LORD TYRONE'S GHOST.

The story of Lord Tyrone's Ghost deserves some archæologic inquiry, since it is the "well-known Irish tradition," as Sir Walter Scott, evidently alluding to this anecdote, terms it, that gave him the idea of the catastrophe of his poem, *The Eve of St. John.* Belief in ghosts has been shown to be general, by the remark, that few men can pass through a church-yard at midnight, without experiencing a sènsation that proves them to have superstitious ideas. For my part, though reposing little faith in such apparitions, *nihil super-humanum a me alienum puto;* so I offer the following version of this story which was given me from an old MS. legendary account of the affair, and which so far as I know, has not appeared in print, and subjoin a few notes and comments. In Ireland, the anecdote about to be told was as current as the curious and somewhat analogous one was in England, respecting the singular circumstances attending the death of Lord Lyttelton. According to this latter ghost-story:—"In a dream there appeared, standing at the foot of his (the younger Lord Lyttelton's) bed, a beautiful diminutive female figure, with a small bird perched on her finger. The apparition announced to him that the third night, precisely at twelve, his death would take place. He was found dead by his valet, with his watch in his hand, and the hand had just passed the fated hour." His lordship had evidently told some one of an apparition and a prophecy; but it has been said that the unfortunate nobleman had previously determined to take poison, and thus had it in his own power to fulfil the prediction. Horace Walpole, ever sceptical and satirical, offers, in the following lively sally to one of his correspondents, a rather cynical explanation of the mystery:—"If you can send us any stories of ghosts out of the North, they will be very welcome; Lord Lyttelton's vision has revived the taste, though it seems a little odd that an apparition should despair of being able to get access to his lordship's bed in the shape of a young woman, without being forced to use the disguise of a robin red-breast."

THE STORY OF LORD TYRONE'S GHOST.

Lord Tyrone[a] and Lady Beresford[b] were born in Ireland, and were left orphans when infants in the care of the same person, by whom they were educated in the principles of Deism. Their guard-

[a] John Poer, second Earl of Tyrone, was born in 1665, and died a bachelor, in Dublin, 14th October, 1693, in the 29th year of his age. His father died in 1690, so he was not left an orphan.

James Poer, third Lord Tyrone, was born in 1667, married in 1692, and died 19th August, 1704. His heiress, Lady Catherine Poer, was married in 1717, to Sir Marcus, son of Sir Tristram Beresford.

[b] Nichola-Sophia, youngest daughter and co-heir of Hugh Hamilton, Baron of Glenawly, was married, in 1687, to Sir Tristram Beresford. In 1704, she married, secondly, Lieutenant-General Richard Gorges, son of Dr. Robert Gorges, and died in 1713.

ian[c] dying when they were young (about fourteen) they fell into different hands, and the persons on whom the care of them devolved used every possible means to eradicate the erroneous principles they had imbibed, and to persuade them to embrace revealed religion, but in vain; their arguments were insufficient to convince, tho' they served to stagger their former faith. Though now separated their friendship remained unalterable, and they continued to regard each other with fraternal affection. After some years had elapsed, and they were each of them grown up, they made a solemn promise that whichever died first would, if permitted, appear to the other to declare what religion was most acceptable to the Supreme Being. Lady Beresford was soon after married to Sir Martin Beresford;[d] but no change of condition could alter their friendship, and the families frequently visited each other. A short time after one of these visits, Sir Martin remarked when his lady came down to breakfast, that her countenance was unusually pale, and bore evident marks of terror and confusion; he enquired anxiously after her health and she assured him she was perfectly well: he repeated his enquiries and begged to know if anything had disordered her; she replied "no, no, she was as well as usual." "You have hurt your wrist; have you sprained it?" observed he, seeing a black ribbon bound round it: she replied she had not, but added, "let me conjure you never to enquire the cause of my wearing this ribbon, which you will never see me without; if it concerned you as a husband to know, I would not for a moment conceal it. I never in my life denied you a request, but of this I must entreat you to forgive me my refusal, and never to urge me further on the subject." "Very well" said he smiling, "since you so earnestly desire it I will enquire no further." Lady Beresford enquired if the post was come in, and in a few minutes she again made the same enquiry, and received the same answer as the first, that it was not. "Do you expect any letters" said Sir Martin. "I do," she exclaimed, "I expect to hear that Lord Tyrone is dead,—he died last Tuesday at four o'clock." "I never in my life," cried he, "believed you to be so superstitious, you must have had some idle dream that has thus alarmed and perplexed you."—At that instant the servant opened the door, and delivered them a letter sealed with black wax:—"As I expected, he is dead!" she exclaimed; Sir Martin opened the letter, which was from Lord Tyrone's steward, and contained the melancholy intelligence that his master died on the Tuesday preceding, at the very hour Lady Beresford had specified. Sir Martin intreated her to compose her spirits, and to endeavour as far as lay in her power not to make herself unhappy. She assured him she was much happier than she had been for some time, and added, "I can communicate to you intelligence which I know will give you pleasure;—I can assure you, I am without doubt, with child of a son." Sir Martin received the

[c] Marcus, Viscount Dungannon, and his wife, a co-heir of Hugh Hamilton, Baron of Glenawly, and sister of Lady Beresford, were guardians of Sir Marcus Beresford. But this conld not have been the guardianship referred to.

[d] There was no Sir "Martin" Beresford. Sir Tristram Beresford, Bart., born in 1669, married, February 1687, Nichola-Sophia, youngest daughter and co-heir of Hugh Hamilton, Baron of Glenawly, and died 16th June, 1701. Sir Marcus, his son, was born in *1694*, married, *in 1717*. Lady Catherine Poer, heiress of the third Lord Tyrone, and died in 1763.

intelligence with the joy it might be expected to convey, and expressed in the strongest terms the felicity he would experience from an event he had so long ardently desired.

