AUTOCHTHONS AND OTHERWORLDS
IN CELTIC AND SLAVIC

1. Introduction. Separation of Ireland in *Mesca Ulad*.

When dealing with Irish Otherworld one encounters the problem of the beginning of historical consciousness in Ireland. The time immemorial when the Túatha Dé were said to have ruled Ireland as described in the first half of ‘The Wooing of Etáin’ (*Tochmarc Etaíne*) is perceived as a period during which there is no sharp division between this world and the Otherworld, nor between sons of Míl and the Tuatha Dé, the time when gods walked on earth (Bergin, Best 1934–38: 142–46). One can even argue that even in the later periods (according to Irish traditional chronology), as they are reflected in early Irish tradition, the border-line between this world and the ‘supernatural’ existence is transparent and in any relevant early Irish narrative one can hardly trace a precise moment when a hero enters the ‘Otherworld’. What is remarkable is that one can definitely detect ‘otherworldly’ characters in this environment such as the supernatural beings (*áes síde*) that are associated with a particular locus, a *síd*. The seemingly ‘historical’ question of when lower Otherworld in Ireland was first separated from the middle world of humans is dealt with in a number of early Irish tales. Let us focus on a short fragment from an Ulster cycle tale ‘The drunkenness of the Ulaid’ (*Mesca Ulad*). The problem of *áes síde* and their opposition to humans is posed here only in order to determine the conflict in the tale. This question as such is not relevant to the Ulster cycle, though it may be taken as an important stimulus for many conflicts described in Early Irish literature. The fragment forms an introduction to a younger version of *Mesca Ulad* (MU³) and is taken from the Book of Leinster 261b:

Ō do-ríachtatar Meic Míleid Espáine Hërind tānic a ngáes timchell Túathi Dé Danann. Cu ru léice Hériu ar raind Amairgin Glúnmáir

---

¹ V.l. Redg. Radg Y; Ridhgel E. Rotbél, Rodbel YE, Boglacthna E.
meic Míled. Úair is samlaid ro báí side rígfilí 7 rígbrithem. Cu ru raind Hērinn dar dó 7 co tuc in leth ro bóí sís d’Hērind do Thūath Dé Danann et in leth aile do Maccaib Míled Espáine da chorpfhíni fadéin.

Do-chuatar Tūath Dé Danann i cnoccaib 7 síidbrugib cu ra accallset sida fo thalmain dóib. Bar-fhácsat cúicfhiur dib ar comair cada cócicd i nHērinn ic mórât chath 7 chongal 7 áig 7 urgaile etir Maccu Míled. Barrácasat cúiciur dib ar chomair cúici Udáid int shainruth. Anmand in chúc-fír sin, Brea mac Belgain a Drommannaiib Breg, Redg Rotbél a Shlemnaib Maige Ítha, Tinnell mac Boclachtnai a Sléib Edlicon, Gríci a Cruachán Aigli, Gulban Glass mac Gráci a Beind Gulbain Guirt meic Ungairb (Watson 1941: 1; LL 261b).

When the sons of Míl of Spain reached Ireland, their wisdom circumvented the Tūatha Dé Danann. Ireland was left to the division of Amorgen Glúnmár, son of Míl, for he was a kingly poet and a kingly judge. He divided Ireland in two and gave the half under the ground to the Tūatha Dé Danann and the other half to the sons of Míl of Spain to his own kin.

The Tūatha Dé Danann went into the hills and fairy regions, and they dug the fairy-mounds (síde) underground for them. They left behind, for each fifth of Ireland, five of their number to increase battles and conflicts and strife and struggle among the sons of Míl. They left behind five of their number for the fifth of Ulaid in particular. The names of those five were Brea son of Belgan from the ridges of Brega, Redg Rotbél from the plains of Mag Ítha, Tinnell son of Boclachtnae from Slíab Edlicon, Gríci from Cruachán Aigli, Gulban Glass son of Gráci from Bend Gulbain Guirt maicc Ungairb.

Leaving aside for the moment the pentadic symbolism of the fragment let us consider the opening lines of the narrative. The special localization of the Otherworld is associated in this text (as well as in other narratives to be discussed) with the coming of the sons of Míl and the beginning of Goidelic Ireland. It is not surprising that the very notion of the separation between the world of humans and the Otherworld is closely related to the beginning of history as such. When history begins the sacred (belonging to gods) has to be separated from the profane (belonging to mortals). One can argue that Ireland has experienced several ‘beginnings’ of history, and alongside with the coming of Christianity and the Anglo-Norman invasion, the coming of the sons of Míl is one of those beginnings of history in medieval Irish historiography. The coming of the sons of Míl has been interpret-
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ed by several scholars as the triumph of men over the elder gods. The latter phenomenon known also in Classical myths introduces not only history but also mythology as a system governing the relations between men and gods, profane and superhuman. This phenomenon of early Irish mythology was earlier commented upon by M.-L. Sjoestedt:

The day on which the race of men triumphed over the race of gods marks the end of the mythical period when the supernatural was undisputed master of the earth, and the beginning of a new period in which men and gods inhabit the earth together. From that moment the great problem of religion becomes important, the problem of relationship between man and the gods. The mythology states the circumstances in which the charter regulating this relationship was established once and for all (Sjoestedt 1949: 47).²

