

Published in *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 29 (2013), 244–81 (discussion, 244–52; letters, 253–67; references, 267–9; notes, 270–81). In this file footnotes are used rather than embedded notes and endnotes. Original page-numbers in square brackets.

LACHLAN CAMPBELL'S LETTERS TO EDWARD LHWYD, 1704–7

Compiling the first Irish–English dictionary, Edward Lhwyd (1659/60–1709) was conscious that he needed advice from people who could read and write Irish as well as speak the language. He made inquiries in both Ireland and Scotland, and he tells us that he submitted the dictionary in unbound sheets to three such readers in Ireland and three in Scotland. Of those one in each country responded with comments.¹ His adviser in Ireland was the learned antiquary Roderick O'Flaherty (1629–1716), of Park, in Cois Fhairrge, and Lhwyd's papers include a dozen folio sheets, forty-eight printed pages of the dictionary, marked up with comments by O'Flaherty.² In Scotland the person who responded with advice on Scottish Gaelic was Lachlan Campbell, a young Presbyterian minister from Campbeltown, whose five surviving letters to Lhwyd are printed here. Campbell had studied in Glasgow, where he was acquainted with Lhwyd's friend Robert Wodrow (1679–1734), named in the first letter. From the age of twenty-one

* The whole of Edward Lhwyd's surviving correspondence has been included, for the most part with images of the original letters, in the database Early Modern Letters Online hosted by the Bodleian Library (emlo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk), which holds some 1700 in-letters from his papers, left in the Ashmolean Museum at his death, some of which had been removed but were recovered from two sources by a later keeper of the museum. Together with other in-letters now preserved elsewhere, copies, and out-letters from addressees' papers, the correspondence amounts to 2100 letters. The letters have been transcribed by Helen Watt at the Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies, Aberystwyth, for the Mellon Foundation funded project Cultures of Knowledge, with assistance from experts in the various languages and subjects. My work on the O'Flaherty correspondence provides a case-study in exploiting this material. The present paper is precisely complementary to my discussion of O'Flaherty's reading the sheets of Lhwyd's Irish dictionary. I owe grateful thanks both to Helen Watt and to Angus Martin, Campbeltown, for his advice on Lachlan Campbell's family.

¹ This is reported in the Irish preface, Edward Lhwyd, *Archaeologia Britannica* (Oxford, 1707), 311; the policy is mentioned in the general preface, sig. c1r–v, but not the number of returns.

² Their correspondence is printed by Richard Sharpe, *Roderick O'Flaherty's Letters to William Molyneux, Edward Lhwyd, and Samuel Molyneux, 1696–1709* (Dublin, 2012). The critical reading of the Irish dictionary is discussed in some detail there, pp. 110–42.

Wodrow had charge of the university library in Glasgow, which included oversight of such museum collections as the university had at this date. Lhwyd was keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford and looked on Wodrow as his opposite number. Campbell and Lhwyd might have been able to meet, either in Glasgow towards the end of 1699 or when Lhwyd stayed near Campbeltown at the beginning of 1700, but Campbell's whereabouts at this time are unknown, and the indications are that no meeting took place. These letters are all that survive from their correspondence. At least two others are mentioned here, which were probably never received by Lhwyd. Nothing has been found from Lhwyd's side of the exchange.

Lachlan Campbell (1675–1707) was one of at least five children born to John Campbell (d. 1705), of Kildalloig, and his wife, Elizabeth, daughter of Lachlan MacNeill Buidhe (1611–1695), of Lossit House, near [245] Machrihanish, a tacksman of some substance.³ John Campbell was the chamberlain of Kintyre for many years in the service of the earl, later duke, of Argyll.⁴ Kintyre was by far the most profitable of the four divisions of the Argyll estate.⁵ Working here in this capacity we can probably assume that he was used to speaking both Gaelic and Scots. Lachlan had two older brothers. The eldest, Duncan Campbell, succeeded to their father's position and was in turn succeeded by his son James Campbell. The second brother, Dugald Campbell (c. 1670–1741), served for more than forty years as minister in the parish of Southend. He outlived his nephew and inherited his father's land at Kildalloig. A younger brother, Archibald Campbell, of Danna, served as sheriff clerk of Argyll. A sister Annabel would marry in 1717 Charles Stewart (1683–1765), minister of the first charge in Campbeltown.⁶ Lachlan was educated at the university in Glasgow and he is said to have served as a tutor in the household of Archibald Campbell (1658–1703), 10th earl of Argyll, who in 1701 became 1st duke of Argyll. In November and December 1700 we find Lachlan Campbell based in Edinburgh.⁷ On 4 February 1703

³ A. I. B. Stewart, 'Lachlan McNeill Buidhe', *Kintyre Magazine* 19 (Spring 1986), 15–19.

⁴ Information in this paragraph is drawn from H. Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae*, new edition (Edinburgh, 1915–28), iv. 50, 66. The principal source for this was the registers of the presbytery of Kintyre (*Fasti*, iv. 47), now in the National Records of Scotland, CH2/1153.

⁵ I rely here on the introduction to E. R. Cregeen, *Argyll Estate Instructions: Mull, Morvern, Tiree 1771–1805*, Scottish History Society 4th ser. 1 (1964).

⁶ There is a note on their children by A. I. B. Stewart, 'Sons of the highland manse', *Kintyre Magazine* 17 (Spring 1984).

⁷ He wrote to Robert Wodrow from Edinburgh on 21 November 1700 and the reply is addressed to him in Edinburgh, 'I need not speak of neuse to you, who lye at the fountain of all kinds of them': Wodrow to Campbell, 7 December 1700, printed from Wodrow's letter-book, EUL MS Laing III 355, by L. W. Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow, 1698–1709*, Scottish History

he was licensed to minister by the presbytery of Dunoon, and on 28 September 1703 he was ordained to his native parish of Campbeltown as minister of the first charge, which appears to have been without a minister since the death of the Gaelic scholar Robert Duncanson, *malleus episcopaliūm* ‘hammer of the episcopalians’, on 9 February 1697.⁸ More than two thirds of the population of the parish adhered to the first charge, the Highland or Gaelic parish. Despite his youth we find that in June 1706 Lachlan Campbell was moderator of the synod of Argyll, in which capacity he wrote to the commission of the General Assembly about the short-lived scheme to provide highland libraries.⁹ In 1707 Lachlan Campbell was called to Capel Street Presbyterian Congregation in Dublin. The *Fasti* would allow that he answered this rather surprising call, saying that he [246] demitted his parish in July and became minister in Dublin on 10 September. The General Assembly, however, ordered him not to go.¹⁰ Within a matter of weeks he died, still in Kintyre, at his brother’s manse in Southend on 6 October 1707.¹¹

He appears in Edward Lhwyd’s correspondence for the first time at the very beginning of 1700, when Eóghan Mac Gilleóin, in Campbeltown, wrote to Lhwyd, then lodged at Machrimore, near Southend, where he was waiting for a boat to Ireland; he indicates that Lachlan Campbell had shown him a list of queries from Lhwyd.¹² By what hand they reached Campbell is not indicated. Next, a letter from James Sutherland (c. 1638–1719), keeper

Society Publications 3rd ser. 24 (1937), 133–4 (no. 67). The letter-book provides nine letters from Wodrow to Campbell during the years 1700–1706. Sharp regrettably did not print letters to Wodrow, though three guardbooks of his in-letters are held by the National Library.

⁸ During this interval the minister of the second charge, that is the Lowland or English congregation, was James Bowes, installed in October 1693, who remained minister at Campbeltown until his death in 1749. Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 283n, refers to ‘a vivid account of his powers of evangelical preaching’ in Robert Wodrow’s *Analecta; or, Materials for a history of remarkable providences* (Edinburgh, 1842–3), i. 20.

⁹ The letter, dated 13 June 1706, is among General Assembly Papers, Main Series, 1706, NRS CH1/2/25/2, fols. 223–224. The scheme is discussed by Donald Maclean, ‘Highland libraries in the eighteenth century’. *TGSI* 31 (1922–4), 69–97.

¹⁰ General Assembly Papers, Main Series, 1707, NRS CH1/2/26/2, fol. 181, ‘Scroll letter from Commission to Lachlan Campbell in presbytery of Kintyre, ordering him to remain in church and not to go to Ireland, August 1707’; Main Series, 1708, NRS CH1/2/27/2, fols. 138–141, 157–159, ‘Call of Lachlan Campbell, minister of Campbeltown, to Capel Street, Dublin, 1707.

¹¹ *Fasti* cites his gravestone as evidence but does not say whether he was buried in the kirkyard at Southend, where he died, or in his own kirkyard at Kilkerran, Campbeltown.

¹² Mac Gilleóin to Lhwyd, dated at Campbeltown, 3 January 1700 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 277). Around this time Lhwyd entered in a notebook: ‘Eogain MacLên Schoolmaster at Kilchynni [*Kilchenzie*] near Campbelstown in Cintire writes the language and understands it very well’ (J. L. Campbell & Derick Thomson, *Edward Lhuyd in the Scottish Highlands 1699–1700* (Oxford, 1963), 10).

of the physic garden in Edinburgh, to Robert Wodrow, dated 24 December 1702, says that Lhwyd had indicated by letter that, ‘he desires I may tell you that he received, about half a year after the date, your oblidging letter, but had not the good fortune of seeing Mr Lachlyn Campbell, but received a kind present of ane Irish Manuscript from him’.¹³ Wodrow’s letter to Lhwyd, which survives, was dated 12 January 1702; it reveals that Campbell was in Holland and intended to return via Oxford.¹⁴ A letter from London again mentions this desire to hear from Lhwyd.¹⁵ It is evident therefore that Campbell had been in contact with Lhwyd earlier than any surviving letter from him among Lhwyd’s papers. The manuscript he sent was a booklet, written as recently as 1698, by the same Eóghan Mac Gilleóin, mentioned above, a practised scribe; it contains two medieval glossarial poems, already reflecting an interest in the older language.¹⁶ If there was an accompanying letter, I have not found it. In 1705 Campbell would send another manuscript, not so newly made and in poor condition.¹⁷

¹³ James Sutherland to Robert Wodrow, dated at Edinburgh, 24 December 1702; NLS MS Wodrow Letters Q^o II, fol. 76 (no. 54) (J. Maidment, *Analecta Scotica* (Edinburgh, 1834–7), ii, 359–61; Sharpe, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 122–5).

¹⁴ Robert Wodrow to Edward Lhwyd, dated at Edinburgh, 12 January 1702; printed from Wodrow’s letter-book, EUL MS Laing III 355, by Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 187–9 (no. 94). The original is not among the main archive of Lhwyd’s in-letters. Wodrow responded to a letter from EL sent by hand on 24 June and received in Glasgow in August. Among Wodrow’s in-letters, there is one from Campbell, dated at Leiden 19/30 March 1702, in which he writes about his studies there (quoted by Sharp, pp. xl–xli).

