/Osborn Bergin/Michael A. O'Brien/Anne O'Sullivan, Dublin 1954–1983) 1–99; the first part until 14b44 has been translated in John T. Koch/John Carey, The Celtic Heroic Age. Literary Sources for Ancient Celtic Europe and Early Ireland and Wales (Andover-Massachusetts ⁴2003) 226–271.

[2] The most comprehensive discussion of the various recensions of Lebor Gabála is Mark R. Scowcroft, Leabhar Gabhála part I: the growth of the text, in: Ériu 38 (1987) 79–140; id., Leabhar Gabhála part II: the growth of the tradition, in: Ériu 39 (1988) 1–66. He discusses the recensions and their sources at 83–89. Important publications since include John Carey, The ancestry of Fénius Farsaid, in: Celtica 21 (1990) 104–112; id., A New Introduction to Lebor Gabála Érenn (Irish Texts Society, Dublin 1993); id. The Irish National Origin-legend: Synthetic Pseudo-history (Quiggin Pamphlets on the Sources of Mediaeval Gaelic History 1, Cambridge 1994); Bart Jaski, "We are of the Greeks in our origin": new perspectives on the Irish origin legend, in: Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies 46 (2003) 1–53.

est manuscripts. A is in the Book of Leinster (ca. 1160), and the last part of the final section of M is found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B 502 (ca. 1130). In other and later manuscripts M is found appended to B, for example in Rawlinson B 512 (in which it is said that it was taken from the Book of Glendalough)[3] and the Book of Lecan, both written around 1400. Recension C is also found in the Book of Lecan, as well as in the Book of Ballymote and Trinity College Dublin, MS 1316 (*olim* H.2.15a), which are slightly earlier in date. As will be seen, recensions M and A differ on various points from B, while C is an effort to combine the two strands, with the inclusion of additional material.

2. LEBOR GABÁLA RECENSIONS A AND M

In order to assess the place of Aeneas and his relationship to Fénius in this material, recension A is partially translated and summarized below, from the period after the Flood until that of the Exodus:

(Lebor Gabála §7) … "The Flood drowned all of Adam's descendants except for Noah with his three sons, i.e. Sem, Ham, and Japhet; and their four wives, i.e. *Cobba* and *Olla* and *Oliba* and *Olibana* …[4] (§8) Shem had 30 sons, including Arphaxad, Asshur, and Persius. Ham had 30 sons, including Cush and Canaan. But Japhet had fifteen, including Madai, Grecus, Hispanius, and Gomerus. Or else Shem had 27 sons … (§9) It is from Japhet son of Noah, that the northern part of Asia derives: Asia Minor, Armenia, Media, and the men of Scythia; and from him are all the peoples of Europe. From Grecus son of Japhet is Great Greece and Little Greece and the Greece of Alexandria. From Hispanius son of Japhet is Hispania. Gomer son of Japhet had two sons, Emoth and Ibath". Ibath had two sons, Bodb and Baath. Dói son of Bodb was the father of Elinus, the forefather of most of the peoples of Europe, which are enumerated.[5] (§10) From Magog son of Japhet descend the peoples who arrived in Ireland before the Gaels (Goídil): Partholón, Nemed, and the descendants of Nemed, namely the Gaileoin, Fir Domnann, Fir Bolg and Túatha Dé Danann.

(§103) From Baath, the second son of Ibath, descend the Gaels and the men of Scythia. His son, Fénius Farsaid, was one of the 72 leaders who went to the building of the Tower of Nimrod, where the languages were divided. (§104) Fénius had two sons, Noenual, and Nél, who was born at the Tower. Nél was a master of languages, so Pharaoh sent for him to learn the many languages from him. But Fénius went from Asia to Scythia, where he died after having been lord of Scythia for 40 years. He was succeeded by Noenual. (§105) At the end of 42 years after the building of the Tower, Ninus son of Belus took the kingship of the world. (§106) "That is the time when Góedel Glas, from whom descend the Gaels, was born of Scota, daughter of Pharaoh. It is after her that the Gaels are named 'Scots', *ut dictum est* 'The Féni were named after Fénius, vigour without restraint; the Gaels from generous Góedel Glas, the Scots from Scota'. (§107) It is Góedel Glas who fashioned Gaelic from the 72 languages". The languages are enumerated in prose and verse. (§108) Srú son of Esrú son of Góedel went out of Egypt (to Scythia) after Pharaoh had drowned in the Red Sea. 770 years from the Flood till then.[6]

This section brings together a varied cast of different provenance. The story of Noah and his sons as found in the Bible has been expanded with the names of their wives, which are found in another context in Ezekiel 23 (the sisters Oolla and Ooliba) and Genesis 36 (Oolibama). The four already appear as Percova, Olla, Oleva and Ollina in Pseudo-Isidore's Liber de Numeris, which was written at

---

[3] On the discussion whether the Book of Glendalough is identical to Rawlinson B 502, see most recently Caoimhín Breatnach, Manuscript sources and methodology: Rawlinson B 502 and Lebar Glinne Dá Locha, in: Celtica 24 (2003) 40–54.

[4] These wives are also in the poem Athair cáich, coimsid nime in recensions B and C, Lebor Gabála Érenn poem V §39, ed. Macalister 1, 188.

[5] This Elinus derives from Alanus, see Carey, Ancestry 106–107; cf. note 19 below.

[6] Lebor Gabála Érenn §§7–10 and 103–108, ed. Macalister 1, 20–24 and 2, 8–14; the translation is taken from Koch/Carey, Celtic Heroic Age 227–230, but in §7 the names are given as they stand in the version in the Book of Leinster. Note that Macalister has Dannai instead of Madui in §8.

about the middle of the eighth century by an Irishman working on the continent.[7] They are also found in various Irish and Anglo-Saxon texts of around the tenth and eleventh centuries.[8] The total number of eight is reflected in the invaders of Ireland arriving in groups of eight in various versions of the Irish origin legend.[9]

Lebor Gabála recension A assigns 30 sons to Shem, but notes that 27 may also be the correct number. The latter figure we find in recension M, from whence it may have taken, and this agrees best with earlier traditions.[10] Augustine claims that 27 peoples descended from Shem, 31 from Ham and 15 from Japhet. These peoples are mentioned by name by Isidore of Seville. Both surmise that the total number of 73 peoples reflects the 72 languages of the world which came into existence at the building of the Tower of Babel.[11] As regards Japhet, they base themselves on Genesis chapter 10, where the names of his seven sons and seven grandsons are given as Gomer (father of Askenez, Rifath and Thogorma), Magog, Madai, Iauan (father of Elisa, Tharsis, Cethim and Dodanim), Thubal, Mosoch and Thiras. This excludes Grecus and Hispanius in Lebor Gabála recension A, who are apparently identical to Iauan and Thubal, the forefathers of, respectively, the Greeks, and the Iberians or Spaniards according to Jerome and Isidore.[12] The latter also mentions that the Greeks were named after a king called Grecus,[13] and the Spaniards after Hispalo.[14] Similarly, Lebor Gabála recension A substitutes the biblical Elam son of Shem for Persius.[15] On the whole, Lebor Gabála recension A gives an inaccurate summary of the biblical account in which a number of eponymous forefathers are introduced.

---

[7] Robert E. McNally, Der irische Liber de numeris. Eine Quellenanalyse des pseudo-isidorischen Liber de numeris (München 1957) 128 (VIII, 1–4).

[8] For discussion, see The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus (ed. James E. Cross/Thomas D. Hill, Toronto 1982) 84–89; Francis L. Utley, The 103 names of Noah's wife, in: Speculum 16 (1941) 426–452; Lebor Gabála Érenn, ed. Macalister 1, 211–13; for the Irish texts, see Saltair na Rann, lines 2485–2488 and 2497–2500 (ed. Whitley Stokes, Saltair na Rann. A Collection of Early Middle Irish Poems, Oxford 1883) 36; Sex aetates mundi §§25, 28, 31, 70 (ed. Dáibhí Ó Cróinín, The Irish Sex Aetates Mundi, Dublin 1983) 74, 75, 77, 99; Synchronisms B in the Book of Ballymote (ed. Bartholomew Mac Carthy, The Codex Palatino-Vaticanus no. 830, Todd Lecture Series 3, Dublin 1892) 286–317, follows the genealogy of Góedel Glas as given in Lebor Gabála recension M, and states at 286–288 that Oliua was the wife of Japhet; for the Ban Shenchus, see §6 and §7 below. For the apocrypha in Lebor Gabála, see David Wasserstein, The creation of Adam and the apocrypha in early Ireland, in: Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy 88C (1988) 1–17; Leslie D. Myrick, The steleographic transmission of prediluvian scéla. An apocryphal reference in the Irish Lebor Gabála, in: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 47 (1995) 18–31; José Carracedo Fraga, Irish elements in the Pseudo-Isidorian Liber de ortu et obitu patriarcharum, in: The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland. Proceedings of the 1993 Conference of the Society for Hiberno-Latin Studies on Early Irish Exegesis and Homeletics, ed. Thomas O'Loughlin (Instrumenta Patristica 31, Turnhout 1999) 37–49, at 47.

[9] Scowcroft, Leabhar Gabhála part II 22–26.

[10] Lebor Gabála Érenn §106, ed. Macalister 1, 166. Recension M omits the wives of Noah and his sons, the names of some of the grandsons of Noah and is mainly concerned with the descendants of Magog.

[11] Augustine, De civitate Dei XVI, 6 (ed. Bernhard Dombart/Alphons Kalb, CC SL 47–48, Turnhout 1955) 507; Isidore of Seville, Etymologiae IX, 2, 2 (ed. Wallace M. Lindsay, Oxford 1911, repr. 1966 [without page number]), but in id., Chronica §18 (ed. Jose Carlos Martin, CC SL 112, Turnhout 2003) 20–21, Ham is given 30 sons, as in the Irish tradition.