It is significant that the victory of the sons of Míl over the Túatha Dé Danann is associated with their wisdom, intelligence (gáes) rather than their military strength. The events alluded to in the tale are explored in *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (‘The Book of the Conquest of Ireland’) in the section devoted to the coming of the sons of Míl and their victory over the Túatha Dé Danann. The main driving force of Ireland’s division in *Mesca Ulad* is the same Amorgen, who plays the most active role at the taking of Ireland by the sons of Míl. It should be remembered that the taking of Ireland by the sons of Míl is described as a contest between the druids and the wise men of the Túatha Dé against the druids and filid of the sons of Míl. The author of *Lebor Gabála* refers to such an early authority as *Cín Dromma Snechta* in stating that druids and filid of the sons of Míl destroyed the magic army conjured by the earth-goddess Ériu: they "sang spells to them, and they saw that they [the warriors] were only sods of the mountain peat" (conrochansat a ndruidh-seom 7 a filid dichetla doib, conaccater ní bat-ir [acht] fhood món na slēibe) (Macalister 1956: 36).³ When confronting "the wind of druids" (gāeth druad) on the sea the sons of Míl blame their learned men (āes dāna) for their failure, and it is only Amorgen who can confront the magic of the Túatha Dé with his spells (Macalister 1956: 38, 114). Amorgen is also associated with divisions and judgments in *Lebor Gabála* but the divisions and judgments concern in this instance the sons of Míl and the only agreement between them and the Túatha Dé ever mentioned in *Lebor Gabála* is when Milesians form a marriage-alliance with the Tuatha Dé Danann, giving them half of Ireland in return for their wives (Scowcroft 1988: 9). Amorgen tries to judge a dispute between Óremón and Éber when they defeat the Túatha Dé Danann and his judgment finally

² This refers also to a treaty between the Dagda and the sons of Míl mentioned in Hull 1933: 55–56.
³ Note also earthly/telluric character of the Túatha Dé magic army.
leads to Ireland's division in two parts, north and south, that is, Éremón's and Éber's (LL 1745–50, 1780). Amorgen is a knowledgeable poet and judge able to divide and govern the existence with his demiurgic functions. His name Amorgen is given to other powerful *filid* in the Irish literary tradition, it literally could probably mean 'song-born' (cf. *amar* 'song', DIL s.v., Kalygin 1997: 51, but according to Vendryes "né de la souffrance, fils du chagrin", LEIA A–65). Knowledge and magical abilities are the dominant factors that helped the sons of Míl to obtain Ireland, thus one should not attribute the second (military) Dumezilian function to them as opposed to the first priestly and sacred function of the Túatha Dé Danann.

The duality of Amorgen's division corresponds to the duality of Ireland's division into north and south, Leth Cuinn and Leth Moga. However, the division here is vertical as opposed to the horizontal divisions of Ireland in its pseudo-history. The Túatha Dé are, as it were, exiled into the lower world, the fact that causes further acts of vengeance on their part which often form the nuclei of the subsequent stories in the Ulster cycle. As it was natural for early Irish narratives describing the distant past, the narrative is structured on the basis of particular mythological schemes. Thus the dual structure of the island's division is recycled in the tale: I mean here the same dual structure or a binary opposition between north and south, Érémon and Éber, Conn and Mug Nuadat, Uí Neill and Eóganachta (Shkunaev 1991: 29–30). The opposition between the human world and the lower world, between top and bottom reflects on a cosmological level the spatial division, the latter being more important for early Irish politics and ideology. These intrinsic divisions in early Irish tradition might have lead to the reduction of the 'three cosmic zones' (middle, celestial and infernal) of the Indo-European worldview to two zones (upper and lower) in Ireland (Scowcroft 1988: 40 n. 111).

2. The problem of the *síd*.

The famous phrase from late seventh century St. Patrick's life by Tírechan describing the inhabitants of the *síd* does not explicitly connect them with the Túatha Dé but implies their affinity to pagan gods: *sed illos uiros side aut deorum terrenorum aut fantassiam estimaurent* ("but they thought they were men of the *síde* or of the earth-gods or a phantom") (Bieler 1979: 142). According to K. Jackson *side* in Tírechán might mean 'fairies' in the gen. pl. and be glossed by Lat. *aut deorum terrenorum* accordingly (Sims-Williams 1990: 76 n. 6). *deorum terrenorum* can also be interpreted as gen. partitivus.

---

4 According to K. Jackson *side* in Tírechán might mean 'fairies' in the gen. pl. and be glossed by Lat. *aut deorum terrenorum* accordingly (Sims-Williams 1990: 76 n. 6). *deorum terrenorum* can also be interpreted as gen. partitivus.
see St. Patrick and his clerics. Latin terminology employed by Tírechán derives from Classical mytho-religious milieu and points to certain Roman connotations apparent for readers learned in Latin. Tírechán as an early Hiberno-Latin author was probably aware of the phenomenon of chthonic gods in Classical tradition and more specifically in ancient Roman religion. His explanation of *áes síde* here is based on a kind of *interpretatio Romana* where the inhabitants of the Irish underworld are equated with the elder chthonic or terrestrial gods of Roman religion. Roman chthonic gods presided over the world of the dead (Scheid 1998: 97) and this association may be supported by the Irish material, where *sid* is an ambiguous Otherworld quite often hostile to humans and sometimes associated with ancestors or the dead ones (cp. the episode with Fróech’s burial in TBC under note 11). There are also archaeological associations which make relevant this link of the *síde* to the domain of the dead. As we know many *síde* or ‘fairy mounds’ of Ireland mentioned in the medieval literature are in fact Neolithic burial mounds (such as Newgrange, Knowth, Dowth etc.) Could there have been continuity in memory between the culture of the Boyne valley and later Goidelic-speaking population where the status of *áes síde* as gods presiding over the ancient burial grounds has been preserved? The etymology of *sid* related to Welsh *gorsedd* ‘manmade tumulus, natural hill’ (Sims-Williams 1990: 64), Latin *sedes* ‘seat, abode’ and by extension, ‘temple’ and ‘burial place’ in later Latin, and to Greek ἑδος with the meaning ‘seat, abode, temple’ implies the original meaning of the word as ‘a residence [of the supernatural beings, earth-gods]’ (Maier 2004: 137–38; Meid 1970: 71–72; Markey, Mees 2003: 154; Koch, Carey 2003: 418). Thus the *síde* being residences of the elder gods were supposed to have existed even before the exile of the

---

5 Lat. *terrenus* refers to infernal deities like Medea: *terrena...numina ciuit* Ovid, Met. 7.248. In the late Middle Irish Cóir Anmann (‘Fitness of Names’) the Dagda himself is called an ‘earth-god’ (dia talmhan) (Arbuthnot 2007: 44). See also a discussion of the episode from Tírechan with an emphasis on the early Irish native roots of the phenomenon in Borsje 2009: 53–81.

