

Early Irish Hostages

Gíall and *brága* in the Annals and narrative literature

Manouk van den Berg

3547876

MA thesis

Middeleeuwen en Renaissance Studies

June 2016

Supervisor: Dr. Mícheál Ó Flaithearta

Plagiarism declaration

June 23, 2016

This thesis was written by me, except for quotations from published and unpublished sources which are clearly indicated by referencing.

Manouk van den Berg

Abbreviations

- AFM O'Donovan, John (ed.), *Annala Rioghachta Eireann: Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters...* (Dublin 1865). CELT edition, online.
- AI Mac Airt, Seán, *The Annals of Inisfallen* (Dublin 1944). CELT edition, online.
- AU Mac Airt, Seán, and Gearóid Mac Niocaill, *The Annals of Ulster* (Dublin 1983). CELT edition, online.
- CELT Corpus of Electronic Texts: a Project of University College, Cork
- CS Mac Niocaill, Gearóid (ed. and tr.), and William M. Hennessy (tr.), *Chronicon Scotorum* [2003] CELT edition, online.
- eDIL Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language
- LL Best, R.I., Bergin et. al., *The book of Leinster, formerly Lebar na Núachongbála*, 6 vols. (Dublin 1954-1983). CELT edition, online.
- LU Best, R.I. and Bergin, Osborn (ed.), *Lebor na hUidre: Book of the Dun Cow* (Dublin 1929). CELT edition, online.

Table of Contents

Plagiarism declaration	2
Abbreviations	3
Table of contents	4
Introduction	5
1. Medieval Irish hostages	7
Words for hostage	7
The differences between <i>aitire</i> , <i>brága</i> and <i>gíall</i>	9
Hostages and Laws	11
Conclusion	13
2. Hostages in Literature	14
Hostages in the Annals	15
<i>The Annals of Ulster</i>	15
<i>The Annals of Inisfallen</i>	17
<i>The Annals of the Four Masters 1</i>	18
<i>The Annals of the Four Masters 2</i>	19
<i>Chronicon Scotorum</i>	22
Warfare and hostages	23
<i>Gíall</i> in names	23
Conclusion	24
Hostages in narrative literature	25
<i>Lebor na hUidre</i>	25
Conclusion	27
<i>The Book of Leinster</i>	28
Conclusion	32
Conclusion	33
Bibliography	34
Appendix 1	36
Appendix 2	42

Introduction

When considering the term ‘hostage’ in a contemporary setting, one might immediately think of someone being held against their will by a criminal or terrorist. But according to Kosto, this current meaning is “a later development still, dateable only to the last third of the twentieth century.”¹ When looking up the definition of ‘hostage’ in the dictionary, the definition is quite broad: “A person seized or held as security for the fulfilment of a condition”² The modern association with criminals and terrorists becomes clear in Article 1.1 of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages. In this 1979 United Nations treaty it is stated that:

“Any person who seizes or detains and threatens to kill, to injure or to continue to detain another person (hereinafter referred to as the “hostage”) in order to compel a third party [...] to do or abstain from doing any act as an explicit or implicit condition for the release of the hostage commits the offence of taking of hostages...”³

A hostage would be a person (or group of persons) who is taken and detained by another person (or group), in order to pressure others into committing an act or into paying a ransom of some sorts.

The medieval idea of hostage is somewhat different and seems to be less hostile: “Hostages were used to make peace with enemies and/or to assert the submission of enemies; they were used to emphasize a ruler’s internal political power; and they could be precursors to future relationships between the two parties.”⁴ According to this definition, a hostage would serve as ‘collateral’, as part of a contract, treaty, or as a guarantee for loyalty. Although it is clear how the modern definition derived from the medieval definition of ‘hostage’, the medieval definition is more political than anything else. This seems to be true for the medieval Irish hostages as well. Hostages would be given as sureties to make sure one’s land would not be invaded:

“Lesser kings who did not have the power or allies to resist a hosting in their territory would often come to terms if the overking threatened to invade his territory or made a show of force at his border. Kings could reach an agreement at a meeting, and these could be guaranteed by the exchange of pledges or sureties.”⁵

The question is then how this medieval Irish hostageship worked. What do we know about the words used to refer to hostages and the laws regarding hostageship? For this thesis I intend to research

¹ Kosto 2012: 4.

² Oxford Dictionaries s.v. hostage

³ *International Convention* 1979 (1983): 207.

⁴ Preston-Matto 2010: 144.

⁵ Jaski 2000: 103

hostages in early Irish law and literature. I will create a basic overview of the institution of hostageship and a corpus of texts in which the hostages are mentioned. The main question I would like to answer is: What is medieval Irish hostageship and how is this institution portrayed in the literature?

Methodology

My thesis will consist of two parts. In the first part I will attempt to create the aforementioned basic overview by answering the following questions:

- What are the words and legal terms regarding hostages and hostageship?
- What are the differences between *gíall*, *brága* and *aitire*?
- What are the laws concerning hostages?

For this first part I will first consult eDIL, the *Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language* to find out which words are used in relation to hostageship. Aside from that I will consult *A Guide to Early Irish Law* by Fergus Kelly, for information on the laws concerning hostages and the legal tracts in which these laws can be found.

In the second part I will establish a corpus of texts from the Old and Middle Irish period. This corpus I will use to answer the following questions:

- In which texts are the words for hostage and hostageship used and in what context? (Who were the hostages and what happened to them?)
- Which words are used to refer to hostages? Is there a specific word describing a specific situation or can these words be used interchangeably?

The corpus will be based on texts referred to in eDIL. To limit the search I will only select Annals and narrative literature, which are digitally available on the Corpus of Electronic Texts (CELT). Further methods concerning this second part I will describe in the introduction of said part.

1. Medieval Irish hostage

Words for hostage

In the early Irish law-texts the word *gíall* is used to refer to a hostage.⁶ The definition given in the Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language (eDIL) for *gíall* is: “a human pledge, hostage.”⁷

According to Binchy, *gíall* is “the oldest word for a personal surety, and is etymologically cognate with *gell*, the real surety: doubtless the latter was originally regarded as a substitute for the *g*.”⁸ In her BA thesis on the meaning of *gell*, Femke Oostenbrink found that there might have been confusion between *gell* and *gíall*. *Gell*, which means ‘pledge’,⁹ appeared multiple times in the Annals, referring to hostages. She states that at times it is difficult to tell whether one is dealing with *gell* or with *gíall*, because the form *geill*, without a length-mark, could refer to both the words.¹⁰

The *gíall* would serve as a surety for a political agreement. Jaski describes it as follows: “A *gíall* was clearly associated with political subordination, and forfeited hostages were clapped in fetters at the court of the king.”¹¹ In *A Guide to Early Irish Law*, Kelly points out that aside from *gíall*, in non-legal texts, *gell* and *aitire* were used to refer to hostages: “[...] the ideas of ‘hostage’, ‘pledge’ and ‘surety’ are closely connected.”¹² A search on eDIL¹³ reveals that aside from *gíall* there were multiple other terms in Old and Middle Irish concerning hostages and hostageship:

Hostage: *aitire*, ‘hostage-surety’;¹⁴ *brága*, ‘captive, prisoner, hostage’;¹⁵ and *gemlech*, ‘a fettered person, a prisoner, a hostage’.¹⁶

Hostageship: *aitires*, (*aitire*) ‘suretyship, hostageship’;¹⁷ *bráigdenas*, *bráigtechas*, (*brága*) ‘hostageship, captivity’;¹⁸ *géilsine*, (*gíall*, *géill*) ‘hostageship, rendering of hostages’;¹⁹ *gíallaigeacht*, (*gíallaige*) ‘hostageship, captivity’;²⁰ *gíallcherd*, ‘hostageship’;²¹ *gíallcherdacht*, (*gíallcherd*) ‘hostageship, the

⁶ Kelly (1988): 173. Old Irish *gíall* is very similar to words for hostage in other Celtic languages and words for hostage in some Germanic languages (Thurneysen 1928: 74). According to the *Nederlands Etomologisch Woordenboek* the words for hostage might be Celtic loanwords in the Germanic languages or even a Celto-Germanic language community (De Vries 1971: 208).

⁷ eDIL s.v. 2 *gíall*

⁸ Binchy 1970: 95.

⁹ Binchy 1970: 94.

¹⁰ Oostenbrink 2013:17.

¹¹ Jaski 2000: 104.

¹² Kelly 1988: 173.

¹³ Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language (eDIL), www.dil.ie search terms: ‘hostage’, ‘hostageship’.

¹⁴ eDIL s.v. *aitire*,

¹⁵ eDIL s.v. 2 *brága*

¹⁶ eDIL s.v. *gemlech*. The word *gemlech*, comes from *gemel*, ‘fetter’ or ‘chain’. (eDIL s.v. *gemel*) It is used to refer to people in chains or fetters. This can be captives, prisoners and even hostages. Since *gemlech* does not specifically refer to hostages and the institution of hostageship, I shall not include it in the rest of this thesis.

¹⁷ eDIL s.v. *aitires*

¹⁸ eDIL s.v. *bráigdenas*, eDIL s.v. *bráigtechas*

¹⁹ eDIL s.v. *géilsine*

²⁰ eDIL s.v. *gíallaigeacht*

state of being under a pledge or condition’;²² *gíallnacht*, (*gíallna*, *gíallnae*) ‘hostageship, captivity’;²³ *gíallnad*, ‘hostageship, captivity’;²⁴ *gíallnae*, ‘submission, hostageship, security’;²⁵ *gíallnus*, (*gíall*) ‘hostageship, captivity’;²⁶ and *gíallus*, (*gíall*) ‘hostageship’.²⁷

These words may not all refer to hostageship directly, but especially for the words meaning ‘surety’ and ‘captive’, I expect they were used in the same context. Therefore, it could be that the meaning of ‘hostage’ and ‘hostageship’ stuck to them, even if it was not their original meaning. It is also possible that *gíall* as a legal term became too specific to refer to hostages in general, and other words, like *brága* were needed to refer to the physical hostage-taking or imprisonment.

In this group of words meaning ‘hostageship’, ‘surety’ and ‘captive’, one meaning stands out. *Gíallnae* seems to deal, first and foremost, with ‘submission’. This could of course be linked to the political subordination of the *gíall*. Binchy mentions that *gíallnae* is a derivative of *gíall* and that it is together with its compound *aicillne* “the oldest term for base clientship.”²⁸ In eDIL it is, in a legal context, also mentioned as a “technical term for status of a ‘dórchéle’ who has received ‘rath’ (= stock) from a flaith or chief, and who thereby becomes dependent on him, being under his protection and bound to render him certain services.”²⁹ In return for a fief, which could be livestock, land or farming equipment, the client would provide services. These services would entail labour services, military duties, the payment of annual food-rents and providing hospitality.³⁰ From this description, one might not immediately connect base clientship with hostages. Stacey points out that in the law tracts no need for a hostage to serve as a guarantee in this type of agreement is mentioned. “But the Irish word for this relationship, *aicillne*, the verbal noun of *ag-gíallna*, contains as its root the now familiar term *gíall*. This alone might suggest that clientship had once involved the giving of a hostage by a base client to his lord.”³¹ Aside from this possible giving of hostages, the *gíallnae*, ‘submission’, shows similarities with the institution of hostageship. The client gives up his independence.³² “For clientship was not an ordinarily private relationship. It was, above all, a relationship of personal and political subordination, one that entailed a loss of personal status for the client, and that enhanced the social and therefore the political standing of the lord.”³³

²¹ eDIL s.v. *gíallcherd*

²² eDIL s.v. *gíallcherdacht*

²³ eDIL s.v. *gíallnacht*

²⁴ eDIL s.v. *gíallnad*

²⁵ eDIL s.v. *gíallnae*

²⁶ eDIL s.v. *gíallnus*

²⁷ eDIL s.v. *gíallus*

²⁸ Binchy 1970: 96.

²⁹ eDIL s.v. *gíallnae*

³⁰ Kelly 1988: 29-31.

³¹ Stacey 1994: 86.

³² This does not mean that the client is unfree. The clientship can be terminated by either party, as long as certain conditions are met (Kelly 1988: 31).

³³ Stacey 1994: 87.

Another connection between submission and hostageship is the relation between a subject king and his over-king. Like a base client, the subject king would have to pay tribute and render services: “On a practical level, a subject king would have been expected to undertake obligations, in the form of labor and military service, and pay tribute in livestock and agricultural produce, as well as deliver hostages, to his over-king. These, in turn, would have been levied from members of his *túath*.”³⁴

The differences between *aitire*, *brága* and *gíall*

As mentioned before, aside from *gíall*, the words *aitire* and *brága* were used to refer to a hostage as well. The question is then if these three words could be used interchangeably, or if they were used in specific situations or for different times in society. Both the *aitire* and the *gíall*, serve as a guarantor in an agreement. But their roles are quite different.