[12] Jerome, Hebraicae quaestiones in Genesim X, 2–5 (ed. Paul Antin, S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera. Pars 1: opera exegetis, CC SL 72, Turnhout 1960) 1–56, at 11–12; Isidore, Etymologiae IX, 2, 26–37, ed. Lindsay.

[13] Isidore, Etymologiae IX, 2, 69, ed. Lindsay: *Graeci ante Thessali a Thessalo, postea a Greco rege Greci sunt nuncupati*, and ibid. XIV, 4, 7: *Graecia a Graeco rege vocata*; cf. Pliny, Historia naturalis IV, 7, 28 (ed. Harris Rackham, Natural History part 2, Loeb Classical Library 352, Cambridge-Massachusetts/London 1969) 138: *rex nomine Graecus a quo Graecia*; Servius, In Vergilii Aeneidos commentarii 2, 4 (ed. Georg Thilo, Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii 1, Leipzig 1878) 212: *Nam Graeci proprie sunt Thessalia a Graeco rege*; Jerome, Chronicon, Anno Abrahae 223 (ed. Rudolf Helm, Eusebius Werke. Siebenter Band: die Chronik des Hieronymus, Berlin 1956) 30b: *Thessalus Graeci filius regnauit in Thessalia*.

[14] Isidore, Etymologiae IX, 2, 109, ed. Lindsay: *Hispani ab Ibero amne primum Iberi, postea ab Hispalo Hispani cognominati sunt*, cf. ibid. XIV, 4, 28; cf. Marcus Junianus Justinus, Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi XLIV, 1 (ed. Otto Seel, Leipzig 1935) 296: *postea ab Hispalo Hispaniam cognominauerunt*.

[15] Isidore, Etymologiae IX, 2, 3, ed. Lindsay: *Quorum primus Elam, a quo Elamitae princeps Persidis*; ibid. IX 2, 47: *Persae a Perseo rege sunt vocati*.

Mainly following the classical author Josephus, Jerome states that Gomer was the forefather of the Galatians (and his son Rifath of the Paphlagonians of Asia Minor), Magog of the Scythians and as some say the Goths, and Iauan of the Ionian Greeks. He adds that the Greeks settled the lands and islands as far as the British Ocean.[16] Isidore further says that the Galatae were also called Galli, and that the descendants of Japhet settled the lands and islands as far as the British Ocean.[17]

Although Irish scholars probably entertained the etymological equations Scythi = Scotti and Galatae / Galli = Goídil (Gael),[18] recension A regards Baath son of Ibath son of Gomer as the forefather of the Scythians rather than the Galatae or Galli. According to Lebor Gabála recension M, Fénius was the son of Baath son of Magog, while Ibath son of Magog is the forefather of the Franks, Romans, Saxons, Britons and Albans (inhabitants of Alba, the Irish name for Scotland).[19] The scheme in M is in accordance with that of early Christian writers such as Jerome and Isidore, and is most likely to be the original. This is also suggested by the fact that Ibath and Baath are brothers, rather than father and son as in recension A. As John Carey has shown, the names Ibath, Baath and Fénius derive from the Liber antiquitatum biblicarum, an early Latin tract translated from Greek which was wrongly attributed to Philo of Alexandria. It states that Itheb, Beath and Fenech were the three sons of Dodanim son of Iauan son of Japhet. Fenech was the leader of the descendants of Japhet at the building of the Tower of Babel.[20] This genealogical configuration is best preserved in recension M, but Iauan and Dodanim are replaced by Magog. Yet other sources refer to Fénius or the Irish in general as descending from the Greeks, which is in agreement both with the scheme in the Liber antiquitatum biblicarum as the statement by Jerome that the Greeks colonized the islands as far as the British Ocean, which would naturally include Ireland.[21] Isidore of Seville simply took it that all of Europe was colonized by the descendants of Japhet, and this is reflected in A §9 above. Hence any son of Japhet was eligible to figure as the ultimate forefather of the Irish, and in due course Iauan was replaced by Magog. The poem Can a mbunadus na nGaedel? ("Whence is the origin of the Gaels?"), attributed to the northern scholar and cleric Máel Muru (†887), still states that "we are of the Greeks in our origin, in our laws", but does not say which son of Japhet was the forefather of Fénius.[22] The poem is usually considered to represent a tradition which also gave rise to Lebor Gabála recensions M and A,[23] in which Magog (later Gomer) figures as the forefather of the Irish. Hence it appears that the Gaels were first held to be related to the Greeks, then the Scythians (as in recension M) and finally the Galatae/Galli (as in recension A).

From the Liber antiquitatum biblicarum it is clear that Fénius figured originally as the Irish forefather present at the building of the Tower of Babel and the division of the languages and peoples of the world. His byname Farsaid 'Division' is similar to the name of Peleg or 'Division' son of Heber (Hebrew), who was born at the time. Additionally, Farsaid means 'Pharisee', a Jewish teacher of traditional and written law, which agrees with the Irish term 'language of the Féni'

---

[16] Jerome, Hebraicae quaestiones X, 2–5, ed. Antin 11–12.

[17] Isidore, Etymologiae IX, 2, 26; 37, 89, ed. Lindsay.

[18] Scowcroft, Leabhar Gabhála part II 17–19. Jürgen Zeidler, Eigenständige keltische Ursprungsmythen? Ein analytisches Modell, in: Keltologie heute. Themen und Fragestellungen. Akten des 3. Deutschen Keltologen Symposiums, Marburg, März 2001, ed. Erich Poppe (Studien und Texte zur Keltologie 6, Münster 2004) 13–30, at 18, thinks that the eymological explanation followed an already established view.

[19] Lebor Gabála Érenn §102, ed. Macalister 1, 166; the descendants of Ibath, excluding the Saxons, are regarded as the descendants of Isacon son of Elenus son of Doi in recension A (Lebor Gabála Érenn §9, ed. Macalister 1, 22). Recension M notes the descent of Fénius via Gomer as an alternative tradition, Lebor Gabála Érenn §103, ed. Macalister 2, 8.

[20] Pseudo-Philo, Liber antiquitatum biblicarum IV, 2–3, V, 1 and VI, 14 (ed. Guido Kisch, Notre Dame 1949) 119, 123 and 129; Carey, Ancestry 108–109.

[21] See Jaski, We are of the Greeks 16–17. The late fourth-century writer Ammianus Marcellinus writes in his Res gestae 15, 9, 4 (ed. John C. Rolfe, Ammianus Marcellinus, Loeb Classical Library 300, 1, Cambridge-Massachusetts/London 1969) 176, on Gaul: "Other state that the Dorians, following the earlier Hercules, settled the lands bordering the Ocean"; he also refers to the Trojan ancestry of the Gauls at ibid. 15, 9, 5, ed. Rolfe 178.

[22] Book of Leinster 133b26–27, ed. Best/O'Brien 3, 516; the author's translation; cf. James H. Todd, The Irish Version of the Historia Britonum of Nennius (Dublin 1848) 224.

[23] Scowcroft, Leabhar Gabhála part II 7–9.

(*bérla Féni*), which refers primarily to legal language.[24] Similarly, Scota, the wife of Fénius' son Nél in recensions M and A, was originally the daughter of Pharaoh who drowned in the Red Sea. Isidore interprets the (unnamed) daughter of the Pharaoh who takes up Moses as the 'church of nations' which takes up Christ.[25] Hence recension A §106 presents us with an attractive association between Góedel, his mother Scota, and his grandfather Fénius, the eponymous ancestors of the Goídil (Gaels), Scotti and Féni respectively. This compact configuration is one of the strong points of the narrative in recensions M and A, but it is based on a faulty chronology. Fénius' son Nél is born at the Tower, but he marries the daughter of the Pharaoh who drowned in the Red Sea. Although the identity of Pharoah is not explicitly stated, the implication is clear when it is said that Góedel's grandson Srú left Egypt after Pharoah drowned in the Red Sea, 770 years after the Flood (A §108).[26] According to Genesis the dispersal of the languages from the Tower of Nimrod occurred 102 years after the Flood,[27] so according to this calculation Nél lived for at least 600 years. This is an improbable figure even according to Old Testament standards after the period of the Flood, and one not matched by Nél's direct forefathers or descendants. The chronological markers in recensions M and A, and their relatively abstract tale, suggest that at some stage in their development scholars became aware of this major flaw. Indeed, one of the characteristics of recension B is that it sets the Irish origin legend in an alternative chronological scheme, albeit one which created problems of its own.

3. LEBOR GABÁLA RECENSION B

Lebor Gabála recension B includes the same key figures in its account of the Irish origin legend as recensions M and A, but equips them with a different genealogy and chronology. It names the three sons of Japhet, and then the prose continues:

(Lebor Gabála §16) "Góedel Glas our ancestor was the son of Nél son of Fénius Farsaid son of Éogan (or Éber) son of Glúnfhind son of Lámfhind son of Etheor son of Thoe son of Bodb son of Sem son of Mar son of Aurthacht son of Aboth son of Ara son of Iara son of Srú son of Esrú son of Baath son of Rifath Scot, from whom are the Scots. Now it was Rifath Scot who brought the Scotic language from the Tower, for he was one of the principal leaders who were at the building of the Tower of Nimrod. From that it is clear that Fénius was not at the building of the Tower, as the historians say without harmonizing the synchronism (*cen comshiniudh chomhaimseraid*). This is why we say so, for Fénius was the sixteenth in descent from Rifath, who brought Scotic from the Tower.

---

[24] See Jaski, We are of the Greeks 9–10, 32–33 (cf. Isidore, Etymologiae VII, 6, 24 and VIII, 4, 3, ed. Lindsay).