6 Koch argues in favour of ideological continuity between the Celtic-speaking Irish and the builders of the Boyne valley monuments, so that the image of *áes síde* is seen as a recollection of the old theocracy (Koch 1991: 24). I am inclined to more religious rather than historically motivated explanation.

7 According to Hamp etymologically distinct from *sid* ‘peace’ (Hamp 1982: 141). Burial associations of the *sid* are shown in the fragment from TBC (Rec. I), where Fróech slain by Cú Chulainn is taken by supernatural women into a mound called after him Sid Froich: *Coínti a ndúnad n-uile Fróech. Co n-accatai banchuire i n-inaraib iúanib for colainn Froích maic Idaid. F-a-cessat úadib issa síd. Síd Froich ainm in tshide sin iarum.* (‘The whole camp bewails Fróech. They saw a band of women dressed in green tunics over the corpse of Fráech mac Idaid. F-a-cessat úadib issa síd. Síd Froich ainm in tshide sin iarum.’) (O’Rahilly 1976: 27).
‘new gods’, the Túatha Dé. Finally, the ‘hidden’ chthonic gods seem to have been mentioned in early Irish poetry, when the dwarf Senbecc declares the source of his wisdom and knowledge. Senbecc (lit. ‘A little old one’) from the side was looking for magic nuts of knowledge at the source of the river Boyne at Segais in order to oppose Cú Chulainn’s force by magic and music. Senbecc introduces himself to Cú Chulainn with a short poem:

\begin{verbatim}
Nidam mac, nidam fer, nidam ferdomhan,
 fesa rom dánsattar dé díamra
Abhcánsa saoí fealbhais,
 file a Seghaigh, Senbhecc mo ainm.
  ua Èbhric a siodhaibh
       I am not a boy, I am not a man, I am not a minor;
               hidden gods have granted me knowledge.
               I am a small dwarf, a sage of enchantment,
               a filí from Segais, Senbecc is my name,
               the grandson of Èbrec from the side.
\end{verbatim}

(Bretnach 1981: 60, Bretnach’s translation is slightly amended).

The poem explicitly connects supernatural knowledge with the sid. It is very important that a protagonist here is non-human, and his knowledge also seem to lack human dimension. Senbecc’s knowledge (fiús) is granted by the old gods hidden underground, which implies that Senbecc is not one of the gods but belongs to a specific layer in the early Irish supernatural hierarchy somewhere close to leprechauns of the later folk tales. He is an anthropomorphic creature from the sid, the fact which shows a complex nature of the sid and its inhabitants. The dwarf calls himself a suí ‘sage’ associated with enchantment or charms (felmas, he is also a sai ecsidh ‘sage of poesy’ in BB 308 b 27). And he is also a filí ‘poet, story-teller’. Judging from this archaic poem we can better understand connections and properties of the supernatural knowledge (fiús, suíthe) connected with the Otherworld and magical practices in the early Irish literature. A structurally similar phrase, which may support the reading of the cited poem, is uttered also by Cú Chulainn in response to Emer, his future wife, in time of their first encounter, Cú Chulainn boasts of being a great intellectual to the same extent as a great warrior: conidam fissid foichmairc hi cerdaib dé druidechta ('And I am a wise man in studying the crafts of the gods of druidism/ gods of magic') (van Hamel 1978, 30).8

The nuances of the vocabulary employed in the fragment from MU are not clear to a modern reader. There is definitely a difference intend-

---

ed between sidbruig and sid. As we mentioned sid is usually interpreted as ‘fairy mound’, or ‘elf-mound’, whereas sidbruig is sometimes invested with a more general meaning of ‘fairy region’ (Watson 1941: 101) or is explained as ‘fairy mansion’ (DIL, S 215.86). The second part of the compound here is a Middle Irish bruig (OI mruig) ‘land, cultivated land, holding’, thus a broader meaning ‘fairy holding, fairy territory’ is preferable. The most obvious illustration of the difference between sid and sidbruig is to be found in the nomenclature associated with the most famous sid in Ireland, Sid in Broga, the burial mound and the megalithic tomb now called Newgrange. The territory adjacent to - and including - the tumulus (sid) itself was known as Bruig na Bónne, or Bruig Meicc ind Óc, or simply Bruig (as the most famous of all brugai in Ireland) (Coffey 1912: 27). This territory consisted of several burial mounds and other man-made phenomena and was traditionally known as one of the primeval burial grounds in Ireland before the coming of Christian faith (primreilce Hérend ría cretim) (LU 4068–4204). It is not only associated with the Túatha Dé Danann and other mythological creatures who have been buried there but it is also described as a burial ground of several legendary kings of Tara (Tuathal Techtmar, Fedelmed Reachtach, Conn Cétchathach etc.). It is noteworthy that the dindshenchas of Bruig na Bónne mentions Sid in Broga as one of the monuments on site: the sid is said to have been built by the Dagda and is described as his fort (dín, dún) (Gwynn 1906: 10–24; Stokes 1894: 292).