The *aitire* is the ‘hostage-surety’, the word itself has derived from the preposition *eter*, ‘between’, he is “‘one who stands between’ the parties of an agreement.”³⁵ The *aitire* acts as a personal surety, instead of using property to warrant a contract, he himself is the guarantee.³⁶ This could mean that he would end up imprisoned for an amount of time, if the contract was not fulfilled: “Should the principal default, the *a.* must surrender himself to the other party, who keeps him in captivity for a definite period (usually ten days).”³⁷ The principal would have to pay a ransom to free his *aitire*, if this is not done in time, the *aitire* can pay the ransom himself. The principal would have to compensate the *aitire*. This compensation would have to be much higher than the original ransom. Binchy describes it as follows: “thereupon the defaulting principal becomes liable to pay him very heavy compensation (*slán*), which includes the ransom price of seven *cumals*, twice the amount of the original debt and a further fee to compensate him for his loss of time and labour during captivity.”³⁸ It would seem then, that it would be worthwhile to be an *aitire*. If the principal holds up to his end of the contract, the *aitire* does not lose or gain anything, but there is quite a profit to be made if the principal defaults. However, there may be consequences for the *aitire* as well, as Kelly points out: “If the *aitire* himself evades his obligations as surety he loses his honour-price.”³⁹

The *gíall* is somewhat similar to the *aitire*. Jaski describes it as follows: “[...] if his *túath* defaulted, he could be taken into custody for thirty days. After this period he could pay for the offence or ransom himself, and was entitled to compensation from the offender for his confinement.”⁴⁰

The main difference seems to be the sort of agreements the hostage would act as guarantee for. The *gíall* would not be a surety in private agreements, but would be guarantee in public agreements. This

³⁴ Aitchison 1994: 47.

³⁵ Kelly 1988: 172.

³⁶ These contracts could be both public and private agreements. (Binchy 1970: 74).

³⁷ Binchy 1970: 74.

³⁸ Binchy 1970: 75.

³⁹ Kelly 1988: 172.

⁴⁰ Jaski 2000: 104.

form of hostageship would usually have a political purpose, ensuring obedience from tribe of the *gíall* to a king.⁴¹ It may be that the role of the *aitire* has been adapted from that of the *gíall*, to be able to use personal sureties for more private contracts.⁴²

Thurneysen described the differences between the hostage and the hostage-surety:

1. The *gíall* is always hostage to a king. There would probably be no need for a new hostage for each agreement, but there would be one person selected to be given as hostage for his family or tribe.⁴³ An *aitire* does not necessarily need to be held by a king. For each new agreement, a new contract would have to be made with the *aitire*.

2. If the contract was not fulfilled, the *gíall* would be imprisoned for thirty nights and his ransom would not be his full honour-price, but two thirds or half of that.⁴⁴ As mentioned before, the *aitire* would be imprisoned for ten days and would have to pay his full honour-price as ransom.

3. The *gíall* could prevent his imprisonment by giving a surety himself.⁴⁵ However, Kelly mentions that this would not correspond with one of the Triads in which it is said that hostageship is one of the things that cannot be postponed.⁴⁶

Stacey argues that parts of the earlier analyses of hostages, by both Thurneysen and Binchy, are outdated.⁴⁷ She states that the *aitire* would not only be the guarantee in private contracts: “Rather, the *aitire*, like the *gíall*, must have been a standing surety who engaged himself through his oath to act in any unexpected claims made against his principals.”⁴⁸ Stacey points out that the *aitire* is also mentioned as the hostage-surety in a public, political treaty. Therefore the earlier theory that the *aitire* was created to serve as a hostage in private matters would be incorrect.⁴⁹ Where the *gíall* would act as surety in “subordinating political relationships”,⁵⁰ the *aitire* would be a hostage-surety “‘between’ tribes or kindreds of relatively equal status.”⁵¹

The main differences between *gíall* and *aitire* based on Stacey’s assessment would be in the sort of agreement they were acting as hostage for. I tend to agree with this view: the *gíall* and *aitire* would be used in very different situations and for a different purpose. Aside from that, there would be a difference in the amount of freedom a hostage had: an *aitire* could stay at home, while the *gíall* could be taken to the king immediately. And another important difference is that, unlike the *gíall*, the *aitire*

⁴¹ Binchy 1970: 95-96.

⁴² Kelly 1988: 173.

⁴³ Thurneysen 1928: 82.

⁴⁴ Thurneysen 1928: 83. Stacey mentions that this would not be very likely, since that honour-price would also be their amount of compensation. (Stacey 1994:83).

⁴⁵ Thurneysen 1928: 83.

⁴⁶ Kelly 1988: 175n.

⁴⁷ Stacey 1994: 97-98.

⁴⁸ Stacey 1994: 98.

⁴⁹ Stacey 1994: 98.

⁵⁰ Stacey 1994: 109.

⁵¹ Stacey 1994: 109.

would probably be of high status and prestige, “forfeited *géill* could be held in chains ... chains or fetters are never associated with the *aitire*.”⁵²

The *brága*, unlike the *gíall* and *aitire*, does not necessarily seem to be part of an agreement. As Preston-Matto points out, the word *brága* would be used for a ‘captive’ in general, but at times also for ‘hostage’. “*Brága* can mean ‘hostage’, although its more usual definition is ‘captive’ or ‘prisoner.’ *Brága* are certainly closer to *gíall* than they are to *aitiri*, and denote an even further loss of political status.”⁵³ The word itself has developed from *brága*, meaning ‘neck’, ‘throat’ or ‘gullet’.⁵⁴ The new meaning of *brága* seems to refer to someone who has something, a chain or a fetter, around his neck. Since a forfeited hostage would be in fetters as well, it would be likely that *brága* would be used to refer to a hostage as well. However, *brága* are as Preston-Matto points out “more prisoners than markers of political sovereignty.”⁵⁵ It would be interesting to see if *brága* is only used to refer to forfeited hostages or to hostages in general. If *brága* is only used for forfeited hostages, I expect there to be some examples in the results of my corpus-search. I also wonder if there is a difference in the situations for which *gíall* or *brága* are used. In the second part of this thesis I hope to find proof of this. Since the *aitire* were used for very different agreements and legal instead of political purposes, I will not include them in the corpus.

Hostages and Laws

It was important for a king to hold hostages; it would be proof of the number of subject kings that were under his control. Or, as Preston-Matto describes it: “the taking of hostages was “a means of asserting political power” from the ninth to the eleventh centuries (and perhaps later). In essence, a hostage was a physical symbol of political subordination, held by the subordinator.”⁵⁶ Kelly refers to some of the early Irish legal tracts in which the *gíall* are mentioned: *Críth Gablach*, *Cáin Adomnáin* and *Di Gnímaib Gíall*.⁵⁷

In *Críth Gablach*, ‘Branched Purchase’,⁵⁸ it is mentioned how a *rí buiden*, ‘king of troops’, is entitled to a higher honour-price, because he takes hostages, presumably from his subordinate tribes: “*Is é rí teora tuath nó chetheora túath insin. Ocht cumala a ene(ch)clan, húaire dofoxla ilgíallu, a dáu no a trí nó [a] cethair.*”⁵⁹ “This is the king of three *tuatha* or of four *tuatha*. Eight *cumals* are his honour-price, for he takes a number of hostages, two or three or four.”⁶⁰ The taking of hostages might

⁵² Stacey 1994: 107.

⁵³ Preston-Matto 2010: 160.

⁵⁴ eDIL s.v. 2 *brága*

⁵⁵ Preston-Matto 2010: 160.

⁵⁶ Preston-Matto 2010: 145-146.

⁵⁷ Kelly 1988: 173-176.

⁵⁸ Kelly 1988: 267. The meaning of the title is not entirely clear.

⁵⁹ Binchy 1970: 18.

⁶⁰ MacNeill 1923: 300-301

not only be a way of ensuring subordination, but also be a requirement for the status of king. Stacey describes it as follows:

“...one law tract even equates the taking of hostages with the ability to claim royal rank:
Ni rig laisna biad geill i nglaisib. Dona tabar chis flatha. Dona eirenedar feich cana, ‘He is no king who does not have hostages in fetters, to whom the tax[es] of lordship are not given, [and] to whom the penalties of a *cáin* are not paid.’⁶¹

Kelly states that hostages would usually be sons of noble families, but at times a king or a lord would also give his daughter as a hostage.⁶² In *Cáin Adomnáin*, ‘The Law of Adomnán’, a law text dealing with offences against women, children and clerics,⁶³ one might expect to find a law on the giving of women as hostages, but the *gíall* is only mentioned once. In the final part of the law it is mentioned how there are hostage-sureties needed from the church to guarantee the Law of Adomnán. These hostage-sureties are the *aitire*, but the last hostage mentioned is a *gíall*. In addition to the testimony of a woman, a hostage would be needed. Because a female witness statement would by itself not be valid.⁶⁴ “*Teōra aitire cac[h]a p̄rimegalsa fri Cāin Adomnāin .i. secnap 7coic 7fertiges 7 aitire cana deirb̄f̄ine fo Ēirinn uile 7dā eitiri cāna ardflat[h]a 7gīalla gabhāla dia dīl, dia mbē tūarasndal bansgāl.*”⁶⁵ Preston-Matto points out that in the *Di Gnúmaib Gíall*,⁶⁶ it is not specified that women cannot be hostages.⁶⁷ There is evidence in the Annals of female hostages: “in 1165, the daughter of Eochaid Mac Dunshléibhe was given as a hostage, along with a son of every chieftain in Ulster, to Muircertach Mac Lochlainn, an aspirant to and sometime high-king with opposition of Ireland.”⁶⁸

It seems like the hostages were, as long their *túath* kept the agreement, treated quite well. In *Críth Gablach*, it is mentioned how they had a fairly prominent place in the king’s banquet hall. As long as they were not forfeited, hostages were seated in a place of honour:

⁶¹ Stacey 1994: 107.

⁶² Kelly 1988: 174.

⁶³ Kelly 1988: 281.

⁶⁴ Thurneysen 1928: 44n.

⁶⁵ Meyer 1905: 32. “Three hostage-sureties for every principle church for the Law of Adomnán, to wit, the prior and the cook and the guest-master, and a hostage-surety for every *derb̄fhine* throughout Ireland and two hostage-sureties for noble lords, and a hostage as warrant for levying it, if there be the [collective] evidence of women.” (Ní Dhonnchadha 2001: 68.)

⁶⁶ *Di Gnúmaib Gíall*, ‘On the actions of hostages’, describes the legal function of the *gíall*. It deals mostly with the payments that have to be made by the *gíall* or by the defendant. The legal function, and the description thereof, is very similar to that of the *aitire*. (Kelly 1988: 175). Only fragments of the text have been preserved. An edition and translation can be found in: Hancock, W. Neilson, Thaddeus O’Mahony, Alexander George Richey, and Robert Atkinson (ed. and tr.), *Ancient laws of Ireland*, 6 vols., vol. 2 (Dublin 1869) 132-145.

⁶⁷ Preston-Matto 2010: 146.

⁶⁸ Preston-Matto 2010: 145.

“Isind le[i]th ailiu, i fochlu, fénnid, fergniae fri forngaire ndoirseo : a charr ar bélaib cehtar n-a(e)í do grés fri cumascc cu[i]rmthige. Sóerchéli na flatha friu aníar – óes insin bís [i] coímthecht do fláith ; géil[l] íar suidib, brithem íar suidib ; a ben nó a brithem fri suidi[u] aníar ; rí íar suidi[u]. Gé[il]l díthma i nglasib i n-airthiur fochlai.”⁶⁹

According to Kelly, this prominent place for the hostages might just be a way for the king to show his power and status: “The *géill* ‘hostages’, also present in the side court, are presumably members of royal or noble families held by the ‘king of overkings’ and brought as a mark of his prestige to court sessions and other official occasions.”⁷⁰

The hostages in fetters, mentioned in *Críth Gablach*, might be placed in the banquet hall for the same reason. It would show what would happen if a subject king would revolt, and would therefore be an attribute to demonstrate the power of the king. Kelly mentions how the lives of these hostages were forfeit, “because of rebellion, withholding of tribute or other treason by the underking or lord whom they represent.”⁷¹ These forfeited hostages could be “killed, blinded or ransomed.”⁷²

Conclusion

eDIL contains many different words concerning hostages and hostageship. The words used to refer to hostages are *aitire*, a human pledge as guarantee for a contract, *gíall*, the real hostage given to an overlord by his subjects, and *brága*, which is used to refer to captives and prisoners as well. The *aitire* has different function than the other hostages, *brága* and *gíall* are closer related. According to a legal tract, hostages are a requirement for a high rank. The hostages were usually of noble birth and, as long as the subjects would not rebel, would be treated well. However, forfeited hostages would be put in fetters and might be mutilated or killed. In the next part of this thesis, I hope to find out if this general information on medieval Irish hostages is reflected in the Annals and the selected narrative literature.