[25] Isidore of Seville, Allegoriae quaedam Scripturae Sacrae 58, PL 83, 99–130, at 109: *Filia Pharaonis quae Moysen expositum ad ripam fluminis collegit, ecclesia gentium est* (cf. Scowcroft, Leabhar Gabhála part II 21 note 56); rephrased in Isidore, Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum: in Exodum 5, 2, PL 83, 287–322, at 288. Scota daughter of Pharaoh already figures in ninth-century continental manuscripts, see John J. Contreni, The Eyptian origins of the Irish: two ninth-century notes, in: St. Kilian: 1300 Jahre Martyrium der Frankenapostel, ed. Klaus Wittstadt (Würzburger Diözesangeschichtsblätter 51, Würzburg 1989) 51–54, repr. in John J. Contreni, Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts (Collected Studies Series 363, Aldershot 1992) XVII; Olivier Szerwiniack, D'Orose au Lebor Gabála Érenn: les gloses du manuscrit Reg. Lat. 1650, in: Études celtiques 31 (1995) 205–217.

[26] Recension M has 470 or 770 years, see Lebor Gabála Érenn §108, ed. Macalister 2, 14; the former figure is surely due to a scribal mistake. The figure of 770 years in recension A appears to be a corruption of the 797 years between the Flood and the crossing of the Red Sea in Jerome's Vulgate (the Hebrew Verity) and Bede's De temporum ratione; it is even 1447 years according to the Eusebian Chronicle (based on the Septuagint), which Jerome also translated into Latin. On these differences, see Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken, Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis ins Zeitalter Ottos von Freising (Düsseldorf 1957) 60–113; Bede, The Reckoning of Time (trans. Faith Wallis, Translated Texts for Historians 29, Liverpool 1999) 353–360. The Chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome sets the drowning of Pharao Chenchres in the 144th year of the Israelite exile in Egypt, which corresponds to Anno Abrahae 505, or 1512 BC according to Helm, Eusebius Werke, 43a. The Irish reception of the Latin translation of the Eusebian Chronicle is most recently discussed in Daniel P. McCarthy, The chronology and sources of the early Irish annals, in: Early Medieval Europe 10 (2001) 323–341.

[27] Genesis 11:10–16, cf. 10:25.

(§17) 62 years from the dispersal of the Tower to the lordship of Ninus son of Belus (… *Nin meic Peil*). 874 years from the beginning of the lordship of Ninus to the end of the lordship of Tutanes, king of the world. Around his time Troy was taken for the last time.[28] There were seven years after that taking until Aeneas son of Anchises (… *Aenias mac Anaciss*) took Lavinia daughter of Latinus son of Faunus (*Latin meic Puin*), so that there are 943 years from the dispersal of the Tower until Aeneas took the daughter of Latinus, and Latinus made his treaties with him. From that it is clear that the authors of the Auraicept do not reach a correct conclusion that Latinus was one of the six chief leaders of the Tower, seeing that the length downward between them is forty years, from the dispersal of the Tower until Fénius Farsaid came from the north out of Scythia with his school to seek for the languages … There were two years after the coming of Fénius from the north until Ninus".

(§18) Pharaoh Cincris invited the learned Nél son of Fenius to come to Egypt, and gave him his daughter Scota in marriage. (§118) Nél helped Aaron and Moses by giving them provisions. (§119) Nél's son Góedel Glas was stung by a serpent, but through the prayers of Moses the boy was cured. Moses commanded that no serpent would ever harm Góedel or his descendants, nor live in the northern island of the world where they would settle. (§120) Then Moses invited Nél to come with him and receive an equal share of the Promised Land, or to receive the boats of Pharaoh and watch the Hebrews' encounter with Pharaoh on their journey back home. (§§122–26). When Pharaoh Tuir showed himself hostile against the Gaels, Góedel's grandson Srú son of Esrú fled to Scythia in the boats of Pharaoh Cincris.[29]

In §16 recension B criticizes the chronological mistakes in the tradition represented by recensions M and A. Fénius is replaced by Rifath Scot (son of Gomer) as the inventor of the Irish language, which is called Scotic. This is an important point in recension B, for later on is said that all those who invaded Ireland after the Flood (Partholón and Nemed and his descendants) were of the progeny of Rifath Scot, and that all spoke the Scotic language.[30] To the compilers of Lebor Gabála, their common language gave the Goídil or Scotti their common identity.

We have seen that Fénius is the narrative and chronological focus-point in recensions M and A, but in B this position is taken up by Góedel Glas, whose long pedigree matches that of his contemporary Moses.[31] According to this scheme, Fénius lived much later than Rifath Scot, but in §17 he is still associated with the Tower of Babel. Ninus son of Belus is dated to 42 years after the dispersal of the Tower, just as in recensions M and A §104 and §105. In §18 we are told that Nél is a learned person, and the reason why he is invited by Pharaoh makes more sense in the context of recensions M and A than in B. It thus seems that recension B represents traditions surrounding Rifath Scot (who is secondary to Fénius) and Góedel, mixed with the story and chronology of Fénius as in recensions M and A. Recension B §17 on Aeneas is also written from the perspective of recensions M and A. The 62 years which separate the dispersal of the Tower and the lordship of Ninus are also found in the poem Annálad anall uile ("All these computations"), which for the rest agrees with the chronology as given in Lebor Gabála recensions M and A. It was composed in 1072 and is attributed to Gilla Cóemáin son of Gilla Samthainne.[32]

---

[28] This line is also in the synchronisms appended to recension B, Lebor Gabála Érenn §273, ed. Macalister 3, 158; cf. §229, ibid. 34.

[29] Lebor Gabála Érenn §§16–18 and 118–126, ed. Macalister 1, 36–38 and 2, 32–38. On Pharaoh Tuir being queen Thores in Eusebius, see ibid. 135.

[30] Lebor Gabála Érenn §247 (recensions B and C), ed. Macalister 3, 128; cf. §497, ibid. 5, 182–184; see also poem XCII, ibid. 426, where is said that the Goídil spoke only Greek at first; Genealogical Tracts I §166 (ed. Toirdhealbhach Ó Raithbheartaigh, Dublin 1932) 179.

[31] See Jaski, We are of the Greeks 9.

[32] Gilla Cóemáin, Annálad anall uile §§8–9, ed. Best/O'Brien 3, 496–503, at 496–497; Whitley Stokes, The Tripartite Life of Patrick and Other Documents Relating to that Saint 2 (London 1887) 530–541, at 530: 210 years from Deluge to Confusion, 62 years from Confusion to Ninus, 21 years from Ninus to Abraham = 293 years. This is roughly based on Bede, who is cited in the beginning of the poem. According to Bede the Second Age (Deluge to Abraham) lasted 292 years, according to the Chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome 942 years. For the 21 years from Ninus to Abraham, see also Synchronisms B, ed. Mac Carthy 288, but for the rest this tract follows the Eusebian tradition. This also applies to the

In §119 and subsequent sections in recension B Nél's son Góedel is not recognized as the inventor of the Gaelic language (Goidelc), but the Gaels are without any attempt at subtlety given the status of most favoured people by the Chosen People themselves. This account is combined with the story that no serpents lived in Ireland, which is already mentioned by the classical writer Solinus (ca. 200 AD),[33] and repeated by Isidore and Bede.[34] The attractive genealogical configuration in recensions M and A has thus been sacrificed in favour of chronological consistency. It is likely that these problems were created when two hitherto independent traditions, namely Fénius at the Tower and Góedel at the Exodus, were combined.[35]

We have now considered the general chronological, genealogical and narrative mixtures which gave rise to the various recensions of Lebor Gabála and related texts. This forms the basis from which we can take a closer look at the position of Aeneas in the various Irish traditions.

Recension B §17 stands somewhat apart from the main narrative of the tract, even if it is also concerned with chronology. It calculates 62 + 874 + 7 = 943 years from the dispersal of the Tower until Aeneas took the daughter of Latinus. The arithmetic is correct, but there is a small difference compared with the Chronicle of Eusebius as translated and redacted by Jerome.[36] The author argues that Latinus, the father-in-law of Aeneas, could not have been one of the six leaders at the Tower of Babel, as is found in the Auraicept. The tract in question is the grammatical tract known as Auraicept na nÉces "Primer of the Scholars".

5. LATINUS IN AURAICEPT NA NÉCES

Auraicept na nÉces has a complicated textual history. It consists of four related 'books', ascribed to Cenn Fáelad mac Ailella (†679) (tract I), the legendary scholars Ferchertne (tract II), and Amairgen (tract III), and Fénius, Iar mac Nema and Góedel mac Ethiuir (tract IV); there is also a tract which claims to be a version of the Auraicept of Munster.[37] In most of the manuscripts tract III contains a number of sections in large script, which are considered to represent the seventh-century core of the original text.[38] The other tracts mainly contain commentaries which on the whole are

---

synchronisms appended to Lebor Gabála recension B (and to recension C in the Book of Ballymote), Lebor Gabála Érenn §228, ed. Macalister 3, 28–30, which date the first year of Abraham to the 23rd year of Ninus. The latter figure is plausably a corruption of the 43rd year as given by Eusebius/Jerome and Bede.

[33] Caius Iulius Solinus, Collectanea rerum memorabilium 22, 3 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, Berlin 1895, repr. 1958) 100. He notes the same for the Kentish isle of Thanet at 22, 8 (ibid. 101).

[34] Isidore, Etymologiae XIV, 6, 6, ed. Lindsay; Bede, Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum I, 1 (ed. Bertram Colgrave/ Roger A.B. Mynors, Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, Oxford 1969) 18. The tradition that Patrick chased the snakes out of Ireland is not attested earlier than the twelfth century, see Ludwig Bieler, The Life and Legend of St. Patrick (Dublin 1948) 124.

[35] See Jaski, We are of the Greeks 31–35; Howard Meroney, Fénius and Gáedel in the Lebar Cindfáelad, in: Modern Philology 43 (1945) 18–24.