¹⁵ ‘If you goe to Oxford, pray give my most humble service to Mr Lhuyd. I wrote to him by Mr Paterson and long for the honnour of a line from him’: Robert Wodrow to Lachlan Campbell at London, 29 May 1702 (Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 224–6, no. 114). Campbell answered from London, 6 June 1702 (NLS MS Wodrow Letters, Q^o II, no. 33).

¹⁶ Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1307 (H. 2. 12, no. 6), which has Lhwyd’s seal and the accompanying number 101; written at Campbeltown by Eóghan Mac Gilleóin ‘chum foghnaimh Maighistir Lochlain Caimpeil’ (‘for the use of Lachlan Campbell’) in September and October 1698, when Campbell was about twenty-three. Lhwyd had acquired another manuscript in his hand in 1700, TCD MS 1362 (H. 4. 21), a copy of the Stowe version of *Táin Bó Cuailgne* and other tales, written in 1691–2. Two other manuscripts written by Mac Gilleóin, now in NLS, are noted by Ronald Black in D. S. Thomson, *The Companion to Gaelic Scotland* (Oxford, 1983), 180, under the name Hugh Maclean. Lhwyd 101 comprises just eight leaves, two short glossarial poems; the first is *Foras focal*, referred to in this correspondence (see below, 00 and n. 54); the second is *Deirbhshiúr don eagna an éigsi*. The two travel together in RIA MS Stowe C. vi. 1 (cat. 936), pt ii, pp. 455–467, copied from an early seventeenth-century exemplar by Seamas Mag Uidhir, 1718, and later owned by Charles O’Conor of Belanagare; RIA MS 23 M. 16 (cat. 308) (s. xviii^{3/4}), pp. 39–68; and RIA MS 23 L. 21 (cat. 979), part A, pp. 1–16 (s. xviii^{4/4}). The two pieces were edited together by Whitley Stokes, ‘On the metrical glossaries of the mediaeval Irish’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1891), 1–104, at pp. 8–22, 22–31. Both of these poems were used by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh in his collection of hard words, *Foclóir nó Sanasán Nua* (Louvain, 1643).

¹⁷ Letter 4 and n. 72.

Lhwyd began the printing of his Irish Dictionary late in 1703, long before any other part of *Archaeologia Britannica*. He says that he felt able to do this out of sequence because the dictionary had no need of page-numbers.¹⁸ In December he sent copies of the first sheet [247] to Robert Wodrow. In the spring of 1704, at an estimate, he sent a specimen to Lachlan Campbell—possibly a copy of the same sheet—who delayed some weeks before responding by letter dated 11 July 1704, the first of the letters printed below. Lhwyd had also inclosed a copy of the printed proposals for subscription to his book, *Archaeologia Britannica*, and Campbell had set about soliciting subscriptions among the clergy of his synod. On 30 October Campbell sent a second letter, written from Belfast, with information about further subscriptions and about his excitement at finding some very old Irish texts printed by John Colgan in 1647. Before even the first answer was received, Lhwyd had reported his writing to Campbell in a letter to Roderick O’Flaherty, whose response, dated 21 July 1704, says, ‘I am very glad of your commerce with Mr Campbell, whom I understand by you to be vers’d in Irish manuscripts’.¹⁹ Soon after receiving this letter, Lhwyd despatched to Campbell a packet containing twenty-two sheets of the dictionary (sig. A–sig. Y), words *A* to *Saxsan*, and requested him to return comments by January. Campbell’s third letter, dated 17 January 1705, tells us that the packet had been three months in transit, leaving him two months to read through the sheets, eighty-eight folio pages in three columns of small print. We infer that the packet had been sent around August, and we presume that it was found at Campbeltown in November or so, when Campbell returned home from Belfast. He met the deadline, but he felt that he had been hurried, as he says in his fourth letter, dated 16 April. Here, with a new deadline of April, he tells us that he read them again ‘with more deliberation’, resulting in a second batch of comments. What is not made clear is that he had meanwhile received seven additional sheets, a fact that must be inferred from some of the lemmata cited in the fourth and fifth letters, which are drawn from all of the remaining sheets, sig. Z, Aa to Ff. The first batch of comments has survived, the second batch has not been found. We do not know how long it took for these comments to reach Oxford, but with the first batch Lhwyd set an assistant to copy them out, along with the covering letter, and the copy was sent to O’Flaherty on 1 August 1705. This reached

¹⁸ EL to Robert Wodrow, dated 10 December 1703; printed from the original in Wodrow’s papers, NLS MS Wodrow Q^o II, fol. 101 (no. 69) by James Maidment, *Analecta Scotica* (Edinburgh, 1834–7), i. 339–41, and quoted by Sharpe, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 125.

¹⁹ *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 238.

the post office in Galway on 13 August and was [248] handed to O’Flaherty on 18 August, when he had made arrangements to cover postage.

O’Flaherty’s first reaction was very positive: ‘I find Mr Campbell to be very judicious, & skillfull in the language, & doe concur with his Judgement towards you & your design’.²⁰ Indeed, he rated Campbell’s contribution above the list of Scottish Gaelic words provided by Robert Kirk for inclusion in Bishop Nicolson’s *Scottish Historical Library*.²¹ On 14 September O’Flaherty returned the comments with his own marks added to the copy, and this too survives. These comments may be read on line. In October he requested, ‘Let me know what return you had from Mr Brownlow: & if any from Mr Campbell’.²² From a later letter, we learn that O’Flaherty now amended the preliminaries to his unpublished treatise, *Ogygia Vindicated*, on the use of the same script in Irish and Scottish Gaelic, ‘to satisfy him further with our character common to Scotland I think I have instanced Mr Campbell of Kentiry preacher now living his old MSS of that character’.²³ We do not know what Lhwyd had written to O’Flaherty, so one may wonder whether he overstated Campbell’s collection of old manuscripts or whether O’Flaherty has magnified what was said. Campbell himself, referring to ancient manuscripts in the fourth letter, says, ‘nor have I any store of such MSS, neither am I so much master of those I have’.

Soon after receiving Campbell’s comments, O’Flaherty’s own contact with Lhwyd’s sheets was resumed. During 1704 and 1705 Lhwyd had been sending sheets to him, starting with the first ten sheets, and then sending a few at a time. The comments on the first batch, written out by O’Flaherty, have survived as a folded sheet, now TCD MS 1392, no. 8, fols. 27r–28v. No comments have survived from the second phase, during which O’Flaherty changed his procedure and wrote on the printed sheets. There was then a long period when nothing was sent. At last, in September 1705, another ten sheets were sent, read by O’Flaherty, and returned in

²⁰ Roderick O’Flaherty to EL, dated at Park, 29 August 1705 (*Letters*, 288).

²¹ William Nicolson, *Scottish Historical Library* (London, 1702), 334–46. There is a valuable study of the making of this book, approached through Nicolson’s correspondence with Robert Wodrow, by Jean Whittaker, *William Nicolson and the Making of Scottish History* ([Tobermory], 2005). O’Flaherty’s judgement may have been clouded by his animosity towards Nicolson’s book.

²² Roderick O’Flaherty to EL, dated at Park, 1 October 1705 (*Letters*, 291).

²³ Roderick O’Flaherty to EL, dated at Park, 7 February 1705/6 (*Letters*, 295). This and other matters touched on in the same paragraph are not found in *Ogygia Vindicated*, not even in the address to the Scottish Nation at the front, which was composed with the date 10 December 1686 (*Letters*, 68–9, 286–7). They must have come from the dedication to King James VII and II, which was cancelled by O’Flaherty in 1709, and no copy has been found.

instalments; these have survived. In all we have O’Flaherty’s written comments on the first ten sheets and we have twelve actual sheets, annotated by him and now bound as part of TCD MS 1392, no. 8.²⁴ [249]

Others to whom sheets were sent can be identified, but they did not respond with any detailed commentary. One of them was Martin Martin, with whom Lhwyd had a fitful correspondence.²⁵ His comments might have allowed us to see another side to his talents, but it is known that Martin had little acquaintance with written Gaelic.²⁶

It would have been laborious to have made and sent manuscript copies before printing, and, given the time taken in transit and in waiting on Campbell’s and O’Flaherty’s convenience, it would have held up the printing by many months. The printer wanted the work, Lhwyd wanted the book printed, and it was convenient to circulate printed sheets. The four pages making a sheet would be set in type, proofed and corrected by Lhwyd at the printers, and several hundred copies worked off, all in the space of a week or so. The type would then be distributed ready for use in the next sheet. Once worked off the press, therefore, sheets could not be altered, so the fruit of this consultation had to be put together as a supplement to the dictionary, called an appendix by Lhwyd.²⁷ Here we see that he largely absorbed the comments from both readers, and it is as a result of Campbell’s comments that there are numerous entries in the appendix identified as Scottish. These entries have been there for all to study since *Archaeologia Britannica* was published at the end of May 1707, but the correspondence and the comments that lie behind them bring this process of consultation to life.

O’Flaherty fluctuates between commenting on individual entries and offering some large views about the way the whole is structured. He objects, for example, to Lhwyd’s presenting verbs in the first person singular and giving an English definition couched in the infinitive. The potential of these

²⁴ It is intended that these notes and sheets, which were carried with O’Flaherty’s letters to Lhwyd but separated from them in his study, will, with the cooperation of Trinity College, be included in the EMLO website along with the letters themselves and Campbell’s comments.

²⁵ In the last of eight letters from Martin to Lhwyd, written from Duntulm, 12 March 1706 (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 342; Sharpe, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 136), we hear of sheets sent, but Martin’s response deals with questions arising from his own *Description of the Western Islands of Scotland* (1703). Lhwyd had been aware of Martin from at least as early as 1698, but his first letter from Martin is dated 17 November 1702.

²⁶ Martin to Lhwyd, dated at London, 22 December 1702, ‘You have guess’d right as to my Native Language, & tho I have not been taught to read it, I am resolved to answer your Queries, after a sight of Dr Sloanes Irish Bible’ (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 330).