⁶⁹ Binchy 1970: 23. “On the other side, in the north, a man at arms, a man of action, to guard the door, each of them having his spear in front of him always against confusion of the banquet-house [by attack from without]. Next to these inward, the free clients of the lord (i.e. of the king). These are the folk who are company to a king. Hostages next to these. The judge (the king’s assessor) next to these. His (the king’s) wife next to him. The king next. Forfeited hostages in fetters in the north-east.” MacNeill 1923: 306.

⁷⁰ Kelly ‘Court procedure’ (1986): 81.

⁷¹ Kelly 1988: 174.

⁷² Kelly 1988: 174.

2. Hostages in Literature

Introduction

To research the use of selected words for hostage and hostageship, I will search for hostages in some of the Annals and in narrative literature. Because of the amount of available texts, I will limit the corpus to texts from the Old and Middle Irish period. My selection is based on the references made on eDIL and the references made in *A Guide to Early Irish Law* concerning hostages. Although the manuscripts that contain the Annals are from the sixteenth and seventeenth century, they are compiled from earlier manuscripts. Therefore, I will include them in the corpus. To keep with the selected Old and Middle Irish period, I shall only include entries from the Annals up to the year 1200. The selected Annals are: *Annals of Ulster*, *Annals of Inisfallen*, *Annals of the Four Masters* and *Chronicum Scotorum*.⁷³ *Lebor na hUidre*, from about 1100, and *Lebor Laighnech*, from about 1160, will be the base for the narrative literature part of the corpus.⁷⁴

Methodology

All six texts are digitally available on CELT, this was a criteria for this corpus, because the search for hostages would be quicker and more accurate. In these texts, I will search for variant forms of *gíall*, *brága*, *gíallnae*, *géilsine* and *gíallaigecht*.

Forms of *gíall*: *gíall*, this would automatically include search results for different forms of *gíallnae* and *gíallaigecht*; *gíil(l)*, this would automatically include search results for *géilsine*; *gíul(l)*; and the lenited forms *ghíall*, *ghéil(l)* and *ghíul(l)*. Nasalized forms would automatically appear with the above mentioned search terms.

Forms of *brága*: *brág-* and *braig-*; and the lenited forms *bhrág* and *bhraig-*

Each individual search result will be analysed and the complete list of search results is attached as an appendix to this thesis. Because it would be too extensive to include every single result, I have decided to base the first part of the corpus on the general information found in the Annals. The results that specify who the hostages were or what happened to them will be mentioned separately. Aside from that I shall also try to point out where the use of *brága* instead of *gíall* became more common.

If available, I have used the translations of the texts from the CELT project or translations made by others. In the few cases where I used my own translations, I have mentioned it in the notes.

⁷³ AU: late 15th century; AFM: 17th century, CS: 18th century. (The Library of Trinity College Dublin website, collections: AU: MS 1282; AFM: MSS 1300-1301; CS: MS 1292). AI: late 11th century, with later additions up to 15th century (Early Manuscripts at Oxford University website, Bodleian Library MS. Rawl. B. 503)

⁷⁴ LU: late 11th, early 12th century. LL: 1160. The tales are older. (Gantz 1981:20-21) Since the focus is on narrative literature, genealogies found in these texts have been left out of the corpus. I have also omitted poetry, since this is a different genre that requires different analysis. Because of the linguistic style, vocabulary and possible use of metaphors, references to hostages and hostageship in poetry do not necessarily refer to hostages in the literal sense.

Hostages in the Annals

The Annals of Ulster AD 431-1201

The *Annals of Ulster* contains entries from 431 to 1201. There are no results for *géilsine* or *gíallaigeacht*, however *gíall* is mentioned 40 times, *brága* is mentioned 14 times and *gíallnae* is mentioned twice. In all cases these words are translated as ‘hostages’ or ‘pledges’, or used to indicate submission. The last entry for *gíall* in AU is U1171.10 and the first entry⁷⁵ to mention *brága* is U1156.2. This would suggest that by the end of the Middle Irish period, *brága* becomes more common, but is not really replacing *gíall*. Both words are used in the same manner and could be used interchangeably.

The situations in which the hostages are mentioned are mostly as follows: an army was brought by X to Y and hostages were taken.

U738.9 “*Slogad Cathail m. Finngúine co Laigiu co rucc gíallu o Faelán & co r-ruc maine mara.*”⁷⁶
“A hosting by Cathal son of Finngúine to Laigin and he took hostages from Faelán and great treasures.”⁷⁷

While most hostages are taken or given after battle or given as sign of submission, they could also be exchanged in return for valuables:

U1166.12 “*Sluagadh la Ruaidhri h-Ua Conchobair & la Tighernan h-Ua Ruairc co h-Es Ruaidh, co tangatur Cenel Conaill i n-a thech, co tardsat a m-braighti do h-Ua Conchobair, co tarat ocht fichtiu bó doibh, i n-ecmais oir & etaigh.*”⁷⁸ “A hosting by Ruaidhri Ua Conchobair and by Tigernan Ua Ruairc to Essruadh, so that the Cenel-Conaill came into his house [and] gave their pledges to Ua Conchobair [and] he gave them eight score cows, besides gold and clothing.”⁷⁹ This seems very similar to the transaction from *gíallnae*, so perhaps *gíallnae* and *gíall* could be used interchangeably as well. In the two entries where *gíallnae* appears, it is translated as ‘hostages’ and used in exactly the same way as *gíall*:

U721.8 “*Innred Laighen la Fergal & maidm inna Boraim & naidm n-aggíallne Laghen fri Fergal*

⁷⁵ The first result for *brága* meaning anything other than ‘neck’, would be U1029.6 “*Amhlaim m. Sitriuc, ri Gall, do erghabhail do Mathgamain H. Riagain, ri Bregh, co fargaibh da .c. dec bó & .ui. xx. ech m-Bretnach & tri .xx. unga do or & cloidim Carlusa & aitire Gaidel eter Laigiu & Leth Cuind, & tri .xx. unga do argut gil ina ungai geimlech, cona cethri fichid bó cuid focall & impidhe & cethri oeitire d'O Riagain fein fri sith, & lan-logh braghad in treas oeiteire.*” (AU: 466) “Amlaib son of Sitriuc, king of the foreigners, was held prisoner by Mathgamain ua Riacaín, king of Brega, and as his ransom he gave up 1,200 cows and six score Welsh horses and sixty ounces of gold and the sword of Carlus and Irish pledges both of Laigin and Conn's Half, and sixty ounces of pure silver; and four score cows was the portion of the award and the bequest, with four pledges, to ua Riacaín himself for peace, and full compensation for the release of one of the three pledges.” (AU: 467). But it turns out that this use of *brága* is not the later meaning of ‘captive’, ‘prisoner’ or ‘hostage’. In a legal context this would mean ‘body’ or ‘person’. (eDIL s.v. 1 *brága*)

⁷⁶ AU: 192.

⁷⁷ AU: 193.

⁷⁸ AU: 154.

⁷⁹ AU: 155.

*mc. Maile Duin.*⁸⁰ “An invasion of the Laigin by Fergal, and the cattletribute was imposed and the hostages of the Laigin secured for Fergal son of Mael Dúin.”⁸¹

In AU it is not often mentioned what happened to the hostages, but there are some entries that mention that the hostages are taken back from attackers or overlords:

U1025.4 “*Sluagad la Flaithbertach H. Neill, i m-Bregaibh & i nGallaib co tuc giallu Gaidhel o Ghallaib.*”⁸² “An army was led by Flaithbertach ua Néill into Brega and among the foreigners, and he took the hostages of the Irish from the foreigners.”⁸³

The hostages would serve as collateral to make sure the subjects would not rebel against their overlord. If the agreement would not be kept, the hostages were forfeited and could be killed. In AU there are two entries that mention that hostages were killed:

U1124.6 “*Geill Desmuman do marbadh la Tairrdelbach H. Conchobair .i. Mael Sechlainn m Cormaic m m Carrthaigh ri Caisil & H. Ciarmeic a h-Áine & H. Cobthaigh do Ib Cuanach Cnamchaille.*”⁸⁴ “The hostages of Desmumu were killed by Tairdelbach ua Conchobuir, i.e. Mael Sechlainn son of Cormac grandson of Carrthach, king of Caisel, and ua Ciarmeic from Áine, and ua Cobthaigh of the Uí Cuanach of Cnámchail.”⁸⁵

U1170.4 “*Braighde Mic Murchadha, .i., a mac fein & mac a mic, .i., mac Domhnaill Chaemhanaigh & mac a comaltha, .i., mac h-Ui Chaellaidhe, do mharbhadh la Ruaidhri h-Ua Conchubhair, tre aslach Tighernain h-Ui Ruairc.*”⁸⁶ “The hostages of Mac Murchadha, namely, his own son and his grandson, that is, the son of Domnall Caemanach and the son of his foster-brother, to wit, the son of Ua Caellaidhe, were killed by Ruaidhri Ua Conchubhair, through suggestion of Tigernan Ua Ruairc.”⁸⁷

It is also mentioned once that the hostages were forfeited because of a rebellion:

U1127.5 “*Fir Muman & Laigen do impodh doriisi for Thairrdhelbach H. Conchobuir & a n-geill do dhilsiughadh doibh & a mac d'aithrighadh do Laighnibh & do Ghallaibh; araide do-rat-sum ri aile forro .i. Domnall m. m. Fhaelain.*”⁸⁸ “The men of Mumu and Laigin turned again on Tairdelbach ua Conchobuir and they forfeited the lives of their hostages, and his son was deposed by the Laigin and the foreigners; for he set another king over them, i.e. Domnall grandson of Faelán.”⁸⁹

There are three entries in which it is mentioned who the hostages were. Aside from the abovementioned son and grandson from entry U1170.4 and the sons of nobles from entry U1124.6,

⁸⁰ AU: 176.

⁸¹ AU: 177.

⁸² AU: 462.

⁸³ AU: 463.

⁸⁴ AU: 568.

⁸⁵ AU: 569.

⁸⁶ AU: 162-164.

⁸⁷ AU: 163-165.

⁸⁸ AU: 572.

⁸⁹ AU: 573.

there is also one case in which a daughter is given as hostage as well as the sons of the Ulster chiefs: U1165.10 “[...]co n-darait h-Ua Lochlainn uile do Mac Duinn Sleibhe tar cenn **giall** Uladh uile: co n-tarait Mac Duinn Sleibhe mac cech toisigh d’ Ulltaibh & a ingin féin i m-braightechus d’ O Lochlainn.”⁹⁰ “[...]Ua Lochlainn gave the entire [kingship] to Mac Duinnsleibhe, in return for the pledges of all Ulidia. So that Mac Duinnsleibhe gave the son of every chief of Ulidia and his own daughter in pledge to O’Lochlainn.”⁹¹

The Annals of Inisfallen

The *Annals of Inisfallen* contains entries from 433 to 1450. *Gíall* is used 38 times; *brága* is used as well, but only 5 times. There are no results for *géilsine*, *gíallagecht* or *gíallnae*. The last entry containing a form of *gíall* is I1130.6 and the first entry containing *brága* is I1088.4. Like in AU *gíall* and *brága* are both translated as ‘hostages’ and the two words would be used in the same situations.

Most entries mention hostages taken or given after battle or given as sign of submission. One entry that stands out mentions the giving of hostages in exchange for valuables, this is again a situation quite similar to *gíallnae*:

I1120.4 “*Tadg mc. Meic Carthaig do dul i n-Osraigib co n-Desmumain imme, co tanic Ua Gillai Patraic, rí Osraigi, ina tech & co tucsat Osraigi **giallu** do, & co rucsat túarastul mór d’ór & d’echaib.*”⁹² “Tadc, son of Mac Carthaig, accompanied by the Desmumu, went to Osraige, and Ua Gilla Pátraic, king of Osraige, submitted to him. And the Osraige gave him hostages, and received [in return] a large stipend of gold and steeds.”⁹³

Another entry that stands out seems to describe a way to get out of an agreement or the submission to an overlord. By imprisoning the high-king, the king of Ailech has leverage to get his hostages back: I1100.6 “*Domnall mac Meic Lochlaind, rí Ailig, do chumrech Don[n]chada h-Uí Eochada, ardrig Ulad, ocus **géill** ro thog fein do thabairt ó Ultaib iar sen.*”⁹⁴ “Domnall son of Mac Lochlainn, king of Ailech, imprisoned Donnchadh Ua hEochada, high-king of Ulaid, and the hostages which he (Donnchadh) had taken, were afterwards brought from Ulaid.”⁹⁵

In none of the found entries of AI it is mentioned what happened to the hostages. Only one entry mentions the identity of a hostage:

I1070.8 “*Tairdelbach h-Ua Briain do dul i l-Laignib doridisi co tuc seotu imda as, & co tuc **giallu***

⁹⁰ AU: 150.