[36] Jerome, Chronicon, Anno Abrahae 811–839, ed. Helm 59a–62b. The reign of Tautanis starts at Anno Abrahae (AA) 811 with the comment *Sub Tautano rege Assyriorum Troia capta est*. The capture of Troy is set at AA 835. Since AA 1 is synchronised with the 43th year of Ninus son of Belus, this gives a total of 877 years between Ninus and the capture of Troy. Three years, or eight years according to others, after the capture of Troy Aeneas became king and reigned for three years. His reign runs from AA 839 (the fourth year after the capture of Troy) to 841. The first year of Aeneas' reign can be synchronised with the foundation of Lavinium after he had made peace with Latinus and married Lavinia. Hence the calculation 874 + 7 in Lebor Gabála recension B is based on 877 + 3 (text) or 4th (AA 839) in the Chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome. In both cases confusion between iiii with uii may underlie the mistakes in the Irish text. See further at note 40 below.

[37] Auraicept na nÉces lines 1–734 (with an introduction at lines 1–62), 735–1027, 1028–1101, 1102–1365, 1366–1636 (ed. George Calder, Edinburgh 1917) 2–54, 54–78, 78–82, 82–106, 106–126; see Rudolf Thurneysen, Auraicept na n-Éces, in: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 17 (1928) 277–303, for their division and dating on linguistic grounds.

[38] For the reconstructed core text, see Anders Ahlqvist, The Early Irish Linguist. An Edition of the Canonical Part of the Auraicept na nÉces (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 73, Helsinki 1983). The core text may be of the seventh century, but the inclusion of the section in tract III related to the Irish origin legend is uncertain, see ibid. 47–48 (1, 2–1, 17 = Auraicept na nÉces lines 1034–1063, ed. Calder 78–79), 26–27 and 33–34, and Harry Roe, review of Anders Ahlqvist, The Early Irish Linguist, in: Peritia 6–7 (1988) 337–339.

dated to the tenth century. A number of sections is given in more than one tract, usually with a number of variations, omissions and additions. Apart form this, differences also occur between the versions of the tracts in the various manuscripts. The recension of Auraicept na nÉces which is found in, for example, the Books of Ballymote, Lecan and Uí Maine, differs from the later recension in the Yellow Book of Lecan, a composite manuscript of roughly the same date (the decades around 1400) and in some later manuscripts. In tract IV we find the section on Latinus and Aeneas to which Lebor Gabála recension B refers. The first part can be summarized as follows:

This is the beginning of the Auraicept according to Fénius, Iar mac Nema and Góedel mac Ethiuir. This trio invented it in Dacia (*i nDacia*), or in the plain of Shinar (*i mmaigh Sennair*) as others say, at the request of the school (of Fénius), so that it could serve as their Primer, after it had been given to Moses. Caí Caínbrethach studied the work with Moses. The alphabets were invented on one table.

Éber son of Selach (forefather of the Hebrews), Gregus son of Gomer (Greeks), Latinus son of Faunus (*mac Puin*) (Latins), Rifath Scot son of Gomer, Nimrod son of Cush and Fénius Farsaid were the six leaders who built the Tower of Nimrod.

"52 years from the dispersal of the Tower to the lordship of Ninus son of Belus (*Nin mic Bel*), 52 years (lasted his) kingship. 774 years from the lordship of Ninus to the end of the lordship of Tutanes, king of the world. It is around the time Troy was taken for the last time. Seven years (until) the daughter of Latinus son of Faunus (*Laitin mic Puin*), so that there are 943 years from the dispersal of the Tower until Aeneas took the daughter of Latinus, and Latinus himself made his covenant with him. From that it is clear that the authors of the Auraicept do not reach a correct conclusion that Latinus was one of the seven (= six) chief leaders of the Tower".[39]

The third part calculates $52 + 774 + 7 = 943$ (rather than 833) years, where Lebor Gabála recension B §17 accurately calculates $62 + 874 + 7 = 943$ years.[40] Both sections are much alike, and basically both say that it is impossible that Latinus the father-in-law of Aeneas could have been present at the Tower of Babel. Of course, Latinus son of Faunus belongs to the period after the destruction of Troy and prior to the foundation of Rome. It is likely that the Latinus at the Tower was originally the supposed eponymous ancestor of the Latins,[41] similar to Persius son of Shem, Hispanius son of Japhet or Grecus son of Japhet in Lebor Gabála recension A §§8–9. Grecus is called son of Gomer in Auraicept na nÉces tract IV as given above, and considered to be identical to Gomer in Lebor Gabála recension C.[42] The poem Athair cáich, coimsid nime ("Father of all, master of heaven"), included in Lebor Gabála recensions B and C (and independently in the Book of Uí Maine), lists those present at the Tower as Nimrod, Assur, Ibath/Baath, Latinus, Longobardus, Grecus, Gomer, Éber (Hebrew), Bodb, Britus, Germanus, Garad, Scithus, Gothus, Dardanus and Sardan.[43] All these examples show a tendency to associate the direct descendants of the sons of Noah and those present at the Tower with the eponymous ancestors of the various languages of the world, even if this does not quite agree with – or even contradicts – the writings of Jerome and Isidore. It is a small step

---

[39] Auraicept na nÉces lines 1102–1128, ed. Calder 82–84 (the author's translation). Compare Lebor Gabála Érenn §139 and §136 (recension C), ed. Macalister 2, 50 and 46, at which an even more extensive list of the persons present at the Tower is given; the figures are as those given in recension B.

[40] The version in the Yellow Book of Lecan has 744 instead of 774 (= 874) years, see Auraicept na nÉces line 4038, ed. Calder 226. The addition that Ninus reigned for 52 years is, like the reference to Tautanis, neither in Bede nor in Isidore. The passage in Lebor Gabála recension B §17 is not the direct source of the passage in Auraicept na nÉces. It may be that an early version of Lebor Gabála recension B was placed in a manuscript which also contained a version of Auraicept na nÉces, and that this provoked the insertion of the part on Aeneas and Latinus in Auraicept na nÉces (which was corrupted in subsequent transmission, probably because the subject-matter of the tract did not deal with chronology) and Lebor Gabála recension B (where it is out of place and hardly intelligible without Auraicept na nÉces at hand).

[41] Isidore, Etymologiae IX, 2, 84, ed. Lindsay: *Nam Latinus Italiae rex fuit, qui ex suo nomine Latinos appellauit.*

[42] Auraicept na nÉces line 1117, ed. Calder 84; Lebor Gabála Érenn §95, ed. Macalister 1, 152–154. Grecus is named as son of Iuban or Ionan (=Iauan) or as son of Gomer in Scél Alexandair (ed. Erik Peters, Die irische Alexandersage, in: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 30 [1967]) 71–264, at 99 = 159, 101 = 166, 103 = 172.

[43] Lebor Gabála Érenn poem V §§47–49, ed. Macalister 1, 190–192. It follows after recension B §19.

from assuming that Latinus, like Grecus, and so on, was present at the Tower, to identifying him as the Latinus son of Faunus known from the story of Aeneas. This seems straightforward enough, were it not that there are some additional sources to be discussed in this context, which take the association between Latinus and Fénius a step further.

6. NÉL SON OF (ASCANIUS SON OF) AENEAS AND LAVINIA DAUGHTER OF LATINUS

The poetic and prose versions of the Ban Shenchus "History of Women" enumerate the mothers or wives of the most important kings and heroes in Irish history. The final draft of the poetic version was completed in 1147 by the poet Gilla Mo Dutu Ua Caiside, and is found in the Book of Leinster; Dublin, National Library of Ireland MS G3 (ca. 1340); the Book of Uí Maine (ca. 1380); and the Book of Lecan.[44] It begins with the women in biblical history, including Percoba, Olla, Oliuan and Oliuane, the wives of Noah and his three sons, who are also found in Lebor Gabála recension A §7 (also in the Book of Leinster), and in the poem Athair cáich, coimsid nime in recensions B and C (e.g. in the Book of Lecan).

The prose version is extant in eight manuscripts. The various versions derive from a common exemplar which is dated ca. 1147–1169. It is based on the metrical version, but contains certain additions and alterations. It also includes Coba, Olla, Oliba / Oilíua, and Olibina / Oilíuana as the wives of Noah and his three sons. In four manuscripts, the Books of Uí Maine, Ballymote, and Lecan, and Trinity College Dublin, MS 1336 (H.3.17), an extensive section on a number of famous women is added from biblical and classical tradition.[45] The version in the Book of Uí Maine is the most extensive one, and enumerates six wives or concubines of Priam, king of Troy, of whom only Hecuba (mother of Hector and others) is firmly established in classical tradition. Among the others we find a woman with an Irish name which all four versions include:

(Book of Lecan 203rb42–43) Scothlia i*ngen* Scail Bailb a hI*ni*s Cirr, *chuma*l aili do Priai*m*, m*athai*r .u. m*ac* do P*riaim*.

(Book of Ballymote 282b35–36) Scoit*h*lia i*ngen* Scail Bailb a hInis Scirr, *cuma*l ele do P*riaim*, m*athai*r .u. m*ac* do P*riaim*.

(TCD MS 1336, 870.35–36) Scotlia *cuma*l i*ngen* Scail Bailb a hI*ni*s Scir, m*athai*r .u. m*ac* do P*riaim*.

(Book of Uí Maine 39rb15–17) Scota ing*en* Scail Bailb a hInis Scir, cuma*l*, m*athai*r .x. m*ac* eili do Priai*m*. Badar carat-ban eili ag Priai*m* a n-egmais Hecuba.[46]

(Lecan/Ballymote/TCD 1336) Scot(h)lia daughter of Scál Balb at *Inis (S)cir(r)*, another bondmaid of Priam, was mother of five sons of Priam.

(Uí Maine) Scota daughter of Scál Balb at *Inis Scir*, a bondmaid, was mother of ten other sons of Priam. She was the other hearts-woman of Priam through the absence of Hecuba.