After a period of some months Lady Beresford was delivered of a son; she had before been mother to two daughters. Sir Martin survived the birth of his son little more than four years, and after his death his lady seldom went from home; she visited no family but that of a clergyman who resided in the same village, with them she frequently passed a few hours every day; the most of her time was entirely devoted to solitude, and she appeared determined for ever to banish all other society.

The clergyman's family consisted of himself, his wife, and one son, who at the time of Sir Martin's death was quite a youth; to him however, notwithstanding the disparity of his years, and the manifest imprudence of a connection so unequal in every respect, she was married in a few years [e]. The event justified the expectation of every one; Lady Beresford was treated by her young husband with contempt and cruelty, while his whole conduct evinced him to be a most abandoned libertine, utterly destitute of every principle of virtue and humanity.

To this, her second husband, Lady Beresford bore two daughters, after which, such was the profligacy of his conduct that she insisted on a separation. They parted for several years, when so great was the contrition he expressed for his former behaviour that, overcome by his persuasion and promises, she was induced to pardon, and once more to reside with him, and in some time became the mother of another son. The day on which she lay in a month, being the anniversary of her birth-day, she sent for Lady Betty Cobb (of whose friendship she had long been possessed), and a few other friends, to request them to spend a few days with her, it being her birth-day: for, said she, I am forty-eight to-day. "No," remarked the clergyman, "you are mistaken, your mother and I have had many disputes concerning your age; happening to go into the parish church where you were christened, I was resolved to put an end to my doubts by searching the register, and I find you are but forty-seven to-day." "You have signed my death-warrant," said she, "I have not much longer to live! I therefore entreat you to leave immediately, as I have something of importance to settle before I die." When the clergyman had left Lady Beresford, she sent to forbid her company coming, and at the same time to request Lady Betty Cobb and her son by Sir Martin Beresford, then about twelve years of age, to come directly to her apartment: upon their arrival she desired her attendant to quit the room. "I have something of importance," said she, "to communicate to you before I die, a period not far distant. You, Lady Betty, are no stranger to the friendship that always subsisted between Lord Tyrone and myself. We were educated under

[e] Lieutenant-General Richard Gorges, the second husband of Lady Beresford, was son of Dr. Robert Gorges. Their marriage took place in April, 1704, four months before the death of Lord Tyrone. The General was born in 1662. They had issue two sons and two daughters. He married secondly, Dorothy, Countess Dowager of Meath, who is mentioned by Dean Swift.

the same roof in the principles of Deism: when the friends into whose hands we afterwards fell endeavoured to persuade us to embrace revealed religion, their arguments, though insufficient to convince, were yet powerful enough to stagger our faith, and to leave us wavering between two opinions. In this perplexing state of doubt and uncertainty, we made a solemn promise to each other, that whichever should first die would, if permitted by the Almighty, appear to the other, to declare what religion was most acceptable to Him. Accordingly, one night as Sir Martin and myself were in bed, I woke and discovered Lord Tyrone sitting by the bed-side. I screamed out, and endeavoured in vain to awake Sir Martin. 'For heaven's sake, Lord Tyrone!' exclaimed I, 'by what means, and for what purpose, did you come here at this time of night.' 'Have you then forgotten our promise?' said he. 'I died last Tuesday night, and am permitted by the Supreme Being to appear to you to assure you that the revealed religion is the true and only one by which you can be saved; I am further permitted to inform you that you are now with child of a son, who, it is decreed, shall marry my daughter: not many years after his birth Sir Martin will die, and you will marry again, and to a man by whose ill treatment you will be rendered miserable; you will bring him two daughters, and afterwards a son, of whom you will die in child-bed, in the 47th year of your age.' 'Just Heaven!' I exclaimed, 'and cannot I prevent this?' 'Undoubtedly you can: you are a free agent, and may prevent it by resisting a second marriage; but your passions are strong, you know not their power—hitherto you have had no trials. More I am not permitted to say; but if, after this warning, you persist in your infidelity, you will be miserable indeed.' 'May I ask,' said I, 'if you are happy?' 'Had I been otherwise,' returned he, 'I should not have been permitted to appear to you thus.' 'I may thence infer that you are happy?'—He smiled. 'But when the morning comes,' rejoined I, 'how shall I be convinced that your appearance to me has been real, and not the mere phantom of my own imagination?' 'Will not the news of my death be sufficient to convince you?' 'No; I might have had such a dream, and that dream might acccordingly come to pass—I wish to have some stronger proof of its reality.' 'You shall;' then waving his hand, the bed-curtains, which were of crimson velvet, were instantly drawn through a large iron hook by which the tester of the bed—which was of an oval form—was suspended. 'In that,' said he, 'you cannot be mistaken; no mortal arm could have performed this.' 'I am but sleeping,' said I;—'we are often possessed of greater strength than when awake, when I could not have done it; but asleep I might, and I shall still doubt.' He then said, 'You have a pocket-book here, in which I will write, you know my hand-writing?' I replied 'Yes.' He then wrote with a pencil on one side of the leaves. 'Still,' said I, 'I have my doubts; though waking I could not imitate your hand, asleep I might.' 'You are hard of belief,' said he; 'I must not touch you, it would injure you irreparably: it is not for spirits to touch mortal flesh.' 'I do not regard a slight blemish,' I replied. 'You are a woman of courage—hold out your hand.' I did so: he clasped my wrist—his hand was cold as marble. In a mo-

ment the sinews shrank up, every nerve withered. 'Now,' said he, 'while you live, let no mortal see that wrist: to see it would be sacrilege.' He ceased to speak; I turned towards him—he was gone. Chilled with horror, I endeavoured to awake Sir Martin, but in vain, all my efforts were ineffectual, and in this state of agitation and fear I lay some time, when a shower of tears coming to my relief, I dropped asleep.