The phrase ra accallset sida fo thalmain dób (‘they dug the fairy mounds (side) underground for them’) adds to the ambiguity of the semantics of the sid. It is possible that sida here refers not to the fairy mounds but to the inhabitants of the fairy mounds and is equivalent to áes síde. The separate usage of pl. side as a term for the chthonic inhabitants is probably supported by Fiacc’s hymn, composed in archaic language with an abnormal word order, where it is stated that before the coming of Christianity the people of Ireland ‘worshipped the side’ (tuatha adortais side) (Stokes, Strachan 1903: 317). The stress on the underground location of the side (fo thalmain) is quite specific for MU: it is sometimes specified in Early Irish literature that the sid is located under the ground but this point is important here as the vertical division of Ireland between mortals and Túatha Dé is discussed earlier. The form ra accallset here is also quite problematic: J. Carmichael Watson reads it as ro-pret. 3 pl. from the verb ad-gíalla ‘serves, is in clientship to, gives hostages to, submits to’ (DIL s.v. ad-gíalla;

---

9 Cf. in-airthiur in ìmbroga (LU 10591) with a survival of OIr. mruig.
10 The reference though may equally be to the mounds and their inhabitants and can be translated: ‘the peoples used to worship fairy-mounds’ (Sims-Williams 1990: 76 n. 6).
Watson 1941: 63). As suggested by the DIL, the form may also refer to ad-claid ‘renders liable’ if sída is acc. pl., which does not make a big difference in the meaning of the phrase. If one accepts the meaning ‘to give hostages to’ then the phrase ra accallset sída fo thalmain dóib can be translated as ‘the síde under the ground granted hostages to them’. The following sentence starting Bar-fhácsat cúicfhiur díb could then refer to the autochthonous inhabitants of the síd (sída) rather than to the Túatha Dé Danann. On the other hand, as J. Carey suggested in a private communication, it is equally possible that the verb ad-claid is to be taken here in the meaning ‘digs’, so that it would refer to the Tuatha Dé constructing their underground dwellings (one of the rare cases where this kind of supernatural construction is described in literature) (DIL A 44.16–17). There is another instance where the verb ad-claid is used in the sense of ‘constructing a mound, or a defense’. It is found in the Metrical Dindshenchas of Alend with regard to its mythological founders: acclaidset mór nAlinde ‘they dug the rampart of Alend’ (Gwynn 1906: 82).

In Cath Maige Tuired on the other hand we encounter a ‘mythological age’ of pre-separation, when gods (Túatha Dé Danann) inhabit the middle world of humans and are referred to as ‘men of Ireland’ (fir Érenn). Their enemies, Fomoire, are called in the tale ‘champions of the síd’ (trénfiru ant sídho) (Gray 1982: 34). An archaic 7th-century poem on a legendary king of Leinster, Mess-Telmann, refers to his exploits in the ‘vales of Fomoire’ located in the underworld and associated with the realm of the dead: Māl ad-rūalaid īathu marb,/ macc sōer Sētnai,/ selaig srathu Fomoire/ fo doīne domnaib (‘A prince who entered the lands of the dead/ the noble son of Sétnae/ laid waste the vales of Fomoire/ under the worlds of humans’) (Meyer 1914: 6; Koch, Carey 2003: 52). According to MU, the Túatha Dé Danann joined their predecessors in the lower world when defeated by the new invaders, the sons of Míl (Scowcroft 1995: 139–140). Moreover, it seems that the Túatha Dé have acquired a status of sovereigns over these chthonic creatures (Fomoire) in the síd. This picture is supported by the account of the division of the fairy mounds among the princes of the Túatha Dé preserved in the tale De Gabáil in t-Shída (Hull 1933: 55–56). T. O’Rahilly argued that the distinction between the Túatha Dé and Fomoire is a thoroughly artificial and ‘learned’ one, and that it was popularized, if not created, by the author of Cath Maige Tuired (O’Rahilly 1946: 483). More balanced approach is that of S. Shkunaev who once remarked that one should not oversimplify relations between the Túatha Dé and Fomoire as a constant conflict between two irreconcilable divine and demonic op-

---

11 As in J. Carey’s translation in Koch, Carey 2003: 106.
ponents. The phenomenon is better explained as a dialectic combination of self-supplementing forces in a single closed system (Shkunaev 1991: 20–21). These complex relations between the Túatha Dé and Fomóire allows the next tale we are going to discuss, *Airne Fíngein*, to describe the protagonists mentioned in our fragment from *MU* as Fomóire left in Ireland after the Second Battle of Mag Tuired.

3. Associated fragment from *Airne Fíngein*.

The version of the story as preserved in *MU* can be interpreted thus: after their exile underground the Túatha Dé have left in Ireland five of their number in each fifth of Ireland (twenty-five in total). Five of them have been left in the fifth of the Ulaíd in particular. The significance of these pentads here is likely to be related to the notion of unity and integrity: the whole five fifths of Ireland are supervised by the pentads from the Túatha Dé. The ‘agents’ of the Túatha Dé are left in Ireland in order to disturb the peace and stability of the new inhabitants, the sons of Míl. The acts of ‘sabotage’ from the Túatha Dé after the coming of the sons of Míl are mentioned also in *De Gabáil in t-Shída: ar collset Túatha Dea ith blicht im Maccu Míled* (‘for the Túatha Dé (‘tribes of gods’) destroyed grain and milk round about the sons of Míl’) (Hull 1933: 55). The following description of the five characters from the Túatha Dé finds correspondence in another Old Irish tale *Airne Fíngein* where four of these five characters are described as the last remaining Fomóire in Ireland left behind after the battle of Mag Tuired. A woman from the *side*, Rothníam, relates to Fíngen the story of the four Fómóire.