Scothlía is an Irish name and probably means "Flower-flood", although both *scoth* and *lía* can also have different meanings. *Scál Balb* can be translated as "Silent Phantom". The name occurs as the byname of Cian son of Dían Cecht of the Túatha Dé Danann,[47] and in other contexts, but none of

---

[44] Gilla Mo Dutu, Adam óen-athair na nduine, ed. Best/O'Brien 3, 533–562; The Ban-Shenchus [poetic version] (ed. Margaret Dobbs, in: Revue celtique 47 [1930]) 282–339; Gilla Mo Dutu, Éri ógh, inis na náemh, ed. Macalister 5, 540–564, on the Christian kings of Ireland is incorporated in Lebor Gabála recension C (ibid. 5, 412, 414).

[45] Muireann Ní Bhrolcháin, The manuscript tradition of the Banshenchas, in: Ériu 33 (1982) 109–135, at 127.

[46] Cf. The Ban-Shenchus [prose version] (ed. Margaret Dobbs, in: Revue celtique 48 [1931]) 163–234, at 166 (Book of Lecan) and 203 (Book of Uí Maine), the author's translations. It may seem that *cumal, mathair* is a corruption of *cumail aili do Priaim, mathair* as found in the Books of Lecan and Ballymote, but in previous entries in the Book of Uí Maine the same construction is used.

[47] Lebor Gabála Érenn §311 (recensions M and A), §330 (B), ed. Macalister 4, 116, 148. Perhaps *Inis (S)cir(r)* "Island of (S)cir(r)" refers to Circe, the mother of Latinus, whose father was Odysseus or his son Telemachos according to Greek tradition, see Servius, In Vergilii I, 273 and XII, 164, ed. Thilo 1, 102 and 2, 594; Hyginus, Fabulae 127 (ed. Herbert Jennings Rose, Leiden 1933, repr. 1963) 94 and notes. According to Pompieus Trogus as quoted in Justinus, Epitoma 43, 1, ed. Seel 290, Latinus was the son of Hercules and the daughter of Faunus; see further Der Neue Pauly, Enzyklopädie der Antike 6, ed. Hubert Cancik/Helmuth Schneider (Stuttgart/Weimar 1999) 1176. Imtheachta Aeniasa line

them pertaining to the Irish origin legend.[48] The longer version of the entry in the Book of Uí Maine names her *Scota* (a meaningful name in this context), states that she had ten rather than five sons, and grants her extra prestige by claiming that she was Priam's chief concubine. While not directly related to the main discussion, the entry exemplifies the attraction classical literature exercized on those who worked on aspects of the Irish origin legend. It also sets the version of the Book of Uí Maine apart form the other three. This is also the case in a subsequent entry, which deals with Lavinia:

(Book of Lecan 203rb46–48) Laui*na* i*n*gen Laidi*n* m*eic* Puin, b*ean* Aeniasa isan Edail. Ba b*ean* do Ascan iar n-eg Aenias. Laui*na* m*athai*r Niuil.[49]

(Book of Ballymote 282b38–40) Lauina i*n*gen Laidi*n* m*eic* P*h*uin, be*n* Aenias isan Edail. Ba be*n* do Asca*n* ia*r* n-ég Aenias. Lauina isid*he* m*athai*r Íuili.

(TCD MS 1336, 870.37–38) Laui*na* i*n*gen Laiti*n* m*eic* Pui*n*, be*n* Aeniasa isi*n* Etail. Ba ben do Ascan m*eic* Aeniasa. Laui*na* do bi side (?) m*athai*r Niuil.

(Book of Uí Maine 39rb23–26) Labina ing*en* Laidin m*eic* P*h*uin, bean eili Ainiasa. Is a*n*d deccnul. Ro bi sen m*athai*r Siluines m*eic* Ainiasa 7 fa bea*n* do Asgan hi iar n-eg Ainuasa. Laibina ro bi sen m*athai*r Giule m*eic* Asscan m*eic* Aimiasa [*sic*].[50]

(Lecan/Ballymote) Lavinia daughter of Latinus son of Faunus, wife of Aeneas in Italy. She was wife of Ascanius after the death of Aeneas. (That) Lavinia [was] mother of Nél (Iulus).

(TCD 1336) Lavinia daughter of Latinus son of Faunus, wife of Aeneas in Italy. She was wife of Ascanius son of Aeneas. That Lavinia was mother of Nél.

(Uí Maine) Lavinia daughter of Latinus son of Faunus, the other wife of Aeneas. It is then/there Nél/Iulus dies (?). She was the mother of Silvius son of Aeneas and she was wife of Ascanius after the death of Aeneas. Lavinia was the mother of Iulus son of Ascanius son of Aeneas.

Again we see that the Book of Uí Maine contains a longer entry, in which Lavinia is regarded as the mother of Silvius son of Aeneas and Iulus son of Ascanius son of Aeneas. The version also contains several odd spellings, and includes the line *is and deccnul*, which may be restored to *is and d'écc Nul [=Nél]* "It is then/there Nél dies". A further possibility is that *Nul* is a corruption of *Iuil*. The short version in TCD 1336, which has the less modernized spelling, gives correctly *Niūil* as the genitive of *Nél*. It differs slightly from the versions in the Books of Lecan and Ballymote, but that last manuscript has Lavinia as the mother of Iulus (*mathair Iuili*) rather than mother of Nél (*mathair Niuil*). The two names were thus prone to be mixed up. Let us first consider the place of Iulus in the Irish tradition, before we turn to Nél.

The reading in the Book of Ballymote is supported by the Irish prose translation of Vergil's Aeneid, Imtheachta Aeniasa, which has been preserved in the Book of Ballymote and King's Inn Ms. 13 of about a century later. It has been dated to the first half of the twelfth century on linguistic grounds.[51] The final section of Imtheachta Aeniasa states that after Turnus' death Aeneas entered

---

1461 (ed. George Calder, Imtheachta Aeniasa: The Irish Aeneid, Irish Texts Society 6, London 1907) 92, refers to *Cirece ingen grene* "Circe daughter of the sun". This tract is further discussed below.

[48] Scál Balb is listed as the mother of Bani or Baine, the wife of Tuathal Techtmar, a legendary forefather of the Uí Néill, who were the most powerful Irish dynasty of the early medieval period, see Ban-Shenchus [poetic version], ed. Dobbs 299; Ban-Shenchus [prose version], ed. Dobbs 175 (which adds that Baine was also mother of Cumall, the father of the legendary hero Finn), 211. In a poem about how Cruachán Aigle (Croaghpatrick) received its name, Scál Balb appears as the daughter of Clíara of Spain, see The Metrical Dindsenchas (ed. Edward J. Gwynn, Todd Lecture Series 8–11, Dublin 1903–1924) 4, 280. Her son is named as Luat. The genealogies of Corcu Loígde of Munster refer to the supernatural son of Scál Balb of the Fir Ol nÉcmacht (ancient inhabitants of Connacht) or the king of the Cruithentúath (British) and Man, see Geineuluch Chorcu Luidhe (ed. John O'Donovan, Geineuluch Chorcu Luidhe; Genealogy of Corco Laidhe, in: Miscellany of the Celtic Society, ed. John O'Donovan [Dublin 1849]) 1–140, at 24.

[49] Ban-Shenchus [prose version], ed. Dobbs 167; the author's translation. The text has *niuil*, but this should not be read as *nIuil*, since *máthair* in the nominative is not followed by nasalization.

[50] Ban-Shenchus [prose version], ed. Dobbs 203; the author's translation.

[51] Isabel Kobus, Imtheachta Aeniasa: Aeneis-Rezeption im irischen Mittelalter, in: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 47 (1995) 76–86, at 78–79; cf. Diego Poli, L'Eneide nella cultura irlandese antica, in: Letterature Comparate. Problemi et Metodo. Studi in Onore di Ettore Paratore 3: Letterature Medievali e Moderne, ed. Manlio/Guiseppina Simonetti (Bologna 1981) 997–1012, at 1002. This date agrees well with that of similar material preserved in both and other manu-

into a marriage alliance with Latinus by taking Lavinia as his wife. After having ruled Italy for three years he died, and afterwards Lavinia gave birth to his son Silvius. Ascanius then ruled Italy for 28 years. He also married Lavinia, and they had a son, named Iulus (*Ilus*).[52] The Ascanius in question was the son of Aeneas, who had fled with his father and mother Creusa from Troy.[53]

The four manuscript versions of the independent tract inserted in the prose Ban Shenchus cite Vergil (*Fergil*) as their source in maintaining that Ascanius was born from Aeneas' wife Creusa at Troy. Yet other aspects of their entry on Lavinia disagree with the Vergilian tradition, notably that Lavinia married Ascanius after Aeneas' death, and that Iulus was their son (or at least the son of Lavinia). The final section of Imtheachta Aeniasa gives the same information, together with the notion that Silvius (Postumus) was born after Aeneas' death. This last tradition is also in Lebor Bretnach, the eleventh-century Gaelic translation of a version of the 'Nennian' recension of the Historia Brittonum.[54] It confusingly says that after the death of Latinus Aeneas took the kingship of the Latins "and the city was founded, i.e. Alba Longa by Ascanius son of Aeneas, and he took a wife and she bore him a son, i.e. Silvius" (*⁊ rocumdaiged in cathair .i. Albalonga la h-Ascan mac Aenias ⁊ tucastair seitig ⁊ ruc mac do .i. Silbius*).[55] It is not immediately clear whether Aeneas or Ascanius took a wife who was the mother of Silvius, and this may have led to various interpretations. Yet it is unlikely that Lebor Bretnach was the direct source for the Irish tradition surrounding Lavinia and Ascanius, since it omits any mention of Iulus or the posthumous birth of Silvius. When we turn to Lebor Bretnach's main source text, the Historia Brittonum, we are again confronted by confusion and contradictions. The Historia Brittonum is a British text which was drafted in 829/30. Currently five recensions are distinguished. The 'Harleian' recension, which is generally regarded as containing the closest rendering of the original, and the 'Vatican' recension of 944 are notably different in their treatment of the whole question of who descended from Aeneas and Ascanius.[56] While the posthumous birth of Silvius is spoken of, especially in the 'Vatican' recension, Iulus, as son of either Aeneas or Ascanius, is again absent.