"In the morning Sir Martin rose and dressed himself, without perceiving the state in which the curtains remained. After he was gone I arose, and having put on my clothes, went into the gallery adjoining, and took from thence a long broom, such a one as is commonly used in large houses to sweep the cornices; with the help of this I took down the curtains, though not without much difficulty, as I imagined their extraordinary position would occasion such inquiries as I wished to avoid. I then went to my bureau, locked up my pocket-book, and took a piece of black ribbon, which I bound round my wrist. When I came down, the agitation of my mind had left an impression on my countenance too visible not to be remarked by Sir Martin, who instantly observed my confusion, and asked the cause. I assured him I was well; but informed him that Lord Tyrone was now no more, that he died the preceding Tuesday, at the hour of 4; and at the same time entreated him to drop all inquiries concerning the black ribbon, and he desisted ever after from further importunity.

"You, my son, (as had been foretold,) I afterwards brought into the world; and a little more than four years after your birth, your lamented father expired in my arms.

"After this melancholy event I determined, as the only probable means of avoiding the sequel of this prediction, to abandon society for ever, to give up every pleasure resulting from it, and to pass the remainder of my days in solitude and retirement. But few can endure to exist long in a state of sequestration: I commenced an intercourse with one family only; nor could I then foresee the fatal consequences which afterwards resulted from it. Little did I imagine that their son, and only son, then a youth, would prove the destroyer of my future peace. In a few years I ceased to regard him with indifference; but I endeavoured, by all possible means in my power, to conquer a passion, the fatal consequences of which I too well knew; and fondly imagined I had overcome its influence, when the events of one fatal day terminated my fortitude, and plunged me in a moment down the abyss I had so long been meditating how to shun.

"He had frequently solicited his parents to permit him go into the army, and had at length obtained their consent, and came to bid me farewell, before the separation. The moment he came into the room he fell on his knees at my feet, told me he was miserable, and that I alone was the cause; at that instant my fortitude forsook me, I gave myself up for lost; and, without further hesitation, consented to a union, the result of which I knew to be misery, and its end death!

"The conduct of my husband, after a few years had passed, amply warranted my demand for a separation, and I hoped by that means to avoid the fated sequel of the prophecy; but, won over by

his reiterated entreaties, I was prevailed upon to pardon, and once more to reside with him,—though not till I had, as I imagined, attained my forty-eighth year. But alas! I have this day heard from indisputable authority that I have hitherto lain under a mistake about my age, and that I am but forty-seven to-day. Of the near approach of my death, therefore, I entertain not the least doubt, but I do not dread its arrival; armed with the sacred principles of Christianity, I can meet the King of Terrors without dismay, and without a tear bid adieu to the regions of mortality for ever! When I am dead, I wish you, Lady Betty, to unbind my wrist, and let my son with yourself behold it."

Lady Beresford here ceased for some time; but resuming the conversation, she entreated her son to behave so as to merit the high honour intended him from a union with the daughter of Lord Tyrone. Lady Betty Cobb and her son immediately called her attendants, and left the room, having first desired them to watch their mistress attentively, and, should they observe the smallest change in her, to call them. An hour passed, and all was silent in her room; they listened at the door, everything was still; in about half an hour more a bell rung most violently: the flew to her apartment, but before they reached the door she had breathed her last. Lady Betty desired the servants to quit the room; she then approached the bed with Lady Beresford's son; they knelt down by the side of it; Lady Betty then lifted up her hand, and unbound the ribbon, and found the wrist exactly in the state Lady Beresford had described it, every sinew shrunk up.

Lady Beresford's son is *now* married to Lord Tyrone's daughter[f], as had been predicted; the pocket-book and black ribbon are in the possession of Lady Betty Cobb, by whom the above is stated, and who, together with the Tyrone family, will be ready to attest its truth."

Assuming that the above story deserves investigation, it contains so many anachronisms, discrepancies, and incoherences, that any belief in it is almost as much staggered by the impossibility of reconciling them as by its supernatural pretentions. For instance, Lady Betty Cobb is represented as the "friend" of Lady Beresford, who, it would seem, was really her grandmother.[g] Again, if the Lord Tyrone who died, a youthful bachelor, in 1693, was the ghostly apparition, it was not his daughter, but the daughter of his brother, that was eventually married to Lady Beresford's son. Other discrepancies, such as that "the lamented father" of Lady Beresford's son, did *not* "expire in her arms four years after" this son's birth, may be gathered from my notes.

Perhaps this ghost story may be resolved into a love one: so let us imagine that the young Earl of Tyrone and Miss Hamilton had been lovers; that she, although wedded to another, was sometimes haunted by him in her dreams; and that the black riband armlet she wore was in memory

[f] This could be no other than Lady Catherine, wife of Sir Marcus Beresford.

[g] Lady Elizabeth Beresford, ninth daughter of Sir Marcus and Lady Catherine, was born in 1736, and married in 1751, to Thomas Cobbe, Esq., of Newbridge, County Dublin.

of his death. All this is natural and more probable than any supernatural occurrence. It would not be less natural, that Lady Beresford, had she hurt and disfigured one of her wrists, should have always concealed the blemish by some riband, which, verily appears to have been the mysterious origin of the whole story.

The main objection, however, lies in the query—why should Lady Beresford have been favoured by Heaven by a special revelation? The question admits of but one answer. Indeed, Christians are assured, on the very highest authority, that such revelations are not vouchsafed. If the teaching of Moses and the Prophets was not to be enforced by the rising of one from the dead, should other than one all-sufficient resurrection be required to testify to the truth of the Christian religion, the recorded revelations of which carry ample conviction?

HERBERT F. HORE.

NOTES ON THE ROUND TOWER CONTROVERSY.

BY RICHARD ROLT BRASH.