⁹¹ AU: 151.

⁹² AI: 278.

⁹³ AL: 279.

⁹⁴ AI: 254-256.

⁹⁵ AI: 257.

*Laigen lais & airther h-Erend im mc. n-Domnaill Remair mc. Maíl na m-Bó.*⁹⁶ “Tairdelbach Ua Briain went to Laigin again and brought away many valuables, also the hostages of Laigin and eastern Ireland, including the son of Domnall Remar, son of Mael na mBó.”⁹⁷

The Annals of the Four Masters I

In the first part of the *Annals of the Four Masters* contains entries from 2242BC to 902. *Gíall* is used 19 times, *brága* appears 4 times and *gíallnae* and *géilsine* both appear once. There are no results for *gíallaigeacht*. The last entry containing a form of *gíall* is M902.7 and the first entry containing *brága* is M683.2. In all entries the forms of *gíall* and *brága* can be translated as ‘hostages’ or ‘prisoners’ and seem to be used interchangeably. It seems like that is also the case for the entry in which *gíallnae* is used. *Gíallnae* is referring to hostages and not to base clientship:

M717.9 “*Indredh Laighen, & naidhm na boromha dorídhisi, & na gíallna la Fergal.*”⁹⁸ “Leinster was plundered and the Borumha again enjoined, and the hostages, by Fearghal.”⁹⁹

All entries mention hostages taken or given after battle or given as sign of submission. However, there is also an entry in which the keeping of hostages is a way to describe status:

M871.10 “*Dunadhach dindorcaill áin, gair fer n-domhan condmaibh gíall.*”¹⁰⁰ “Dunadhach, a noble protection, a famous man by whom hostages were held.”¹⁰¹

None of the entries mentions what happens to the hostages, but one entry does stand out:

M531.2 “*Cath Claonlocha h-i c-Cenel Aodha ria n-Goibhneann, taoisioch Ua Fiachrach Aidhne, airm in ro marbhadh Maine, mac Cerbhaill, ag cosnamh géillsine Ua Maine Connacht.*”¹⁰² “The battle of Claenloch, in Cinel Aedh, by Goibhneann, chief of Ui Fiachrach Aidhne, where Maine, son of Cearbhall, was killed, in defending the hostages of Ui Maine of Connaught.”¹⁰³

This very early entry describes a situation where hostages were defended. Here *géillsine* is used like *gíall*. Because it is such an early entry and the use of *géillsine* is quite rare, it is unclear if *géillsine* was used instead of *gíall* before the Old Irish period, or if the two words could be used interchangeably.

Unfortunately, I have not been able to find evidence to confirm this.

Only one of the entries in is quite specific about the identity of the hostages:

M839.10 “*Orgain Lughmhaidh la Gallaibh Locha h-Eathach, & ro ghabhsat braighde iomdha*

⁹⁶ AI: 226.

⁹⁷ AI: 27.

⁹⁸ AFM: 316.

⁹⁹ AFM: 317.

¹⁰⁰ AFM: 516.

¹⁰¹ AFM: 517.

¹⁰² AFM: 176.

¹⁰³ AFM: 177.

d'espucioibh & do dhaoinibh eaccnaidhe foghlamtha, & ruccsat iatt dochom a longphort iar marbhadh sochaidhe oile leó bheós."¹⁰⁴ "The plundering of Lughmhadh by the foreigners of Loch Eathach; and they made prisoners of many bishops and other wise and learned men, and carried them to their fortress, after having, moreover, slain many others."¹⁰⁵

The Annals of the Four Masters 2

This second part of the *Annals of the Four Masters* contains entries from entries 902 to 1151. There are no results for *géilsine* or *gíallaigeacht*, but *gíall* is used 84 times, *brága* is used 40 times and *gíallnae* appears 3 times. In all cases these words are translated as 'hostages' and again they seem to be used interchangeably. The last entry containing a form of *gíall* is M1171.14 and the first entry containing *brága* is M1132.6.

Most entries concern the giving or taking of hostages. But again hostages are mentioned in the description of status:

M917.7 "*Acc égaíne Néill ro raidhedh beos, Brónach aniu Ere uagh, cen ruirigh ruadh righi gíall.*"¹⁰⁶ "In lamentation of Niall was moreover said: Sorrowful this day is sacred Ireland, without a valiant chief of hostage reign."¹⁰⁷

There also is a case where land is given in exchange for hostages:

M1156.17 "*Sloighedh oile lá Muirchertach & la Tuaisceart Ereann h-i Laighnibh, co t-tard ríge Laighen do Dhiarmaid Mac Murchadha, dar cenn braghad, & ro innrestar Osraighe etir cealla & tuatha.*"¹⁰⁸ "Another army was led by Muircheartach and the people of the north of Ireland into Leinster, and they gave the kingdom of Leinster to Diarmaid Mac Murchadha for hostages, and they plundered Osraighe, both churches and territories."¹⁰⁹

Even in this amount of entries, it is not often specified what happened to the hostages. But as seen before there are a few cases in which it is described that hostages are taken back:

M1024.8 "*Slóicched lá mac n-Eochadha go Gallu, go ro loiscceadh lais, & go t-tucc gíalla Gaoidheal uadhaibh.*"¹¹⁰ "An army was led by the son of Eochaidh against the foreigners, so that he burned their territory, and carried away the hostages of the Irish from them."¹¹¹

¹⁰⁴ AFM: 460.

¹⁰⁵ AFM: 461.

¹⁰⁶ AFM: 594.

¹⁰⁷ AFM: 595.

¹⁰⁸ AFM: 1120.

¹⁰⁹ AFM: 1121.

¹¹⁰ AFM: 808.

¹¹¹ AFM: 809.

M1025.12 “*Slóichcedh lá Flaithbertach Ua Néill i m-Breghaibh, co t-tucc **gialla** Gaoidheal ó Ghallaibh.[...]*”¹¹² “An army was led by Flaithbheartach Ua Neill into Breagha, and he carried off the hostages of the Irish from the foreigners. [...]”¹¹³

There are also some entries in which the hostages were killed:

M1124.17 “*Geill Desmhumhan im mac Corbmaic mic meic Carthaigh, do marbhadh la Toirdhealbhach Ua Conchobhair.*”¹¹⁴ “The hostages of Desmond, among whom was the son of Cormac, son of Mac Carthy, were put to death by Toirdhealbhach Ua Conchobhair.”¹¹⁵

M1170.16 “*Braighde Dhiarmada Mic Murchadha do mharbhadh lá Ruaidhri Ua Conchobhair, rí Ereann, occ Ath Luain .i. Conchobhar mac Diarmada, riogh-mhacaomh Laighen, & mac mic Diarmada .i. mac Domhnaill Chaomhanaigh, & mac a chomhalta .i. Ua Caollaighe.*”¹¹⁶ “The hostages of Diarmaid Mac Murchadha were put to death by Ruaidhri Ua Conchobhair, King of Ireland, at Ath-Luain, namely, Conchobhar, son of Diarmaid, heir apparent of Leinster, and Diarmaid's grandson, i.e. the son of Domhnall Caemhanach, and the son of his foster-brother, i.e. O'Caellaighe.”¹¹⁷

M1170.18 “*Braighde Airthir Midhe do mharbhadh lá Tighearnan Ua Ruairc.*”¹¹⁸ “The hostages of East Meath were put to death by Tighearnan Ua Ruairc.”¹¹⁹

Like the son of the king and the grandson in entries M1170.16 and M1124.17, there are some entries in which it is mentioned who the hostages were. As seen before, these hostages are nobles, sons of nobles and kings and also daughters:

M939.9 “*Muirchertach iaradh do thionól Conaill & Eoghain, & an Tuaisceirt archena co h-Oileach, co ndo-roeghda dech céd lais do gléire gaisgedhach ind Fhochla, & ro tairmchill Erinn láimh clí frí fairrge co riacht Atha Cliath, & do-bhert Sitriuc, tighearna Atha Cliath h-i n-**giallnus** lais [...]*”¹²⁰

“Muircheartach afterwards assembled the Cinel-Conaill and Cinell-Eoghain, and the people of the North in general, at Oileach, where he selected ten hundred of the chosen heroes, and made a circuit of Ireland, keeping his left hand to the sea, until he arrived at Ath-cliaith; and he brought Sitric, lord of Ath-cliaith, with him as a hostage[...].”¹²¹

M1088.10 “*Slóighedh lá Domhnall, mac mic Lochlainn, lá rígh n-Ailigh, co t-Tuaisceirt Ereann imme h-i c-Connachtaibh, co t-tart Ruaidhri Ua Conchobhair, rí Connacht, **gialla** Connacht uile dhó. Do-dheochattar dibhlinibh cona sochraittibh isin Mumhain, go ro loiscset Luimneach, & ro indraiset machaire na Mumhan .i. co h-Imleach Iubhair, & Loch Gair, & Brúgh Rígh, & Dún Achéd, & co*

¹¹² AFM: 810.

¹¹³ AFM: 811.

¹¹⁴ AFM: 1020.

¹¹⁵ AFM: 1021.

¹¹⁶ AFM: 1176-1178.

¹¹⁷ AFM: 1177-1179.

¹¹⁸ AFM: 1178.

¹¹⁹ AFM: 1179.

¹²⁰ AFM: 642.

¹²¹ AFM: 643.

Druim Ua Clercén, & rucsat cenn mic Cailigh Ui Ruairc o chnocaibh Sainccil, & ro thoghailset, & ro mhúrsat Cenn Coradh, & ro gabhsat ocht b-fichit laech etir Galla, & Gaoidheala i n-giallnus a n-aittire, & tangattar dia t-tighibh iaramh. At iad roighne na n-aittire-sin mac Madadháin Ui Cinneidigh, mac Congalaigh I Occáin, & mac Eachdhach Ui Loingsigh. Do-radadh bá, ech, ór, orgat, & carna tar a cenn ó Muircherthach Ua Briain ina f-fuaslaccadh.”¹²² “An army was led by Domhnall, the son of Mac Lochlainn, King of Ireland, and the people of the north of Ireland with him, into Connaught; and Ruaidhri Ua Conchobhair, King of Connaught, gave him the hostages of all Connaught. Both proceeded with their forces into Munster; and they burned Luimneach, and plundered the plain of Munster, i.e. as far as Imleach-Ibhair, Loch-Gair, Brugh-Righ, un-Aiched, and Druim-Ui-Cleirchein; and they carried off the head of the son of Caileach Ua Ruairc from the hills of Saingeal; and they broke down and demolished Ceann-coradh; and they obtained eight score heroes, both foreigners and Irish, as hostages and pledges, and then returned to their houses. The chief of these hostages were the son of Madadhan Ua Ceinneidigh; the son of Conghalach Ua hOgain; and the son of Eochaidh Ua Loingsigh. Cows, horses, gold, silver, and flesh-meat, were afterwards given in ransom of them by Muircheartach Ua Briain.”¹²³

M1148.9 “*Sluaighedh la Muirchertach, mac Neill Ui Lochlainn, & lá Cenél n-Eoghain, & la Donnchadh Ua Cerbhaill co n-Airghiallaibh i n-Ultaibh, co t-tuccsat gialla Uladh im mac righ Uladh leó, & ro fhagaibhset cethrar tighernadh for Ultoibh don chur-sin. Ulaidh & Airghialla do iompódh for Mag Lachlainn & for Cenel n-Eoghain iar sin.*”¹²⁴ “An army was led by Muircheartach, son of Niall Ua Lochlainn, by the Cinel-Eoghain and Donnchadh Ua Cearbhaill, and the Airghialla, into Ulidia; and they carried off the hostages of the Ulidians, together with the son of the King of Ulidia, and left four lords over Ulidia on that occasion. The Ulidians and Airghialla turned against Mac Lochlainn and the Cinel-Eoghain after this.”¹²⁵

M1149.10 “[...] *Tainic iar t-tain h-Ua Duind Slébbe i t-taigh h-Ui Lachlainn co t-tucc a mac fein i n-giallna dho, & an ro chuinnigh do ghiallaibh archena.*”¹²⁶ “[...] Ua Duinnsleibhe afterwards came into the house of Ua Lochlainn, and delivered his own son up to him as a hostage, and whatever other hostages he demanded.”¹²⁷

M1165.5 “*Do-rad Ua Lachlainn an ríge dó dar cend ghiall n-Uladh uile, & tucc Eochaidh mac gach toisigh do Ultaibh dhó, & a inghen féin a n-giallnas do Ua Lachlainn.*”¹²⁸ “Ua Lochlainn gave him the kingdom, in consideration of receiving the hostages of all Ulidia; and Eochaidh gave him a son of every chieftain in Ulidia, and his own daughter, to be kept by Ua Lochlainn as a hostage.”¹²⁹

¹²² AFM: 932-934.

¹²³ AFM: 933-935.