It is possible that the noted uncertainties were already part of one of the sources of the Historia Brittonum, the Annales Romanorum, which are cited in the Collectio canonum Hibernensis of the

---

scripts, for which see John Ellis Caerwyn Williams/Patrick K. Ford, The Irish Literary Tradition (Cardiff/Belmont-Massachusetts 1992) 135–136; Barbara Hillers, Ulysses and the judge of truth: sources and meanings in the Irish Odyssey, in: Peritia 13 (1999) 194–223, at 201–202 discusses how Imtheachta Aeniasa influenced Merugud Uilixis meic Leirtis, the Irish rendering of a story about Ulysses.

[52] Imtheachta Aeniasa lines 3206–3213, ed. Calder 200. Note that this text also has the section on Dido daughter of Belus, rendered in Irish as Dido ingen Beoil at lines 299, 377 and 721 (ibid. 20, 24 and 46) but once Dido ingen Peil line 324 (ibid. 20), whose father may have been confused with the father of Ninus mac Peil/Bel (see §3 and §5 above); cf. Servius, In Vergilii I 642 and 729, ed. Thilo I 185 and 203, where Belus the father of Dido is identified as *primus rex Assyriorum*.

[53] Imtheachta Aeniasa line 571, ed. Calder 36. On this matter, see also Erich Poppe, A New Introduction to Imtheachta Aeniasa (Irish Texts Society Subsidiary Series 3, Dublin 1995).

[54] See David N. Dumville, Historia Brittonum: an insular history from the Carolingian age, in: Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter, ed. Anton Scharer/Georg Scheibelreiter (VIÖG 32, Wien/München 1994) 406–434; Thomas Owen Clancy, Scotland, the 'Nennian' recension of the Historia Brittonum, and the Lebor Bretnach, in: Kings, Clerics and Chronicles in Scotland, 500–1297. Essays in Honour of Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson on the Occasion of her Ninetieth Birthday, ed. Simon Taylor (Dublin 2000) 87–107.

[55] Lebor Bretnach §8 (ed. Anton G. van Hamel, The Irish Version of the Historia Britonum Ascribed to Nennius, Dublin 1932) 15; the author's translation. The tract is found, among others, in the Books of Uí Maine, Ballymote and Lecan; a fragment is in Lebor na hUidre (ca. 1100). The parentage of Silvius is discussed in other parts of Lebor Bretnach, but these are left out for the sake of brevity. They do not affect the argument as presented below.

[56] Historia Brittonum 8–11 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH AA 11, Berlin 1894) 111–222, at 149–153; see also Ferdinand Lot, Nennius et l'Historia Brittonum (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. Sciences historiques et philologiques 263, Paris 1934) 17–19, for discussion; his edition of the relevant text is at 153–155, chapters 10–11; Historia Brittonum, Vatican recension 4–5 (ed. David N. Dumville, The Historia Brittonum 3. The 'Vatican' Recension, Cambridge 1985) 64f. The development of the classical tradition about Aeneas and his successors in the medieval period still needs to be established.

early eighth century and in what can be called the Irish section in the Historia Brittonum.[57] Roman historians were not of one mind about the exact relationship between the first ancestors of the Latins, Albans and Romans. Vergil states that Ascanius Iulus, who founded Alba Longa, was the son of Aeneas and Creusa, and that in Italy Lavinia and Aeneas had a son named Silvius.[58] Livy states that Ascanius (Iulus) was the son of Aeneas and Lavinia (or Creusa), who left their son Silvius 'born in the woods' in the care of his (step)mother; Ascanius founded Alba Longa.[59] The story of Servius' posthumous birth is already noted by Gellius and Servius.[60] It is also found in summary in the Chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome, in which Aeneas is succeeded by Ascanius, who reigned for 38 years, founded Alba Longa and raised his (half-)brother Silvius Postumus. Ascanius himself had a son called Iulus from whom the Iulii descended, but because of his youth it was Silvius who succeeded Ascanius.[61]

Here we find both the story of Silvius' posthumous birth and Iulus son of Ascanius, but nothing about a marriage between Lavinia and Ascanius, which appears to be based on a wrong interpretation in a complex issue.[62] It seems that the Irish tradition about Aeneas, Lavinia, Ascanius, Iulus and Silvius came from the Chronicle of Eusebius/Jerome or one related to it (such as the Annales Romanorum) and/or a particular recension of the Historia Brittonum. It has been argued above that it did not depend directly on Lebor Bretnach, since that text does not contain the other peculiarities of the Irish tradition. For another argument in favour of this interpretation we turn to the Life of St Cathróe of Metz of the early 980s. It contains a brief version of the Irish origin legend, relating how a group of Greeks want to cross over to Thracia. Through a storm they are blown to the Irish shores. They land near Cruachan Éli (Croaghpatrick, co. Mayo), where they find the region inhabited by the Picts (*gentem Pictaneorum*), whom they defeat. The island is called Scotia, after Scota, the Egyptian wife of the Spartan commander Nel or Niul son of Aeneas.[63]

The account confuses Aeneas with Fénius, the father of Nél who married Scota according to all the Lebor Gabála recensions. He is here curiously depicted as a Spartan commander, which may reflect the Greek dimension of the Irish origin legend.

Since the text also regards Nél as the son of Aeneas, the confusion between Nél and Iulus already existed in the 980s, long before Lebor Bretnach was written. Hence the latter text is not the source

[57] Collectio canonum Hibernensis 63:2b (ed. Hermann Wasserschleben, Die irische Kanonensammlung, Leipzig ²1885) 230: *In annalibus Romanorum* on St Peter, followed by an entry from *in chronicis*; Historia Brittonum 10, ed. Mommsen 149: *In annalibus autem Romanorum sic scriptum est.* This matter is discussed in Thomas Charles-Edwards, The Arthur of history, in: The Arthur of the Welsh. The Arthurian Legend in Medieval Welsh Literature, ed. Rachel Bromwich/Alfred O. H. Jarman/Brynley F. Roberts (Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages 1, Cardiff 1991) 15–32, at 16f.; David Dumville, Historia Brittonum 408.

[58] See especially Vergil, Aeneid I, 267–271, II, 597–598, V, 597, VI, 763–766, VIII, 48 (ed. Henry Rushton Fairclough, Vergil, Loeb Classical Library 63–64, London/Cambridge-Massachusetts ²1956) 1, 258–260, 334, 484, 558; ibid. 2, 62.

[59] Livy, Ab Urbe condita 1, 1–3 (ed. Benjamin O. Foster, Livy I, books I–II, Loeb Classical Library 114, London/Cambridge-Massachusetts 1919, repr. 1976) 8–16; Servius, In Vergilii I, 7 and VI, 760, ed. Thilo 1, 13 and 2, 107–108, disagrees with Livy. For the (indirect) use of Livy in Ireland, see Philip M. Freeman, A Middle-Irish version of the Romulus and Remus story, in: Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium 11 (1991) 1–13.

[60] Aulus Gellius, Noctes Atticae II, 16 (ed. Peter K. Marshall, Oxford 1968) 1, 202–204; Servius, In Vergilii VI, 763, ed. Thilo 2, 108; both interpret Vergil, Aeneid, VI, 763, ed. Fairclough 1, 558: *Silvius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles.*

[61] Jerome, Chronicon, Anno Abrahae 842–880, ed. Helm 62b–64b.

[62] On the Trojan ancestry of the Gauls or the Gaulish tribes of the Arverni and Haedui in the first centuries BC and AD in the context of their alliance with Rome, see Zeidler, Eigenständige keltische Ursprungsmythen? 16–17. This may have stood at the basis for an adoption of a Trojan-Latin origin by the British as well.

[63] Todd, The Irish Version 225–226 note a; David N. Dumville, St Cathróe of Metz and the hagiography of exoticism, in: Studies in Irish Hagiography. Saints and Scholars, ed. John Carey/Máire Herbert/Pádraig Ó Riain (Dublin 2001) 172–188, at 172–176, gives the text from the first five chapters of the Life of St Cathróe as printed in Acta sanctorum Hiberniae 1 (ed. John Colgan, Louvain 1645, repr. Dublin 1948) 494–507, and argues that the internal dating agrees with the contents of the text. For Hebrew maidens being blown to Ireland by a storm, see the Book of Lecan 181va8–41 (ed. Vernam Hull, The Milesian invasion of Ireland, in: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 19 [1932]) 155–160; for the region near Croaghpatrick as the landing place of the Túatha Dé Danann, see Lebor Gabála Érenn §306 (recensions M and A), §321 (B), §358 (C), ed. Macalister 4, 108, 140, 170.

of this confusion, but rather expresses similar uncertainties as in the Historia Brittonum and even among Roman historians. In other words, various Irish texts give evidence of a tradition in which the genealogiocal relationships between Aeneas and his wives and their descendants had already been mixed up. The readings in the Ban Shenchus (BS) in the Book of Lecan and TCD 1336 come after the statement that Lavinia was married with Ascanius, and combined with the confusion between Iulus and Nél, the following development can be postulated:

Iulus son of Lavinia wife of Ascanius (BS Ballymote, BS Uí Maine, Imtheachta Aeniasa) >
Nél son of Lavinia wife of Ascanius / Nél son of Lavinia (BS TCD 1336, BS Lecan) >
Nél son of Lavinia wife of Aeneas (cf. is and d'écc Nul BS Uí Maine?) >
Nél son of Aeneas (Life of St Cathróe)

If this interpretation is correct, the "Nel or Niul son of Aeneas" in the Life of St Cathróe comes last in the development. It follows that the confusion between Iulus and Nél dates from before the 980s, even if the tracts in which it is found are generally dated to the twelfth century. Hence it seems probable that the Historia Brittonum or older sources stand at the basis of the characteristics of the Irish tradition. It is this tradition which subsequently gave rise to the association between Nél and Aeneas. However, this is only part of a more extensive scheme of relationships.