THE names by which the Round Towers of Ireland are locally known has not received that attention and investigation which the subject deserves; not that I would expect from such to arrive at very decisive results, as affecting the question at issue in this still undecided controversy. I have always endeavoured, however, when possible, in examining these structures, to ascertain the names by which they are known to the Irish-speaking people of the neighbourhood. In the south and west of Ireland, where the ancient language is still generally spoken among the peasantry, this is not difficult to ascertain, especially if the inquirer knows how to go about it, as with strangers a little diplomacy is sometimes requisite to gain the confidence of the people. The first answer I generally received to my question of "What do you call that building?" is, "Wisha then, sure isn't it the steeple of Cloyne;" or "sure, your honor, they call it the big steeple of Ratto;" but when I followed up the inquiry by asking them what they called it in Irish, I soon found it had its peculiar and distinctive name in that language.

As far as my inquiries have gone, then, I find that our Towers are known by *three* distinct Irish appellations—namely, *Clugaugh; Clugaus*, or *Clochais;* and *Gio'cach*, or *Quilcach.* I have written the names as they are pronounced.

Dr. Petrie considers that the first of these appellations is the *Clochteach*, or *Cloichteach*, of the Irish annals, and that it means a round tower belfry; that wherever it is met with it should be so translated; that all notices where the word occurs refer to our Round Towers, and that, consequently, they fix the age and uses of these structures. This learned writer has devoted a consider-

able space in his work *On the Ancient Architecture of Ireland* to this branch of his subject. He has treated it with great ingenuity, and has given it such a manifest importance that the reader cannot fail to recognize the fact that it is at once the foundation and cap-stone of the structure he has laboured to rear. Most readers on the subject are aware that the Round Tower controversy has been narrowed to two theories, the Christian and pre-Christian. Dr. Petrie has ably and ingeniously advocated the first theory in his work, which is an invaluable contribution to our knowledge of the early architecture of Ireland, but in my opinion a failure as regards the theory he supports. Many seem to think that the high standing the author has deservedly attained in the archæological world is quite a sufficient warrant for the correctness of the statements and opinions put forward: but this I hold as not sound discretion. If we are to be carried away by the *prestige* of names, by far the greatest amount of Irish antiquarian learning and research has been on the other side. The Christian theory found advocates in Lynch, Ledwich, and Molyneux, who advocated their Danish origin (the Danes being Pagans), as also Harris, Milner, Smith, Sir R. C. Hoare, Bell, Wilkinson, and finally, Petrie. Of these, Milner and Hoare had no knowledge of Irish antiquities. Bell and Wilkinson's treatises are purely descriptive.

On the side of Pagan antiquity are, Vallancey, editor of the *Collectanea de Rebus Hibernicis;* Dr. Lanigan, author of the *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland;* Dr. O'Conor, the learned librarian of Stowe, and editor of the *Hibernicarum Scriptores Veteres;* Sir William Betham, author of the *Etruria Celtica;* the *Gael and Cimbri*, &c.; Beaufort, Dalton, O'Brien, Moore, and Windele, all deeply versed in the literature, language, and monumental antiquities of the country. To these I could add the names of many who have made the Irish language and antiquities the study of their lives, but who have not come before the public as authors.

The earnest inquirer, however, will not be carried away by the mere pretensions of individual learning, however well founded; but will patiently investigate all sides of the subject, examine the buildings themselves in all their details and analogies, compare the peculiarities of their construction, and their architectural features with those of similar erections in other countries. He must study the language, religion, and customs of the people amongst whom they are found, and the traditions connected with them, the known history of the people, their origin and migrations. Such a mode of investigation is requisite, in order to form sound opinions upon the subject before us, and is obviously the only mode, in the absence of all *historical evidence* as to their origin and uses; and I fearlessly assert, that up to the present time, we have no such evidence whatsoever as to the erection of a single *round tower* in Ireland.

I proceed now to advert to the several local names applied to these mysterious buildings.

1. *Clugaugh.*—This term, as a local designation for a round tower, is very rarely used. The only instance I have been able to ascertain of its application is to the tower of Fartagh, County Kilkenny, which is called *Clugach-na-Feartagh.* Mr. John Windele, of Cork, who has made a personal exa-

mination of all our southern Round Towers, informs me it is the only instance he has met with of its use. This word may be derived from some of the following sources:—

Clogad, a helmet. [O'Brien's Dict.] The ancient Irish helmet was conical, and bore no inapt resemblance to the conical covering of the towers.

Clogad, Clogaide, a helmet, a cone, a pyramid. [Dictionary of the Scottish-Gaelic language.]

Clogad, a helmet. [O'Reilly's Irish Dictionary.]

Clogad, a cone, a pyramid. [ibid.]

It will require no stretch of imagination, or straining of etymologies to make application of the above. Again we have—

Clogachd, a belfry. [O'Reilly's Dictionary.]

Clogachd, a belfry. [Gaelic Dictionary.]

It is curious that the more ancient dictionary of O'Brien has not that word; and O'Reilly takes it from Shaw's Gaelic Dictionary.

2. *Clugaus, Clochais.*—The term *Clugaus, Clochas*, or *Clochfás* is locally applied to a great many of our Round Towers, as—Dysert O'Dea, County Clare; Kilneboy, County Clare; Kilmacduagh, County Galway; Clonmacnois, King's County.

At the latter place, where there are two towers in existence, they are respectively called *Clochaus Mor* and *Clochaus Beg*. O'Brien's dictionary gives us *Clogas, i.e. Clog-cás*, a belfry or steeple; O'Reilly, *Clogas, Clogchas*, a belfry.

Mr. Windele has suggested to me the derivation of this name from *Cloch*, a stone, and *fás*, growth; "the growth of stones," in allusion to the superstitious tradition so prevalent concerning Round Towers, of their being built in one night: thence termed in the Irish language familiarly *Fas-aon-oidhche*, "the growth of one night." This tradition respecting buildings of great antiquity, or whose origin is involved in obscurity, is prevalent all through the East, and particularly in China.