²⁷ *Archaeologia Britannica*, 426–34.

comments for the process of drawing lexical data from a native speaker three hundred years ago has yet to be exploited. Campbell's general comments are considerably more systematic than O'Flaherty's and probably reflect a more informed approach to language and in particular to orthography. The extent of errors in spelling suggested but not itemized by Campbell may have been disheartening to Lhwyd, but nothing could be done about it. He was by now concerned only with new words and senses. [250]

What is perhaps surprising, however, is the degree to which Campbell comes across as diffident about his knowledge of Gaelic. As minister of the first charge in Campbeltown it was his daily language. In his first letter he refers to 'that part of your book which concerns *our* Language', mentions '*our* vulgar pronunciation', and speaks of older Irish writers distant 'from *us* who rather speak a Dialect of the Irish than Good Irish'; in the third he speaks of 'a more full collation of *our* words', so there can be no doubt that he was a native speaker. Yet he refers to '*their* grammarians' in such a way as to leave one unsure whose they were.²⁸ The first letter includes reflections on spellings he had encountered 'in an old parchment (which I am scarce master of yet)', from which we infer that he has been making an effort to improve his reading of the older language. He appears excited to find printed texts 'in the oldest Irish I ever yet saw', texts now recognized as Old Irish from the eighth and ninth centuries.²⁹ We learn too that he has been accustoming himself to the Irish character, 'I hope my using the Irish characters will occasion no mistake to you, as the changing of them would have done to me after having now for some time accustomed my self unto them'. This suggests that he was adapting himself from reading printed Gaelic in the roman letter to reading manuscripts in Irish script. He complains in the first letter about the difficulty presented by the traditional contractions in writing but he still uses some of them, particularly the contracted *ea* and the Latin-derived contractions for *air* and *cht*. The suspension-mark for *n* continued even in English use at this date. In the fifth letter Campbell uses the word diffidence in his own case: 'because of my diffidence of my own skill in the Language'. What he says of his want of skill seems inexplicably strong: 'my small knowledge of the language' in the third letter; 'I or any other so ill qualifyd for a study of that nature' in the first letter; and most surprising of all, in the same letter, 'the difficulty of the Language, which made me often despair of attaining any more of it than was absolutely necessary for a minister in this country'. Diffidence in his

²⁸ Letter 1.

²⁹ Letter 3.

understanding of Irish as he would have found it in the printed bible or in older texts is readily understood. Yet he seems to play down his command of the language in which he preached and catechized and conducted the [251] kirk session. It was still the predominant language in Kintyre, but one may wonder whether his prosperous family had tended to adopt the language of the duke's settlers from Ayrshire and Renfrewshire. Lachlan must surely have had Gaelic, but after several years in the duke's household and in Edinburgh, he had to work at it. He was also more aware than many that there were written texts, some of them very old, from across the Gaelic-speaking lands. Aware of the limits of his knowledge, he was perhaps chiefly concerned to lower Lhwyd's expectations.

These few letters, and the notes on words that survive with the fourth letter, make little contribution to Scottish Gaelic lexicography, and whatever Campbell contributed to Lhwyd's dictionary is most readily found in the appendix to the dictionary itself, where Lhwyd set out the additions made by both Campbell and O'Flaherty. The correspondence explains how this contribution came about, but it is also revealing in other ways. In Lachlan Campbell Lhwyd had an educated collaborator for whom Gaelic was mother-tongue but not part of his education. He was, however, interested in developing his understanding of the language, but he found this difficult. He may have had access to some old manuscript grammars, but he found their grammarians unhelpful. Guidance from the living was not easily had: as he puts it in the fifth letter, 'concerning many words I have this doubt, but not being sure my self and having no body whose judgment both in Irish language & in Grammer in the general by me I can rely on, I can say nothing'. When one considers the people from whom he solicited commendatory verses in Gaelic for Lhwyd's book, one wonders why he thought their authors lacked this judgement.³⁰ His insecurity surely stems not from any deficiency in the spoken language, but from a lack of wider philological skills. The work of the dictionary, he realised, demanded someone with a thorough understanding of the Irish language, who was besides 'not a stranger in other philologic learning, which alas! most Irish and Highlanders [. . .] are'. He was perhaps conscious of some mismatch between his knowledge of Gaelic and his understanding of Latin, in which he had been schooled. Yet he has a desire to read older texts and to grapple with the older manuscripts in which they could be found. In the Old Irish poems he has read, with [252] Colgan's Latin rendering, he has recognized the divergent old and modern forms of the same word, such as *cech* and

³⁰ Letter 5 and n. 95.

gach, ‘which’, he says, ‘I wish were carefully gathered by one that is master of the old Irish which I confess I am [[not]]’. His interest in reading the older language appears to be self-motivated and he gives no sense of being surrounded by a culture of written learning. He was no doubt a generation removed from John Beaton (d. 1714), through whom both Sir George Mackenzie and Edward Lhwyd made contact with a manuscript which was supposed to date from the second or third century – a dating derived from the notional authorship of the text rather than from the making of the copy. In Ireland Roderick O’Flaherty lived right through the break in the Gaelic learned tradition, but Lachlan Campbell shows no sign of any awareness that it survived at all in Kintyre. Seeking subscribers to Lhwyd’s *Archaeologia Britannica* in Argyll and Ulster, he refers to ‘the few men of letters that understand any thing of it’, but whether he refers to the old scholarship or the new philology is not clear. It is, however, interesting that Campbell is clearly conscious of the otherness in language of ‘authors who lived at some distance of time & place from us’. Lhwyd was aware of obsolete language, even if O’Flaherty warned against the notion. He was well aware of the divergence between Welsh, Cornish, and Breton, and between Irish and Scottish Gaelic, though he was focused on recovering similarities. And he was liable to confuse differences arising from time with differences arising from place, as demonstrated by his judging Old Welsh verse to be written in the Pictish language.³¹ Campbell’s clear recognition of diachronic differences, especially in the context of the little Old Irish he had seen, is perhaps witness to a sadly lost talent.

Archaeologia Britannica was published in May 1707.³² Lhwyd gave a copy to Roderick O’Flaherty, which reached him on 15 November 1707.³³ There is no evidence to show whether a copy had reached Campbell, or any of his Argyll subscribers, before he died in October.

[269] NOTE ON THE TRANSCRIPTION: Abbreviations have in general been expanded, including places where Campbell used dashes rather than write out the same word twice, and in places I have added punctuation for clarity. The edges of the letters are in places damaged, and words in double square brackets [[word]] are supplied by me unless italicized [*word*], when I merely report the damage. Deletions are shown thus [-word], words inserted above the line thus \word/, words in the margins thus \\word//.

[253]

³¹ R. Sharpe, ‘In quest of Pictish manuscripts’, *Innes Review* 59 (2008), 145–67, at pp. 164–7.

³² Sharpe, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 134.

³³ O’Flaherty to EL, dated at Park, 22 November 1707 (*Letters*, 308).

1 Lachlan Campbell to Edward Lhwyd, Campbeltown, 11 July 1704

SOURCE: Bodl. MS. Ashmole 1814, fols. 288–289.

ADDRESS: None. The other half of the sheet of paper has been torn away, leaving only a stump with the first two or three letters from nine lines of writing and a trace of a postmark.

Worthy Sir

I cannot forbear expressing the satisfaction I had by your kind letter (which I received some weeks agoe but wanted the conveniency of answering untill now)³⁴ & in which you give so full and satisfying an account of that part of your book which concerns our Language, which has made all those to whom I shewed it conceive no small hopes of the performance and would have made more of our Clergy forward in subscribing if I had had it when I was with them: However as it was I got subscriptions for [*–one word*] \\fourteen// copys which is for more than half our Synod, (tho' you may guess, many of them will not be curious of books of that nature)³⁵ therefor I have given you this second trouble to know the method you have laid down for the return of the money & the conveyance of the books & how soon we may expect them in Scotland & whom you have appointed your correspondent at Glasgow to that purpose: for if it be Mr Wodrow or any other of my acquaintance, I will write to him to send the foresaid number of copys to Inverary as soon as they arrive:³⁶ for if I had them there to be delivered against our next synod in October I might assure you of the money against Christmass following; otherways, not before next Summer about this time, because we meet not again till June. I therefor

³⁴ The next letter here reveals that EL had written on 13 May 1704. This letter shows that it did not reach LC's hands until after he returned home from the meeting of the Synod of Argyll: these letters refer to synods as taking place in June and October—the general custom was April and October—so he must have had this letter from sometime in June.

³⁵ Proposals advertising *Archaeologia Britannica* and seeking subscriptions were printed in July 1703 and distributed before the end of that month. Although not mentioned in this sentence, LC refers below to 'your advertisement and proposals', and he has been energetic in soliciting subscriptions among local ministers. EL had sent the printed proposals to Roderick O'Flaherty on 2 March 1704 (*Letters*, 222–3). The proposals asked for a downpayment of 5s, with the balance due when the book was delivered—its price on publication in May 1707 was 21s 6d—but in Scotland and Ireland EL sought only parole subscriptions, in effect that subscribers had only to put their names down to take a copy.

³⁶ By this date LC was minister in Campbeltown and no longer based in the duke's household. He must refer to Inveraray, therefore, as the place to which a carrier was most likely to ship the books from Glasgow.

earnestly entreat for your return with all convenient hast. I would have got some subscriptions also in the North of Irland if I had thought your advertisement and proposals had not reached that length as I am lately informed they have not: for neither Coll. O Neale nor Mr Brumlo of Lurgan, the only persons \there/ that are any way curious in that language, so far as I understand have heard of them:³⁷ however if you think it fit to \ad/venture sending any more [254] than are subscribed for I make no doubt in process of time to get them off (to the number of four or five) in that Kingdom.

I am Glad any of your English Critiques think it worth while to enquire into our Language or antiquitys only I am sorry ours were not before hand with them, as being more concerned: this I am sure, whoever follows, you have led the way, & removed the greatest hinderance, I mean the difficulty of the Language, which made me often despair of attaining any more of it than was absolutely necessary for a minister in this country: and therefor I cannot express how glad your proposals made me especially when by the specimen I saw how exact the Dictionary is like to bee of which I am now more confirmed by the account you gave me of your method and vouchers. Yet I am affraid as to the old parchment books, the difficulty will in part remain, except[-in] in using your dictionary allowances be made for the Endless variety that occurs in the syllabication of the same words \in different authors & different places of one & the same authour// partly owing to the negligence & unskilfulness of Copiers, [fol. 288v] which you know has bred much trouble to Critiques of all sorts: and partly because the Language it self seems not to have been reduced to any constant rule, or at least that their Grammarians have allowed themselves such a Latitude

³⁷ It appears that LC may have recently been in the north of Ireland. His contacts there have told him that Colonel O'Neill and Mr Brownlow are the only persons with an inquiring interest in the Irish language. It is useless to ask by what criteria such interest was restricted to only two men, but EL tells us that Eóin Ó Gnímh, 'whose ancestors had been hereditary poets [. . .] had forsaken the Muses and betaken himself to the plow: so we made an easy purchase of about a dozen ancient manuscripts on parchment' (EL to Tancred Robinson (1657/8–1748), dated at Bathgate, 15 December 1699; Gunther, *Life and Letters*, 421–3, no. 214). Whether lack of interest or lack of money was the stronger reason is not apparent. I have not yet identified Colonel O'Neill. Arthur Brownlow (1645–1711), of Lurgan, Co. Armagh, was a prosperous linen-manufacturer with a collection of Irish manuscripts, among them the early-ninth-century Book of Armagh. EL had visited Brownlow in 1699 and had taken notes concerning this and other manuscripts in Brownlow's possession (Sharpe, *O'Flaherty's Letters*, 239n). Only one letter is extant from Brownlow to EL, dated at Lurgan, 10 June 1704. He had been shown the first sheet of the dictionary some time previous by a contact in Dublin, Mr Davies, and commented, 'although there are several words therein that are now obsolete & some few mistakes of letters & other small errors, which perhaps were faults of the transcribers or the press, yett I conceive the work will bee of use to any that are studious in that language' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1814, fol. 285; Sharpe, *O'Flaherty's Letters*, 127).