¹²⁴ AFM: 1086.

¹²⁵ AFM: 1085-1087.

¹²⁶ AFM: 1088-1090.

¹²⁷ AFM: 1089-1091.

¹²⁸ AFM: 1154.

¹²⁹ AFM: 1155.

M1167.11 “[...] *Rangattar iaramh h-i t-Tír Eóghain, & ro rann Ua Conchobhair an tír i n-dó .i. Tír Eoghain o Shléibh Challain fo thuaidh do Niall Ua Lachlainn dar cend da **bhrághadh** .i. Ua Catháin na Craoibhe, & mac An Ghaill Uí Bhrain, & Cenél Eoghain ó Shlebh fo dheas do Aedh Ua Néill dar cend dá **bhrághatt** oile .i. Ua Maoil Aedha do Chenél Aonghusa, & h-Ua h-Urthuile do h-Uibh Tuirtre, comhaltai Uí Néill fodhéism.[...]*”¹³⁰ “[...] They afterwards arrived in Tir-Eoghain, and Ua Conchobhair divided the territory into two parts, i.e. gave that part of Tir-Eoghain north of the mountain, i.e. Callainn, to Niall Ua Lochlainn, for two hostages, i.e. Ua Cathain of Craebh, and Macan-Ghaill Ua Brain, and that part of the country of the Cinel to the south of the mountain to Aedh Ua Neill, for two other hostages, i.e. Ua Maelaedha, one of the Cinel-Aenghusa, and Ua hUrthuile, one of the Ui-Tuirtre Ua Neill's own foster-brothers. [...]”¹³¹

Chronicon Scotorum

Chronicon Scotorum contains entries from 353 to 1150, in which the word *gíall* is used 35 times and *brága* only appears 5 times. There are no results for *géilsine*, *gíallaigecht* or *gíallnae*. The last entry containing a form of *gíall* is CS1118 and the first entry containing *brága* is CS882. All forms of *gíall* and *brága* are translated as ‘hostages’ or ‘captive’ and they seem to be used interchangeably.

Most entries refer to the giving or taking of hostages after a battle. There is also one entry that seems to refer to ‘pledges’. This might actually be a form of *gell* instead of *gíall*:

CS897 “*Inradh Connact la Flann mac Maoilseclainn et **geill** do thobach.*”¹³² “Connacht was attacked by Flann son of Mael Sechnaill and its pledges exacted.”¹³³

Nothing specific is mentioned about what happened to the hostages, except for two entries that describe that hostages were taken back:

CS979 “*Morsluaighedh la Maoileclainn mac Domhnaill la righ Temrach & la Eochaidh mac Ardgal ri Uladh go Gallaibh Atha Cliath go ttugsat forbais tri la et tri n-oidqe forra go ttugsat **gialla** hErenn ass um Domnall Claon ri Laigen [...]*”¹³⁴ “A great army was led by Mael Sechnaill son of Domnall, king of Temair, and by Eochaidh son of Ardgal, king of Ulaid, to the foreigners of Áth Cliath and they besieged them for three days and three nights, and brought away the hostages of Ireland including Domnall Claen, king of Laigin [...]”¹³⁵

¹³⁰ AFM 1164.

¹³¹ AFM: 1165. This entry also appears in AU U1165.10.

¹³² CS: 150.

¹³³ CS: 149.

¹³⁴ CS: 196.

¹³⁵ CS: 195.

CS1024 “*Sluaighedh la mac nEochadha go Gallaibh gur losg íad & go ttug gíalla Gaoidheal uaithibh.*”¹³⁶ “An army was led by the son of Eochaidh to the foreigners and he burned them and took the hostages of the Irish from them.”¹³⁷

Only in the abovementioned entry CS979 it is mentioned who the hostages were.

Warfare and hostages

While comparing the entries in which hostages are mentioned, it is apparent that most entries occur in the Middle Irish period. Each century more hostages are mentioned and most of these results appear in the eleventh and twelfth century. The only entries that mention that the hostages were killed are from the twelfth century. Ó Cróinín explains that in the twelfth century there was a change in warfare. Wars would last longer and would have more casualties.¹³⁸ In the eleventh century, after the battle of Clontarf, kings would attempt to gain high kingship. Different dynasties would attempt to claim the highest position and these conflicts lasted well into the twelfth century, even after the Anglo-Norman invasion.¹³⁹ With this amount of conflict in the last centuries of the Middle Irish period, it is not surprising that there are more entries in which the hostages and their fates are mentioned.

Gíall in names

During my search in the Annals, I encountered two names related to *gíall*. Although they do not really have a place in this corpus, I believe it is necessary to mention them here. The first name is Níall Noígíallach, ‘Niall of the Nine Hostages’, he and his descendants appear very often. Níall was king of Ireland from 379 to 405.¹⁴⁰ He earned his epithet, because he took a hostage from each of the five provinces of Ireland, and four hostages from Scotland. This of course indicates high kingship, which was held by his descendants, the Uí Néill, for over six hundred years.¹⁴¹

The other result that turned up very often is the kingdom of the Airgialla. This was a federation of different peoples that originated in the eighth century. The name Airgialla can be translated as ‘eastern subjects/hostages’.¹⁴² The Airgialla were originally subject to Ulster, but “they switched their allegiance to the Uí Néill and became an important element in their military.”¹⁴³ Here *gíalla* seems to be used like *gíallnae*, since it refers to submission and the subjects provide, in this case military, services for their overlord.

¹³⁶ CS: 226.

¹³⁷ CS: 225.

¹³⁸ Ó Cróinín 1995: 274.

¹³⁹ Ó Cróinín 1995: 276-286. Mac Murrough attacked Waterford and Dublin and (high) king Rory O’Connor killed his hostages. This is mentioned in the entries in AU and AFM for the year 1170. (Ó Cróinín 1995: 287).

¹⁴⁰ This is the period Dillon mentions, however, depending on the source it defers.

¹⁴¹ Dillon 1946: 38.

¹⁴² Ó Cróinín 1995: 43.

¹⁴³ Wiley 2008: 45-47.

Conclusion

In the Old Irish period *gíall* is prevalent. *Brága* is used as well, from at least the end of the seventh century onwards, but is not very common. During the Middle Irish period both words are used interchangeably, but *gíall* is more common up until 1100. This would suggest that *gíall* would be the prevalent word used in both the Old and Middle Irish period, but by the end of the Middle Irish period *gíall* becomes rarer and seems to be gradually replaced by *brága*. In the few times that *gíallnae* and *géilsine* appear, they are used in the same way as *gíall*, which leads me to believe that all these words could be used interchangeably. Perhaps, they were replaced by *gíall* over time. Unfortunately, I have not found any evidence of this.

The Annals reveal that most of these hostage situations simply describe hostages being given or taken after a battle. *Gíall* is also used often to indicate the submission of a subject to his king and the tribute of hostages that has to be given. The keeping of hostages is used to describe a high status as well. There are a few exceptions, but in general it is not specified who the hostages were. If it is mentioned it is usually a son or daughter of a chief or a noble, not just a commoner. The fate of the hostages is not often mentioned and can have very different outcomes; hostages can be defended, returned or killed. Unfortunately, because of the short entries, there is not much additional information concerning hostages and hostageship to be found in the Annals. However, these results do confirm some of the information from other sources mentioned in the previous part.

Hostages in narrative literature

Lebor na hUidre

In LU there are no results for *gállagecht*. *Géilsine* does appear in LU in *Amra Choluim Cille* (l. 983), but since this is an elegy I have not included it in the corpus. Different forms of *brága* appear quite often in LU, in *Táin Bó Cúailnge* and *Fled Bricrend*, but only with the original meaning of ‘neck’ or ‘throat’. Forms of *gíall* appear 10 times and *gíallnae* is used twice. These words are translated as ‘hostage’, ‘hostageship’ or used to indicate submission.

Immram Curaig Maíle Dúin

In this *immram*, ‘The Voyage of Mael Duin’, Mael Duin’s travels to many islands are described as well as his conception and birth. It is in this first part that two forms of *gíall* occur:

l. 1659 “*Luid iarom in rí dúa chrích iar n-inriud 7gíallai dó.*”¹⁴⁴ “Ailill Ochair Agai, Mael Duin’s father, plunders the church and takes hostages.”¹⁴⁵ He also slept with a nun and that is how Mael Duin was conceived.

l. 1674 “*Tussu ol se nád fess can cland ná cenel duit 7nicon fes mátair ná hathair do gáillud forni in cech óenchluchi cid for tír cid for usce cid for fídhill cotrísam fris.*”¹⁴⁶ Stokes translated this as “To vanquish us in every game”.¹⁴⁷ Mael Duin is very skilled and wins every game of *fidchell*. Although this translation at first seems not related to hostageship at all, it clearly indicates a sort of submission. Mael Duin is simply a better player.

Tucait Indarba na nDéisse

The ‘Expulsion of the Déisi’, contains the (pseudo-) history of the Déisi. It describes how they were banished from Tara. Three forms of *gálla* can be found in the beginning of this tale:

l. 4364 - l. 4366 “*A dalta hi farrad Óengusa .i. Corc Duibni mac Corpri Musc meic Conaire meic Etersceoil ro boiside o feraib Muman i ngíallai fri láim Cormaic I tech nÓengusa ro aithniset fir Muman a ngíall dia airchisecht.*”¹⁴⁸ These words can be translated as hostageship and hostages. The foster-son of Óengus was in hostageship in Munster and in the house of Óengus the men of Munster entrusted their hostages to be kindly treated.¹⁴⁹

l. 4376 “*a dalta leiss .i. Corc Duibni & atrulláeside a gíallai.*”¹⁵⁰ Corc Duibne went with Óengus and

¹⁴⁴ LU: 58.

¹⁴⁵ Stokes (Mael Duin) 1988: 455.

¹⁴⁶ LU: 59

¹⁴⁷ Stokes (Mael Duin) 1988: 457.

¹⁴⁸ LU: 137-138.

¹⁴⁹ Own translation

¹⁵⁰ LU: 138.

escaped his hostageship.¹⁵¹ This seems to be the same form as above and can therefore be translated as ‘hostageship’. Óengus attacked Cormac and escaped, his foster-son escaped with him.

Togail Bruidne Dá Derga

In the ‘Destruction of Dá Derga’s Hostel’, two forms of *gíallnae* were found. No other tale from LU contains *gíallnae*. The tale describes Conaire Mór’s visit to Dá Derga’s hostel and contains a description of what was encountered in each room. In The Room of the Fomorians there are three Fomorians who were brought from the land of the Fomorians by Mac Cécht.

l. 7285 “*Ní frith do Fomórib fer do chomruc fris co tucc in tríar sin úadib conda fil hi tig Conaire hi ngíallnae nar coillet ith na blicht i nHerind tara cáin téchta céin bes Conaire hi flaithius.*”¹⁵² “Not one of the Fomorians was found to fight him, so he brought away those three, and they are in Conaire’s house as sureties that, while Conaire is reigning, the Fomorians destroy neither corn nor milk in Erin beyond their fair tribute.”¹⁵³ Apparently there is a tribute that has to be paid, but the Fomorians cannot take more than what is fair. The Fomorians are the sureties for this agreement.

l. 7295 “*Dáig ní léicter airm léo isin tig úaire is i ngíallnai fri fraigid atát arná dernat mídenom issin tig.*”¹⁵⁴ “[...]for no arms are allowed them in the house, since they are in hostageship at the wall.”¹⁵⁵ Even as hostages the Fomorians are very dangerous. They have to be at the wall, presumably chained up against it, to avoid a slaughter.

Siaburcharpat Con Culaind

In ‘The Phantom Chariot of Cú Chulainn’, St. Patrick calls back Cú Chulainn from the grave, so that he may convince high-king Lóegaire to accept Christianity. Lóegaire does not believe it is Cú Chulainn and asks him to tell of his great deeds to prove it is truly him:

l. 9318 “*Bassa collid gíallasa i n-airitin átha mo thúath.*”¹⁵⁶ “I was the destroyer of hostageship in the reception of the fords of my territories.”¹⁵⁷ According to eDIL, *airitin* can also be translated as ‘safekeeping’ or ‘looking after’,¹⁵⁸ which could change the translation to: “I am destroyer of hostageship in safekeeping of the ford of my people.”¹⁵⁹ Cú Chulainn was the protector of Ulster, therefore I believe this means that no hostages were taken from Ulster, while he was protecting it.

Cath Cairnd Chonaill

‘The Battle of Carn Conaill’ describes the battle fought between Diarmait and Gúaire, because the

¹⁵¹ Own translation.

¹⁵² LU: 223.

¹⁵³ Stokes (Dá Derga) 1901: 84.

¹⁵⁴ LU: 223

¹⁵⁵ Stokes (Dá Derga) 1901: 84.

¹⁵⁶ LU: 2008

¹⁵⁷ Crowe 1878: 381.