7. THE WIFE OF FÉNIUS

In §5 above we have discussed the confusion of Latinus father of Lavinia, wife of Aeneas, and Latinus at the Tower of Babel, as we find it in Auraicept na nÉces tract IV and criticized in Lebor Gabála recension B. And just as the daughter of Latinus married Aeneas and/or Ascanius, and had a son called Iulus, corrupted to Nél, so we find that the daughter of Latinus of the Tower married Fénius, who also had a son called Nél.

The poetic version of the Ban Shenchus begins with the women in biblical history, including the wives of Noah and his three sons, and then continues:

> *Ingen luchair Latin Belait; ben Feiniusa Farsaid find.*
> *dóib ropo mac Nél na nóidin; Nél ba hathair Gaedil grind.*
> *bás Belbrati rofes feli; do thes na gréni sin glind.*
> *Scotta ingen Fhoraind bladmair; ben Niuil mathair Gaedil Glais …*

> Belait, radiant daughter of Latinus, was wife of fair Fénius Farsaid;
> they had a son Nél of the infants; Nél was father of pleasant Góedel;
> the death of Belbrait, from the heat of the sun in the glen, is known in poetry.
> Scota daughter of famous Pharaoh was wife of Nél (and) mother of Góedel Glas …[64]

The last line does not make clear which recension of Lebor Gabála was used by Gilla Mo Dutu, but Bel(br)ait is not found in the prose versions of the Ban Shenchus. The author claims to cite from poetry, and this may refer to a short poem found in tract II of Auraicept na nÉces:

> *Bellat mathair Niu[i]l neimnigh; do chloind Laitin langeimligh;*
> *fuair bas i llo grene glain; cele Feniusa Farsaidh.*

> Bellat mother of envenomed Nél; of the children of full-fettered Latinus
> died on a bright day of the sun; spouse of Fénius Farsaid.[65]

The textual relationship between Nél son of Aeneas/Ascanius and Lavinia daughter of Latinus on the one hand and Nél son of Fénius and Belait/Bellat daughter of Latinus on the other is too close to be coincidental, even if they are concerned with different chronologies. In both cases Nél is

---

[64] Gilla Mo Dutu, Adam óen-athair na nduine, in the Book of Leinster 136b40–43, ed. Best/O'Brien 3, 534; Ban-Shenchus [poetic version], ed. Dobbs 290; the author's translation, based on ibid. 317.

[65] Auraicept na nÉces lines 801–804, ed. Calder 60. The version in the Yellow Book of Lecan reads: *Bellat mathair Niuil neimhnigh; do claind Laidin langeimligh; fuair bas a lo greine glain; ceile Feniusa Farsaidh*, lines 3618–3621; ibid. 213.

a son of the daughter of Latinus. We can be certain that the placement of Latinus in the period of the building of the Tower of Babel is secondary, and the cause of the confusion between the two. It is therefore likely that the genealogical configuration involving Lavinia and Aeneas was applied to the new period and hence to Fénius, whose name happens to resemble that of Aeneas very closely. To further this line of inquiry, it is necessary to discuss other texts which deal with the wife of Fénius, who is nowhere else identified as the daughter of Latinus. The background of her death from the heat of the sun is uniquely revealed in the glosses to the poem Apraid a éolchu Elga by Eochaid Éolach Ua Céirín (ca. 1050). They state that Belait died after Fénius had killed her lover Iar mac Nema with the jaw-bone of a camel. Fénius himself died five days later from a drink of forgetfullness, and was buried to the north of the plain of Shinar (*Mag Senair*), since he did not want to be buried with Iar in the city of Epithena (*i nEipithena ciuitate*).[66]

The deaths of Belait and Iar mac Nema, from the heat of the sun and by the jaw-bone of a camel respectively, find a parallel in Irish biblical tradition. The death of Ham in Sliab Rafan (Paphlagonian Mountains) from the heat of the sun (*do thes grene*) is related in Lebor Gabála recension C as preserved in the Book of Lecan, and the slaying of Abel by Cain with the bone of a camel in Lebor Gabála recension A.[67] The poem Athair cáich, coimsid Nime in recensions B and C refers to the death of Ham in Sliab Rafan and the slaying of Abel by Cain with "a guilty jaw-bone of a camel" (*lecain cintaing in chamuill*). It also mentions the presence of Latinus at the Tower of Babel, thus combining the two strands. Belait or the like does not appear, but the poet refers to Fénius' school 'in the city of Ibitena' (*sin chathraig Ibitena/Hebotena*) in the plain of Shinar.[68] As with the wives of Noah and his three sons, we may be dealing here with non-biblical information about the forefathers of the human race which found its way into the Irish origin legend. The story of Belait and Fénius thus appears to be based on borrowed motifs, and this includes the references to Eipithena or Ibitena/Ebotena in the plain of Shinar.

Iar mac Nema, Belait's lover who was slain by Fénius, appears in tract IV of the Auraicept as one of its authors, besides Fénius and Góedel mac Ethiuir. The tract states that it was invented in Dacia (*i nDacia*) or Asia (*a nAisia*),[69] or otherwise in the plain of Shinar (*i mmaigh Sennair*), and further adds that the alphabets were invented on one table (see §5 above). *Mag Senair* is certainly to be identified as the land Shinar (*terra Sennaar*), which in Genesis 10:10 is in the lands ruled by Nimrod. The connection between Belait and Shinar is already present in Sanas Chormaic "Cormac's Glossary", attributed to the bishop-king of Cashel, Cormac mac Cuilennáin (†908). The woman's name *Baulúan* is taken to derive from *Babilon*, where the languages of the world were confused at the Tower in the plain of Shinar (*i mag Senair*).[70] This etymology would not have been included if there had not been an Irish element to it, so it is likely that *Baulúan* is related to *Belait/Bellat*, the wife of Fénius, although it is not clear which name is the original one, even if Cormac's derivations

---

[66] Eochaid Ua Céirín, Apraid a éolchu Elga §§1–3 (ed. Rudolf Thurneysen, Das Gedicht der vierzig Fragen von Eochaid ua Cérín, in: Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie 13 [1921]) 130–136, at 131.

[67] Lebor Gabála Érenn §231, ed. Macalister 3, 36 (only in the Book of Lecan, recension C). The death by a jaw-bone of a camel has a parallel with the story of the slaying of Cain as found in Lebor Gabála recension A (the ms is unclear at this place): "Cain slew his brother Abel … with a bone of a camel (*lasin (?) cnaim chamaill*) as learned men say. (In this manner?) began the kin-slayings of the world"; the version in the Book of Fermoy (15th/16th century) is somewhat different (*co fid cnama camaill*); see Lebor Gabála Érenn §6, ed. Macalister 1, 18. For this tradition in Anglo-Saxon and English medieval texts and illustrations from at least the eleventh century onwards, and its association with Samson's killing of the Philistines in Judges 15:15, see George Henderson, Cain's jaw-bone, in: Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 24 (1961) 108–114; Alphons A. Barb, Cain's murder-weapon and Samson's jawbone of an ass, in: ibid. 35 (1972) 386–389; James Edwin Cross, On Hiberno-Latin texts and Anglo-Saxon writings, in: The Scriptures and Early Medieval Ireland. Proceedings of the 1993 Conference of the Society for Hiberno-Latin Studies on Early Irish Exegesis and Homeletics, ed. Thomas O'Loughlin (Instrumenta Patristica 31, Turnhout 1999) 69–76, at 73.

[68] See Lebor Gabála Érenn poem V §42, §20, §48, §53, ed. Macalister 1, 188, 180, 192, 194.

[69] Auraicept na nÉces line 1105, ed. Calder 82, and line 4139 (Yellow Book of Lecan), ibid. 229.

[70] Sanas Cormaic in the Yellow Book of Lecan §116 (ed. Kuno Meyer, Sanas Cormaic: an Old-Irish glossary, in: Anecdota from Irish manuscripts 4 [(1912]) 1–128, at 12. This tract is discussed in Paul Russell, The sounds of a silence: the growth of Cormac's Glossary, in: Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies 15 (1988) 1–30. See also Lebor Gabála Érenn §136 (recension C), ed. Macalister 2, 46.

makes sense in the story of the invention of the Gaelic language after the confusion of tongues at Babel. The alternative tradition places this event in Dacia, Asia or in the city of Epithena (*i nEipithena ciuitate*) or the like. The situation of the last place becomes clear when we turn to Auraicept na nÉces tract I, which can be summarized as follows:

When the 72 languages of the world were formed by God in order to confuse the men building the Tower, poets (*filid*) from Scythia, led by the sage (*sai*) Fénius, came to the plain of Shinar (*Mag Seannair*) to learn them. But the poets did not learn enough, so for seven years they dispersed all over the world to become acquainted with them, while Fénius was teaching at the Tower.

… His pupils asked Fénius to construct a language from all the languages of the world for their exclusive use, and so he invented Gaelic and its five sub-divisions, together with Iar mac Nema and Góedel mac Ethiuir "at the city of Eotena or Athens" (*apud Eotenam uel Athena ciuitatem*).