therein, that the design thereof cannot be obtained:³⁸ for you shall observe not only the vowels a, o, u & e & i often interchanged and put for one another in the same words which with them may be done regularly; but also oe and ae for ao, ea for e \\and the simple vowels for the diphthongs, in which they sound most & so diphthongs for triphthongs, and likeways// bh for mh, gh for dh, and vice versa & th for gh or dh in the end of a word or left out altogether. And in an old parchment (which I am scarce master of yet) I observe c put always for ζ sometimes double [–sometimes] \\but more often/ single: & neither the letter h nor the mark of it, written but very seldom, except before a vowel beginning a word; which made me often wish your Dictionary had been printed in Irish Characters, that the h being only marked above, one might the more easily search for a word, without any regard had to it at all, in reading of books where it is omitted: and I am apt to beleieve that it has been only added by their latter Grammarians for a more particular direction in the pronunciation. [255] But the difficulty that arises from the particles and construction to me seems the greatest of all because these I think have undergone greater alterations than any other part of the Language. But I am hopefull your Grammer will not a little contribute to remove this as well as the rest, of which I question not you observed more than I or any other so ill qualifyd for a study of that nature and otherways so much diverted.³⁹ There is another difficulty I had almost forgot, occasioned by a silly piece of affectation in the Irish writers in these last ages especially the poets of doing all they could to make the Language obscure and mysterious to the vulgar (called ὀριόεανὰς or thornyness)⁴⁰ which consisted chiefly in changing the form of words & construction of the sentences and in hard contractions in the writing which last is very troublesome in \\such of/ their books of Medecine and philosophy as I have seen:⁴¹ only for the most part they write the word first ad Longam & then abridge it variously: but this will perhaps be no great difficulty to such as are accustomed to read old MSS of any sort.⁴² I am Glad I am out in my notes

³⁸ This allusion to ‘their Grammarians’ is not transparent: whose grammarians? Those of the older Irish language? Compare ‘their latter Grammarians’ later in the paragraph.

³⁹ This is probably not mere modesty but the supposition that EL’s wider linguistic knowledge gave him a material advantage in understanding the grammar of Gaelic.

⁴⁰ From ScGael *droighneach* ‘thorny’, but I do not find this usage in the dictionaries. OIr *draigen* ‘blackthorn’ gave the name *draigneach* to a form of metre.

⁴¹ What has he seen? The fourth letter refers to his imperfect copy of Hippocrates’s Aphorisms in Irish (below, n. 69).

⁴² Many shared his difficulty with manuscript contractions. EL remarks on their use, *Archaeologia Britannica*, 304: ‘Divers of the Irish manuscripts of the four or five last centuries have too much of such obscure writing; but those of greater antiquity have only the same

on your specimen: indeed I conjectured a great many words might vary \both/ from our vulgar pronunciation and books as to their writing, when you take them from authors who lived at some distance of time & place from us who rather speak a Dialect of the Irish than Good Irish: which consideration always furnished me with an answer to other objections more trivial, made by such as scarce arrived my own length & I am now convinced I was in the right. But fearing I have incroached to far upon your patience when I am sorry I can give you no assistance in a work to which I heartily wish success; I conclude impatiently expecting your book.

Sir

Your very much obliged Humble servant

La: Campbell

Campbeltoun July 11 1704

EL notes: Received Aug. 25.⁴³ [256]

2 Lachlan Campbell to Edward Lhwyd, Belfast, 30 October 1704

SOURCE: Bodl. MS. Ashmole 1814, fols. 290–291.

ADDRESS: To | Mr Edward Lhwyd Keeper of | the Asmolean Museum at | Oxford |
England.

POSTMARKS: Bishop mark and town stamp (both indistinct).

Belfast 8ber 30 1704

Sir

Having had occasion to come to this place since my last in answer to yours of May 13, I communicated the proposals for your *Archæol.* to severall here in the north \of Ireland/ who never heard of them before. They were all so well pleased with the design of your Book cheifly that part of it that concerns the Language of this country, that the few men of letters that

abbreviations, (as well as letters) with the Cambridge Juvencus. [. . .] These abbreviations are in some measure still continued, as we find by those many copies of Dr Keating's History and other manuscripts transcribed by Mr Owen Kiph of the county of Keri yet living: And there are also some of them cast amongst the Irish letters of Mr Everingham's press in London and at the Irish press in Louvain'.

⁴³ The letter was written on Tuesday, 11 July 1704, and arrived in Oxford on Friday, 25 August, more than six weeks later.

understand any thing of it subscribed: so that now I will adventure to oblige my self for eighteen copys in all, which according to the proposals will amount to 21 of which I mightily long now to get an account (as I signifyd to you in my last) that I might be the sooner in capacity to return the money which among us (that is both in Scotland and here) who live at such a distance from one another and without any fixed correspondence, cannot be expected so soon as elsewhere.⁴⁴ Therefor I desire you be pleased, to acquaint me with your first conveniency what method you are to fix for the conveyance of both the books & money & how soon they are to be expected, that [–I may acquaint] our ministers in Argyleshire (who are the chief part of the subscribers that I know of) may be advertised betwixt & our next Provincial Synod which is to be in June next.

I met here with two very old Irish remains. Both in meetre. The one the life of St Patrick written by St Fiecus his contemporary and the other that of St Brigide written about the same time according the publisher Colganus in a Collection of the Lives of the Irish Saints printed in 2 vol. fol. at Lovain 1645 & 1647. in the last of which are those in Irish.⁴⁵ I truly beleive them to be very ancient, for not only [257] the words are generally obsolete, but the construction is such as I should never understand them by it were it not for the Latine version printed over against then in the same page. There are also some other fragments dispersed throw the same volume, the most considerable of which is a piece of a poem written in our Malcolm Canmores times about 1057, giveing a succinct [–& word] view of our History from which OColgan endeavours to prove the Bishop of St Asaphs

⁴⁴ The arithmetic does not make sense. Taking what looks like 21 as 2l, i.e. £2, this can hardly represent eighteen downpayments towards the price of the book.

⁴⁵ LC has come across in Belfast a copy of *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae*, the work of John Colgan OFM (1592–1658), of which the first volume, covering the saints whose feast days fall in January–March was published for the Irish Franciscans at Louvain in 1645. The second volume has the added title *Triadis thaumaturgae acta*, usually shortened to the nominative *Trias*, published in 1647. The latter comprises extensive dossiers of texts concerning St Patrick, St Columba, and St Brigit. Colgan gives priority to the poem on St Patrick, *Génair Pátraicc* (*Trias*, 1–10), which he printed from the Franciscan copy of the Irish *Liber hymnorum*, a manuscript of the twelfth century. From the same source he also printed *Ní car Brigit* (*Trias*, 515–20), concerning St Brigit. The first is ascribed in the manuscript to St Fiacc, the second to St Broccan. Although such ascriptions carry little weight, they led to the supposition that the texts were composed at a very early date. Modern scholarship recognizes both as dating from the Old Irish period, and LC says to EL in the third letter that they were ‘in the oldest Irish I ever yet saw’. For two hundred years, until Johann Caspar Zeuss began the publication of glosses from manuscripts actually written in the Old Irish period, these poems, and especially *Génair Pátraicc*, accessible in print, were the chief touchstone for the oldest known period of the language.

hypothesis about the late beginning of our Kingdom.^{46,47} I doubt not but you may find Colganus himself in your library, or have seen it before now.⁴⁸ But if you have not, I shall have a copy of the Hymns at your service, having [fol. 290v] been at the pains to write them both over.⁴⁹ If you can give me any further account of the foresaid Scotch poet (mentioned also (if I forget not) by O Flaherty) or help me to a copy of the poem it self it will be no small favour.⁵⁰ One of the subscribers here, namely Mr John Mc Bride minister in this toun is very desirous to see your proposals and specimen I only having shewed him an abridgement of the former wherefor be pleased to direct them to him by post; at least the proposals.⁵¹ This is all in hast from

⁴⁶ The poem, ‘A eolcha Alban uile’, was printed in part by Colgan, *Trias*, 114–15. It was known from the same source to another Franciscan, Hugh Ward, *al. Aodh Buidhe Mac an Bhaird* (c. 1590–1635) and is quoted in his posthumously published work, *Sancti Rumoldi acta* (Louvain, 1662), 361, 371–2. It was quoted also by Geoffrey Keating, before *Trias* was published, and it was known from all three sources to Roderick O’Flaherty, who quotes from it in *Ogygia* (London, 1685), 323, 467, and refers to it, *ib.* 188, 428. LC could not have known O’Flaherty’s more controversial discussion in his still unpublished work, *Ogygia Vindicated*, edited by C. O’Conor (Dublin, 1775), 142–5, nor his private comments on it in letters to EL, *Letters*, 273–5. The most perfect copy now known was made by O’Flaherty’s friend, Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh, in his *Leabhar Mór na nGenealach*, UCD MS Add. Ir. 14 (AD 1649–50), pp. 414–16 (ed. N. Ó Muraíle, *The Great Book of Genealogies compiled (1645–66) by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh* (Dublin, 2003–4), ii. 162–7). The poem was edited in full by K. H. Jackson, ‘The poem *A eolcha Alban uile*’, *Celtica* 3 (1956), 149–67, which presents the Irish text with an extensive survey of the textual evidence; English translation by K. H. Jackson, ‘The Duan Albanach’, *Scottish Historical Review* 36 (1957), 124–37.

⁴⁷ The bishop of St Asaph, William Lloyd, had provoked controversy, when he contested the antiquity of Scottish kings, said to go back to the fifth century, in his book, *An Historical Account of Church-Government as it was in Great-Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion* (London, 1684). The controversy was liveliest in 1684–6, when O’Flaherty’s *Ogygia* was caught in the crossfire (Sharpe, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 145–9). Nicolson refers to ‘the Grand Controversy, that alarmed [. . .] all the Antiquaries of Scotland, by the noise of the Bishop of S. Asaphs Book’ (*Scottish Historical Library*, 134; quoted by O’Flaherty in a letter dated 12 June 1705, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 271). Of course, Colgan made no attempt to support an argument he could never have seen, but lying further in the background was the long-running dispute between representatives of Irish and Scottish claimants to antiquity and in particular to a great crowd of early saints.

⁴⁸ O’Flaherty had already referred EL to Colgan’s two volumes and found him slow to consult the copies in the Bodleian Library (Sharpe, *O’Flaherty’s Letters*, 247–8, 250, 259, 264–5).