¹⁵⁸ eDIL s.v. *airitiu*

¹⁵⁹ Own translation.

Connachtmen were stealing cattle from Diarmait's foster-mother. Gúaire loses the fight because of a curse put in him by St. Cámmine.

l. 9652 “*Dolluidseom tra do gíallad fri claideb do Diarmait intí Gúairi.*”¹⁶⁰ Then Gúaire went to make submission to Diarmait at the sword's point.¹⁶¹ According to DIL, *gíallad* is a verb that comes from *gíall*, and means ‘to give hostages’, ‘to obey’, or ‘to submit’,¹⁶² in this situation it clearly indicates submission after battle and it is unclear if any hostages were exchanged in this situation.

l. 9661- l. 9662 “*Maith or Diarmait ro gíallaisiu do rí g aile .i. do Mac Dé. asso mo gíallsa duit siu im.*”¹⁶³ “Well, says Diarmait, thou hast submitted to another king, even to God's Son. Here, however, is my submission to thee.”¹⁶⁴ This part seems to be quite odd; Gúaire went to see St. Cámmine about the curse and fasted with him. He shows a lot of generosity to the church as well.¹⁶⁵ Gúaire has submitted to Christ and therefore Diarmait submits to Gúaire. Peace was made after this.

Comthoth Lóegaire

This tale describes the conversion of Lóegaire to the Christian faith and his death. A form of *gíall* appears only once:

l. 9786 “*Geill do rí g aib.*”¹⁶⁶ “...hostages to kings.”¹⁶⁷ The men of Ireland come together in a meeting concerning conversion to Christianity. St. Patrick is present as well; he forgives the men of Ireland after they killed his charioteer. Lóegaire converts and the men of Ireland ask St. Patrick for new, and proper, laws. One of these laws is that “hostages (are given) to kings,” I believe this might either mean that hostages can only be held by a king or that tribute or hostages should be given to a king by his subjects. From the context this is not clear.

Conclusion

In *Lebor na hUidre* various forms of *gíall* appear quite often. In general the word is used to refer to the hostages that were taken or given. In other cases variants of *gíall* are used to indicate submission. No forms of *brága* or *gíallagecht* appear in LU, *gíallnae* appears twice but only in *Togail Bruidne Dá Derga*. It seems that, at the time LU was created, *gíall* was still the common word used to refer to hostages and hostageship. In most of these cases it is mentioned who the hostages were and who took them, but it is not specified what actually happened to the hostages. Aside from the foster-son of Óengus from *Tucait Indarba na nDésse*, they all might still be stuck at the wall like the Fomorians.

¹⁶⁰ LU: 290.

¹⁶¹ Stokes (Carn Conaill) 1901: 213.

¹⁶² eDIL s.v. *gíallaid*

¹⁶³ LU: 290.

¹⁶⁴ Stokes (Carn Conaill): 213.

¹⁶⁵ Stokes (Carn Conaill): 211.

¹⁶⁶ LU 294

¹⁶⁷ Plummer 1883-1885: 167.

The Book of Leinster

In LL no results were found for *géilsine*, *gíallaigecht* or *gíallnae*. *Brága* appears only once. Forms of *brága*, meaning ‘neck’ or ‘throat’, appear very often. For example: *Tain Bó Fraich* (l. 33123; 33269), *Tochmarc Ferbae* (l. 33463) and *Mesca Ulad* (l. 35050). *Gíall* appears 20 times. All forms are translated as ‘hostage’, ‘pledge’, ‘captive’, or used to indicate submission.

Lebor Gabála

In LL version of ‘The Book of the Taking of Ireland’, different forms of *gíall* appear. The text contains the pseudo-history of Ireland from the Creation to the Middle Ages and it describes the various peoples that settled in Ireland:

l. 1608 “*Fuigliset fri maccu Miled combad leo ind inis co cend tri tráth. fri telcud no fri tinól catha no fri gíallad.*”¹⁶⁸ “They pronounced judgement against the sons of Mil, that they [themselves] should have the island to the end of three days, free from assault, from assembly of battle, or from giving of hostages.”¹⁶⁹ Three kings of Ireland make this agreement with the Sons of Míl, who were the invaders at that time, because the kings believed the Sons of Míl would not return to Ireland. In this case the form of *gíall* clearly refers to hostages given by a subject to an overlord.

After the last invasion, two ‘books’ are added to the *Lebor Gabála*: ‘The Roll of Kings’ and ‘The Roll of Christian Kings’. In these books the deeds of historical and fictional Irish kings are described in a manner somewhat similar to the Annals. Multiple variants of *gíall* are mentioned:

l. 2013 “*Fri ré .xxx. at bliadan bil ro gíallad do mac Ebir,*”¹⁷⁰ “For a space of thirty fortunate years submission was paid to the son of Eber.”¹⁷¹ This seems to indicate that the son of Eber was ruling over subjects and received a tribute from them. From the context it is unclear whether or not these are hostages.

l. 2164 “*ro gíallad an drong duned.*”¹⁷² “homage was paid to the troop of forts.”¹⁷³ ‘Homage’ in this case seems to indicate submission, but it could also be that the warriors were respected. The meaning of *gíallad* is in this case unclear.

l. 2450 “*Gabais Gíallchath ríge fri ré .ix. mbliadan tuc gíall cach cóicfir a mMumain.*”¹⁷⁴ “Gíallchad took kingship for a space of nine years. He took a hostage from every five men in Mumu.”¹⁷⁵ Here *gíall* clearly refers to the hostages an overlord takes from his subjects.

l. 3120 “*Fland mac Mael Sechnaill .xxiii. co n-ebailt. Is leis ro leicit géill Herend for cúlu. & ro*

¹⁶⁸ LL Vol. 1: 50-51.

¹⁶⁹ Macalister 1956: 37.

¹⁷⁰ LL Vol. 1: 63.

¹⁷¹ Macalister 1956: 433.

¹⁷² LL Vol. 1: 68.

¹⁷³ Macalister 1956: 443.

¹⁷⁴ LL Vol. 1: 77.

¹⁷⁵ Macalister 1956: 247.

*gabsom iat ar écin doridisi.*¹⁷⁶ “Flann s. Máel-Sechlainn, twenty-seven years, till he died. By him the hostages of Ireland were allowed to go back, but he took them again by force.”¹⁷⁷ In this case it is quite unclear what happened, there is no additional information in the context. However, I think it might have something to do with the behaviour of Flann’s subjects. Perhaps he released some hostages as a reward for loyalty and a gesture of good faith in his subjects. If his subjects rebelled, he would have to take hostages by force to regain control.

l. 3141 “*Forbais tri laa & tri n-aidchi leis for Gallaib co tuc giallu Herend ar écin uadib.*”¹⁷⁸ “A siege of three days and three nights by him [Máel-Sechlainn] against the Foreigners, so that he took the hostages of Ireland by force from them.”¹⁷⁹ Máel-Sechlainn took back the Irish hostages from the foreigners after a siege. This could mean that the Irish were subject to foreign overlords and that by taking back their hostages the Irish regained control.

Scéla Chonchobuir

‘The Tidings of Conchobar’ describes Conchobar’s life and how he became king of Ulster. In the beginning of the tale Conchobar’s mother Nessa made sure her son would become a king.

l. 12458 “*Doringart i suidiu Fergus a giallu.*”¹⁸⁰ “Thereupon Fergus claimed his pledges.”¹⁸¹ In this case the use of *gíallu* seems odd. Fergus wanted to marry Nessa and she asked him to give kingship of Ulster for a year to Conchobar (her son). After a year he returns to claim something. I find the translation ‘pledges’ to be very vague. Perhaps it simply refers to the fact that Fergus comes to claim his kingship and the hostages that come with it.

Scel Mucci Meic Da Thó

Aside from being an illustration of the conflict between Ulster and Connacht, ‘The Tale of Mac Datho’s Pig’ includes many a dispute over who deserves the champion’s portion of the meal. This dispute leads to Conall Cernach earning the champion’s portion. He leaves little of the pig for the men of Connacht and this starts the battle.

l. 13291 “*móra gialla móra gill.*”¹⁸² “Great are the captives, and vast the tomb.”¹⁸³ *Gíalla* is here translated as ‘captives’, but could be translated as ‘hostages’ just as well. Since the taking of hostages is a reference to the outcome of a battle, I think in this case it would even make for a better translation.

¹⁷⁶ LL Vol. 1: 97.

¹⁷⁷ Macalister 1956: 399.

¹⁷⁸ LL Vol. 1: 98.

¹⁷⁹ Macalister 1956: 403.

¹⁸⁰ LL Vol. 2: 401.

¹⁸¹ Stokes (Conchobar) 1910: 25.

¹⁸² LL Vol. 2: 425.

¹⁸³ Leahy 1905: 49.

Talland Etair

In ‘The Siege of Howth’, the Ulstermen take refuge in Howth after being chased by angry Leinstermen. While they wait for the rest of the Ulstermen to be gathered and set them free, the Leinstermen bring out Ulster hostages:

l. 13405 “& **geill** Ulad do thabairt immach cech lá do Lagnib fó thrí. & a mbreith innund do Mes Dead fo thrí ar galaib.”¹⁸⁴ “And Ulster’s hostages were brought out three times every day by the Leinstermen and they were brought back three times by Mess Dead in single combat.”¹⁸⁵ A seven year old defends the fort until the Ulstermen get there. It seems like the hostages are used as leverage in this case, but it does not work. Mess Dead manages to take back the hostages.

l. 13476 “Dofairchelsa **giall** cech coicid de choicedaib Herend.”¹⁸⁶ “They gave a pledge for a hostage for every province in Ireland.”¹⁸⁷ This is part of Leborcham’s prophecy, she tells the women of Ulster that the Ulstermen will win the battle and that they will return. As a result they will take away hostages from the provinces. The use of *giall* is quite clear here, because the hostages will be taken after a battle.

Cath Carn Chonaill

The LL version of ‘The Battle of Carn Conaill’ is very similar to the LU version. At times however, it is a bit expanded. Four variants of *gialla* appear in the tale.

l. 36068 *giall*, l. 36077 *giallaisiu* and l. 36078 *giallsa*¹⁸⁸ are the same as in the LU version of the tale. l. 36046 “Dorat Diarmait láim dar Connachta co raimid riam for Guaire Aidne coro **giallsaide** dó fri rind cliadib.”¹⁸⁹ This is not entirely clear, but it seems to indicate submission after the battle. It is almost the same as the submission at ‘the sword’s point’ from LU l. 9652 and LL l. 36068. But here it is mentioned after the battle and before Gúaire goes to see St. Cämmine about the curse.

Longes Chonaill Chuiric

‘The Exile of Conall Corc’ describes his exile to Scotland and how he eventually returned to Ireland and became king of Munster.

l. 37018 “**giallo** gebai Mumain mórsluagaig”¹⁹⁰ “In Munster-of-the-great-hosts you will receive hostages.”¹⁹¹ Conaill Corc will receive hostages in Munster, because he will become king of Munster. The receiving of hostages seems in this case to refer to the submission of the subjects to their (new) king.

¹⁸⁴ LL Vol 2: 429.

¹⁸⁵ Ó Dónaill 2005: 56.

¹⁸⁶ LL Vol 2: 431.

¹⁸⁷ Ó Dónaill 2005: 59.

¹⁸⁸ LL Vol. 5: 1215-1216.

¹⁸⁹ LL Vol. 5: 1214.

¹⁹⁰ LL Vol. 5: 1249.

¹⁹¹ Hull 1941: 945.

l. 37076 “& dobert a macc i **ngiallai** fria láim.”¹⁹² “... he put his son in surety under his custody.”¹⁹³ Aed the king of Muscraige recognizes Conaill Corc as the future king of Munster and hands over his son. To me it seems that *giallai* could be translated as ‘hostageship’ in this situation as well. It clearly shows the submission of a subject to a king.

l. 37080 “Is é dí **cetgiall** ceta ra gaib rí Muman **giall** Múscraige.”¹⁹⁴ “The surety of the Muscraige is the first surety that a king of Munster ever took.”¹⁹⁵ Aed accepted Conaill Corc as the king of Munster and as his overlord. Apparently, this is the first time that Muscraige falls under the rule of Munster. Again, I think that translating *giall* as ‘hostage’ would be suitable as well.

Cath Maige Mucrima

‘The Battle of Mag Mucrama’ describes the cause of Mac Con’s exile and his return to Ireland. Together with armies of the Britons and the Saxons he invades Ireland and does not seem to encounter real opposition until they reach Mag Mucrama.

l. 37233 “Ro indrettar dí in Herind coro **giallsat** sochaide mór díb dó.”¹⁹⁶ “They invaded Ireland and many submitted to him.”¹⁹⁷ In this case *giallsat* is used to describe the submission of Ireland to these combined armies. In the context it is not really specified, but I imagine, because the focus is on the battle at Mag Mucrama, that the rest of the invasion might just be a submission of all who saw Mac Con and his allies.