… Others say that the alphabet (*aipgitir*) was invented "in Achaid" (*isin Achaidh*).[71]

We can now establish that *i nEipithena ciuitate* in Apraid a éolchu Elga refers to *apud Eotenam uel Athena ciuitatem*, which occurs in a vernacular section of Auraicept na nÉces tract I. The last reading can be compared with the contention by Isidore that Greece, where the city of Athens (*Athenae ciuitas*) was situated, was the mother of the liberal letters and philosophy.[72] However, tract I also refers to *isind Achaidh* (also *issin Aisia*) and *i ndAchia* (also *a nAisia*) and tract IV *i nDacia* (also *a nAisia*). This may refer to Achaia or Greece (or Asia or Dacia), rather than Accad, which in Genesis 10:10 is situated in the land Shinar (*Archad … in terra Sennaar*).[73] Apparently, the two traditions were mixed up, so that in the glosses to the poem Apraid a éolchu Elga *i nEipithena ciuitate* is situated near the plain of Shinar. Hence a geographical displacement seems to have occurred in which Athens in Greece as the place where the Gaelic language was invented was corrupted to a city called *Eotena/Hebotena/Epithena/Ibitena* in the plain of Shinar near the Tower of Nimrod.[74] In conclusion, we can regard the story of Fénius and Belait (variously spelled) as having developed from the deaths from the heat of the sun and by a camel-bone known from apocryphal tradition, and the confusion between Latinus of Italy and Latinus of the Tower, and between Athens / Achaia and Mag Sinar – both elements which linked it to the story of the confusion of tongues at the building of the Tower of Babel.

8. CONCLUSION

In about the middle of the seventh century the probably Irish grammarian and self-proclaimed philosopher Virgilius Maro Grammaticus discusses the origin of the term 'Latin' (*Latinitas*). He writes that some think that the Latin language is named after Latinus *quidem fuit anneus* ('who was aged'), who lived for two centuries. But this Latinus was a contemporary of king Belus who lived long before the division of the languages, so that it is impossible to think that Latin derived its name from him. As an alternative he proposes that it comes from 'latitudo' (*ex latitudine*), 'longitude, broadness', instead, citing his master Aeneas as an authority.[75]

---

[71] Auraicept na nÉces lines 104–214, 250–251, ed. Calder 8–16, 20. On the five sub-divisions of Gaelic modelled on the division of Greek, see Jaski, We are of the Greeks 10–11.

[72] At Auraicept na nÉces, xxxiii, Calder refers to Isidore, Etymologiae XIV, 4, 10 and VIII, 11, 84; see Isidore, Etymologiae I, 3, ed. Lindsay, on writing and the Greek letters deriving from the Hebrews and Phoenicians.

[73] Auraicept na nÉces line 251, ed. Calder 20 (cf. line 2571, ibid. 180); line 338, ibid. 30 (cf. line 2771, ibid. 186); and note 69 above. The reading *Asia* is favoured in the later recension in the Yellow Book of Lecan (cf. §5 above).

[74] The last two forms are in Lebor Gabála Érenn poem V §53, ed. Macalister 1, 194 (see above). Compare the reference to Calcanensis as the place of origin (Auraicept na nÉces lines 42–45, ed. Calder 4), which is Chalanne or Seleucia (which can also be located in the Shinar), see Isidore, Etymologiae XV, 1, 13, ed. Lindsay.

[75] Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, Epitomae I, 42 (ed. Dominique Tardi, Les Epitomae de Virgile de Toulouse, essai de traduction critique; avec une bibliographie, une introduction et des notes, Paris 1928) 39, who reads *quidem fuit Aeneus*; for discussion, see Vivien Law, Serious aspects of the wordplay of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, in: L'heritage des grammariens latins de l'Antiquité aux Lumières. Actes de Colloque de Chantilly, 2–4 septembre 1987, ed. Irène Rosier (Paris/Louvain 1988) 121–131, at 125; eadem, Wisdom, Authority and Grammar in the Seventh Century: Decoding

Confusion about the identity of Latinus, the eponymous ancestor of the Latins and their language, seems to have been a long-standing tradition in Ireland, if not elsewhere. The basis for the present article has been the confusion between Latinus of Italy, the father-in-law of Aeneas, and Iulus son of (Ascanius son of) Aeneas on the one hand, and Latinus of the Tower of Babel, the father-in-law of Fénius, and Nél son of (Lavinia wife of Ascanius or) Aeneas on the other. In the extant sources this confusion is entwined with biblical material, in which apocryphal stories and secondary interpretations are particularly evident. We have seen that eponymous ancestors such as Latinus, Grecus, Hispanius and Persius were regarded as grandsons of Noah in the main text of Lebor Gabála recensions M and A. In the poem Athair cáich, coimsid nime in Lebor Gabála recensions B and C, and in Auraicept na nÉces, Latinus and other eponymous ancestors are present at the confusion of tongues. Latinus is regarded as the father of Bel(br)ait/Bellat, the wife of Fénius and mother of Nél, in the poetic Ban Shenchus and in a short poem in Auraicept na nÉces. Her death by the heat of the sun is also related in glosses to another poem, which also mentions the death of her lover Iar mac Nema at the hand of Fénius with the jaw-bone of a camel. Fénius is buried in the city of Eipithena in the plain of Shinar. The manner in which Iar and Belait die is borrowed from an apocryphal tradition about the deaths of Abel and Ham. The poem Athair cáich, coimsid nime refers to both these events, as well as to the city of Ibitena/Hebotena and to the names of the wives of Noah and his sons, which are also found in Lebor Gabála, the Ban Shenchus and other tracts related to the origin legend. It has been argued that the city of Eipithena (variously spelled) is a corruption of the city of Athens, as found in Auraicept na nÉces. The names of the wives of Noah and his sons also appear in the Liber de Numeris of the eighth century, and it is possible that the apocryphal tradition about the deaths of Abel and Ham also derives from an earlier tradition. This tradition was also known in Anglo-Saxon England in about the same period.[76]

The Ban Shenchus shows a scribal confusion between Iulus and Nél, which is probably also exemplified in the late tenth-century Life of St Cathróe. Together with the last part of Imtheachta Aeniasa they contain a peculiar version of the relationship between Aeneas, Lavinia, Ascanius and Silvius, which does not derive directly from Vergil. Disagreements on these matters is also displayed in the various recensions of the Historia Brittonum, and may even go back to the Annales Romanorum (which were known in Ireland) and the Eusebian tradition about the destruction of Troy and the first kings of the forefathers of the Romans. Here, too, we may postulate an eighth-century tradition, now lost, which contained the roots of this confusion.

That Latinus the father-in-law of Aeneas did not belong in the Tower of Babel is argued in the passage in Lebor Gabála recension B §17 and in Auraicept na nÉces. Both versions show several degrees of corruption, which can be related to Annálad anall uile and the textual tradition of Lebor Gabála recensions M and A. This situation is the by-product of an attempt to combine various traditions which probably had been independent before. At this stage, the partially conflicting opinions about world history and its chronology of Eusebius and his followers and Bede were already misunderstood by Irish scholars. Hence they were not able to solve the chonological contradictions in the various versions of their own origin legend.

In discussing this material, a number of manuscripts keep reappearing, especially the Books of Ballymote, Lecan and Uí Maine from Connacht, and a number of tracts which are often found in all of them, such as Auraicept na nÉces, the poem Athair cáich, coimsid nime in Lebor Gabála recensions B and C, and the Ban-Shenchus. Additionally, the Book of Ballymote contains Imtheachta Aeniasa and the chronological tract Synchronisms B, both which are also relevant to the material

Virgilius Maro Grammaticus (Cambridge 1995) 13. On the identity and date of Virgilius, see Dáibhí Ó Cróinín, The date, provenance, and earliest use of the works of Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, in: Tradition und Wertung: Festschrift Franz Brunhölzl, ed. Günter Bernt/Fidel Rädle/Gabriel Silagi (Sigmaringen 1989) 13–22, repr. in id., Early Irish History and Chronology (Dublin 2003) 191–200.

[76] For a possible context, see Jane Stevenson, The Irish contribution to Anglo-Latin hermeneutic prose, in: Ogma. Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin, ed. Michael Richter/Jean-Michel Picard (Dublin 2002) 268–282; Cross, On Hiberno-Latin texts; Charles D. Wright, The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 6, Cambridge 1993).

under discussion. Their mutual relationship and their link with the (other) Lebor Gabála material is extremely complex and difficult to analyse. Much editorial work and comparisions between various texts still remain to be done. Apart from that, the question of the reception of classical literature in medieval Ireland and its effects is still in need of further study.[77] The present article shows that, as regards the introduction of Aeneas, Latinus, Lavinia and others into the medieval Irish literary tradition, it is still unclear how and when information about them was transmitted to the island. But our discussion indicates that certain Irish scholars had lost contact with their original source material, either because it was not available to them any more or because they chose to ignore it. If the arguments presented above are correct, this had already happened by the tenth and eleventh centuries, perhaps before new material with a classical background was redacted and translated into Irish. And this, in its turn, raises questions about the knowledge, intentions and make-up of Irish scholarly circles between the 'Golden Age' of ca. 650–750 and the spiritual and scholarly revival in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[78]

---

[77] The focus has maily been on the earlier period, see, for example, Michael W. Herren, Classical and secular learning among the Irish before the Carolingian renaissance, in: Florilegium 3 (1981) 118–157, repr. in id., Latin Letters in Early Christian Ireland (Aldershot 1996) 1–39; id., Literary and glossarial evidence for the study of classical mythology in Ireland, A.D. 600–800, in: Text and Gloss. Studies in Insular Language and Literature Presented to Joseph Donovan Pheifer, ed. Helen Conrad-O'Brien/Anne-Marie D'Arcy/John Scattergood (Dublin 1999) 49–67. For the later period, see, for example, Patrick K. Ford, Amazon dot Choin, in: Identifying the 'Celtic'. CSANA Yearbook 2, ed. Joseph Falaky Nagy (Dublin 2002) 100–110.

[78] Cf. Máire Herbert, The Life of Martin of Tours: a view from twelfth-century Ireland, in: Ogma. Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin, ed. Michael Richter/Jean-Michel Picard (Dublin 2002) 76–84, at 77–78; Bart Jaski, The genealogical section of the Psalter of Cashel, in: Peritia 17–18 (2003–04) 295–337, at 330–334.