Atá ann cethrar atrullaiset ré túathaib Dé Danann a cath Muigi Tuired, co rrabatar fo dichleith oc coll etha 7 blechta 7 mesa 7 mursoraid, .i. fer dib i Slemnaib Maige Itha, Redg a ainm side; fer aile dib i n-Dromannaib Breg, Brea a ainm sidhe; fer aile i Sléib Smóil, Greand a ainm side; fer aile i críchaib Crúachan, Tinell a ainm side. Innoch ro sraîntea a hÉrinn arna tofund don Morrīgain do Bodb Side Fémín 7 do Midir Bríg Léith 7 do Mac ind Óc, connâbat floglaig Fomóire for Érinn cēin maras sil Cuind (Vendryes 1953: 14–16).

---

There are four persons who escaped from the Túatha Dé Danann from the battle of Mag Tuired and they were hidden destroying corn, milk, mast, and sea produce, i.e. one man of them in the plains of Mag Itha, Redg his name, another man from them in the ridges of Brega, Brea his name, another man in Sliab Smóil, Greand his name, another man in the confines of Crúachu, Tinell his name. Tonight they were driven out of Ireland after being chased out by the Morrígán, and by Bodb of Síd Femen, and by Midir of Brí Léith, and by Mac ind Óc, so that there will not be plunderers from the Fomóire as long as the seed of Conn remains.

J. Carmichael Watson suggested that the fragment from AF may derive some of its story from the earlier version in MU and can hardly be independent evidence for the names (Watson 1941: 51). Nevertheless, the language of the fragment from AF points to an Old Irish date, and a separate list of the four characters from the Túatha Dé Danann (Morrígán, Bodb, Midir, and Mac ind Óc) involved in the pursuit suggests a unique and independent account. Here, four, not five characters are associated with chthonic demons, the Fomóire, rather than with the exiled Túatha Dé Danann. The turning point of the plot in AF is the second battle of Mag Tuired between the Túatha Dé and the Fomóire rather than the coming of the sons of Míl. There is definitely some kind of intertextual relations between the two fragments but the plots as well as the origins and roles of the heroes are different.
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A closer look at the personal names and place-names may solve the enigma of the two plots in the stories. J. Carmichael Watson took Redg as a form of Redgach near Rámind in Donegal (co Rámaind is co Redgaig, Gwynn 1913: 258.32; Watson 1941: 51). Redg is also a noun meaning ‘a sudden impulsive movement’ (DIL s.v.) and here it is not necessary related to the place-name. It is more important that in both accounts the character is associated with the plain of Mag Itha situated along the river Finn near Raphoe in co. Donegal (Watson 1941: 128; Vendryes 1953: 51).

The eponym Brea in our fragments associated with the ridges of Brega is otherwise connected with Dún mBrea (modern Bray Head, co. Wicklow); it makes an appearance in both prose and metrical dindshenchas of Bend Étaír. In this variant he is one of Partholón’s people (another group of autochthons), and it is Partholón who sends him to the East (both characters from the dindshenchas and from the tales are located in the East of the country). Brea is said to be a ‘cultural hero’: he is the first man who in Ireland built a house, made an iron cauldron and fought a duel (Gwynn 1913: 112; Stokes 1894: 330). His name seems to be related to bréo ‘flame’ which is often used to describe heroes and saints in complimentary sense (DIL s.v.) (cf. Lat. frigō ‘to roast’ and Scr. bhrijáti ‘to boil’) (Kalygin 1997: 28). His name may be directly connected with his function as a cultural hero and the domesticator of the island. In another account from the dindshenchas (secundum quosdam) Brea is called one of the seven seers of Ireland and is also associated with Dún Brea in Uí Briuin Cúalann (LL 169b).

Sliab Smóil in Airne Fingein and Slíab Edlicon in Mesca Ulad are likely to be one and the same mountain (Watson 1941: 1, 51). Slíab Smóil is variously called Slíab Smóil meic Eidlicon (Stokes 1900: 4531) and is identified as Slíab Bladma (modern Slieve Bloom, co. Laois) by Hogan (Hogan 1910 s.v. sliab smóil). According to DIL smál, smól, smúal ‘ember, glowing coal, fire’, and Slíab Smóil can be interpreted as ‘Mountain of Embers’. Two different characters are associated with the mountain according to AF and MU: in AF this is Greand (this name is likely to be equivalent with 1grend ‘beard, hair, bristles’, DIL), and in MU this is Tinnell mac Boclachtnai. This Tinell is variously associated with the ‘confines of Crúachu’ (Síd Crúachan?) in Connacht according to AF. It is important that all these characters except for Redg are not located in Ulster and it does not support the MU version of the story. The underground location of both Fomoire and áes síde discussed above resolves the problem of these two contradictory accounts in MU and AF.
4. The division of the *side* of Ireland in *De gabáil in t-ṡída*.

The third relevant Old Irish fragment is devoted to the division of the *side* of Ireland among Túatha Dé and is found in the short tale *De gabáil in t-ṡída* (hereafter DGS, ‘Concerning the seizure of the fairy mound’) from the Book of Leinster. Both Thurneysen and Hull agreed that the text from the Book of Leinster must be very archaic and composed at least as early as the ninth century (g.pl. *dea* for *dia*, the disyllabic *oäc* for *óc*, *olse* instead of *ar se*, imperative *collá*) (Thurneysen 1921: 604; Hull 1933: 54). An archaic character of the tale is supported by the absence of literary unity, fragmentary and unbalanced narrative, thereby revealing the compiler’s deliberate intention to choose and focus on particular traditional points of attraction (both toponymic and semantic) (Shkunaev 1991: 21). Below I supply the text from the Book of Leinster (fo182rb41–182va15) with some variant readings from D.IV.2 (fo50rb25–50vab) and my translation:

Boí rí amra for Tuathaib Dé ãi n-hÈre, Dagân a ainm. Ba móir, didiu, a chumachta, ced la Maccu Mìled ĭar ñ-gabâil in tíre, a[i]r colset Tuatha Dé ãa ith 7 blich im Maccu Mìled, con-digensat chairdddes in Dagdai. Do-essart saide, ĭarum, ith 7 blich dóïb. Ba móir, di-diu, a chumachta-som in tan ba rí i tossuch, 7 ba hé fo-dáil inna śide do fheraib Dea ĭ. Lug mac Cethnend i s-Síd Ro-Drubán; Ogma i s-Síd Aircheltrai. Don Dagdu fessin, immurgu, Sith Leithet Lacht-maige, Oí a Śíd; Cnocc Báine, Brú Rùair. Śíd in Broga, da-no, ba laiss i tossuch, amail as-berat.