Bóroma

The Bóroma consists of poems and tales relating the collection of tribute. In this collection the first and only form of *brága*, with the meaning of ‘prisoner’ instead of ‘neck’, is found.

l. 38540 “Lagen & teglach Branduib na timchell & ro gabait ar **bragtib** iat.”¹⁹⁸ “The boys of Ulster were taken prisoner by the Leinstermen.”¹⁹⁹ The boys seem to be taken by the Leinstermen to negotiate a peace between Ulster and Leinster. Therefore, I believe that *bragtib* could be translated as ‘hostages’ as well, because they would be guarantee for an agreement.

l. 38927 “dofaeth Dáre dían la Bran Find na **ngiall** i cath Ruis da Charn.”²⁰⁰ It seems that hostages were taken after the battle. Because the battle is mentioned by name it would only make sense that *gíall* in this case is used to refer to the hostages given to the victor.

¹⁹² LL Vol. 5: 1251.

¹⁹³ Hull 1941: 950.

¹⁹⁴ LL Vol. 5: 1216.

¹⁹⁵ Hull 1941: 950.

¹⁹⁶ LL Vol. 5: 1255.

¹⁹⁷ O’Daly 1975: 49.

¹⁹⁸ LL Vol. 5: 1295.

¹⁹⁹ Stokes (Bóroma) 1892: 73.

²⁰⁰ LL Vol. 5: 1306.

Conclusion

In *Lebor Laighnech* different forms of *gíall* appear. They refer to hostages taken after battle or they are used to indicate submission to an overlord. I have found no results for *géilsine*, *gíallaigecht* or *gíallnae*. For *brága* only one form with its later meaning ‘captive’ occurred in Vol. 5. Forms of *brága*, with their original meaning ‘neck’ or ‘throat’, appear very often. It seems that at the time LL was created *gíall* was still the common word used to refer to hostages, but by the end of the manuscript *brága* is introduced. However, just one search result for *brága* does not indicate an immediate switch to *brága* being used to refer to hostages. Just as in LU there is not a lot of context about these hostages. It is at times mentioned who these hostages were, like for example Aed’s son, but again it is not specified what happened to them.

Conclusion

In the Old and Middle Irish period multiple words were used to refer to hostages and hostageship. The word for the ‘real’ hostage, *gíall*, and the word *brága*, referring to captives as well as hostages, are closely related and were used interchangeably. *Gíall* and the words related to it would refer to the hostages and submission given by a subject to his overlord. This sort of submission could also be base clientship, in which the subject offers his services and or tribute in return for a fief. Keeping hostages would be a sign of high status, because it would show that many submitted to that lord. As long as the subjects would not rebel, the hostages would be treated kindly. If the subjects would rebel, the hostages would no longer be treated as guests, but as prisoners, and they could be killed.

In the Annals the use of variants of *gíall* to refer to hostages is prevalent in the Old Irish period. *Brága* is not very common. In the Middle Irish period *brága* becomes more common, but *gíall* is still used more often. The Annals do not contain specific information about hostages. Most cases in which hostages are mentioned, describe hostages being given or taken after a battle. *Gíall* is also used often to indicate the submission. The keeping of hostages is used to describe a high status as well. Both the identity and fate of the hostages are, with a few exceptions, left out. The information found in the Annals confirms the information from the basic overview, but the treatment of hostages like guests is not confirmed.

In *Lebor na hUidre* various forms of *gíall* appear quite often. No forms of *brága*, referring to hostages or captives, are used. It seems that, at the time LU was created, *gíall* was still the common word used to refer to hostages. In contrast to the information in the Annals, in LU it is mentioned who the hostages were, but it is not mentioned what happened to them. In *Lebor Laighnech* different forms of *gíall* appear. They refer to hostages taken after battle or they are used to indicate submission to an overlord. For *brága* only one form with its later meaning ‘captive’ was used. It seems that at the time LL was created *gíall* was still prevalent, but by the end of the manuscript *brága* is introduced. The identity of the hostages is usually mentioned, but again it is not specified what happened to them. For narrative literature a description of characters is of course important, therefore I expected more information to be found in LU and LL. Adding hostages would of course be good for dramatic purposes. That expectation was not met. However, the results do confirm the information from most of the basic overview. *Gíall* is used to refer to hostages, hostageship and submission. They can serve as a guarantee for an agreement. The hostages are usually sons of nobles and their lives would be forfeited if the agreement was not kept or if the subjects would rebel.

The information found is not very detailed. This leads me to believe that the giving and keeping of hostages was such a common practice that for contemporaries, no further explanation would be needed. Since this corpus only entails a small part of the available literature from the Old and Middle Irish period, more research would be needed to see if there is more to these hostages than the evidence found so far.

Bibliography

- Aitchison, N.B., ‘Kingship, Society, and Sacrality: Rank, Power, and Ideology in Early Medieval Ireland’, *Traditio* 49 (1994) 45-75.
- Binchy, D.A. (ed.), *Críth Gablach*, Mediaeval and Modern Irish Series 11 (Dublin 1970).
- Crowe, John O’Beirne (ed. and tr.), ‘Siabur-charpat Con Culaind’, *The Journal of the Royal Historical and Archaeological Association of Ireland* 4 (1878) 371–448.
- Dillon, Myles, *The cycles of the kings* (London 1946).
- Jaski, Bart, *Early Irish Kingship and Succession* (Dublin 2000).
- Hull, Vernam (ed. and tr.), ‘The Exile of Conall Corc’, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 56/4 (1941) 937-950.
- Kelly, Fergus, - *A Guide to Early Irish Law* (Dublin 1988).
- ‘An Old-Irish Text on Court Procedure’, *Peritia* 5 (1986) 74-106.
- Kosto, Adam J., *Hostages in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 2012).
- Leahy, A. H., *Heroic romances of Ireland*, 2 vols, Irish Saga Library 2, vol. 1 (London 1905-1906).
- Macalister, R. A. S., *Lebor gabála Éirenn: The book of the taking of Ireland*, 5 vols, Irish Texts Society 34, 35, 39, 41, 44, Vol. 5 (Dublin 1932–1942).
- MacNeill, Eoin, ‘Ancient Irish law. The law of status or franchise’, *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 36 (1923) 265–316.
- Meyer, Kuno (ed. and tr.), *Cáin Adamnáin: an Old-Irish treatise on the law of Adamnan* (Oxford 1905).
- Ní Dhonnchadha, Máirín, ‘The Law of Adomnán: a translation’, *Adomnán at Birr, AD 697: essays in commemoration of the law of the innocents*, ed. Thomas O’Loughlin (Dublin 2001) 53-68.
- Ó Cróinín, Dáibhí, *Early medieval Ireland, 400–1200*, Longman History of Ireland, Vol. 1 (London 1995).
- O’Daly, Máirín (ed. and tr.), *Cath Maige Mucrama: The battle of Mag Mucrama*, Irish Texts Society 50 (Dublin 1975).
- Ó Dónaill, Caoimhín (ed. and tr.), *Talland Étair*, Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 4 (Maynooth 2005).
- Oostenbrink, Femke, ‘De betekenis van gell’ (BA thesis, Utrecht University, 2013).
- Preston-Matto, Lahney, ‘Queens as Political Hostages in Pre-Norman Ireland: Derbforgaill and the Three Gormlaiths’, *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 109/2 (2010) 141-161.
- Plummer, Charles (ed. and tr.), ‘Irish miscellanies: The conversion of Lóegaire, and his death’, *Revue Celtique* 6 (1883–1885) 162–172.
- Stacey, Robin Chapman, *The Road to Judgment: From Custom to Court in Medieval Ireland and Wales* (Philadelphia, PA, 1994).
- Stokes, Whitley, - ‘The Voyage of Mael Duin’, *Revue Celtique* 9 (1888) 447–495.
- (ed. and tr.), ‘The Bóroma’, *Revue Celtique* 13 (1892): 32–124, 299–300.
- (ed. and tr.), ‘The battle of Carn Conaill’, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 3 (1901) 203–219.
- (ed. and tr.), “The destruction of Dá Derga's hostel”, *Revue Celtique* 22 (1901) 9–61, 165–215, 282–329, 390–437, 260.
- ‘Tidings of Conchobar Mac Nessa”, *Ériu* 4 (1910) 18-38.
- Thurneysen, Rudolf, ‘Die Bürgerschaft im irischen Recht’, *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 2 (Berlin 1928).
- De Vries, Jan, *Nederlands Etymologisch Woordenboek* (Leiden 1971).
- Wiley, Dan M., ‘An introduction to the early Irish king tales’, *Essays on the early Irish king tales*, Wiley, Dan M. (ed.) (Dublin 2008) 13–67.

Electronic resources:

- Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language (eDIL): www.dil.ie
- ‘International Convention against the Taking of Hostages’ (1979), United Nations, *Treaty Series 1316* (New York 1983) 205-280. Available via the United Nations website: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201316/v1316.pdf>
- Oxford Dictionaries: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com>
- Early Manuscripts at Oxford University: <http://image.ox.ac.uk/>
- The Library of Trinity College Dublin <https://www.tcd.ie/Library/>
- CELT: Corpus of Electronic Texts: a Project of University College, Cork: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/index.html>
- Best, R.I., Bergin et. al., *The book of Leinster, formerly Lebar na Núachongbála*, 6 vols. (Dublin 1954-1983). CELT edition, online.²⁰¹
- Best, R.I. and Bergin, Osborn (ed.), *Lebor na hUidre: Book of the Dun Cow* (Dublin 1929). CELT edition, online.²⁰²
- Mac Airt, Seán, *The Annals of Inisfallen* (Dublin 1944). CELT edition, online.²⁰³
- Mac Airt, Seán, and Gearóid Mac Niocaill, *The Annals of Ulster* (Dublin 1983). CELT edition, online.²⁰⁴
- Mac Niocaill, Gearóid (ed. and tr.), and William M. Hennessy (tr.), *Chronicon Scotorum* [2003] CELT edition, online.²⁰⁵
- O’Donovan, John (ed.), *Annala Rioghachta Eireann: Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters...* (Dublin 1865). CELT edition, online.²⁰⁶

²⁰¹ Vol. 1 edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G800011A/index.html>

Vol. 2 edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G800011B/index.html>

Vol. 5. edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G800011E/index.html>

²⁰² Edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G301900/index.html>

²⁰³ Edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100004/index.html>

translation: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100004/index.html>

²⁰⁴ Edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100001A/index.html>

translation: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100001A/index.html>

²⁰⁵ Edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100016/index.html>

translation: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100016/index.html>

²⁰⁶ 1, edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100005A/index.html>

translation: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100005A/index.html>

2, edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100005B/index.html>

translation: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100005B/index.html>

3, edition: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/G100005C/index.html>

translation: <http://www.ucc.ie/celt/published/T100005C/index.html>

Appendix 1: Search results from the Annals²⁰⁷

The Annals of Ulster AD 431-1201				
<i>Gíall</i>	form	translated as	context	who
U738.9	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U764.15	<i>giall</i>	hostages	to ensure submission	-
U779.10	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U804.10	<i>giall</i>	-	used to indicate submission	-
U822.3	<i>giallsat</i>	-	used to indicate submission	-
U853.2	<i>giallsat</i>	-	used to indicate submission	-
U854.2	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U856.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U858.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U866.1	<i>giallo</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U919.3	<i>giall</i>	hostages	a king needs hostages	-
U940.1	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U955.3	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U965.6	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U998.1	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	to ensure submission	-
U1000.4	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given to overlord	-
U1002.1	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1002.8	<i>giall</i>	hostages	as security for a truce	-
U1014.7	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1025.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	Irish hostages taken back	-
U1026.1	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1026.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1088.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
U1090.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given to overlord	-
U1099.8	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
U1101.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after a battle	-
U1104.6	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1109.5	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
U1118.6	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given and taken	-
U1124.6	<i>geill</i>	hostages	were killed	sons of noble
U1126.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1127.1	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1127.5	<i>geill</i>	hostages	forfeited because of rebellion	-
U1128.8	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1130.5	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given to overlord	-
U1131.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1159.4	<i>giallu</i>	pledges	none were taken to ensure peace	-
U1165.5	<i>geill</i>	pledges	given to overlord	-
U1165.10	<i>giall</i>	pledges	given after battle	-
U1171.10	<i>giallu</i>	pledges	given to overlord	-
<i>Brága</i>				
U1029.6	<i>braghad</i>	-	used to indicate release pledge	-
U1156.2	<i>braighdi</i>	pledges	taken after battle	-
U1156.4	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U1157.5	<i>braighiti</i>	pledges	given to overlord	-
U1161.4	<i>braighde</i>	pledges	given to overlord	-
U1161.7	<i>braighde</i>	pledges	given to overlord	-
U1165.10	<i>braighiti</i>	pledges	given to overlord.	sons of nobles and a daughter
“	<i>braightechus</i>	pledge	-	
U1166.9	<i>braighiti</i>	pledges	given after battle	-
U1166.12	<i>braighiti</i>	pledges	given in return for gold and cattle	-

²⁰⁷ In an attempt to create an overview of the use of the different words, I have simplified the context. ‘taken after battle’, for example could mean that the hostages were taken after battle, conflict or to avoid battle. Just seeing an army show up at one’s borders could mean instant submission and the giving of hostages. ‘Given to overlord’, indicates submission, this could be a king, but the Annals are not always specific.