⁴⁹ LC’s transcript is not known to survive. If he also made a copy for EL, it is not now among his Irish manuscripts in Trinity College, Dublin.

⁵⁰ Evidence that LC had read O’Flaherty’s *Ogygia*; he correctly remembered its mention there (above, n. 00). This is LC’s only mention of O’Flaherty, and one does not know whether he was told anything about EL’s correspondence with the Irish antiquary.

⁵¹ John McBride (?1651–1718), was a Scottish presbyterian minister in Belfast from 1694 to 1705 and again from 1709 to his death in 1718. During the interim he was based in Glasgow as minister of the College church (*Fasti*, iii. 399), demolished along with the old College buildings in the nineteenth century. Five letters from McBride, addressed to Dr John Stirling (1666–1727),

Sir

Your very affectionate Humble servant
La: Campbell

I ask your pardon for so confused a letter.

3 Lachlan Campbell to Edward Lhwyd, Campbeltown, 17 January 1705

SOURCE: Bodl. MS. Ashmole 1814, fols. 294r–295v, of which the first three pages are Campbell's notes on Lhwyd's Irish Dictionary, A–S (not transcribed here), and the fourth page Campbell's letter. Fols. 296r–297v is a second folded sheet comprising a copy of Campbell's notes and letter, lacking its date, made by one of [258] Lhwyd's assistants to send to Roderick O'Flaherty. It was marked with comments by O'Flaherty, who added at the bottom: 'What I approve of Mr Campbell's notes, I mark with X. Where I add to his sense, you may add Scot to his word. Where otherwise correct, you shall find so corrected. What is beyond my knowledge, I [[pass]] by [[without any]] mark'. From the correspondence between Lhwyd and O'Flaherty it can be worked out that the copy of Campbell's comments was sent to O'Flaherty with Lhwyd's letter dated 1 August 1705, received by O'Flaherty on 18 August 1705; the annotated copy was returned to Lhwyd on 14 September 1705. The letter and enclosure would have been filed together, but the copy was moved to its alphabetical place under Campbell when the letters were rearranged in the nineteenth century, so separating it from O'Flaherty's letter. Within the arrangement there the original and the copy were placed after the next letter, almost certainly because the date in the original was misread as 'July'.

DATE: Scottish style, reckoning the year from 1 January.

ADDRESS: None. Wrapper missing.

Worthy Sir

I have sent you here inclosed the few remarques I have made upon the 22 sheets you sent me of your dictionary. Those of any moment that might occasion any considerable mistake are but very few as you may see at first view by this mark (*) which I have prefixed to them. The rest are either amendments that are dubious or inconsiderable and which therefor you may take no nottice of if you think fit; or some of our Scotch Irish words which according to your desire I inserted in their order as they ocurred to me: most of them are also used in Ireland, but because I was sure that they are a part of the language of our Country and omitted in your dictionary I wrote them

principal of the university of Glasgow from 1701 to 1727, are preserved in the fourth volume of the guardbooks of Stirling's in-letters in Glasgow University Library, MS Gen. 204–207.

down with this distinction (Scot) and could have added many more if your sheets had come to me in time:⁵² But three of the five moneths which you allowed me for returning them, being elapsed, before they came to my hands, I applyed my self, (as much as I could for other avocations) to peruse them as soon as possible expecting the rest or more of them against I were ready with the first, and so to have done it all against the prefixed time; By which it came to pass [259] that I was a little precipitated and consequently that the Supplement of Earsh words is not near what it might have been if I had had more time, which was also mightily abridged by being in the winter season which we are here oblidge to spend in Examining or Catechizing our parishes. However I beleve I have omitted nothing material of what I was capable to judge of; without meddling with the rest, except where I thought my self secured from mistake by the Irish explications or examples subjoined. Its true there are some of the more modern Irish words which we either understand or syllabicate other ways, or with some difference from the way you have them; but besides that they are not many, I was not sure but yours was the right way. I hope my using the Irish characters will occasion no mistake to you, as the changing of them would have done to me after having now for some time accustomed my self unto them. I have subjoined this mark] only to the words of your dictionary to distinguish them from the addenda after which I have omitted it.

And now after I have perused the greatest part of your Dictionary, as I can give my sentiments thereof [*—word struck out*] so far as I understand it, upon better Grounds \than before/, so I am still confirmed the more in my former judgment; that abstracting altogether from the disadvantage under which you being a stranger have laboured in compiling of it; it is in it self a very usefull book for the Design thereof and upon the whole matter very exactly done, and having as few faults as the first draught of a work of that nature, where there have been so few helps, and so small foundations to build upon; has been attempted in any language like the Irish: But when I consider that all this has been performed in so short a time, by a foraigner, and with so little assistance I think my judgment cannot be too favorable of it. Only I am heartily sorry that throw distance of place, avocations and my small knowledge of the Language, I cannot contribute to it in any measure answerable to my own inclinations or my obligations to you. If I had had more time allowed me perhaps I might have been capable to give a more full collation of our words. But that which you limited me to being now almost over I choose to send this such as it is rather than it should come too late,

⁵² The fourth letter was accompanied by a second instalment of comments.

though after all I know not if it be worth your while, I am sure it is not very much. And when the rest of it comes I shall [260] endeavour to make amends if you do not hurry me too much. I shall be glad to know if you received my letter from Belfast where I told you I got a copy of St Patricks life and St Brigids in the oldest Irish I ever yet saw, and that I picked up some more subscriptions which with them I got before will amount to the number of 22 \books/, which I do not doubt but you will be carefull to secure for me. I add no more at present but that I am Sir

Your obliged friend and humble servant
La: Campbell

Campbelltown January 17. 1705.

4 Lachlan Campbell to Edward Lhwyd, Campbeltown, 16 April 1705

SOURCE: Bodl. MS. Ashmole 1814, fols. 292–293. The piece of paper is twice the size of his other letters.

ADDRESS: None. Wrapper missing.

Worthy Sir

It is now near two months since I received the favour of yours of December 26 to which I returned an answer much sooner, had not my thoughts been otherways much diver[[ted]] not only by a hurry of Business, but also by the Melancholy reflexions I have had, and the constant attendance I was oblided to by the sickness and death of my dear Father of whom I was deprived some weeks agoe.⁵³ These are Excuses which I hope will procure an easy pardon for this delay; especially if after all this be so happy as to come straight to your hands, which your prolonging the time you first set from January [[to Apr]]ile makes me expect it will.

Being sensible I hurried my self too much in perusing your first parcell of sheets. I resolved to look over them again with more deliberation, & accordingly I have now sent what I observed more than at first reading, together with what occured in the last parcell. But truly as I said before, so

⁵³ The testament of John Campbell, of Kildalloig, parish of Kilchuban (*sic*), was registered on 6 May 1706 (Francis J. Grant, *The Commissariat Record of Argyle. The Register of Testaments 1674–1800*, Scottish Record Society 9 (1902), 7). Since there is a gap in the registers between 29 July 1693 and 28 July 1705, this must be a daleyed registration rather than a misprint in the year.

now I adventure to repeat it with more confidence [261] after a Review, that the material Errours of all I understand of your dictionary seem to be but few; the sheet I sent you before and that I transmit along with this, being for the most part amendments of no great moment; or an addition of our Scottish words (which I have marked as such, not so much because none of them is used in Ireland, for I am sure some of them are tho perhaps varied as to their form; but because I know they are also in use here with us). As for those words of obsolete Irish, which make up no small part and in my oppinion the most valuable part of your Dictionary;⁵⁴ because I understand them not, nor have your riches whereby I might examin your translation of them; I can make no Judgement concerning them: only where the subjoined Irish Explications or other probable [[Grounds]] seemed to found a conjecture, I have offerd it, yet always with a subjoined Q to signify that I could not be sure. Only as to what you cite the [[ῥοραρ]] ῥοαλ for I think you have been pretty exact.⁵⁵ What General mistakes I marked I shall comprise them all in these few particulars.⁵⁶ 1^o. h is often deficient as in ῥζιορταῖο for ῥζιορτῥαιῖο active, cobλαc̄ for cobhlaç̄ in †ταρκορ.⁵⁷ 2^o. h often redundant as in ῥλαιοῖμ, οο ῥλαιοῖ for οο ῥλαιοῖ numb. 16:32.⁵⁸ ρυιζη [[past]] tense for

⁵⁴ He refers to the obsolete words, marked with a dagger by EL, which he derived from Mícheál Ó Cléirigh's printed *Foclóir nó Sanasán nua* (Louvain, 1643). He comments more directly on this in the fifth letter.

⁵⁵ *Foras focal* ('Knowledge of words') is a brief metrical explanation of hard words, cited by EL using the abbreviation 'F.', as explained in his abbreviations, *Archaeologia Britannica*, 440. In the dictionary itself, under the lemma †*Foras* he enters 'foras focal, etymology'. The work in question, *Foras focal luighter libh*, is sometimes attributed to Seán Ó Dubhagáin (d. 1372). There is a partial copy, used by Stokes in his edition, which he refers to as the Book of Leinster, p. 395, using the facsimile made by Joseph O'Longan in 1880, published with an introduction by Robert Atkinson (Dublin, 1880). The Trinity College catalogue, under MS 1339, summarizes the contents of the facsimile and makes no attempt to describe the manuscript. One section of the original manuscript, pp. 355–74, was detached long ago and sent to Louvain by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh and his colleagues; this is now UCD–OFM A3, described by Pádraig de Brún in the Killiney catalogue (Dublin, 1972). The modern diplomatic edition ends with p. 374. For pp. 375–410, there seems nothing better informed than Atkinson. The first ten quatrains of *Foras focal* are part of a sixteenth-century section of the manuscript, pp. 377–96 (Atkinson, 15, 78–80). Assuming that these quires were with the twelfth-century manuscript when it came into EL's possession in 1699–1700, he already had these few quatrains. *Foras focal* was used by Mícheál Ó Cléirigh in his *Foclóir* (1643) and by Ristead Plúincead in his Latin–Irish dictionary (1662). EL was also given a recent copy of the poem by LC (above, 00).

⁵⁶ LC retained the notes on which this letter is based and revisited them in letter 5, dated 3 January 1707, where more examples are included.

⁵⁷ Both examples come from sheets sent after the initial despatch of twenty-two sheets, sig. A–Y: 'Sgiopaidh, *Active &c.* Pl. Gnavus (sig. Z2vc, including a reference to Richard Plunket's Latin–Irish dictionary, much used by EL); '†Tascor, coblach. *A navy.* Q.' (sig. Cc1rc).

⁵⁸ The numerical reference identifies the lemma, *Slugam*, thirty-second entry in what is actually the nineteenth column, not the sixteenth, of the second lot of sheets sent. 'Slugam, *To swallow; to*

ρυϊζιμ &c. these two could not be always avoided because of their mixing the h with a small point for the most part. 3^o. a Consonant doubled where it should be single, and vice versa as τρεανν for τρέαν strong:⁵⁹ and bin for binn sweet or melodious.⁶⁰ These occur often and alter the signification and pronunciation much [*two words*]. 4^o. a noun or verb beginning with a vowel is set down sometimes under [[the letters]] τ which only stands for the article and ϑ which is a mark of the tense: [[τοιρελμ]] for [[οιρελμ]] a plowman,⁶¹ [[all]] I remarked of this sort because of more [[*six or eight words, including 5^o*]] some words in the Irish examples [fol. 292v] and explications are not to be understood except by making one word of two as †bruinneac, naoio eana for naoioeana and in †broc na barcar for nabarcar &c.⁶² This happening sometimes together and your not writing the explications of the examples [[in]] modern Irish full but only a part & then an &c. will (to my no small grief who have not the fountains to consult,) make them scarce intelligible. 6^o. words explained in the Glossary by other Irish words which are homonymous or of two or [262] more significations are rendered into English according to one of those significations only, without any reason given for the determination as corbad, caiceam, a cast or throw.⁶³ Q. why not wearing, wasting, where by the example subjoined one would think, caiceam ought to be understood in the cast signification, but of this sort I have not met with many. 7^o. words confounded which are different as ρυϊζιμ and ρυϊζιμ and in ball, ballac and bealac. Bealac is properly a breach or passage, ballac is spotted but ball signifys both a spot and a plane.⁶⁴ 8^o. the same words occur sometimes twice as bann pila and

devour: Do sluigh an talamh iad, *the earth swallow'd them*: Sluigfighear iad, *they shall be devoured*' (sig. Aa2ra). The first quotation is from Exod 15:12. The printed edition of the Old Testament, *Leabhuir na Seintiomna* (London, 1685), was one of EL's two basic texts in studying the language; the other was Keating's *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, of which he possessed manuscript copies in the original and in English.

⁵⁹ 'Treann, *Strong, stout, lusty*: Le na treanuibh, *By his strong ones*. Ps. 10. 10' (sig. Dd2rc).

⁶⁰ 'Bin, *Sweet*: Sailmheadleach bin, *The sweet psalmist*. Is bin do ghuth, *Thy voice is sweet* (sig. C1vb). The second quotation is from Song 2:14.

⁶¹ 'Toireamh, *A plough-man*. Féach tiucfuid na laethe, go mbéaruidh an toireamh air an mbúanuighe; *Behold the days come, that the plow-man shall overtake the reaper*: Am. 9. 19' (sig. Dd1va).

⁶² '†Bruinneach, mathair: do bhrigh go mbiathann naoidh eana ar a bruinne no ar a cighibh, *A mother, a matron*' (sig. D1va). LC points out the need to read 'naoidheana' as one word. '†Broth, Bruith seoil: O nabarthar eanbhruith no anbhruith; uisge feola. *Broth*' (sig. D1rc). In this case there is, I think, no incorrect word-space in 'nabarthar', though the two letters are widely set.

⁶³ '†Corbadh, Caitheamh: Corbadh an talmhan, &c. *A cast or throw*' (sig. G1vc).

⁶⁴ 'Fuighim, *To leave*: An feadh dfuigfinnsi, *whilst I leave; also to find*: Gidh bé da bhfuightheair é, *with whomsoever it is found*' (sig. O1ra). LC objects to the triple lemma, 'Ball, Ballach, & Bealach, *A way*: Am ball ar bith, *any Whither*' (sig. B2va); there also separate entries, 'Ball &

ḃḃḃḃ ḃḃḃḃḃḃ which also signify a ball &c.⁶⁵ These are the chief general mistakes I have observed, which are not very material and therefor it will serve to mention any of them you shall think worth while in an Irish advertisement, only because the knowledge of the three first will save a great deal of labour in searching for a word, or rather prevent ones despairing of finding it, it may not be a miss to give advertisement thereof in English. But that which I imagine will be of most use to such as have a mind with the help of the dictionary to peruse our old Remains, is to advertise them of the frequent promiscuous use of most of the vowels, diphthongs and consonants of the same kind (as the Labiales, dentales &c) with or without h in General all the letters that have an affinity of sound are interchangeably put the one for the other (as I told you more particularly in a former Letter) which variety no Dictionary can comprehend nor is it needfull, since the Latitude which their Grammarians have taken to themselves in fixing the analogy, rules and standard of their language doth allow of for the most part. To accommodate the Dictionary more for the use of the Curious, it would be proper to subjoin to this an account of the great difference between the modern syllabication and that which is used in the ancientest MSS (as for example oe was always used where now ao is written, and bh where now m̃ as in the word noeḃ ḃḃḃḃḃḃ so ceḃ for ḃḃḃḃ &c) concerning which you gave me a line in one of your Letters. But hitherto I have not had the time, nor have I any store of such MSS, neither am I so much master of those I have, as to be able for doing any thing of that nature that will turn to any account; as in process of tyme I may be with the help of your Dictionary when I have got it bound and ready for use. But I [263] question not but by this time you are more capable your [[self]] than any other from the lor[[. . .]]crease you have had in this study [fol. 293r] [[If]] Mr Brownlo would give himself the trouble of elaborating an exact version (not a paraphrase of as Colgan's is) of St Patrick and St Brigids life and thereto [[word]] notes to this purpose and conjectures about other difficultys, and send it to [[you]] in tyme, to be published as a specimen, it would be of singular advantage to such as might have a mind to be masters of the Language. I mention Mr [[Bro]]wnlo, because he has a great insight into the Language (as I am told beyond any in that part of Ireland) and in otherways a man of Good sense and some culture being a lawyer, but chiefly because he can there in Ireland and especially

Bal, *A place*: Ar an mball comhluath, *as soon as*' (sig. B2va), 'Ball, *A limb or member*, plur. Boill' (ib.), 'Ballach, *speckled*' (ib.), 'Bealach & Ballach, *a way or path; also a gap*' (sig. C1ra).
⁶⁵ Two entries from Ó Cléirigh, who supplied no fewer than six lemmata, '†Bann', including the second, glossed 'liathroid' and the sixth glossed 'q. pila, Pl. ex Cl.' [*i.e.* Plunket ex Clery] (sig. B2vb).

from Connought (where I am told there are some still that understand the language to the bottom) get such assistance as nobody in Brittain that I know of can have.^{66, 67}

The fear I was in that my last sheet of remarques would \have/ come too late to your hands, made me order it to be sent post under a cover, by which I am sensible I was unjust to you in puting you to more expense than it was all worth; I hope my Correspondent at Edinburgh will find a way of transmitting this parcell at a more easy rate.⁶⁸ I have sent therin the Latin-Irish MS I told you I had of Hypocrat's Aphor(isms) according to your desire,⁶⁹ it being legible enough to one that understands the characters: only I find that instead of 7 sections I have but 4 & the last of these not complete, the rest having been unluckily cut out before I had the book.⁷⁰ The Translation is pretty regular so far as I perused it and therefor I hope may be of use. I thank you kindly for the Catalogue you sent me of the books lately printed at your Theatre, which was very refreshing to me:⁷¹ for tho at present

⁶⁶ Arthur Brownlow (d. 1711), of Lurgan, was a linen-manufacturer, who had taken an interest in the Irish language. He was in no sense a representative of the Gaelic learned tradition. EL met him at Lurgan in 1699 and was shown the great treasure of his manuscript collection, the Book of Armagh, written in the year 807 (now in Trinity College Dublin). They exchanged letters during EL's work on the dictionary, but it is not all clear that Brownlow had the experience of the language that LC supposed. His reputation in Belfast had perhaps magnified the reality.

⁶⁷ Roderick O'Flaherty was, of course, based in Connacht, but at this date he signals that there were none with whom he could discuss the antiquities of the language. His only named contact, after the death of Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh in 1671, was Tadhg Ó Rodaighe (1614–1706), of Crossfield, Co. Leitrim, with whom EL also made contact (Sharpe, *O'Flaherty's Letters*, 96–7).

⁶⁸ Postage was paid by the recipient. The rate reflected the distance the letter had been carried. This rate applied only to a single folded sheet. It was doubled for two sheets, and for more than that a rate by the ounce was applied. The charge mounted quickly, therefore, since the post office was meant only as a letter service. Carriers, delivering goods around the country, would carry parcels and letters less quickly but at a cheaper rate.

⁶⁹ The words 'I told you I had' are not backed up by anything in the extant letters.

⁷⁰ There is a good chance that this copy is now TCD MS 1388 (H. 5. 16), dated to s. xvii in the catalogue, comprising 38pp (on paper) and breaking off imperfect in the the fourth part of the work. In its present state Lhwyd's seal is not present, but someone has written 'Olim 104' on the first leaf, which might have been the number accompanying the seal. Martin Martin mentions in a letter to Lhwyd, 17 November 1702, 'several volums of Hippocratess's in fine vellum, the chapiters having the first letters in fine red capitals [. . .] in the custody of Fergus Beaton, chirurgeon in the isle of South Uist' (Bodl. MS Ashm. 1816, fol. 338). The Irish translation of Hippocrates's Aphorisms with commentary made in 1403 by Aonghus Ó Callanáin and Niocól Ó hIceadha enjoyed a wide manuscript circulation. The oldest extant copy belonged at this date to EL and is now Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1318 (H. 2. 16), cols. 487–499, dated to 1413 and signed by the scribe 'Gilla Padraig Albanach'.

⁷¹ The Sheldonian catalogue was presumably sent along with EL's letter, dated 26 December 1704, as mentioned in the opening sentence of this reply. Broadside catalogues were produced more or less annually at this date, and I have published a list of those extant or attested, 'Selling books at the Sheldonian Theatre 1677–1720', *The Library* 7th ser. 11 (2010), 275–320. No copy

I have so little time to employ in study of that nature that I am rather losing the small tincture I had of them, yet I have a great deal of satisfaction in getting news from the Republic of Letters (of which the Illustrious Society of which you are a Member make no small part)⁷² and therefor if you'l be pleased to communicate any papers of that \nature/ as occasion should offer hereafter, it will be no small favour done to Sir

Your most oblidge Humble Servant
La: Campbell

[264]

Campbeltown April 16 1705

Be pleased to acquaint me per [[post]] what the Bishop of Worcester's Exposition of Daniels prophecy of 70 [[weeks]] (the 5th book in the catalogue) may be bought for.⁷³

5 Lachlan Campbell to Edward Lhwyd, Campbeltown, 3 January 1707

SOURCE: Bodl. MS. Ashmole 1814, fols. 298–299.

DATE: Scottish style, reckoning the year from 1 January.

ADDRESS: To Mr Edward Lhwyd | Keeper of the | Ashmolean Museum | Oxford.