Another derivation suggests itself from *Cloch*, a stone; *fas*, hollow, vacant [see O'Reilly, also McLeod and Dewar's Gaelic Dictionary]; "the hollow stone," a term peculiarly expressive of the nature of the building.

But another suggests itself to me of more force and probability than any of the preceding, and one the earnest consideration of which I would recommend to those more competent to analyze these etymologies than I am—namely, from *Cloch-ais*, the stone of death: *Aise*, death. [O'Reilly's Dictionary.] *Aise*, death, applied to a dead person; a shroud. [O'Brien's Irish Dictionary.] It may sound strange to some that a tower should be called a "stone," but this is a figurative mode of expression very usual among the Irish. Thus, we have near Macroom, County Cork, a mediæval castle called *Cloch-Dhaibhi*, or "David's stone," from the builder's name; another, in the same county, is called *Cloch-Phillip*, at page 2174 of the *Annals of the Four Masters* (O'Donovan's translation) we have also the Knight of Glinn's castle, on the Shannon, called *Cloch*-Gleanna ; and

again we have the oratory of the recluse called *Cloch-ancoire*, "the stone of the Anchorite." Amongst the Highlanders, to the present day, it is customary to intimate going to the church by the expression, going to the *Clochan*.

But some may ask, why should a Round Tower be called *Cloch-aise*, "the stone," or "pillar of death?" My answer would be, because the pillar towers of Ireland are *monumental* and *sepulchral*. I cannot now go into all the facts and arguments which suggest themselves in support of this theory, but would briefly state my reasons for holding this opinion. It has been the custom in the remotest ages, and amongst the rudest tribes, to set up some object to mark the resting-place of the distinguished dead, or to commemorate some remarkable event: thus, the pillar-stone became the prevailing monument of uncivilized nations, and was sometimes erected of a height that almost rivalled the masonry-built towers of more polished nations. All the megalithic monuments ascribed to the Celts are still found among the Khasia mountaineers, in Northern India; amongst which are pillar-stones 30 feet in height, standing by *Cromlechs*, and marking the graves of their deceased friends. [See Hooker's *Himalaya Journal*.] At Carnac, in Brittany, exist pillar-stones 40 feet in height. [See Deane's *Worship of the Serpent*.] In our own country, pillar-stones from 15 to 20 feet in height are not uncommon. The monumental pillar-towers of the Chinese go back to a date of near 1000 years before our era. The Buddhist Minar, and the Jain towers of India are of a similar class. The Romans likewise adopted the hollow pillar both for sepulchral and monumental purposes. On a tumulus at Cocumella, in Etruria, is a sepulchral Round Tower. Remains of conical towers surmount the tomb of Aruns, at Albano. The *hollow column* of Trajan was erected by Apollodorus, for a tomb, and as a memorial of his victories. The Column of Antoninus Pius was erected by Marcus Aurelius, in memory of that Emperor. There are numbers of circular tower sepulchres at Palmyra; and in Armenia the ancient form of sepulchre was a low circular tower, with a dome-shaped covering. We, too, in our day, have followed the prevailing fashion of antiquity: our cities and towns present numerous examples of pillar towers, which, though not sepulchral, are monumental and commemorative. And it is a curious and suggestive fact, that national instinct so far overcame prejudice and theory, that a pillar-tower after the veritable ancient Celtic type has been erected to perpetuate the memory of Daniel O'Connell, in the cemetery at Glasnevin, near Dublin.

That the ancient Irish, in the progress of civilization, should be led to relinquish the lofty, unshapen, and ponderous pillar-stone for the more symmetrical and aspiring hollow column, is but natural; and that they erected these columns, at least many of them, for sepulchral uses is certain, if stubborn facts are to be relied on.

The South Munster Society of Antiquaries were the first who turned their attention to the sepulchral character of our towers. The idea, I believe, originated with Mr. John Windele, of Cork: in the year 1841 they explored the towers of Cloyne, Ardmore, Kinneigh, Cashel, and

Ardpatrick. In Ardmore and Cloyne they found human remains, placed in the basement of the towers, under circumstances indicating great care and forethought. Cashel and Ardpatrick were found to have been previously ransacked, as was proved by indubitable evidences.

Some gentlemen of Ulster also took up this interesting subject, and made explorations within the basements of most of the towers in that province: the result of their labours has been published in the *Ulster Journal of Archæology;* from which we find that human remains, deposited under similar circumstances, and with evident care, were found in the Round Towers of Clones, Maghera, Armoy, Drumbo, Drumlane, and Inniskeen. The exploration of Antrim tower was imperfect; at Ram's Island, the usual concrete floor, generally found protecting the remains, was found broken through, corroborating a previous statement made by Mr. Windele, of Cork, that human remains had been at one time found there. At Nendrum no discovery was made; at Devenish there was also no result; at Tory Island merely a portion of a sepulchral urn was found. Sir William Betham states that Dr. John Leslie, Bishop of Raphoe, removed a Round Tower which formerly existed there, and discovered the bones of a man under it. Human remains were also found at Roscrea tower. At Timahoe such relics were also found, and a sepulchral urn.

Dr. Small, in his account of the Round Tower at Abernethy, Scotland, states that the ancient tradition of the place was, that the Tower was erected as a mausoleum for the Pictish kings: to verify, or rather to test the tradition, the Tower was excavated, and several skeletons were found therein. I remember well that, on visiting Abernethy myself, the aged sexton who assisted me in measuring it, stated, in answer to my enquiries respecting the traditions, that the old people informed him it was built by the *Peghts* as a burial place for their kings; in confirmation of which he pointed to the remains of the palace of the kings of the *Peghts*—a mighty ruined *Dun* on a prominent spur of the Ochill hills, and about half a mile from the Tower.