U1167.2	<i>braighti</i>	hostages	given to ensure submission	-
U1168.3	<i>braighti</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
U1170.4	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were killed	son and grandson
U1199.4	<i>braighti</i>	pledges	given after battle	-
<i>Gíallnae</i>				
U563.1	<i>giallno</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
U721.8	<i>agiallne</i>	hostages	taken to ensure submission	-

Annals of Inisfallen				
<i>Gíall</i>	form	translated as	context	who
I721.2	<i>giallais</i>	submitted	king submitted to overking	-
I859.2	<i>giallsat</i>	submitted	submission after battle	-
I907.3	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I924.1	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken to different location	-
I969.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I974.5	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken	-
I983.4	<i>géill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	-	-
I984.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	exchange as guarantee	-
I987.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken as guarantee	-
I996.2	<i>geill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I997.2	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given after dividing lands	-
I998.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken	-
I1000.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given, submission	-
I1002.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1002.4	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1003.4	<i>géill</i>	hostages	given to overlord	-
I1005.3	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1007.3	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1010.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1016.3	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1026.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1049.5	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1051.7	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
I1070.8	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	hostages taken	includes son of noble
I1071.3	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1072.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1073.3	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given, submission	-
I1073.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1094.8	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
I1095.11	<i>giall</i>	hostage	given, submission	-
I1100.6	<i>géill</i>	hostages	hostages released	-
I1101.2	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1105.11	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given, submission	-
I1109.2	<i>giall</i>	hostage	returned without hostages	-
I1111.6	<i>geill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
I1120.4	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	given in return for gold/horses	-
I1130.6	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
<i>Brága</i>				
I1088.4	<i>bragti</i>	captives	taken after battle	-
I1120.4	<i>braigte</i>	hostages	given, submission	-
I1165.2	<i>braigdi</i>	hostages	given	-
I1175.4	<i>braigdi</i>	hostages	given in exchange for release	-
I1176.3	<i>bráigti</i>	hostages	given to ensure peace	-

Annals of the Four Masters 1				
<i>Gíall</i>	form	translated as	context	
M527.1	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	were taken away?	-
M557.5	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-

M701.2	<i>giallfaidh</i>	would submit	after battle/show of force	-
M733.8	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M774.6	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M799.10	<i>géill</i>	hostages	given, submission	-
M820.8	<i>ghiallsat</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M839.15	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken without battle	-
M851.15	<i>ghiallsat</i>	submitted	foreign tribes submitting to king	-
M852.3	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M854.7	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M856.7	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M856.9	<i>geill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M862.12	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M871.10	<i>giall</i>	hostages	description: king keeps hostages	-
M877.11	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	hostages were taken	-
M879.11	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M892.10	<i>geill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M902.7	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
<i>Brága</i>				
M683.2	<i>braigdi</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M835.10	<i>braighdibh</i>	prisoners	taken after battle	-
M839.10	<i>braighde</i>	prisoners	taken after battle	bishop, scholars (clergy)
M879.13	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
<i>Gíallnae</i>				
M717.9	<i>giallna</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
<i>Géilsine</i>				
M531.2	<i>geilsine</i>	hostages	were defended	-

Annals of the Four Masters 2				
<i>Gíall</i>	form	translated as	context	who
M917.7	<i>giall</i>	hostage	description: king keeps hostages	-
M938.10	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M939.9	<i>giallnus</i>	hostages	kings taken as hostages	king
“	<i>géill</i>	hostages	given to king	-
“	<i>giall</i>	hostage	no hostage accepted in exchange	-
M943.10	<i>geill</i>	hostages	were delivered	-
M949.8	<i>geill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M953.14	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M958.7	<i>giallu</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M963.7	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M965.17	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M967.13	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M978.4	<i>géill</i>	hostages	king keeps hostages	-
M979.6	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M997.7	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M999.8	<i>geill</i>	hostages	were given?	-
M1001.14	<i>giallaibh</i>	hostages	peace without hostages	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1001.17	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1004.9	<i>giall</i>	hostages	campaign to demand hostages	-
M1005.7	<i>giall</i>	hostages	campaign to demand hostages	-
“	<i>ghiallsat</i>	hostages	Ulster surrendered hostages	-
“	<i>géill</i>	hostages	Conall and Eoghan did not	-
M1013.9	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1013.13	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1014.20	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1015.8	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1015.16	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1019.3	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given after battle	-

M1024.8	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	Irish hostages taken back	-
M1024.9	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	Irish hostages taken back	-
M1025.12	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	Irish hostages taken back	-
M1026.3	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1026.4	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1049.10	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1063.19	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1063.21	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken, given to foster-son	-
M1075.10	<i>giall 2x</i>	hostages	hostages were demanded, but	-
M1088.10	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	hostages given to king	-
“	<i>giallnus</i>	hostages	taken after battle	heroes, sons of nobles
M1090.5	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given to ensure peace	-
M1092.13	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	take after battle	-
M1098.13	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
M1099.6	<i>ghiall</i>	hostages	plan to obtain hostages	-
M1099.7	<i>géill</i>	hostages	were taken by force	-
M1100.6	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	none were taken, battle was lost	-
M1101.6	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1104.11	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	take after battle	-
M1109.5	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1118.6	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken in exchange for lands ?	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle?	-
M1120.1	<i>ghéill</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1123.9	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1124.17	<i>geill</i>	hostages	were killed	son of noble
M1126.11	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1127.13	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1128.14	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1130.7	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given to ensure peace	-
M1131.4	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1133.9	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
M1133.20	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
M1137.12	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1138.10	<i>gialladh</i>	hostages	no hostages were exchanged	-
M1142.8	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
M1145.10	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	no hostages were exchanged	-
M1147.10	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1148.9	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	son of king
M1148.12	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given to ensure peace	-
M1149.10	<i>ghiallaibh</i>	hostage	demand and given	son of noble
M1150.15	<i>géill</i>	hostages	were given to king	-
M1153.13	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1157.10	<i>géill</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1159.14	<i>gialla</i>	-	returned without hostages	-
M1161.7	<i>ghiall</i>	hostages	were taken	-
M1162.11	<i>ghialla</i>	hostages	returned without hostages	-
M1165.4	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1165.5	<i>ghiall</i>	hostages	received from Ulster	including daughter
M1166.13	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1166.14	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1170.10	<i>ghiall</i>	hostages	taken	-
M1171.14	<i>ghiall</i>	hostages	were delivered	-
<u>Brága</u>				
M1132.6	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1135.21	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1137.13	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given in exchange for defence	-
M1141.13	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given to ensure peace	-
M1141.13	<i>bhraighde</i>	hostages	were given	-
M1142.8	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1143.13	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-

M1148.12	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were kept by overlord?	-
M1149.12	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given in submission	-
M1151.16	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	send to the king	-
M1152.10	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1152.11	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were taken	-
M1153.11	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1153.13	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1153.16	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were taken	-
M1154.12	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
M1155.11	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1155.20	<i>braghat</i>	hostages	given for higher status	-
M1156.7	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were given	-
M1156.13	<i>bhraghaid</i>	hostages	were given	-
M1156.16	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1156.17	<i>braghad</i>	hostages	given in exchange for lands	-
M1157.10	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1157.12	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given as guarantees	-
M1158.13	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1160.20	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1160.23	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1161.8	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1161.9	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1161.11	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1166.14	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1166.16	<i>braghat</i>	hostages	exchange for land	-
M1167.11	<i>bhrághadh</i>	hostages	exchange for land	-
“	<i>bhrághatt</i>	hostages	given, submission	foster-brother
M1167.13	<i>braigde</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
M1168.18	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
M1170.16	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were killed	sons of king and nobles
M1170.17	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were given	-
M1170.18	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were killed	-
M1171.10	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	were taken	-
<i>Gíallnae</i>				
M1143.15	<i>ghiallna</i>	hostages	no hostages taken after battle	-
M1149.10	<i>giallna</i>	hostages	given	son of noble
M1165.5	<i>giallnas</i>	hostage	given	daughter, sons of noble

Annals of the Four Masters 3				
<i>Gíall</i>	form	translated as	context	who
M1189.8	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	were taken	-
“	<i>geil</i>	hostages	given	-
<i>Brága</i>				
M1185.6	<i>braighde</i>	hostages	not send to the English	-

Chronicum Scotorum				
<u>Gíall</u>	form	translated as	context	who
CS531.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>giallaibh</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS563.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS721.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS853.	<i>giallsat</i>	submitted	submitted to overlord	-
CS854.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS856.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken	-
CS858.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS882.	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS897.	<i>geill</i>	pledges	after battle, maybe not human	-
CS907.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS940.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS959.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS964.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS979.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	Irish hostages taken back	-
CS998.	<i>gialla (2x)</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1002.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>giall</i>	hostage	truce was made, no hostages	-
CS1004.	<i>giall</i>	hostages	campaign to obtain hostages	-
CS1006.	<i>giall</i>	hostages	campaign to obtain hostages	-
“	<i>giallsat</i>	hostages	Ulaid give hostages	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	Conall and Eogan did not	-
CS1014.	<i>giall</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
“	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1016.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1019.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	given after battle	-
CS1024.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	Irish hostages taken back	-
CS1026.	<i>gialla 2x</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1048.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1088.	<i>gialla</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1118.	<i>gialla 2x</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
<u>Brága</u>				
CS882.	<i>braigde</i>	hostages	taken after battle	-
CS1113.	<i>braiged</i>	hostages	were exchanged	-
CS1149.	<i>braigde</i>	captives	taken after battle	-
“	<i>braighde 2x</i>	captives	taken after battle	-
“	<i>braighdi</i>	captives	taken after battle	-

Appendix 2: Search results from LU and LL

<u>Lebor na hUidre</u>			
<u>Gíall</u>	form	translated as	context
1. 1659	<i>giallai</i>	hostages	taken after battle
1. 1674	<i>giallud</i>	vanquished	used to indicate victories in games
1. 4364	<i>giallai</i>	hostageship	foster-son as hostage
1. 4366	<i>giall</i>	hostages	treatment of hostages
1. 4376	<i>giallai</i>	hostageship	hostage escaped
1. 9318	<i>giallasa</i>	hostageship	to avoid giving hostages
1. 9652	<i>giallad</i>	submitted	after battle
1. 9661	<i>giallaisiu</i>	submission	to Christ
1. 9662	<i>giallsa</i>	submitted	to ensure peace?
1. 9786	<i>geill</i>	hostages	given to overlord
<u>Gíallnae</u>			
1. 7285	<i>giallnae</i>	sureties	taken as guarantee for agreement
1. 7295	<i>giallnai</i>	hostageship	chained to the wall
The Book of Leinster Vol. 1			
<u>Gíall</u>			
1. 1608	<i>giallad</i>	hostages	free from giving hostages for three days
1. 2013	<i>giallad</i>	submission	tribute paid to overlord
1. 2164	<i>giallad</i>	homage	-
1. 2450	<i>giall</i>	hostage	taken from subjects
1. 3121	<i>géill</i>	hostages	returned to subjects?
1. 3141	<i>giallu</i>	hostage	Irish hostages were taken back
The Book of Leinster Vol. 2			
<u>Gíall</u>			
1. 12458	<i>giallu</i>	pledges	returns to claim kingship?
1. 13291	<i>gialla</i>	captives	taken after battle
1. 13405	<i>geill</i>	hostages	were brought out
1. 13476	<i>giall</i>	hostage	taken after battle
The Book of Leinster Vol. 5			
<u>Gíall</u>			
1. 36046	<i>giallsaide</i>	-	submission after battle
1. 36068	<i>giall</i>	submitted	after battle
1. 36077	<i>giallaisiu</i>	submission	to Christ
1. 36078	<i>giallsa</i>	submitted	to ensure peace?
1. 37018	<i>giallo</i>	hostages	given to overlord
1. 37076	<i>giallai</i>	hostage	gives his son to overlord
1. 37080	<i>cetgiall</i>	first hostage	given to overlord
“	<i>giall</i>	hostages	received by overlord
1. 37233	<i>giallsat</i>	submitted	indicates submission after invasion
1. 38927	<i>giall</i>	-	taken after battle
<u>Brága</u>			
38540	<i>bragtib</i>	captives	captured to ensure peace