Ni-m-thá duit, - ol in Dagda, - Ni tharnaic fodail lemm.

Etá dam, di-diu, - ol in Macc Oóc, - cid bia co n-aidchi i-t’ t[h]ri[u]b féin.

Do-breth dō-som ōn, ĭarum.
- Collá do-t’ daim, - ol in Dagda,- ūaire do-romait do ré[e].

Is menand, - olsé, - is láa 7 adaig in bith uile, 7 iss ed ōn do-ratad dam-sa.

Luid, do-no, Dagán ass, ĭarum, 7 anaid in Mac Óóc in-a s[h]íd.
Amra, da-no, a tîr hi-sin. A-ţaăt tri chrand co torud and do-grés, 7 mucc bith-beō fo chossaib, 7 mucc fhonaithe, 7 lestar co l-lind saine-mail, 7 ni-erchran and-sin uile do-grés.

---

13 Fodrubain, D IV 2.
14 Ĭo Cúalann, D IV 2.
There was a wonderful king over the Tuatha Dé (Tribes of gods) in Ireland, Dagán by name. Great, then, was his power, even among the sons of Míl after the conquest of the country, for the Tuatha Dé destroyed the corn and the milk of the sons of Míl until they made a treaty with the Dagda. Thereafter he saved corn and milk for them. Great, then, was his power, when he was king at first, and it was he who distributed the *síde* among the men of the gods, i.e. Lug son of Eithliu in Síd Rodrubán; Ogma in Síd Airtheltrai. To the Dagda himself, then, Síd Leithet Lacht-maige,..., Cnoc Báine, Brú Ruair. However, as they say, he had Síd in Broga at first. Then the Mac Óac came to the Dagda to ask for land when he has made division to everyone. He was a foster son of Midir of Brí Léith (‘Hill of a Grey One’) and of Nindid the prophet.

‘I have nothing for you,’ said the Dagda; ‘I have not found (?) the share.’

‘Get me then,’ said the Mac Óac, ‘that I will be in your own dwelling until night.’

That then was given to him.

‘Go home,’ said the Dagda, ‘since you have used up your time.’

‘It is clear,’ said he, ‘that the whole world is day and night, and it is that which has been given to me.’

Then Dagán went out of it, and the Mac Óac remains in his *síd*.

Wonderful, then, is this land. There are three trees with fruits always on them, and an undying pig at their disposal (lit. under feet), and a cooked pig, and a vessel with excellent drink, and all of this never decreases there.

A specific feature of this short tale is the name of the main protagonist, namely Dagán. This native name seems to be related to Gaulish *Dagānia*, *Dago(n)* ‘good one’ (Holder 1896: col. 1214, 1215) and is attested as a personal name in Early Ireland (*DIL*, s.v. Dagán). On the other hand, it was employed as a substitute for a Biblical name of a major northwest Semitic god Dagon in a famous Middle Irish Old Testament apocryphon *Saltair na Rann* (Stokes 1883: 5393, 5408, 5409). It is probable that the name of a major pagan Irish god in *DGS* was recontextualized in view of the Old Testament narrative, where Dagon is portrayed as a mighty pagan god of the Philistines (1 Samuel 5.2–7). It is also significant that the mythological character called Dagán is supplied in our text with the usual and more familiar epithet *in Dagda* (which is not a name but a title, ‘The Good God’, possibly replacing a tabooed name?) (Sjoestedt 1949: 38).
The destructive character of the Tuatha Dé is described using the same lexis as in AF, cp. *collset Tuatha Déa ith blicht im Maccu Miled* (DGS) and *oc coll etha blechta* (AF). Taking into account the earlier date of composition of DGS and the composite character of AF, it is plausible to assume that the fragment on the destructive Fomóire in AF is based on the account from the DGS involving destructive autochthons (Tuatha Dé) and their confrontation with the Sons of Míl.

The tale invests the Dagda with all powers and responsibilities for the division of land after the conquest of the sons of Míl. Without question, he is limited to the lower world, that is síde (faery mounds). However the text is silent with regard to the decisive role played by Amorgen Glúnmár in the division of land according to *MU*. In contrast with the *MU* account, the sons of Míl are portrayed here as silent victims of the old gods and especially of the Dagda. (Might it reflect the new Christian reading of the earlier myth, a reading which becomes evident in the word play with the Dagda’s name (Dagán)?) The image of the all-mighty Dagda here is similar to his description in *Tochmarc Étaíne* (further TÉ) where he controls weather and harvest for Tuatha Dé in the primordial time when gods walked on earth (*conmidhéadh na sina na toirthe doib*) (Bergin and Best 1934–38: 142). The story of Oengus Mac ind Óc and his trick with time in the *sid* is also attested in TÉ. In contrast with the earlier variant of *DGS*, it is the Dagda himself who instructs Oengus how to get the *sid* from Elcmar, who is the owner the Bruig according to TÉ (Bergin and Best 1934–38: 144, 146). I cannot agree with J. Koch who sees the Tuatha Dé described in *DGS* as being subordinated by Milesians and that the ‘treaty’ (*cairddes*) in the tale is to be understood as referring to the division of Ireland by Amorgen (Koch 1991: 24). There is no reciprocity between the two sides in the tale; it is only the good will of the Dagda in his capacity as the god of harvest and prosperity that made possible the treaty (‘peace’, ‘friendship’).15