POSTMARK: Bishop marks IA/18, IA/24 (18 and 24 January). The two postmarks suggest that the letter was dated on receipt at the letter offices in both Edinburgh and London.

Sir

Since I wrote my letter I find I have yet by me a note I took of some general mistakes you desired me to mark down in my going throw your

survives from 1704, but EL had sent one to O'Flaherty, which was acknowledged by letter dated 8 December 1704 (*O'Flaherty's Letters*, 259–60).

⁷² Participation in the republic of letters was a motivating force in the correspondence between LC and Wodrow; see, for example, Wodrow to LC, 7 December 1700, 'I intreat for long accompts of affairs from you both as to civil affairs and especially concerning the Republick of Learning, quhat [MS qn, ? *read* quhen] neu advances you meet with or make in your reading and excellent converse, quhat neu books or curiouse old ones' (Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow*, 133, no. 67).

⁷³ This refers to a work advertised as in press in the Sheldonian sale catalogue. It appears in second position in the two extant catalogues from 1705, 'An Exposition of Daniel's Prophecy of LXX Weeks, with Chronological Tables of those Weeks and other matters relating to the same; by the Right Reverend Father in God, William, Lord Bishop of Worcester, 4to'. The work in question, by William Lloyd, bishop of Worcester since 1699, had appeared some time earlier and without imprint; ESTC suggests London, c. 1690. The Sheldonian edition seems never to have materialised.

Dictionary which I here transcribe and send you at the same adventure I have done the rest:⁷⁴ But I dare not answer for their being infallibly right both because of my diffidence of my own skill in the Language and because I have not now time minutely to compare what I noted only overly (*sic*) with the places in your Dictionary they refer to, which I did more exactly in the letter I sent you in June.⁷⁵

(1) h deficient as ρζιορταῖο for ρζιορτᾶῖο active, κοβλαῖ for κοβῶλαῖ in the word ταρκορ. μαζυιρζε for μαζυιρζε in βιρραῖ (2) h redundant as το ρῥιζ for το ρῥιζ in ρῥιζιμ vid: numb: 16:32. βρεαδαῖ for βρεαδοῖ beauty (but this belongs to the preceding head);⁷⁶ ταιτνεαῖ for ταιτνεαῖ in ταιτοῖ.⁷⁷ In the general in [265] reading MSS no great regard must be had to the (h) at all in seeking words in the dictionary for reasons I told you of before. (3) errata Typographica [–as] that are evidently such: as ροοζαῖ for ραοζαῖ in ριῖβε,⁷⁸ τουαῖ for τουαῖ ibid,⁷⁹ βιοῖβυαῖ for βιοῖβυαῖ everlasting,⁸⁰ βοῖ for βοῖ, limbs,⁸¹ οῖ for οῖ in †fi.⁸² &c. (4) words beginning with a vowel, set down as beginning in τ which is the article as ταιτνεαῖ concerning which you have a needless doubt, ταιτνεαῖ for οῖτνεαῖ a plowman, of this kind is οῖζλαιρῖζεαῖ for οῖοῖζλαιρῖζεαῖ.⁸³ (5) a consonant doubled where it should be single which alters the sound very much as ταιτνεαῖ for ταινεαῖ strong. (6) 2 words joined in one as ανυαῖ for ανυαῖ (7) the same word twice over as αταῖ a request which seems to be explained in the preceding line, thus βαῖν λιαῖρῖοῖ and again βαῖν ρῖλα. (8) different words confounded as βαῖλαῖ spotted and βαῖλαῖ a breach,

⁷⁴ A comparison with the fourth letter above shows that LC has revisited the notes he had used for that letter without apparently noticing the extent of repetition.

⁷⁵ Referring to a letter dated 3 June 1706 (see below), of which there is no trace now among EL's correspondence. The fact that LC does not begin by citing the subsequent letter from EL suggests that it had been neither received nor answered.

⁷⁶ Lenition missing in 'Breadachd, *Beauty, ornament*' (sig. C2vc).

⁷⁷ '†Tuidhle, Taidhleach, no Taithneamhach; *Pleasant, delightful, agreeable*' (sig. Ee1va). There is also a correctly written entry, 'Taitneamach, *Goodly, pleasant*' (sig. Bb2vb).

⁷⁸ '†Sithbhe, Sithbhéo fod sooghail: *Continual, perpetual, &c.*' (sig. Aa1va).

⁷⁹ '†Sithbhe, i.e. Duan; *A City*' (sig. Aa1va).

⁸⁰ 'Biothbhunn, *Everlasting*' (sig. C1vc).

⁸¹ 'Boil, *The plural of Bal. Limbs, members*' (sig. C2rc).

⁸² The entry reads, '†Fi, olc. *Fo ainm do mhaith is do mhiadh, Fi ainm dule is daimhriar, &c.* bad, naught [*read* naughty], corrupt' (sig. M2rc). The immediate source was Ó Cléirigh. The quotation is an early one, a quatrain already quoted in the scholia on *Amrae Choluimb Chille* in *Leabhar na hUidhre*: 'Fó ainm do maith is do míad, / Fí ainm d'ulc ocus d'anriad, / án fír is ní forus fand / íath mind ocus íath ferand' (LU 526–9; R. I. Best & Osborn Bergin, *Lebor na hUidre* (Dublin, 1929), 19).

⁸³ 'Ioghláithrigheadh: No gur dioghláithrigheadh iad an uile gheinealach. *Until all the Generation was consumed.* Num. 32. 13' (sig. Q1vc).

passage way &c. in $\beta\lambda\lambda$. (9) consonants single where they ought to be double as $\beta\mu$ sweet (or rather melodious) for $\beta\mu\mu$. $\beta\mu\mu$ for $\beta\mu\mu\mu$ of the belly (10) Cl. exemples are not to be understood except by reading them in one word which is divided as $\mu\alpha\iota\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda$ for (as I conjecture) $\mu\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\epsilon\lambda\eta\lambda$ infants, in $\beta\mu\mu\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ and $\mu\alpha$ $\beta\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ for $\mu\alpha\beta\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ and vice versa, it were to be wished you had printed all his exemples at large it being the only book I hear of whereby the old Irish may be recovered.⁸⁴ (11) some words translated in the Glossary by an homonymous Irish word, which is suggested again according to one of its significations, with no reason given of the difference: as cob , $\beta\mu\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\epsilon$ English victory,⁸⁵ [[*several words*]] (12) the metaphoric signification put instead of the proper as $\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\mu$ to redeem, properly to loose,⁸⁶ concerning many words I have this doubt, but not being sure my self and having no body whose judgment both in Irish language & in Grammer in the general by me I can rely on, I can say nothing. There are many instances upon each of these heads: I only pickt up these in reading a few sheets after having perused the whole before. But if I had thought the publication had been so long delayd I would have been far more exact.

To these I added some general variations (consistent enough with the analogy of the Irish Language) to be noticed in searching for words in the Dictionary which will be of as much consequence as the Errata in using of it: whereof I hinted something in one of my letters [266] you receivd but gave a more full account with exemples in my last.⁸⁷ In the general one letter is often to be substituted in our minds in the place of another of the same or near the same sound as α for \omicron and vice versa: as $\alpha\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta$ for $\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta$ the thumb,⁸⁸ $\alpha\tau\alpha\eta$ for $\omicron\tau\alpha\eta$ a stocking,⁸⁹ α for υ as $\alpha\tau\mu\iota\zeta\tau\epsilon$ for $\upsilon\tau\mu\iota\zeta\tau\epsilon$ prayers,⁹⁰ thus ϵ , $\epsilon\lambda$, and $\epsilon\upsilon$, are interchanged as $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron$, $\beta\epsilon\upsilon\omicron$, and $\beta\epsilon\lambda\omicron$: bad manners, pride, and again ϵ , $\epsilon\lambda$, and $\epsilon\iota$, and $\omicron\iota$, and $\upsilon\iota$, as $\beta\omicron\iota\lambda$ and $\beta\upsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon$, Issue, success, $\beta\omicron\iota\lambda\lambda\zeta\epsilon\alpha\eta$ $\beta\upsilon\iota\lambda\lambda\zeta\epsilon\alpha\eta$ the navel or middle of any thing, also β and μ are used promiscuously as $\beta\mu\mu\mu\epsilon\lambda\tau\alpha$ and $\mu\mu\mu\mu\epsilon\lambda\tau\alpha$ pretty,⁹¹

⁸⁴ ‘Cl.’ is EL’s abbreviation for Ó Cléirigh’s *Foclóir nó Sanasán Nua* (Louvain, 1643), from which he drew many entries, in most cases daggered as obsolete; LC had remarked on the importance of this material in the fourth letter.

⁸⁵ ‘†Cobh, Buaidh, Victory’ (sig. F1vc). What has happened here is the EL has added an English gloss after Ó Cléirigh’s Irish gloss.

⁸⁶ ‘Fuasglaim, To redeem, &c.’ (sig. O1ra).

⁸⁷ Above, 00.

⁸⁸ Two entries, ‘Ardóg, A thumb’ (sig. B1rc), ‘Ordóg, A thumb; also a great toe [. . .]’ (sig. V2vb).

⁸⁹ ‘Asan, A stocking or hose. Pl.’ (sig. B1vb), but no doublet under O.

⁹⁰ ‘Arnighthe: Le harnighthe, By praying’ (sig. B1va), ‘Ornaighe, A prayer’ (sig. V2vb), ‘Urnaighe, A Prayer: Do rinne se urnaighe, He prayed’ (sig. Ff1va).

⁹¹ LC adds alternations not represented in the dictionary.

and io and i as b_ir and b_ior: Water;⁹² also a spit, b_ioç and b_iç &c. thus b and p. and ðh and çh passim as b_ireððáçt and b_ireðçáçt beauty. The remarking of this and some others that are as common might have saved you many repetitions of the same words, after the same manner io and iu are interchanged as c_io_mnar and c_iu_mnar, a border, ç and c as c_ilar and ç_ilar a lock. This is most frequent in words having the double consonant rç or rc. oi and ui as c_oi_mmuçáð and c_ui_mmuçáð and o and u as c_or_rçá and c_ur_rçá weary, c_oçh_ið and c_uçh_ið help. These variations are not only observable betwixt different authors but also in one and the same because not contrary to the analogy of Irish Grammer. There are other differences betwixt ancient & modern syllabing (as cech for çáç each, and noeb for n_om_eçá holy and generally oe for áo and bh for mh in St Patricks and St Brigids Life in Colganus) which I wish were carefully gathered by one that is master of the old Irish which I confess I am [[*several words*]] either by way of annotations on those authors [fol. 299r] [[*three words*]] together with other differences betwixt the ancient and modern Languages [[*damage*]]ould be of great use. If I had the rest of my dictionary once [[*damage*]]ould get it bound I would soon gather all I could be sure of in the books I have.⁹³ But as I said he behoved to be capable in that language that would attempt it to purpose and not a stranger in other philologic learning, which alas! most Irish and Highlanders (the smaller ers in Latine and Logick) are.

I wrote a line to you two dayes ago acquainting you of the miscarriage (as I hear) of mine of June 3. wherein I sent some Irish verses in praise of your work, additional remarks on your Dictionary, and more Irish words together with what is here at more large: which [267] Mr Campbell at Edinburgh assures me he put in the black box but tells me by a letter I received January 1, that he hears tis miscarried. I beleeve 'tis to be found however at Mr D Browns or the Scotch office at London.⁹⁴ I have sent you in mine of January 2. some of the verses as they came from their authors not having had the time to abridge or explain them or write them over again as I did in my last.^{95,96} But because tis soe Bulksome I send this only by post

⁹² ‘†Bior, *Water*. Pl. Tiobra, no Tobar bior, *A well, or well-water*. Cl. & al.’ (sig. C1vc), and a little below, ‘Bir, *Water*. Cl’, ‘†Bir, Vid. Bior: Bir Tipra, *a well*. Gloss. Vet.’ (ib.).

⁹³ LC had retained the twenty-two sheets received in 1704, and he presumably also kept sig. Z to sig. Ff, which he had clearly read. There is no confirmation that he ever saw the two further sheets that complete the appendix (sig. Gg, Hh).

⁹⁴ This sentence may provide useful information on private routes for the carriage of packets between Scotland and London, but I have no further evidence to interpret it.

⁹⁵ From this paragraph we learn of a lost letter from LC, dated 3 June 1706. What was sent on 2 January 1707 was a packet which appears to have been received. See next note.

(which at my beginning to write it I did not design but now think it expedient) I conclude because of the bearers calling me⁹⁷ once and again only desiring earnestly your pardon my being so little able to contribute to a work I wished for so much, and my being so much disappointed by the miscarriage of my mean endeavours; and that you acquaint me per post when your Book was or will be publisht, subscribing myself, Worthy Sir
 Your most obligd humble servant
 La: Campbell

Campbelltoun January 3 1707

⁹⁶ These verses, of which LC was not himself the author, are some of the commendatory verses printed at the beginning of EL's *Archaeologia Britannica*. EL had told LC that he was seeking such verses 'especially in Irish' (Sharpe, *O'Flaherty's Letters*, 138), and we must imagine that LC had solicited these among his contacts. LC's fair copies miscarried with the letter of 3 June 1706. In a letter to John Urry, dated 21 December 1706, EL mentions Colin Campbell's verses, which he had already received directly, and goes on to mention 'some other such compliments sent last Summer out of the Highlands together with a collection of Scottish-Irish words to be added to the Irish-English Dictionary. I writ to Mr Lachlyn Campbel who sent them that I would thankfully print any Irish Verses but that Latin and English are now out of Fashion, before Books. Of what sort those he sent were, I know not; [-all] the Verses & Words having [[all]] miscarried' (Sharpe, *O'Flaherty's Letters*, 139). Although we have not the means to confirm by what route each verse arrived, three of those in Gaelic have probably come by this route: (1) verses by Robert Campbell, described as forester of Argyll in Cowal, printed by EL from TCD MS 1392, no. 2, fol. 8r; Colm Ó Baoill, 'Robert Campbell, forsair Choire an t-Síth', *SGS* 23 (2007), 57–84; Dewi W. Evans & Brynley F. Roberts, *Edward Lhwyd, Archaeologia Britannica. Texts & Translations* (Aberystwyth, 2009), 88–91. (2) verses by Séamus Mac Mhuir(ich), *al.* James Currie, minister of Kildalton, Islay, from 1698 to 1712 (*Fasti*, iv. 75), printed by EL from TCD MS 1392, no. 2, fol. 7r, identified as autograph by Ó Baoill, who comments on his well-practised *corra-litir*, and reprinted by Evans & Roberts, 92–3. (3) verses by Eóin Mac Gilleóin, *al.* John Maclean ('Maighistir Seathan'), minister of Kilninian, Mull, from 1702 to 1756 (*Fasti*, iv. 114), edited by Colm Ó Baoill, *Eachann Bacach agus bàird eile de Chloinn Ghill-Eathain*, Scottish Gaelic Texts Society 14 (Edinburgh, 1979), 100–103 (text and translation), 149 (source-note), 261–7 (commentary), and reprinted by Evans & Roberts, 94–9. As John Maclean, this last corresponded with Robert Wodrow, who earlier transmitted information from him to EL, though that does not rule out Campbell's possible role as the intermediary in this case. Andrew Frazier's verses may also have come through him (Evans & Roberts, 70–71). Other verses from Scotland are less likely to have come through Campbell, though it is hard to see how Anndra Mac Ghill-Eòin's reached EL (Evans & Roberts, 66–7). John Keill was already in Oxford. Colin Campbell, of Achnaba, minister of Ardchattan and Muckairn from 1667 to 1726 (*Fasti*, iv. 81), sent his Latin verses independently to EL and received a letter of thanks, dated 22 August 1707 (EUL MS 3099. 14; Sharpe, *O'Flaherty's Letters*, 139n). See also Colm Ó Baoill's paper, 'Colin Campbell, minister of Ardchattan', *TGSI* 53 (1982–4), 464–90.

⁹⁷ Apparently hastily written and not perspicuous. The letter was sent by post, for it has postmarks, but the bearer who was about to depart was not necessarily the postman but someone who would be able to put the letter into the hands of the post. What was sent on 2 January was bulky and was therefore not sent by post because of the expense to the recipient, whereas 'this only', i.e. the letter, would be carried by post.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson 1880: Robert Atkinson, *The Book of Leinster, now for the first time published from the original manuscript* (Dublin, 1880).
- Best & Bergin 1929: R. I. Best & Osborn Bergin, *Lebor na hUidre* (Dublin, 1929).
- Campbell & Thomson 1963: John Lorne Campbell & Derick Thomson, *Edward Lhuyd in the Scottish Highlands 1699–1700* (Oxford, 1963).
- Colgan 1645: John Colgan, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae i Tomus primus [. . .] Ianuarius, Februarium, Martium complectens* (Louvain, 1645).
- Colgan 1647: John Colgan, *Triadis thaumaturgae seu Diuorum Patricii, Columbae et Brigidae, trium veteris et maioris Scotiae, seu Hiberniae sanctorum insulae, communium patronorum acta* (Louvain, 1647).
- Cregeen 1964: Eric R. Cregeen, *Argyll Estate Instructions: Mull, Morvern, Tiree 1771–1805*, Scottish History Society 4th ser. 1 (1964).
- de Brún 1972: Myles Dillon, Canice Mooney, Pádraig de Brún, *Catalogue of Irish Manuscripts in the Franciscan Librar, Killiney* (Dublin, 1972).
- Evans & Roberts 2009: Dewi W. Evans & Brynley F. Roberts, *Edward Lhwyd, Archaeologia Britannica. Texts & Translations* (Aberystwyth, 2009).
- Grant 1902: Francis J. Grant, *The Commissariat Record of Argyle. The Register of Testaments 1674–1800*, Scottish Record Society 9 (1902).
- Gunther 1945: R. T. Gunther, *Life and Letters of Edward Lhwyd*, Early Science in Oxford 14 (Oxford, 1945).
- Jackson 1956: K. H. Jackson, ‘The poem *A eolcha Alban uile*’, *Celtica* 3 (1956), 149–67.
- Jackson 1957: K. H. Jackson, ‘The Duan Albanach’, *Scottish Historical Review* 36 (1957), 124–37.
- Lhwyd 1707: Edward Lhuyd, *Archaeologia Britannica i Glossography* (Oxford, 1707) [no more published].
- Lloyd 1684: William Lloyd, *An Historical Account of Church-Government as it was in Great-Britain and Ireland when they first received the Christian religion* (London, 1684).
- Maclean 1922: Donald Maclean, ‘Highland libraries in the eighteenth century’, *TGSI* 31 (1922–4), 69–97.
- Maidment 1834: James Maidment, *Analecta Scotica* (Edinburgh, 1834–7).
- Martin 1703: Martin Martin, *Description of the Western Islands of Scotland* (London 1703).
- Nicolson 1702: William Nicolson, *Scottish Historical Library* (London, 1702).
- Ó Baoill 1979: Colm Ó Baoill, *Eachann Bacach agus bàird eile de Chloinn Ghill-Eathain*, Scottish Gaelic Texts Society 14 (Edinburgh, 1979)
- Ó Baoill 1984: Colm Ó Baoill, ‘Colin Campbell, minister of Ardchattan’, *TGSI* 53 (1982–4), 464–90
- Ó Baoill 2007: Colm Ó Baoill, ‘Robert Campbell, forsair Choire an t-Síth’, *SGS* 23 (2007), 57–84
- Ó Cléirigh 1643: Mícheál Ó Cléirigh, *Foclóir nó Sanasán nua* (Louvain, 1643)
- O’Conor 1775: Roderick O’Flaherty, *Ogygia Vindicated* (1686), edited by Charles O’Conor (Dublin, 1775)
- Ó Muraíle 2003: N. Ó Muraíle, *The Great Book of Genealogies compiled (1645–66) by Dubhaltach Mac Fhirbhisigh* (Dublin, 2003–4)

- Scott 1923: Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae*, new edition, 7 vols (Edinburgh, 1915–28).
- Sharp 1937: L. W. Sharp, *Early Letters of Robert Wodrow, 1698–1709*, Scottish History Society Publications 3rd ser. 24 (1937).
- Sharpe 2008: Richard Sharpe, ‘In quest of Pictish manuscripts’, *Innes Review* 59 (2008), 145–67.
- Sharpe 2010: Richard Sharpe, ‘Selling books at the Sheldonian Theatre 1677–1720’, *The Library* 7th ser. 11 (2010), 275–320.
- Sharpe 2012: Richard Sharpe, *Roderick O’Flaherty’s Letters to William Molyneux, Edward Lhwyd, and Samuel Molyneux, 1696–1709* (Dublin, 2012).
- Stewart 1984: A. I. B. Stewart, ‘Sons of the highland manse’, *Kintyre Magazine* 17 (Spring 1984).
- Stewart 1986: A. I. B. Stewart, ‘Lachlan McNeill Buidhe’, *Kintyre Magazine* 19 (Spring 1986), 15–19.
- Stokes 1891: Whitley Stokes, ‘On the metrical glossaries of the mediaeval Irish’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1891), 1–104.
- Thomson 1983: Derick S. Thomson, *The Companion to Gaelic Scotland* (Oxford, 1983).
- Ward 1662: Hugh Ward, *Sancti Rumoldi acta* (Louvain, 1662).
- Whittaker 2005: Jean Whittaker, *William Nicolson and the Making of Scottish History* ([Tobermory], 2005).
- Wodrow 1842: Robert Wodrow, *Analecta; or, Materials for a history of remarkable providences* (Edinburgh, 1842–3).