The scope of the present paper will not permit me to follow up these investigations. I have barely touched upon the reasons that have induced me to give my attention to the sepulchral and monumental character of these unique structures, and I submit that they are of a nature deserving of serious consideration. Should this theory be the correct one, the derivation of the term *Cloch-ais, Cloch-as,* or *Clogas* would no longer be doubtful as the "Stone (tower) of Death."

3. *Giolcach.*—Among the towers locally called *Giolcach,* or as it is pronounced, *Quilcach,* and sometimes *Killcach,* we have—Ardmore, County Waterford; Kinneigh, County Cork; Cloyne, County Cork; Ratto, County Kerry; Ardpatrick, County Limerick.

With reference to the Tower at Ratto, Dr. Petrie says [page 397] it is now popularly known by the name *Giolcach,* by which *is understood a Bell-house,* and which is *obviously a local corruption of Cloighteach, or Cloichteach.* Now I beg to state that I lived two months in the neighbourhood of Ratto, and that there is not in Ireland a locality where the Irish language is better spoken and understood. The local people do not understand the word *Giolcach* to mean a Bell-house; they would be astonished

at the Doctor's convenient assumption if they heard of it; and it is not so found in any Irish dictionary; neither is it a local corruption of *Cloigteach*, as the people there know the meaning of the term perfectly well, and have very truthfully applied it. By reference to O'Reilly, we find *Giolcach*, "a reed, cane, broom; a place where reeds or canes grow." Now, any one who knows the locality of Ratto will remember that it stands about a furlong from the river Brick; and that the river, with the extensive marshes which bound it, and the banks of a canal running from the river up to the tower, are prolific of those enormous *reeds* with tufted tops, called in Irish *Giolcach*. What, then, can be more natural, than that a highly imaginative and poetical people like the Irish, should call their lofty, slender, graceful towers from those elegant and tapering reeds, which, with their tufted conical tops, offer so striking a similitude. How numerous are the instances of such appropriations in our topographic nomenclature. Besides its application to some of our towers, we find this word used in many places as a topographical designation. In the county of Waterford we have a parish called *Guilcach*; in the county of Cavan is the celebrated hill of *Cuilcagh*, of which so many legends are current, and which was the Mount of Inauguration of the Maguires; there is, also, another locality near Ballieborough called *Quilcagh*. These instances shew, that the term is a well-known, and properly applied designation, and not a corruption of *Cloigteach*, as Dr. Petrie would lead us to suppose.

Having thus given instances of the use of the terms locally applied to these remarkable structures, I would next direct attention to the mis-application of the word *Cloichteach*. I have before remarked the great importance attached by Dr. Petrie to the assumption, that this term, used in a certain number of places in the Irish Annals, signifies "a Round Tower belfry"—we shall see with what probability. The term is compounded of two words, *cloich*, a stone, and *teach*, a house. The term, then, *cloichteach*, would read "stone house," to distinguish a building erected of stone from those in general use, formed of wattles, logs, or built of sods, —such as were not only the private houses and cabins of the ancient Irish, but also a great many churches and oratories in the early ages of Christianity, not merely in Ireland, but in England. And, that buildings constructed of stone, whether churches or otherwise, should be distinguished from those composed of other materials, is extremely probable and natural: indeed, in our native annals they are so distinguished. Thus, the term *damliag* applied to a church, is exactly of the same meaning as *cloichteach*, from *daimh*, a house, a church, and *liag*, a stone. The compound name is given in O'Reilly's Irish dictionary, *daimhliag*, a church of stone.

The native annalists use a similar expression to designate wooden churches and oratories; the compound term, *dairtheach*, *duirthech*, &c., from *dair*, an oak, and *teach*, a house, "the oak house, or house of wood" [see Dr. Petrie's work, page 342.] So that we have here terms profusely used by our native historians, to designate religious structures by the materials of which they were composed; and we must, therefore, in analogy with these other terms, take *cloichteach* to mean stone house, and not a round tower belfry, as it expresses neither form, height, nor use.

That there were belfries at a comparatively early period in Ireland, I will not by any means dispute; and that they were sometimes called *clogtheach* is probable enough; and that the ancient Round Towers were turned into belfries on the introduction of church bells into Ireland, is more than likely; but I do dispute that there were belfries—that is, buildings specially erected for hanging church bells in—before the tenth century.

Indeed, the first notice that Dr. Petrie has been able to produce, of what he designates a round-tower belfry, is in the middle of the tenth century, and is, as follows, from Dr. O'Donovan's translation of the " Annals of the Four Masters":—

"A.D. 948. The Cloichteach of Slane was burned by the foreigners, with its full of relics and distinguished persons," &c.

Dr. Petrie maintains that this was a round tower. What is there in the term to designate its circular form, or its tower-like elevation? But the circumstance itself is very unlikely to have happened to, or in, a round tower. In the first place, there is not, and never was, in memory or tradition, a Round Tower at Slane; and secondly, how could a round tower be burned? It is a circular edifice of stone, with massive wall, stone roof, a small doorway at a considerable elevation from the ground, and a few small apertures for windows at a much greater height. What was there to burn? "The wooden floors and doors," suggests Dr. Petrie. But what evidence have we that the floors, *if any*, were of wood? None. We have not a scintilla of evidence that they were of any material but stone, if we can take as evidence the fact, that the only original remaining floors are of stone. Four of these floors remain in existence. Portions of two arched floors are at present to be seen in the Castledermot example; the first, of which nearly two-thirds exist, is about fifteen feet above the sill of doorway; of the second—which is about fifteen feet higher up—about one-third remains. They are constructed of rubble, cemented together by a most powerful mortar of extreme hardness; they have a rise of about 13 inches in the centre, and the arch was about a foot thick; but its strength evidently depended more upon the solidifying property of the mortar than upon the disposition of the stones in the arch. These arches spring from projecting string-courses, and here we may see what the internal string-courses of the towers were intended for. These floors were destroyed for the *purpose of getting up the bells*, when this tower was converted into a belfry. The tower at Kinneigh, County Cork, has a floor formed of slabs of stone which "tail" into the wall. At Meeleck, County Galway, is an interesting example of one of these arched floors, given in Mr. Wilkinson's *Practical Geology and Ancient Architecture of Ireland*. The ancient Irish, who erected great stone forts, with stone lintelled gates and passages; who constructed underground chambers domed with stone, and intricate passages lintelled with the same material; who on the southern and western coasts constructed numerous buildings entirely of stone to the apex of the roof, on plans embracing the rectangle, square, circle, ellipsis, quadrant, and the form of the human eye; and who subsequently built their churches with stone roofs: such, a people, I say,

were not likely to put wooden floors in their stone-walled and stone-roofed towers. Indeed, it is certain that many of the towers had no floors, as we have instances of towers without floors, string-courses, off-sets, joist-holes, or any provision for floors.

Under such circumstances, we must reduce the conflagration to that of the door itself, which would not make enough of a blaze to justify the annalist in the strength of his language. But if we consider the historian to mean here the stone house, or church of Slane, all difficulty vanishes. The sacred edifice has been in all ages, and among all people—Pagans as well as Christians—the refuge in time of public calamity and danger: thither they fled to be under the special protection of the Deity. The Church of Slane alone could contain the numbers of persons stated to have taken refuge. The roof, altars, doors, fittings, &c., offered alone sufficient food for the flames of a conflagration, attended with such results.

The next notice is, A.D. 995, as follows:—"A.D. 995—Ardmacha [Armagh] was burnt by lightning, both houses, churches, and *cloichtheaca* and its *Fidh-neimhed* [sacred wood], with all destruction." That the word here does not refer to a round tower is evident to the simplest understanding; for how could a hollow stone pillar, stone to the pinnacle, be burned by lightning? Yet, upon such absurdities has Dr. Petrie erected his Christian theory. The appellation must refer to some other class of religious structure, connected with the large ecclesiastical establishment at Armagh. But, supposing that the word does mean a bell-house, or belfry, it does not imply that it was a round tower; it is very probable that wooden belfries were used here, as on the Continent and in England, at that and much later periods. It is absurd to suppose that where we had churches of wood we should erect belfries of stone 120 feet high, and almost as durable as the pyramids. There is no round tower at present at Armagh, nor has there been in any living memory. At A.D. 1020 of the same "Annals," we have the burning of the *Cloichteach* of Armagh with its bells. It is utterly absurd to suppose that these repetitions of conflagrations refer to any but structures of a fragile and inflammable construction. The above passage records, I believe, the first mention of church-bells in Ireland. Bells were in use previously, but they were hand-bells, used in church services as among the Egyptians, Romans, and Hindoos. There has been a great deal of archæological nonsense written about these bells, and a great many idle and superstitious legends recorded of them, and gravely retailed by a certain class of modern antiquaries. I believe that, about this period, bells to call persons to public worship came into use, though still confined to churches of eminence. As I have before stated, it is only reasonable to infer that the ancient towers were used as belfries (as indeed some are to this day) in those places where they existed, and that in other places appropriate bell-turrets, or bell-cots, were erected.

It is probable many of our earliest belfries were of wood; ancient ones of stone are also in existence, some of considerable antiquity. A triangular-headed bell-cot is found over the west gable of the ancient church of Roscrea, an example of early Romanesque. A similar one exists over the

west gable of the very ancient church of Monaincha. A large triple bell-cot is found at Donoughmore, in close proximity to the Round Tower. The example at Roscrea is also within a few yards of the Round Tower. In a great many instances, belfries are found on churches of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, in close proximity to Round Towers; an evident proof that the towers were not used as belfries, or considered suitable for that purpose. Square belfries of a remote antiquity are also found in Ireland. On Innis-clothran Island, in Lough Ree, is one as old as the tenth or eleventh century. A very ancient one is over the west gable of the little church of Cloghereen, near Killarney. Cormac's chapel, at Cashel, was commenced about the year 1100; it was consecrated in A.D. 1134. It is a small building, consisting of a nave and chancel, showing evidently that the magnificent Round Tower standing within twenty yards, and looking down majestically upon these things of yesterday, was not considered suitable for a belfry, or held in any particular veneration.

The remaining notices referring to "cloichteach," in the "Annals," are eleven, being altogether fourteen, commencing at the year 948, and extending to 1238. Of the above number of places thus noticed, Round Towers exist but at five. It is also remarkable that six notices record the burning of a "cloichteach," which I have shown to be impossible to a Round Tower. Two of these notices occur, one in the middle, and the other at the close, of the tenth century; the rest occur in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, at a period when it is well known extensive monasteries and large abbey churches were erected, such as Boyle, Jerpoint, Dunbrody, Ballintubber, Cong, Corcumroe, and others. These edifices are planned on the same principles as the continental churches of the same period, and of dimensions not far short; consisting of nave, aisles, transepts, chancel, and numerous chapels, with massive square belfries over the intersection of the nave, transepts, and chancel.

The Irish language gives us unmistakeable terms both for bells and belfries; thus, we have *Clocc*, *Clog*, a bell; *Clogachd*, *Clogas*, a belfry. If the Irish annalists, in the passages quoted by Dr. Petrie, intended to have expressed "belfry," they would surely have used some of the above terms, and not the word *Cloichteach*, which I have already shown means "stone house." And what do I find? Why, that the only notice of an authenticated belfry, and which is still in existence, and can be identified, occurs in the *Annals of the Four Masters*, at A.D. 1584, where the *square* belfry of the abbey church of Quin, in the County of Clare, is called a *Cloccas*. The learned translator, in a note to the passage, says:—

"*The clocus of Cuinnche, i.e.* the belfry of Quin. The word 'clogas' is *usually* applied to a round-tower belfry detached from the church; but it is here evidently applied to the square tower of the great abbey of Quin, still remaining." How can the translator say, "*usually* applied," when in the entire "Annals," there is not a single instance of the use of the term, except in this

one instance, where it is used to designate a belfry, which happens to be a square one, of the fourteenth century?

According to Dr. Petrie, the first notice we have of the erection of a belfry is in the year 965. The passage he quotes from the "Chronicon Scotorum," has reference to the erection of a "cloigteach," *at Tomgraney*: the word has an affinity to, and is derived fom "*clog*," a bell; but whether the belfry, or bell-house was a round or square tower, or whether it was a tower at all, is very problematical. The only tower at present in existence at Tomgraney is a massive square one adjoining the church; but there formerly existed an ancient bell-cot on the west gable of this truly primitive building. Dr. Petrie asserts that a tower was in existence at Tomgraney forty years ago.

Now, I visited Tomgraney in the year 1852, accompanied by that eminent and laborious antiquary, Mr. John Windele, of Cork. We made the strictest inquiry respecting this fabled tower; indeed, to satisfy ourselves on this point was one of the principal objects of our visit: we procured the following evidence:—Peter Byrne, woodranger, aged over sixty years, "remembers the old church from his infancy, certainly over fifty years. Never saw a steeple or any portion of a steeple here; never saw any building like the round tower on Holy Island." [a]

Simon Hickey, an intelligent old man and a Protestant, frequenting Tomgraney church all his life-time, stated "He was eighty-six years old, and never saw a belfry round or square; never saw a building like the tower on Holy Island at Tuam (Tomgraney); it could not have been there unknown to him. Never heard the old people (his parents) say there was. He remembers a belfry on the west gable of the church, but it has been down for many years; and there has been no bell in it since his time."

That the word "cloichteach," does not *always* mean a *round* tower, is, indeed, admitted by Dr. Petrie himself; for, in quoting the erection of one at Annadown, A.D. 1238, he says,—"As there is no belfry now remaining at Annadown, it may be uncertain whether this 'cloichteach' was of the usual ancient round form, or of the quadrangular shape, and connected with the church, as generally adopted in Ireland, at the period of the Anglo-Norman invasion." If, then, there is any uncertainty as to the meaning of the term in this case, every other is open to the same objection; and I certainly, for one, am not prepared to accept a theory based upon so flimsy a foundation.

The characteristics of the belfries belonging to parochial and monastic churches in Ireland, in the thirteenth century, are too well known to every student of Irish mediæval architecture, to admit the probability of a *round tower belfry*, being erected at an era when church architecture received such an impetus, as it did at that period from the influx of the Anglo-Saxon invaders, and from the more immediate connection of the Irish church with that of Rome. From the year 1200 to 1260, were erected the following extensive monastic houses:—Drogheda, Newtown, Lorha, Kilkenny, Youghal, Trim, Ballybeg, Buttevant, Athenry, Kildare. These buildings were erected in the first Pointed

[a] Inniscaltra, in Lough Derg, on which there is a fine Round Tower.

style; their towers were lofty, square, battlemented structures, poised upon arches, between the nave and the chancel. The churches were from 140 to 200 feet in length, consisting of a nave with, and often without, aisles, a chancel, generally but one transept, with side chapels. The conventual buildings consisted of the usual domestic offices, surrounding a cloister court, and were very extensive, as the ample ruins still existing testify.

Before I conclude, I would wish to notice one singular fact. It may appear strange to the English reader, that the Irish had no word to express a lofty and tower-like object; but such is not the case: the word *Tuir* s. m., signifies a tower, or castle. *Tor* s. m., a tower, a castle, spire, steeple. Welsh *twr*. [O'Reilly's Dictionary; see also O'Brien's.] It is, therefore, very singular, if the passages before quoted alluded to the Round Towers, that so appropriate a designation in every respect was not adopted. The word is frequently used in the *Annals of the Four Masters:* thus, at A.M. 3066, mention is made of the demolition of the *Tuir* [tower] of Conain; and again, at A.D. 991, mention is made of "Taidhg of the *Tuir*." Dr. O'Donovan, in every case, translates it "Tower."

ANTIQUE WOODEN IMPLEMENT.

The curious implement represented in the accompanying plate, was found lately in a bog in the townland of Coolnaman, the property of George Stirling, Esq., in the parish of Aghadowey, County Derry; and has been forwarded to us through the kind attention of Alexander Barklie, Esq., of Mullamore. It was discovered embedded in a solid bank of turf, at a depth of four feet from the surface; the bog extending to a great depth underneath. No other article was found near it.

It is entirely of wood, and measures as follows:—

Extreme length, 3 feet 5 inches; breadth across the centre, 7½ inches; depth, 2½ inches; lid, 14 inches long, and 3½ inches broad; under hole, 12¾ inches long, and 3½ inches broad. The upper edges have evidently been higher on all sides, when perfect; probably on a level with the lid or small door, or even extending still higher, so as to form a kind of trough. The lid is now somewhat narrower than the opening which it is intended to close; but, no doubt, was made to fit accurately when in use. It moves up and down on a hinge, formed by two projections which lie in corresponding hollows, and seems to have been opened and shut by means of a handle inserted into a hole in its centre. These hinges have, no doubt, been kept in their places by some part of the wood above them which is now lost. From each end of the lid, and on a level with its upper surface, there runs a hollow groove, sloping regularly downwards to the end of the implement, and terminating in a hole which perforates the bottom, seemingly for the discharge of a liquid. Towards each end are two lateral holes, placed opposite to each other, one in each lip of the groove,