The tale remains silent on the vertical division of Ireland between sons of Míl and Tuatha Dé. The chronology reflected in *DGS* though seems to support the *MU* mythologem: the *sid* are distributed by the Dagda only after the ‘treaty’ (*cairddes*) with the sons of Míl is established and when the ancient inhabitants of the *sid* have submitted to the exiled gods from Tuatha Dé. It is significant that Midir is associated with Brí Leith but does not receive this abode from the Dagda. Most of the place names mentioned in the tale are obscure and cannot be associated with any known *sid* of Ireland (apart from Síd in Broga and Cnocc Báine, which can be possi-

---

15 The same is true about the treaty (*kerennyð*) made by Pwyll and Arawn, the king of Annwn, in the first branch of the Mabinogi (Koch and Carey 2003: 412).
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bly associated with the hill of Knockmany, co. Tyrone; m here is prob-
bly due to a hypercorrect nasalization as in di cnuc mbane in G7 version
of Scél Mongáin.16 In Brú Ruair which remains unidentified, brú stands ei-
ther for brúig or for 3 brú ‘brink, border’ and is probably attached to the
gen. of a personal name Ruar (Ó Riain, Ó Murchadha, Murray 2005: 208).
Notwithstanding the authentic character of the place-names mentioned in
the tale, - some of which could have easily been symbolic rather than geo-
graphical, as Síd Leithet Lachtmaige (Síd of the Width of the Milk-plain?),
- the mythological space in the text is not continuous and is seen as a com-
bination of several topographical objects (side) labelled with specific per-
sonal names (Lotman, Uspenskiy 1973: 288). The space in DGS has a "patch-
work" character and the presence of a number of place-names makes the
mythological space finite and countable, where most known sites (as Síd
in Broga, Brí Leith (Ardagh Hill, co. Longford) and Cnocc Báine) served as
mnemonic nodes which were important in various other narratives.

5. Pro domo sua: an appendix on Northern Russian and Finno-
Ugrian folklore.

A phenomenon typologically similar to the early Irish topos of the
Tuatha Dé exile underground is observed in the northern Russian ‘synthet-
icity’ and folklore dealing with the hidden supernatural autochthons
(Chud’beloglazaya, чудь белоглазая). Чудь originally is an Old Russian
ethnic name referring to the autochthonous Finnish population in Estonia,
regions of Pskov and Novgorod, Karelia and Archangel region and is men-
tioned as early as in the twelfth century ‘Tale of the past years’ (Повѣсть
временныхъ лѣт): Въ Афетови же части сѣдить русь, чюдь и вси языцѣ
‘In the share of Japheth lies Rus’, Chud’ and all [other] nations’ (Biblioteka
1997: §1; Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor 1953: 52). Old Russian чюдь (lat-
er чудь) is related to Old Church Sl. чтудь, штудь, Russian чужой
‘alien, foreign’, and interpreted as an early borrowing from Germanic
(Gothic þiuda ‘Volk’, ON thjodh, OHG diota etc.) referring originally to

16 There is an inscribed stone circle (with the Neolithic zigzags and spiral ornaments similar
in style to those found in Newgrange) and a Passage Grave on the hill. The monument
belongs to the Boyne valley culture and in literary tradition said to have been the grave of
a queen Báine (‘Whiteness’?), the wife of Tuathal Teachtmhar and the mother of Feidlimid
Rechtmar (LL 24a: Cnocc Báine), and by the peasantry of the 19th century associated with
the fairy Áine (MacNeill 2008: 307). Síd Chnuci Báine also figures prominently in ‘The
story of Mongán’ (Scél Mongáin), where a fi’s disciple visits the síd on Mongán’s behalf
and finds hospitality from a noble couple who reside in the síd (LU 134a; N. White (ed.),
Compert Mongáin and Three Other Early Mongán Tales (Maynooth, 2006), p. 169–70).
the Germanic neighbours of the Slavs (Vasmer 1958: 352; Preobrazhensky 1949: 80) (on the other hand it is remarkable that Chud’ is often associated with the Finno-Ugrian population rather than with Germanic). The form could have been contaminated by OCS/Old Russian чудо ‘wonder, marvel’. There is also OCS штудь(ъ) ‘giant’ which might be an equivalent of Old Russian чюдь, while in the later sources, чудь is described as supernatural giants (Chernykh 1999: 359; Komogortsev 2007: 273). The form’s relation to OIr. tuath is accidental though semantically it may also refer to marginal and alien ‘tribes’ to the same extent as OIr. Tuatha Dé. It is also important that on the level of historical narrative Chud’ is always ethnically alien towards the Russians to the same extent as Tuatha Dé are always alien towards the Irish (or the sons of Míl).

Later northern Russian folklore contains several accounts how Chud’ were made to go into exile north-eastwards under an advance of Russian settlers. The last refuge which was open to them was to go underground and there are several tales describing how Chud’ went underground (чудь под землю ушла) (Krinichnaya 1991: № 108–122). One should not associate the Chud’ of Russian folklore with any Finnish autochthones in the North because the local Finnish autochthonic population Komi also have several legends concerning semi-supernatural autochthones called in Komi т’суд’, an ethnic name borrowed from Russian (Komogortsev 2007: 273). Moreover, the Nenets population of the far North (Yamal peninsula) has similar legends involving the dwarfish autochthones called sirtya (sihirtya, sihirchi) who inhabited the tundra before the Nenets and later moved underground into the high sand hills (cede). After their settlement underground they hardly appear on the earth surface, and only Nenets shamans know the actual hills (cede) which are inhabited by sirtya (ibid.: 274; Lashuk 1968: 178–93). In the nineteenth century Russian explorers associated sirtya with Chud’. The most known account of the Chud’s exile is known from the nineteenth century northern Russian folklore recorded by Maximov. The late date for the attestation of the mythologem is explained by the comparatively late ethnic and toponymic change in the area:

<...> чудь в землю ушла, под землей пропала, живьем закопалась. Сделала она это, по одним, оттого, что испугалась Ермака, по другим, оттого, что увидала белую березу, внезапно появившуюся и означавшую владычество Белого царя.

<...> Chud’ went underground, was lost underground, buried themselves alive. They did as some people say, because they were afraid of Yermak, and as other people say, because they saw a white birch tree suddenly manifested and signifying the power of the White tsar.
This motif of the underground escape/exile was interpreted as a reference to the ancient totemic creatures, submerging into earth, or mountain, or any water source in the end of their life (cp. Svyatogor’s myth in Russian epic poems) (Krinichnaya 1991: № 110; Lashuk 1969: 213). I would rather connect this phenomenon of mythological consciousness with the specific attitude towards ancient autochthonous population. Non-Christian autochthones leave the historical scene as well as this world of humans and enter the lower Otherworld, which can be entered and accessed through caves, graves and mounds (ibid.: 209). To the same extent as Tuatha Dé in Ireland, Chud’ is associated with the burial mounds of the ancient autochthonous culture. It is also quite important that in Russian sources the earliest accounts of Chud’ are associated with the pagan wisdom and are portrayed as persistent opponents of the Christian faith. The ‘Russian primary chronicle’ is surprisingly eloquent in its entry under 1071 when giving a live ethnographic scene from the life of the Chud’s shamans:

Приключися некоему новгородцю прити в Чудь, и приде к кудеснику, хотя волхованья от него: он же по обычаю своему нача призывати бесы в храмину свою. Новгородцю же седящу на по-розе того же храмины, кудесник же лежаше оцепенев, и шибе им бес (Povest 1910: 146).

It happened that a certain man from Novgorod went among the Chuds, and approached a magician, desiring to have magic done by him. The latter according to his custom, began to call devils into his abode. The man from Novgorod sat upon the threshold of that house, while the magician lay there in trance, and the devil took possession of him (Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor 1953: 153).

The magicians from the Chud’ are mentioned as late as the sixteenth century in the Stoglav (Hundred Chapters), the proceedings of the Church Council in Moscow in 1551. It tells about the magic of the Chudian arbuys (magicians) (Kozhanchikov 1863). Chud’ is often portrayed as pagan autochthonic tribes seeking refuge from the coming of Christianity, and the last escape for them is found underground in the netherworld, where the ‘devils’ of the Chuds’ magician are located according to the Russian primary chronicle. They either hid themselves in the caves or bury themselves alive in low wooden houses (Lashuk 1969: 209). The ways of their underground exile are supported by the archaeological evidence from the Komi region which shows inhumation in small wooden houses (срубы) as the burial rite of local autochthones (чудь заволочская) (ibid.: 213). 

Ancient
settlements, mounds and other burial sites are associated with Chud’ on the rivers Pinega and Mezen (Mil’chik 1971: 15).

6. Conclusion

The separation of the lower Otherworld from the human middle world is explained as a ‘historical’ fact both in medieval Irish tales and in northern Russian folklore. The problem of subterranean autochthones (áes síde or Chud’) and their enmity towards humans is posed in order to determine the conflict in the narratives. The special localization of the Otherworld is associated in the texts discussed with the coming of the sons of Míl and the beginning of Goidelic Ireland or with the coming of Russian settlers and the beginning of history in the Russian North. The very notion of the separation between this world of humans and the Otherworld is closely related to the beginning of history as such. When history begins the sacred has to be separated from the profane (belonging to mortals). When this separation is performed the binary opposition between the lower Otherworld and the upper world of humans becomes a distinctive feature of the early Irish mythological narrative or Northern Russian and Komi folklore. Both Celtic and Slavic examples seem to reflect a transition stage when cosmological elements (such as the lower world, supernatural chthonic entities etc.) are superimposed on the emerging historical consciousness.

Abbreviations
LEIA: Lexique étymologique de l’irlandais ancien
LL: Book of Leinster
MU: Mesca Ulad
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Autohtoni i Drugi svjetovi u keltskome i slavenskom

Sažetak

Nekolicina ranih irskih priča bavi se ‘povijesnim’ pitanjem: ”Kad se Podzemni svijet u Irskoj odvojio od gornjeg svijeta?” Problem áes síde i njihovo neprijateljstvo s ljudima određuje sukob u pričama. Ovaj rad bavi se uvodnim dijelom priče iz Ulsterskog ciklusa, ‘Pijanstvo Ulata’ (Mesca Ulad). Specijalna raspodjela Drugog svijeta u tekstu se povezuje s dolaskom Mílovih sinova i s početkom goidelske Irske. Sam pojam razdvajanja ovog ljudskog i Drugog svijeta usko je vezan uz početak same povijesti. Kad počinje povijest, mora se odvojiti sveto (koje pripada bogovima) od svjetovnog (koje pripada smrtnicima). Budući da se odvija razdvajanje, binarna opozicija između podzemnog Drugog svijeta i gornjeg ljudskog svijeta postaje razlikovno obilježje ranih irskih mitova. Tipološki sličan fenomen uočen je i u sjevernoj ruskoj "sintetskoj povijesti" i folkloru koji se bave skrivenim natprirodnim starosjediocima (чудь белоглазая). I keltski i slavenski primjeri odražavaju prijelazno stanje u kojem se kozmološki elementi ugrađuju u rastuću svijest o povijesti.

Ključne riječi:
Key word: