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INTRODUCTION

The Irish Marco Polo (IMP) is an Early Modern Irish translation and adaptaion of Francesco Pipino’s Latin translation of Marco Polo’s *Travels* (P) which is found between ff 121-131 of the Book of Lismore (L), or *Leabhar Mhic Carthaigh Riabhaigh*. This manuscript was probably compiled between 1478 and 1505 in the Franciscan friary of Timoleague in south west Cork for Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, ruler of Cairbre, and his wife Caitilín Fitzgerald. In its present state, the manuscript has leaves missing immediately before and after the text, depriving it of its beginning and its end. This is a unique copy of the only known adaptation of the text in Irish. Since the original title of the text does not survive, for the purposes of this dissertation I will refer to it as ‘The Irish Marco Polo’ (IMP). The general account of Marco Polo’s journey, which was retold in many different versions, adaptations and translations across Europe during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, will be referred to as the *Travels*.

The objective of the present study is to assess IMP both as a contribution to Early Modern Irish literature and as a contribution to the vast and complex tradition of Marco Polo’s *Travels*. This dissertation attempts (1) to locate IMP in its cultural and linguistic context in late-medieval Ireland and Europe; (2) to gain a perspective of the author of IMP as a learned man operating within the parameters of Irish and European literary tradition; and (3) to establish IMP as a literary work in its own right, the product of a master of Irish literary prose who created a unique text indebted to but also independent of its textual antecedents. Approaching these objectives entailed a combination of methodologies: linguistic, paleographical, text-critical, literary and historical. In order to conduct this investigation of IMP, I have divided this dissertation into four chapters, each of which deals with a different aspect of the text.

---

2 For information on the nineteenth century copies of L see MacAlister, *The Book*, xxvi-xxviii.
In order to introduce the topic of the present study, Chapter I will offer a basic summary of Marco Polo’s life and journeys, and discuss the principal issues of the textual tradition of the *Travels*, which are illustrated in the schema on page 14. It will then introduce the Dominican friar Francesco Pipino, author of P, the Latin translation of the *Travels*, entitled *De conditionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum*, from which IMP was translated. It concludes with an examination of the main features of L, including scribal hands and texts contained, in order to describe the cultural milieu from which the manuscript emanated.

Chapter II examines the language and style of IMP. It is divided into three parts: Part I will begin by addressing the use of archaic language in Early Modern Irish prose and the impact of various learned authors on the linguistic style of a number of Early Modern Irish prose texts; Part II contains a linguistic study of IMP beginning with an analysis of the orthographical features of Scribe A and of the relief scribe who writes on folio 125rb, followed by an examination of nominal and verbal forms found in the text. In Part III, I compare the various narrative styles which are discernible in IMP and discuss how they are distributed throughout the text. This analysis of the language and style of IMP shows how the Irish author was enhancing certain linguistic features in the text and adapting the narrative styles he used in order to accentuate different aspects of his adaptation.

Chapter III contains a study of the textual tradition of P, the Latin textual family of the *Travels* to which IMP belongs, in order to understand the place of IMP within its wider European context. P survives in a total of sixty-nine manuscripts, of which none appear to have been the direct source of IMP. However, my examination of a representative section (forty-seven) of the surviving manuscripts of P has revealed the branch of the stemma codicum of P to which the lost exemplar of IMP probably belonged. This chapter also provides a summary of previous research on the textual tradition of P, and gives a full list of the manuscripts considered in this study. The special focus of this chapter is the examination of details from transcriptions made over the course of my research from a number of manuscripts of P, which elucidates the differences between many of the subgroups of P. The objective of this chapter, therefore, is to shine light on the historical and textual context of IMP by examining the family of manuscripts of P from which it derives. Chapter III concludes with a stemma codicum of the ‘fidelissimi’ group of manuscripts of P, found on page 290.
Chapter IV contains a textual analysis of IMP and discusses innovations on the part of the Irish author. In this chapter I offer possible explanations of and sources for a number of modifications made by the author of IMP, beginning with an overview of how he summarised the content of P, illustrating those parts of the text which he considered to be more important and the chapters he chose to omit. This is followed by an analysis of some of the principal divergences from P found in IMP. The chapter will conclude with an examination of a number of secondary variations in the adaptation, which indicate that the Irish author was influenced by a number of texts other than P. Such an analysis is important for determining the objectives and priorities of the Irish author, and ultimately for understanding the motivations behind the Irish translation of the *Travels*.

**Style of reference to P and IMP**

Folio references are to L unless otherwise specified. References to IMP are as follows: folio number and line number are found in brackets following the quote or in the footnotes. The paragraph marker ¶ is used to refer to Stokes’s edition of IMP. My transcription of IMP appears as Appendix I. References to Pipino’s translation are as follows: P = Pipino, from Dr Simion’s transcription of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983 unless otherwise specified. Simion’s transcription now appears online as part of the *Ramusio digitale* project coordinated by Professor Eugenio Burgio at Università di Ca’ Foscari of Venice: [http://virgo.unive.it/eef-workflow/books/Ramusio/testi_completi/P_marcato-main.html](http://virgo.unive.it/eef-workflow/books/Ramusio/testi_completi/P_marcato-main.html) (retrieved 02/01/18); book numbers of P are given in Roman numerals; chapter numbers are given in Arabic numerals; section numbers are given in Arabic numerals. For example P.II.3.4 = Pipino, book two, chapter three, section four.
CHAPTER I

MAPPING THE ROUTE TO IRELAND

The Irish Marco Polo (IMP) is an Early Modern Irish translation and adaptaion of Francesco Pipino’s Latin translation of Marco Polo’s Travels (P), contained between ff. 121-131 of the Book of Lismore (L), or Leabhar Mhic Carthaigh Riabhaigh. In the following chapter I will provide an introduction to and summary of three matters that are key to understanding how information regarding the Far East travelled from modern-day Beijing, via Venice to West Cork between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries. This chapter will begin with a summary of Marco Polo’s life and journeys, and a discussion of the principal issues of the textual tradition of the Travels, illustrated in a diagram of the various versions of the Travels on page 14. Following this, I will introduce the Dominican friar Francesco Pipino, author of P, from a version of which IMP was translated and abridged, before concluding with a discussion of the main features of L, including scribal hands, texts and historical context, in order to describe the cultural milieu from which the manuscript emanated.

BACKGROUND

1. Marco Polo

The following description of the journey of the Polos is found in the first eighteen chapters of the Devisement du Monde (henceforth Devisement), the title of the Italo-French verison of the Travels written in 1298 by Rustichello da Pisa.3 These correspond to the first ten chapters of Pipino’s Latin translation of the Travels (P). Unfortunately, this part of the Travels does not survive in IMP since there is a lacuna of at least two folios in L which contained the end of the preceding text, i.e. Sdair na Lumbardach (SNL), and the beginning of IMP.4 This is the only section of the Travels which contains an actual narrative of the journey of the Polos. The Devisement is in

---

3 Gaunt, Marco, 2.
4 For a discussion of the content of the missing folios between SNL and IMP see Chapter IV.
fact a collection of descriptions of the regions and peoples of Asia rather than a first-hand account of a journey. Nevertheless, I have included a synopsis of this narrative section which opens the *Travels* in order to describe the circumstances in which the *Travels* were first written, and to introduce the topic of this dissertation.

### 1.1. Life

Marco Polo (figure 1)\(^5\) was born in Venice in 1254, into a family of Venetian merchants.\(^6\) Between 1253 and 1254, before Marco was born, his father, Niccolò Polo, and his uncle, Matteo Polo, left for Constantinople, where they owned houses from which they traded with Asia through the Black Sea. In 1260 the two brothers travelled east to Soldadia, now Sudak in Crimea,\(^7\) and to Bolgara, now Bolghar in Tartastan, Russia. Here they met Berke Khan, the ruler of the Golden Horde, a khanate which comprised the north-west sector of the Mongolian Empire, stretching from the northern coast of the Black Sea to the eastern borders of modern day Kazakhstan. Berke Khan was the grandson of Genghis Khan (†1227) and cousin of

\(^5\) The decorations included in the present study (figure 1 at p. 5 and figure 2 at p. 15) are found on the first folio of Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi Soppressi C.7.1170, which was produced during the second quarter of the fourteenth century. This expensive production is unique among Italian manuscripts in its combination of fine decoration with the Pipino version of the *Travels*. Dutschke has suggested that this manuscript was produced in or for the Dominican house of Santa Mara Novella in Florence not long after the time of Pipino’s translation. On the other hand, Gadrat has recently suggested that the script and decoration in the manuscript indicates a Padoan or Bolognese origin. It is the only manuscript, of which I am aware, that contains a full length figure of Francesco Pipino. Chapter IV contains a discussion of the fact that the character of Pipino is transformed from a Dominican to a Franciscan in IMP, an innovation on the part of the Irish author which suggests he may have himself been a Franciscan. I examined and made a partial transcription of this manuscript in September 2016 and am grateful to the Manuscript Department of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze for sending me photographs of the first folio and allowing me to reproduce them in the present study.


\(^7\) Larner, *Marco*, 32-33.
Kublai Khan, the nominal ruler of the Mongolian Empire. The Polos were received enthusiastically by Berke Khan and remained with him for a year, during which war broke out between Berke Khan and Hülagü Khan, known as Alau in the *Travels*,
brother of the great Kublai Khan and ruler of the Ilkhanate of Persia, a khanate which stretched from most of modern-day Afghanistan to eastern Anatolia.

With war now on the horizon, the Polos pushed even further east in an attempt to escape the conflict and find an alternative route back to Venice. They eventually reached Boccara, now Bukhara in Uzbekistan, a large city on the silk road where they remained and traded for three years. Here, the brothers were met by a number of Hülagü’s envoys who were travelling to Cambaluc, modern day Beijing, to meet Kublai Khan, ruler of the Mongol Empire. The emissaries persuaded the brothers to travel with them so that Kublai Khan, who had never before seen ‘Latin men’, could meet them, as is recalled in the *Devisement: Seignor, je voç di que le Grant Sire de Tartars ne vit unques nul latin et a grant desider et volonté de veoire*.

The Polos travelled east for another two years before they reached Cambaluc, where Kublai Khan received them with great honours and festivities: *il les recevi honorablemente et fait elç grant joie et grant feste*. Kublai Khan became very interested in the tales of Europe and of Christianity which the brothers brought with them and ordered them to return to Italy on his behalf with a letter to the Pope, asking for one hundred sages that could teach Christianity and western customs to his people: *il mandoit desant a l’apostoile que il li deust mander jusque a cent sajes homes de la cristien loy*. He also asked for oil from the lamp of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem.

After meeting with the Khan, the brothers began their long journey back to Italy and finally reached Venice in 1269, where a fifteen-year-old Marco Polo awaited them. After the death of Pope Clement IV in 1268, there was no papal election for three years and only when Pope Gregory X was elected in 1271 were Matteo and Niccolò able to deliver Kublai Khan’s letter. The Pope granted the brothers two Dominican missionaries, Nicolau de Vincense and Guilielme de Tripule, to travel

---

8 Eusebi, *Il Manoscritto*, 4: *Alau, le sire des Tartar dou Levant*. For a discussion of the transformation of Alau in IMP see Chapter IV.
11 *ibid*. 5: Yule, *Travels*, I:10: ‘In truth, the Great Khan hath never seen any Latins, and he hath a great desire to do so.’
with them to the Far East and later that year the brothers set off once again, with their new companions and a seventeen-year-old Marco Polo.

The Polos reached Cambaluc in 1274, by which time the two missionaries who had been accompanying them had deserted the company: *Et quant il furent la venus, il ont grant dotance d’aler plus avant*. Unfortunately, the *Travels* do not reveal a great deal about what the Polos actually did during the seventeen years that they attended Kublai Khan’s court, but it does mention that they served as ambassadors to the Mongol Empire, and were involved in carrying out the Khan’s internal and foreign affairs. As mentioned above, the account of their travels is instead primarily concerned with listing ethnographical and geographical information about the territories of the Far East, in part based on Marco Polo’s own first-hand experiences and in part based on hearsay. As a result, the *Travels* incorporate a great number of fantastical elements, such as tales of giant eagles, islands of cannibals and of invincible warriors. In 1291 Kublai Khan allowed the Polos to return home and in 1295 they reached Venice: *s’en vidrent a Negropont, et de Negropont a Venese, et ce fu as .M.CC.XCV. anz de l’ancarnasion de Crist*.

The next mention of Marco Polo’s whereabouts is found at the end of the opening chapter of the *Devisement* which declares that he dictated the following account of his journeys to Rustichello da Pisa, a writer of romances, while imprisoned in Genoa in 1298:

*Le quell puis, demorant en la charchre de Jenere, fist retraire toutes cestes chouses a messier Rustaciaus de Pise, que en celle meissme charter estoit, au tens qui’l avoit .MCCXCVII. anç que Jeçucrit nesquit.*

Marco Polo was released by the Genoese in 1299, after which he returned to Venice where he lived out the rest of his days, until his death on the 9 January 1324. An

---

14 Ibid., 10.
16 Ibid., 16.
17 Ramusio suggested that it is possible that Marco Polo fought on a Venetian galley at the Battle of Curzola, which the Venetians lost and this resulted in his imprisonment in Genoa. Cf. Gaunt, *Marco*, 5.
inventory of his possessions made after his death offers a tantalising insight into his life and travels in the Orient. They included: Tartar bedding, robes from Cathay, brocades from Tenduuc, a Buddhist rosary, the silver girdle of a Tartar knight, the headdress of a Tartar lady and a golden tablet from the Great Khan.20

Over two centuries after the death of Marco Polo, Giambattista Ramusio described the return of the Polos to Venice in the preface to his translation of the Travels, which was printed in 1559.21 He writes that at first the Polos, who had forgotten their native Venetian language, were not recognised by their relatives and it was only when they cut open the seams of their outlandish garments and let a torrent of rubies, sapphires, carbuncles, diamonds and emeralds cascade to the ground that they were finally welcomed home. This fictitious anecdote exemplifies how the fame of the Polos grew in the centuries following their return from the Far East, and how accounts of their adventures were reimagined for many years after the Travels were first written. In this regard, the embellishments and interpolations made by the author of the Irish adaptation of the Travels, discussed in Chapter IV, may be appreciated as part of a wider trend of expanding and developing Marco Polo’s account of the Orient, which continues to this day.

1.2. Textual Tradition of the Travels

The original manuscript of the Travels has not survived. However, most scholars generally believe that the original copy of the Travels was written by Rustichello da Pisa in 1298 in a Franco-Italian hybrid language most commonly used in Arthurian romances, which were widespread in Italy at the time.22 Over the course of the following centuries, the Travels became increasingly popular in Medieval European literary and courtly circles. The text was copied, translated and revised into a multitude of different versions as it spread across Europe. Consequently, the task of understanding the relationship between the surviving manuscripts of the Travels is of fundamental importance in Polo studies. The following paragraphs will summarise past scholarship on this topic, in order to describe the wider paleographical background of IMP and better understand its place in this larger European framework.

20 Larner, Marco, 45. For a full transcription of the inventory, from a document dating from 1366, see: Moule-Pelliot, vol. i, 554-58.
22 Larner, Marco, 46.
There are a total of 141 manuscripts that contain a version of the *Travels*. These versions are divided into two main subgroups, A and B, which are summarised below. In the following paragraphs, abbreviations used by Dutschke and Benedetto have been maintained for convenience of reference:

**Group A**

*Franco-Italian version (F)*

The Franco-Italian version is represented by one manuscript, namely Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, fr. 1116. This is considered to be the exemplar which best represents the original language in which Rustichello da Pisa wrote the *Devisement* in 1298. However, the manuscript itself is several steps removed from the archetype. Andreose has indicated that the language in which the *Devisement* was first written had a basis of Old French ‘heavily sprinkled with morphological as well as lexical Italianisms.’ Scholarship is divided as to whether these Italianisms have a Tuscan or Venetian origin.

*Court French version (FG)*

The Court French group versions, written c. 1310-1311, of which there exist seventeen exemplars and which may be divided into a further four versions. This is

---

23 This is the latest count, as far as I am aware, cf. Gadrat, *Lire*, 9.
24 Dutschke, *Pipino*, 9, 276-82. 1062. For manuscripts rejected in Dutschke’s study see p. 1062, these include ‘early modern and modern hand-made copies from extant manuscripts.
25 For more comprehensive studies of the various versions of the *Travels*, see: Marco Polo, *Il milione*, ed. Luigi Foscolo Benedetto (Florence, 1928) and Gadrat, *Lire Marco Polo au Moyen Age*.
29 Andreose, *Franco-Italian tradition*, 267-75; Eusebi, *Il Manoscritto*, XII.
30 Dutschke, *Pipino*, 276-77 and 1170-71; Andreose, *Franco-Italian tradition*, 262; Benedetto, *Il Millione*, XXXIV-LXXIX; Ménard, P., *Marco Polo le Devisement du monde*, (Genève, 2001-2009) (see especially introduction); NB, Eusebi and Burgio refer to this manuscript as Fr as opposed to De Benedetto and Dutschke’s FG.
based on a Franco-Italian text similar to that found in F, but is not based on F itself and is also several steps removed from the archetype.\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{Anglo-Norman version}

The Anglo-Norman version, identified by Ménard, survives in one manuscript, namely London, British Library, Cotton Otho D. v., which was severely damaged by fire in 1731.\textsuperscript{32} It is closely related to the F and FG versions but not directly descended from either.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{Latin compendium (L)}

A Latin compendium of the \textit{Travels} survives in six manuscripts. It consists of a résumé which is close to the Franco-Italian text (F).\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{Avignonese version (K)}

This version of the \textit{Travels} is represented by three manuscripts in three different languages; one Catalan, one Aragonese and one French.\textsuperscript{35} The incorporation of additional information from Odoric of Pordenone’s \textit{Relatio} in this version of the \textit{Travels} sets a \textit{terminus post quem} of 1331. A \textit{terminus ante quem} is set by the Aragonese version, which was written for the Grand Master of the Knights of Rhodes, Juan Fernandez de Heredia (†1396).

\textsuperscript{31} Burgio and Eusebi, \textit{nuova edizione}, 17-45.
\textsuperscript{33} Gadrat, \textit{Lire}, 24.
\textsuperscript{34} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 281 and 311-12; NB one of these six manuscripts is currently missing, see Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 486-87.
\textsuperscript{35} Gadrat, \textit{Lire}, 24-25.
**Tuscan version (TA)**

The Tuscan version is represented in five fourteenth-century manuscripts.\(^{36}\) It is based on a Franco-Italian text similar to that found in F, but is not based on F itself and is also several steps removed from the archetype.\(^{37}\) One manuscript which contains this version, namely Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, II.iv.88, the so-called “Ottimo” manuscript, contains a note by Piero del Riccio written in 1458 who claims that the manuscript was written by his great-grandfather Niccholo Ormanni who died in 1309.\(^{38}\) There is one manuscript of a Latin translation (LT) of the *Travels* which was made from this Tuscan version.\(^{39}\)

**Venetian Abridgement (VB)**

A Venetian abridgement survives in three manuscripts. This version consists of a ‘freely abridged and manipulated Venetian version that derives from a Franco-Italian text’.\(^{40}\) Professor Burgio and Dr Simion have recently shown that this version is closely connected to the VA and TA versions.\(^{41}\)

**Venetian version (VA)**

The Venetian version survives in thirty-two manuscripts. It is based on a Franco-Italian text similar to that found in F, but is not based on F itself and is also several steps removed from the archetype.\(^{42}\) The VA version was translated into Latin (LB) and into Tuscan (TB). A German translation (VG) and a Latin translation (LA) were made from the Tuscan version (TB) of the VA version, and new Tuscan and German translation were then made from the LA version.\(^{43}\) Of particular interest for the

---


\(^{40}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 281 and 474-75.

\(^{41}\) Burgio and Simion, *forthcoming*.


present study is that the VA version served as a base for Pipino’s Latin translation of the *Travels* (P).\textsuperscript{44}

**Pipino version (P)**

The Pipino version, entitled *De conditionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum*, was written by the Dominican friar Francesco Pipino of Bologna between 1310 and 1324.\textsuperscript{45} Pipino used the VA version as a basis for his edition of the *Travels*.\textsuperscript{46} This was the most popular version of the *Travels* in Medieval Europe and copies, abridgements and translations of it account for sixty-nine of the total 141 manuscripts of the *Travels*, amounting to just under 50%.\textsuperscript{47} Four translations of P were made: two copies of a French translation, a Czech translation, a Venetian translation and IMP, which is the subject of the present study.\textsuperscript{48} A Portuguese edition and translation of P was made in 1502 and a Latin abridgement of the text is found in the so-called ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version, which will be discussed in Chapter III.

**Group B**

**The Z version (Z)**

This unique version is represented by one fifteenth-century manuscript, namely: Toledo, Biblioteca del Cabildo, 49, 20 Zelada, which contains a version of the *Travels* in Latin, which includes details that are not in F and seem older.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{44} Dutschke, *Pipino*, 438.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 239; see below, under ‘Date of P’, for discussion on this dating.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 228, 279-81 and 438.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 238; Gadrat, *Lire*, 94 and 384-85.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 279-81, 305-07, 436-37, 449-52 and 467-68; De Benedetto, *Il Milione*, CXLIV-CXLV.
The V version (V)

This unique Venetian version is represented by one manuscript, namely: Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 424. Dutschke and Gadrat-Ouerfelli (henceforth Gadrat) argued that this version of the Travels is closely related to Z,\textsuperscript{50} however Simion has recently shown that it also bears resemblances to F in many points.\textsuperscript{51}

1.3. Summary and note to map of versions of the Travels

The schema below displays the connections between the various versions of the Travels discussed above and helps visualise the complex relationship between the many recensions of the text. This interpretation draws heavily on recent studies by Burgio and Eusebi, by Gadrat and by Dr Simion.\textsuperscript{52} I am especially grateful to Professor Burgio and Dr Simion for providing me with forthcoming publications discussing the relationship between the various versions of the Travels and for notifying me about their recent discoveries.

I have highlighted in red the path from Rustichello’s original, and now lost, version of the Travels written in 1298 to IMP. The languages of the various versions of the Travels are represented in the schema below beside the abbreviation used to describe the version in the discussion above, in round brackets, followed by the number of manuscripts in which that version survives.

\textsuperscript{50} Dutschke, Pipino, 281 and 288. Gadrat, Lire, 106.
\textsuperscript{51} Simion, ‘Struttura e fonti di V’, 27-29.
\textsuperscript{52} Burgio and Eusebi, nuova edizione, 45; Gadrat, Lire, 17; Burgio and Simion, ‘La ricezione medieval del Devisement dou Monde (Secoli XIV-XV)’, Medioevo Romano (2018), forthcoming.
2. Francesco Pipino

2.1. Life

A biographical profile of Francesco Pipino (figure 2) is of interest to the study of IMP because his personal details are modified in the Irish adaptation. In fact, as will be discussed in Chapter IV, he is transformed into a brother of a king in the habit of Saint Francis, *brathair righ an aibit san Fronses*.\(^53\) The following summary of Pipino’s life will show that not only was Pipino a Dominican, but that he came from a family of humble origins that lived near the convent of San Domenico in Bologna at the end of the thirteenth century. The biography of Pipino has been pieced together by Consuelo Dutschke who studied a series of wills, acts and convent records dated between 1289 to 1328, some of which were written by Pipino himself, others in which he appears as a witness and others still which he may have used as sources in his works. More specific information, such as Pipino’s date of birth or death, has not survived. The following summary is taken from Dutschke and Gadrat’s studies of the life and works of Pipino.\(^54\)

Francesco Pipino was the son of Rodaldo Pipino and Thixina de Lemogne who lived in the parish of San Domenico in Bologna at the end of the thirteenth century. The involvement of the Pipino family with the Dominicans of San Domenico is suggested by the name of a notary who worked for the convent during the second half of the thirteenth century, namely Zenzanome di Rolandino di Pipino.\(^55\) A will dating from from November 1289 and signed ‘in presentia ... fratis Francischini Pipini’, is the first document to mention Pipino and his vocation as a friar in the convent of San Domenico.\(^56\) He transferred to the convent of Sant’ Agostino in Padua

\(^{53}\) 121ra1-2.  
\(^{54}\) For a more extended discussion on Pipino’s biography, see Dutschke, *Pipino*, 100-159; Gadrat, *Lire*, 64-66.  
\(^{55}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 107-08  
\(^{56}\) Ibid., 111-12.
towards the turn of the century where he became lector in theology, but was back in Bologna by 1311 where he became subprior of the convent of San Domenico.  

In November 1313 a vacancy arose for the role of prior in the Dominican convent of Sant’Agostino in Padua and by January 1314, Francesco Pipino had filled the post. In 1317, 1318 and 1319, Pipino was in Bologna again and is the witness to three wills, one for each year. In 1319, Pipino writes a document entrusting certain lands to the people named in preparation for a visit to the holy lands: ‘Ego Francesco Pipini … volens me ultra mare transferre’. This trip took place over the following year, and formed the basis for his Tractatus de locis terre sancte, which opens: ‘Ista sunt loca sacre venerationis que ego frater Franciscus Pipinus … visitavi in mea peregrinacione quam feci anno domini MCCCXX.’ In March 1321, Pipino had returned from the holy lands and is named on a list of friars of San Domenico. During the next four years, his name appears on a series of documents in roles such as a beneficiary, witness to testaments and seller of convent property, active between Bologna and Modena. In a document which dates from 1325, Pipino sells all debts owed to him to a relative named Zenzanome di Rolandino di Pipino, whom Dutschke has suggested may have been his brother. The reason for this transaction is even more interesting in the context of Pipino’s own personal interests, as the document declares that Pipino had transferred to the congregation of the ‘Fratres Peregrinantes propter Christum’, an organisation of friars who engaged in missionary activity abroad. However, whether or not Pipino actually left Italy again is less certain and the question has been much debated amongst scholars. Planzer noted that Pipino’s Tabula Privilegiorum Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, an alphabetically ordered register of privileges granted to the Dominican order by various popes, references a bull issued by Pope John XXII on 27 January 1327 called Illa sine. In addition,
Pipino’s *Tabula* also contains an act from 1328 which declares that any Dominicans wishing to transfer to the order of the Benedictines must seek the pope’s permission first. Given that no such papal bull has survived, Planzer and Dutschke argue that this decision may have taken place at the general chapter meeting in Toulouse, in May 1328, and that Pipino noted it down in his *Tabula* directly from there. Therefore, according to these estimates, Dutschke has suggested that Pipino died during the latter part of 1328.

2.2. Date and location of P

The date of P is of interest to the study of IMP because it sets a definite *terminus post quem* for the Irish adaptation. It is especially interesting to consider the date of P with regard to the archaic features of the language of IMP. As I will discuss in Chapter II, the author of IMP employs a variety of nominal and verbal forms in his adaptation which range from the Old, Middle and Early Modern periods of the language. The date of P may be determined by examining the prologue of the text. Dutschke noted that a *terminus ante quem* for the translation may be set at the death of Marco Polo in 1324, since in his prologue Pipino uses one present infinitive, *esse*, and one present participle, *habentem*, to refer to Marco, meaning that he was still alive at the time of writing.

> cunctis in eo legentibus innotescat prefatum dominum Marchum horum mirabilium relatorem virum *esse* prudentem, fidelem et devotum atque honestis moribus adornatum, a cunctis sibi domesticis testimonium bonum *habentem* ut multiplicis virtutis eius merito sit ipsius relacio fidedigna.

---

69 Ibid., 225.  
70 Ibid., 217-18.  
71 Transcription by Samuela Simion from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f.1vb: ‘let it be known to all who read this that the aforementioned master Marco, relator of these wondrous things, is a prudent, trustworthy and devout man, endowed with an honest character, having a good witness from all his servants so that by merit of his multiple virtues, this account of his may justly [considered] trustworthy.’ Translation is my own.
Similarly, Dutschke noted that Pipino refers to Matteo and Niccolò Polo in the past tense in his prologue:\textsuperscript{72}

\begin{quote}
pater autem ei\us\ dominus Nicolaus to\ius pr\ocentie vir\ hec omnia similiter referebat; patruus vero ipsius dominus Matheus, cuius mem\oci\us liber iste, vir\ ut\ocque maturus, devote\si et sapiens, in mortis articulo constitutus, confessor\ocer suo in familiari colloquio const\ocant\ocie firmitate asser\ocuit libr\um hunc veritatum per omnia continere.\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}

Niccolò Polo was dead by 31 August 1300, when his son Matteo, Marco’s half brother, wrote a will before his departure for Crete, in which his father is referred to as the ‘late’ Niccolò: ‘\textit{filius quondam Nicolai.}’\textsuperscript{74} On the other hand, the will of the other Matteo Polo, Marco’s uncle, dates from 6 February 1310.\textsuperscript{75} However, since Matteo is not actually referred to as being dead until a document dating from 1318, on the evidence at hand, the date of Matteo’s death can only be narrowed down to the eight-year period between 1310 and 1318.\textsuperscript{76}

Further attempts to narrow the date of composition of $P$ differ somewhat: Dutschke noted that a comment made by Pipino in another of his works, entitled the \textit{Chronicon}, a Latin history of Italy, France, Germany and England organised into thirty-one books, indicates that he had already written $P$ at the time of his writing of the \textit{Chronicon}:\textsuperscript{77} \textit{refert Marchus Paulus venetus in quodam suo libello a me in latinum ex vulgari ydiomate lombardico translatum.}\textsuperscript{78} This comment implies that the \textit{Chronicon}, which has yet to be edited, was written after Pipino had translated the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{72} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 216-17.
\textsuperscript{73} Transcription by Samuela Simion from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, ff. 1vb-2ra: ‘indeed, his father, master Nicolaus, a man of complete prudence recalled all these things in a similar way; master Matheus, his uncle, to whom this book is dedicated, a man by all means mature, devout and wise, of sound mind on the point of death, in a friendly conversation with his confessor, assured with unremitting firmness that this book contained the truth in every aspect.’ Translation is my own.
\textsuperscript{74} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 217; Zorzi, \textit{Vita}, 368: ‘son of the late Niccolò’. Translation is my own.
\textsuperscript{75} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 217; Zorzi, \textit{Vita}, 369. The will is printed by Orlandini, ‘Marco Polo’, 25, doc. 6.
\textsuperscript{76} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 217; Yule, \textit{Travels}, I:64-66 and 77.
\textsuperscript{77} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 161.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid.172: ‘Marco Polo the Venetian says in his book which has been translated by me from the common northern-Italian tongue into Latin.’ The transcription from the \textit{Chronicon}, book 24 chapter 71, is Dutschke’s. For translation of \textit{lombardicus} see, De Benedetto, \textit{Il Milione}, cliv-clvii; Yule, \textit{Travels}, I:119.
\end{flushright}
Travels. Unfortunately however, this quote can only indicate the relative chronology of the two works, since absolute dating of the Chronicon is also problematic. Although most of the events it describes occur in or before 1314, it also refers to one event in 1316, one in 1317 and one in 1322. This last event, namely the execution of the counts of Lancaster and Hereford in 1322, is taken as the year of completion of the Chronicon by Gadrat, who therefore sets the terminus ante quem of P to 1322. However, it is also possible, logically at least, that Pipino began work on the Chronicon several years after the execution of the counts of Lancaster and Hereford in 1322, the latest event to be mentioned in the Chronicon. Dutschke in fact suggested that Pipino may have been working on this text until his death, which occurred after 1328, and that the work is incomplete. A modern edition of the Chronicon may help solve these issues. For the purposes of the present study, I return to the will of Matteo Polo in 1310 as the terminus post quem and the death of Marco Polo himself in 1324 as the terminus ante quem for P.

Regarding the location in which Pipino wrote P, Dutschke has suggested Padua, given its geographical proximity to Venice, where Pipino may have acquired a copy of the VA version, and given Pipino’s connections with the Dominican convent of Sant’ Agostino in Padua, only forty kilometres from Venice. On the other hand, Andreose has recently shown that the earliest copy of the VA version of the Travels, found in Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense ms. 3999, displays linguistic features of the Bolognese region and has suggested that Pipino’s exemplar may have also been written in Bologna.

---

79 Dutschke, Pipino, 218-19: Dutschke took the fact that most information in the Chronicon dates to before 1314 as an indication that P was written ‘probably after 1314 (most of the Chronicon’s events) or after 1322 (some of the Chronicon’s events),’ a suggestion that was perpetuated by Gaunt: Gaunt, Marco, 12.
80 Gadrat, Lire, 66.
81 This dating is maintained also by Andreose in: Andreose, ‘Tradizione’, 237). However Barbieri and Andreose opted for a dating ‘ante 1324’ in Barbieri e Andreose, Il Milione, 38.
82 Dutschke, Pipino, 219; Gadrat, Lire, 66.
83 Ibid., 162.
84 Larner suggests a date prior to 1314, but does not elaborate further: Larner, Marco, 111-112.
85 Dutschke, Pipino, 220.
86 Andreose, La prima attestazione, 665.
2.2.1. Editions of P

A modern, critical edition of P remains one of the great desiderata for the study of IMP and for Marco Polo studies in general. Until recently, the only available edition, of which I am aware, was that of Justin Prášek, which he printed in 1902 as part of his study of the fifteenth-century Czech translation of the *Travels.* The present study has benefited immensely from the recent work carried out by Dr Samuela Simion and Professor Eugenio Burgio of Università di Ca’ Foscari of Venice, who supplied me with their copy of a full transcription of P from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, which has been prepared for a new critical edition of the *Travels.* This transcription of P, made by Dr Simion, is the version of P referenced in this dissertation.

2.2.2. Innovations of P found in IMP

A major innovation of Pipino’s translation of the *Travels* is his division of the text into three books. The preservation of this division in IMP is one of the strongest indications that the Irish author was working from an exemplar of the P version. In fact, where one book ends and another begins in IMP the Irish author copies Pipino’s explicits and incipits in Latin directly into his adaptation. IMP also contains a trace of chapter lists occurring between the end of one book and the beginning of the next, as occurs in most manuscripts of P that I have examined. The Irish author seems to have accidently copied the wrong incipit at the beginning of the third book, copying the incipit of the chapter list of book three instead of the incipit of book three. This is best seen by comparing the two book divisions found in IMP:

Explicit secundus liber. Incipit sequenda partis.

Explicit secundus liber. Incipiunt capitula tercii libri.

---

87 Prášek, *Milion: Dle jediného rukopisu spolu s příslušným základem latinským* (Prague, 1902). The version of P used in this edition was transcribed from Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Vindob. Lat. 50 [3273], numbered 30 in the manuscript list in Chapter III.
88 Dr Simion’s transcription of P has since been published online at [http://virgo.unive.it/ecf-workflow/books/Ramusio/testi_completi/P_marcato-main.html](http://virgo.unive.it/ecf-workflow/books/Ramusio/testi_completi/P_marcato-main.html) (retrieved: 02/01/18).
89 See Chapter III for a description of the Early Modern editions of P.
91 124ra14-15.
Of course, it is also possible that this oversight was already present in the exemplar used to write IMP. However, I will argue in Chapter III with regard to the Irish author’s recalculation of the number of households in the city of Quinsay that the adaptor of IMP was also correcting the mistakes that he noticed in his exemplar. In any case, the division of the *Travels* into three books and the traces of chapter lists between the end of one book and the beginning of another indicate that the version of the *Travels* used by the Irish author was P.

### 2.2.3. Tone of P

An important stylistic innovation in Pipino’s translation of the *Travels*, which is neither found in the VA version or the F version, is the introduction of a reproachful and denouncing tone in discussing the customs and beliefs of the Orient. For example, the name *Machometus* is regularly accompanied by derogatory adjectives in sentences such as: *Turchi linguam propriam habent et Machometi abhominabilis legem;* promittit enim *infelicissimus* Machometi sectatoribus sue legis; *ibi etiam habetur lex pessimi Machometi.* Similarly, in discussing the religious practices of the Tartars, Pipino inserts passing comments such as *diabolica cecitate seducti* and *cecitas paganorum.* This tone of condemnation, which is so distinctive of Pipino’s translation of the *Travels*, is not translated by the Irish author, who never uses pejorative adjectives when referring to Muhammad and transforms Pipino’s *diabolica arte* of the Khan’s wizards into ‘cunning and craft’, *tuachlecht 7 amuinse.*

---

92 129rb2-3.
94 P.I.12.2. ‘The Turks have their own language and the law of the abhorrent Muhammad.’ All translations are my own.
95 P.I.28.6. ‘The most wretched Muhammad in fact promised the followers of his law.’
96 P.I.37.4. ‘Here is maintained the law of the awful Muhammad.’
97 P.I.58.4.
98 P.I.45.7.
99 P.I.66.7.
100 124ra3.
3. Book of Lismore (L)

The Book of Lismore (L), or Leabhar Mhic Carthaigh Riabhaigh, was probably written between 1478 and 1505 in the Franciscan friary of Timoleague in south west Cork for Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, ruler of Cairbre, and his wife Caitilín Fitzgerald, daughter of Thomas Fitzgerald (†1468) eighth earl of Desmond.\(^\text{101}\) IMP is unique to this manuscript. It is contained between ff. 121 and 131\(^\text{102}\) of the manuscript and is missing its beginning and end due to loss of folios. L is one of the few Medieval Irish manuscripts still in private ownership. It is housed in Chatsworth House, England, ancestral home of the Cavendish family and of the Duke of Devonshire. The manuscript was discovered in 1814 in Lismore Castle, County Waterford, Irish seat of the Duke of Devonshire, where it is thought to have been kept since the wars in the seventeenth century.\(^\text{103}\) The historical context of the manuscript is described in detail in Chapter IV. In the following paragraphs I will give a summary of past scholarship relating to the production of the manuscript and discuss the various scribes who contributed to it. A discussion of these scribes, and a reflection on their links with other events occurring in fifteenth-century Munster, can shine light on the audience for which IMP may have been written.

In its present state the manuscript contains 198 folios of vellum, however at least forty-one folios are missing from the beginning of the manuscript and an unknown number of leaves have been lost from the end. Furthermore, as will be seen with IMP, there are a number of internal lacunae in the manuscript. Apart from the poem on f. 158 and a nineteenth-century contribution by Cork scholar Donnchadh Ó Floinn on f.157v, the manuscript is written in double columns. Unfortunately, it is impossible to identify the original structure of L since all folios are now detached and nowhere bound in diplomas, a consequence, perhaps, of the nineteenth century binders of the manuscript.\(^\text{104}\) It is likely however that it was originally conceived as a collection of quires of eight folios, which contained at least one major text together with poems, anecdotes and short stories used as column and line fillers.\(^\text{105}\)

---


\(^{102}\) The facsimile numbering (upper right-hand corner) of L is followed here. This is also the numbering used on www.isos.dias.ie.

\(^{103}\) MacAlister, The Book, ix. Cf. also Ó Macháin’s description on www.isos.dias.ie.

\(^{104}\) Ibid., xiii; Ó Macháin, ‘Aonghas’, 145.

\(^{105}\) See Chapter IV for a discussion of the quires of L and of the missing folios at the beginning of IMP.
L has been described as one of the most poorly decorated Irish manuscripts of the fifteenth century.\(^\text{106}\) Four marginal notes in L indicate that the manuscript was written for or commissioned by a married couple, *lánamhain*.\(^\text{107}\) A scribal note on f. 134rb by Aonghas Ó Callanáin indicates that the manuscript was written for Fínghean mac Diarmada Mac Carthaigh Riabhach: *Aonghas Ó Callanáin do scríbh so do Mhag Carrthaig i. Fínghean mac Diarmada*. Likewise a poem on f. 158 beginning *Ní théd an éigin a n-aisgidh*,\(^\text{108}\) by Mathghamhain mac Domhnaill mheic Eoghain Í Dhálaigh, is centred around Fínghean’s struggle against his cousin Cormac mac Donnchaídh during the second half of the fifteenth century. This poem also contains a quatrain dedicated to Fínghean’s wife Caitilín ‘daughter of the earl’, *inghean an Iarla*, and to Saint Francis, suggesting a Franciscan context for the codex. L is primarily the work of one anonymous scribe, discussed below:

### 3.1. Scribes of L

#### 3.1.1. Scribe A

No signature of the main scribe of L has survived. He is referred to by MacAlister as Scribe A\(^\text{109}\) and is the main scribe of L, responsible for around 175 of the 198 surviving leaves, making him, as Ó Macháin has stated, ‘*ar na scriobhaithe is mó saothar sa tréimhse seo, ar an bhfianaise a mhaireann inniu pé scéal é*’.\(^\text{110}\)

Scribe A is responsible for writing the following folios in L: ff. 42-131, 135-157r.,

---

\(^{106}\) Ó Macháin, ‘*Leabhar*’, 233: ‘níorbh aon Leabhar Ceanannais é ach an lámhscribhinn Ghaeilge ba mheasa maisiú a scriobhadh sa chúigiú haois déag.’

\(^{107}\) These are found in the upper margins of ff 42r and 49v, and in the lower margins of ff 53r and 59r. All of these marginalia are very similar in style and are found at the beginning of lives of Irish saints. The writing is faded and the notes in the upper margins of ff 42r and 49v appear to have been truncated, perhaps by a binder. Half of the note in the upper margin of f. 49r has been retraced by another scribe. It is difficult to assess whether these marginalia are in the same hand as any of the major scribes of L since the script is smaller and the writing is faded. Preliminary testing seems to indicate that they are in the hand of Scribe A, whose features Ó Macháin has noted include: ‘1) a right-hand stroke of a miniscule a descending well below the left-hand finish, resting on and sometimes descending below the line, and at its most developed presenting with a right-hand hook at the end. 2) the agus-sign with a turn in the centre of the horizontal stroke.’ I am grateful to Professor Ó Macháin for providing me with unpublished material regarding the scribal features of L.

\(^{108}\) Ó Cuív, ‘*A Poem*’, 98. See Chapter IV for a discussion of this poem and the note which accompanies it.


\(^{110}\) Ó Macháin, ‘*Aonghas*’, 144.
159-193, 202-end. He is the main scribe of IMP, except for the contribution of a relief scribe on f. 125rb21-z, discussed below.

Scribe A was referred to by early scholars of L as ‘in Bráthair Ó Buagacháin’, whose name appears at the end of *Beatha Finnchu* on f. 72rbz. However, Hyde’s discovery of a slightly extended version of the same colophon in another copy of the saint’s life in Dublin, University College, Franciscan A9, written in the fifteenth-century, indicates that Scribe A probably copied the colophon from his exemplar. Ó Macháín has further suggested that, given the satirical tone of *Beatha Finnchu*, Ó Buagacháin’s colophon may form part of the narrative of the text, contrasting the burlesque tale of the saint’s life with the authority of clerical authorship.

Ó Macháín has recently shown that Scribe A and Aonghus Ó Callanáin, the second main scribe of L, were working together on the manuscript, a point that was doubted by Ó Cuív. This is demonstrable in three points in the manuscript: 1) f. 201, the opening leaf of *Agallamh na Seanórach* (henceforth *Agallamh*), was ruled for Scribe A but is in the hand of Aonghas; 2) on f. 202r the writing of the *Agallamh* is taken over by Scribe A completing a quatrain begun by Aonghas; 3) on f. 200v Scribe A inserts a line filler at the end of Aonghas’ copy of the *An Agallamh Bheag*.

3.1.2. Aonghas Ó Callanáin

Aonghas Ó Callanáin’s contribution to L amounts to eleven leaves, namely ff. 132-134, 194-201. I am aware of no evidence of his hand in the folios in which IMP is found in the manuscript, however his involvement with the manuscript is especially interesting in light of the role of other members of the Ó Callanáin family with the

---

112 Hyde, *Gabháltais*, x.
114 Ó Macháín, *forthcoming*.
115 The following I take from a talk delivered by Ó Macháín at a conference on the Book of Lismore held in University College Cork in 2011.
117 The two scribes have distinctive styles of ruling: Scribe A uses single left-hand bounding lines of the columns whereas Aonghas Ó Callanáin uses double-rule.
118 Ó Macháín, ‘Aonghas’, 144.
translation of medical texts during the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{119} A seventeenth-century paper fragment inserted at ff. 195-96 in London, British Library, Egerton 89, written in 1482,\textsuperscript{120} indicates that the aphorisms contained in the manuscript, which are a commentary and translation of the well-known Latin medical text known as ‘Aphorisms of Hippocrates’, were written by Aonghas Ó Callanán and Niocól Ó hIcedha in 1403.\textsuperscript{121} Another reference to an Ó Callanán physician, this time explicitly associated with Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, is found in Dublin, National University of Ireland, Maynooth MS C 110, which preserves a colophon on p.5b43-53 indicating that the preceding text, i.e. a translation of Arnaldus de Villanova’s \textit{Speculum}, was completed in Rosscarbery\textsuperscript{122} on the Eve of Saint Brendan 1414 by Eoin Ó Callanán who began work on the text, under the supervision of Master Piarus Ó hUallacháin, in Kilbrittain immediately prior to the death of Domhnall Riabhach Mac Carthaigh:

\begin{verbatim}
Do crichnaige anois a Ros Oilitri, maille grasaibh Tigearna na tri muintear, Speclaire Arnalldi on Bhaile Nua do tarrang a Laidin a nGaedhilg dEoin O Callannain maille foirceadal a oidi fein i. mhaighistir Phiaruis I Uallachain arna tinnsgain a Cill Britain a mbeathaidh 7 a ngalar ega Domhnail Riabhagh Meg Carrthaigh 7 arna eg do crichnaiged a tarrang 7 a sgribhadh in la roim Feil Brenainn in xiii bliadhain ar ceathraibh cedaibh ar mhillie iar ngabhail Crist a colainn. A finid. Amen. A bhuidhi.\textsuperscript{123}
\end{verbatim}

The \textit{Speculum} is an learned academic text which deals with both theoretical and practical concepts of medicine. Nic Dhonnchadha has stated that its translation by a member of the Ó Callanán family is testimony to the advanced state of learning in their medical school.\textsuperscript{124} It is quite possible that Aonghas Ó Callanán, the scribe of L, was in some way related to the Aonghas Ó Callanán who wrote the Irish version of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{119} I am grateful to Dr Aoibheann Nic Dhonnchadha for her insight on the family connections of Aonghas, and for providing me with unpublished material regarding the manuscripts of the Ó Callanán family during the fifteenth century in Cairbre.
\textsuperscript{120} O’Grady, \textit{Catalogue I}, 202.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 222.
\textsuperscript{122} For the identification of Ross Oilitri see Lanigan, \textit{Ecclesiastical history}, 194.
\textsuperscript{123} Transcription is Ó Macháin’s from \url{www.isos.dias.ie} (retrieved: 21/12/17).
\textsuperscript{124} Nic Dhonnchadha, \textit{forthcoming}.
\end{footnotesize}
the Aphorisms of Hippocrates in 1403 and to Eoin Ó Callanáin who translated the *Speculum*, and to deduce from it that our scribe may have had a medical background.

Ó Macháin has suggested that the quire immediately following that of IMP, ff. 132-139, to which Aonghas contributed two folios (ff. 132-134), contain a selection of thematically coherent texts on kingship, *seanchas* and early Irish history. Aonghas’s involvement in the copying of *fiannaíocht* texts in L – all of *An Agallamh Bheag* (ff. 194-200) and the first leaf of *Agallamh na Seanórach* (f. 201) – may further indicate that he was considered an authority in the genre and that he was assigned specific texts in the compilation of the manuscript.

Aonghas’ contribution of *seanchas* and *fiannaíocht* texts to L combined with the possibility of his medical background describe the profile of a physician historian, a social class that played a considerable role in the development of historical knowledge in Europe between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. From a European perspective, it is not surprising to find a version of Marco Polo’s *Travels* in this context. An interesting parallel is found for example in Germany, in the unique Latin re-arrangement of P written by the physician Hermann Schedel (†1485) and later copied by his cousin Hartmann Schedel (†1514), a doctor, book collector and leading member of a humanist circle in Nuremberg, who compiled the famous *Nuremberg Chronicle*, published in 1493.

### 3.1.3. Scribe of poem on f. 158

A mixture of scribal hands is found on f. 158, which contains a poem dedicated to Finghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach beginning *Ní thèd an éigin a n-aiglidh* (*recto*) and an accompanying note explaining the historical context of the poem (*verso*). Ó Macháin has suggested that the hand of the poem is different to that of the note, and

---

126 Ó Callanáin began writing *An Agallamh Beag* on f. 134va1 but stopped at f.134vb12, suggesting that a decision was made to place the text elsewhere in the manuscript. See Ó Macháin, ‘Aonghas’.
127 For a detailed study of the connections between medical and historical learning, see Siraisi, *History*. For a summary of the involvement of the medical class with the transmission of the *Travels*, see Gadra, *Lire*, 144-46.
128 Siraisi, *History*, 1 and 30. For an analysis of the ‘Schedel’ version of P and how it compares to IMP, see Chapter III.
that both hands on f. 158 are different from those of Scribe A and Aonghas Ó Callanáin.\textsuperscript{130} According to the note on f. 158v, the preceding poem was composed by Mathghamhain mac Domhnaill mheic Eoghain Í Dhálaigh.\textsuperscript{131} It is important to observe the fact that the note does not say that the poem was written by Mathghamhain, rather that he had made it, \textit{do rinne}.\textsuperscript{132}

It is interesting to consider whether Mathghamhain’s grandfather, Eoghan Ó Dálaigh, is the same individual as Eoghan mac Gofraidh Fhinn Ó Dálaigh to whom the poem beginning \textit{Is maith an locht airdtig óige} is ascribed.\textsuperscript{133} The poem is dedicated to Domhnall Riabhach Mac Carthaigh (†1414), Finghean’s grandfather, in whose home of Kilbrittain Eoin Ó Callanáin began his translation of Arnaldus de Villanova’s \textit{Speculum} in 1414. Such a conclusion may have been reached by O’Grady, who described the author of the poem on f. 158r as the ‘hereditary rhymer to the Mac Carthys-Riach.’\textsuperscript{134}

\subsection*{3.1.4. Relief scribes}

The hands of at least four different relief scribes are discernible in L, their contributions are as follows: relief scribe (a) on ff. 41rb2-13, 53ra1-17, 56ra1-9, 61vb1-16; (b) 87va1-31; (c) 125rb21-37; (d) 184ra15-32. Ó Macháin has proposed that these relief entries may indicate a scholastic or monastic environment. In this regard, my study of the orthography of IMP has revealed that the relief scribe responsible for f. 125rb21-37 adopted a slightly different spelling system to that of Scribe A. Noteworthy examples are: \textit{taighseach},\textsuperscript{135} of the relief scribe, and \textit{taiseach}\textsuperscript{136} of Scribe A, which all occur in the same column. As far as I am aware, the spelling \textit{taighseach} is never used by Scribe A in IMP; a second example is in the rendition of the diphthong \textit{ae}, which is only spelled \textit{ao} by the relief scribe but always spelled \textit{ae} and \textit{oe} by Scribe A in IMP, with one exception, namely \textit{la n-aon}.\textsuperscript{137} In addition, the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{130} Ó Macháin, \textit{forthcoming}.
\item \textsuperscript{131} 158va23-24.
\item \textsuperscript{132} 158va23.
\item \textsuperscript{133} The poem has been edited by McKenna, ‘To Mág Carthaigh Riabhach’. See also O’Grady, \textit{Catalogue} I, 358, num. 28.
\item \textsuperscript{134} O’Grady, \textit{Silva Gadelica} ii, xi.
\item \textsuperscript{135} 125rb21; 125rby.
\item \textsuperscript{136} 125rb5; 125rb6.
\item \textsuperscript{137} 129rb26.
\end{itemize}
orthography of the relief scribe reveals an important feature of his pronunciation, namely in the spelling of the adjective órdha with unhistoric -dh ending: cupa órdadh.\textsuperscript{138} This hyper-correct form indicates that the relief scribe was pronouncing final -adh as -a, a distinctive feature of spoken Irish of the southern half of the island since the fifteenth-century.\textsuperscript{139}

Evidence for a scholastic setting of the manuscript may be further indicated by a correction in the hand of Scribe A of an oversight of the relief scribe on 125rb21. The relief appears to have omitted a line beginning no bhíd from his exemplar and copied from the following line, beginning no bhi. In the following transcription I have attempted to retain the arrangement in L. The correction of Scribe A, which is connected to the marginal footnote by a + sign in the manuscript, is in bold characters and has been highlighted in yellow. Line numbers on f.125rb are represented on the left-hand side of the page.

20. foracli 7narighna eli na deagaid 7 mná
21. [na righ marg.] 7 na taighsec for aneagar cubaid nandeaghadha. No [+ marg.]
22. bhi tunna ordha amedhon an rightoighi 7 cetri
23. tunna ordha budh lugha inassom fria ataobhaibh

\textit{[lower marg.: + No bhíd in rí uas na sloghaibh oca bhfhairesí cur bhó comhard fria a bhondsumh mullach gach aein dia mhunntir.]}

Scribe A’s correction of the relief scribe was noted by Stokes and incorporated into his edition of IMP.\textsuperscript{140} This observation supports the theory that Scribe A may have been involved in tuition and was offering his students the opportunity to relieve him of his scribal duties in brief sections of the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{138} 125rb30.
\textsuperscript{139} O’Rahilly, \textit{Dialects}, 65-66.
\textsuperscript{140} Stokes, ‘Gaelic abridgement’, 372-73.
CHAPTER II: LANGUAGE AND STYLE

0.1. Introduction

The language of IMP contains a mix of Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish forms. This chapter will examine how the text contains vocabulary and grammatical constructions which were already in disuse by the late Middle Irish period. The language of IMP provides a striking contrast to that of the Gaelic Mandeville (GM), a text which contains significant thematic similarities with IMP and which also written in Munster in the latter part of the fifteenth century, but in a much less linguistically-artificial style. By discussing the linguistic capabilities of the author of IMP, it is possible to gain insight into his literary influences and reflect on his motives for adapting the Travels in this style. Linguistic archaisms in IMP are also contrasted by modern orthographic and grammatical features that are present also. The result is a mixed language, which displays features from the Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish period.

This chapter is divided into three parts: Part I will begin by addressing the use of archaic language in Early Modern Irish prose and the impact of certain scribes on the linguistic style of a number of Early Modern Irish prose texts; Part II contains a linguistic study of IMP beginning with an analysis of the orthographical features of Scribe A and of the relief scribe who writes on folio 125rb, and follows with an examination of nominal and verbal forms found in the text. In Part III, I compare the various narrative styles which are discernible in IMP and discuss how they are distributed throughout the text.

141 Ó hUiginn, ‘Some linguistic’, 94.
0.2. Methodology

In this chapter I will discuss a number of transcriptions which exemplify orthographical and linguistic features in IMP. I have provided exhaustive lists of words which reference Stokes’s paragraph number (¶) for convenience of reference. Only the reference to Stokes’s paragraph number is given if the example is identical to the one immediately preceding it, for example: ¶23 laech, ¶23, ¶29, ¶61 deglaech. Transcriptions are my own unless otherwise specified in the footnotes. For convenience, and for ease of reading, expansion of contractions and abbreviations is not indicated in any forms cited below: their abbreviated or non-abbreviated status may be readily checked in the transcription, which appears as Appendix I. Proper names of people, languages and places are capitalised, and nasalising consonants and infixed pronouns are represented with a hyphen, for example ¶148 là n-aon and ¶2 ro-s-tinnta Proniscus in leabhar so.
PART I

1.1. The Language of IMP in the context of Early Modern Irish prose

The tendency for texts to be written in archaic language has been noted in studies of a number of Early Modern Irish prose works, including *Turas na dtaoiseach nUltach as Éirinn* (henceforth *Turas*) written by Tadhg Ó Cianáin in 1609, *Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Ui Dhomhnaill* (henceforth *Beatha*), written by Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh after 1616,142 and *Trí Biorghaoithe an Bháis*, written by Séathrún Céitinn in 1631.143 A fifteenth-century Irish text which displays this style most noticeably is *Lorgaireacht an tSoidhigh Naomhtha (LSN)*, dated to around 1450,144 about which Falconer stated:

A glance at the Irish Quest is sufficient to show that it does not represent the contemporary state of the language but that, on the contrary, it has been written in a deliberately archaic manner as far as spelling, grammar and vocabulary are concerned.145

Similarly, Quin noted that the language of *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bhás (SE)*, which was most likely written during the last quarter of the fifteenth century,146 abounds in deliberate archaisms. In addition to deliberate archaising it is worth mentioning that orthographical variation was a feature of Irish manuscripts that received particular recognition from Míchéal Ó Cléirigh, one of the last of the traditional scholars, in his introduction to *Foclóir nó Sanasán Nuadh* (1643):

Biodh a fhios ag an áos óg 7 ag aos an ainbhfís lerab mian na seinleabhair do léughadh (ní nach bfuil na aincheas ar eolchaibh ar tíre) gurab annamh bhios coimhéd aca ar cháol ré leathan, no ar leathan re ccaol do sgríobhadh, 7 as firthearc chuirid uathadh ar na connsainibh mar atá bh, ch, dh, fh, etc, 7

---

142 Mac Craith, ‘The *Beatha*’, 36-37.
144 Falconer, *Lorgaireacht*, xxxii.
145 Ibid., xliii.
146 Quin, *Stair*, xxiv-xxiv.
In his account of the Irish language during the Early Modern period, McManus distinguishes between two types of prose texts: type A texts, comprising of works written in a language that closely reflected the spoken language of the time and that were understood by people who did not have a professional-linguistic training. In this instance it is useful to recall Flaithrí Ó Maolchonaire’s remark in his preface of *Desiderius* regarding the language of his text and its designated audience: *ar son simplidheachta na stíle inar sgriobhamar go sonnradhach chum leasa na ndaoine simplidhe nách foil géarchúiseach a nduibheagan na Gaoidhilge.* On the other hand, McManus distinguishes texts of type B, characterised by a great deal of linguistic archaisms, for which the reader would have had to have a fairly good understanding of Old and Middle Irish lexicon and grammar, and a firm grasp of Classical Early Modern Irish. Therefore, according to McManus’s distinction, we may assign IMP to the type B category.

Mac Gearailt has shown that archaisms used by Ó Cianáin in the *Turas* were already obsolete by the Middle Irish period, and that the author was able to emulate grammatical structures which had not been in use since the Old Irish period. Similarly, McManus has shown that Ó Cléirigh was able to reproduce Old and Middle Irish.

---

147 Ó Cléirigh, *Sanasáin Nuadh*, 4-5; cf. also, for example, Ó hEódhusa's notes on consonantal variation in pronunciation (Mac Aogáin, Graiméir, 5-6).
149 Ibid., 336; Mac Gearailt, ‘Archaísm’, 65; Ó Maolchonaire, *Desiderius*, 2.: ‘in regards to the simplicity of the stile in which we wrote, (it is) especially for the benefit of simple folk who are not refined in the complexity of Irish.’
Irish forms in the *Beatha* during the seventeenth century. However, beside these linguistic archaisms, the authors of the *Turas* and the *Beatha* also incorporated numerous modern linguistic features in their texts, resulting in a mixed language, which draws on works written during the Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish periods. McManus, concerning Ó Cléirigh’s writing in the *Beatha*, has suggested that this linguistic style displays the author’s notion of an Irish language continuum in which Old, Middle and Early Modern forms of Irish could coexist. This chapter will discuss how a similar use of language is found in IMP.

Falconer and Quin also noted that archaisms were distributed unevenly throughout *LSN* and *SE*, and that certain passages of the texts contained more archaicisms than others. Falconer suggested that this may be due to ‘a copyist wearying of the archaisms in his exemplar’. Falconer also drew attention to the tendency of the scribes who copied *LSN* to modify the language and orthography of their text. I have not found the distribution of archaisms in IMP to follow any coherent pattern, rather these are sprinkled across the text and alternate with Early Modern Irish forms in an inconsistent manner, as will become apparent in the following linguistic analysis of the language of IMP. Falconer’s observations are particularly important when considering archaisms in IMP and whether these were conceived by the Irish author of the text or introduced by a scribe who copied it.

In his distinction between texts of type A and type B, McManus further notes that religious works are often of type A, whereas historical texts tend to belong to type B. It is worth noting at this point that GM, a text which shares a great deal of thematic similarities with IMP and which was also written in Ireland during the second half of the fifteenth century, belongs to the type A category, as it is not written in a pseudo-archaic linguistic style. Consequently, it is not possible to say that travel texts were written in a consistent linguistic style during the fifteenth century in Ireland. In this chapter I will be referring to the language of GM and contrasting it with that of IMP, in order to exemplify these two vastly different approaches to Early Modern Irish prose.

---

155 Ibid., xlv.
The language of IMP also differs greatly from that of *Gabháltais Serluis Mhóir* (*GSM*) and *Sdair na Lumbardach* (*SNL*), which precede it in L, are also in the hand of Scribe A but are written in a much less linguistically artificial style. In fact, by comparing linguistic and orthographic differences between IMP, *GSM* and *SNL*, the stylistic influences of their authors emerge and it is possible to speculate on how great a role scribes played in enhancing the language of the texts they copied.

This chapter will begin by discussing whether archaisms in IMP can be attributed to linguistic tendencies of the scribe or whether they might be considered authorial by comparing the language of IMP to that of other texts in L. In the following paragraphs my transcription of the linguistic item in question is given besides the chapter number from Stokes’s edition of IMP, for convenience of reference. Manuscript page and line number are found in the footnotes.

### 1.2. Archaisms in IMP: Scribal or Authorial?

The scribe of IMP, referred to by scholars of L as Scribe A, is the main scribe of L, responsible for around 175 of the 198 surviving leaves, making him, as Ó Macháin has stated, ‘ar na scríobhaithe is mó saothar sa tréimhse seo, ar an bhfianaise a mhaireann inniu againn pé scéal é’.

As is the case with a great deal of Early Modern Irish scribes, Scribe A did not maintain a consistent orthographic system and his texts contain numerous internal variations in spelling. Editors of texts written by this scribe have commented on this feature, and in particular on Scribe A’s use of archaisms: Stokes, in his edition of the *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore* (henceforth *Lives*), which, except for several instances of relief scribes, are mostly in the hand of Scribe A, suggested that the archaic features in the language of the *Lives* were due to the fact that they were copied from older manuscripts and that the scribe was ‘modernising, as a rule, the spelling and grammatical forms’ which

---

157 I am grateful to Prof. Ó Macháin for sharing unpublished material regarding the scribes of L.
158 Ó Macháin, ‘Aonghas’, 144.
161 Ó Macháin, ‘Aonghas’, 144.
he found before him, ‘but sometimes leaving intact the ancient orthography and
ancient endings of the noun and verb,’ resulting in ‘a mixed language, in which Old
Irish forms appear side by side those belonging to the late Middle, and even Modern,
periods of the language.’ Similarly, Bugge, in his edition of Caithréim
Cheallacháin Chaisil (CCC), which is also found in the hand of Scribe A in L,
observed that ‘the language of the Lismore text is also remarkably inconsistent’, with
‘old and new forms used indiscriminately, and the same word written in many ways’,
and that ‘more ancient verbal forms sometimes occur, as if they were relics of an
older text.’ Bugge concluded that these features indicate that ‘the text in the Book
of Lismore must be based on an older text.’ More recently, John Carey, in his
analysis of the language of In Tenga Bithnua (TB), which is also found in L in the
hand of Scribe A, argued that TB contains a mix of Old and Middle Irish forms
‘resulting from the transmission, and partial recasting, of an essentially Old Irish text
in the Middle Irish period,’ while stating also that ‘the number of spellings which
conform with the Old Irish usage is impressive’. Carey concluded in his analysis
that ‘it is not difficult to recognise an Old Irish exemplar beneath the surface of what
we find in L.’

However, the presence of linguistic archaisms in IMP cannot be explained by
it being a ‘partial recasting’ of an Old or Middle Irish text since it is not older than
Francesco Pipino’s version of the Travels (P), written between 1310 and 1324 and
from which it was translated. Instead, the language of IMP appears to have been
deliberately archaising in order to replicate the linguistic style of an Old or Middle
Irish text that had been rebranded in the Early Modern period. The present study of
the linguistic features of IMP reveals that a significant effort was made to enhance the
language of the text and create an artificial medium which conveyed the desired
stylistic effects. Yet, since IMP is unique to L, it is difficult to distinguish between the
linguistic choices made by the author of IMP and those made by Scribe A. Likewise it
is impossible to determine whether the copy of IMP in L is the autograph copy of the
text, and that therefore the Irish author and Scribe A are one and the same, or whether

162 Stokes, Lives, xlv.
163 Ibid., xlv.
164 Bugge, Caithreim, vi-vii.
165 Ibid., vii.
166 Carey, Tenga, 71 and 73.
167 Ibid.,72.
168 See Chapter III.
IMP was copied from another, now lost, manuscript. The following considerations regarding the work of other scribes during the fifteenth century, and the language of other texts in the hand of Scribe A which precede IMP in L, whose language has not been considered before, can help understand whether archaisms in IMP should be considered as authorial or scribal.

1.2.1. Scribes as linguistic innovators: The examples of GM and LSN

Although GM is written in a much less linguistically artificial style than IMP, Ó Gliasáin has shown that a number of older spellings and linguistic features found in the copy of GM in Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, (henceforth R) written after 1475 in the Franciscan monastery of Kilcrea, are modernised in the copy of GM that occurs in British Library MS Egerton 1781, (henceforth E) written in Bréifne during the 1480s. Ó Gliasáin cites the following examples for modernisation in E compared to R: beus in R for fós in E; ní mó coin ináitt lochait in R for ní mó coin ná lochaidh in E; feacht n-aill in R for uair éigin in E; atbert in R for adubairt in E; athér frib in R for inneósad dibh in E. Since both R and E derive independently from a lost exemplar written by Finghean Ó Mathghamhna in Ros Broin in 1475, it is difficult to ascertain which forms of the above examples were intended by the author of the text and which are the results of linguistic and orthographic modifications on the part of the scribes. Whereas alternative forms such as fós and beus, or even atbert and adubairt, may be considered orthographic innovations, variants such as feacht n-aill and uair éigin, and ináitt and ná, have a more significant linguistic impact on the delivery of the text, since they reference archaic grammatical features of an older stage of Irish, namely nasalisation following an accusative of time in the case of feacht n-aill and the 3rd pl. inflection of Old Irish indás in ináitt lochait.

Similarly, Falconer noted that a great deal of the archaisms which occur in the copy of LSN in Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, D IV 2, known as the Stowe manuscript (henceforth S), compiled in Kilcormac in Offaly at the end of the fifteenth

---

169 Ó Gliasáin, Scéal, 24-25.
171 Ó Gliasáin, Scéal, 25.
century,\textsuperscript{173} are modernised in the copy of \textit{LSN} in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlson B 512, (henceforth Rawl.), written at the end of the fifteenth century by Seán Ó Mailchonaire for John Plunket, third Baron Dunsany.\textsuperscript{174} Falconer has shown that S and Rawl. derive independently from the same manuscript.\textsuperscript{175} She cites the following examples to indicate the more modern forms found in Rawl. compared to S: \textit{do tomailt} in S for \textit{do caithem} in Rawl.; \textit{ro fuabair} in S for \textit{ro triall} in Rawl.; \textit{amail} in S for \textit{mar} in Rawl.; \textit{fäitsine} in S for \textit{fäistine} in Rawl.; \textit{éitsecht} in S for \textit{éistecht} in R.\textsuperscript{176} Falconer also noted that certain older grammatical constructions which are found in S are modernised in Rawl., for example: \textit{eturra 7 Eualac} in S is found as \textit{etair se 7 Eualac} in Rawl.; similarly, infixed pronoun constructions in S are modernised in Rawl., for example: \textit{nirom tadhbad aenben maith frisin rē sin} in S occurs as \textit{ni tabhfas aenben maith frisin rē sin dam}.\textsuperscript{177}

Since none of the manuscripts listed above contain autograph copies of GM or \textit{LSN}, Ó Gliasáin and Falconer’s observations suggest that linguistic enhancement, whether by archaisation or modernisation, could be as much a choice of the scribe copying the text as it was of the author of the text. Furthermore, Falconer’s observations on the incidence of certain Old Irish grammatical constructions in S and their modernisation in Rawl. indicate that scribal innovation could be both orthographical and grammatical. It is therefore worth considering whether archaisms in IMP are due to predilections of the scribe rather than decisions of the Irish author of the \textit{Travels}. By comparing the language of IMP to that of the two other major translated texts which precede it in L, namely \textit{Gabháltais Serluis Mhóir} (GSM) and \textit{Sdair na Lumbardach} (SNL), which are also in the hand of Scribe A, it is possible to gain further insight into whether Scribe A was introducing archaisms into all the texts he copied or whether IMP stands out in L as a particularly linguistically enhanced text.

\textsuperscript{173} Falconer, \textit{Lorgaireacht}, xxxiii.
\textsuperscript{174} Ibid., xxxv.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., xxxix.
\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., xliv-xlv.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid., xlvi and 125, 1.3168. ‘and in all that space no good woman have I seen.’ ibid., 261.
1.2.2. Orthographical and grammatical features in the work of Scribe A: The examples of IMP, GSM and SNL

1.2.2.1. Methodology

Since IMP is unique to L, it is difficult to determine whether efforts to render the text linguistically archaic were prerogatives of Scribe A or of the Irish author of IMP. However, comparison with the language of GSM and SNL, which precede IMP in L, and are also in the hand of Scribe A, indicate that if Scribe A was responsible for the linguistic enhancement of IMP, he did not introduce many of the same archaic features in the two other major translation texts which he was copying in L. Whereas an in-depth analysis of the language of GSM and SNL is beyond the purpose of this study, an overview of the grammatical and orthographical features in these texts and a comparison with the language of IMP offer the opportunity to assess the range of linguistic styles copied by Scribe A. Such an analysis cannot exclude the possibility that Scribe A was choosing to incorporate archaisms in some of the texts he copied and not in others, however it does reveal a lack of interest on the part of Scribe A to modify the language of all texts he copied in view of arranging them in a linguistically coherent way in L.

I have discussed above, in relation to the scribal innovations in copies of GM and LSN, how it is also difficult to draw a clear line between orthographical and grammatical archaisms, since modifications in spelling or substitution of one word for another can have varying effects on the archaic features which a text presents. However, by juxtaposing first the orthographic and then the grammatical features of IMP, GSM and SNL, it emerges that texts which display orthographic archaisms correspond to texts which feature grammatical archaisms. This indicates that Scribe A was adhering to a specific linguistic register in IMP, and another in GSM and SNL. This is exemplified in the following paragraphs in relation to the spelling of prepositions for/iar, fri/re and oc/og/ac/ag, in order to indicate the orthographic norms in these texts, and in relation to verbal forms, such as the prevalence of infixed pronouns, the alteration between fil and atá, and the past tense of tēit, in order to indicate grammatical features in these texts. The purpose of this analysis is to offer examples of the variety of linguistic styles copied by Scribe A, without compiling an in depth study of the language of GSM and SNL; an in-depth analysis of the language of IMP is found in Part II of this chapter.
1.2.2.2. Variations in Orthography: The Example of Prepositions

Both Old Irish for and Early Modern Irish ar occur in IMP, for example: ¶8 for an sliabh ucot (121rb33), and ¶3 ar muir ata si (121ra27). Within the first twenty paragraphs of IMP, which I have taken as a representative portion of the text, for is by far the more common form, occurring 49 times (92% of instances), as opposed to ar which occurs 4 times (8% of instances): ¶1 for (121ra6), ¶1 (121ra14), ¶5 (121ra37), ¶8 (121rb33), ¶8 (121rb34), ¶8 (121rb35), ¶9 (121va6), ¶10 (121va11), ¶10 (121va17), ¶11 (121va24), ¶11 (121va24), ¶12 (121va28), ¶13 (121vb8), ¶14 (121vb12), ¶14 (121vb14), ¶14 (121vb16), ¶15 (121vb22), ¶15 (121vb24), ¶15 (121vb25), ¶17 (121vb36), ¶17 (122ra8), ¶18 (122ra10), ¶18 (122ra14), ¶18 (122ra18), ¶19 (122ra23), ¶20 (122ra28), ¶20 (122ra34), ¶20 (122ray), ¶6 fora (121rb11), ¶12 (121va15), ¶15 (121vb24), ¶19 (122ra23), ¶19 (122ra26), ¶20 (122ra34), ¶7 fort (121rb18), ¶8 foraibh (121rb34), ¶12 forru (121va37), ¶12 forro (121vb2), ¶14 (121vb16), ¶17 (121vbx), ¶20 (122raz), ¶12 foran (121vax), ¶20 (122ra32), ¶20 (122ra33), ¶20 (122ra36), ¶18 forna (122ra12), ¶18 forsin (122ra18), ¶3 ar (121ra27), ¶5 (121rb1), ¶8 (121rb30), ¶13 aru (121vb6).

On the other hand, I am not aware of any occurrences of the Old Irish preposition for in GSM, and the form ar is found throughout, for example: do chuaidh Serlus ar fud na spainne.178 Similarly, I have found only one example of Old Irish for in SNL, namely: do rindi fanāmhad for in baistedh ar aslach in diabhāil.179 Whereas ar occurs in all other instances, for example: thāngatar na Lumbaraigh isin Etāil ar tūs.180

Both the Old Irish spelling fri and Early Modern Irish re occur in IMP, for example: ¶10 fri re .uii. la airisis in ciaich sin;181 and ¶61 gur comhthlaighcet na catha re cheli.182 However, within the first twenty paragraphs of IMP, which I have taken as a representative portion of the text, fri is by far the more common form in IMP, occurring 18 times (95% of instances), as opposed re occurring once (5% of instances): ¶1 fria (121ra8), ¶1 (121ra15), ¶1 (121ra19), ¶3 (121ra26), ¶5 (121ra8), ¶8

178 Hyde, Gabhálaís, 10.
179 Mac Niocaill, Sdair, 104: 1.572.
180 Ibid., 90: 1.8.
181 121va18.
182 124ra18.
(121rb3), ¶10 (121va9), ¶10 (121va10), ¶11 (121va26), ¶12 (121va31), ¶15 (121vb19), ¶20 (122ra30), ¶8 frisin (121rb23), ¶16 (121vb32), ¶10 fri (121va18), ¶12 friu (121va34), ¶12 (121vb3), ¶17 fris (121vby), ¶1 riasin (121ra16). On the other hand, I have found no examples of Old Irish fri replacing re in GSM, and re is found throughout, for example: ruc a buidi re Dia ocus re San Sem.\(^{183}\) Likewise, I have found no examples of Old Irish fri replacing re in SNL, for example: ar ngabháil na hÉtáiile re haimsir ghír.\(^{184}\)

Old Irish spellings oc and og occur beside Early Modern Irish ac and ag in IMP, for example: ¶91 oc feithimh;\(^{185}\) ¶21 og creicc 7 cunnrad;\(^{186}\) and ¶58 gabsat na laeich ac snas a sleagh 7 ag limadh a lann.\(^{187}\) Of the various spellings of this preposition, ac is the most common, occurring 26 times in the text (44% of instances), followed by oc, occurring 22 times (37% of instances), followed by ag in 17% of instances, followed by og in 2% of instances.\(^{188}\) ¶1 ac (121ra18), ¶5 (121rb4), ¶14 (121vb17), ¶14 (121vb17), ¶33 (123ra26), ¶35 (123rb4), ¶53 (124ra13), ¶54 (124ra22), ¶57 (124rb19), ¶58 (124rb23), ¶61 (124va8), ¶70 (125ra13), ¶76 (125rb8), ¶77 (125rb14), ¶79 (125rb24), ¶79 (125rb24), ¶86 (125vb29), ¶85 (125vb29), ¶100 (126va23), ¶112 (127rb20), ¶121 (128ra11), ¶124 (128rb5), ¶128 (128rb29), ¶128 (128rbx), ¶131 (128va22), ¶136 (128vb24), ¶28 oc (122vb9), ¶33 (123ra25), ¶53 (124ra11), ¶55 (124ra11), ¶55 (124rb1), ¶61 (124va12), ¶65 (124vb3), ¶69 (125ra2), ¶75 (125rb1), ¶84 (125vb5), ¶91 (126ra33), ¶98 (126va8), ¶107 (127ra8), ¶107 (127ra12), ¶128 (128rbv), ¶131 (128va23), ¶148 (129rb31), ¶156 (130ra2), ¶169 (130va21), ¶178 (131rb3), ¶189 (131vb23), ¶189 (131vb26); ¶10 ag (121va13), ¶58 (124rb23), ¶67 (124vb22), ¶116 (127va30), ¶136 (128vb24), ¶141 (129ra28), ¶151 (128vb6), ¶151 (128vb6), ¶178 (131ra23), ¶183 (131va1); ¶22 og (122rb4). On the other hand, I am not aware of any examples of Old Irish oc or og in GSM, whereas ag and ac are the common forms in the text, for example: fo dhaeirsí ag na Seirrisdinibh;\(^{189}\) and, ac so na cathracha do mhallaigh Serlus.\(^{190}\) Lastly, I have found no instances of Old Irish oc or og in SNL, where ag and ac occur throughout, for

\(^{183}\) Hyde, Gabháltaitis, 8.
\(^{184}\) Mac Niocaill, Sdair, 95: 1.136.
\(^{185}\) 126ra33.
\(^{186}\) 122rb4.
\(^{187}\) 124rb23.
\(^{188}\) A full list of all occurrences of this preposition is found below under ‘Prepositions’.
\(^{189}\) Hyde, Gabháltaitis, 4.
\(^{190}\) Ibid., 10.
example: *do ghabh in rī in crann do bhē ag cosaibh a leaptha 7 do bhē aga dhēn co feramhail lais*;¹⁹¹ and, *ac cōmhradh risin aìngel*.¹⁹²

These observations on the spellings of prepositions found in IMP, *GSM* and *SNL* suggest that Scribe A was observing a specific orthographic register in copying IMP, that was different from that which he employed to copy *GSM* and *SNL*. In fact, in IMP he used a array of Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish forms, while in *GSM* and *SNL* he used mostly Early Modern Irish spellings. In order to assess whether this use of archaic orthography corresponds to a use of archaic grammar, the following paragraph will examine a number of verbal forms found in IMP, *GSM* and *SNL*.

### 1.2.2.3. Variations in Grammatical forms: The Example of Verbs

IMP contains a number of infixed pronouns, some of which are pleonastic (i.e. used in combination with a noun or independent pronoun expressing the object) and some of which are true. Ó Catháin has shown¹⁹³ that IMP contains a total of twenty-five¹⁹⁴ examples of infixed pronouns, eight of which are meaningful or true, i.e. they are not used in combination with a noun or independent pronoun to express the object, for example: ¶98 *blìadhain dó na giallaigi cu ro-s-leic for cula dia thighe* (126va15). Of the seventeen examples of pleonastic infixed pronouns in IMP, thirteen are in combination with a noun, for example: ¶1 *ro-s-tinnta Pronsiscus in leabar so* (121ra21), and four are in combination with an independent pronoun, for example: ¶52 *isèdh asberit-sium beous conudh iat na dei no-s-freasdlat iat 7 in ri* (124ra5). I have divided object pronouns in IMP into five groups: true independent pronouns (61%); pleonastic infixed pronouns in combination with independent pronouns (2%); pleonastic infixed pronouns in combination with a noun (23%); true infixed pronouns (5%); true infixed pronouns in relative construction (8%). A discussion of these groups is found below in the discussion of verbal forms in IMP. For the purpose of this discussion on the use of grammatical archaisms in IMP, I have summarised these divisions in the following pie chart:

---

¹⁹² Ibid., 97: 1.280.
¹⁹⁴ A full list of these examples is found below under ‘Verbal Forms’.
This chart displays the frequency with which infixed pronouns, both pleonastic and true, are used in IMP. On the other hand, I have found no examples of infixed pronouns in GSM or SNL, where the independent pronoun is used throughout, for example: *do chuiretar a luing he*;\(^{195}\) and, *ocus do lean Agiolauns iat*;\(^{196}\) in GSM, and: *do mharbh hē isin cath*;\(^{197}\) and, *co tuc dona leanbaibh do bhē maille ris iat*;\(^{198}\) in SNL.

Another characteristic of IMP’s archaic grammar is the use of *fil* instead of *atá* in absolute position. In fact, the more common form of the substantive verb in absolute position in IMP is *fil*, whereas in GSM and SNL the form *atá* is found throughout and *fil* in absolute position is never used. In IMP *fil* is found in absolute position on 78% of instances;\(^{199}\) for example: ¶5 *fil mainster isin crich sin* (121rb2-3), ¶6 *fil crich n-aili innti* (121rb6), and ¶6 *fil cathair oirdndhi innte* (121rb7), whereas *atá* is found in absolute position on 22% of instances, for example: ¶71 *ata clog romhor fora lar* (125ra14), ¶90 *ata taisech dia muintir co n-deich milib lais* (126ra18), ¶116 *ata magh isin crich sin* (127va15). Similarly, *fil* is used in dependent relative position in 78% of instances in IMP, whereas *atá* is used in relative position in 22% of instances, for example: ¶121 *fria h-or in mara ffil si* (128ra2), ¶3 *Glaisia is*\(^{199}\).
cathair oireachais di 7 ar muir ata si (127ra27). On the other hand, in GSM and SNL there are no occurrences of fil in absolute or dependent relative position and atá is found throughout, for example: ata sruth fora lar a mbi moran d’iasgaibh dubha, in GSM, and: ór atáit trí srotha isin flaithimhnus, in SNL. Mac Gearailt has shown that fil in absolute and dependent relative position is also used by Ó Cianáin in the Turas, and is also common in the Book of Leinster versions of the Táin and Cath Ruis na Rígh.

I am aware of three nasalising relative clauses in IMP when the antecedent is the object of the verb of the relative clause, as in Old Irish. In two examples, the verb used is OIr. ailid, t-pret. alt, and in one example the verb is OIr. adraid: ¶89 is forro ro-n-alt iat (126ra9-14), ¶112 is fria galaib ro-n-altad sib (127rb27), ¶23 do Macametus no-n-adhrunn (122rb23-25). The fact that two of these nasalising relative clauses are constructed using the same verb and are almost identical, indicates that ro-n-alt may have been a stock formula taken from an older text. I will discuss in Chapter IV how this recycling of Old and Middle Irish sayings is found elsewhere in IMP. These clauses are pseudo-archaisms in IMP, comparable to Ó Cléirigh’s attempts to reconstruct Old Irish nasalising relative clauses in the Beatha.

1.3. Conclusions

The examples discussed above indicate that archaisms in orthography are reflected by the use of archaic grammatical forms in IMP. Conversely, examples from GSM and SNL show that Early Modern Irish orthography is reflective of Early Modern Irish grammar in these texts. Since all three texts are in the hand of Scribe A, I believe there is a case to be made that variations in orthography in GSM, SNL and IMP do not represent predilections of Scribe A, rather they can be taken as indicators of authorial intention. Therefore, it seems clear that pseudo-archaisms in IMP, whether orthographical or grammatical, are attributable to the author of IMP and are not consequences of the linguistic enthusiasm of the copyist. In this sense, the linguistic

---

200 Hyde, Gabháitais, 8: 96vb20.
201 Mac Niocaill, Sdaire, 100: 1402. 115va11.
203 Thurneysen, Grammar, 317.
204 Strachan, Paradigms, 64.
ventures of the Irish author are comparable to those of Ó Cianáin, whose autograph copy of the *Turas* indicates that archaic grammar was intended by its author,\(^{206}\) and of Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh, who McManus has shown also composed *Beatha Aodha Ruaidh* in a pseudo-archaic linguistic style.\(^{207}\)

Although Ó Gliasáin and Falconer’s analysis of the various manuscript versions of GM and *LSN* suggests that scribes were able to modify both the orthography and the grammar of the texts which they copied, I believe that the contrast of archaic features in the language of IMP and Early Modern forms in the language of *GSM* and *SNL* indicates Scribe A’s regard for the stylistic choices of the authors of these texts.

In Part II of this chapter I will conduct an in depth analysis of the orthography, nominal inflection and verbal syntax in IMP, in order to further understand how the Irish author was stylising the language of his adaptation.

---

\(^{206}\) Ó Macháin ‘Observations’, 201.

\(^{207}\) McManus, ‘Language’, 54-73.
PART II

2. Analysis of Orthography, Nominal System and Verbal Forms of IMP

2.1 Orthography and Phonology

As discussed in Part I, internal variation in orthography is common in the work of Scribe A and has been noticed by Stokes in the Lives, Bugge in CCC and Carey in TB.\(^{208}\) The purpose of the following discussion is to examine the orthography of Scribe A in IMP and compare it to his orthography in other parts of L. I will also compare the orthography of Scribe A to that of the relief scribe who writes on folio 125rb, and to that of other fifteenth-century Irish scribes, in order to discuss the modern linguistic features in IMP as well as the archaisms introduced for stylistic purposes by the author of IMP. Only plene readings reflective of the orthographical and morphological variations are cited.

2.1.1. Vowels

*Short Vowels*

*Iomlat: the interchanging of unstressed syllables.*

Tadhg Óg Ó hUiginn describes *iomlat* in his grammar as *cumhachta a n-áitibh dh’áiridhe in dá ghuthaidhe chaola d’athrughadh a n-áit a chéile 7 na trí ghuthaidhe leathna mar an ccēdna go neamhshoirimeallach.*\(^{209}\) Since this is a common feature of Early Modern Irish orthography,\(^{210}\) found in the *Lives,\(^{211}\) LSN,\(^{212}\) in Flaithri Ó

---


\(^{212}\) Falconer, *Lorgaireacht*, xlix.
Maolchonaire’s *Desiderius*, \(^{213}\) in Seán Ó Murchadhá’s copy of *Parliament na mBan*\(^{214}\) and in the *Turas*, \(^{215}\) to name but a few, I will limit myself to giving only a handful of examples from IMP.

**Short a o u.**

Short *a o u* are interchangeable in unstressed syllables, for example: ¶1 *omhun* (121ra6), beside ¶76 *omon* (125rb10), ¶3 *imat* (121ra30), beside ¶4 *imut* (121ra32), ¶1 *marcus* (121ra21), and ¶1 *marcais* (121ra16).

**ai oi ui.**

Short *ai oi ui* are often interchangeable in unstressed syllables, for example: ¶165 *amhail* (130rb34), beside ¶23 *amhuil* (122rb30). Thus, *-aibh* and *-uibh* are interchangeable as prepositional plural endings, for example: ¶11 *taebhaibh* (121va26), ¶73 *taebhuibh* (125ra26). IMP contains only one example of *-oibh* in unstressed position, in the 3rd sg. perfect indicative ending of *fo-ácaib*: ¶13 *conar fhacoibh* (121vb8). IMP also has examples of spellings of the same form with *-aibh* and *-uibh*, for example: ¶1 *ro fhagaibh* (121ra18-19), ¶83 *ro fhacuibh* (125va25).

**e and i.**

Short *e* and *i* are interchangeable in final syllables, for example: ¶64 *geinnti* (124va23), ¶64 *geinnte* (124va26), ¶134 *prouinse* (128va7), ¶143 *prouinnsi* (129rb1).

**ai and oi in stressed syllables.**

I have found 21 examples of *araili/araile*, namely: ¶32 *araíli* (123ra16), ¶33 (123ra26), ¶38 (123va2), ¶38 (123va7), ¶55 (124ra29), ¶61 (124va6), ¶64 (124va27), ¶83 (125va27), ¶85 (125vb8), ¶85 (125vb13), ¶97 (126rbz), ¶98 (126va16), ¶116 (127va25), ¶124 (128rb2), ¶139 (129ra17), ¶151 (129vb11), ¶156 (130ra11), ¶183 (131va2), beside four examples of *aroili*, namely: ¶10 *aroili* (121va13), ¶113 (127rb28), ¶149 (129va10), ¶149 (129va15). IMP also has 11 examples of the Old Irish neuter adjective *araill*, namely: ¶8 *araill* (121rb30), ¶8 *araild* (121va2), ¶26

---

\(^{213}\) Ó Maolchonaire, *Desiderius*, xvii.  
\(^{214}\) Ó Cuív, *Parliament*, 152.  
Similarly, I have found 17 examples of oiris-, namely: ¶21 oirisium (122rb3), ¶25 (122va12), ¶82 (125va17), ¶121 (128ra3), ¶188 (131vb14), ¶42 oirisimhe (123va23), ¶62 oirisis (124va12), ¶66 (124vb4), ¶133 (128vb4), ¶85 oirisedh (125vb10), ¶91 oirisid (126ra32), ¶107 (127ra7), ¶113 (127rb35), ¶126 (128rb17), beside 13 examples of airis-, namely ¶4 ro airis (121ra35), ¶27 (122vaz), ¶8 airisis (121va1-2), ¶10 (121va19), ¶18 airisius (122ra19), ¶20 airisim (122ra29), ¶32 airisium (123ra5), ¶56 (124rb6), ¶101 (126va32), ¶29 airisit (122vb19), ¶102 (126vb10), ¶116 (127va29), ¶30 airisidh (122vb28).

There is one example of croidhi, namely ¶127 croidhi (128rb22), beside one example of craidhi, ¶7 craidhi (121rb19).

I have found one example of Old Irish spelling traigh, in ¶18 traighed (122ra21). On the other hand, there are two examples of Early Modern Irish troigh, namely: ¶107 x. troighthi fora letheat (127ra4), ¶159 ceatra troigthe fora doiminne (130ra22). There are also two examples of the word troighteach, ‘footman’, namely: ¶55 troightec (124ra38), ¶111 troighhigh (127rb9). I have found no examples of traighthech.

The alteration between oi and ai spellings indicates that the author of IMP was aware of Old and Middle Irish orthography and was incorporating it into his text. However, rather than considering these spellings as evidence for archaic pronunciation during the Early Modern period, I believe they constitute part of an aesthetic element in the pseudoarchaic process in IMP.

ai and et

aile/aili and ele/eli.

I have found 35 examples of the spellings aile/aili, namely: ¶8 aile (121rb34), ¶28 (122vb5), ¶33 (123ra30), ¶35 (123raz), ¶36 (123rb19), ¶47 (123vb7), ¶47 (123vb8), ¶67 (124vb21), ¶67 (124vb28), ¶106 (127vb34), ¶135 (128vb11), ¶140 (129ra26), ¶146 (129rb17), ¶6 aili (121rb6), ¶8 (121rb21), ¶10 (121va10), ¶19 (122ra25), ¶23 (122rb24), ¶35 (123rb7), ¶43 (123va27), ¶47 (123vb5), ¶50 (123vbx), ¶53 (124rb12), ¶63 (124va19), ¶68 (124vb29), ¶72 (125ra24), ¶132 (128va30), ¶136 (128vb17), ¶143 (129ra33), ¶145 (129rb12), ¶150 (129va31), ¶155 (129vb32), ¶172
(130vb11), ¶179 (131rb9), ¶189 (131vb27). On the other hand, I have found 10 examples of the spellings \textit{ele/eli}, namely: ¶79 \textit{ele} (125rb26), ¶96 (126rb26), ¶111 (127rb2), ¶123 (128ra23), ¶149 (129va19), ¶178 (131rb4), ¶187 (131vb5), ¶78 \textit{eli} (125rb20), ¶79 (125rbx) ¶90 (126ra14). I have found no examples of the Old Irish spelling \textit{oile/oili}. By way of comparison, I have found no examples of the spellings \textit{aile/aili} in \textit{GSM} or \textit{SNL}, in which \textit{ele} and \textit{eli} are found throughout. For example: \textit{do ghabhadar righa ele don Fraingc},

\cite{216} in \textit{GSM} and \textit{co cuirdh neach ele dā dhēnamh}.

\cite{217} Of a total 45 instances of the adjective \textit{aile/ele} in \textit{IMP}, the spelling \textit{aile} is found in 29% of examples, \textit{aili} in 49%, \textit{ele} in 18% and \textit{eli} in 4%.

\textit{a and i in pretonic syllables.}

I have found two spellings of Old Irish \textit{indiu} in \textit{IMP}, namely: ¶18 \textit{aniu} (122ra21), ¶173 (130vb18), and ¶169 \textit{inniu} (13va13). Interestingly these spellings also alternate in the \textit{Lives}, for example: \textit{o aniu cu brath},

\cite{218} and \textit{tuc la t do mac inniu}.

\cite{219} By way of contrast neither spellings, i.e. \textit{aniu} or \textit{inniu}, occur in \textit{GSM} or \textit{SNL} which instead have \textit{aniugh}, for example: \textit{na diult dam-sa aniugh},

\cite{220} in \textit{GSM} and \textit{techt a talmhain na hEt āille re n-abar in Lumbaird aniugh}, in \textit{SNL}.

\cite{221} I am not aware of any occurrences of the spelling \textit{aniugh} in \textit{IMP} or the \textit{Lives}. This is another indication of the different linguistic registers employed in \textit{IMP}, \textit{GSM}, \textit{SNL} and the \textit{Lives}.

The preposition \textit{i n-/a n-}, ‘in’, in combination with \textit{a}, either the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. and pl. poss. pron. or the rel. part., occurs as \textit{ina} in 36 instances, namely: ¶11 \textit{ina} (121va22), ¶30 (122vb28), ¶37 (123rb33), ¶49 (123vb15), ¶66 (124vb5), ¶70 (125ra6), ¶72 (125ra23), ¶74 (125ra29), ¶78 (125rb15), ¶91 (126ra30), ¶91 (126ra30), ¶92 (126rb4), ¶92 (126rb7), ¶92 (126rb7), ¶97 (126rb35), ¶97 (126rb36), ¶99 (126va18), ¶100 (126va24), ¶101 (126va28), ¶110 (127ra30), ¶111 (127rb16), ¶122 (12ra16), ¶135 (128vb12), ¶136 (128vb18), ¶137 (128vb33), ¶149 (129va14), ¶150 (129va28), ¶161 (130ra28), ¶169 (130va11), ¶169 (130va13), ¶173 (130vb22), ¶178 (131ra34), ¶178 (131rb2), ¶183 (131va3), ¶186 (131va23), ¶186 (131va30). It occurs twice as \textit{ana}, namely: ¶100 \textit{ana} (126va26), ¶116 (127va19). It also occurs in 31 instances as \textit{na}, showing loss of the pretonic vowel, namely: ¶20 \textit{na} (122ra37), ¶20 (122ra37), ¶20

\cite{216} Hyde, \textit{Gabháltais}, 8.

\cite{217} Mac Niocaill, \textit{Sdair}, 94:155.

\cite{218} Stokes, \textit{Lives}, 12:391.

\cite{219} Ibid., 14:115.

\cite{220} Hyde, \textit{Gabháltais}, 9.

\cite{221} Mac Niocaill, \textit{Sdair}, 92:96.
Similarly, there is one example of *amuigh*, namely: ¶49 *amuigh* (123vb23), besides one example of *immuigh*, namely: ¶91 *immuigh* (126va26).

**ai and a in final position.**

I have found six examples of *ai* replacing short *a* in final position. Three of these are found in the dative of *cúl*, ‘back’, namely: ¶18 *for culai* (122ra18), ¶80 *oo culai* (126ra14), ¶149 *for culai* (129va12). The spelling *for culu* occurs once, namely: ¶65 *for culu* (124va39). The spelling *for cula* is the most common in IMP, occurring in ¶1 *for cula* (121ra6), ¶1 (121ra14), ¶19 (122ra24), ¶20 (122ray), ¶21 (122rb7), ¶24 (122rbz), ¶25 (122va5), ¶25 (122va8), ¶30 (122vb28), ¶30 (122vb34), ¶32 (123ra17), ¶36 (123rb29), ¶50 (123vb28), ¶90 (126ra24), ¶98 (126va15), ¶107 (127ra13), ¶113 (127rb32), ¶133 (128va33), ¶155 (129vb31), ¶183 (131va4).

The fourth example occurs in the spelling *fodai*, namely: ¶26 *fó-s-gebha fasach fodai* (122va13). The spelling is *foda/fota* in all other instances, namely: ¶10 *foda* (121va8), ¶28 (122vb13), ¶42 (123va25), ¶81 (125va5), ¶61 *sithfhota* (124rb36).

The fifth example of *ai* in final position occurs in the spelling of the Old Irish noun *lámdae*, namely: ¶36 *araill dib la druinechus 7 lamhdhai* (123rb15). The forms given in IGT II § 3 are *lámhda* and *lámhdaighi*, however, based on the analogical evidence of *ai* being used in final position for archaicising purposes in IMP, I believe that the spelling *lamhdhai* is an imitation of the Old Irish form *lámdae*, rather than being an example of *ighi > i*.

The sixth example of *ai* replacing short *a* in final position in IMP is found in the spelling of the adjective *órdha*, namely: ¶22 *a n-eilitrumh n-ordhai* (122rb4). In all but one other example of this adjective in IMP, the spelling is *órdha*, namely: ¶61 *dathordha* (124rbz), ¶66 *do litribh ordha* (124vb10), ¶79 (125rb22), ¶79 (125rb23), ¶84 (125va32-33), ¶86 (125vb28), ¶86 (125vb29), ¶90 (126ra22), ¶96 (126rb28), ¶117 (127vb5). The final example of *órdha* in IMP is in the hand of the relief scribe.

---

222 See also the non *plene* spelling 126va27.
who writes ¶79 linaid cuach nó cupa órdadh (125rb30), with the hyper-correct -dh ending. This is an important example since it shows that the relief scribe was pronouncing final -adh as -a, a distinctive feature of spoken Irish of the southern half of the island since the fifteenth-century.  

The spellings fodai and ordhai may represent efforts of the Irish author to replicate the archaic ending -ae/-ai in io-stem adjectives, whereas the spelling culai appears to be a recollection of the Old Irish dative of cūl, which occurs as for caúlæ in the Rule of Tallaght.  Similarly, the spelling lamhdhai appears to be a recollection of Old Irish lamdae, and an indication that the Irish author was imitating orthography which preceded the standards set in IGT. Falconer noticed similar features in the orthography of LSN and suggested that such alterations were ‘recollections of earlier forms’.  

It will be seen below that since length marks are frequently not employed by Scribe A, ai is also used to indicate the diphthong āe, āi, ae, oe (Mod.Ir. ao), as well as to indicate the inflected form of the same diphthong, aei (Mod. Ir. aoi).

ea and e in final position.

The imperfect indicative and past subjunctive passive endings the/te often occur as thea/tea in IMP. I have found 18 examples of endings in -the/-te, namely: ¶12 no berthe (121vaz), ¶12 (121vb1), ¶50 (123vb32), ¶52 (124ra8), ¶15 gia adaighthe (121vb26), ¶15 dia tomhailte (121vb23), ¶16 foa n-adhnaicthe (121vb31), ¶18 dia cuirthe (122ra14), ¶22 no cuirthe (122rb14), ¶26 (122va22), ¶52 no doirtte (124ra8), ¶72 ina taiscthe (125ra23), ¶76 ro gniithe (125rb10), ¶94 do suidhighthe (126rb12), ¶109 dia lamhnaighthe (127ra21), ¶126 cu nach tabairte (128rb15).

Conversely, there are 11 examples of imperfect indicative and past subjunctive passive endings in -thea/-tea in IMP, namely: ¶17 no berthea (121vb38), ¶26 (122va19), ¶26 no brisdtea (122va20), ¶26 no adaighthea (122va21), ¶26 do gnithea

---

223 O’Rahilly, Dialects, 65-66.
224 Thurneysen, Grammar, 225.
226 Falconer, Lorgaireacht, xlix.
There are also 5 examples of the imperfect indicative and past subjunctive passive optional endings\(^{228}\) that/a in IMP, namely: ¶12 do berta (121vax), ¶15 co ndenta (121vb22), ¶25 dia n-dernta (122va9), ¶94 ara canta (126rb10), ¶186 frisa samhalta (131va25). Interestingly, these do not occur as thai/tae in IMP, indicating that the Irish author perhaps felt that replacing a final a with ai, discussed above, was a orthographical technique restricted to the pseudo-archaicising of adjectives and nouns, as in ¶22 a n-eilitrumh n-ordhai, and ¶18 for culai. On the other hand, the fact that final ea is a substitute for e only in the imperfect indicative and past subjunctive passive endings may indicate that the author considered this orthographical variant to be restricted to the enhancement of verbal forms alone, perhaps in imitation of the conjunct preterite passive ending in Old Irish, -thea.\(^{229}\)

\(\text{ea and a alteration in initial position.}\)

I have found one example of \(\text{ea}\) instead of \(\text{a}\) in the spelling of the noun \(\text{eathach}\), which occurs once, namely: ¶187 ilchenala eathachdha (131vaz). This spelling is found in the hand of Scribe A in GSM, adubhairt in t-eathach (102va11), and in the Acallam, in t-eathach a n-deireadh in churaigh (214ra27) and as far as I am aware is the only spelling of the word employed by the scribe. The noun \(\text{eathach/attach}\) is not found in SNL. IGT marks this spelling as lochtach,\(^{230}\) and in the Dinnsheanchas in Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, written in Kilcrea probably during the latter part of the fifteenth century, we find: \(\text{ni ghebat frium athaigh}\).\(^{231}\) Ó Cuív drew attention to alternation between \(\text{ea}\) and \(\text{a}\) in the language of Parliament na mBan.\(^{232}\)


\(^{229}\) Thurneysen, Grammar, 460: cf. -léicthea.

\(^{230}\) IGT II §11.

\(^{231}\) Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, 101vb32. Transcription is my own.

\(^{232}\) Ó Cuív, Parliament, 152.
y in personal and place names.

y is found in personal and place names, such as ¶48 Cublauy (123vb11), ¶49 Cublay (123vb18), ¶89 Baym (126ra5), and ¶112 Niscardyn (127rb19). I am not aware of any examples in IMP of y being used to indicate ui.

Long vowels

The length mark is shown as often as not in the hand of Scribe A. The diphthong ae, M.Ir. ao, occurs as ae àe æi ái úi óe ao, with length marks over either vowel. This may be observed in the following four occurrences of the noun máine, ‘jewel’: ¶177 máine (131ra19), ¶18 máine (122ra18), ¶66 máine (124vb8), and ¶124 for muínibh (128ra34).

There are several examples of doubling of vowels to indicate vowel length in monosyllabic words in IMP, as was common in Middle Irish. I have found five examples of doubling of a, namely: ¶184 mnaa (131va11), ¶17 laa (121vb36), ¶30 (122vb29), ¶98 (126va7), ¶98 (126va12). Doubling of vowels is also found in several examples of placenames, namely: ¶111 prouninds Oraandum (127rb4), ¶111 (127rb6), ¶175 Maabar (130vb34), ¶176 (131ra11), ¶188 (131vb19), ¶170 Buaar (130va30). Similarly, the vowel length of dé, ‘god’, is shown nine times by doubling the vowel, namely: ¶21 dona déeibh (122rb12), ¶37 in dee (123rb30), ¶64 (124va28), ¶110 (127ra30), ¶110 (127ra33), ¶110 (127raz), ¶152 (129vb19), ¶170 (130vay), ¶176 (131ra13). Doubling of e is also found in the personal name, ¶54 Barsceel (124ra23). I am aware also of one example where the length mark is combined with the doubling of the vowel, namely: ¶21 dona déeibh (122rb6). I am aware of one instance where long i combines with short i, namely: ¶23 faiidh (122rb32). Lastly, I am aware of doubling of o to mark vowel length on two occasions, namely: ¶8 goo (121rb32), ¶80 oo culai (126ra14). There is also one occurrence of where the length mark is combined with the doubling of the vowel, namely: ¶186 ba móomh (131va29).

234 Ó Cuív, Linguistic, 8;
236 Excluding the commonplace doubling of a in prepositions fa and la + a (3rd poss. pron. or rel. part).
á and ó alteration.

There are examples of alteration between á and ó in the word anóir. I am aware of two spellings with á, namely: ¶22 co n-anair (122rb15), ¶152 (129vb23). On the other hand, I have found nine spellings with ó, namely: ¶7 anóir (121rb16), ¶7 (121rb17), ¶14 (121vb18), ¶17 (121vb37), ¶105 (126vb29), ¶107 (127ra18), ¶116 (127va21), ¶118 (127vb13), ¶119 (127vb29). The length mark is never shown.

Similarly, the vowel length of the conjunction ór, ‘because’, Middle Irish uair < Old Irish óre and uaire,²³⁷ may have influenced the vowel length of the a in the conjunction ar, ‘because’, < Old Irish air,²³⁸ which is marked with a clear length mark on folio 122va2: ¶122 clódh for cula on t-saebhđligdh fora taithe, ór is a h-imut taeb as dochar h-e, ár ni deimhin la nech acaibh in lais in t-oigbre facbais dia eis (122rbz-122va1-2).

I have found 38 examples of dóibh as the 3rd pl. prep. pron., namely: ¶25 doibh (122va12), ¶27 (122vay), ¶32 (123ra5), ¶32 (123ra9), ¶38 (123va2), ¶46 (123vb1), ¶50 (123vb27), ¶52 (124ra9), ¶53 (124ra11), ¶56 (124rb11), ¶67 (124vb24), ¶79 (125rb33-34), ¶79 (125rb35-36), ¶80 (125va3), ¶85 (125vb13), ¶85 (125vb14), ¶93 (126rb8), ¶98 (126va12), ¶99 (126va20), ¶101 (126va33), ¶101 (126vb1), ¶102 (126vb2), ¶103 (126vb15), ¶104 (126vb26), ¶110 (127ra34), ¶110 (127rb1), ¶112 (127rb22), ¶114 (127va2), ¶115 (127va13), ¶116 (127va22), ¶118 (127vb12), ¶129 (128va5), ¶133 (128va35), ¶149 (129va3), ¶151 (129vb4), ¶171 (130vb2), ¶173 (130vb14), ¶178 (131ra25), but there is only one example of dáihb as 3rd pl. prep. pron., namely: ¶17 daibh (122ra3). The length mark is never shown.

ó ou and oȝ

I have found two examples in IMP of ó being written with the digraph ou. The first example is in the 3rd pl. prep. pron. of laile, namely: ¶147 leou (129rb20), which is found as leo in every other instance: ¶3 leo (121ra30), ¶4 (121ra32), ¶10 (121va9), ¶10 (121va9), ¶12 (121va32), ¶12 (121va33), ¶12 (121va33), ¶12 (121va38), ¶12 (121va38), ¶14 (121vb13), ¶15 (121vb27), ¶24 (122rb6), ¶25 (122va6), ¶26 (122va22), ¶27 (122va32), ¶27 (122va34), ¶27 (122va35), ¶28 (122vb14), ¶29 (122vb17), ¶32 (123ra12), ¶32 (123ra18), ¶33 (123ra27), ¶35 (123rb5), ¶36 (123rb13), ¶36 (123rb13), ¶36 (123rb21), ¶36 (123rb24), ¶36 (123rb28), ¶37 (123rb38), ¶39 (123va8), ¶42

²³⁷ DIL s.v., ‘4 ór,’ accessed 02/01/18 dil.ie/33928.
²³⁸ DIL s.v., ‘2 ar’, accessed 02/01/18 dil.ie/3903.
The second example is in the spelling of the defective verb ol, ‘says’ ‘said’, namely: ¶8 *oul siat* (121rbx), which occurs as *ol* in every other instance: ¶1 *ol* (121ra7), ¶7 (121rb7), ¶8 (121rb32), ¶18 (122ra13), ¶18 (122ra15), ¶18 (122ra16), ¶18 (122ra16), ¶23 (122rb30), ¶24 (122rbz), ¶25 (122va7), ¶28 (122vb11), ¶30 (122vb33), ¶31 (122vbz), ¶31 (123ra3), ¶54 (124ra19), ¶64 (124va29), ¶65 (124va36), ¶65 (124va37), ¶85 (125vb21), ¶98 (126va9), ¶112 (127rb26), ¶118 (127vb13), ¶127 (128rb25), ¶128 (128rb33), ¶164 (130rb23), ¶191 (131vb32), ¶191 (131vby).

I am not aware of any other plene readings of *ou* instead of *ó* in IMP, however there is one example of the noun *nós*, ‘custom’, with the symbol *Ȝ*, namely: ¶96 *d’fhoillsiugud na nóś sin* (126rb20). The noun also occurs as *nos*, namely: ¶96 *nos* (126rb18), ¶96 (126rb31). There are also seven examples of the adverb *beos*, and one example of the later spelling *fos* occurring with the *us* symbol, namely: ¶50 *beoȜ* (123vb28),239 ¶52 (124ra6),240 ¶65 (124va39), ¶66 (124vb9), ¶67 (124vb18), ¶70 (125ra7), ¶107 (127ra19), ¶123 (128ra24), and ¶64 *foȜ* (124va29).244 The plene reading *beos* occurs twice namely: ¶74 *beos* (125ra31),242 ¶152 (129vb18),243 and the plene reading *fos* occurs once, namely: ¶115 *fos* (127va10).

---

239 *b foȜ*.
240 *beoȜ*.
244 *foȜ*.
242 *b fos*.
243 *beos*. 
Caoimhín Breathnach has shown that the symbol ȝ was used by the scribe of Liber Flavius Fergusorum, written during the first half of the fifteenth century, to indicate final -s, -us, and -uis.\textsuperscript{244} In light of the plene readings beos and fos, it is likely that Scribe A was also using ȝ to indicate final -s in IMP.

However, I believe that the plene spellings of ou for ó form part of the linguistic ornamentation in IMP, and have been intentionally inserted in the text as imitations of Old Irish hiatus vowels.

\textit{Combinations of vowels and lenited spirants.}

I am aware of two examples of the spelling taighseat, for taiseach in IMP, namely: ¶78 taighseac (125rb21), ¶79 taighseac (125rby), both in the hand of the relief scribe on folio 125rb. There is also the curious incidence of ¶79 toi[space]seacaibh (figure 1), also in the hand of the relief scribe on folio 125rb, which suggests that a letter was scraped away, perhaps a gh as in the other spellings. The spelling taighseach only occurs in the hand of the relief scribe in IMP, and occurs as taiseach or toiseach, in the hand of Scribe A in the rest of IMP.\textsuperscript{245} It is interesting to consider whether another scribe, perhaps Scribe A, read over the passage copied by the relief scribe and decided to scratch out the gh in this instance, perhaps in order to avoid the repetition of the same spelling three times on the same page. The order of these spellings is in fact ¶78 taighseac, ¶79 toi[space]seacaibh, ¶79 taighseac.

The spelling ¶67 oighri (124vb21), < Anglo Norman (AN) heire, indicates a similar phenomenon to that of taighseach, by which intervocalic gh was being used to indicate vowel length, or as here, diphthongisation, during the Early Modern period.\textsuperscript{246}

Similarly, there is one example of ¶166 do phughdar (130va4), where short u followed by the lenited spirant gh are used to indicate ù. The word is a borrowing from AN pudre or Middle English (ME) poudre/pouder, which had no guttural consonant between the vowel and the d, and already had a long ù at the time of borrowing into Irish.\textsuperscript{247}

\textsuperscript{244} Breathnach, ‘Manuscript’, 137.
\textsuperscript{245} A full list of examples is found below under ‘Diphthongs’.
\textsuperscript{246} McManus, ‘Nua-Ghaeilge’, 352.
A similar phenomenon occurs with dh, which may indicate a lengthening of e in the noun reifeadh, ‘rope’. There is one example of reidhfeadh in IMP, namely: ¶49 is la reidhfeadhuibh sidu ro snadhmtha (123vb22). On the other hand there are two examples of reifeadh, namely: ¶65 reifeadhbaibh (124vb1), ¶92 reifedha (126rb5).

Similarly, the dh in taidhbli, for táible < Lat. tabulae may indicate lengthening of the a: ¶133 taidhbli (128vaz). There is only one occurrence of this word.

Diphthongs

ai oi ui alteration.

The 3rd sg. past indicative of atá, i.e. bai/bui, is represented with both ai and ui, but the length mark is never shown. Bai occurs fifteen times, namely: ¶1 bai (121ra1), ¶7 (121rb13), ¶8 (121rb22), ¶28 (122vb7), ¶60 (124rb28), ¶98 (126va11), ¶99 (126va19), ¶125 (128vb6), ¶129 (128va6), ¶132 (128va25), ¶138 (129ra3), ¶149 (129va15), ¶156 (129vby), ¶156 (130ra5), ¶169 (130va10). The length mark is never shown. Similarly, bui occurs twenty-five times, namely ¶16 bui (121vb30), ¶18 (122ra20), ¶24 (122rb), ¶25 (122va6), ¶28 (122vb5), ¶29 (122vb16), ¶29 (122vb16), ¶29 (122vb20), ¶30 (122vb27), ¶54 (124ra18), ¶59 (124rb27), ¶64 (124va24), ¶68 (124vb31), ¶82 (125va18), ¶85 (125vb15), ¶96 (126rb22), ¶96 (126rb27), ¶112 (127rb22), ¶114 (127va8), ¶117 (127va32), ¶128 (128rb28), ¶132 (128va31), ¶148 (129rb32), ¶151 (129vb8), ¶172 (130vb9), ¶173 (130vb19). The length mark is never shown. On the two occasions when the 3rd sg. past indicative of atá is preceded by the preverbal particle ro, <OIr. perfect indicative, the spelling bui occurs, namely: ¶16 ro bui, ¶28. I am aware of no examples of boí in IMP.

The diphthongs ai and oi alternate in the word taiseach in the hand of Scribe A in IMP, although the length mark is rarely shown. I have found twenty-five examples of taiseach, namely: ¶1 taiseachaibh (121ra1), ¶13 (121vb7), ¶86 (125vb29), ¶94 (126rb10), ¶96 (126rb19), ¶148, ¶23 taiseach, ¶35 (123rb4), ¶61 (124rb37), ¶62 (124vb13), ¶76 (125rb6), ¶76 (125rb7), ¶85 (125vb10), ¶85 (125vb24), ¶89 (126ra3), ¶89 (126ra10), ¶90 (126ra18), ¶94 (126rb12), ¶111 (127rb5), ¶111 (127rb12), ¶130 (128va12-13), ¶172 (130vb8), ¶28 taisigh (122vb7), ¶111 (127rb8), ¶76 taisigh (127rb5). The spelling toiseach occurs nine times, namely: ¶84 toiseachaibh (125va31), ¶85 toiseach (125vb9), ¶128 (128rb28), ¶128 (128rb30), ¶156 (129vb33), ¶156 (130ra5), ¶78 thoisigh (125rb18), ¶91 (126ra29), ¶129 (128va2). See above, in
the discussion of lenited spirants and short vowels, for the occurrence of taighseach in the hand of the relief scribe on folio 125rb.

Similarly, oi and ui alternate in the verb moídid. I have found 3 examples of the spelling with oi, namely: ¶7 cu ro mhoidh (121rb19), ¶61 moíg (124va5), ¶113 moídhit (127rb28-29). On the other hand, I am aware of two spellings with ui, namely: ¶33 muidhis (123ra28), ¶63 muidhis (124va21).

ae oe ao and ái

The diphthong ae, occurs as ae and oe interchangeably in the hand of Scribe A,248 however ae is the more common form. For example, the spelling laech occurs thirty-three times in IMP, namely: ¶23 laech (122rb28), ¶23 (122rb34), ¶29 (122vb16), ¶35 (123rb3), ¶35 (123rb9), ¶51 (123vbz), ¶55 (124ra31), ¶57 (124rb19), ¶60 (124rb29), ¶69 (125ra1), ¶73 (125ra24), ¶76 (125rb6), ¶82 (125va13), ¶92 (126rb2), ¶109 (127ra23), ¶111 (127rb15), ¶121 (128ra8), ¶122 (128ra17), ¶123 (128ra29), ¶126 (128rb21), ¶131 (128va20), ¶135 (128vb15), ¶143 (129rax), ¶156 (129vbz), ¶167 (130va7), ¶183 (131va3), ¶61 deglaech (124rb37), ¶36 laechaibh (123rb17), ¶75 (125rb3-4), ¶114 (127va6), ¶152 (129vb12), ¶40 laechdha (123va11), ¶183 laechdacht (131va8). On the other hand the spelling loech occurs only once, namely: ¶107 loech (127ra5).249

Similarly, the noun taebh, occurs with the form ae forty times in IMP, namely: ¶5 taebh (121rb3), ¶8 (121rb23), ¶12 (121va31), ¶24 (122va1), ¶26 (122a15), ¶33 (123ra20), ¶56 (124rb4), ¶61 (124rb39), ¶61 (124va4), ¶68 (124vb35), ¶77 (125rb14), ¶104 (126vb21), ¶111 (127rb11), ¶111 (127rb19), ¶112 (127rb21), ¶112 (127rb22), ¶117 (127va32), ¶117 (127vb2), ¶127 (128rb23), ¶127 (128rb28), ¶131 (128va17), ¶136 (128vb17), ¶143 (129ra33), ¶168 (130va9), ¶11 taebhaibh (121va26), ¶56 (124rb7), ¶65 (124vb3), ¶73 (125ra26), ¶75 (125raz), ¶84 (125vb4), ¶86 (125vb30), ¶92 (126raz), ¶92 (126rb7), ¶97 (126va2), ¶130 (128va10), ¶134 (128vb10), ¶149 (129va16), ¶75 taebhu (125rb5), ¶94 (126rb11), ¶159 cét míle gacha taebha dhi (130ra23). On the other hand the form with oe occurs seven times, namely: ¶5 toebh (121ra36), ¶77 (125rb11), ¶77 (125rb11) ¶82 (125va19), ¶123 (128ra24), ¶149 (129va15), ¶14 toebuibh (121vb15).

248 Analogous variations in the spellings of Scribe A were noticed by Stokes in his edition of the Lives. See Stokes, Lives, xlvi.

249 lo fh.
The form *ao* is used by Scribe A only in one instance, namely: ¶148 *la naon* (129rb26).

That this digraph was pronounced /e:/ in *aen* is suggested by the alternative form *énn* which occurs in a passage in *GSM* copied by Scribe A, namely: do luidh in ri fa henndia,²⁵⁰ Compare the example of *aen n-dia* in IMP: ¶8 *guighit in t-aen n-dia* (121rb35). I am not aware of any examples of the form *én* in IMP.

The spelling *ao* is the only one employed by the relief scribe on folio 125rb in all renderings of this digraph, namely: ¶79 *laoch* (125rb29), ¶79 *fria a taobhaibh* (125rb23), ¶79 *do gach aon* (125rb32). The spellings *ae* and *oe* are never used by the relief scribe.

I am aware of two forms of the noun *daethan*,²⁵¹ ‘enough’, in IMP, namely: ¶12 *a n-* *daethain fleagh* (125vb1), and ¶166 *a n-dáith* *an bigh* (130va3). This is the clearest example in IMP that indicates that *ái* was being used by Scribe A as an alternative form for *ae*, /e:/²⁵²

The digraph *ái* often occurs without a lengthmark in IMP, making it identical in form to final -*ai* used by Scribe A in *culai*, *fodai*, *lamhdhai* and *ordhai*, and described above. The form *ai* may be used to indicate *ae* in the one example of the Old Irish noun *gae*, ‘spear’, namely: ¶175 *la neach dhibh acht gai 7 sciath* (130vb30). Although no length mark is visible in the manuscript, I believe that this orthography indicates the same sound we find in *dáithan*, discussed above. I am not aware of any examples in IMP of the form *ga*, the main form permitted in IGT beside *gae/gai*.²⁵³

The form *gai* is common in the hand of Scribe A in *GSM*, for example: *do chuaidh gan gai gan arm*.²⁵⁴ I am aware of one occurrence of *ae* in this word in the gen. pl. in *GSM*, namely: *ba hiat lucht na ngaethe*.²⁵⁵ I am also aware of one form in *GSM* with *ai* in the gen. pl., namely: do *fhasatar croinn mhora a premhaibh na ngaithi*.²⁵⁶ Neither have a length mark.

The form *lai*, gen. sg. of *lá*, ‘day’, occurs once in IMP, namely: ¶161 *a tús lai* (130ra30). The same spelling occurs in the hand of Scribe A in *GSM*, namely: *medon*

---

²⁵¹ IGT II §11, 54.6.
²⁵³ IGT II §81, 123.4.
²⁵⁴ Hyde, *Gabháltais*, 22.
²⁵⁵ Ibid., 18, 97vby.
²⁵⁶ Ibid., 18, 98ra5.
I am aware of three different forms of the gen. sg. of lá in GM from the Rennes manuscript, namely: comainm an lái, and, ac fás co meadhon lái 7 ó meadhón láe. These examples illustrate that áei, ái and ae were alternative spellings of the same sound in final position for the scribe in the Rennes manuscript, written in Kilcrea during the last quarter of the fifteenth century. We shall see below that the same alteration of forms is used in IMP.

The trigraph aei is the most common spelling of the diphthong ae when it is followed by a palatal consonant in IMP, for example: ¶12 amhal bud toil la menmanraid gach aein laeich (121va31).

I am aware of only one example of oei in IMP in the noun OIr. saer, which is followed by the noun of opposite meaning OIr. daer, with the spelling oi, namely: ¶94 do shoeiri nó do dhoiri (126rb13).

I have found one example of oi substituting aei, in the adjective naemh, namely: ¶16 ro ghabh baisdeadh na h-eaclasi noime (121vb35). The spellings naeimh and naeimhe, in the gen. sg. masc. and fem. respectively, also occur on two occasions, namely: ¶171 o gheir in daim naeim do chomailt fair (130vb6), ¶1 ac tabhairt mhind na h-eaclasi naeime (121ra18). The length mark is never shown. O’Rahilly observed that pronunciation could vary in poetry, and Ó Cuív has shown that naoimh rhymes with béas and Dé in two quatrains in Parliament na mBan, indicating that aoi was pronounced /e:/ in verse in seventeenth-century Cork, but that naoimhúghdar rhymes with biodh diúlta, indicating the sound /i:/.

I am aware of two forms of the Old Irish num. adj. nó, twice with ai, namely: ¶138 nai (129ra1), ¶142 nai (129ra30). Once with aei, ¶41 nai (123va17). The length mark is never shown.

257 Hyde, Gabháaltais, 12.
258 Ibid., 52.
259 Ibid., 104.
260 Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, 67rb19.
261 Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, 69va31.
262 Cf. O’Rahilly, Dialects, 30.
263 O’Rahilly, Dialects, 28.
265 Ó Cuív, Parliament, 159, 16:479.
I have found two forms of the Old Irish noun cáe, ‘way’, once with ai, namely: ¶8 aenchai (121rb35). Twice with aei, namely: ¶31 for aenchaei (123ra1), ¶56 ar aenchaei (124rb13). The length mark is never shown.

The lack of length marks in any of the examples of the diphthong aei in IMP prevents us from drawing any conclusions as to the pronunciation of naei/nai and caei/cai, since ai can indicate /i:/ as in bai, discussed above, or /e:/ as in dàithan. See also the form of 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. pres. of atá which occurs in GSM: atai dall.\textsuperscript{266}

2.1.2. Consonants

\textit{Nasals}

\textit{nn} and \textit{nd}.

The forms \textit{nd} and \textit{nn} are used interchangeably in both final and medial positions. There are a number of instances where the orthographic variation of \textit{nn/nd} is highlighted by the close succession of the same word spelled in different ways, namely: ¶11 crann gréine ina tuaisceart crand direach esidhe (121va22); and ¶50 no beirthe bainni na lairtheach ngeal sin ... no dhoirteadh maghnus in baindi sin for in raen (123va32-36). It is interesting to consider whether these are deliberate exhibitions of orthographic flexibility on the part of the scribe.

\textit{mm}

\textit{mm} is often used to indicate the lack of lenition on a medial or final \textit{m}. I am not aware of any plene examples of \textit{mm} in IMP, either the first or the second \textit{m} being always indicated by use of the \textit{m} stroke, for example: ¶49 commoradh (123vb18); ¶101 fuaimm (126va36), ¶148 cu ro coimmbriseadh (129va6), ¶181 immat (131rb28). In this respect Scribe A is inconsistent in his orthography and often writes the same words with one \textit{m}, or with one suspension stroke at the end of the word or between the vowels, for example: ¶2 imat (121ra25), ¶61 fuaim (124va9).

\textsuperscript{266} Hyde, \textit{Gabháltais}, 54, 102rb3.
Liquids

rr.

r is often doubled before s, for example: ¶150 doirrsi (129va38), ¶69 don dá ndoirrsib (125ra3), ¶82 don mac ro derrscagh dib (125va12), ¶121 tharrsa (128ra1).

Slender rr and broad rr are interchangeable in: ¶121 earradha (127vbx), ¶103 eirreadha (126vb19). I have not found any other examples.

ll and ld.

I am aware of two examples where ld replaces ll in IMP, namely: ¶8 et rogabsat aariald do na geintibh baisdeadh lasin mirbhuil sin (121va2-3), and ¶117 cluic airgit for in tor naild (127vb6). All other examples of these words have ll in IMP, namely: ¶8 ariall (121rb30), ¶26 (122va15), ¶36 (123rb15), ¶42 (123va22), ¶53 (124ra12-13), ¶61 (124va4), ¶66 (124vb11), ¶68 (124vb35), ¶172 (130vb10), ¶185 (131va15), and ¶8 aill (121va1), ¶11 (121va25), ¶24 (122bx), ¶32 (123ra14), ¶156 (129vb33), ¶183 (131va5), ¶187 (131vax). This feature was noticed by Stokes in the Lives,267 where it appears in the word agallmh three times, namely in Beatha Seanáin: dacalduimh martan cu torinis,268 in Beatha Findéin: luid iar sin finden 7 cathmhael 7 daibhid 7 gillas dagalduimh righ bretain do chuinghidh inaidh reclesa fair,269 and lastly in Beatha Ciaráin: badar on trath co araile andsin ic imacalduim 7 oc denumh an aentadh.270 In the Lives, this Old Irish spelling271 is often found beside the Early Modern Irish spelling agallamh, for example: acalluinm.272 The spelling ld for ll also appears in the third recension of Tochmarc Émire, in British Library MS, Harley 5280: Poi ri aumrau airgedai and Emain Macho fecht n-aild edon Coincopor mac Fauchtnae,273 in the hand of Giolla Riabach Ó Cléirigh, written during the first half of the sixteenth century in Donegal.274 Hamp suggested that this form of fecht n-

267 Stokes, Lives, xlvi.
268 Ibid., 62, 61va12. Transcription is my own.
269 Ibid., 76, 65vb9-11. Transcription is my own.
270 Ibid., 133, f. 81rb32. Transcription is my own.
aild is ‘an archaic form that can be explained only as a survival.’ However, in the case of IMP, it is clear that Scribe A was also able to emulate these older spellings, since IMP must have been written during the Early Modern period. These orthographical archaisms may have been inserted in the text in order to give it a more authoritative tone, and may have added to the appreciation of the text, since it would have rendered it reminiscent of the language and orthography in manuscripts dating from the Old and Middle Irish period.

Another possible explanation of the forms aild and araild is that they reflect the development of lI > ld in East Cork Irish. Ó Cuív collected the following examples from Ballymacoda in the twentieth century: ‘aldas for allas, brohaldax for brothallach, fald for falla, bild’i for buille, kild’i for cuille, faild’i for faille, fg’il’d’in’ for sgilling.’ This development retained the differentiation between lI and l and must have occurred before the seventeenth century, when it was being lost in other Munster dialects. However, in light of the pseudo-archaic tendencies of the author of IMP, and of Ó Cléirigh’s use of the same form during the sixteenth century, it seems more likely that the forms aild and araild were intended as pseudo-archaic ornamentations in the text rather than phonological renderings of dialectal forms.

Labials

f ph p b

p is sometimes used for f in initial or intervocalic position, especially in loan words, for example: ¶2 pronsiscus (121ra21), and ¶6 calipus (121rb9). But, the spelling ¶1 fransiscus (121ra4), is also found. I have found no examples of califus.

I have found three examples of final and medial p being used to indicate b, namely: ¶26 topraibh (122va21), ¶73 (125ra26), ¶191 eascop (131vby). It is also used in every instance of Latin presbiter, namely: ¶28 prespiter (122vb4), ¶28 (122vb9), ¶30 (122vb26), ¶46 (123vb2), ¶98 (126va5), ¶98 (126va7), ¶98 (126va14). However b is also used in two examples of the noun tobar, namely: ¶178 tobair (131ra23), ¶12 tobraibh (121va30). I am aware of no examples where ph is used to indicate bh.

275 Hamp, ‘Fecht n-ail’, 477.
277 Williams, ‘Na Canúnti’, 448.
278 Cf. also in: Quin, Stair, xxxvii; and Stokes, Lives, xlvii.
Gutturals

cc

Medial and final cc is often used to indicate /g/, for example: ¶26 beathadhuigh beacca (122va17), ¶97 Marcus ócc (126rb31). However, cc may also be used to indicate unlenited c, for example: ¶151 accu (129vb4). A similar orthographical feature has been noticed in mm, and discussed above.

ch gh

The alteration between gh and ch in teach/teagh displays variation in permitted orthography rather than a phonological development. They each occur once, namely: ¶50 teach (123vb26), ¶124 teagh (128ra34). Both forms are permitted in IGT.

Dentals

tt

Medial tt is often used to indicate /d/, for example: ¶175 ni fëttar (130vbz). However, tt may also be used for unlenited t, for example: ¶113 remhraitti (127rb33).

Spirants

Slender th and ch alteration in medial position.

I am aware of two examples in IMP which display the coalescing of slender th and ch in medial position. The first of these is cluiche/cluithe, which occurs twice, only with th: ¶12 cluitchheadha (121va32), ¶91 oc feithimh na cleas 7 na cluitchheadh sin (126ra33). The historical form cluiche does not occur in IMP.

The second example is the noun tuaichle/tuaithle and related forms, which occur with -ch- or -th- interchangeably. I am aware of the following examples in IMP:

---

280 IGT II §164.
Slender *th* and *ch* alteration in final position.

I am aware of one example in IMP which displays the coalescing of slender *th* and *ch* in final position, namely the genitive of Old Irish *ní, neich/neith,* which occurs in the following three examples: ¶52 *neich* (124ra4), ¶175 (130vb29), and ¶85 *neith* (125vb14).

-\dhch- -\ghth- \>/h/

The spelling \dhch is used only once in IMP, namely in the spelling of the adverb *coidhche:* ¶8 *coidhche* (121va2). In SNL this same adverb occurs with -\ghth- in the hand of Scribe A, namely: *choighthi* (120va17).282

The spelling -\ghth- occurs in every instance of the noun *oidhche* in IMP, giving *oighthi.*283 The pronunciation of -\ghth- as -h- in unstressed position is revealed by two spellings of the equitative, namely: ¶116 *airdighthir* (127va18), ¶187 *leithighthir* (131vb3), which show unhistoric -\gh-. Compare also the other plene spelling of the equitative in IMP which shows no -\gh-, namely: ¶169 *glainithir* (130va23). This may be an indication of Munster pronunciation, since the unstressed termination -\ghte, in past participle of verbs, had become /i:/ in Northern Irish by the sixteenth century.284

Treatment of Old Irish *gh dh.*

In final and medial position *gh* and *dh* are interchangeable in IMP. The tendency of Scribe A to use *gh* for *dh* and vice versa was also noticed by Stokes in the *Lives.*285

I am aware of three plene examples of the noun *bliadhain,* ‘year’, in IMP, namely: ¶1 *bliadhna* (121ra22), ¶175 (130vb33), ¶27 *bliadhain* (122vaz), besides one plene occurrence of *bliaghain,* namely: ¶85 *bliaghain* (125vb12).

---

283 See below, under *i*-stems, for full list of examples.
284 O’Rahilly, *Dialects,* 207-08.
I am aware of two plene spellings of the noun biadh, ‘food’, in IMP, namely: ¶15 biadh (121vb27), ¶39 biadhaibh (123rb35), besides one spelling of biagh, namely: ¶40 cin bhiagh (123va13).

I am not aware of any plene readings of dh in fleadh,286 ‘feast’, in IMP. There are two examples where -eadh- is an expansion of the symbol 7, Lat. ‘et’, namely: ¶139 fledhughudh (129ra6), ¶181 fleadhaibh (131vb12). All other plene examples occur with gh, namely: ¶12 fon bhfhleaghughudh (121vb3), ¶12 fleagh (121vb1), ¶15 (121vb23), ¶22 fleaghachus (122rb22), ¶84 for in bhfleigh (125va32), ¶88 (126ra1), ¶12 a bhfeagha (121va35), ¶104 (126vb25), ¶166 (130va1), ¶187 (131vb9).

The noun crodh, ‘wealth’, is always spelled crogh in the text: ¶37 do berur crogh do mhathair na h- inghine ár ni tabhar crogh la seitigh i crichuibh na tartruigheach (123va4-6); ¶45 crogh (123va34), ¶45 (123va35). On the other hand, the adjective cródha, ‘brave’, occurs once in IMP, namely: ¶57 croda (124rb16).

The nouns fiadh, ‘tree’ and fiadhbhaidh, ‘forest’, are found as figh and fighbhaidh respectively in IMP: ¶49 figh (123vb14), ¶49 (123vb18), ¶49 (123vb19), ¶113 (127rb33), ¶113 (127rb35), ¶81 fighbhaidh (125va5), ¶101 (126va30), ¶113 (127rbx), ¶132 (128va31), ¶165 (130rb28), ¶95 fighbhuidi (126rb13), ¶121 (127vby), ¶166 (130rbz), ¶166 (130va2), ¶100 dfhighbadaibh (126va25). I have found no examples of these words being spelled with gh.

Slender gh and dh are also interchangeable in intervocalic position, for example: ¶33 toigheacht (123ra20), ¶22 toidheacht (122rb22), ¶28 tartraidhi (122vb10), ¶28 tartraighi (122vb15).

-aí and -adha

There are two plural forms of the noun eascra,287 ‘vessel’, in IMP. The first of these, which occurs only once in the hand of Scribe A, retains historic -aí in the nom. pl.: ¶125 ina taiscthe a cuaich 7 a n-eascrai (125ra23). This plural form does not occur in IGT288 and may be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, this could be another example of archaic orthography in IMP, and be added to the examples of words

286 fledh IGT II §39.
287 DIL s.v., ‘esca’, accessed 02/01/18 dil.ie/20480.
288 IGT II §2: comha, don chomha, méad an chomha, na comha, na comhadha, dona comhuibh, dona comhadhuibh (etc.).
ending in -*ai* in an imitation of Old Irish endings in diphthong -*ae*.\(^{289}\) On the other hand, it could be an example of Early Modern Irish pronunciation of -*adha-* as *ai*.\(^{290}\) The second example in IMP shows the expansion of the plural dental stem ending -*adha-* in the nom. pl. form: ¶52 *na heascradha* (124ra5).

The same variation occurs in the hand of the relief scribe on folio 125rb, ¶79 *eascradha* (125rb27), ¶79 *eascradhaibh* (125rb29), ¶79 *easraibh* (125rb29). Based on the analogical evidence of the pseudo-archaic tendencies of the Irish author, and of his use of the ending in diphthong -*ai* in other words in the text, I believe that *escrâi* is a pseudo-archaic formation rather than a modern feature.

\textit{gh dh th} alteration in medial position.

I am aware of two plural forms of OIr. *tech*, namely *tighe* and *tithe*. I have found three examples of Classical Irish *tighe*, namely: ¶133 *tighi* (128vaz), ¶175 *isna tighibh* (125rb5), ¶183 *dia tighibh* (131va4-5), and one example of *tithe*: ¶92 *ina tithibh* (126rb4).

A similar variation in spelling is found in the plural forms of OIr. *druí*.\(^{291}\) This noun is used only in the plural in IMP, and occurs in seven plene readings. The first form is *draidhe*, which occurs twice: ¶58 *faidhis Cublay a draidhe uadha* (124rb21), ¶164 *fiafraighit dia ndraidhibh* (130rb19). The second form is *draithi*, which occurs four times: ¶32 *do berar a ndraithi dia saighid* (123ra7); ¶32 *triallait na draithi* (123ra17), ¶58 *tecuait na draithi* (124rb25), ¶110 *fiafraight dia n-draithibh* (126ra29). These two forms are permitted in IGT, the second ó *chanamhain*.\(^{292}\) The third form is the historic plural *druí* (<*druïd*):\(^{293}\) ¶32 *luidhset na druíd fora cíthaibh fis* (123ra10). This form is not found in IGT, but it is attested in Middle Irish, for example in the second recension of the *Táin* from the Book of Leinster: is ann luid Mac Con i *n-imaccallaim fria drúid*.\(^{294}\) I believe the spelling *druïd* in IMP is a recollection of the historic plural rather than a representation of final -*idh > -i*.

I am aware of one other word which shows alteration between -*th-* and -*dh-*", namely *teitheadh/teidheadh*. The first spelling occurs twice: ¶55 *teitheadh* (124ra34),

\(^{289}\) Discussed above.
\(^{290}\) Williams, ‘Na Canúintí’, 451.
\(^{291}\) DIL s.v., ‘*druí*’, accessed 02/01/18 dil.ie/18853. IGT II §85.
\(^{292}\) IGT II §85.
\(^{294}\) Dublin, Trinity College MS 1339, 288b37-38. Transcription is my own.
\[101 \text{ cu teithdis} \ (126vaz). \ The \ second \ spelling \ occurs \ once:\ ¶89 \text{ ó nach teidheadh fiadh for bith} \ (126ra11). \ I \ am \ aware \ of \ only \ one \ other \ example \ of \ this \ form, \ which \ occurs \ in \ Leabhar \ na \ hUidhre: \ ro \ theigh \ 7 \ ro \ folaidg \ ria \ german.\] Based on this reading, I have taken the form \textit{teidheadh} in IMP to be an archaism rather than a phonological representation.

Final -\textit{th}

The verbal ending -\textit{th}\footnote{Dublin, Royal Irish Academy MS 23 E 25, 4a6. Transcription is my own.} occurs in the archaic form \textit{at-bath}, ‘he died’, which supplied the narrative tense to OIr. \textit{at-bail}, ‘dies’.\footnote{McCone, ‘An tSean-Ghaeilge’, 87.} I am aware of three examples in IMP, all in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg.: ¶16 \textit{atbath} \ (121vb30), ¶18 \ (122ra8-9), ¶83 \ (125va24-25). This form also occurs in LSN\footnote{Thurneysen, \textit{Grammar}, 408, §758.} and SE.\footnote{Falconer, \textit{Lorgaireacht}, lxxxii, 111:2906.} Final -\textit{th} is retained in four examples of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. imperf. indic. of the substantive verb: ¶32 \textit{no biath} \ (123ra9), ¶58 \textit{no bhiath} \ (124rb22), ¶105 \textit{nac biath} \ (126vb29), ¶124 \textit{do bhiath} \ (128rb1). In seven examples, the later form is used: ¶79 \textit{no bhidh} \ (125r lower marg), ¶84 \textit{no bidh} \ (125vb4), ¶124 \textit{no bhiad} \ (128ray), ¶124 \textit{no bhidh} \ (128rb5), ¶125 \textit{ara mbiadh} \ (128rb9), ¶125 \textit{oca mbiadh} \ (128rb12). Final -\textit{th} appears on two examples of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. imperf. indic. of \textit{do-beir}: ¶96 \textit{do bereth} \ (126rb18), ¶96 \ (126rb19). In the remainder of examples (nine), later -\textit{d(h)} occurs: ¶18 \textit{do bered} \ (122ra17), ¶66 \ (124vb8), ¶66 \ (124vb9), ¶84 \ (125vaz), ¶156 \ (130ra9), ¶175 \ (131ra3), ¶29 \textit{no beredh} \ (122vb22), ¶52 \ (124ra9), ¶66 \ (124vb7). I am aware of one example of final -\textit{th} in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. cons. pres. abs. form of the substantive verb, an unhistoric form: ¶179 \textit{bith} \ (131rb15). In all remaining examples of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. cons. pres. abs. form (eight), historic -\textit{d(h)} occurs: ¶31 \textit{bidh} \ (123ra3), ¶32 \ (123ra18), ¶102 \textit{bidh} \ (126vb11), ¶109 \ (127ra25), ¶165 \ (130rb30), ¶176 \textit{cu mbid} \ (131ra15), ¶179 \ (131rb11).

\textit{mh} and \textit{bh}

The forms \textit{bh} and \textit{mh} alternate in the noun \textit{simhin}, ‘rush’, for example: ¶49 \textit{do boicshimnibh} \ (123vb20), ¶49 \textit{fod gacha sibhne} \ (123vb21), ¶101 \textit{boicshimhne} \ (126va30), ¶101 \textit{boicshibhean} \ (126vay), ¶101 \textit{simne} \ (126va31), ¶101 \textit{simne}
I am not aware of any examples in IMP which display the vocalisation of palatal -mh- and -bh- and lengthening of the preceding vowel, i.e. *ibhi > i:*, as found in Munster Irish.\(^{300}\)

*mh* is found instead of *gh* in the noun *omh*: ¶108 *ni berbhthar feoil isin rigi sin acht salann do chaithimh le omh* (127ra21). However, in the plural the noun appears as *uighi*: ¶175 *feoil beirbhthi 7 uighi 7 rightle* (130vb34-35). The correct historic form is *ogh* or *ugh*, which is also given in IGT.\(^{301}\) IGT does not mention *omh*. I am not aware of any earlier example that displays stressed -*gh* becoming -*/v*/.

I am aware of one example of alternation between intervocalic broad *bh* and *dh* in the pl. noun *Iudhaidhe/Iubhaidhe*, ‘jews’, namely: ¶17 *sin na nIubhaidhe* (122ra1), ¶8 *gu cualatar na hIudhaidhi* (121rb21). The Old Irish noun *ídal*, found in IGT as *idhal* and *iúdhal*, occurs twice in IMP, both with *dh*, namely: ¶1 *idhul* (121ra9), ¶8 *idhuil* (121rby). However, the spelling *iubhul* is found in GSM, also in the hand of Scribe A, namely: *iubhul* (105vb8).\(^{302}\)

*bh* is often written *u* in the noun *probhinnse*, for example: ¶101 *probhinnsi* (126va27), ¶102 *probhinsí* (126vb3), ¶104 *proúnnsí* (126vb21), ¶109 *prouindsi* (126ra22). This same orthographical variation in the noun *probhinnse* was noticed by Quin in *SE*,\(^{303}\) and is common elsewhere, e.g. in the spelling *Siuán* for *Siobhán* in the duanaire of the contemporary Book of Fermoy.

### 2.2. Initial Mutations

**Lenition**

Lenition is marked with a punctum or a suprascript ` over the consonant in the hand of Scribe A in IMP, for example: ¶1 *nisam oṁna-sa* (121ra16), or by adding a *h* to the lenited consonant, for example: ¶2 *con imat cathrach* (121ra26).

---

\(^{300}\) O’Rahilly, *Dialects*, 25.

\(^{301}\) IGT II §30: *ogh, don ugh, méd an uighi, na huighi, dona huighibh, méd na n-uigheadh, méd na n-ugh.*

\(^{302}\) Transcription is my own. Cf. Hyde, *Gabháltas*, 84.

\(^{303}\) Quin, *Stair Ercul*, 237.
Marking of lenition is erratic in grammatical situations where it would be expected, such as following nom. sg. fem., gen. sg. masc., dat. sg., \(^{304}\) nom. pl. o-stem nouns. I am aware of the following examples which display this feature in the nom. sg. fem.: ¶4 \textit{in Airmein mhor} (121ra31), ¶3 \textit{in Airmein beac} (121ra25), ¶146 \textit{inis mhuiridi} (129rb15), ¶159 (129vb28), ¶158 \textit{inis muiridi} (130va16). And in the dat. sg.: ¶117 \textit{dia irghabaila nirt chatha} (127vay), ¶122 \textit{dia n-irghabail a nirt catha} (128ra23).

I am also aware of lenition being marked in the following grammatical circumstances in IMP.

\textit{On a noun in the accusative directly following the verb}

I am aware of only one example in IMP which displays lenition of the accusative (inflected or non-inflected) directly following the verb, \(^ {305}\) namely: ¶32 \textit{luidhset na druidh} (...) \textit{do berat bhoicshimhin n-dimoir leo} (123ra9-12). This example also contains the correct Classical use of the accusative followed by nasalisation. \(^{306}\) In all other instances in IMP of an accusative directly following the verb, of which I am aware, lenition is not shown: ¶1 \textit{in neach nach guighfe caithfidh calma a chuirp fria clodh} (121ra15), ¶14 \textit{do berat dorcha for dreich gréne} (121vb12), ¶115 \textit{na tartraighidh immorro} (...) \textit{cu tucsat saeire} (127va11), ¶130 \textit{do tucsat celmhaine na n-druadh} (128va13-14), ¶137 \textit{do ronsat palas rigda for loch} (128vb27), ¶179 \textit{ni benuit crann na duille} (131rb10), ¶179 \textit{ni chanuit gó tria bhithu} (131rb6), ¶148 \textit{nar fhaelsat braen dia cru} (129rbx).

\textit{Initial consonant of a verb in the relative.}

Lenition is often marked on the first consonant of the relative form of the verb in IMP, \(^{307}\) for example: ¶1 \textit{ár gidh scéla ainscristaidhi fhaisneighter sunn} (121ra11).

---

\(^{304}\) IGT I §157. Mac Cáithnaigh, \textit{Art}, 146-47.
\(^{305}\) IGT I §81; McManus, ‘Nua-Ghaeilge’, 356;
\(^{306}\) IGT I §187: Mac Cáithnaigh, \textit{Art}, 147-49.
Nasalisation

Nasalisation is not always marked in the text, however it is commonly found on g, d, b and vowels, for example: ¶12 do ronta palas rigda lais a n-glind dithoghlaidhi for sliabh urard, co neimh n-oir fair (121va27-30), ¶16 ro creid do Choimdhidh na n-dul (121vb34), ¶19 co n-imat cloch m-buadh (122ra26). Nasalisation is marked on two occasions on a c by a preceding g, namely ¶167 iar gcur (130va5), and ¶169 a gcaithuibh (130va8). Furthermore, reduplication of liquid consonants l and r occurs in a number of instances under the influence of nasalisation, namely: on l in three instances, ¶92 a llin (126rb2), ¶115 i llogh (127va12), ¶151 i lliu (129vb7), and on r on one instance, namely ¶191 i rraibhe (131vb31).

As indicated in IGT, nasalisation occurs on an adjective in IMP after the acc. sg. (following a preposition that takes the accusative) and gen. pl. noun, for example: ¶182 for in muir n-Indeagda sin (131rb31), ¶180 immat leomhan n-dubh isin crich sin (131rb22). I have found no examples of nasalisation being used to mark the direct object after the acc. sg. article, as was the norm in Old Irish.

Nasalisation is also marked in the following grammatical situations.

Calcified Old Irish neuter

Nasalisation is calcified following the OIr. nom. sg. neut. noun tîr, in: ¶10 tîr n-aili fora hor gu righ fuirr (121va10). However, the prepositional pronoun fuirrì, indicates that the noun was considered feminine, as does lenition following the noun in the nom. sg. in: ¶162 tîr shleibhtighi (130va33). Nasalisation also follows the masculine noun ceolán, ‘bell’, in ¶90 ceolan beag n-ordha for cois gacha sebhac dibh (126ra22). These may be examples of attempts at pseudoarchaic reconstructions of Old Irish neuter nasalisation in the nominative. Conversely, nasalisation in tîr n-

309 Thurneysen, Grammar, 148.
aili, and ceolan beag n-ordha, sentences which have no verb in the main clause, may be caused by the analogical pressure of sentences in IMP which begin with the substantive verb fil in absolute position, which was followed by the accusative in Old Irish and Classical Irish.\textsuperscript{310} For example: ¶6 fil crich n-aili innti (121rb6), ¶8 fil cathair n-aili isin crich sin (121rb21).

\textit{Accusative of time}

Traces of the accusative of time\textsuperscript{311} are commonly found in certain expressions, such as: ¶148 la n-aon (129rb26), ¶17 laa n-aen (121vb36), ¶156 feacht n-aill (129vb33), ¶191 feacht n-aen (131vb30). These expressions meaning, ‘one day’, ‘on one occasion’ or ‘on another occasion’, are common in Early Modern Irish narrative, and are also found in Céitinn.\textsuperscript{312} The expression là n-aon is found a total of six times in IMP, namely: ¶8 laithi n-aen (121rb24), ¶17 laa n-aen (121vb36), ¶30 (122rb29), ¶98 (126va7), ¶98 la n-aen (126va12), ¶148 (129rb26), while là aon and là éigin do not occur. The expression laithi aighrithi is used once in IMP, as an accusative of time but without nasalisation on aighrithi, namely: ¶116 aes na criche... ticit laithi aighrithi (127va21). The expression feacht n-aill is used twice in IMP, namely: ¶24 feacht n-aill (122rbx), ¶156 feacht n-aill (129vb33). The expression fecht n-aen is found once, namely: ¶191 feacht n-aen (131vb30), while feacht aill and feacht aen are absent. In contrast, the expression là n-aon is never found in GM. Instead, Ó Mathghamhna uses là éigin.\textsuperscript{313} Similarly, the expression feacht n-aill is used once in the copy of GM found in R,\textsuperscript{314} whereas in E it is replaced by uair éigin.\textsuperscript{315}

\textsuperscript{310} Ibid., 479: IGT I §129. Mac Cárthaigh, \textit{Art}, 130-31. For a discussion of this use of fil in IMP see ‘Verbal Forms’ below.
\textsuperscript{311} Thurneysen, \textit{Grammar}, 157.
\textsuperscript{312} Bergin, \textit{TBg}, 10 and 444.
\textsuperscript{313} Stokes, ‘Maundeville’, 234.
\textsuperscript{314} Ibid., 236.
\textsuperscript{315} Ó Gliasáin, \textit{Scéal}, 25.
Nasalising relatives

I am aware of three nasalising relative clauses in IMP when the antecedent is the object of the verb of the relative clause.\textsuperscript{316} In two examples the verb used is OIr. \textit{ailid}, \textit{t}-pret. \textit{alt},\textsuperscript{317} and in the third it is OIr. \textit{adraid}:

\begin{quote}
\textsection 89 In ri diüi cu maithibh a righ 7 a thaisech \textit{for} tulaigh aird oca feithimh samlaíd\textit{h} 7 leomhuin \textit{for} cuanairt lais o \textit{nach} teidheadh fiadh \textit{for} bith na \textit{anmann} eceann	extit{us} archena or is forro \textit{ro-\textit{n}}-alt iat. (126ra9-14)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsection 112 is fria galaib \textit{ro-\textit{n}}-alta\textit{d} sib. (127rb27)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsection 23 do Macametus \textit{no-\textit{n}}-adhrum. (122rb23-25)
\end{quote}

The fact that two of these nasalising relative clauses are constructed using the same verb and are almost identical, indicates that the phrase may have been a stock formula taken from another text. I will discuss in Chapter IV how this is a common feature of the Irish author of IMP. In all three cases these clauses are pseudo-archaisms in IMP, comparable to Ó Cléirigh’s attempts to reconstruct Old Irish nasalising relative clauses in the \textit{Beatha}.\textsuperscript{318}

I am not aware of any examples of nasalising relative clauses in IMP when the antecedent designates the time at or during which the content of the relative clause takes place.\textsuperscript{319} I am aware of only one example, in the hand of the relief scribe, of lenition being marked after the temporal conjunction \textit{cein}, namely: \textsection 79 \textit{in cen bhis Cublay for a chuid} (125rbz).

\textsuperscript{316} Thurneysen, \textit{Grammar}, 317.
\textsuperscript{317} Strachan, \textit{Paradigms}, 64.
\textsuperscript{318} McManus, ‘Language’, 64-65.
\textsuperscript{319} Thurneysen, \textit{Grammar}, 316.
2.3. Nominal Inflection

Methodology

The following paragraphs will discuss certain features of the nominal system in IMP, which draws on elements from Old Irish, Classical Irish and Early Modern forms. In order to best picture the range of linguistic forms used by the author of IMP, I have arranged paradigms of the nouns under discussion and aligned their inflection as occurs in IMP with their corresponding declensions in IGT to represent Classical Irish, and in Thurneysen’s *Grammar of Old Irish* and DIL to represent Old Irish. This allows for a visualisation of the extent to which the Irish author was blending archaic language with Classical and Early Modern forms in IMP. A number of nouns in IMP fluctuate in gender and draw on more than one declension, as expected in Early Modern and Classical Irish. In order to display this I have arranged a number of paradigms which reflect the multiple declensions found in IGT and aligned them with the paradigm of the noun from IMP.

Each example in IMP has a footnote with my transcription from L of the passage which contains the nominal form in question. In the following paradigms the forms from IMP are found in the right column, with my transcriptions and corresponding paragraph number from Stokes’s edition in the footnotes; Old Irish forms are found in the left column, and Classical forms in the middle. In paradigms which show two Classical Irish forms, these are arranged in the left and middle column, and the declension in IMP in the right column.

---

As expected in Classical Irish, *u*-quality is shown in the dat. sg. of the following *o*-stem nouns in IMP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT/CNOC/CORP/LORG/GORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Irish</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nouns, such as *corp*, which resisted *u*-quality in Old Irish have been generalised to take *u*-quality in IMP and in Classical Irish. The inflection of these nouns shows allignment between IGT and IMP, but there is also the example of ¶113 *fora lorg* (127rb35), which displays loss of *u*-quality as in Middle and Early Modern Irish.

The presence of *u*-quality in monosyllabic *o*-stem nouns is a common feature of Early Modern Irish prose and is found in Ó Maolchonaire’s *Desiderius*, who also has dat. sg. *corp*, \(^{331}\) and in *LSN*, which contains dat. sg. forms *sceol* and *neoll*. Williams has suggested that although dat. sg. masc. forms were still being used during

---

\(^{321}\) 122ra31: ¶20 conid air sin is port airisim da gach aen.

\(^{322}\) 125ra25: ¶73 lubghuir.

\(^{323}\) 129ra25: ¶140 ria chorp.


\(^{325}\) 121vb31: ¶16 a cnuc.

\(^{326}\) 127vb32: ¶120 dia churp.

\(^{327}\) 127vb18: ¶118 fora lurg sin.

\(^{328}\) 127rb35: ¶113 fora lorg.

\(^{329}\) 128ra4: ¶121 in phuirt.


\(^{331}\) Ó Maolchonaire, *Desiderius*, xxiv, 43:1217.


the seventeenth century these reflected orthographical norms rather than Early Modern pronunciation.\(^{334}\)

I am aware of only two examples of \(u\)-quality occurring after a high vowel in the dat. sg. in IMP, namely: ¶9 \(dá\ cét\ punt\ for\ each\ n-eoch\) (121va6). This is the dat. sg. form found in IGT.\(^{335}\) The full paradigm of this noun is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Irish</th>
<th>IGT §171</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>ech</td>
<td>eich</td>
<td>each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>ech</td>
<td>eochu</td>
<td>each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>eoch</td>
<td>echaibh</td>
<td>don eoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>eich</td>
<td>ech</td>
<td>méd an eich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, \(u\)-quality is shown on the dat. sg. of the indef. pron. \(neach\) in three instances, namely: ¶21 \(do\ neoch\) (122rb6), ¶48 (123vb9), ¶52 (124ra4). I am also aware of one example of the nom. sg. form following the preposition \(for\), namely: ¶119 \(for\ neach\ dhe\) (127vb29).

OIr. dat. sg. \(neurt\),\(^{343}\) nom. sg. \(nert\), is not attested in IMP, instead we find five examples of \(nirt\ (=niort)\): ¶7 \(a\ nirt\ chatha\) (121rb13), ¶117 (127vay), ¶122 (128ra23), ¶127 (128rb27), ¶156 (129vby). I am not aware of any use of the nom. sg. form \(nert\) in the dat. sg. in IMP.

\(^{334}\) Williams, ‘Na Canúintí’, 450.
\(^{335}\) IGT II §171.
\(^{336}\) 130vb32: ¶175 each.
\(^{337}\) 131vb6: ¶187 eich.
\(^{338}\) 126rb25: ¶96 in t-each.
\(^{339}\) 127rbx.
\(^{340}\) 121va6: ¶9 for each neoch. Cf. also ¶121 dh’eoch. 128ra8.
\(^{341}\) 127rb31: ¶113 fora naghaidh dia echaibh.
\(^{342}\) 123va13: ¶40 a n-each.
\(^{343}\) Thurneysen, Grammar, 107: IGT II §65.
OIr. dat. sg. *ciunn*, nom. sg. *cenn*, is not attested in IMP, instead we find two examples of *cinn/cind* (= *cionn*), which is an alternative OIr. form and the form which occurs in IGT.\(^{344}\) ¶61 *os cinn na curad* (124va2), ¶96 *fora cind* (126rb26). I am also aware of one example of the nom. sg. form being used after *for*, namely: ¶55 *faidhis teachta for ceann a laech* (124ra31).

There are two dat. sg. forms of *gleand* in IGT, namely *don ghlionn* and *don ghlind*,\(^ {345}\) but only the second one of these is attested in IMP. It occurs three times, namely: ¶12 *a n-glind* (121va28), ¶15 *isin glind* (121vb21), ¶178 (131rax).

I am also aware of three examples in IMP where *u*-quality is shown in the gen. sg. of *o*-stem nouns in IMP, namely: ¶68 *a bh-faicsin neoil* (124vb32), ¶79 *na cairchi ciuil* (125rb34),\(^ {346}\) ¶162 *imat gacha ceneoil napad* (130rb5).\(^ {347}\) There is also one example in the nom. sg.: ¶187 *beoil leathna* (131vb3).\(^ {348}\)

### Fluctuation in gender and mixed declensions

Gender fluctuates in the inflection of a number of nouns in IMP, as reflected in IGT.\(^ {349}\) Following is the paradigm of *loingius*, which inflects both as an *o*-stem and as a *ā*-stem in the gen. sg. in IMP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOINGIUS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IGT §53 (masc.)</td>
<td>IGT §54 (fem.)</td>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>loingeas</td>
<td>na loingis</td>
<td>na loingsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>loingeas</td>
<td>tug loingsi</td>
<td>loinges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>don</td>
<td>dona</td>
<td>don loingis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{344}\) Thurneysen, *Grammar*, 177.
\(^{345}\) IGT II §66.
\(^{346}\) Cf. IGT II §75: reóidh, don riúd, don reódh, méid an riúidh, méid an reóidh, na riúidh, na reóidh, dona reódaibh méid na reódh, féich riúdha 7 reóda.
\(^{347}\) 130rb5.
\(^{348}\) 131vb3.
\(^{350}\) 128vb11: ¶134 is lia do loingius do imat srotha in beatha.
\(^{351}\) 128ra15: ¶122 loingis in righ.
\(^{352}\) 129va13: ¶149 gu ro clodhsat *for* culai *cusin loingius* doridhisi.
There are two gen. sg. of loingius in IMP, namely o-stem loingis and ā-stem loingsi, indicating that the Irish author was inflecting this noun both as masculine and feminine in the text.

Another noun with composite inflection is dorus, ‘door’, which occurs in IGT §54 beside loingeas. It forms its nom. pl. as a u-stem: ¶150 osluicid aes na cathrach na doirrsi (129va). However, the gen. pl. u-stem + adh form doirrseadh is not attested in IMP, and instead we find gen. pl. o-stem form dorus: ¶77 ac gabàil na ndorus (125rb14), as permitted in IGT.

Fluctuation in gender is also found in the inflection of taebh, which inflects as a u-stem in the gen. sg., ¶96 shaeri gacha taebha (126rb12), ¶159 cét mile gacha taebhá dhí (130ra23), and in the dat. sg., ¶8 don taebh anaillí (121rb23), but also as an ā-stem in the dat. sg., ¶66 don taeibh arailí (124vb11). In the acc. sg. we find taebh: ¶111 fria taebh (127rb19), ¶112 (127rb21), ¶112 (127rb22), ¶131 (128va13), ¶136 (128vb17), ¶143 (129ra33). This also reflects the forms in IGT, which are displayed in the following table, with the forms that occur in IMP highlighted in bold:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IGT §38 - masc.</th>
<th>IGT §39 - fem.</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>taebh</td>
<td>na taeibh/</td>
<td>taebh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>taebh</td>
<td>iar taebha</td>
<td>taeibh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IGT §38 - masc.</th>
<th>IGT §39 - fem.</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>taebh</td>
<td>na taeibh/</td>
<td>taebh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>taebh</td>
<td>iar taebha</td>
<td>taeibh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

353 129va16: ¶149 buailís in ainbhthine forbha in loingis fria taeibaibh 7 tractaibh na hinnis.
354 129va21: ¶149 tiaghait trícha mile don t-slogh loingsi sin.
355 124vb11.
356 IGT II §38: trágh f., don trágh, méd an trágh, méd an trágha, na tráigh, na trágha, dona tра́ghаibh, méd na trágha, iar trágha. IGT II §39: trágh, .b. don tráigh, méd na tráighe, na trágha, dona tráighaibh, méd na trágha, iar trágha.
357 127rb11: ¶112 fria taebh.
Fluctuation in gender is also seen in the inflection of *cathair*. This form is the only one found in IMP, but is marked *lochtach* in IGT.\(^\text{361}\) In the nom. sg. we find *cathair*: ¶3 *Glatisia is cathair oirechais di* (121ra27). In the gen. sg. and pl. we find *cathrach*: ¶11 *co nimat duinti 7 cathrach* (121va19), ¶148 *for aes na cathrac* (129vb34). In the dat. sg., both *cathair* and *cathraigh* are attested: ¶139 *don chathair sin* (129ra19). ¶8 *bai sliabh urard frisin cathraigh sin* (121rb23). This declension is the same as in IGT which has: *caithir, don chaithir, don chaithrigh*.\(^\text{362}\)

The noun *talamh* is inflected as a masculine noun in the gen. sg. in two examples, namely: ¶58 *fria licuibh 7 tuinnidhibh in talmhan* (124rb24); ¶148 *do lorcuibh 7 tuinnidhibh in talman forro* (129va5). Its gender is also revealed by the use of the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) sg. masc. poss. pron. *a* to refer to it in: ¶25 *do beanfadh in talamh a thoirthi forin* (122va6). However it also inflects as a gen. sg. nasal stem noun in one example, namely: ¶135 *cathair na talmhan* (128vb16). This is also reflected in IGT.\(^\text{363}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dat.</th>
<th>don taeibh</th>
<th>dona taebhaibh</th>
<th>dona taebhaibh</th>
<th>taeibh(^{\text{359}}) / taebibh</th>
<th>taeibhaibh(^{\text{360}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mèd an taeibh</td>
<td>mèd na taeibh</td>
<td>mèd na taeibh</td>
<td>taeibh</td>
<td>taebhaibh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dat.</th>
<th>don taeibh</th>
<th>dona taebhaibh</th>
<th>dona taebhaibh</th>
<th>taeibh(^{\text{359}}) / taebibh</th>
<th>taeibhaibh(^{\text{360}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>mèd an taeibh</td>
<td>mèd na taeibh</td>
<td>mèd na taeibh</td>
<td>taeibh</td>
<td>taebhaibh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fluctuation in gender is also seen in the inflection of *cathair*. This form is the only one found in IMP, but is marked *lochtach* in IGT.\(^\text{361}\) In the nom. sg. we find *cathair*: ¶3 *Glatisia is cathair oirechais di* (121ra27). In the gen. sg. and pl. we find *cathrach*: ¶11 *co nimat duinti 7 cathrach* (121va19), ¶148 *for aes na cathrac* (129vb34). In the dat. sg., both *cathair* and *cathraigh* are attested: ¶139 *don chathair sin* (129ra19). ¶8 *bai sliabh urard frisin cathraigh sin* (121rb23). This declension is the same as in IGT which has: *caithir, don chaithir, don chaithrigh*.\(^\text{362}\)

The noun *talamh* is inflected as a masculine noun in the gen. sg. in two examples, namely: ¶58 *fria licuibh 7 tuinnidhibh in talmhan* (124rb24); ¶148 *do lorcuibh 7 tuinnidhibh in talman forro* (129va5). Its gender is also revealed by the use of the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) sg. masc. poss. pron. *a* to refer to it in: ¶25 *do beanfadh in talamh a thoirthi forin* (122va6). However it also inflects as a gen. sg. nasal stem noun in one example, namely: ¶135 *cathair na talmhan* (128vb16). This is also reflected in IGT.\(^\text{363}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TALAMH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGT §19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{\text{358}}\) 125rb5: ¶75 *fria taebhiu.*

\(^{\text{359}}\) 121rb23.

\(^{\text{360}}\) 125vb30: ¶186 *for culaibh 7 taebaibh in tighi.*

\(^{\text{361}}\) IGT II §120.

\(^{\text{362}}\) IGT II §120. Despite this prohibition forms based on *cathair* occur from time to time in Classical poetry.

\(^{\text{363}}\) IGT II §17 also shows *talamh* with *o*-stem inflection.
Fluctuation between masculine and feminine gender in another early neuter is found in the noun *tir*, as indicated in IGT.\textsuperscript{364} In one example *tir* nasalis the following adjective in the nom. sg., in pseudoarchaic reconstruction of the neuter, but feminine gender is expressed by the 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. fem. prep. pron. *fuirre*: ¶10 *tir n-aili fora h-or gu righ fuirre* (121va10). The following adjective is lenited in another example: ¶162 *tir shleibhtighi* (130va33). In the gen. sg. it takes the masculine article in: ¶118 *for loscudh 7 innreadh an tiri* (127vb8). In the dat. sg.: ¶121 *isin tir sin* (128ra7). I am aware of two examples of the dat. pl. form ¶90 *a tiribh ciana* (126ra21), ¶90 (126ra24). All other plural forms of *tir* are found in the compound *iltir*, for example in the gen. pl.: ¶162 *is anorach la righaibh na n-iltire* (130rb9). Two dat. pl. forms occur in IMP, namely, *iltiribh* and *iltiribh*: ¶188 *fria h-iltiribh* (131vb18), ¶162 *beruit iat dia creic a n-ilthirthaibh* (130rb7). The following table aligns the forms found in IGT with those which occur in IMP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIR</th>
<th>IGT §45 (masc. and fem.)</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| nom. | *tir* | *na tīre* | *tir n-\textsuperscript{365}/ tīr\textsuperscript{L 366}*
| acc. | | *fēch thīre* |
| dat. | *don tīr* | *dona tīribh* | *tīr\textsuperscript{367}*/ *iltiribh\textsuperscript{368}/ *ilthirthaibh\textsuperscript{369}/ *tīribh\textsuperscript{370}*
| gen. | *mēd na tīre/ mēd an tīre* | *mēd na tireadh* | *an tīr\textsuperscript{371}*/ *na n-iltīre\textsuperscript{372}*

The dat. pl. form *ilthirthaibh* probably reflects a spoken form which displays the advancement of strong dental endings as distinctive plural forms during the late Early

\textsuperscript{364} IGT II §45.
\textsuperscript{365} 121va10.
\textsuperscript{366} 130va33.
\textsuperscript{367} 128ra7.
\textsuperscript{368} 131vb18.
\textsuperscript{369} 130rb7.
\textsuperscript{370} 126ra21.
\textsuperscript{371} 127vb8.
\textsuperscript{372} 130rb9.
Modern period, but are given as lochtach in IGT: tri tírthi san n-ágh úaighfe. The expansion of strong dental endings will be discussed under the next heading.

**Formation of new plural forms**

**-adha**

There are two plural forms given for of io- and iā-stems in IGT, namely -a and -adha. Both of these are attested in IMP. The following table compares the inflection of OIr. io-stem escrae, with its declension in IGT and its forms in IMP. I have also added a number of other nouns which follow the same inflection pattern as escra in IGT, and which will be discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EASCRA</th>
<th>Old Irish</th>
<th>IGT §2</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>escrae</td>
<td>escrai</td>
<td>escra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>escrae</td>
<td>escru</td>
<td>escra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>escru</td>
<td>escraib</td>
<td>donsgra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

373 Ó Cuív, Páirliamint, 161.
374 IGT II §45.
375 Thurneysen, Grammar, 179.
376 125vb34: ¶87 escra.
377 125rb22: ¶79 no bhi tunna ordha.
378 125ra23: ¶125 ina taiscthe a cuaih 7 a n-eascrai.
379 124ra5: ¶52 na h-eascradh.
380 125rb23: ¶79 ceithri tunna ordha.
381 121va32: ¶12 cluitheadha 7 cleasa imdha leo.
382 126rb5: ¶92 reifedha.
383 125rb27: ¶79 cosna tunnaibh.
384 124vb1: ¶65 do cheangal do reifeadhbhaibh 7 fonnsaidhibh.
The phonological reduction of unstressed vowels to /ǝ/ during the Middle Irish period caused the distinctive inflectional endings of *io*-stem nouns to coalesce, which in turn led to a restructuring of the nominal sector. The new distinct plural form -*adha-* was derived from acc. pl. forms of nouns ending in -*d*. As was mentioned above, in the discussion of orthography and phonology of IMP regarding the forms -*adha-* > -*ai-* , two nom. pl. forms of the noun *eascra*, 'vessel', are attested in IMP, namely Classical Irish: ¶52 *na h-eascradha* (124ra5), and Old Irish: ¶125 *eascrai* (125ra23). I have argued above that *eascrai* shows how the Irish author was emulating OIr. -*io* stem nom. pl. endings in -*ai*, which became /ǝ/ during the Middle Irish period due to the phonological erosion of unstressed vowels. The author of IMP uses this Old Irish orthography in five other instances in the text: ¶18 *for culai* (122ra18), ¶80 *oo culai* (126ra14), ¶22 *a n-eilitrumh n-ordhai* (122rb4), ¶26 *fo-s-gebha fasach fodai* (122va13), ¶36 *araill dib la druinechus 7 lamhdhai* (123rb15). I believe these examples provide analogical evidence for the author’s tendency to use Old Irish -*ae* endings in IMP. Gray noticed a similar feature in the forms used in *Cath Maige Tuired*, written during the first half of the fifteenth century by Gilla Riabach Ó Cléirigh.

Conversely, if *eascrai* were evidence of a phonetic form of *eascradha*, it would be the only such form in IMP of which I am aware. In fact, this dental ending is consistently found as -*adha-* or -*aidhi-* in IMP. O’Rahilly and Ua Súilleabháin have shown that the Middle and Early Modern Irish tendency to alternate palatal and non-

---

385 125vb28.
386 128vb32.
387 126ra33: ¶91 *oirisid fein na shuidhi oc feithimh* na cleas 7 na cluithedh sin.
389 IGT II §2.
palatal gh (/ɣ/) after a (ai)\(^\text{392}\) gave rise to /ɔi/ in stressed syllables and /i:/ in unstressed syllables.\(^\text{393}\) This process of palatalisation of medial /ɣ/ is seen in the dat. pl. forms ¶65 fonnsaidhibh (124vb1) and ¶86 ceansaidhibh (125vb28) in IMP. On the other hand the tendency to retain broad /ɣ/ in -adha- is seen in dat. pl. form ¶137 seomradhuibh (128vb32).

Middle Irish reduction of unstressed vowels to /ə/ made the sg. and pl. forms of io- and iä-stem nouns indistinguishable, however they were still in use in Classical Irish and are represented in IGT.\(^\text{394}\) The use of nom. pl. tunna after the num. adj. cethri and of dat. pl. tunnaibh indicates that Old and Classical Irish plural forms ending in -a were also being used by the author of IMP.

There are three nom. pl. forms of OIr. druï\(^\text{395}\) in IMP. This noun is used only in the plural in IMP, and occurs in seven plene readings. The first form is the historic plural druid, (druid, druid),\(^\text{396}\) which occurs once: ¶32 luidhset na druidh fora cliathaibh fis (123ra10). This form is not found in IGT, but it is attested in Middle Irish, for example in the second recension of the Táin from the Book of Leinster: is ann luid Mac Con i n-imaccallaim fria druí.\(^\text{397}\) I believe the spelling druid in IMP is a recollection of the historic plural rather than a representation of final -idh > -i. The second form is draidhe, which occurs twice in IMP: ¶58 faidhis Cublay a draidhe uadha (124rb21), ¶164 fiafraight dia ndraidhibh (130rb19). The third form is draithi, which occurs four times: ¶32 do berar a ndraithi dia saighid (123ra7), ¶32 triallait na draithi (123ra17), ¶58 tecuit na draithi (124rb25), ¶110 fiafraghit dia ndraithibh (126ra29). These last two forms are permitted in IGT, the second ó chanamhain.\(^\text{398}\)

Plural forms in -adha- also occur on two i-stem nouns in IMP, namely OIr. inis and sétig, which are displayed in the following paradigms. The OIr. forms of inis which Thurneysen does not list have been completed with examples from Old Irish Glosses listed in DIL, the references to which are found in the footnotes. Since sétig does not occur in IGT, I have compared the forms in IMP with the declension given by Thurneysen.

\(^{392}\) O’Rahilly, *Dialects*, 178.


\(^{394}\) IGT II §1-3.

\(^{395}\) DIL s.v. ‘druí,’ accessed 02/01/18 dil.ie/18853. IGT II §85.


\(^{397}\) Dublin, Trinity College MS 1339, 288b37-38. Transcription is my own.

\(^{398}\) IGT II §85, l. 124.
These paradigms show the plural form -adha- was being used by the author of IMP though not reflected in IGT. This form was already in use during the Middle Irish
period and appears, for example, in *Cogad Gaedhel re Gallaihb: ro daingnit leis dano, dúin ocus daingni, ocus inseda ocus rigpuiirt aireda na Mumhan*.\footnote{Todd, *Cogad*, 140:3.}

The absence of the -adha- form in the dat. pl. of these nouns may indicate a tendency to retain the original ē-stem ending in dat. pl. forms, since -ibh would have remained sufficiently distinctive even after reduction of unstressed vowels to /ə/ during the Middle Irish period. However, as I have shown above, dat. pl. forms in -adhaibh and -aidhibh are attested for other nouns in IMP, suggesting that the analogical pressure of nom. and acc. pl. forms in -adha- was already influencing the forms of the dat. pl. in IMP. The Middle and Early Modern pl. form innseadha occurs once in IMP, namely: ¶182 genmotha innseadha na h-India Bice (131rb33-34), and the gen. pl. form innseadh occurs once, namely: ¶188 oirisiumh do sceluibh innseadh (131vb14-15). On the other hand, the nom. pl. form innsi occurs twice, both after cardinal numeral adjectives, namely: ¶153 seacht n-innessi (129vb25), ¶182 da mili dhec innsi (131rb32). The use of the nom. sg. form inis, which occurs once, after a cardinal numeral substantive is discussed below: ¶153 .uii. mile inis (129vb26). This last form will be discussed in more detailed below regarding the nominal forms which follow numbers.

Regarding séitig, I am not aware of any plural forms occurring in IMP other than the ones cited in the paradigm above and transcribed in the footnotes.

\( -(e)adh \) in the gen. pl.

Williams has suggested that the gen. pl. form -(e)adh was the most common in Classical Irish.\footnote{Williams, ‘Na Canúintí’, 452.} The expansion of the dental plural -adha-, is also seen on a number of gen. pl. forms in -(e)adh, which do not have nom. pl. form in -adha-. In IMP, I am aware of the following:

OIr. dúnad, ‘fort’, occurs once in the gen. pl. as diúntedh: ¶123 daingne a dhúntedh 7 a chathrach (128ra29-30), besides its OIr. gen. pl. forms duinte, which occurs four times in the text: ¶11 co n-imat duinti (121va10), ¶128 ac brised a duinte 7 a chathrach (128rb36), ¶139 a meadhon na n-duinte (129ra11), ¶143 imat duinte 7
chathrach (129ra34). This is reflected in IGT which gives both forms. The nom. pl. in IMP is dúinti, as in: ¶10 toglait a n-dinna 7 a n-duinti (121va14).

Similarly, the borrowed noun eilifint, has two gen. pl. forms in IMP. I am aware of one attestation of the dental pl. form -(e)adh in IMP on this noun, namely: ¶42 imud camhall 7 gribh 7 elifainteadh (123va24). On the other hand the gen. pl. form eilifint occurs four times: ¶110 m.m. elifint (127rb15), ¶113 iar faicsin na n-eilifant (127rb30), ¶113 la homun na n-eilifant (127rb31-32). ¶115 cc. elifant (127va13). Although this word is not attested in IGT, the formation of the gen. pl. -eadh is permitted for the word firmamuint in bardic language. The dental plural is not attested in any other pl. form of the noun eilifint in IMP, the nom. and acc pl. form being elifainti, and the dat. pl. being elifaintibh.

I am unaware of the gen. pl. form -(e)adh being used in any grammatical situation other than the genitive, as was noted by Williams in Early Modern Irish of East Ulster.

-the/ -te

As well as the formation of new plurals in -adha-, Middle and Early Modern Irish endings -the, -te are also attested in IMP. They are often found as alternative stems to those in -adha-, as was noted above in the discussion of the three pl. forms of OIr. dráit attested in the IMP, namely, historical plural druid, attested once in IMP but not reflected in IGT, the form draidhe, which occurs twice in IMP and is found in IGT, and the form draithi, which occurs four times in the text, namely: ¶32 do berar a ndraithi dia saighid (123ra7), ¶32 triallait na draithi (123ra17), ¶58 tecuit na draithi (124rb25), ¶110 fiafraighti dia n-draithibh (126ra29), and is permitted ó chanamhain in IGT. These last examples show the advancement of the dental stem -the in plural forms.

420 IGT II §48.
421 Dil s.v. ‘elef(a)int,’ accessed 02/01/18 dil.ie/19944
422 Cf. gen. sg./pl. elephant in Irish bardic poetry p. 141.16 (Giolla Brighde Ó hEódhusa).
423 IGT II §3 and §13.
424 124ra40: ¶55 cet h-elifainti; 127va2: ¶114 gonait na tortraigid na helifainte.
426 Williams, ‘Na Canúintí’, 452.
428 IGT II §85, 124.
429 124rb21: ¶58 faidhis Cublic y draidhe uadha; 130rb19: ¶164 fiafraighti dia ndraidhibh.
A similar situation is found in the inflection of *teach/teagh* in IMP, for which two pl. forms are attested, the first is *tighe*, which occurs twice once in the nom. pl. and once in the dat. pl.: ¶133 *gur brisedh a taidhbli 7 a tighi* (128va), ¶183 *impóidhit na firu for cula dia tighibh* (131va4-5). This is the only pl. form of *teach/teagh* which occurs in IGT.\(^{430}\) The second form which is used in IMP is *tithe*, in the dat. pl.: ¶92 *ina tithibh* (126rb4). I am not aware of any earlier attestations of this form, but it is the only form of the dat. pl. in the *Párliment* (seventeenth century), occurring three times: *ionna titheidhribh, do na tithhibh, astigh ina titheidhribh*,\(^{431}\) and is also found three times in the *Turas*, namely: *fo a titheidhribh ósta, dia titheidhribh and roi-dhes a tighthi*.\(^{432}\)

I am aware of one other example in IMP which shows the advancement of *-the* during the Early Modern period, namely the dat. pl. of *tir*, mentioned above, in the compound *ilthir*: ¶162 *a n-ilthirthaibh* (130rb7). I am also aware of one instance of the strong dental ending *-the* in the gen. pl. form *tirhadh* in the *Párliment* (seventeenth century), occurring three times: *ionna tighribh, do na tighribh, astigh ina tighribh*, and is also found three times in the *Turas*, namely: *fo a tighribh ósta, dia tighribh and roi-dhes a tighthi*.\(^{432}\)

The advancement of *-te* plurals may be exemplified in the noun *sliabh*.\(^{436}\) The nom. and dat. sg. forms are the same in IMP: ¶8 *sliabh urard frisin cathaig sin* (121rb23), ¶8 *for an sliabh ucut* (121rb34). In the nom. pl. the form *sléibhte* is found, in: ¶116 *fasach eisiumh co m-beannuibh 7 sleibhti urarda na timcheall* (127va17), ¶178 *sleibhte 7 beanna urarda isin crich sin* (131ra26). This form is given in IGT *ó chanamhain*, besides the advised, *ceart*, nom. pl. inflection *sliabha* which is not present in IMP. On the other hand the gen. pl. *sliabh*, which is given in IGT as *ceart*, is the only gen. pl. form attested in IMP: ¶14 *fileat dithreabaigh a maintribh 7 a sepelaibh a m-beannuibh sliabh* (121vb17). The gen. pl. *ó chanamhain* in IGT, *sléibhteadh*, is not present in IMP. The inflection of this noun in IMP is a good

---

\(^{430}\) IGT II §31: plural forms: *toighe/tighe; toighibh/tigheibh; toigheadh*; cf. IGT II §164: *teagh fionn móir, don tigh nó do tigh fhinn móir nó fhíonn móir, méd an tighe, méd an toighe, fhíonn móir acu uile, ..l. moladh canamhna a ndiaidh an molta ceirt, na tighe fionna móra, mar sin ghabhhas ar illradh.*


\(^{432}\) Walsh, *Imtheacht*, 66.

\(^{433}\) Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, 62r30.

\(^{434}\) Ó Cuív, *Párliment*, 161.

\(^{435}\) IGT II §45.

\(^{436}\) See Ó Cuív, ‘Linguistic training’, 15, 24-25.
example of how the author was combining Classical Irish with spoken forms in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>acc.</th>
<th>dat.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Irish</td>
<td>IGT §66</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sliab</td>
<td>sléibe</td>
<td>sliabh</td>
<td>na sliabha/na sléibhtí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sliab</td>
<td>sliabh</td>
<td>iar</td>
<td>shliabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sléib</td>
<td>sléibib</td>
<td>ar sléibh</td>
<td>dona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sléibe</td>
<td>sléibe</td>
<td>méd an t-sliabha/méd an t-sléibhe</td>
<td>méd na sliabh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advancement of strong plural ending `-ta` is seen on the noun `gael`, which appears in the plural only as `gaelta`, once in the dat. pl.: ¶21 `do ghaeltuibh` (122rb11), and three times in the nominative: ¶102 `a ngaelta` (126vb7), ¶109 `a ghaelta` (127ra24), ¶164 (130rb22). This form is permitted `ó chanamhain` in IGT. 441

Similarly, I am aware of one example of `seolta`: ¶145 cethra seolta for gach luing dhibh (129rb10), besides one example of `seola`: ¶185 cona seola an aghaidh ghaethi (131va17). The `-t` plural is not found in IGT, which gives nom. pl. forms of the similarly inflected noun `reódh`, as `riúidh` and `reóidh`, and acc. pl. forms `riúdha` and `reódha`. 442 The plural form `seolta` probably corresponds to a spoken form,

---

437 121rb23: ¶8 bai sliab ura d frisín cathraigh sin.
438 127va17: ¶116 fasach eisiumh co m-beannuiibh 7 sleibhri urarda na timcheall; 131ra26: ¶178 sleibhite 7 beanua urarda isin crich sin
439 121rb34: ¶8 for an sliabh ucut.
440 121vb l.17.
441 IGT II §60.
442 IGT II §75.
however I am unaware of any earlier attestations. It also occurs in the *Turas*, for example: *tógbhaid a seólta ainnséin*.\textsuperscript{443}

-anna

I am aware of several examples in IMP which display the advancement of nasal plural endings, -anna, during the Early Modern period.

OIr. *druimm* occurs once in the plural in IMP, in the dat.: ¶14 *for dromumnibh* (121vb15). This pl. form is permitted *ó chanamhain* in IGT beside the form *droma*.\textsuperscript{444} OIr. acc. pl. *drummai* occurs in the Milan glosses.\textsuperscript{445}

OIr. *uam* occurs once in the plural in IMP, in the dat.: ¶61 *i n-uamhunnaib* (124va8). This form is not attested in IGT, which only gives nom. pl. *uamha*, and dat. pl. *uamhaibh*.\textsuperscript{446} However, the nasal plural is a Middle Irish form and is already attested, beside *uamha*,\textsuperscript{447} in Cogad Gaedhel re Gallaibh: *ro sir lacha ocus linti ocus uamhanna na Fodhla fondardi*.\textsuperscript{448}

OIr. *aimm* occurs six times in the nom. pl. as *anamanna*: ¶4 *Agiron 7 Baririm a n-anmunn* (121ra34), ¶19 (121ra27), ¶89 (126ra5-6), ¶148 (129rb28), ¶178 (131ra32), ¶186 (131va29-30). This form is permitted *ó chanamhain* in IGT,\textsuperscript{449} besides *anma*. In IMP, the nom. pl. of *aimm*, ‘name’, is identical to the nom. pl. of *anmann*,\textsuperscript{450} ‘animal’, for example: ¶179 *ni marbhthar duine na anmanda aili leo* (131rb8), ¶27 *gin anmunna gin fhiadhmhila do mharbhud* (122vax). These plural forms are distinct from those of *anam*, <OIr. *ainim*, ‘soul’, which is *anma* in IMP, for example: ¶179 *a n-doigh anma do beith inntibh* (131rb11). In the gen. pl.: ¶12 *do nertad a n-anma do Macametus* (121vb2). The noun *anam* also has a distinct dat. sg. form: ¶34 *cu ro farcuibh cin anmain* (123ra33).\textsuperscript{451}

\textsuperscript{443} Walsh, *Imtheacht*, 8.
\textsuperscript{444} IGT II §41: *sgéith dhatha ar a ndromandaib*.
\textsuperscript{445} Stokes and Strachan, *Theaurus* I, 52.
\textsuperscript{446} IGT II §39 and §41, derived from *na trágha* and *dona trághaibh*.
\textsuperscript{447} Todd, *Cogad*, 253:11.
\textsuperscript{448} Todd, *Cogad*, 188:1-2.
\textsuperscript{449} IGT II §41.
\textsuperscript{450} *DIL* s.v., ‘1 anmann’ accessed 10/05/18 *dil.ie/3675*.
\textsuperscript{451} See the various declensions of *anam* in IGT II §8, 11, 17, 19.
-acha

I am aware of the plural ending -acha on four nouns in IMP, three of which reflect the forms in IGT\(^{452}\) namely: ¶45 maithreachu (123va36), ¶70 cathracha (125ra5), ¶107 nathracha (127ra10). The fourth example is the plural of the compound noun tuae, ‘fort’, + tebair, ‘hill’, tuaitheabhracha,\(^{453}\) which is used in the following sentence in IMP: ¶61 curro linsat na tolcha 7 na tuaitheabhracha for gech taebh do uaim (124rb37-38). A similar sentence is found in the Táin from the Book of Leinster: go ro lina grían glenta 7 fanta 7 tulcha 7 tuaidibrecha na hErend.\(^{454}\) The presence of this form in the Lenster Táin indicates that guttural plural -acha- was already a productive form during the Middle Irish period.

This comparison also incidentally indicates the Irish author’s use of stock saga formulas in IMP, displaying the manner in which he was not only translating P but also adapting and remodelling it in a distinctly Irish manner. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter IV.

**Interchanging of nom. pl. and acc. pl. forms**

**Acc. pl. forms in the nominative**

The use of acc. pl. forms as the subject of the verb, has been exemplified in the following paradigms of fear and rí. The following table aligns the paradigm of these nouns in Old Irish, IGT and IMP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>fer(^{455})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{452}\) IGT II §32 and §120.

\(^{453}\) temair/tebair, DIL s.v., ‘1 tuaithebair’ accessed on 10/05/18 [dil.ie/42192](http://dil.ie/42192).

\(^{454}\) O’Rahilly, Táin Leinster, 129, 264: ‘until the sun rises into the vaults of heaven and fills the glens and slopes, the hills and mounds of Ireland.’

\(^{455}\) Thurneysen, Grammar, 176.

\(^{456}\) 123rb14: ¶36 as i in cetna inghen laa faifi fear dhibh.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>acc.</th>
<th></th>
<th>dat.</th>
<th></th>
<th>gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fer n-</td>
<td>firu</td>
<td>fear n-</td>
<td>meall fhira</td>
<td>fear n-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>firu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       |       |       |       |       |       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Irish</td>
<td>IGT §21</td>
<td>IMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

457 131vb3-4: ¶187 leithighthir fria gach cethrar don droing dhaenna a bh-fhir 7 a mna.
458 131va4: ¶183 impódhit na firu for cula dia tighibh.
459 131va11: ¶184 gach cenel toraidh do thir 7 muir no melit fira.
460 122ra25: ¶19 foifidh a sheitic la fear n-aili.
461 129rbw:¶148 cu ro lásat ár for aes na cathrach, firu, macu, mna.
462 128rb18: ¶125 la fearaibh.
463 131rby: ¶183 oilm na bh-fhear.
465 125vb5: ¶84 no bidh in ri na shuidhi righuaisdibh.
466 123ra21,¶33 ro gairmitt chuigi a righ 7 a thaisigh 7 a charuid; 122vb23: ¶29 ro umhlaighseait .uui. righ dho.
467 122vby: ¶31 ro gairmit a righa 7 a thaisigh dia shaighid; 129ra1: ¶138 ro h-oirdneadh nai righa do Tartraidibh forro.
468 125va3: ¶80 ni samhail doibh rigu nait slóig for bith.
469 121va10: ¶10 gu righ fuiri.
470 124vb6: ¶66 achta riga.
471 121vb5: ¶13 ot clos do Alan i. do righ na Tarraidh.
472 123rb3: ¶45 do righuibh.
473 121ra2: ¶1 bai bráthair righ an aibit san Fronses.
474 126rb6: ¶92 pupla na righ.
These paradigms show how the Irish author was using Old and Classical Irish acc. pl. *firu/fira* and *righa/righu* in nominative position beside regular nom. pl. forms, thus: ¶187 leithighthir fria gach cethrar don droing dhaenna a bh-*fhir* 7 a mna (131vb3-4), is found beside: ¶183 impóidhit na *fír* for cula dia tighibh (131va4). The nom. pl. form only occurs once, and is used in nominative position, whereas the acc. pl. form occurs five times, and is used as an accusative twice, namely: ¶119 do niatt a rinnadh forro, firu, macu, mna (127vb25), ¶148 for aes na cathrach, firu, macu, mna, firu (129rb34), and three times as a nominative, namely: ¶183 impóidhit na *fír* for cula dia tighibh (131va4), ¶184 *fír* an hainsi iat (131va9), ¶184 gach cenel toraidh do thir 7 mhúir no melit *fír* (131va11). I am not aware of any examples of the nom. pl. form *firu/fira* being used as an accusative.

The nom. pl. *righ* is found four times as a nominative in IMP, namely: ¶33 *righ* (123ra21), ¶29 (122vb23), ¶54 (124ra21), ¶169 (130va17), but never as an accusative plural. On the other hand the acc. pl. forms *righa/righu* occur six times as nominatives: ¶31 rogaímit a *righ* 7 a thaisigh dia shaigid (122vbx), ¶91 a *righ* 7 a thaisigh 7 a shlogha ina sreathaibh 7 ina neisibh allamuigh de (126ra29), ¶127 do gairit cuigi a *righ* 7 a thaisigh (128rb24), ¶138 rohoirdneadh nai *righ* do tharraidibh forro (129ra1), ¶189 .iii. *righ* dhíbh oc adhrad don fhírdhia (131vb27), ¶80 ni samhail doib rigu nait slúaig for bith (125va3), ¶85 a druim fho túath na *righu* for a dheis 7 na *righna* fora eit (125vb20), and once as an accusative, ¶66 acht a *righ* (124vb6).

Besides these examples of acc. pl. *firu/fira* and *righa/righu* occurring in nominative position, I am aware of another three examples which show acc. pl. forms being used in the nominative, namely: ¶14 cu treagdúid a conu 7 a cuanarta don fhíonna ghoisidech (121vb14), ¶15 ni lamh eonu na fiadh mhilu ceana beith for an sliab sin (121vb25), ¶183 mad macu (131va8). This brings the total number of examples of acc. pl. forms being used in the nom. pl. in IMP to twelve.

The variation in orthography of the acc. pl. forms, i.e. of *fír* beside *fíra* and of *righ* beside *righu*, is explained in IGT: *gach ainm iollraidh cáol 7 a thochlughadh*

---

475 See example ¶187.
leathan, ní cóir gan a réim connsaine do dhénamh, 7 as cóir deireadh a thochlaighthi a n-u. ’s a n-o. ’s a n-a, and reflects detoning of final unstressed vowels.

Examples in IMP such as: ¶31 ro gairmit a righa 7 a thaisigh dia shaighd (122vbx), beside: ¶33 ro gairmit chuígi a righ 7 a thaisigh (123ra21), may indicate that acc. pl. forms had lost grammatical significance and were being used as stylistic enhancers. In fact, the use of acc. pl. forms in nominative position may have added to the archaic tone of the text, enhancing the language of IMP by recalling Old Irish inflection irrespective of its correct grammatical use.

Nom. pl. forms in the accusative

That acc. pl. forms were falling into disuse and that nom. pl. forms were being used in accusative position is implied by IGT which indicates that it is incorrect to use a nom. pl. form, which has a distinctive acc. pl. form, as an accusative: ní coir ainm iollraidh ar bioth a ndiaigh oibrighthi nó fulaírmhe acht a cruth tochluighthe. I am aware of six examples in IMP which display nom. pl. forms, which have distinct acc. pl. forms, being used as accusatives, namely: ¶10 marbhuit a sin (121va15), ¶107 co treaghdath a cuirp (127ra14), ¶129 ni ro chuirset a n-oicc (128va3), ¶163 ceanglait a croinn (130rb13), ¶165 beanaid aes na cric hacroinn a h-uir dia n-athcudhais (130rb29-30), ¶172 loiscid a cuirp diblinaibh (130vb12).

O’Rahilly noticed this incorrect use of nom. pl. forms in the language of Ó Maolchonaire’s Desiderius, for example: ór mar cheangloid na cuisleanna 7 na féithe bhalla an chirp nádúrtha dhá chéile, as amhloidh sin cheanglas an creideamh boill chirp spioradáltha mhisticídhe na hEaglais dhá chéile eatorra féin. Similarly, Falconer noticed the use of nom. pl. forms in the acc. pl. in LSN, for example: ro toccaib a lamha 7 a rusc fri Dia in cein co roisce in ceilebrad, and;

---

476 IGT I §158. Mac Cáithaigh, *Art*, 148-49: ‘every slender nominative plural whose accusative plural is broad, it is incorrect not to lenite it when it is the object of a verb, and its accusative plural ending is correct in u and o and in a.’

477 IGT I §78. Mac Cáithaigh, *Art*, 104-05: ‘no nominative plural at all is correct after a verb or an imperative; rather, [it should be] in accusative plural form.’

478 Ó Maolchonaire, *Desiderius*, xxiv.

479 Ibid., 134:4090-4094.


481 Ibid., 76:1789-90.
This incorrect use of nom. pl. forms in the accusative in IMP is contrasted by a hypercorrect use of acc. pl. forms in the nominative, which, though grammatically incorrect, may have amplified the archaic tone of the text in a recollection of abandoned Old Irish inflections.

**Acc. sg. fem. forms as direct objects**

I am aware of two examples in IMP of a form identical to a dative singular form and distinct from nominative singular being used as an accusative, namely: ¶130 do berait in cathraigh (128va15), ¶133 co tucs in cathraigh (128vb2). This practice is indicated in IGT:

Lochtach ainm úathaidh asa ttéid a réim nó ainm iollraidh cáol gá mbi tochlughadh leathan a ndiaigh oibrighthi; òr a ccruth tuillréime as cóir an t-aimm úathaidh asa ttéid a réim a ndiaigh an oibrighthe, 7 gach ainm iollraidh a ccruth tochlaighthe.\(^{483}\)

Besides the fact that the form *cathair* is marked *lochtach* in IGT, two dat. sg. forms for *caithir* are attested in the tracts, namely *don chathruigh* and *don chaithir*.\(^{484}\) In IMP, the dat. sg. form *cathair*, identical with the nom. sg. form of the noun, is more commonly used as the direct object of a verb, occurring four times in the text: ¶48 fo gebhu cathair Siaudu for in conair (123vb10), ¶99 rannait a tri maic in cathair (126va19), ¶138 in tan ro irghabh magnus cam in cathair sin (128vbz), ¶151 do beruit in cathair iarsin (129vb10). Furthermore, the acc. sg. form *cathraigh* is never found after the substantive verb *fil*, which takes the accusative: ¶6 fil cathair (121rb7), ¶8 (121rb21), ¶23 (122rb24), ¶68 (124vb29), ¶135 (128vb11), ¶136 (128vb17), ¶147 (129rb20). In fact, I am not aware of any examples of a dat. sg. form

\(^{482}\) Ibid., 177:4366-67.  
\(^{483}\) IGT I §79. Mac Cáirtaigh, *Art*, 104-105: ‘Use of a nominative singular that is inflected in the accusative or a slender nominative plural that has a broad accusative plural is incorrect after a verb; because the nominative singular that is inflected in the accusative should take dative form after a verb, and every nominative plural should take accusative plural form.’  
\(^{484}\) IGT II §120.
which is different from the nom. sg. occurring after *fil* or as the direct object of a sentence, except in the two examples listed above.

**Adverbial use of *adhaigh***

The nom. sg. form *adhaigh* is never expanded in IMP, instead Scribe A uses the contraction *ag*-.

Incidentally, the same contraction is employed to indicate the noun *aghaidh*, ‘face’, for example: ¶54 *aenta at aghaidh-si* (124ra21). The inflection of *aghaidh* in IMP has been arranged into the following paradigm, which compares the forms in IMP to those in IGT and Thurneysen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Irish</th>
<th>IGT §93</th>
<th>IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>adaigh486</td>
<td>aidchi</td>
<td>adhaigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>aidchi</td>
<td>aidchi</td>
<td>sir oidhchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>aidchi</td>
<td>aidchaib</td>
<td>dona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt;adaig)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hoidhchib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>aidche/</td>
<td>aidche</td>
<td>méd na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aithche</td>
<td></td>
<td>hoidhche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>méd na n-oidhcheadh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OIr. nom. sg. form *adhaigh*, which occurs once as a nom. sg. in IMP: ¶10 *amhail budh aghaidh*, also occurs three times in the acc. sg. as an accusative of time, once following the preposition *fri/ri*: ¶56 *ro niat-somh airisiumh risin aghaidh sin isin du*
sin (124rb6), and twice on its own, ‘for a night’: ¶101 iar n-airisium adaigh dhoibh foran conair (126va32), ¶121 ni leiceann omhon na leoman do luimg na do bharc oirisium adaig (128ra4). The occurrence of the nom. sg. form adhaigh instead of the acc. sg. aidhche as an accusative of time may be as a result of the fusion of the accusative of time with the OIr. temporal form, originally a petrified dative < (n)d' adaig ‘this following night’, which also occurs in IMP:496 ¶56 C ublay didiu ro ghluais in aghaidh sin (124rb10). The Classical Irish dat. sg. form oighthi also occurs once, following the preposition co n-, ‘with’: ¶183 tri la co n-oighthi (131va2).

I am aware of three examples of gen. sg. forms aighthi/oighthi occurring in the genitive of time497 following the adjective cech/gach: ¶69 mili laech cech n-aighthi oc faire in righ (125ra2), ¶107 gabhuit sechnon na criche gach n-oighthi (127ra8), ¶170 in oiread cetna gach n-oidhche (130vay). In this last example, oidhche is expanded from the contraction o-, which is used again for the gen. sg. in: ¶71 a tús oidhche (125ra16).

In the nom. and acc. pl., following the cardinal tri, the form oighthi is used once: ¶76 tri h-oighthi da gach thaiseach dibh diaigh a n-diaigh ac faire in righ (125rb7). Following cardinal substantives, i.e. multiples of ten,498 instead of the gen. pl. oidhcheadh,499 the contraction ag- is used again, indicating the nom. sg. form: ¶109 xl. la 7 aghaidh (127ra24). This development is discussed below regarding inflection after numerals. The dat. pl. form occurs once in IMP: ¶7 cóic la cona n-oighthibh (121rb18).

The acc. sg. forms adhaigh and séitig500 after the preposition fri in IMP are indicative of the collapse of distinctive OIr. acc. sg. forms in i-stem nouns. Despite this innovation, it is possible that an adverbial use of the nom. sg. form adhaigh, perhaps derived from a calcified OIr. temporal dative, may have increased the perception of archaism in IMP. Jackson’s observation that both adhaigh and aidhchí are used in the same adverbial construction in Cath Maighe Léna indicates that there may have been a choice as to which form could be used: táinic Eógan began

496 Thurneysen, Grammar, 161 and 185-86.
497 Thurneysen, Grammar, 159.
498 Ibid., 244.
500 122vay: ¶27 ni bhi col frial séitig doib.
sochraidí beó-ghonta an adaigh sin aris d’aimdeóin Édaíne, and: tàngadar go Carn mBuidhe an aidhchi sin.  

Note on ciach.

There is one occurrence of the noun *ciach* in IMP, which derives from the gen. sg. form of OIr. *ceo*, *ciach*:\footnote{10 fri re .uii. la airisis in ciach sin (121va19).} It is used in the nom. sg. and displays slenderisation of the final consonant before the demonstrative pronoun *sin*. The classical paradigm of *ceo* is as follows: *ceo, don chiaigh, méd na ciach, na ciacha, dona ciachaibh, méd na ciach, iar ciacha*.\footnote{It translates Lat. *obscuritas: tenentque obscuritatem huiusmodi quandoque diebus VII.*}  

I am aware of one other attestation of the nom. sg. form *ciach*, in the tale of the abbot of Drimnagh who turned into a woman:\footnote{‘as mór’ ar sé ‘an ciach a fuilim.’}  

The tale survives in three manuscripts from the fifteenth century: London, British Library MS Add. 30512,\footnote{much of which was written by Uillian Mac an Lega, whom Quin has suggested translated and authored *SE*;}\footnote{London, British Library, Egerton 1781, written in Breifne between 1484 and 1487, which also contains GM and *GSM*;}\footnote{Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 E 29, otherwise known as the *Book of Fermoy*, written for the Roches of Fermoy during the fifteenth century, which once also contained *GSM*, now separated from the rest of the manuscript and found in a fragment in London, British Library, Egerton 92.}\footnote{These manuscripts, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter III, indicate that *ciach* may have been a spoken form of *ceo* in use during the fifteenth century.} London, British Library, Egerton 1781,\footnote{written in Breifne between 1484 and 1487, which also contains GM and *GSM*;}\footnote{Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 E 29, otherwise known as the *Book of Fermoy*, written for the Roches of Fermoy during the fifteenth century, which once also contained *GSM*, now separated from the rest of the manuscript and found in a fragment in London, British Library, Egerton 92.}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Jackson, *Cath*, 16:407-07, 17:438, 112.}
\footnote{I am grateful to Tadhg Ó Síocháin for making me aware of the use of *ciach* in the tale of the abbot of Drimnagh.}
\footnote{\textit{IGT} II §97, although the form is also listed under \textit{IGT} II §108: *annró*.}
\footnote{P.1.22.7.}
\footnote{Ó Síocháin, *The Case*; Bergin, \textit{Anecdota i}, 76-79.}
\footnote{Dublin, Royal Irish Academy MS 23 E 29, p.113.25.}
\footnote{Flower, \textit{Catalogue} ii, 470 and 475.}
\footnote{Quin, \textit{Stair}, xxxviii-xl.}
\footnote{Flower, \textit{Catalogue} ii, 526 and 542.}
\footnote{RIACat, 3091-125.}
\footnote{Flower, \textit{Catalogue} ii, 505-519.}
\end{footnotes}
Nom. sg. vs gen. pl. forms after cardinal numeral substantives

In Old Irish cardinal substantives, i.e. multiples of ten, were followed by the gen. pl. However, the levelling of distinctive inflectional endings of io- and ːā-stem nouns during the Middle Irish period, triggered by the decline of unstressed final vowels to /ǝ/, caused the nom. sg. and gen. pl. forms of these nouns to coalesce. With the formation of new distinctive plural forms, -adha in the nom. and -eadh in the gen., two forms were permitted after numeral adjectives 3-10, namely: the OIr. pl. form -e, referred to in IGT as ‘ainm isiol iollraidh’ and followed by lenition; and the new Middle Irish formation with -adha, referred to in IGT as ‘ainm ard iollraidh’ which was not lenited after numerals:

Gach focal bhíos d’úathadh 7 d’iollraidh, séimh as coir a ainm isiol iollraidh a ndiaigh an áirimh, mur so: ‘trí bhile’, ‘trí mhaide’, ‘trí uisge’; 7 lom as coir a ainm ard iollraidh ‘na dhíaigh mur so: ‘trí bileadha’, ‘trí maideadha’, ‘trí huisgeadh’. Greene has argued that this use of the ‘ainm isiol iollraidh’ following numeral adjectives came to be understood as a nom. sg. form, and caused the spread of nom. sg. forms in other declension classes to be used after cardinals. This may have been further aided by the fact that OIr. nom. sg. and gen. pl. forms were identical in o-stem and ːā-stem nouns. As it was elegantly summarised by Greene: ‘once an undoubted singular could be used after a numeral, as in trí mharg, the interpretation of the noun in cèad fear ‘a hundred men’ as a nominative singular rather than a genitive plural became a possibility.’

In IMP I am aware of eight examples of nom. sg. forms, which have distinctive gen. pl. forms, being used after cardinal substantives which are multiples of ten, namely: ¶50 x. m. lair gheal aroen frís (124vb31). ¶109 xl. la 7 aghaidh

512 Thurneysen, Grammar, 244.
513 Greene, ‘Celtic’, 527.
514 Thurneysen, Grammar, 242.
515 IGT I §18: Mac Carthaigh, Art, 72-73: ‘Every noun that is the same in the singular and in the plural: its low nominative plural should be lenited after the numeral, like this: trí bhile, trí mhaide, trí uisge; and its high nominative plural should be unmutated after it, like this: trí bileadha, trí maideadha, trí huisgeadh.
517 Greene, ‘Celtic’, 528.
There are also three examples of *elefaint* occurring after a cardinal substantive numeral, ¶110 *m.m. elifint* (127rb15), ¶115 *cc. eilifant* (127va13), ¶156 *xx. elefaint* (130ra9), there being two gen. pl. forms attested in IMP, namely *elifant* and *elifainteadh*. These forms have been arranged in the following table, which shows the Irish author’s use of OIr. nom. sg. forms instead of Classical Irish gen. pl. forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OIr. and IGT nom. sg.</th>
<th>OIr. gen. pl.</th>
<th>IGT gen. pl.</th>
<th>nom. sg. after cardinal substantive in IMP</th>
<th>Other attestations of gen. pl. form in IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIr.: láir⁵¹⁸</td>
<td><em>lairi</em></td>
<td>méd na lár/</td>
<td>¶50 <em>x. m. lair gheal aroen fris</em>.⁵¹⁹</td>
<td>¶36 lairtheach.⁵²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGT§201: láir</td>
<td>(not attested)</td>
<td>méd na láirtheach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>méd na n-oidhcheadh</td>
<td>¶109 <em>xl. la 7 aghaidh</em>.⁵²²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIr: adaig⁵²¹</td>
<td>aidche</td>
<td>méd na súil/</td>
<td>¶125 <em>c. sui</em>,⁵²⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGT§93: adhaigh</td>
<td></td>
<td>méd na súileadh</td>
<td>¶125,⁵²⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¶128,⁵²⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>¶130.⁵²⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the dual:</td>
<td>súil⁵²⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁵¹⁸ Thurneysen, Grammar, 175.
⁵¹⁹ 124vb31.
⁵²⁰ 123rb24: ¶36 ba mian leo bainn a n-groigheadh 7 a lairtheach.
⁵²¹ Thurneysen, Grammar, 185.
⁵²² 127ra 1.24: *xl. la 7 aghaidh*.
⁵²³ Thurneysen, Grammar, 190.
⁵²⁴ 128rb9.
⁵²⁵ 128rb11-12.
⁵²⁶ 128rb31.
⁵²⁷ 128va13.
⁵²⁸ 130rb3: *beann dimhor a comhroin* a dha shul.
On the other hand, I am aware of only one example in IMP of a gen. pl. form, which has a different nom. sg. form, occurring after a cardinal substantive numeral multiple of ten, namely: ¶96 .x. m. cathrach (126rb29). This preference for nom. sg. rather than gen. pl. forms after cardinal numeral substantives, reveals a substrata of Early Modern Irish syntax operating in IMP, which has been coated in layers of linguistic archaics.

I am aware of the following forms occurring in IMP after a cardinal substantive numeral multiple of ten which could be either nom. sg. or gen. pl.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶96 .x. m. cathrach</td>
<td>126rb29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶11 co nimat duinti 7 cathrach</td>
<td>121va19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶111 .lx. m. laech</td>
<td>127rb15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶119 tri cét rigan lasan rig bis</td>
<td>127rb31-32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

530 128vb9.
531 121va19: ¶11 co nimat duinti 7 cathrach.
533 Stokes and Strachan, *Thesaurus* I, 301.
534 129vb26: ¶153 .uui. mile inis.
535 131vb15: ¶188 oirisiumh do sceluibh innseadh.
536 127rb15.
537 127va13.
538 130ra9.
539 123va24.
540 127rb31-32.
fuirre (127vb19), ¶122 .xx. laech (128ra17), ¶122 .x. cét cubat fora lethet (128ra15), ¶152 nó gu cét lam beos (129vb17), ¶175 .x. mili each (130vb33).
2.4. Verbal Forms

Reassessment of Ó Catháin’s linguistic analysis of IMP

As far as I am aware, the only published article which deals with IMP in some detail is Seán Ó Catháin’s ‘Studies in the Development of Middle to Modern Irish’,\(^{541}\) in which Ó Catháin compares linguistic data from three Early Modern Irish texts, namely IMP, *Aided Fergusa* and *Imtheacht na Tromdháimhe*, with the language of the Annals of Ulster (AU) from the period 1057-1499, in order to assess the development of specific linguistic features from Middle to Early Modern Irish. Ó Catháin’s objective was to study the decline of infixed pronouns, the transition of *ro* to *do* and the generalisation of *r*-endings in plurals of past tenses during the Early Modern Irish period. By comparing these linguistic features in IMP and AU, which he uses as a representation of the language of the period which they chronicle,\(^{542}\) Ó Catháin determined that that the language of IMP ‘seems to have been consistently “archaised” to represent the language of the twelfth century.’\(^{543}\)

In this chapter I have argued that the language of IMP contains features which range from across a much broader linguistic spectrum than that suggested by Ó Catháin. Old Irish features in IMP which include final -*th*, representation of hiatus vowels, and of unstressed final vowel endings in examples such as *escrai* and *for culai* are contrasted by Early Modern features such as the prevalence of nom. sg. forms after cardinal numeral substantives, nom. pl. forms used in the accusative and the use of pl. forms such as *tithe* and *tirthe* instead of Classical Irish *tighe* and *tire*. Furthermore, as I have argued above, the Irish author’s efforts to archaise the language of IMP may be discernable in the overuse of acc. pl. forms in the nominative. In this respect, the language of IMP is comparable to that of *Beatha Aodha Ruaidh*, about which McManus has stated: ‘Ó Cléirigh’s *Beatha* confronts the modern reader with a panoply of linguistic forms and constructions which no modern

\(^{541}\) Ó Catháin, ‘Studies’, 1-47.

\(^{542}\) Ibid., 2.

\(^{543}\) Ibid., 32.
grammar knows and much of which is equally as foreign to the most detailed linguistic analysis of the language ever undertaken in its long history, namely the Irish Grammatical and Syntactical tracts.\textsuperscript{544}

Nevertheless, the results yielded by Ó Catháin’s linguistic analysis of IMP remain of great value to our understanding of the text, and can be used to study the manner in which the Irish author was archaicising the language of IMP and understand the techniques he employed. In the following paragraphs I will re-evaluate Ó Catháin’s analysis of infixed pronouns and of the endings of plural forms in past tenses in IMP, before discussing other aspects of verbal syntax in the text. Ó Catháin’s observations regarding the ratio between ro and do as preverbal particles in IMP and AU may be briefly summarised as follows.

\textit{Preverbal particles: ro vs do}

In his analysis of preverbal particles in IMP, Ó Catháin counted seventy-five occurrences of ro (83\%) compared to fifteen occurrences of do (17\%) in the text.\textsuperscript{545} This ratio is especially interesting when compared to the decline of ro and rise of do as a preverbal particle during the Middle and Early Modern periods of the language.

In his article, Ó Catháin compares the ratio of ro against do in contemporaneous entries of AU from the eleventh century to the fifteenth, displaying the steady decline of ro and the rise of do during this period. I have arranged Ó Catháin’s results regarding the incidences of ro and do in AU into the following table as they appear in his article, and followed this with a line chart of my own which helps visualise the decline of ro during the Early Modern period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU years</th>
<th>ro vs do</th>
<th>occurrences</th>
<th>% of ro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1057-1100</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101-1055</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{544} McManus, ‘Language’, 54.
\textsuperscript{545} Ó Catháin, ‘Studies’, 14-17.
An interesting result of Ó Catháin’s analysis of preverbal particles for the study of IMP is that IMP contains the exact opposite ratio of *ro* to *do* preverbal particles than that which occurs in AU entries written during the second half of the fifteenth century. In fact, while in IMP *ro* is used as a preverbal particle in 83% of instances...
and *do* occurs in 17%, in AU entries written between 1451-1499 Ó Catháin found *do* in 83% of instances and *ro* in 17%.

Ó Catháin’s analysis shows the systematic manner in which the Irish author was archaising the language of IMP, which, when we look at the ratio of preverbal particles alone, is reflective of the language found in AU during the twelfth century, roughly one hundred years before the *Travels* were first written and three hundred years before L was compiled. This methodical use of *ro* as a preverbal particle contributes to the sense of there being multiple linguistic layers in the text.

IMP is not alone in this late use of *ro* as a stylistic enhancer: Gray noticed that *ro* often replaces *do* in the version of *Cath Maige Tuired* written by Gilla Riabhach Ó Cléirigh during the fifteenth century, and similarly Ó Cuív noticed that ‘*ro* occurs almost one-and-a-half times as often as *do*’ in the version of *Cath Muighe Tuireadh* written by David Duigenan in 1651-1652. Likewise, Falconer remarked that ‘*ro* is much commoner in the past tense than *do*’ in *LSN*, and Quin observed that ‘the preverb *ro* is a good deal more frequent than *do*’ in *SE*. Not counting the commonplace copula formations *rob* and *ro ba*, I am aware of no examples of the preverbal particle *ro* occurring in *SNL* and I have found only two examples in *GSM*, namely: *ni ro imthigheadh sé gan bas no gan guasachd d’fághail on dee sin*, *drong ele dibh do hadhlacadh isin inad in ro marbadh*. Therefore in the analysis of preverbal particles also, the language of IMP offers a striking contrast to that of the two other major translated texts which precede it in L, namely *GSM* and *SNL*. In the following paragraphs I will discuss how this is discernable in other features of verbal syntax in IMP.

*Past plural endings: retention and spread of -s endings*

As well as studying the decline of *ro* and the rise of *do* as a preverbal particle in the AU, Ó Catháin collected verbal forms from AU to study the spread of *-r* endings in

---

547 Ó Cuív, *Cath*, 16.
550 Except the copula formation in: *ocus amhail ro bo dingbhala leat do geineamhain ar mu shon* (Hyde, *Gabháltais*, 90).
552 *ibid*. 100.
past plural active forms from strong verbs which had the t-preterite and reduplicated preterite, to weak verbs which had the s-preterite. It is likely that confusion between active and deponent forms also played a part in this development from the Early Middle Irish period.\textsuperscript{553} Ó Catháin’s analysis showed how MIr. forms such as ro marbsat\textsuperscript{554} and co tucsat\textsuperscript{555} were gradually superseded by do marbadar\textsuperscript{556} and tucadur\textsuperscript{557} during the Early Modern Irish period.\textsuperscript{558} This change happened in all three persons of plural past active forms, thus OIr. s-preterite 1\textsuperscript{st} pl. -sam/-sem, 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. -said/-sid and 3\textsuperscript{rd} pl. -sat/-set (henceforth -s endings) were steadily replaced by OIr. t-preterite and reduplicated preterite 1\textsuperscript{st} pl. -mar, 2\textsuperscript{nd} pl. -id and later -ebair,\textsuperscript{559} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} pl. -atar (henceforth -r endings). I have copied Ó Catháin’s results into the following table and displayed them in a line chart of my own which shows the decline of -s endings in the past plural forms of weak verbs during the late-Middle and Early Modern Irish periods in AU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU years</th>
<th>-s</th>
<th>-r</th>
<th>% of -s endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1057-1100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101-1055</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1156-1200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201-1250</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251-1300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{553} Ó Catháin, ‘Studies’, 38.
\textsuperscript{554} AU 1102.6.
\textsuperscript{555} AU 1128.8.
\textsuperscript{556} AU 1487.34.
\textsuperscript{557} AU 1457.4.
\textsuperscript{558} Ó Catháin, ‘Studies’, 21-29.
\textsuperscript{559} Breatnach, ‘An Mheán-Ghaeilge’, 301 and 305.
Ó Catháin’s results indicate that in fifteenth-century entries in AU, -r endings had, by and large, replaced -s endings in past plural forms. It is striking therefore that, contrary to this development, IMP not only retains almost all -s endings in the past plural forms of -s- preterite verbs, but also extends these endings to the past plural forms of strong verbs which had -r endings in Old Irish. In fact, Ó Catháin noticed that instead of OIr. lotar or lotair, IMP has luighset: ¶150 luighset a tir a n-inis Sipangu (129va32-33), where the OIr. 3rd sg. preterite form luid has been inflected in the plural as an -s- preterite. Similarly, for OIr. co n-dechutar, IMP has both co n-dechsat, ¶54 co n-decsat for leth (124ra18), and co n-decatur ¶64 co n-decatur gennte 7 cristaidi i n-dail chatha fri araili (124va26-27).

The following table contains Ó Catháin’s complete list and division of all instances of the active plural past forms in IMP. I have added one example which is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1301-1378</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-r</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379-1450</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-r</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451-1499</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-r</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

560 Ó Catháin, ‘Studies’, 20 and 32.
not found in Ó Catháin’s list, namely: ¶153 do cursid lucht taistil (129vb23). Following this table is a discussion of how these verbs and their forms compare to those found in SNL and GSM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weak Verbs</th>
<th>Strong Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; pl.</td>
<td>¶166 <em>amail ro raidhsium romuin</em> (130va1).</td>
<td>¶8 <em>ro gabs</em> (121va2), ¶33 (123ra23), ¶58 (124rb22), ¶128 (128rb35), ¶128 (128vbz), ¶133 (128vay), ¶148 (129rb29), ¶148 (129rb31), ¶148 (129vbz), ¶156 (130ra1), ¶8 <em>gu cuala</em> (121rb24), ¶31 <em>fricart</em> (123ra4), ¶32 <em>laidh</em> (123ra10), ¶150 (129va32), ¶33 <em>otconne</em> (123ra22), ¶118 (127vb10), ¶150 <em>atconne</em> (129vaz), ¶35 <em>foruarad</em> (123rb10), ¶54 <em>co nde</em> (124ra18), ¶114 (127va5), ¶64 <em>co nde</em> (124va26-27), ¶57 <em>co fac</em> (124rb13), ¶118 <em>cu riach</em> (127vb8), ¶148 <em>gur fha</em> (129va7), ¶150 <em>cu ranc</em> (129va31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; pl.</td>
<td>¶12 <em>do ronas</em> (121vb4), ¶35 <em>do ronas</em> (123rb7).</td>
<td>¶17 <em>ro iars</em> (121vbz), ¶18 <em>gu rucas</em> (122ra18), ¶98 (126va13), ¶28 <em>ro ronsat</em> (122vb16), ¶32 (123ra13), ¶88 (125vb7), ¶137 (128vb27), ¶29 <em>ro uimaig</em> (122vb23), ¶29 <em>ro thimaic</em> (122vb1), ¶30 <em>ar chans</em> (122vbz), ¶32 <em>ro scoilt</em> (123ra32), ¶32 <em>tuc</em> (123ra16), ¶57 (124rb16), ¶115 (125va11), ¶130 (128va13), ¶133 (128vb2), ¶32 <em>ro thoghairm</em> (123ra11), ¶33 <em>ro gair</em> (123ra24), ¶35 <em>ro marb</em> (123rb9), ¶173 (130vb18), ¶56 <em>nir saile</em> (124rb8), ¶60 <em>nir fhinns</em> (124rb29), ¶150 <em>nir fhinns</em> (129vay), ¶61 <em>cu ro lins</em> (124rb38), ¶61 <em>gur comdhuil</em> (124rbx), ¶64 <em>ro rads</em> (124va23), ¶98 <em>ro gheal</em> (126va14), ¶57 <em>nir fhac</em> (124rb29), ¶118 <em>cu riach</em> (127vb8), ¶148 <em>gur fhas</em> (129va7), ¶150 <em>cu ran</em> (129va31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; pl.</td>
<td>¶17 <em>ro iars</em> (121vbz), ¶18 <em>gu rucas</em> (122ra18), ¶98 (126va13), ¶28 <em>ro ronsat</em> (122vb16), ¶32 (123ra13), ¶88 (125vb7), ¶137 (128vb27), ¶29 <em>ro uimaig</em> (122vb23), ¶29 <em>ro thimaic</em> (122vb1), ¶30 <em>ar chans</em> (122vbz), ¶32 <em>ro scoilt</em> (123ra32), ¶32 <em>tuc</em> (123ra16), ¶57 (124rb16), ¶115 (125va11), ¶130 (128va13), ¶133 (128vb2), ¶32 <em>ro thoghairm</em> (123ra11), ¶33 <em>ro gair</em> (123ra24), ¶35 <em>ro marb</em> (123rb9), ¶173 (130vb18), ¶56 <em>nir saile</em> (124rb8), ¶60 <em>nir fhinns</em> (124rb29), ¶150 <em>nir fhinns</em> (129vay), ¶61 <em>cu ro lins</em> (124rb38), ¶61 <em>gur comdhuil</em> (124rbx), ¶64 <em>ro rads</em> (124va23), ¶98 <em>ro gheal</em> (126va14), ¶57 <em>nir fhac</em> (124rb29), ¶118 <em>cu riach</em> (127vb8), ¶148 <em>gur fhas</em> (129va7), ¶150 <em>cu ran</em> (129va31).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am aware of only one example of a past plural form in IMP which displays the loss of -s, namely ¶12 do ronabair, which however also occurs as ¶35 do ronsabair later on in the text. Apart from this one example, which shows the spread of -ebair endings into -s preterite verbs, IMP preserves -s endings in all cases.

Although the linguistic data collected by Ó Catháin from AU indicates that plural -s endings were being steadily replaced by -r endings during the Early Modern period, they are still used in a great deal of Early Modern Irish texts and are even found as alternative past forms in Bonaventura Ó hEodhasa’s seventeenth-century grammar of Irish, *Rudimenta Grammatica Hibernica*. A closer look at other texts from L, such as *GSM* and *SNL*, reveals that -s endings were being used in texts which did not contain archaic language as alternatives to -r endings in weak verbs. In the following table I have compared a number of readings from IMP, *SNL* and *GSM* which contain the same verbs and show how -s endings were being employed in all three texts. In particular, this table shows that in *SNL* and *GSM* -s endings and -r endings are used interchangeably on the same verbs in a number of instances:

---

561 Mac Aogáin, *Graiméir*, 152.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>SNL</th>
<th>GSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| beridh inleth fora **tucsat** sisim buaidh.\(^{562}\) | **tucsat** cath mor mimhaiseach da cheili.\(^{563}\) | **tucadar** ucht ar a cheili.\(^{565}\) 
| | cred in bas **tucadar** dho.\(^{564}\) | |
| **co** **rucsat** na laeic sin fair.\(^{566}\) | **rucsat** in lenabh ona mhâthair.\(^{567}\) | **rucsat** leo é cum na cathrach.\(^{568}\) 
| | | **rucadar** leo iat isin cathair.\(^{569}\) 
| **do ronsat** palas rigda for loch.\(^{570}\) | **do ronsat** fesda mor na baindsi sin.\(^{571}\) | **do ronsat** na Cristaighi ceithre tosaig.\(^{572}\) 
| | | **do rineadar** na Seirrisdinigh a cuic.\(^{573}\) 
| **in ait inar** marbsat he fil derg aniu.\(^{574}\) | **do mharbhsat** mil muight.\(^{575}\) | **do mharbhsat** a namhait iat.\(^{577}\) 
| | **do mharbhatar** drong acu.\(^{576}\) | **do mharbhatar** Moran dona Padhanachaibh.\(^{578}\) |

---

562 123ra16.  
564 Ibid., 115:1032.  
565 Hyde, *Gabháltas*, 104-06.  
566 126va13.  
569 Ibid., 22.  
570 128vb27.  
572 Hyde, *Gabháltas*, 42.  
573 Ibid., 42.  
574 130vb18.  
576 Ibid., 113:969.  
578 Ibid., 26.
As was mentioned in Part I, the language of SNL and GSM has not been archaised to the same extent as that of IMP, and both texts contain a great deal of modern features in both orthography and grammar. The use of -s endings as alternatives to -r endings in weak verbs in these texts may suggest that -s endings were not felt to have been particularly strong archaic features. On the other hand, there are a number of examples which show that IMP uses -s endings where SNL and GSM do not:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>SNL</th>
<th>GSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>co ndecsat fon coill gin comus dialachaib.⁵⁷⁹</td>
<td>cá ndechadar na righa.⁵⁸¹</td>
<td>a ndechadar na Cristaigh.⁵⁸²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co ndecatur gennte 7 cristaidi indail chatha fria raiili.⁵⁸⁰</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gur fhacsat gin anmain iat.⁵⁸³</td>
<td>do fhacbhatar an leanabh a nglaic croinn.⁵⁸⁴</td>
<td>do fhacbhadar Marsirius amille becan buidhne.⁵⁸⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ro gabsat araild dona gentib baisded.⁵⁸⁶</td>
<td>do ghabhadur Sairristinigh nert.⁵⁸⁷</td>
<td>do ghabhadar baistedh cuca.⁵⁸⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am not aware of any examples of co ndechsat, do fhacsat or do ghabsat in SNL or GSM, and conversely there are no examples of do ghabhadar or do fhacbhatar in IMP. These examples may suggest that the author of IMP was using -s endings as stylistic enhancers by using them on verbs which only inflected with -r endings, either because, like -dechatur they did so in Old Irish, or because their -s endings had become superseded, as may have been the case with do fhacbhatar and do ghabhadar. This use of -s endings in verbs which had acquired -r endings combined with the

⁵⁷⁹ 127va5.
⁵⁸⁰ 124va26.
⁵⁸² Hyde, Gabháltas, 82.
⁵⁸³ 129va7.
⁵⁸⁵ 105rb31.
⁵⁸⁶ 121va2.
⁵⁸⁸ Hyde, Gabháltas, 8. 96vb3.
prevalence of -s endings over -r endings in IMP, illustrates the techniques used by the
Irish author to raise the style of his prose and archaise the language of IMP. Although
the use of -s endings is not unusual in an Early Modern Irish text, the preference for
these endings in IMP antiquates the language considerably.

Often the use of -s endings in the plural coincides with a choice in vocabulary.
For example, to say ‘the aforementioned’ and ‘they went’, the following forms are
found in IMP, SNL and GSM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>SNL</th>
<th>GSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amail ro raidhshium romuinn.(^{589})</td>
<td>do thagradar risin easboc adubhramur.(^{590})</td>
<td>tar an sruth adubhramar.(^{591})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luidhset na druidh fora cliathaib fis.(^{592})</td>
<td>do chuatar isin coiccrich.(^{593})</td>
<td>do chuadar chum na cathrach.(^{594})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first of these examples IMP uses OIr. ráidid in the 1\(^{st}\) pl. past with its expected
Middle Irish -s- preterite ending, whereas the Early Modern Irish -r ending is found in
the 1\(^{st}\) pl. past indicative of adeir in SNL and GSM. I am not aware of any examples of
inflected forms of ráidid in SNL or GSM except in the verbal noun, as expected, and
conversely as-beir does not occur in the 1\(^{st}\) pl. past in IMP. In the second example, to
say ‘they went’ in absolute position the historical preterite form luid is used in IMP
whereas the OIr. perfect and EMIr. past indicative form do chuaidh is found in SNL
and GSM. I am not aware of any examples of the historical preterite form luid in SNL
or GSM or of the absolute form do chuaidh being used in IMP.

Ó Catháin’s analysis of past plural endings in AU and IMP indicates that the
author of IMP was deliberately archaising the language of his text by incorporating -s
endings in verbs which had -r endings in Early Modern Irish. However, the use of -s
endings in past plurals is not an indication of archaisation in itself, since they are
found also in other Early Modern Irish texts which do not contain archaic language,

\(^{589}\) 130va1.
\(^{590}\) Mac Niocaill, ‘Sdair’, 91:51.
\(^{591}\) Hyde, Gabháltas, 104. 107vb17.
\(^{592}\) 123ra10.
\(^{593}\) Mac Niocaill, ‘Sdair’, 90:20.
\(^{594}\) Hyde, Gabháltas, 22. 98va2.
such as SNL and GSM, rather it is the overuse of the -s ending in past plural forms which creates the linguistic embellishment in IMP.

**Infixed pronouns vs independent pronouns**

The third linguistic feature in IMP which Ó Catháin analysed in detail was infixed pronouns. There are twenty-five infixed pronouns in IMP, eight of which are meaningful or true, i.e. not used in combination with a noun or independent pronoun to express the object, and seventeen of which are pleonastic. Twenty-three of these infixed pronouns occur as -s- in the 3rd sg. and pl., and two occur as -n- in the 3rd pl.

In the following table I have arranged all occurrences of infixed pronouns in IMP and divided them according to person and to whether they are pleonastic or true. In the second table I have arranged a full list of all independent pronouns in IMP, which were also examined in Ó Catháin’s study, according to whether they occur in combination with an infixed pronoun or a noun, or whether they are used ‘truly’ independently. This will allow for a visualisation of the variety of pronominal forms employed by the Irish author in IMP, which is discussed below.

---

## INFIXED PRONOUNS IN IMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleonastic:</th>
<th>True:</th>
<th>3rd sg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 examples.</td>
<td>4 examples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Pleonastic:*
| *Pleonastic:* | 5 examples. | | 3rd sg. |
| 2 cídh fil ann tra acht *ro-s-tinnta* Pronsiscus in leabarso Mharcuis a Tartairidh a Laitín (121ra20-22), ¶14 feoil 7 righle *no-s-toimlìt* (121vb12), ¶26 iar cur chuil frisin crichsin *fo-s-gebh* fasac fodi (122va13), ¶42 Ragú ummorro magh forleathan eisdhe. uidh .xl. aitreachus ann. sealg *no-s-toimlìt* (123va12-13), ¶45 ni tabhar crog la’ hìghin i’ crìchaib na tartraigec, na laeich *no-s-ber* crogh dia maithrecu (123va34-36), ¶57 conadh eadh *ro-s-dùsìgh* in slògh as a suan (124rb17-18), ¶61 gur comdluthaigseat na catha re cheli in tan sin, cu *ro-s-tocaìb* nel niamdha dá ndornclaidib dathordha (124rbx-z), ¶68 co facuidh cublay ar bfaicsin neoil 7 rotha grene 7 esca celmaine do chuir do beith do de dia mbeith in sruth trithi cu *ro-s-tocaïbh* in cathair don taeb araill don tsruth la tuaithleacht 7 amaindisi (124vb32-35), ¶119 feoil 7 righle *no-s-toimlìt* (127vb21-22), ¶166 ni fhàsann arbhur for bith na fineamain tre uir innite conadh righle *no-s-toimlìt* (130rby-z), ¶169 bai .c. 7 tri .m. do mhìlibh ina timcell feact riamh gu *ro-s-caìth* imghluaiseacht mara la gaeith hi (130va10-12), ¶173 do ghnì an uir sin icslialnti da gac aen *no-s-toimliunn* bec no mor dhi for dhìgh (130vb19-21). | *True:* |

| *Pleonastic:* | 98 bliadain dò na giall aigi cu *ro-s-leic* forcula dia thìgh fein (126va14-15), ¶106 dia tisat aidhgh no eachtraínn do thìgh no do dhun dib dia carait é *no-s-muirbhfit* (126vb34-35), ¶175 ni thoimlit fin tria bithu 7 ni gabuid aeur na aithis in neich dhìbh *no-s-ibeann* (130vb27-29), ¶187 Samsibár a ainm, ilchenala eathachdha *no-s-aireabann* (130vay-z). | 113 |

| *Pleonastic:* | 35 in sìabh urad sin in ro adhnaicht Sìsím is ann *ro-s-adhnachta* ar ghein do righuìb fora lurch (123rb1-3), ¶52 is ed asbertisim beos conudh iat na dei *no-s-freasdlìat* iat (124ra6-7), ¶101 lointi imchuìb de *no-s-berat* leo dia siubal for dumuìb 7 asanaìbh (126va28-29), ¶114 gabait na h-eilifaint for miri 7 dasacht co n-decsat | 113 |
| 3rd pl. | **All -s-** | **True:**  
4 examples.  
Two -s- and two -n- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fon coill gin comus dia laechaib forro, cu <strong>ro-s-trascrait</strong> la dairghibh 7 omnuib in fheagha a caislena debthai cusin bhfialluch ngaiscid bui nambroinn (127va6-8), ¶183 in tan lamhnaigid na mna mad ingena no-s-berat no-n-alad fri druine 7 gresa (131va6-7).</td>
<td>¶92 pupla na h-ingenraide, sida uili <strong>no-s-ditneann</strong> (126rb5-6), ¶147 fil cathair oirecuis leou do roine in ripalas anorac na meadhon cu halla rigda 7 gu seomradhaib solusda ba do claruibh óir aitheaghtha <strong>ro-s-din dibлинаib</strong> (129rb20-24), ¶183 in tan lamhnaigid na mna mad ingena no-s-berat <strong>no-n-alad</strong> fri druine 7 gresa (131va6-7), ¶189 as feardha a cathuibh iat ár is friu <strong>ro-nn-altadh</strong> oc imaireacc fria genntiu (131vb25-26).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEPENDENT PRONOUNS IN IMP

| 3rd sg | Infx. pron.: | ¶169 bai .c. 7 tri .m. do mhilibh ina timcell fact riamh gu ro-s-caith imghluaisecht mara la gaeith hi (130va10-12). |
| Indep. pron.: | ¶1 guighit he fa an cetna doridisi (121ra9), ¶1 do thadhaill mu rosca he (121ra17), ¶13 ro mharbh é cona righuib 7 taiscaibh (121vb7), ¶26 no gabhad sal no dorcatu he (122vb25), ¶29 ro h-oirnded i righi leo he (122vb17), ¶30 do beradh do sistim hi (122vb32), ¶34 rodibraiceadh doshoighid he (123ra32), ¶51 toimhlit he (124ra1), ¶55 ba he lin in tslúaig do freagair he (124ra36), ¶85 do ronta he (125vb7), ¶98 berit he co Prespiter Seon amail ro gheallsat (126va13-14), ¶99 cuiris magnus cam faa smacht he (126va21), ¶105 ni rannuid ni is lugha he (126vb31-32), ¶106 dia carait é (126vbx), ¶111 ba he lin do freacair he (127rb14), ¶120 cuirit a crannoc chumhdachta hi (128vb31), ¶120 cu nac faiceat daine na eathaite he (128vb32-33), ¶140 7 scribhthar aris he (129ra22-23), ¶143 toghuit hi (128by-z), ¶152 marbhuit he (129vb22), ¶164 marbtur leo he (130rb26-27), ¶173 inar marbsat he (130vb18), ¶179 crothait forro hi (131rb14), ¶191 cuir ccohadhnucl issu he (131vby-z). |
| 2nd pl. | Indep. pron.: | ¶112 is ferdha bar laeich in naid 7 is fria galaib ro-n-altad sib (127rb26-27). |
| 3rd pl. | Infx. pron.: | ¶52 is ed asberitsium beos conudh iat na dei no-s-freasdlat iat (124ra6-7). |
| Indep. pron.: | ¶36 no h-aitea iat (123rb20), ¶89 is forro ro-n-alt iat (126ra12-13), ¶94 is lasnataiseachaib sin dosuidhighthe iat (126rb12), ¶102 indar leo is ar a maith ro thoghsat iat (126vb15), ¶115 beris Niscardyn iat (127va13), ¶121 gurub amlaid sin dhithaigid laeich nacrichi iat (128ra11-12), ¶148 gur fhacsat gin anmain iat (129va6-7), ¶149 sreathais |
| 15 examples | ainbhthine dermail friaroiili *iat* (129va14-15), ¶151 rotinlaiced *iatsom* (129rb10), ¶162 beruit *iat* diacreic anilhirthaib (130rb7), ¶167 acht a mbeith deanocht amail thuismiter *iat* (130va8), ¶169 gu mbaidhter *iat* (130va17), ¶185 curannait eatarra *iat* iarnangabail (131va18), ¶186 *ni fhil* for talmain cenel frisa samalta *iat* (131va24-25), ¶186 *co n-denann briscbruar diamballaib cutoimhlint* *iat iarum* (131va32-33). |
Further to the divisions in these tables, Ó Catháin noticed that of the eight true infixed pronouns in IMP five occur in relative construction.\(^596\) In fact, as was noted by Strachan, Class A infixed pronouns became generalised in Middle Irish and took over the relative function of Class C infixed pronouns.\(^597\) This resulted in a tendency of the generalised Class A infixed pronoun -s- to be used to express the relative. With this last consideration, the infixed and independent pronouns in IMP may be divided into five groups:

i) 40 true independent pronouns: ¶1, ¶1, ¶13, ¶26, ¶29, ¶30, ¶34, ¶36, ¶51, ¶55, ¶85, ¶89, ¶94, ¶98, ¶99, ¶101, ¶105, ¶106, ¶111, ¶112, ¶115, ¶120, ¶120, ¶121, ¶140, ¶143, ¶148, ¶149, ¶151, ¶152, ¶162, ¶164, ¶167, ¶169, ¶173, ¶179, ¶185, ¶186, ¶186, ¶191.

ii) 2 pleonastic infixed pronouns in combination with an independent pronouns: ¶52, ¶169.


iv) 3 true infixed pronouns: ¶98, ¶106, ¶183.

v) 5 true infixed pronouns in relative construction: ¶92, ¶147, ¶175, ¶187, ¶189.

This division of the pronouns of IMP may be visualised in the following pie chart:

\(^{596}\) Ó Catháin, ‘Studies’, 11.
This chart displays the proportion of IMP in which the direct object is expressed by an independent pronoun against the proportion of the text in which infixed pronouns are used, at times in combination with a noun, at others with a pronoun or in relative construction, and at times alone. The fact that there are three true infixed pronouns in IMP indicates that the Irish author was aware of how to correctly construct a sentence using this archaic syntax. On the other hand, the fact that the great majority of infixed pronouns are used either pleonastically, i.e. in combination with a pronoun or a noun, or are found in relative construction, suggests that the Irish author may have been softening the delivery of infixed-pronoun syntax in IMP in order to make it more intelligible to a fifteenth-century audience.\footnote{In contrast to this distribution of infixed pronouns in IMP, I have found no examples of infixed pronouns in GSM or SNL, where the independent pronoun is used throughout, for example: do chuiretar a luígh he (Hyde, Gabhálaí, 2), and, ocus do lean Agiolandus iat (Ibid., 24) in GSM, and: do mharb hē isin cath (Mac Niocaill, Sdair, 92: 1.68) and, co tuc dona leanaibh do bhí maille ris iat (Ibid., 96: 1.257) in SNL.}  

The decline of infixed pronouns in Irish is a major syntactical development in the language, which had already begun in the Middle Irish period, some five-hundred years before L was compiled.\footnote{Breathnach, ‘An Mheán-Ghseilge’, 263-268.} In creating a pseudo-archaic text the Irish author would have therefore had to find a balance between Old and Early Modern Irish features so as not to render his text grammatically impenetrable to his less erudite
contemporaries. This pie chart reveals the Irish author’s methodology for incorporating infixed pronouns into the syntax of IMP. While on the one hand he was integrating obsolete archaisms into his prose, the Irish author was also finding ways to ease Old Irish grammar and render it comprehensible to his audience.

Note on *nisam*. 600

This rare form of the copula is found at the beginning of IMP when the nobles request Proniscus to translate Marcus’s book and Prosiscus replies that he has no fear of doing so. 601 ¶1. *nisam omhanachsa riasin leabarsa Mharcais or ni fhuiil go ann* (121ra15-17). The absolute form *isam* is well attested as being a late-Middle and Early Modern development of 1st sg. of the copula, composed of *is*, 3rd sg. pres. of the copula, and *am* 1st sg. infixed pronoun Class A. 602 Some examples from Middle Irish texts are: *issam ingen rig 7 rigna*, 603 from *Táin Bó Fraich* and, *ar asam senoir cena*, 604 from *In Cath Catharda*. Its corresponding negative forms are *nida*, *nidam*, *nidom*, *nimda*, *nim*, *niam*, *niom* and *niom*. 605 On the other hand the form *nisam* appears to be a combination of the negative particle *ni* + and the absolute *isam*. The form *nidam* occurs elsewhere in L in the hand of Scribe A, namely in *CCC*, when Mór ingen Aedha meic Echach says that she is not yet a woman to Ceallachán: *nidam ben-sa fós do*. 606

I am aware of only one other attestation of *nisam*, namely in the copy of Sansas Cormaic (SC) found in the Leabhar Breac, written during the first part of the fifteenth century, in the entry under the word *prull*: *nisam eolach immid adbaig*. 607 The form *nibsa* replaces *nisam* in the copy of SC found in British Library MS, Harley 5280, written by Gilla Riabhach Ó Cléirigh in Donegal during the first half of the

---

600 For infixed pronouns after the copula see Thurneysen, *Grammar*, 269-270.
601 For a discussion of this scene in IMP, see Chapter IV.
605 *DIL*, s.v. ‘1 is’; accessed 02/01/18 [dil.ie/29104].
sixteenth century, as it does in the Yellow Book of Lecan copy of *SC*: *nibsa eolaig immig odbaigh*, and in *Leabhar na Rátha*. Unfortunately, the fragments of *SC* which survive in the Book of Leinster and the section of text which contained this word have been lost.

The rarity of this form of the copula is testimony to the Irish author’s vast linguistic knowledge of obscure Old and Middle Irish forms. The choice of this form also exemplifies the Irish author’s approach to enhancing the language of his text, showing how he introduced rare and archaic language while making sure that it did not obstruct the understanding of his text.

**Substantive verb: *fil* vs *atá***

A distinctive feature of the language of IMP is the preference for *fil* over *atá* as the present substantive form in absolute position. Following is a list of all occurrences of *fil*, in the left column, compared to instances of *atá*, in the right column, in absolute position in IMP. There are three examples in IMP of the 3rd pl. form of *fil*, namely ¶14 *fileat* (121vb16), ¶53 (124ra11) and ¶189 (131vb27). I have excluded from these lists the examples of *fil* and *atá* when they occur as part of stock literary forumlas such as *cidh fil ann trà* and *atá ni chena*, and instead counted only the occurrences where they are used as main clause verbs. I am aware of thirty-one examples of *fil* and nine examples of *atá* in absolute position, indicating that *fil* occurs in 78% and *atá* in 22% of instances of the present substantive verb in absolute position in IMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute Present Substantive Forms in IMP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>fil</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>atá</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

608 I have not been able to consult this manuscript personally and go by Meyer’s edition. Cf. Meyer, Anecdota iv, x.
609 Dublin, Trinity College MS 1318, col.75.6-7. Transcription is my own.
610 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 610, ff. 85rb14: Transcription is my own.
611 Dublin, Trinity College MS 1339, f. 179ra. This fragment of *SC* breaks off before the entry with *nisam*.
(31 examples - 78% of instances)

5 fil mainster isin crich sin 7 loch fria taebh (121rb2-3).
6 fil crich n-aili innti (121rb6).
6 fil cathair oirdndhi innte (121rb7).
8 fil cathair n-aili isin crich sin (121rb21).
12 fil ri fuirre (121va27).
14 fileat dithreabhaigh a mainstribh (121vb16).
15 fil sliabh urard (121vb19).
23 fil cathair naili uidhi dha la allamuigh don cathraigh sin (122vb24).
26 fil sliabh urard isin crich sin (122vb15).
43 fil anmann n-aili ann (123va26).
53 fil mainster la Cublay (124ra10).
53 filet manuigh aili isin crich sin (124ra11).
68 fil cathair n-aili la Magnus Cam (124vb29).
81 fil tulach ard allamuigh don cathraigh sin (125va4).
100 fil droicheat ac on chathraigh sin (126va22).
104 fil prouinssi Cariaiam fria thaebh sidhe (126vb21).
105 fil loch isin crich cétna sin (126vb26).
111 fil crich ele fria h-or na criche sin (127rb21).
123 fil prouindsi ele fria toebh 7 ri fuirri

(9 examples - 22% of instances)

54 atat 7 na cetri righ fil fo mamus Naim (124ra21).
71 ata clog romor fora lar (125ra14).
90 ata taisech dia muintir co n-deich milib lais (126ra18).
116 ata magh isin crich sin (127va15).
116 ata ummorro dhairdi na h-aiti (127va28).
134 ata sruth for fod prouinns Manguay (128vb7).
163 ata coill isin crich sin (130rb12).
173 ata began Cristaidi imm on cathraig mbic ina bhfuil corp Tomáis (130vb21).
183 atat di inis a fudomhuin in mara sin (131rb35).
A similar ratio of *fil* to *atá* is found in the forms of the present substantive verb in direct relative position in IMP. Thus *fil* occurs twelve times as the direct relative form of the substantive verb, and *atá* occurs four times. I am not aware of any examples in IMP of the specifically relative form *file*.

### Direct Relative Present Substantive Forms in IMP

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>fil</strong></td>
<td><strong>atá</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 examples - 75% of instances)</td>
<td>(4 examples - 25% of instances)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶3 <em>fo chis do Magnus fil si</em> (121ra25).</td>
<td>¶3 <em>Glaisia is cathair oirechais di 7 ar muir atá si</em> (121ra28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶25 <em>masa dhith oir nó ilmaine n-anaitinte fil fort</em> (122va11).</td>
<td>¶4 <em>isin tirsin atá sliab Armenia</em> (121ra34).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These lists indicate that the Irish author was methodically using *fil* instead of *atá* in four out of five instances in IMP. The accusative following *fil*, as expected in Old Irish and Classical Irish, is marked by nasalisation in 53% of examples in which the adjective following the noun in the singular begins with a vowel. Out of fifteen examples in which an adjective following a singular noun after *fil* begins with a vowel, nasalisation is marked on eight: ¶6, ¶8, ¶23, ¶43, ¶68, ¶135, ¶136, ¶143, and nasalisation is not marked on seven: ¶6, ¶15, ¶26, ¶81, ¶111, ¶123, ¶147.

Thurneysen observed that *fil* is found often in ‘archaic texts and poetry (...) with the meaning “there is”’. In fact, Mac Gearailt has shown that *fil* in absolute and relative position occurs in the Book of Leinster versions of the *Táin* and *Cath Ruis na Rígh (CRR)*, for example:

---

613 Thurneysen, *Grammar*, 479.
Mac Gearailt also noticed Ó Cianáin’s use of *fil* instead of the expected absolute form in the *Turas*, and likewise Ó Cuív noticed that it occurs in the version of *Cath Muighe Tuireadh* written by David Duigenan in 1651-1652. These observations indicate that *fil* was being used instead of *átá* for stylistic purposes as late as the seventeenth century in order to give the language of texts an archaic flair. The preference for *fil* over *átá* in IMP significantly alters the linguistic tone of the text, evoking the language of Middle Irish saga narrative.

On the other hand, I am not aware of any occurrences of *fil* in absolute or dependent relative position in *GSM* or *SNL*, in which *átá* occurs throughout, for example: *ata sruth fora lar a mbi moran d'iasgaibh dubha*, in *GSM*, and: *ór atáit trí srotha isin flaithimhnus*, in *SNL*.

---

615 O’Rahilly, *Táin Leinster*, 10:342,
616 Ibid., 43:1581-82.
618 Ibid., 768:22899.
620 Ó Cuív, *Cath*, 16.
OIr. 3rd sg. absolute pret. forms: -is and -us.

I am aware of forty-six occurrences of the OIr. and Classical 3rd sg. absolute s-pret. form -(a)is in IMP, thirty-four of which are plene spellings. Of these thirty-four examples, thirty-two are OIr. 3rd sg. absolute pret. -is, and two are the relative form -us. Following is a table containing all plene spellings of the OIr. 3rd sg. absolute pret. forms, in the left column, and the two examples of the OIr. relative form -us, in the right column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd sg. absolute pret. forms in IMP</th>
<th>-is</th>
<th>-us</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶8 airisis air coidhche (121va1-2), ¶10 (121va19), ¶24 faidhis magnus cam feacht naill teachta (122rbx), ¶30 (122vb26), ¶30 (122vb29), ¶55 (123ra31), ¶55 (123ra35), ¶58 (124rb20), ¶111 (127vb12), ¶117 (127va34), ¶128 (128rb34-35), ¶133 (128va33), ¶156 (129vb33), ¶156 (130ra3-4), ¶25 foemuis magnus. doibh oirisium for dliged a sean (122va11-12). ¶33 muidhis for na hindecdhaibh (123ra28), ¶63 (124va21), ¶56 Naim ummorro gluaisis coslogh ndermhair lais (124rb2). ¶62 oirisis naim (124va12), ¶66 (124vb4-5), ¶133 (128vb4-5), ¶94 trialluis fora set (126rb33-34). ¶98 accainis Prespiter Seon (126va7). ¶98 gellaissium sin (126va10). ¶99 cuiris magnus cam fa a smacht he (126va21), ¶169 (130va24). ¶112 sreathais a scora fria taebh (127rb21), ¶149 (129va14). ¶112 gairis a thaisigh 7 a laeich gaili cuigi (127rb24).</td>
<td>¶18 airisis didiu an eaclais amail as deach bui riam (122ra19-20). ¶111 faidhius magnus cam taisec dia muintir cuslog ndearmhair lais dfurtacht prouindsi Oraandum (127rb4-6).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The forms -is and -us are used interchangeably in IMP, suggesting that the ending -us no longer conveyed relative meaning. Mac Gearailt and Williams observed that though the OIr. absolute pret. form -(a)is was probably not used in speech already by the twelfth century, it continued to be used as literary forms until the eighteenth century, and Jackson suggested that the 3rd sg. absolute pret. form ‘seems to have regained some popularity in literary circles as a “high class” form in Early Modern Irish’. O’Rahilly counted sixteen instances of -is and eight of -as in Ó Maolchonaire’s Desiderius from the seventeenth century, however I am not aware of any examples earlier than IMP which display this confusion between the two forms. This confusion between the forms -is and -us is further indication that the OIr. 3rd sg. absolute s-pret. form was no longer in everyday use.

The spread of -s endings into strong verbs in IMP is seen in the pseudo-archaic construction beris, which inflected as a t-preterite - birt - in Old Irish. In IMP, the form beiris has been re-inflected as an s-preterite, perhaps by using the OIr. conjunct pres. form -beir as its stem. Mac Gearailt observed that this form is common in Ó Cianáin’s Turas, where it is also likely to be a purely literary form.

I am not aware of any examples in IMP of the 3rd sg. past form -(a)sdar, which spread from OIr. deponent forms.

**Plural past passive forms: -adh, -id and -ta**

Three forms of the past pass. plural occur in IMP, namely: the OIr. sg. conjunct perfect pass. form -adh/-edh; MIr. pl. past pass. form -it/-id in IMP; OIr. pl. perfect

---

624 Jackson, Aislinge, 131.
625 Ó Maolchonaire, Desiderius, xxvii.
pass. form -ta, which occurred in OIr. strong verbs, is found on two verbs in IMP, namely OIr. do-gni and ad-anaig.

Of these forms, -adh/-edh is used for both the sg. and pl., as expected in Early Modern Irish. It occurs eight times with a plural noun and four times with plural pronouns, two of which are infixed:

**With pl. noun:**

¶49 **do ronad** istada rebroinn seilgi lais a ndiamhair in fheaga 7 ba do boicshimnibh **do ronad**. (123vb19-21).
¶55 **ro hindledh** cetri helifainti don rig 7 caislen claruig forro. (124rax-y).
¶74 **do rinnadh** fair beos do brechtrad gaca datha imhaighi na cath 7 na congol **do ratad** isna hiltirib sin. (125ra31-33).
¶133 **imat cloch 7 aile ndimhor asta forsin cathraig gur brised a taidhblit 7 a tighi.** (128vay-z).
¶138 **ro hoirdneadh** nai righa do tarraidibh forro. (129ra1-2).
¶142 **na nai righa hoirdned** for righi stactur. (129ra30-31).
¶148 **gabsat do lorcuibh 7 tuinidibh in talman forro curo coimmbriseadh a cnamha 7 a cuirp.** (129va5-6).

**With pl. pronoun:**

¶112 **is ferdha bar laeich innaid 7 is fria galaib ro-n-altad sib.** (127rb26-27).
¶151 **ro tinnaiced** iatsom go cublay. (129vb10-11).
¶183 **in tan lamhnaigid na mna mad ingena no-s-berat no-n-alad fri druine 7 gresa.** (131va6-7).
¶189 **as feardha a cathuibh iat ár is friu ro-nn-altadh oc imaireace fria genntiu.** (131vb25-26).

I am aware of five examples of the MIr. pl. past pass. form -it/-id in IMP, all of which occur with pl. nouns:

¶31 **ro gairmit a righa 7 a thaisigh dia shaigid.** (122vby-z).
¶33 **ro seindit a sduic.** (123ra24).
This use of the pl. past pass. form -it/-id with plural nouns complies with that indicated in *Rudimenta Grammatica Hibernicae* (*RGH*), in which Ó hEodhasa specifies that -it/-id be used with plural nouns, while the sg. past pass. form -adh/-edh be used with plural pronouns. The fact the sg. past pass. form -adh/-edh is used eight times in IMP with pl. nouns and that the pl. past pass. form -it/-id is only used five times, contrary to Ó hEodhasa’s recommendation, may indicate that the pl. past pass. form -it/-id form was obsolete in speech, and that it was being used as an archaism. A similar situation is found in *LSN*, in which Falconer observed that the sg. past pass. form -adh/-edh is used with a pl. subject in at least six plene readings. Ó Corráin has shown that the pl. past pass. form -it/-id was not known to the seventeenth-century copyists of *RGH*, who wrote the Mlr. pl. past pass. form -it/-id as -uidh/-aidh, indicating their unfamiliarity with the form. Hull observed that the first example of the sg. past pass. form -adh/-edh being used with pl. subject in AU occurs in 1177, and after 1207 it is the only past pass. form used in AU. This suggests that the Mlr. pl. past pass. form -it/-id was not in current use during the fifteenth century, and was being used in IMP to enhance the language of the text.

I am aware of two verbs which use OIr. pl. perf. pass. form -ta in IMP, namely OIr. *do-gní* and *ad-anáig*. Interestingly, the pl. forms of these verbs are used both with sg. and pl. subjects. All examples of pl. perf. pass. forms -ta in IMP are listed below, and have been divided according to whether they have a sg. or pl. subject:

**With sg. subject:**

¶12 *do ronta* palas rigda lais a nglind dithoghlaidi. (121va26-28).

---

630 Hull, ‘Middle Irish’, 108.
¶12 as aire do ronta sin leo. (121va33).
¶16 ro hadhnachta in ri foithi. (121vb32).
¶85 in .c.na laithi don bliadain do ronta he. (125vb7).

With pl. subject:

¶17 ro iarsat a shaeursiumh an ail dimhor fo ro hadhnachta a athair 7 sin na nIubhaidhe. (121vbz-122ra1).
¶18 in ail fo ro hadhnachta a sin. (122ra12-13).
¶35 is ann ro-s-adhnachta ar ghein do righuib fora lurg. (123rb2-3).

The three examples of do ronta occurring with sg. subjects (¶12, ¶12, ¶85) are especially interesting when compared with the the examples of the sg. past passive form do ronad being used with pl. subject, listed above: ¶49 do ronad istada re broinn seilgi lais a ndiamhair in fheaga 7 ba do boicshimnibh do ronad (123vb19-21).

This example in particular shows how the Irish author was using OIr. pl. pass. forms for stylistic effect in IMP and was not concerned with implementing them according to correct OIr. usage. In fact, of the seven examples of OIr. pl. pass. forms -ta only three are used correctly with a pl. subject. Finally, the fact that the sg. past pass. form -adh/-edh is used as the pl. form in the majority of cases in IMP, suggests that distinctive pl. past pass. forms were literary features rather than reflections of the author’s spoken practices.

Finally, Hull’s observations that the pl. past pass. form -it/-id occurs in AU between 1014 and 1187
d and in the Annals of Inisfallen between 1013 and 1282, and that the OIr. perf. pass. ending -ta is last found in AU in 1207, indicates that the Irish author was reviving verbal forms in his prose which may have been out of use for at least three centuries.

2.5. Conclusions

This analysis of the orthography, nominal inflection and verbal forms of IMP has shown that the language of the text contains a mix of Old, Middle and Early Modern Irish features. The use of this linguistic style, which is not unusual in fifteenth-century Irish texts, shows an awareness of contemporary archaized prose styles. In particular this chapter has shown how the author was incorporating archaic language in IMP and adapting it to an Early Modern audience.

I have argued that the archaic spelling system employed in IMP was intended by the author of the text and was not a consequence of the orthographical tendencies of Scribe A. Phonological points of interest that I have raised in this chapter include: the spelling ¶79 órdadh (125rb30), by the relief scribe of f. 125rb, with unhistoric final -dh, which indicates that he pronounced final -adh as -a, a distinctive feature of spoken Irish of the southern half of the island since the fifteenth-century;\(^{633}\) and the unhistoric spelling -ghth- in two examples of the equitative, namely ¶116 airdighthir (127va18), ¶187 leithighthir (131vb3), also spelled -th- in ¶169 glainithir (130va23), which indicates that Scribe A pronounced unstressed -ghth- as -h-, as in Munster Irish. Preservation of archaic endings such as -ai in the nom. pl. form ¶125 eascrai (125ra23) and -ea in imperf. and past subj. pass. forms such as ¶17 no berthea (121vb38), indicate that the author was imitating the orthography of texts written prior to the decline of unstressed final vowels to /ǝ/. On the other hand, the use of distinctive plural endings -adha and -the/-te shows the influence of Early Modern forms on the language of the text.

The overall correspondence of the nominal system of IMP with IGT II is evidence of the linguistic training of the Irish author and might indicate familiarity with the training of schools of poetry, though this would not necessarily follow, as a scholar from any of the branches of Irish learning would have more than a working knowledge of the norms of Classical Irish. The use of acc. pl. forms in nom. pl. position, such as firu and rigu, indicates that acc. pl. forms had lost grammatical significance and were being used for stylistic purposes, enhancing the language of IMP by recalling Old Irish inflectonal endings irrespective of their correct grammatical use.

The preference for *ro* over *do*, the use of 3rd pl. *s*-preterite endings and of infixed pronouns in IMP reveal the methodology adopted by the Irish author in archaising the language of the text. In particular, the use of pleonastic infixed pronouns in the text shows how he was adapting archaic verbal syntax for an Early Modern audience. The preference for *fil* over *átá* as the 3rd sg. pres. indic. of the substantive verb is another indication of the systematic manner in which the Irish author was writing IMP in a literary and quasi-artificial language. The confusion between 3rd sg. *s*-preterite past indic. ending -ais and the relative form -us, commonplace up to the mid-seventeenth century, shows that the author of IMP was employing verbal forms which were not in spoken use, and the various past passive forms in the text show how he was using forms from the Old, Middle and Early Modern language side by side.

In conclusion, the author of IMP was not interested in reviving Old or Middle Irish in IMP, rather he was using obsolete forms to give his prose a more antique tone. Comparison with the language of GSM and SNL indicates that this linguistic style is unique to IMP among the translated texts which deal with European and Oriental history in L, and that GSM, SNL and IMP do not form a linguistic unit in the manuscript. Comparison with the language of GM also indicates that the same linguistic style was not being used to adapt texts of the same genre in late fifteenth-century Munster.

The motivation behind the author’s choice of style may lie in a desire to parade linguistic erudition and knowledge of Old and Middle Irish forms. Sophisticated language would have complimented not only the author of the text but also its audience, setting it aside from texts written *chum leasa na ndaoine simplidhe nách foil géarchúiseach a nduibheagán na Gaidhilge*, to quote Flaithri Ó Maolchonaire. The different linguistic styles of GSM and SNL on the one hand, and IMP on the other may indicate that these texts were written with different audiences in mind. I will argue in Chapter IV that there are sections of IMP which were embellished and expanded by the Irish author because they offered parallels with the career and personal life of Finghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, patron of L. If these parallels are correct, and IMP was translated for Finghean Mac Carthaigh, it may be suggested that the language of

---

634 Ó Maolchonaire, *Desiderius*, 2.
IMP was archaized because the text was intended for the lord of Cairbre himself. In this respect IMP may be compared to Tadhg Ó Cianáin’s Turas written in 1609 and Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh’s Beatha Aodha Ruaidh Úi Dhomhnaill, written after 1616, which were composed with learned court audiences in mind.

PART III

3. Narrative Styles of IMP

I have already discussed in Chapter I how the critical tone which permeates Pipino’s translation of the *Travels* is not present in IMP. Instead, the prose of IMP alternates primarily between three distinctive narrative styles. The first is a clipped, terse, succinct style, which is evocative of the narrative of many Old Irish short tales, such as *Fingal Rónáin, Esnada Tige Buchet* or *Scéla Mucce Meic Dathó*. The second is a fluid narrative style, used for anecdotes and events. Some of its features include: multiple dependent clauses in each sentence; and ample use of direct speech. This style is common in other Early Modern Irish texts such as GM, GSM, SNL and *Stair Ercuil ocus a Bhás*. The third is the bombastic, alliterative, adjective-heavy prose style of the Irish *cath*, so called because it is most frequently found in Late Middle and Early Modern Irish battle narrative, in texts such as *Cogad Gaedhel re Gallaibh, Caithréim Cheallacháin Chaisil* and *In Cath Catharada*. The following paragraphs will analyse these three styles in IMP, examining how they alternate and adapt to the themes of the text.

3.1. Clipped style

P is divided into three books. For the most part, in each of these books, every chapter deals with a different region, or with a different custom of each region. There are of course exceptions, such as chapters one to ten of the first book, which describe the first journey of Matteo and Nicolò Polo, or chapters fifty-five to sixty-one of the first book which discuss the customs of the Tartars. However, examination of the chapter lists of P shows how, by and large, the text has been divided so that one chapter will contain information pertaining to a single region, province or city. Following is the list
of forty consecutive chapters, from eleven to fifty-one of the first book of P, which
displays this feature.  

XI. Descripicio orientalium regionum et primo de Minori Armenia.
XII. De provincia Turchie.
XIII. De Armenia Maiori.
XIV. De provincia Çorçanie.
XV. De regno Mosul.
XVI. De civitate Baldachi.
XVII. De civitate Taurisii.
XVIII. De miraculo translacionis cuiusdam montis in regione illa.
XIX. De regione Persarum.
XX. De civitate Iasdi.
XXI. De civitate Cremam.
XXII. De civitate Camandu et regione Theobarle.
XXIII. De campestribus formosa et civitate Cormos et Creman.
XXIV. De intermedia regione inter civitatem Cormos et Creman.
XXV. De regione que media est inter Creman et civitatem Cobinam.
XXVI. De civitate Cobinam.
XXVII. De regno Thumochayn et arbore solis, qui vulgariter a latinis dicitur Arbor
Sicca.
XXVIII. De tiranno qui dicebatur Senex de Montanis et siccaris seu assessinis
 eius.
XXIX. De morte eius et destructione loci eius.
XXX. De civitate Sopurgan et terminis eius.
XXXI. De civitate Balach.
XXXII. De Castro Taycam et terminis eius.
XXXIII. De civitate Scassen.
XXXIV. De provincia Balascie.
XXXV. De provincia Bascie.
XXXVI. De provincia Chesumur.
XXXVII. De provincia Vocam et montibus altissimis.
XXXVIII. De provincia Cascar.
XXXIX. De civitate Samarcha et miraculo columnne facto in ecclesia beati

636 From Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, ff. 2ra-2vb.
Iohannis Baptiste.

XL. De provincia Carchan.

XLI. De provincia Coram.

XLII. De provincia Peum.

XLIII. De provincia Ciarchiam.

XLIV. De civitate Lop et deserto maximo.

XLV. De civitate Sachion et ritu paganorum in combustione mortuorum.

XLVI. De provincia Chamul.

XLVII. De provincia Chynchytalas.

XLVIII. De provincia Siccuir.

XLIX. De provincia Campicion.

L. De civitate Ezina et alio deserto magno.

LI. De civitate Carochoram et inicio dominii Tartarorum.

These chapters are connected to one another by the geographical location of the regions which they describe. Therefore, the chapter describing the province of Armenia Minor is followed by a chapter on Turkey, followed by one on Greater Armenia, which is followed by Georgia and so forth. Typically, the description of a region in one chapter will be followed by the description of a neighbouring region in the next chapter, and will often open with a sentence describing its position in relation to the region described in the previous chapter, such as: *euntes autem de Crerman versus Cobinam inveniunt viam pessimam que in longitudine VII. dietas habet* \(^{637}\) or *post discessum de Cobinam invenitur desertum, habens longitudinis dietas octo, ubi est ariditas magna* \(^{638}\). These opening statements are usually followed by a description of the landscape and a list of the principal cities, where present, before the text moves on to notable features of the region and customs of its inhabitants.

This efficient and methodical approach to description and layout in *P*, was adapted in *IMP* to match the succinct, clipped and concise style common in many Old and Middle Irish prose texts. \(^{639}\) This may be observed in the following table which compares chapters ten to twelve of the third book of *P*, in the right column, with the corresponding sections of *IMP*, in the left column.

\(^{637}\) P I.25.1.

\(^{638}\) P I.27.1.

\(^{639}\) See for example Mac Gearailt, ‘Issues’, 105.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(¶157) IAna mor fria huur na righisin 7ri fuirri cin comus righ for bith fair. Tricha .c.m. a timcill na ri ghisin. is lan da gac uili mhaithius for bith hi. ⁶⁴⁰</td>
<td>De insula magna Iana. Capitulum X.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| ¶158 | De provincia Loath. Capitulum XI. |
| Gendur 7 gondur fria hor na righi sin. dá inis muiridi iatsum co nimmat gaca maine leo INIS leoch allamuigh dhibh sin. righi forlerhan isside 7 ri fuirri nac giallann do righ for bith As ferdha linmhär a laeich. immut oir 7 ele finnted fora feadh. ⁶⁴¹ | [1] Dimissa insula Iana itur intra meridiem et garbinum per miliaria septingenta, et pervenitur ad insulas duas que dicuntur Sandur et Condur, ultra quas ad quingenta miliaria est provincia Loath, que grandis est et ditissima valde, regem proprium et linguam propriet habens, nulli tributum reddens nisi proprio regi. [2] Est enim fortis valde et a nemine |

⁶⁴⁰ 130ra11-14.  
⁶⁴¹ 130ra15-20.

(¶159) INIS peantam didiu. tir isidhe conimad fheagh toir na timechell. ceatra troigthi foradoinne .c.m. gaca taebha dhi nac tualang barc seolaid na sdiuraid for in muir sin.642

De insula Pentayn. Capitulum XII.


Characteristics of this style in IMP include: a quick succession of brief independent clauses, with few subordinate or coordinate clauses, which often omit the main-clause verb, as in ¶158 above: Gendur 7 Gondur fria h-or na righi sin. Dà inis muirdi iat-sum co n-immat gacha maine leo. Inis Leach allamuigh dhibh sin; and a restraint in the use of adjectives, when compared to the bombastic alliterative style which is

642 130ra21-24.
discussed below, which are mostly predicative when used, as in ¶158 above: *as ferdha línmarh a laeich*.

These specific stylistic features are reminiscent of the opening lines of a number of Old Irish prose texts, which set the scene of their stories by listing the basic information and introducing the main characters of the tale using this same concise and abrupt narrative rhythm. The following extracts, display the similarity between the prose styles in the opening lines of *Scéla Mucce Meic Dathó*, *Fingal Rónáin*, *Esnada Tige Buchet* and IMP:

Boi ri amrae for Laignib, Mac Dathó a ainm. Boí cú occo. Im·díched in cú Laigniu huili. Ailbe ainm in chon, ocus ba lán Héíru dia airdicus in chon. Do·eth ò Ailll ocus ò Meidb do chungid in chon. Immalle *dano* tāncatar ocus techta Ulad ocus Conchobair do chungid in chon chētna.643

(*Scéla Mucce Meic Dathó*).

Rí amra ro boí for Laignib .i. Rónán mac Aeda, 7 Ethni ingen Chummascaig maeic Eogain do Déisib Muman na fharrad. Co rruc mac do .i. Mael Fothartaíg mac Rónáín, mac is amru tānic Laigniu riam. Is immi con·eírigitis fri dāla 7 dūnada 7 cluichi ocus cēti 7 tressa ocus dībircthi. Ba hé menmarc a n·ingen ocus lennán a n·ócban uli Mail Fothartaíg.644

(*Fingal Rónáin*).


(*Esnada Tige Buchet*).

---

645 Ibid., 28.
However, while the narrative of texts such as *Scéla Mucce Meic Dathó* and *Fingal Rónáin* becomes more elaborate after the opening scene has been set, by the introduction of dialogue and the description of series of events, the clipped and concise style of IMP is found throughout much of that text. This is due to the fact that P itself is written so that the author is constantly opening and setting a new scene in each chapter. At times these geographical and ethnographical descriptions develop into an anecdote or an action sequence, but for the most part the prose of each chapter remains static, often functioning as no more than a series of notes on a particular region, such as in ¶190 *rigi Aden .i. soudan is ri forro-sum.*

### 3.1.1. Note on punctuation

The clipped, matter-of-fact style of most of IMP appears closely related to the feature of tight punctuation that is consistently imposed on the text throughout, one that is accompanied by a use of capital letters at the head of sentences and clauses. This feature may also be an innovation on the part of the Irish author. It is exemplified by many passages in IMP, of which the following is typical:

(¶117) **Prouindsí cangigu fil fria thaebsidhe. Bui ri amra fuirri 7 nir bo miadh lais magnus cam do beith na righ fair. Faidhis cublay slóg dia irghabail a nirt chatha. Gabuis serg galuir ri cangigu co táinic a thighbhai.** Ro orduigh a adhnacul co h ancorach 7 tor do thocbail for gac taebh dhe[.] x. cubait in airdi ceach dib. Cean co claradh oir for tor dibh 7 di ordlach fora thighi. Cluic ordha uassa cu toghluisedh gaeth a ceol. Cluic airgit forintor naidl. (127va31-b6)
In this passage, there are only two points where an editor might augment the pre-existing punctuation of the manuscript, indicated as [.] above. Such punctuation is also unique in the context of the other major works of translation in L, such as GSM and SNL, which are written in a more fluid and continuous narrative style such as the one discussed below. This use of punctuation may suggest a familiarity with, and perhaps even an indebtedness to the style of the *itineraria* of medieval Europe,\(^{646}\) where formulaic recordings of places and details associated with them are frequent, a feature which also connects IMP stylistically to Ó Cianáin’s *Turas*.\(^{647}\) Variants of the formulaic in IMP follow patterns such as placename + situation + what god is worshiped + peculiarites of the country, as in this example:

\[(\|20)\] LOP didu cathair oirdnidi isidhe for bel fhasaigh dhimhoir. Imat gacha maine allamuich di conid airi sin is port airisim da gac aen fria creic 7 cundrad 7 maine hi. Do Macametus adhruit Camhaill 7 asail berar fa lohintibh la gac naen dia teit foran fасac sin. uisceda serba fair. magha gaimmhidi 7 sleibti uiscide foran conuir. uidhi bliadna fora fot. uidhi .xxx. la fora leithed gin fhiadhmhila gin innile.\(^{648}\)

A consideration of the feature of punctuation and presentation serves to highlight – and to isolate – all the more the intrusion of the alliterative, bombastic style in other parts of the text, namely paragraphs ¶57, ¶58 and ¶61, discussed below. It is that breach, or foreshortening, of the tacit objective distance between text and the impartiality of the translator that reveals his engagement with the narrative beyond an obvious wish to reveal to his audience the wonders, the manners and customs of the East, as recorded in a renowned European classic. This is reinforced by his realisation of the allegorical potential of the text for reflecting political developments in the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach territory in the second half of the fifteenth century, as I argue in Chapter IV; and at the less weighty end of the narrative spectrum, by a minor intrusion

---

\(^{646}\) See for example Geyer et al, *Itineraria et alia geographica*. For an investigation into the development of punctuation see Parkes, *Pause and effect*.

\(^{647}\) Ó Macháin, ‘Observations’, 189-90.

\(^{648}\) 122ra28-35.
such as that explaining the name of Bayam/Baiam as meaning ‘cétshúil’ *asin bèrla scoiteacda*.649

The style used to set the scene in the Old Irish prose texts quoted above was well suited to translate the systematic layout of P, and was employed to write a great deal of IMP. In many cases however, the description of a region or a city develops into an anecdote concerning the ruler or the population of the province, at which point the pace of the prose accelerates, with longer clauses and the introduction of dialogue. In light of the efforts of the Irish author to archaise the language of IMP, discussed above, it is possible that the choice of this clipped, dry and succinct narrative style, which is found throughout most of the text, was also an attempt to give the text the resonance and tone of Old Irish prose. This is in contrast to the fluidity of Pipino’s Latin style, which is eloquent and profuse in its descriptions and narrative rhythm, and does not lend itself to the punctuated style of IMP. The clipped, terse and succinct style of IMP is also in contrast to the heavy, bombastic and alliterative style which is employed in other sequences of IMP, discussed below.

3.2. Fluid style

A fluid, continuous narrative style is employed in IMP to narrate anecdotes and events relating to a region or a people which has been previously described. It is mid-way between the concise, clipped style described above and the alliterative, bombastic style of the *cath*, discussed below, in that it is distinctly more fluid, with longer sentences and more dependent clauses, but does not contain the alliteration or the fast pace of battle narrative. It often resorts to direct speech in order to progress the narrative, even where this is not present in P. For example, in P, direct speech is not used in the prophet Mohammed’s description of paradise: *promitit enim infelicitissimus Machometus sectatoribus sue legis quod in vita alia huiusmodi, ut dictum est, delectaciones habebunt*.650 On the other hand, IMP introduces direct speech: ¶12 *Macametus dia chantain friu ‘amail bethi abhus beithi thall am righi-siu iar m-blaisecht bhais’*. This preference for direct speech in IMP may be an effort on behalf

649 128rb32.
650 P I.28.6: ‘In fact, the most unhappy Mohammed promised the followers of his law that they shall enjoy pleasures of this kind in the next life, as is said.’
of the Irish translator to enhance the otherwise plain and clipped narrative with brief action sequences and dialogue, in order to render his prose more vivid and involve his audience more actively.

The following extract from IMP displays how the concise and clipped style used throughout much of IMP and discussed above, is interwoven with the more fluid and continuous style described here, in order to relate the episode of the Church of Saint John the Baptist in Samarcan that remained standing after one of its supporting columns was removed by the pagans. The former style is underlined, whereas the latter is highlighted. I have inserted inverted commas and punctuation in the transcription below, which is my own, for ease of reading and to highlight the use of direct speech in IMP, discussed below.

¶17 Columhai marmor foa lar dia himarchar cu saine gaca gresa fair ro bhatar dibhinaibh for an lig reamhaidit.

¶18 Abath in ri focetoir 7 gabuit a mac righi dia eis et ni ro an for lur g a athar acht ro adhair do Macametus Otclos dona geinntib in ri do adhrad do Macameatus cuingit forna cristaigib in ail foro hadhnachta a sin. ‘Nato itir’, ol na Cristaidi ‘no thoitfhead eacrais Eoin dia cuirthe togluasacht foran lig sin.’ ‘Maith’ ol na geinnt. ‘Rosia maine imdha duib furri’ ol na cristaidi. ‘Lig as dith duin’, ol nageinti ‘7 ni maime,’ donertuih inri lasna geinti 7 dobered fuirmeadh forsinn cloich gu rucsat for culai hi Aitchit na cristaidh eoin 7 isa arna facsin sin. Airisius didiu an eacrais amail as deach bui riam. cobhful iiii ra traigead uas talam aniu 7 biaidh co forceann mbraitha

¶19 PEIN unmorro tir forleathan isidhe conimat cathraic. uidhe .u. laithi fora fot.

This extract displays how the more fluid narrative style in IMP develops from the clipped and succinct style, which is used to describe the basic ethnographical and geographical features of a people or region. Furthermore, a comparison with the corresponding section of P illustrates how the use of dialogue is an innovation of the Irish author:
Factum est autem ut moreretur princeps, cui filius in regno sed non in fide successit: Sarraceni vero impetraverunt ab ipso ut christiani suum eis lapidem restituere cogerentur; offerentibus vero christianis illis precium de lapide magnum, renuerunt Sarraceni precium, volentes ut, sublato lapide, destrueretur ecclesia, cadente columna.  

The use of dialogue in IMP renders the scene more dramatic, giving a sense of immediacy and presence to the prose which is not present in P. Instead, P tells the episode from the perspective of an omniscient narrator. Once the anecdote, battle or miracle is described, using this more fluid narrative style, the prose reverts to the dry and concise style in order to introduce the following region. This fluid style is the second most common used by the author of IMP, and is also employed in the description of Cublay’s palaces, feasts, hunts, conquests and battles. However, for one of the battles in IMP, the author chose a more identifiably native narrative style, namely that of the Late Middle and Early Modern Irish cath.

3.3. Alliterative cath style:

The third distinctive prose style which is present in IMP is that of the late Middle Irish cath, so called because it is most commonly found in the battle narrative and action sequences of texts such as Cogad Gaedhel re Gallaibh, Caithréim Cheallacháin Chaisil (CCC) and In Cath Catharda. One of the principal characteristics of this style is the use of long sentences which contain a sequence of dependent clauses, rich in runs of attributive alliterating adjectives. Six battles take place in IMP, and although for each of these the narrative style picks up pace significantly from the clipped and succinct style used to describe the geography of the Far East, the alliterative cath style

---

651 P 1.39.3: ‘And it came to pass that the prince died, and his son succeeded him in kingdom but not in faith: the Saracens obtained from him that the Christians would have to be compelled to hand back the stone to them; the Christians offered the great price of the stone to them, but the Saracens refused, desiring that the church be destroyed, by removing the stone which would cause the fall of the column.’

652 Miles, Heroic, 142.

653 ¶33 (not bombastic, but continuous prose); ¶61-62 (cath style alliteration, see below); ¶112-115 (not bombastic, but continuous prose); ¶125-133 (not bombastic, but continuous prose); ¶148-151 (some alliteration, but mostly continuous prose); ¶156 (not bombastic, but continuous prose).
It is only used for one of these battles, namely that in which Cublay faces the rebellion of his uncle Naim and his nephew Cadau, which opens the second book of P and IMP. The following two extracts exemplify the cath style, from CCC and IMP respectively. Alliteration has been highlighted and is in bold characters:

Is andsín ro eirghetar Clanna Eogain gu crodha ciallmar curata ima caem-ri im Ceallachan cum an chatha. Ocus do korraighedh gu calma ag na curadubh bro bhadhbha bith-aluinn bhuan-aimchheil bratac ocs sonn sesmach sith-remhar sleagh 7 tor tenn triath-onchonta taisech 7 grinne gasda gadhamail gormlan & lonn-bhuaille ladhach linanart uman laechraid. ár ni rabhutar gorm-ait nait glan-luirecha 'gá n-gasraid. Achtmad inair cuanna coir-tharblaithi & cotuin 7 moincedha maisecha min-gresacha re diden corp 7 enes 7 caiem-cenn.655

(Caithréim Cheallacháin Chaisil)

(¶61) Gabhait naslú’aig sin a nasain gloinidí gorma glaisiáruimh 7 a luireca daingne doibrisdi 7 a scabail cuana chumdachta fona minnaib slipta sorradhairc. Síní a mergeda badbdha breacamlacha risna sleaghuibh seimneca sithfhota. gur iadh gac deaglaech dibh ima rig 7 ima thaisec euró linsat na tolcha 7 na taiséadhreaca for gech taebh do uaim. Gur comdlothaigseat na catha re cheli in tan sin. Cu rostocaib nel niamdha dá ndornclaidhí dathordha 7 da moincéidí dubalacha dergoir cor ba soighnen solusta a clethe nime os cinn na curad ceachtardha sin. (124rb31-124va3).

(IMP)

The use of the cath style in IMP is a clear departure from the clipped and succinct style used to describe the geography of the Far East, and gives this section of the text a colour and intensity which accentuates and emphasises it. It is also distinct from the fluid style which is used in the description of anecdotes and other events in IMP. In paragraphs ¶57, ¶58 and ¶61 the author makes a clear effort to change the tone of the narrative, by conforming to the specific and well-defined style of the cath. As was

654 Nayam and Caydu in P.
655 Bugge, Caithréim, 6-7.
mentioned above, this *cath* style is found only in one of the six battles described in IMP, namely that between Cublay Khan and his rebellious uncle Naim and cousin Cadau. When this section of IMP is compared to the corresponding chapters of P, it becomes clear that the Irish author made significant rearrangements to the order of events and descriptions in P. For the first time since the prologue of the text, the translator departs quite noticeably from P, reshuffling the details and events into a new order in IMP.

It will be discussed in Chapter IV how particular attention may have been given to this section of the text in IMP because the war waged by Cublay’s cousin and uncle against him may have offered parallels to the wars in Munster surrounding the succession to the Mac Carthaigh Riabhaigh lordship during the latter part of the fifteenth century, between Finghin, the likely patron of L, and his cousin Cormac.

### 3.4. Distribution of Narrative Styles in IMP

In order to display how the various narrative styles of IMP, described above, are distributed throughout the text, I have developed the following chart. This helps to visualise how variation in narrative style accentuates particular episodes within the text, comprising mainly of miracles, battles, feasts, hunts and rituals, and how it is used to distinguish the encyclopedic information regarding the geography of the Far East, from the more entertaining, action packed sequences in the text.

The X-Axis represents the chapters of IMP as designated in Stokes’s edition, whereas the Y-Axis represents the various styles described in the previous paragraphs. The most common of these, the clipped style, has been given the value 3, found at the top of the chart. The fluid, continuous prose style has been given the value 2, in the centre of the chart. The value 2.5 has been given to paragraphs which alternate between these two styles, such that it is not possible to determine an overall stylistic tendency in the narrative. The value 1, at the bottom of the chart, has been given to the alliterative and bombastic style of the *cath*, which is found exclusively in one episode of IMP, namely that of the battle between Cublay and his relatives Naim and Cadau.

---

656 IMP ¶54-66; P II.1-II.8.
657 See Chapter IV.
which will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV. The three book divisions have been marked with two lines perpendicular to the X-Axis. In the chart below, I have highlighted the sections of IMP which are written in the fluid, continuous prose style, value 2, and the alliterative *cath* style, value 3, and given short titles of the accounts which they describe. This allows for a visualisation of the main events in IMP and of the narrative styles used to portray them.
Distribution of Narrative Styles

Narrative Styles

1. Prologue
   - Battle between Sisim and Prespiter Seon
2. 1.5
   - Sép Eoin Baistid
   - Customs of the Tartars
3. 2
   - Miracle of Moving Mountain
   - Cublay's Hunts and Rituals
   - Cublay's Palaces, Hunting Expeditions and Celebrations
4. 2.5
   - Battle between Niscardin of Oraandum and Bagul of Míena
5. 3
   - Battle between Stactur and Maghnus Cam
   - Maghnus Cam conquers Cyambai
   - Maghnus Cam's generals invade the Island of Sipangu:
   - Shipwreck and Defeat.
   - Various Anecdotes about Islands in the Indian Ocean and their Inhabitants
3.5. Conclusions

Unlike the archaic linguistic style which is found throughout IMP, three different narrative styles alternate in the text and are used to emphasise particular aspects of the adaptation. The late Middle Irish style of the *cath* in particular is used to accentuate the battle between Cublay and his uncle Naim and cousin Cadau. This is contrasted by the clipped and succinct style used for the geographical description of the regions of the Far East and their inhabitants. The use of these native literary styles in IMP indicates that the *Travels* were being adapted to match the style of native historical texts. An interesting parallel in this regard is the language used by Rustichello da Pisa to write the original version of the *Travels*, the *Devisement*, in 1298: a Franco-Italian hybrid language most commonly used in Arthurian romances, which were widespread in Italy at the time.658 Ó Macháin has shown that Irish historical texts were considered to be of two genres by Medieval Irish learned men: on the one hand they were considered to be factual and authoritative collections of *seanchas*, and on the other they were literary explorations of history, tales which could be rewritten and readapted to suit the objectives of the author.659 The incorporation of native narrative styles in IMP is not an indication that Marco Polo’s account of the Orient was taken to be false, rather it shows how the *Travels* was being assimilated to native texts and brought into the canon of Medieval Irish literature.

---

CHAPTER III: MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF P

Whereas IMP is unique to the Book of Lismore (L), the manuscript tradition of P is somewhat more complex, with copies and versions of the text surviving in a total of sixty-nine manuscripts. A study of the textual tradition of P is necessary in order to understand the place of IMP within its wider European context. Of the surviving manuscripts of P, none appear to have been the direct source of IMP. However, this study has discovered the branch of the stemma codicum of P to which the lost exemplar of IMP probably belonged. The following chapter examines how IMP relates to the other versions of P, in many cases consolidating previous observations on the various groups of this branch of the textual tradition of the Travels. It will begin with an account of previous research on the textual tradition of P, and give a full list of the manuscripts considered in this study. The focus of this chapter will be the examination of details from transcriptions made over the course of my research from a number of manuscripts of P, which elucidate the differences between many of the subgroups of P. The objective of this chapter is to shine light on the historical and textual context of IMP by examining the family of manuscripts of P from which it derives.

1. Manuscripts of P

P was written by the Dominican friar Francesco Pipino of Bologna between 1310 and 1324, however no autograph of the text has survived. The question of how to count all the surviving manuscripts of P is one with which previous scholars have struggled, since a number of abbreviated, reworked and translated versions of P also exist, some of which are so different from P that they are not considered as belonging to the P group. For example, Gadrat excluded Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 ‘qui ne

660 For a discussion of the life and works of Franesco Pipino see Chapter I.
661 Dutschke, Pipino, 263-75; Gadrat, Lire, 9 and 384-85.
contiennent pas à proprement parler le récit de Marco Polo', whilst she included the abridgement found in London, British Library, Harley 5115, as well as the version of P located in Cambridge, University Library, Dd.8.7 and Dublin, Trinity College E.5.20, which are also abbreviated versions of P. Dutschke on the other hand, considers all of the above in her numeration of the manuscripts of P. Dutschke was unaware, however, of a number of P manuscripts which were discovered after the submission of her thesis in 1993. It is necessary therefore, to give a brief summary of the past scholarship on the textual tradition of P.

De Benedetto was the first to give a description of the manuscripts that contained P, and counted fifty copies. Dutschke added a further eight copies to this count in her thesis on Pipino, bringing the total number of manuscripts up to fifty eight. Lastly, Gadrat added a further four manuscripts to this list, but removed two as they contained reductions of P which she considered separately. This brings the total manuscripts of P to sixty, plus a further nine manuscripts that contain abridgements and translations of P, among which is IMP. My research has not added any further manuscripts to those listed by Gadrat, but it has discovered that IMP derives from the English branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group of P manuscripts. The ‘fidelissimi’ group was discovered by Dutschke, and contains versions of P which are distinguished by the reading fidelissimi instead of fidelis, in the prologue of P. Dutschke also noticed that a large portion of the ‘fidelissimi’ manuscripts were written in England, and were distinguished by the lack of the reading seu falcones pelegrini in the explicit of the text. This thesis has corroborated and added to Dutschke’s finding of an ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, with the discovery that all ‘fidelissimi’ manuscripts of English origin contain the scribal error lacus instead of locus in the Quinsay chapter, usually found at II.64 of P. A number of other such scribal errors have been discovered here which distinguish further groups

---

665 Gadrat, *Lire*, 9; manuscripts of P added by Gadrat are: Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5; Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek 722 A; Saint Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Lat.F.I.233; Skokloster, Folio 67. The manuscripts of P removed by Gadrat in her listing of manuscripts of P are: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 18624; Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196.
668 Ibid., 246.
within the ‘English’ branch and which explain a number of IMP’s divergences from P. Crucially, the present study has revealed the two manuscripts of P which share the most details with IMP and are its closest surviving relatives, these are: Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek 218 and Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum T.4.1 [84].

I have examined and made transcriptions from forty-seven of the sixty manuscripts which contain P. Transcriptions were also made from the two Latin abridged and edited versions of P found in Oxford, Digby 196 and in Würzburg, Diözesanbibliothek, I 58. The total list of manuscripts of P is as follows, with dates from Gadrat and Dutschke.669

669 Gadrat, Lire, 357-85; Dutschke, Pipino, 263-75.
1.1. List of P manuscripts

1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70  
   14th C

2) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 618  
   1407

3) Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83  
   14th C

4) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.17  
   14th C

5) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.8.7  
   14th C

6) Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5  
   14th C

7) Dublin, Trinity College E.5.20 [Abbot 632]  
   15th C

8) Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi C.7.1170  
   14th C

9) Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983  
   14th C

10) Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13  
    15th C

11) Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek 218  
    15th C


13) Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum V.6.8.[458]  
    14th C

14) Göttingen, Universitätsbibliothek, 4° Hist. 61  
    15th C

15) Jena, Universitätsbibliothek, Bosianus 4° 10  
    15th C
16) Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek 722 A  
15th C

17) Kórnik, Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN, ms. 131  
15th C

18) Kraków, Biblioteka Jagellonska, lat. 1441 [431]  
1441

19) Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75  
15th C

20) London, British Library, Add. 19513  
14th C

21) London, British Library, Add 19952  
1445

22) London, British Library, Arundel 13  
14th C

23) London, British Library, Harley 5115  
14th C

before 1352

25) Lucerne, Zentralbibliothek, KB Msc. 5. 4°  
14th C

26) Modena, Biblioteca Estense, lat. 131 [α.S.6.14]  
14th C

27) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 249  
15th C

28) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 850  
15th C

29) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 5339  
15th C

30) Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Vindob. Lat. 50 [3273]  
15th C

31) Oxford, Merton College 312  
before 1344

32) Paris, Bibliothèque National de France, lat. 1616  
15th C
33) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6244° 1439

34) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 17800 14th C

35) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, nal. 1768 14th C

36) Prague, Knihovna Mertopolitni Kapituli, G. XXI 15th C

37) Prague, Knihovna Metropolitni Kapituli, G. XXVIII 15th C

38) Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University, Garrett 157 c. 1400


40) Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana. 35.E.29 [III] 16th C

41) Saint Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Lat.F.I.233 15th C

42) San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Real monasterio, Q.II.13 15th C

43) Skokloster, Folio 67 before 1469

44) Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Hist. 4° 10 15th C

45) Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1641 15th C

46) Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1875 1520

47) Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1358 1433

670 Sold before September 1982 to an undisclosed private collector, by John Howell Books of San Francisco. Referred to in Dutschke as the Howell manuscript, for full description see Dutschke, Pipino, 1016-1018.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Codex Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48)</td>
<td>Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1359</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49)</td>
<td>Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1846</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50)</td>
<td>Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3153</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51)</td>
<td>Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat lat. 5260</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52)</td>
<td>Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 7317</td>
<td></td>
<td>1458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53)</td>
<td>Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X. 73 [3445]</td>
<td></td>
<td>1465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54)</td>
<td>Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. X. 128 [3307]</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55)</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreischishe Nationalbibliothek 3497</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56)</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreischische Nationalbibliothek 12823</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57)</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 3 Gud. lat. 3°</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58)</td>
<td>Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1450-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59)</td>
<td>Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwesytecka, IV Fol 103</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60)</td>
<td>Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, Chart. F. 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>15th C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2. Extracts, abridgements and translations of P

'Digby' Version:
61) Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 c.1440

This unique manuscript was made for personal use and contains miscellaneous texts including extracts from P written by a member of the English royal court circa 1440.671

‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ Version:

62) Melk, Stiftsbibliothek 1094 15th C

63) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 18624 1450-1500

64) Würzburg, Diözesanbibliothek, I 58 (previously: Würzburg, Franziskamern-Minoritenkloster I 58) 1462

These manuscripts contain a much abbreviated version of P, which was written in either southern Germany or northern Austria during the mid-fifteenth century.672

French Translation:

65) London, British Library, Egerton 2176 15th C

66) Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Holm. M 305 15th C

These two manuscripts contain the same French translation, written during the second half of the fifteenth century in the north of France, as is shown by their respective colophons:673

Guillaume Gaubain clerc natif de Boroon ou diocese de Sainct Malo en Bretagne, d’Angleterre en France. Vive le Roy de France d’Angleterre et duc de Breaigne.674

671 Gadrat, Lire, 206-07.
672 Ibid., 91-94
673 Ibid., 86.
Cy finist le livre de messire Marc Paul natif de Venise de condicions et coustumes de principalles regions de orient. Le quel livre a escript Guillaume Gauvain clerc natif de la paroisse de Broon ou diocese Sainct Malo de l’isle en Bretaigne. Le quel livre est et appartient a honorable homme et saige monseigneur maistre Jehan Gilbert sieur de la chambre des comptes du Roy nostre sire en son palais a Paris.  

Czech Translation:

67) Prague, Narodni Muzeum, III E 42 (15th C)

This unique Czech language translation of P, dating from the fifteenth century, contains the expanded version of the miracle of the moving mountain, which ties it to a very specific branch of the textual tradition of P, which will be discussed below. It is found alongside a Czech translation of Mandeville. This version was published by Prášek in 1902, beside the Latin text of Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, Vindob. Lat. 50. 

Venetian Translation:

68) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, ital.VI.56 15th C

This is a unique translation of P, found beside another Venetian translation of Pipino’s Tractatus De Locis Terre Sancte. 

IMP

69) Chatsworth House, Book of Lismore 1478-1505

---

676 De Benedetto, Milione, cxlvii; Dutschke, Pipino, 233; Gadrat, Lire, 89. 
677 Prášek, Justin V., Milion: Dle jediného rukopisu spolu s příslušným základem latinským (Prague, 1902). 
678 De Benedetto, Milione, cxlvii; Gadrat, Lire, 89.
1.3. Early printed editions of P and a fifteenth-century English poem

In addition to the sixty-nine manuscripts listed above, it is worth noting the edition of P made by Gheraert Leeu and printed between 1483 and 11th June 1484 in Gouda, Holland.\(^{679}\) Two manuscripts in the above list were copied from this edition, namely Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13 and San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Real monasterio, Q.II.13.\(^{680}\) This was the first printed edition of P, but the third printed edition of the Travels, the first and second editions having been being printed in 1477 and 1481, from the same German language translation of the Venetian translation of the Travels, known as the VA version.\(^{681}\) Alongside P, Leeu also printed Ludolph of Suchem’s Travels to the Holy Lands and the Mandeville text, an indication of the kinds of texts that were associated with the Travels in the mind of the late-fifteenth-century editor.\(^{682}\) Leeu’s edition of these three texts is known as the ‘Gouda triplet’.\(^{683}\)

However, the edition of P which enjoyed most success during the sixteenth century and after was the so-called Huttich-Grynaeus edition, first printed in Basel in 1532 as part of a collection of travels entitled Novus Orbis Regionum Ac Insularum Veteribus Incognitarum.\(^{684}\) The history of this edition was summarised by Dutschke as follows:

This Huttich-Grynaeus text was printed in German in 1534, in Latin in 1535, again in 1537 and again in 1554, then in French in 1556, in Italian (with some corrections from other versions) by Ramusio in 1559 (which then went into English in 1625, in 1811, and 1818), in Dutch in 1563, in Castilian in 1601, in a different German translation in 1609, in a different Dutch translation in 1664, back to Huttich-Grynaeus’s Latin in 1671, itself into French in 1735.\(^{685}\)

---

\(^{679}\) For further discussion of the printed version by Leeu see Helling, Marco Polo, 278-303.

\(^{680}\) Gadrat, Lire, 86.

\(^{681}\) De Benedetto, Milione, cxiv-cxix; Dutschke, Pipino, 228-29. For a discussion of the VA version, see the introduction to this thesis.

\(^{682}\) Dutschke, Pipino, 232.

\(^{683}\) Ibid., 235.

\(^{684}\) Ibid., 229.

\(^{685}\) Ibid., 229.
As well as the sixty-nine manuscripts of P considered in this study, a Portuguese translation was printed in Lisbon in 1502 by Valentim Fernandes. Whether this existed in manuscript form before the printed edition was made has been the matter of some debate. However, Gadrat has suggested that this translation was made from the printed edition of Gheraert Leeu. Lastly, a German translation of the Huttich-Grynaeus edition was made in 1582 and survives in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, cod. germ. 937.

The first English language translation of the *Travels*, entitled *The Most Noble and Famous Travels of Marco Polo together with the Travels of Nicolò De’ Conti*, was translated during the reign of Elizabeth I by John Frampton from the Castilian version, and was printed in 1579. However, an English poem entitled *Off the Grete Cane* was composed during the late-fifteenth century, inspired both by Mandeville and the *Travels*, and survives in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS. e Musaeo 160. The poem contains 313 verses, but the section relevant to this study has been copied below from Seymour’s edition:

125 In Ser Markis tym felle sich a case  
that Cublay the Gret Caane did wyn  
the kyngdom of Mangy that worthy was  
**a thowsande cetyes and thre hundreth** was þerin.  
The hed cety was gretist men may myn.
130 **c. myle compas it was abowte,**  
waterit withowtyn and within,  
wheron shippis myght saile þat was fulle stowt.  
**Ten thowsand bryggis** forowtyn dowte  
Off ston was mad within the walle  
135 That shippis saylid vnder and nedit not lowte.  
Quinsay the cety do they calle.  
When the Grete Cane had conquest alle  
the cetyes and andis of Mangye,

---

688 De Benedetto, *Milione*, cxlxi;  
he dyvidet it into iii. kyngdoms talle
140 and gafe it to iii. of his sonny's shortlye. 691

These verses draw on the chapter of the *Travels* containing a description of the city of Quinsay, at II.64 in P. Although Seymour identified the version of the *Travels* from which this poem draws inspiration as the P version, he did not identify which version of P was used to write this poem. 692 This may be done by examining the differences in the numbers of cities, bridges and kingdoms found in the English poem above and in the various manuscript versions of P. The relevant sections have been underlined and are in bold type in the excerpt of the poem above and in the transcriptions from P below. By comparing this section of the English poem with the corresponding sections of the text in various manuscripts of P it emerges that the numbers in the English poem are different to those in most versions of P.

Below are three transcriptions from the sections of the Quinsay chapter containing these numbers, from four manuscripts of P as well as from the VA version of the *Travels*, from which P was translated. 693 The VA version is given in order to indicate which numbers were most likely in the original text, now lost, written by Pipino. Transcriptions from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983 were made by Dr Samuela Simion in preparation for a new edition of the *Travels*, in collaboration with Professor Burgio of Università di Ca’ Foscari, Venice. 694 All other transcriptions are my own. Transcriptions from Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi C.7.1170, are given because this is considered to be one of the earliest manuscripts that contains P. 695 Transcriptions from Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84, are given because this is the manuscript that most closely resembles IMP. 696 Representing the printed version of Gheraert Leuu is the transcription from the manuscript of Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13, which was copied from the printed edition of P. 697

---

694 I am grateful to both for having provided me with a full transcription of P from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, prior to its publication.
696 This will be discussed below.


[22] Provincia vero Mangi habet in universo civitates 1300.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbibliothek 13)


[21] Provinciam Mangy divisit Magnus Kaam in regna IX.

[22] Provincia enim Mangy habet in universo civitates MCC.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983)


[22] provincia enim Mangi habet in universo civitates 1200.

(Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi C.7.1170)


[22] provincia enim Mangi habet in universo civitates 1200.
[4] Sapié per verità ch’ella volze ben zento meglia e à dodexemillia ponti de piera.

[42] Ancora ve digo che ’l Gran Chaan à partida la provinzia de Mangi in nuove regniami.

[45] E sapiate per zerto che la provinzia de Mangi sì à plui de mille e duxento zità. 698

The numbers found in the English poem, namely: *a thowsande cetyes and thre hundreth, c. myle compass it was abowte, ten thowsand bryggis and iiij. kyngdoms*, most closely resemble the numbers found in Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13 (a copy of Gheraert Leeu’s printed edition of P), which reads: *civitates 1300, miliaria 100, pontes 12.000 and regna 4*. The details are almost identical with the exception being in the number of bridges given as 10.000 in the English poem rather than 12.000, a discrepancy possibly due either to a scribal error of the poet or to a corruption of his exemplar. My study of forty-seven of the sixty manuscripts of P has found that the combination of the corrupt details *civitates 1300 and regna 4* is unique to Gheraert Leeu’s edition of P and to manuscripts derived from it and that therefore it is very likely that the author of this poem was working from this edition of P if not a copy of it. This group of the manuscripts of P is indicated by the letter γ2 in the *stemma codicum* at the end of this chapter.

The methodology employed here is useful in identifying the group of manuscripts which most closely resemble IMP, and the relationship of the Irish adaptation to the P tradition.

---

698 Barbieri, A. and Andreose, A., *Il «Milione» veneto ms. CM 211 della Biblioteca Civica di Padova*, 214 and 216.: [4] May you know in truth that it has one hundred miles in circumference and has twelve-thousand stone bridges.” [42] Still I tell you that the Great Khan has partitioned the province of Magni into nine kingdoms.” [45] And may you know for certain that the province of Mangi has more than one thousand and two hundred cities.”
2. Relationship of IMP to Manuscript Tradition of P

2.1. Methodology

The differences between IMP and the various manuscripts of the P tradition were identified by making partial transcriptions from forty-seven of the sixty manuscripts of P. A further two partial transcriptions were compiled from the Latin summaries and edited versions of P found in Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 and Würzburg, Diözesanbibliothek, I 58. The excerpts transcribed from each manuscript were selected after completing a face-to-face reading of IMP and P and compiling a list of the instances in which the variations of IMP could be ascribed to misreadings of the Latin exemplar, rather than being deliberate interpolations and expansions of the Irish author. Just as it is possible to identify the version of P used as inspiration for the English poem *Off the Grete Cane*, as discussed above, by tracing the source of the corrupted numbers of cities and kingdoms, it is also possible to identify the group of manuscripts which most closely resemble the lost Latin exemplar of IMP.

The text of P from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983 was used as the base text for comparison with IMP because it is the most recently transcribed version of P and it was made available to me in digital format.699 The transcriptions made from the manuscripts of P are represented in two ways, referred to as Comparison A and Comparison B below.

*Comparison A* compares a full transcription, from each of the forty-seven manuscripts of P examined, of the chapter entitled: *de nobilissima et mirabili civitate Quinsay*, found at II.64 in most versions of P, with a full transcription of the corresponding section in IMP.700 This was done for a several reasons: firstly, the corresponding section of IMP contains a number of details that differ from those found in Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983; secondly, a number of manuscripts of P contain details in II.64 that are different to those shared by IMP and Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana R 983; thirdly, this chapter contains a great deal of numbers, used to measure distances and count soldiers or inhabitants of the city. As has been

699 I am especially grateful to Prof. Burgio for supplying a complete transcription of the Pipino text from this manuscript, ahead of publication. The transcription was made by Doctor Samuela Simion di Università di Ca’ Foscarì, Venice.

700 Henceforth referred to as the Quinsay chapter.
observed in the discussion of the English poem above, these sorts of details are particularly prone to scribal error, and a set of numbers differing from those in another manuscript can be markers of a group of closely connected texts; lastly, the Quinsay chapter is one of the longest chapters of P containing an average of 1100 words, a characteristic that allows for a more wide-ranging and precise comparison to be made of the various versions of P. In other words, the Quinsay chapter offers an ample enough portion of text for specific subgroups of the textual tradition of P to be corroborated by multiple scribal errors and variants, even where these readings are not represented in the Irish translation.

For this purpose, I give below my transcription of the section of IMP that translates the Quinsay chapter, found between folios 128vb17 and 129ra28 of L, chapters ¶136-¶141 of Stokes’s edition. Stokes’s paragraph numeration given in round brackets; numeration introduced for the purpose of this comparison is given in square brackets. The order of the sections and of the details given in the Quinsay chapter in P was changed significantly by the author of IMP, therefore I have divided and numbered the various sections of my transcription of IMP in order to facilitate comparison with the various versions of P. Lenition and abbreviations have been expanded in the following transcription, but length marks have not been added.


(¶137) [6] do ronsat palas rigda for loch a meadhon na cathrach sin ni fuil séd na samhail do phalas for bith do .xx. sluaintheach lais 7 .x. mile do theimhileadh in gach sluaintheach dibh 7 tene bithbeo a meadhon gacha bruidhne dhibh 7 mile do sheomradhuihb solusda fria suan 7 freasdal ina nur thimceall co neimh noir forra 7 co fuath gach anmanua eceannus for bith ar na rinnadh forro do ilbreachtadh gacha datha.
(¶138) [7] in tan ro ighabh magnus cam in cathair sin 7 prounidsi manguay ro hoirdheadh nai riga do tharraidhi forro 7 do ronnad forro in da mile decc cathair bai isin rigi sin occus ni raibhi cathair dhibh gan drong do mileadhuib magnuis cam oca himcoimhet ar omhun a himpóidh fair.

(¶139) [8] fil loch a meadon na cathrach sin 7 xxx. mile na uirtimcheall. di inis fair dun rigda a meadhon gacha hinnisi dhibh ni la neach for bith iat som 7 in as fearr do bhiudh 7 deoch 7 mhainibh na cathrach cuirid a meadon na nduinte 7 inti dianad ail fleadhughadh do dhena mh taigait dia tocaithimh inntibh 7 foghebha 7 ni la neach don caththaigh dimn ná caisldén da fuil fora feadh acht coimhdheas da gach aen iatsumh 7 as eadh do beir an timat droicheat sin le for srothaibh 7 uisceadhaibh fil si 7 ni bhi an imtheacht for araili acht dibh [9] .xl. mile tighidhis .xl. feacht is aitreachthaigh don cathair sin.

(¶140) [10] ni tusmidter gein inti nach scribhthar a ainm 7 in cruth forsa mbi in re 7 reanna nimhe oca tusmheadh 7 dia ndeach neach dibh as bean tar a ainm as 7 scribhthar aris he 7 ainm a each 7 a maine 7 a aesa cumtha 7 loiscter diblinuibh ar aen ria chorp 7 dar leo gach a scribtha dho do beidis ar aen fris isin beathaídh naile.


The following Comparison A table compares the section which translates the Quinsay chapter in IMP, transcribed in the left column, with the Quinsay chapter from P of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, in the right column. In the left column, the Quinsay chapter from IMP has been rearranged to match the order of P, but numbered from [1] to [11] in order to illustrate its original order in IMP. This reshuffled order of the sections of the Quinsay chapter from IMP will be maintained in all Comparison A tables in order to facilitate comparison with the version of P with which IMP is being compared. The details translated in IMP are in bold.
characters and have been underlined in order to help visualise the translation of IMP, and highlighting has been used where the details of IMP do not match those of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] fil cathair naili <strong>uidhi .u. laithe</strong> frí a theabh sin</td>
<td>[1] Post recessum a civitate Singuy itur per dietas .V. et inveniuntur in via civitates plures magne ubi negotiaciones maxime fiunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] quinlay a haim inan son 7 in <strong>cathair neamhdha</strong> dia teangaid siúmh ár ni thuill for bith cathair is mó inás.</td>
<td>[2] Postmodum pervenitur ad nobilissimam civitatem Quinsay quod in nostra lingua sonat <strong>civitas celi</strong>, que maior civitas orbis est et est principalior in provincia Mangi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[5] In hac civitate sunt artes principales .XII. et pro qualibet ipsarum sunt in civitate .XII. milia stacionum, in quibus ipsarum artium artifices operantur; quelibet autem stacio operarios habet inter magistros et ministros .X. aut .XV. sive .XX., et sunt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[8] fil loch a meadon na cathrach sin 7
.xxx. mile na uirtimechall.

di inis fair dun rigda a meadhon gacha
hinnsi dibh ni la neach for bith iat som 7
in as fearr do bhiudh 7 deoch 7 mhainibh
na cathrach cuirid a meadon na nduinte 7
inti dianad ail fleadhughadh do dhenamh
tiagait dia tochaithimh inntibh 7
foghebha 7 ni la neach don cathraigh
dinn ná caisléin da fuil fora feadh acht
coimhdheas da gach aen iatsumh 7 as
eadh do beir an timat droicheat sin le for
srothaibh 7 uisceadhaibh fil si 7 ni bhi an
quandoque in aliquibus .XL. [6] Tanta est
ibi artificum et mercacionum innumera
multitudo quod hiis qui non viderunt
incredibile penitus videretur. [7] Homines
civitatis huius delitosissime vivunt;
divites, qui principales sunt, in
stationibus artium honorifice valde vivunt
et neque ipsi neque uxores ipsorum
manibus propriis operantur; faciunt autem
ministros alios operari: ex antiquo enim
regni statuto consuetudo est ibi ut quilibet
in domo propria teneat stationem et
artem, sicut fecit hactenus pater eius, sed
si dives est non cogitur manibus propriis
operari. [8] In hac civitate sunt mulieres
formose valde et communiter sunt multis
delitiis enutrite. [9] Versus meridiem est
in ipsa civitate lacus magna que .XXX.
miliaria in giro continet; in hoc circuitu
sunt multa palatia et multe domus magne
nobilium et sunt interius et exterius
mirabiliter adornate, sunt etiam ibi eclesie
ydolorum; in medio lacus ipsius due
parvule insule sunt et in qualibet
ipsarum est palatium nobile et pulcrum
valde ubi sunt preparamenta et vasa
omnia necessaria pro nuptiis et solemni
convivio; si quis igitur vult in solemni
loco tenere convivium accedit illuc, ubi
potest convivium vel nuptias cum honore
tenere. [10] In civitate hac Quinsay multe
per vicos eius parve lapidee turres pro
ibi supra mare est civitas Ganfu ubi portus est optimus ad quem conveniunt naves in multitudine maxima de India et de regionibus aliis; a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad civitatem veniunt, qui fluvius transit per plurimas alias regiones. [21]

Provinciam Mangy divisit Magnus Kaam in regna .IX. dans regem proprium unicuique regno iuxta sue beneplacitum voluntatis; sunt autem omnes hii reges potentes valde, sed subditi Magno Kaam, et oportet eosannis singulis de omnibus regnorum suorum proventibus et expensis et de suo regimine Magni Kaam officialibus reddere rationem; unus autem illorum regum in civitate Quinsay continue commoratur, qui sub ditione sua .CXL. civitates habet. [22] Provincia enim Mangy habet in universo civitates .MCC. et in singulis ipsarum per Magnum Kaam positi sunt custodes, ne forte presumant ‹rebellare›; hominum custodum innumerabilis est stupenda magnitudo; non sunt tamen omnes Tartari, sed sunt de diversis exercitibus et stipendiariis Magni Kaam. [23] In hac civitate Quinsay et in tota provincia Mangy consuetudo est ut statim cum puer nascitur parentes eius scribi faciunt diem et horam nativitatis eius et sub quo planeta natus est: in cunctis itineribus suis
et factis astrologorum reguntur iudiciis, ideoque scire volunt sui ortum diem et horam. [24] Quando in hac provincia moritur quis, canapinis saccis eius consanguinei induuntur et mortui cadaver cum magno cantu et ymaginibus servorum, ancillarum, equorum et denariorum comburunt, que omnia de papiro faciunt, creduntque quod in vita alia talia obtinebit defunctus, qualia in similitudine sunt combusta; post hec cum leticia magna tangunt musica instrumenta, dicentes quod dii sui cum tali eos honore susciplunt cum quali corpora comburuntur. [25] In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangy tenebat curiam primo; locus magnus circumcinctus est muro per quadrum altitudinis magne que in giro continet miliaria .X., intra quos muros sunt viridaria pulcra valde cum fructibus delicatis; ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces habentur. [26] In medio autem interioris spacci palatium pulcherrimum est et maius quod sit in mundo: habet enim aulas .XX. magnitudinis eiusdem ‹omnes›, in quarum qualibet comederent simul .X. milia hominum in multa commoditate et debita congruitate cunctis discumbentibus collocatis; sunt autem aule depicte et deaurate pulcherrimo opere. In ipso
Comparison A was designed with three objectives: firstly, to identify those manuscripts of P that might explain the changes, highlighted above, to [5] .iiii. milid from [16] .x. custodes, and to [6] palas for loch from [25] palatium mirabile […] locus magnus circumcintus est muro. Secondly, to exclude from this discussion of the
relationship between IMP and the manuscripts of P, versions of P lacking sections of the Quinsay chapter that must have been present in IMP’s exemplar as well as versions of P containing different details to those shared by IMP and P in Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983. Lastly, to corroborate the existence of the subgroups of P, which emerge from the previous two methods of comparison with IMP, by identifying additional readings distinguishing the various branches of the stemma of P, even where these readings are not discernible in IMP, such as the use of one Latin synonym for another. By using Comparison A tables to compare the Quinsay chapter in forty-seven of the sixty manuscripts of P with the corresponding section in IMP it is possible to identify a group of manuscripts of P, namely those belonging to the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, that share the most details with IMP. The results of this comparative work, which will be discussed in the rest of this chapter, suggest that the Latin exemplar used to translate IMP was written in England.\textsuperscript{701}

Comparison B is a refinement of results established in Comparison A. It compares a set of ten readings from IMP and P selected on the basis that their respective translations in IMP differ because of a mistake on the part of the Irish translator or because of a scribal error in his exemplar, and are not conscious departures from P. Numbered below from [1] to [10] are the excerpts in question, which I have transcribed from L. Stokes’s paragraph numeration is also given in brackets, for convenience of reference with his edition of IMP:

\textsuperscript{701} This comparative work was accelerated significantly by the program Juxta, a cross-platform software designed for textual analysis and cross comparison of versions of a textual work. Developed by the University of Virginia, Juxta permits the user to visualise variations and scribal errors in multiple versions of the same text on the same platform and at the same time.
### Comparison B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(¶23)</td>
<td>I.46 quod in longitudine vie continet <em>dietas tres.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fil cathair nailli uidhi <em>dhra la</em> allamuigh don cathraigh sin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(¶27)</td>
<td>I.49 In hac civitate ydolatra quilibet habere potest <em>uxores .XXX.</em> vel plures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>l. ainder</em> la cech naen dibh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(¶29)</td>
<td>I.52 brevi vero in tempore <em>provincias octo</em> cepit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cidh fil ann acht ro umhlaigseat <em>uii.</em> <em>righ</em> dho la homun a imaireac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(¶29)</td>
<td>I.54 Primus igitur rex Tartarorum fuit <em>Chinchis,</em> secundus <em>Cui,</em> tercius <em>Bacui,</em> quartus <em>Alau,</em> quintus <em>Manguth,</em> sextus <em>Cublay</em> qui modo regnat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bui laech amra [...] <em>Simisis</em> a ainnm [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(¶35)</td>
<td>I.61 septem vicibus fuste ceditur, aut <em>XVII.</em> aut <em>XXVII.</em> aut <em>XXXVII.</em> aut <em>XLVII.</em> pro mensura enim peccati est <em>percussionum numerus usque ad C,</em> semper addendo decem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>xxx.</em> beim do luirk dhó nó <em>lx.</em> <em>mad cin</em> is mo indás, nó a <em>x. for cét mad mo in treas feacht.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

I.46 quod in longitudine vie continet *dietas tres.*

I.49 In hac civitate ydolatra quilibet habere potest *uxores .XXX.* vel plures

I.52 brevi vero in tempore *provincias octo* cepit.

I.54 Primus igitur rex Tartarorum fuit *Chinchis,* secundus *Cui,* tercius *Bacui,* quartus *Alau,* quintus *Manguth,* sextus *Cublay* qui modo regnat

I.61 septem vicibus fuste ceditur, aut *XVII.* aut *XXVII.* aut *XXXVII.* aut *XLVII.* pro mensura enim peccati est *percussionum numerus usque ad C,* semper addendo decem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶50</td>
<td>[6] <em>in tochtmad la déc</em> do mi Augusti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶84</td>
<td>[7] <em>in tochtmad la .xx. do mhi Decimbris</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶94</td>
<td>[8] dá <em>thaisech déc</em> la Cublay 7 as iat ba coimsigh ara canta fris 7 uaidh eethra ericha .xxx.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.66

Die autem .XXVIII. augusti Magnus Kaam

II.14

Festum autem Magni Kaam est die .XXVIII. *septembris*

II.22

Habet Magnus Kaam barones .XII. qui .XXIII. provinciis sunt prefecti

II.36

Protenditur autem in longum provincia per dietas .XX.

II.53

singulis annis recoligi facebat pueros abiecutos a matribus circa .XX. *milia*, quos suis sumptibus nutriri optime faciebat.

Generally it is not possible to use scribal errors and variants in order to identify the exemplar of a translated text when the writer is actively engaging with the text and can choose to omit or correct his exemplar’s mistakes. Similarly, whereas the use of one word in one version of a text and the choice of a synonym of that word in another version of the same text may be what set the two versions apart, these subtle differences are rarely noticeable once the text has been translated into another language. The exception to this is in the copying of numbers and proper names. This concept informed the selection of the excerpts included in Comparison B, which aims to collate those differences between IMP and P that are most likely due to scribal errors occurring somewhere between Pipino’s lost autograph and IMP. For example, it
is easy to see how dietas tres might become dha la, or die autem XXVIII. autem
might be copied as in tochtmad la déc do mí Augusti, from the loss of a minim and an x respectively. The principle behind this comparative technique is that at least some of the differences between IMP and P, which were not additions of the Irish translator but were already present in his exemplar, should appear in one or more of the surviving manuscripts of P, and that these manuscripts are the closest surviving relatives of IMP. Comparison B aims to provide a sort of barcode, comprised of a sequence of numbers and proper names that may be used to identify the group of manuscripts from which IMP derives.

2.2. IMP and the Latin Abridgements of P

In addition to being a translation of P, IMP is also a heavily reduced account of the Travels. Therefore it is necessary to demonstrate that IMP does not derive from any of the existing Latin abridgements and rearrangements of P, these are: the fifteenth-century version in Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 and the fifteenth-century summary of P from southern Germany known as the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version.\footnote{702} In addition to the two Latin abridgements of P listed under ‘Extracts, Abridgements and Translations of P’ above, also considered here are two heavily reduced versions of P found in the main list of P manuscripts, these are: the version that survives in Cambridge, University Library, Dd.8.7 and Dublin, Trinity College, E.5.20, and the unique version found in London, British Library, Harley 5115.

The position held by De Benedetto in this regard was in fact that the Irish translator must have been working from a reduced version of P:

\begin{quotation}
‘il traduttore ebbe probabilmente dinanzi un testo già frammentario o vigorosamente abbreviato.’\footnote{703}
\end{quotation}

Regarding the possibility that IMP was translated from an already much reduced version of P, it is worth mentioning the case of Stair Fortibrais (SF), a fifteenth-

\footnote{702} The French, Czech and Venetian translations of P are not considered in this dissertation, since I have shown in Chapter I that IMP was translated from Latin.
\footnote{703} De Benedetto, Milione, cxlvi: ‘the translator probably had before him a text which was either fragmentary or had been heavily abbreviated.’
century Irish translation of the Hiberno-Latin text *Gesta Karoli Magni (GKM)*,\(^{704}\) which itself is a translation of the French epic poem *Chanson de Fierabras (CF)*. Davies observed that ‘the relationship between *GKM* and the *CF* seems not nearly as close as that between *SF* and *GKM*,\(^ {705}\) and that *SF* is a close translation of its Latin original. Furthermore, Davies argued that the decision to abridge and reduce the size of *CF* was made by the Hiberno-Latin author of *GKM*, and not the Irish translator of *SF*. It cannot be ruled out therefore, that IMP was based on an already abridged version of *P* in Latin and that the Irish author simply translated IMP from it. It does not seem likely however, that any of the surviving Latin abridgements of *P* were the source of IMP. This can be demonstrated by comparing those details shared by IMP and *P*, but that have been skipped or edited out of the abridged versions. In the following paragraphs, this study will provide a description of these summaries and of the manuscripts that contain them, followed by a discussion on how they are related to IMP and to the other manuscripts of *P*.

### 2.2.1. ‘Digby’ Version

Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 contains a miscellany of extracts from a number of historical, geographical and astronomical texts. Alongside excerpts of *P*, the manuscript contains selected extracts from Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon* and Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae*, a text entitled *Descriptio Urbis Rome*, a *Disposicio Arche Secundum Augustinum*, an astronomical text entitled *Circuitus terrae et distantiae lunae atque planetarum*, a collection of prophecies, a list of English kings, a list of English placenames, a list of popes, a list of the names of the winds and a map of the world.\(^ {706}\) The manuscript also contains a note on household expenses, suggesting a private use: *notae de variis expensis domesticis, pro carnibus, piscibus, vino*. Based on internal evidence, discussed by Dutschke, the manuscript may be dated to the 1430s and 1440s.\(^ {707}\) Dutschke has suggested that it

---

\(^{704}\) Copeland, *From Fierabras*, 1.  
\(^{705}\) Davies, ‘Fierbras’, 218.  
\(^{707}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 795.
was most likely written by a single individual, probably a layman with access to a well-furnished library.\textsuperscript{708}

The extracts of P contained in the Oxford manuscript are found in three separate sections of the manuscript and do not follow the original order of P. The chapters of P transcribed in this manuscript may be seen in the table below, divided into three sections according to their location in the manuscript.\textsuperscript{709} The extracts from section one have been highlighted, those from section two have been underlined, and those from the third section are in bold characters:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
2r-5v & 172r l.30 – 173v l.30 & 177v – 183v \\
\hline
II.58-70; III.chapter list; & III.37-43; III.45 & I.11-16; I.18-19; I.21-27; \\
III.1-3, & & I.30-31; I.33-47; I.49-51; \\
& & I.54-58; I.65; I.67; II.8; \\
& & II.12; II.25-26; II.35; \\
& & II.37; II.41; III.15; III.48. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Below are the chapters contained in Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, rearranged in the order they are found in P, highlighted, underlined and in bold characters according to the table above.

- Book I.11-16; 18-19; 21-27; 30-31; 33-47; 49-51; 54-58; 65; 67.

- Book II.8; 12; 25-26; 35; 37; 41; 58-70.

- Book III chapter list and III.1-3; 15; III.37-43; 45; 48.

This visualisation illustrates the extent to which the author of the Oxford manuscript reshuffled the contents of P. It is unlikely that any copyist of this manuscript would have been able to rearrange the extracts of P contained in the Oxford manuscript into

\textsuperscript{708} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 798; Macray, W.D. \textit{Bodleian Library quarto catalogue}, t. IX: \textit{Digby manuscripts} 212-218 (Copied from Gadrat & Dutschke, needs better footnote).

\textsuperscript{709} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 796: ‘book and chapter numbers cited above are given only as an indication of the copyist’s roughly systematic approach to the Pipino version: chapters here vary from complete to one-line to reworking to omission.’
their original order, without the aid of a more faithful copy of P. It can therefore be deduced that the extracts of P contained in Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, were not the direct source of IMP.

This is confirmed by the omission of certain chapters of P from the Oxford manuscript, which are however translated in IMP. The following table aligns the chapters of the first book of P, from the chapter list of P located between ff. 2ra-3rb of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, as transcribed by Dr Simion, in the central column, with the corresponding paragraphs of IMP, as divided by Stokes, in the left-hand column. The transcriptions of IMP in the table below are my own. A full transcription of IMP appears as Appendix I. In the right-hand column is the same transcription of the chapter list of the first book of P as in the central column, with the chapters that are omitted in Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, removed. This table provides a visualisation of a number of facts:

Firstly, that Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 was not the direct source of IMP, because IMP translates chapters that the Oxford manuscript omits. For example: I.17 De civitate Taurisii; I.28 De tiranno qui dicebatur Senex de Montanis; I.29 De morte eius et destructione loci eius, or the entire section in P from I.59 De strenuitate, industria et fortitudine Tartarorum to I.64 De provincia Egregia, are all missing in the Oxford manuscript, but have been translated in IMP. The cells which lack these chapters have been highlighted in the table below.

Secondly, this table illustrates clearly which chapters in the first book of P the author of the ‘Digby’ version chose to omit.

Thirdly, by examining the left-hand and central column, this table throws light on the manner in which the Irish author was editing as well as translating P, choosing to omit entire chapters of P as he wrote IMP. This process will be discussed in more detail in Chapter IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983</th>
<th>Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prologue ¶1 - ¶2</td>
<td>Incipit prologus in librum domini Marchi Pauli de Veneciis de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| ¶3 IN airmein beac ceatamus (...) tursie i. proibhinni fuil intti. | condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum. | 11. Descripcio orientalium regionum et primo de Minori Armenia. | 11. Descripcio orientalium regionum et primo de Minori Armenia. |
| ¶6 Fil crich n-aili innti, rigi Musul iside. Fil cathair oirdnidi innte. Baldasi a hainm. ¶7 Luidh Alan .i. ri na Tarraidhí, do irghabhail a chathrach fair. | 15. De regno Mosul. | 15. De regno Mosul. |
| ¶8 FIL cathair naili isi crich sin. Taurisius a haim. | 17. De civitate Taurisii. | 17. De civitate Taurisii. |
| ¶10 Cricha Camandi. | 22. De civitate Camandu et regione | 22. De civitate Camandu et regione |

710 121ra25-28.  
711 121ra31.  
712 121rax.  
713 121rb21.  
714 121va4.  
715 121va7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>De campestribus formosa et civitate Cormos et Creman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>De intermedia regione inter civitatem Cormos et Creman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>De regione que media est inter Creman et civitatem Cobinam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>De civitate Cobinam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>De regno Thumochayn et arbore solis, qui vulgariter a latinis dicitur Arbor Sicca.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>De tiranno qui dicebatur Senex de Montanis et siccaris seu assessinis eius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>De morte eius et destructione loci eius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>De civitate Sopurgan et terminis eius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>De civitate Balach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>De castro Taycam et terminis eius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>De civitate Scassen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>719</td>
<td>34. De provincia Balascie.</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>34. De provincia Balascie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720</td>
<td>¶14 Bassia ummorro tir iside co nert ngrene fuirri.</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>¶15 Fil sliabh urard isin crichsin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725</td>
<td>40. De provincia Carchan.</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>41. De provincia Coram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>¶19 Pein ummorro.</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>¶20 Lop didiu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>42. De provincia Peum.</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>43. De provincia Ciarchiam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>44. De civitate Lop et deserto maximo.</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>44. De civitate Lop et deserto maximo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>729</td>
<td>45. De civitate Sachion</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>45. De civitate Sachion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

719 121vb13.  
720 121vb9.  
721 121vb19.  
722 121vb28.  
723 121vb35-36.  
724 122ra8-9.  
725 122ra22.  
726 122ra22.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td><em>ndithrub sin</em>. 727</td>
<td><em>et ritu paganorum in combustione mortuorum.</em></td>
<td><em>et ritu paganorum in combustione mortuorum.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Gach marbh lasin cathraig sin. 728</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fil cathair naili (...) Camul a haimm. 729</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Faidhis Magnus Cam. 730</td>
<td>Teacht for cula. 731</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>De provincia Camul.</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>IAr cur chu frisin crichsin (...) Sing singcalas don taeb araill de. 732</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>De provincia Chychantalas.</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>De provincia Siccuir.</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cricha cambu ummorro (...) Campision is cathair oirecus di. 733</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>De provincia Campicion.</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>De civitate Ezina et alio deserto magno.</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Caracorum ummorro. 734</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>De civitate Carochoram et inicio dominii Tartarorum.</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bui laech amra intansin duaislib na tarraigec (...) Simisis a aimm. 735</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Faidis prespiter seon neach dochuinghidh inchisa inn[ecda]</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
<td>(I.45.5-6-7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

727 122rb1.
728 122rb13.
729 122rb24-25.
730 122rbx.
731 122va5.
733 122va27-29.
734 122vb1.
735 122vb16-18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶31</td>
<td>Ba lan dferg 7 londás Sisim. (737) (I.53.1). ¶32 Gabhuirt na sloigh chechtardha sin in roen fora nagaíd. (738) (I.53.2). ¶33 Preispiter seon ummorro odelos dó cath do chuinghamidh fair. (739) (I.53.3). ¶34 et in .ui.ed bliadhain 32. dia hítháisi. (740) (I.53.4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶35</td>
<td>Facbuis mac di eis. (741)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶36</td>
<td>Na tarraighidh ummorro cineadh linmar iatsein. (742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶37</td>
<td>Natay indee dia nadraít do níter. (743) (I.58.1) ¶38 Dia teasdaíidí oglach cin sheitig. (744)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>De conflictu Tartarorum cum rege illo et victoria ipsorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Cathalogus regum Tartarorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>De generalibus consuetudinibus et moribus Tartarorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>De armis et vestibus ipsorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>De cibis comunibus Tartarorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>De ydolatria et erroribus eorum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(736\) 122vb26-27.
\(737\) 122vbx-y.
\(738\) 123ra4-5.
\(739\) 123ra33.
\(740\) 123ra31-32.
\(741\) 123ra34-35.
\(742\) 123rb11.
\(743\) 123rb30-31.
\(744\) 123rbz.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶40 at ferdha a cathuibh 7 at laechdha a nairm.</td>
<td>59. De strenuitate, industria et fortitudine Tartarorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶41 dianderna nech cin noguim gin dilged.</td>
<td>60. De ordine exercitus Tartarorum et sagacitate bellandi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶42 Ragu unmorro magh forlethan eisdhe.</td>
<td>61. De iudiciis et iustitia eorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶43 Fil anmann naili ann.</td>
<td>62. De campestribus Burgi et de extremis insulis aquilonis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I.63.6-7). ¶44 Ni teascthar folt na ulcha laech isin crichsin.</td>
<td>63. De regno Ergimul et civitate Sangu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I.63.8). ¶45 Ni tabhar crog lahingin.</td>
<td>64. De provincia Egregaia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶46 Tenduc unmorro crich forlethan isside.</td>
<td>65. De provincia Tenduch et Gog et Magog, et civitate Ciangamor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶47 Corra dubha.</td>
<td>66. De civitate Ciandau et nemore regali quod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶48 IArbhfacbáil na crichisin (...) fogebhu cathair Siaudu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61. 123va8. 123va10.
63. 123va44-45. 123va34. 123va26-27.
64. 123va44-45. 123va34. 123va26-27.
65. 123va44-45. 123va34. 123va26-27.
66. 123va44-45. 123va34. 123va26-27.
Although the Digby manuscript was not the parent text of IMP, I have transcribed and analysed the Quinsay extract from this manuscript in order to ascertain whether the version of P which was the source of the Digby manuscript may have been in any way related to IMP.

The following Comparison A table compares my transcription of the Quinsay chapter from IMP with my transcription of the same chapter from Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, which incidentally is the first excerpt of P to appear in the composite manuscript:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, ff. 2v-3v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] fil cathair nailli uidhi , u, laithe frìa a</td>
<td>[1] Post recessum a civitate Singuy itur per dietas 5 et invenitur ad civitates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

755 123vb14.
756 123vb25.
757 123vbz.
758 125ra3-4.
759 124ra4.
thaebh sin

[3] quinlay a haimn inan son 7 in cathair neamhdha dia teangaid siumh ár ni fhuil for bith cathair is mó inás.

[2] cét mile ina timcill
[4] da mile dhéc droicheat le fo ngabhuit longa dimhora cen trascradh seoil dibh

[5] 7 tor dithoglaidhi for cech ndroicheat dibh 7 .iii. milid ag magnus ac fare for cech ndroicheat dibh ar omhun a himpóidh faír ór ba cathair oireachuis do rightaidh manguay isidhe feacht riamh.

7 do ronnad forro in da mile decc

[22] Provincia enim Mangi habet in universo civitates 1200 et in singulis ipsarum per Magnum Kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte rebellare presumant horum custodum multitudo est innumerabile et stupenda non tamen sunt omnes tartari sed sunt de diversis exercitibus et stipendiariis Magni Kaam.

[23] In hac civitate Quinsay et in tota provincia Mangi consuetudo est ut statim quando puer nascitur parentes eius scribi faciunt diem et horam nativitatis eius et sub qua planeta natus est in cunctis vero itineribus suis et factis suis reguntur astrologorum iudiciis ideo scire volunt ortum sui diem et horam.

[24] Quando autem moritur quis in hac civitate canapinis saccis eius consanguinei induuntur et mortuorum cadaver cum cantu magno et imaginibus servorum suorum et ancillarum equorum et denariorum comburunt que omnia de
[6] do ronsat palas rigda for loch a meadhon na cathrach sin ni fuil séd na samhail do phalas for bith do

[9] .xl. mile tighidhis .xl. feacht is aitreabhthaigh don cathair sin.

dapiro faciunt creduntque quod in vita alia veraciter obtinebit defunctus qualia in similitudine sunt combusta post hec cum leticia magna tangunt musica instrumenta dicentes que dii sui cum tali honore eos suspiciunt cum quali corpora combururntur. [25] In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabilis valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangi curiam tenebat primo lacus magnus est circumcintus muro altitudinis valde magne qui in giro continet 10 miliaria intra quos muros sunt viridaria pulcra valde cum fructibus delicatis ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces habentur. [26] In medio autem interioris spatii palatio pulcherrimo est et maius quod in mundo sit habet enim aulas 20 eiusdem magnitudinis omnes in quarum qualibet simul comenderent 10,000 hominum in multa commoditate et cogitate cunctis discumbentibus atque collocatis sunt autem aula picte et deaurate pulcherrimo opere in ipso palatio sunt camera 1000 aut circa. [27] In civitatem Quinsay sunt ignes iuxta vulgare italico seu familiae tot numero quo ad 160 tomani ascendunt in computatione summaria tomani vero 10,000 continet sunt enim ibi in universo numero familie ut earum numerus ad mille milia et ad sexcenta milia (1.600.000) familiarum ascendat. [28]
Highlighted in the table above are those details which do not correspond in the two versions of the text. The first is section [5] in IMP, which corresponds to section [16] in P, where IMP has *iii. milid* and the Oxford manuscript version of P has *10 custodes*. The number four appears in IMP as well as in a minority of manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, discussed below. It is therefore likely that the manuscript which was the source of the ‘Digby’ version was not closely related to IMP. Furthermore, at the end of section [7] of IMP, which corresponds to the end of section [21] of P, IMP has *in da mile decc cathair* whereas the ‘Digby’ version has *140 civitates habet*. In this case, it is the Oxford manuscript version of P that diverges from the majority of
versions of P which, in common with IMP, quote the number 1,200. It is not possible to discern whether this was a scribal error made by the author of the ‘Digby’ version, or whether this mistake was present in his exemplar, however such variance in details between the version of P contained in the Oxford manuscript and IMP is further evidence that the two texts are not closely related. Lastly, at section [25] of the ‘Digby’ version is the reading *lacus* instead of the more common *locus*. It will be advanced below, under ‘English’ branch, that this feature indicates that the ‘Digby’ version was probably copied from a manuscript of English origin, pertaining to the α branch of of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, the *stemma codicum* of which is displayed at the end of this chapter. IMP also belongs to this group of manuscripts of P, but further analysis has found a subgroup of the ‘English’ branch to which it is more closely related

As well as containing the reading *lacus* instead of *locus*, Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 also contains a unique reading in the Quinsay chapters which separates it from all other manuscripts of P, but which is not discernible in IMP, namely the reading *consinatus sum* instead of *perscrutatus* or *perscruptatus sum*. This reading is numbered 19) in the *stemma codicum* at the end of this chapter:

19)

Ego Marcus fui in hac civitate et curiose ac diligenter condiciones
ipsius *constintatus fui*.

(Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, f. 2v)

Ego Marcus fui in hac civitate et curiose ac diligenter conditiones illius
*perscrutatus sum*.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84, f. 233v)

Ego Marcus fui in hac civitate et curiose ac diligenter conditiones ipsius
*perscrutatus sum*.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, VLF 75, f. 36v)

Ego Marcus fui in hac civitate et curiose et diligenter conditiones ipsius
*perscruptatus sum*. 

192
Ego Marchus fui in hac civitate et curiose et diligenter conditiones illius perscrutatus sum.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 65rb)

The above analysis has shown that IMP and Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196 are not directly related. However, the ‘Digby’ version is related to IMP in that they are both derived from the ‘English’ branch of the same ‘fidelissimi’ group of manuscripts of P.

2.2.2. ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ or $\beta_3$ Version

The same summarised version of P survives in two manuscripts written in England namely, Cambridge, University Library MS Dd.87 and Dublin, Trinity College, MS E.5.2 [Abbot 632].

My study has concluded that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P is not the source of IMP for two following reasons: firstly, this version is divided into thirty-one chapters, and lacks the tripart book division that is found in both P and IMP. Secondly, this version of P lacks several chapters found in IMP, for example: in the chapter of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version entitled Item De Provinciis Orientis capitulum vi, the author copies the end of Pipino’s chapter I.61 onto the end of Pipino’s chapter I.54, omitting all content between I.55 and I.61.3 of P, much of which is contained in IMP, and found between ¶36 and ¶41 of Stokes’s edition. This is shown in the following extract from Dublin, Trinity College E.5.20, with chapter markings inserted by me for convenience of reference with the transcription of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983:

[I.54].20. milia hominum occiderunt [I.61.3] mores autem et conditiones tartarorum alibi in libro converet sed quia modo intra diversos populos sunt commixti indei suis consuetutinibus dimittentes in pluribus provincis aliorum aliorum morborum se conformant.

---

760 Gadrat, Lire, 202-05. That these two manuscripts contain the same version of P was noted first by Gadrat. Transcriptions made over the course of this doctorate from these manuscripts confirm her observations.

761 Dutschke, Pipino, 548.

762 Dublin, Trinity College, E.5.20, 55r.
The table below displays the content which has been omitted by the author of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version, in the right-hand column, beside the respective paragraph incipits as found in Stokes’s edition of IMP between ¶35 and ¶41, in the left-hand column. The transcriptions of IMP in the following table have also been taken from Stokes’s edition of the text. The titles of the corresponding chapters of P from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, are listed in the central column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP (Stokes’s Paragraph Incipits)</th>
<th>Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983 (Chapter Titles)</th>
<th>Dublin, Trinity College, E.5.20, 55r (Text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶35 Faebuis mac di eis.(^{763})</td>
<td>I.54 Cathalogus regum Tartarorum et qualiter illorum regum corpora sepeliuntur in monte Alchay.</td>
<td>[I.54] .20. milia hominum occiderunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶36 Na tartraighidh unnorro cine dh linmar iatsein.(^ {764})</td>
<td>I.55 De generalibus consuetudinis et moribus Tartarorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.56 De armis et vestibus ipsorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.57 De cibis comunibus Tartarorum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{763}\) 123ra34-35.  
\(^{764}\) 123rb11.
Further to this analysis, which shows that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version could not have been the source of IMP, I have made transcriptions of the Quinsay chapter from both manuscripts of this version in order to ascertain whether any of the scribal errors present in IMP are also present in the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version, indicating a close relationship between the texts. The following Comparison A table compares my transcription of the Quinsay chapter from IMP with my transcription of the same chapter from Dublin, Trinity College, MS E.5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Dublin, Trinity College, MS E.5.2. ff 73r-75r.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] fil cathair nai li uidhi .u. laithe fria a</td>
<td>[1] Post recessum a civitate Singuy itur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

765 123rb30-31.
766 123rbz.
767 123va8.
768 123va10.
769 123va14.
thaebh sin

[3] quinlay a haimn inan son 7 in cathair neamhda dia teangaid siunh ár ni fhuil for bith cathair is mó inás.

[2] cét mile ina timcill

[4] da mile dhéc droicheat le fo ngabhuit longa dimhora cen trascadh seoi dibh

fil loch a meadon na cathrach sin 7
.xxx. mile na uirtimcheall.

di inisfair
dun rigda a meadhon gacha
hinnsidibh
ni la neach for bith iat som 7
in as fearr
do bhidiadh 7 deoch 7 mhainibh
na cathrach
cuirid a meadon
na nduinte 7
inti dianad
ail fleadhughadh
do dhenamh
tiagait
dia tochaithimh
inntibh
7
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7
ni la neach
don cathraigh
dim
ná caislèn
da fuil
for
feadh acht
coimhdheas
da gach
aen iatsumh
7
as
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do
beir
an
timath
droicheat
sin
le
for
srothaibh
7
wisceedhaibh
fil
si
7
ni
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an
imtheacht
for
araili
acht
dibh
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tor
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for
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7
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ag
magnus
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fare
for
cech
ndroicheat
dibh
ar
omhun
a
himpóidh
fairy
or
ba
caithar
oireachuis
do
rightaidh
manguay
isidhe
feacht
riamh.

formose
valde
et
multis
deliciis
enutrite.

Versus meridiem
est
in
ipsam

civitatem
lacus
magna
quem
30
miliaria
in
giro
continet
in
hoc
circitu
super
lacum
sunt
multa
palacia
et
multe
domus
magne
nobiliun
et
sunt
internis
et
externis
mirabiliter
adornate
sunt
etiam
ibi
ecclesie
ydolorum
in
medio
lacus
illis
duo
parve
sunt
insule
et
in
qualibet
ipsarum
palaciac
pulcerum
est
et
nobile
valde
ibi
sunt
omnia
preparamenta
et
vasa
neccessaria
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nuptiis
vel
solemnii
convivio
si
quis
igitur
vult
in
solemnii
loco
tenere
convivio
vel
nuptias
cum
honore
tenere
accedit
illuc.
[10
omitted]

Sunt
etiam
per
vicos
huius
civitatis
lapides

turres
pro
communi
usu
contracte
ut
quando
fortuna
ignis
acciderit
possunt

convicini
res
suas
ad
prefatas


turres
derferre
ne
comburantur
quia
enim
in

civitate
multe
domus
ligneae
sunt
sepe
in


civitate
ignis
accenditur.
[12]

Incole
ydolatre.
[13]

Sunt
carnes
equorum

canum
et
animalium
omnia
comedunt.
[14]

Currit
ibi
moneta
Magni
Kaam.
[15]

Ponitur
ibi
custodia
maxima
ne
civitas

rebellare
presumat
aut
furta
vel
homicidia
fiant.
[16]

In
quolibet
ponte

civitatis
de
die
et
nocte
10
custodes
sunt.
[17]

In
hac
civitate
est
unus
mons
super
quam
est
turris
et
super
turrim
tabule
sunt
de
asseribus
quando
autem
ignis
in
urbe

accenditur
si
custodes


turris
hoc
videre
possint cum ligneo malleo percutiunt tabulas ut huius sonitus circumquaque terram eminus audiatur et concurrant homines ad auxilium afferendum similiter autem fit si pro quacumque causa commotio vel tumultus fiat. [18 omitted]

[19] In civitate in hac civitate sunt terme circiter 3000 pulchrum valde in quibus sepe homines lavantur munditie corporali multum student. [20] Ultra civitatem Quinsay ad 25 miliaria ad orientem est oceanum mare et ibi supra mare est civitas Ganfu ubi est portus optimus ad quem conveniunt naves in in multitudine maxima de India et de regionibus aliis.

[21] Provinciam Mangi divisit Magnus Kaam in regna 4 dans proprium regem regno unicuique iuxta sue voluntatis beneplacitum sunt autem omnes reges potentes valde sed subditi sunt Magno Kaam et oportet eos annis singulis de omnibus regnorum proventibus et expensis et de suo regimine Magni Kaam officialibus racionem reddere unus autem illorum regnum in civitate Quinsay continue moratur qui sub dicione sua 140 civitates habet. [22] Provincia enim Mangi habet in universo civitates 1200 et singulis ipsarum per Magnum Kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte debellare presumant horum custodum multitudo est innumerabilis et stupenda. [23] in hac civitate Quinsay et in tota provincia

7 do ronnad forro in da mille decc

cathair bai isin rigi sin occus ni raibhi
cathair dhibh gan drong do mileadhui
magnus cam oca himcoimhet ar omhun a
himpóidh fair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Mangi consuetudo est quod statim ut puer nascitur parentes eius scribi faciunt diem et horam nativitatis eius sub quo planeta natus est in cunctis enim itineribus et factis suis reguntur astrologorum iudiciis ideoque scire volunt ortus sui diem et horam. [24 omitted] [25] In hac civitate Quinsay est palacium magnum valde cuius circuitus muri continet miliaria 20 inter quos muros sunt viridaria pulchra valde cum fructibus delicatis ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus pisces multo capiuntur. [26] in medio autem interioris spacci palacium est pulcherrimum et maius quod in mundo sit habet enim aulas pulcherrimas eiusdem magnitudinis 20 in quarum qualibet simul comederent 10,000 hominum in ipso palacio sunt camere 1000. [27] In civitate Quinsay sunt ignes sive familie tot numero quod ad 160 tomanis ascendunt tomanis vero 10,000 continet sunt igitur in universo tot familie ut earum numerus ad mille milia et ad sexcenta milia (1,600,000) familiarum ascendat. [28] Palacia in hac civitate multa sunt et pulchra valde. [29] Una sola est ibi christianorum ecclesia nestorinorum. [30] Hospitum receptores omnes scribunt in suis quaternis nomina homium viatorum quos in suis hospiciis recipiunt et quo mense et quo die in eius hospitium sunt ingressi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>do ronsat palas rigda for loch a meadhon na cathrach sin ni fuil se'd na samhail do phalas for bith do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>xx. sluaghteach lais 7 x. mile do thoimhileadh in gach sluaghteach dibh 7 tene bithbeo a meadhon gacha bruidhne dibh 7 mile do sheomradhuihbh solusda fria suan 7 freasdal ina nur thimceall co neimh noir forra 7 co fuath gach ammanna eceannus for bith ar na rinnadh forro do ilbreachtadh gacha datha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>xl. mile tighidhis xl. feacht is aitreabhthaigh don cathair sin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ni tusmidter gein innti nach scribhtar a ainm 7 in cruth forsa mbi in re 7 reanna nimhe oca tusmheadh 7 dia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table reveals three differences between the two texts that suggest that they are not closely related: firstly, section [5] of IMP, which corresponds to section [16] of P from the Dublin manuscript, shows that IMP’s *mílid* and Dublin’s *custodes* do not correspond. Secondly, section [7] of IMP reads *nai riga* where the corresponding section [21] of the Dublin manuscript reads *regna 4*. Thirdly, the last part of section [7] of IMP reads *in da mile decc cathair* where the corresponding detail in the Dublin manuscript, found at the end of section [21], reads *140 civitates*. These different details suggest that IMP and the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version do not share a close relationship.

Finally, it is interesting to note how the author of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P dealt with section [25], which in many manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, contains the scribal error *lacus* instead of *locus*. The following examples show how the scribes of Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5 and Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), both manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, also tried to make sense of their garbled exemplar. These manuscripts are compared with the same passage from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, which contains the passage without the scribal error, and from the Dublin manuscript, which omits the mistake entirely. All transcriptions and translations are my own, except for the transcription of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, which was made by Dr Simion:
In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangi tenebat curiam primo locus magnus circumcinctus est muro per quadrum altitudinis magne que in giro continet miliaria 10. 770

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66vb)

In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangi curiam tenebat primo lacus magnus circumcintus est muris altitudinis valde magne qui in giro totius 10 miliaria. 771

(Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5, f. 268b)

In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangi curiam tenebat lacus magnus est in circuitu muris cuius altitudo magna est valde quem in giro continet miliaria 9. 772

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234v)

In hac civitate Quinsay est palacium magnum valde cuius circuitus muri continet miliaria 20. 773

(Dublin, Trinity College, MS E.5.2. f. 74v)

Although the author of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version was omitting large portions of P and was composing his own version of the Travels from it, it may be suggested that in the case of section [25] of the Quinsay chapter, the author recognised that his source had been corrupted and chose to amend the text by omitting many of the details of the passage. If this is the case, then the source of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P was a manuscript of the ‘English’ branch, all members of which contain the reading *lacus* instead of *locus*. This, in combination with the likelihood that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version was written in England, indicates that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’

---

770 ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a great palace in which Facfur, who was once the king of Mangy, first kept his court, a great area is surrounded by a wall of great height in a square, and which has a perimeter of 10 miles.’

771 ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a truly wonderful palace in which Facfur, who was once the king of Mangy, first kept his court. A large lake is surrounded by walls of great height for ten miles.’

772 ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a truly wonderful palace in which Facfur, who was once the king of Mangy, first kept his court. A great lake is all around with walls which are of very great height and has a perimeter of 9 miles.’

773 ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a very large palace which has a wall that encompasses 20 miles.’
Dublin’ version most probably derives from the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group.

Furthermore, the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version shares the reading 140 civitates habet at section [21], with Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, indicating that the two versions of P may have shared a parent text. If this is the case, it would support the proposal that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version derives from the ‘English’ branch of P.

Gadrat has argued that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P was used by John of Tynemouth during the mid-fourteenth century to write the Historia Aurea (HA), a vast historical tract which runs up to the year 1347, incorporating a wide range of sources including an early version of the contemporary Polychronicon, a chronicle of universal history and theology by Ranulf Higden. In addition, she has suggested that John of Tynemouth wrote this résumé of P before incorporating parts of it in HA. It has been argued that only reduced versions of HA survive and that it does not exist in full in any manuscript. In fact, not all versions of HA contain extracts from P, and the ones which do place them in different sections of the text: in London, Lambeth Palace 10-12, which comes from Durham priory and was already in the library there in 1395, the extracts from P are found after the year 1252, the date of the first expedition of the Polo brothers from Venice; on the other hand, in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 5, which was commissioned by William Wynterschulle of St. Albans shortly after 1420, the extracts of P are found at the beginning of the text, within a section entitled ‘Descriptio Orbis.’

The Cambridge manuscript was written in England during the 1340s. The summarised version of P is followed by Ranulf Hidgen’s Polychronicon, ff. 15r - 355v. Dutschke has suggested that the association of these two texts in the manuscript indicates that its compiler attributed a historical value to the Travels, intending it ‘as a recitation of actual events’.  

---

774 Galbraith, ‘The Historia Aurea of John, Vicar of Tynemouth, and the sources of the St. Albans Chronicle’, Essays in History presented to Reginald Lane Poole, éd H. W. Carless Davis (Oxford 1927) 381; Gansden, Historical Writing, 56.
775 Gadrat, Lire, 204-05.
777 Ibid., 385; Gadrat, Lire, 205.
778 Galbraith, ‘Historia’, 385; Gadrat, Lire, 205; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 5-6, f.2v.
779 Dutschke, Pipino, 545.
780 Ibid., 547.
On the other hand, the Dublin manuscript was written in Norfolk, probably by a single scribe, during the mid-fifteenth century, and contains a miscellany of historical, geographical and philosophical texts.\textsuperscript{781} Regarding the content of the Dublin manuscript, Dutschke noted that ‘the texts surrounding Marco Polo demonstrate an intense desire for knowledge, albeit a knowledge alien to the concrete realities available in the Marco Polo: palmistry, astrology, marvels, excerpts and proverbs amount to what the modern world qualifies as specifically “medieval” knowledge.’\textsuperscript{782} For example, the manuscript contains: \textit{Alexandri Magni iter ad paradisum}, a text on the dimensions, praise and marvels of Britain, a text on palmistry, extracts from Seneca’s \textit{De Beneficiis}, moralistic passages from various classical and late classical authors, such as Cassiodorus, Petronius, Terence, Sallust and Boethius, a text on the Fall of Thebes and a dialogue on avoiding informers and false friends.\textsuperscript{783} Therefore, in contrast to the historical value which is attributed to the \textit{Travels} in the Cambridge manuscript, by its association with the \textit{Polychronicon}, the variety of texts surrounding P in the Dublin manuscript suggests that the text was being read and interpreted in the context of wisdom literature, or ‘\textit{litriocht na gaoise’ as Ó Macháin has coined it:

‘Bíonn idir léann diaga agus léann tuata i gceist i litriocht seo na gaoise mar sin, agus gabhann scata stileanna reacaireachta léi, i véarsaíocht nó i bprós: an t-agallamh, an ceistiú, an tomhas, an tseanmóir, an fháistine, an tré nó an seachta, an teagasc lom, an afóraisce agus an seanfhocal. […] cineál litriochta é an ghaois ar cuma leis gabháil thr seachta fhóil ó \textit{genre} go chéile.’\textsuperscript{784}

The fact that the same version of P survives in two such different manuscripts, one concerned with history and fact, and the other with anecdotes and marvels, is indicative of the different ways in which the \textit{Travels} was being received and considered by its medieval readers. In the preface to his edition of the \textit{Travels}, published in the sixteenth century, Ramusio alludes to a generalised scepticism as to the veracity of Marco Polo’s account:

\textsuperscript{782} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 556.
\textsuperscript{783} Ibid., 554.
\textsuperscript{784} Ó Macháin, ‘Buaine’, 334.
‘Il libro del quale (Marco Polo), per cause de infinite scorrezioni ed errori, è stato molte decine d’anni riputato favola, e che i nomi delle città e provincie fussero tutte fizioni e imaginazioni senza fondamento alcuno, e per dir meglio sogni.’

Like the Dublin manuscript, IMP is surrounded by texts of various genres in L, including lives of saints, fiannaíocht texts, historical and ethnographical texts such as Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir (GSM), Sdair na Lumbardach (SNL), as well as apocryphal and anecdotal texts such as In Tenga Bithnua, Scel na Samhna or Sgela an Trir Meic Cleirech. Although the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P was not the direct source of IMP, the manner in which the compiler of the Dublin manuscript and the scribes of the L read and understood the Travels may be comparable, suggesting that the author of IMP perhaps did not consider P to be completely factual, but was still intrigued by the wisdom that it conveyed within the broader context of ‘litriocht na gaoise’.

2.2.3. ‘Harley’ Version

The abbreviation of P contained in British Library, Harley 5115 was written during the second half of the fourteenth century in England, possibly in Dorset by, or for, an individual named Robert Grey. Its relationship with the other manuscripts of the ‘fidelissimi’ group is represented in the stemma codicum at the end of this chapter. The manuscript also contains Hayton’s *Flos Historiarum Terre Orientis* and Geoffrey of Monmouth *Historia Regum Britanniae*.

The following Comparison A table compares my transcription of II.64 from ff. 36rb-36vb of British Library, Harley 5115 with my transcription of the corresponding section of IMP, found at ¶136-¶141 in Stokes’s edition. The corresponding sections of the ‘Harley’ version and the translations in IMP have been underlined and are in bold characters, while the sections of IMP that are not found in the ‘Harley’ version have been underlined, are in bold characters and have been highlighted, with the corresponding gap in the ‘Harley’ version filled in with the numbers of the sections

---

785 Ramusio, *Navigazioni*, 22: ‘Whose book (Marco Polo’s), due to a great number of mistakes and errors, has been considered a fable for many decades, that the names of cities were all fictions and imagined with no truth to them at all, or perhaps even dreams’.

which have been omitted in square brackets, for convenience of reference with the transcription of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983. These have also been highlighted, underlined and are in bold characters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] fil cathair nai li uidihi .u. laithe fria a thaebh sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] quinlay a hainn inan son 7 in cathair neamhdha dia teangaid siumh ár ni fhuil for bith cathair is mó ináis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] cét mile ina tincill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] da mile dhéic droicheat le fo ngabhuit longa dimhora cen trascranbh seoil dibh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] fil loch a meadon na cathrach sin 7 .xxx. mile na uirtimcheall. di inis fair dun rigda a meadhon gacha himsi dibh ni la neach for bith iat som 7 in as fêrr do bhiudh 7 deoch 7 mhainibh na cathrach cuirid a meadon na ndúinte 7 inti dianad aill fleadhughadh do dhenamh tiagait dia tochaithimh inntibh 7 foghebha 7 ni la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London, British Library, Harley 5115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
neach don cathtraigh dimn ná caislen dá fuid fora feadh acht coimhadhneas dá gach aen iatsumh 7 as eadh do beir an timat droicheat sin le for srothaibh 7uisceadhaibh fil si 7 ni bhi an imtheacht for araili acht dibh


[7] in tan ro irghabh magnus cam in cathair sin 7 prouindsi manguay ro hoirdreadh nai riga do thartraidh forro 7 do ronnad forro in da mile dece cathair bai isin rigi sin occus ni raibhi cathair dibh gan drong do mileadhuib magnus cam oca himcoimhet ar omhun a himpoidh fair

[6] do ronsat palas rigda for loch a meadhon na cathrach sin ni fuil séd na samhail do phalas for bith do


[25] in civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile valde in quo Facfur quodam rex Mangi curiam tenebat primo lacus magnus circuitus est murus a quaram altitudinis valde magne qui murus in giro continet 10 miliaria intra quem murum sunt viridaria multa pulcra valde cum fructibus delicatis ibi sunt fontes lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces habentur
.XX. Sluaíghtheach lais

7. X. Mile do thoimgileadh in gach sluaíghtheach dhibh 7 tene bithbo a meadhon gacha bruidhne dhibh

7 mile do sheomradhuibh solusda fria suan 7 freasdal ina nur thimceall co neimh noir forra 7 co fuath gach anmanna eceannus for bith ar na rinnadh forro do ilbreachtadh gacha datha

[9] XL. Mile tighidhis. XL. Seacht is aitreabhthaigh don cathair sin.

[10] Ni tusmidter gein innti nach scribhthar a ainm 7 in cruth forsa mbi in re 7 reanna nimhe oca tasmheadh 7 dia ndeach neach dhibh as bean tar a ainm as 7 scribhthar aris he 7 ainm a each 7 a maine 7 a aesa cumtha 7 loiscter diblinuibh ar aen ria chorp 7 dar leo gach a scribtha dho do beidis ar aen fris isin beathaidd naile.

[26] In medio autem interioris spatii palatium pulcherrimum est et maius quod in mundo sit habet enim 20 eiusdem magnitudinis omnes in quark qualibet simul comederent 10.000 hominum in multa commoditate et in debitate congruitate cuncits discumbentibus collocatis sunt autem aule picte et deaurate pulcherrimo opere in ipso palatio sunt camere 1000 aut circa [27] in civitate Quinsay sunt ignes iuxta vulgare italicum seu familie tot numero quod ad 160 tomani ascenderent in computatione summaria tomani vero 10.000 continet sunt igitur tot in universo familie ut earum numeros ad milia milia et sexcenta milia familiarum ascendat [28] palatia in hac civitate multa sunt et pulcra valde [29] in tota autem hac civitate una sola ecclesia christianorum et nestorinorum est [30] in hac civitate et in tota provincia Mangi oportet ut quilibet pater familias supra hostium domus sue scribi faciat nomen suus uxoris sue et nomina omnia de familia sua et numerum equorum cum autem quis de familia moritur aut domus mutat oportet ut deleatur nomen mortui aut decedentis et scribatur ibi nomen cuiusque de novo nascentis vel ad familiam additi et isto modo de faciliter scribi potest numerus omnium qui est in civitate similiter et stabularii seu
An examination of these transcriptions reveal that sections [5-9], [15-19½] and [22-24] of the Quinsay chapter of P, have been edited out of the ‘Harley’ version. Therefore, it follows that the ‘Harley’ version could not have been the direct source of IMP, because sections [8], [5] and the second half of [7] of IMP are translated from [9], [16] and [22] of P respectively, none of which are found in the ‘Harley’ version of P.

2.2.4. ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ Version

This heavily abridged version of P survives in three manuscripts from the border area of Germany and Austria namely: Melk, Stiftsbibliothek 1094, Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 18624 and Würzburg, Diözesanbibliothek, I 58 (previosly, Würzburg, Franziskamer-Minoritenkloster I 58).787 The author of this summary is anonymous, however Gadrat has noticed that two of these manuscripts, namely those of Melk and of Tergensee, were located in two Benedictine abbeys which underwent the same monastic reform during the fifteenth century.788 Furthermore, Gadrat has suggested that the Tergensee text is a direct copy of the text found in the Melk manuscript, and that the Würzburg text and the Melk text were copied from the same source.789

The following Comparison A table contains my transcription of the Quinsay chapter from IMP and my transcription of corresponding section from folio 177v of Würzburg, Diözesanbibliothek, I 58. The numbers of the sections, as assigned by Burgio and Simion in their transcription of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, have been inserted accordingly. The numbers of the sections which have been omitted

787 Gadrat, Lire, 91.
788 Ibid., 91-93.
789 Ibid., 93.
have also been inserted. These numbers provide a visualisation of the reason why the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version is not the direct source of IMP. In the following table, the sections of the Quinsay chapter from IMP which have been omitted in the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version have been highlighted in the left-hand column, and the numbers of the missing sections from which they were translated have been highlighted in the right-hand column. Additions by the author of the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version, which are not present in IMP, have been italicised in the right-hand column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Würzburg, Diözesanbibliothek, I 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] fil cathair nailing uidhi .u. laithe fria a</td>
<td>[1 omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thaebh sin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neamhdha dia teangaid siunh ar ní thuil</td>
<td>civitas orbis est [2 ½ omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for bith cathair is mó inás.</td>
<td>[3 omitted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] cét mile ina timeill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longa dimhora cen trasradh seol dibh</td>
<td>habet pontes circa 12.000 tante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>altitudinins ut navis sub eis plurimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transire possit est autem civitas in lacunis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>posita et si careret pontibus non pateret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transitus de domo in domum [5] in qua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sunt artes principales 12 et pro qualibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sunt in civitate 12.000 stationes et tanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>est ibi artium et mercationum multitudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] fil loch a meadon na cathrach sin 7 xxx. mile na uirtimcheall.</td>
<td>quod non videntibus incredibile videatur [6-8 omitted] [9] in civitate Quinsay est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rigda a meadhon gacha hinsí dibh ni la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
neach for bith iat som 7 in as fearr do bhiudh 7 deoch 7 mhainibh na cathrach cuirid a meadon na nduínne 7 inti dianad aíl fleadhughadh do dhéanmh tiagait dia tochaithimh inntíbh 7 foghebha 7 ní lás neach don cathraigh dinn ná caisiléan da fuil fora feadh acht coimhdheas da gach aen iatsumh 7 as eadh do beir an timat droicheat sin le for srothaibh 7 úisceadhaibh fil sí 7 ní bhi an imtheacht for araili acht dibh

[5] 7 tor dithoglaíthí for cech ndroicheat dibh 7 .iii. milid ag magnus ac fare for cech ndroicheat dibh ar omhun a himpóidh fair ór ba cathair oireachuí do rightaidh manguay isidhe feacht riamh.

[7] in tan ro irghabh magnus cam in cathair sin 7 prounídsí manguay ro hoirdnedadh ná riga do thrarraidhí forro 7 do ronnad forro in da mile decc cathair bai isin rigi sin occus ní raibhi cathair dibh gan drong do mileadhuiub magnus cam oca himcoimhnet ar omhun a himpóidhír faire

[6] do rosnat palas rigda for loch a

lacu continens in giro 30 miliaria [9½ omitted]

[10-19 omitted]


[II.63.2-3] est autem provincia Mangi ita popolosa que si homines in armis strenui essent totum mundu delorent sed sunt ibidem multi mercatores multi artifices multi medici et physisci

[II.64.23-26½ omitted]
[26½] in civitate Quinsay est palacium quod habet 20 aulas mire pulchritudinis in quarum qualibet comederent simul 10,000 hominum cum multa commoditate sunt autem aule depictae decorate pulcherrimo opere in ipso autem palacio sunt circa 1000 cameras.

[II.67.1-3] in montibus Signi civitatis provincie Mangi transit rebarbarum et contiber in tanta copia quod pro uno veneto argenteo habentur 80 librum recentis et optimi cupilem civitatis cives comuniter utiutur vestibus de sericis iter

[II.64.27] in civitate Quinsay sunt familie tot quod ad 160 romaninos ascendunt romaninus autem 10,000 continet sunt autem in toto deces mille milia et .lx. milia familiarum.

[28-30 omitted]
A comparison with IMP shows that the Irish translator could not have derived his translation from this version of P directly. Specifically, the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version is lacking sections [1], the second half of [2], the second half of [9], [16], [22], [25], [29] and [30], which are found in IMP and correspond to [1], the second half of [3], the second half of [8], [5], the second half of [7], [6], [11] and [12] respectively. Furthermore the author of the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version incorporated sections from other chapters of P into his chapter on the city of Quinsay, namely sections [2] and [3] from the previous chapter II.63 De nobili civitate Synguy, which were inserted after section [21] of II.64, and sections [1], [2] and [3] from chapter II.67 De Regno Fuguy, after section [26] of II.64. These have been italicised in the Comparison A table above.

Two conclusions may be drawn from this analysis: firstly, that none of the surviving Latin abridgements of P were the direct source of IMP; and secondly, that the author of IMP was by no means alone in his reworking and editing of the material of P, but that it was commonplace for scholars and copyists of the Travels across Europe to edit and rearrange the material of P during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. On the evidence of the surviving manuscripts, this activity seems to have been most common in England. In fact, three of the four surviving Latin summaries of P were compiled in England, two during the fourteenth century, namely the ‘Harley’ version and the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version, and the other during the first half of the fifteenth century, namely the ‘Digby’ version.

2.3. IMP and the Groups of P

Having concluded that IMP does not derive from any of the surviving Latin abridgements of P, this study shall now examine the relationship between IMP and
forty-seven of the sixty surviving manuscripts which contain the unabridged version of P. The aim of this exercise is to identify the version of P which most closely resembles IMP, in order to initiate a discussion on the geographical area and literary context in which the source text of IMP was written.

Due to the size of the corpus of surviving manuscripts of P, previous scholarship has not attempted to draw a complete stemma codicum of all sixty manuscripts, and of the nine abridgements of P. However, a number of groups were distinguished by De Benedetto and Dutschke, and Gadrat has taken some preliminary steps in drawing a partial stemma of P. The description of a complete stemma codicum of all surviving manuscripts of P is beyond the immediate interest of this study, however an account of the distinguishable groups of P manuscripts is necessary in order to understand the relationship between IMP and the surviving manuscripts of P.

What follows is partial stemma of thirty-five of the sixty-nine manuscripts of P which can be distinguished into groups. The stemma of P belows draws heavily on Gadrat’s work, ‘qui n’est pas un stemma à proprement parler, mais une première tentative de classement de différents manuscrits de la traduction de Francesco Pipino.’ To Gadrat’s stemma I have added the ‘Florence 1442’ group and the group of the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version, both of which Gadrat knew of, but did not included in her stemma.

I have also added IMP to this stemma, showing how it derives from the ‘lacus’ subgroup of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, corresponding to Gadrat’s ‘Angleterre’ group and the ‘English’ branch described in this study, with several adjustments. These are: the addition of the following manuscripts to the ‘lacus’ group: Cambridge, Univeristy Library, Dd.87; Dublin, Trinity College, MS E.5.2 [Abbot 632]; Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek 218; Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum V.6.8.[458]; London, British Library Add 19513; London, British Library Arundel 13. The abridged version of P found in Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby 196, was also not included in Gadrat’s stemma, but is included here as deriving from the ‘lacus’ group, as discussed above. Private Collection [prev. Devon, Library of Boies Penrose

---

Dutschke, Pipino, 232-33 and 248.
Gadrat, Lire, 85.
Ibid., 86: ‘which is not strictly speaking a stemma, rather a first attempt to classify the different manuscripts of the Francesco Pipino translation’.
Ibid., 78-82 and 85.
23] was removed from Gadrat’s stemma because I have not been able to gain access to this manuscript and was therefore unable to verify its relation to the other manuscripts of the ‘lacus’ group.⁷⁹⁴

The discovery that IMP derives from the ‘lacus’ group of manuscripts of P was made by comparing IMP and all the manuscripts of the ‘fidelissimi’ group available to me, using the Comparison A and Comparison B techniques outlined in the methodology section above. This finding will be discussed under the heading ‘English’ branch (a).

Following this stemma are a summary and discussion of each of the various groups of P that are represented in the stemma, with a description of how they relate to IMP:

⁷⁹⁴ See footnote to this manuscript in the list of P manuscripts above for information about why I have not been able to consult it.
Extended Colophon

‘Colophon’ group - 5 MSS
   a) Colophon - Extended version.
   b) Miracle of Mountain – Short version.
   1) Berlin, SPK lat. 4° 618
   2) Stuttgart, WL Hist 4° 10
   3) BAV, Ottob. lat. 1641
   4) BAV, Ottob. lat. 1875
   5) Vienna, ÖNB 12823

‘Miracle’ group – 6 MSS + Czech Translation
   a) Colophon - Extended version.
   b) Miracle of Mountain – Extended version.
   1) Florence, BNC C.7.1170
   2) Klosterneuburg, S., 722 A
   3) Göttigen, U., 4° Hist. 61
   4) Körnik, BK, PAN, ms. 131
   5) Skokloster, Folio 67
   6) Wrocław, BU, IV Fol 103

Czech Translation – 1 MS

Short Colophon

‘Fidelissimi’ group - 20 MSS
   1) Munich, BS clm 249
   2) Munich, BS clm 850

‘De Ordine Exercitus’ group - 3 MSS
   1) Modena, BE, lat. 131 [α.S.6.14]
   2) Vatican, BAV, Vat. lat. 3153
   3) Wolfenbüttel, Gud. lat. 3

‘Ducalis’ group = ‘English’ branch
   1) Berlin, SPK lat. 4° 70
   2) Cambridge, G&C 162/83
   3) Cambridge, UL Dd.1.17
   4) Cambridge, UL Dd.8.7
   5) Copenhagen, KB Acc 20115
   6) Dublin, TC E.5.2 [Abbot 632]
   7) Gießen, U 218
   8) Glasgow, UL Hunter T.4.1 [84]
   9) Glasgow, UL Hunter V.6.8 [458]
   10) Leiden, BDR, Voss. Lat. F. 75
   11) London, BL Add 19513
   12) London, BL Arundel 13
   13) London, BL Harley 5115
   14) London, BL Royal 14.C.xiii
   15) Oxford, Merton College 312
   16) Princeton, PU, Garrett 157

IMP – 1 MS

‘Schedel’ version – 2 MSS
   1) Munich, BS clm 5339
   2) Vienna, ÖNB 3497

Possibly related to:
   3) Jena, U Bosianus 4° 10

‘Lacus’ group = ‘English’ branch
   1) Venice, Marciana X.73

Printed edition by G. Leeu 1483-84
   1) Ghent, Universiteitsbibliothek 13
   2) San Lorenzo de El Escorial, RM .II.13

‘Florence 1442’ group – 3 MSS
   1) Munich, BS clm 5339
   2) Vienna, ÖNB 3497

Würzburg

‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version – 3 MSS

Munich

‘Melk’ group – 3 MSS

Venice, Marciana X.73

‘Barbarigo’ colophon – 2 MSS
   1) Paris, lat. 6244°
   2) BAV, Vat. lat. 7317

etc. (another 24 MSS)
2.3.1. Colophon Division

It has been suggested by Gadrat that a group of manuscripts of P are distinguished by an expanded *explicit* at the end of the third book.\(^{795}\) It must be noted however, that not all extended versions of this *explicit* correspond verbatim.\(^{796}\) In particular, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1641 and Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1875, contain a condensed version of this expanded explicit, which however is still not the same as the short colophon which is found in most other manuscripts of P.

The following transcriptions show this variation in the *explicit*. All transcriptions are my own, except for Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi, C.7.1170, which was made by Gadrat,\(^{797}\) and Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, which was made by Simion.

Explicit liber tertius et ultimus domini Marchi Pauli de Venetiis de condictionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum. Quem librum frater Franciscus Pipini civis Bononie ordinis predicatorem credens et asserens ipsum verum et vera continere omnia in eo scripta de vulgari in grammaticam et bonam et intelligibilem latinitatem transmutavit.

(Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi, C.7.1170, f.69.)

Explicit liber tertius et ultimus domini Marchi Pauli de Veneciis de condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum. Quem librum frater Franciscus Pipini civis Bononie ordinis predicatorem credens et asserens ipsum verum et vera continere omnia in eo scripta de vulgari in grammaticam et bonam et intelligibilem latinitatem ut asseruit transmutavit. Laus tibi sit Criste quoniam liber explicit iste. Amen.

(Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, IV Fol 103, 67ra.)

Explicit liber prudentis et eloquentis viri domini Marchi Pauli de Venetiis de mirabilibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum. Deo gratias.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 91b.)

---

\(^{795}\) Gadrat, *Lire*, 74-75.
\(^{796}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 256-57.
\(^{797}\) Gadrat, *Lire*, 74.
Explicit liber domini marci pauli de venetiiis de condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum.

(Berlin, SPK, lat. 4° 70, 118v.)

Explicit liber domini marchi pauli de venetiis de condictionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum.

(Modena, BE, lat. 131 [α.S.6.14], 40va.)

It is not possible to verify whether an expanded explicit was present in the source text of IMP, because even if this had been translated, the final chapters of the Irish text are missing due to a loss of folios in L. However, evidence discussed with regard to the ‘English’ branch below, will show that IMP derives from a group of manuscripts that contain the short explicit.

2.3.2. ‘Miracle’ Group

The ‘miracle’ group is named after the chapter describing the ‘miracle of the moving mountain’, inserted after I.18 in a number of manuscripts of P.798 The chapter is present in VA, which was Pipino’s source text, but is omitted in most versions of P. Gadrat argues that this group is a subgroup of the ‘Extended Colophon’ group, because all manuscripts of the ‘miracle’ group also contain the expanded explicit discussed above. Dutschke noted that the ‘miracle’ manuscripts contain a slightly different reading in the explicit from those of the expanded colophon: in fact, the ‘miracle’ group reads transmutavit where the manuscripts of the expanded colophon read either translatavit or translatus.799 The ‘miracle’ version of P survives in seven manuscripts, including the fifteenth-century Czech translation, which translated the extended ‘miracle of the moving mountain’ chapter.

IMP does not contain the expanded episode of the miracle of the moving mountain. It may be that the source text of IMP contained the expanded version, and that the Irish author chose to omit it, as he did with many other chapters of P. However, the simpler explanation is that the extended version of the ‘miracle’ chapter was not in the source text of IMP.

798 Dutschke, Pipino, 253-55; De Benedetto, Milione, cxlvii.
799 Dutschke, Pipino, 256-57; Gadrat, Lire, 74-75.
This may be observed in the following table which contains my transcription of the ‘miracle of the moving mountain’ section from IMP, along with the beginning of the following chapter on Persia, located at I.19 in P, in the left-hand column, with Simion’s transcription of I.18 and the beginning of I.19 from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983 in the central column, and my transcription of the expanded version of the same chapter, including the beginning of I.19, from Wrocław, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, IV Fol 103, in the right-hand column.

---

800 located at ¶8 of Stokes’s edition.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP – L. ff. 121rb-121va</th>
<th>Florence, BR 983 – ff. 10a-10b</th>
<th>Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, IV Fol 103 - 7vb-9ra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bai sliabh urard frisín cathraigh sin 7 sliabh don taebh anaill gu cualatar na hiudhaidhí laithí naen amhal adeir in soiscél diadhá ‘si abueritis fídem ut granum sinapis huic monti transi 7 transibit 7 nichil imposibile erit uobis .i. dia mbeth aireat in ghraíne mdúfaírd do sheirc ísí lat do thoghluaisféa in sliabh ar in sliabh araíll diamad ail duit’ ‘is fáidh guach in t-issa dia ndáharthaí’ ol na geintí ‘7 as briathra goo lais ár dia cuingheadh sibh for an sliabh uctoghlúassacht for an sliabh aile ni dingnad forai bh ití’ Tiaghuit na cristaidhí for</td>
<td>In illis regionibus inter Thaurisium et Baldachum, mons est qui olim de loco suo ad locum alium est translatus virtute divina. Volebant enim saraceni Christi Euvangelium vanum ostendere, pro eo quod Dominus ait: ‘Si habueritis fídem sicut granum sinapis dicetis huic monti transire hinc et transibit, et nichil impossibile erit vobis.’ Dixerunt enim christianis qui sub eorum domino in partibus illis habitabant: ‘Aut in Christi nomine montem istum transferte aut omnes ad Machotetum convertimini aut omnes peribitis gladio tunc devotus quidam vir christianus confortans oracione fideliter ad dominus Iesum Christum montem illum vidente multitudine populum transtulit ad designatum locum propter quod multi ex sarraenen ad Christum conversi sunt.</td>
<td>In illis regionibus scilicet inter Thaurisium et Baldachium mons est qui olym de loco suo ad locum alium translatus est virtute divina. Volebant enim sarraenen Christi Euvangelium vanum ostendere, pro eo quod Dominus ait: ‘Si habueritis fídem sicut granum sinapis dicetis huic monti transire hinc et transibit, et nichil impossibile erit vobis.’ Dixerunt enim christianis qui sub eorum domino in partibus illis habitabant. ‘Aut in Christi nomine montem istum transferte aut omnes ad Machotetum convertimini aut omnes peribitis gladio tunc devotus quidam vir christianus confortans oracione fideliter ad dominus Iesum Christum montem illum vidente multitudine populum transtulit ad designatum locum propter quod multi ex sarraenen ad Christum conversi sunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aenchai 7 guighit in taen ndia uman sliabh do claechlodh ‘Aísa’ oul siat ‘na leic idhuil 7 aichreitmhigh diar bhforrachne. Adre in sliabh in tan sin for an sliabh naill a bhfreacnaircus na slógh 7 airisis air coidheche et rogabsat araild do na geintibh baisdeadh lasin mirbhuil sin. confortans se oracione fideliter ad dominum Iesum Christum, montem illum, vidente multitudine populorum, transtulit ad designatum locum, propter quod multi ex saracenis ad Christum conversi sunt. super hoc. Ipsi ad hoc erant multum solliciti ad inveniendam causam iustum ut possent ipsos christianos destruere et occidere aut negarent. Unus vero ex sapientibus et consiliariis de caliphi dixit, ‘Ego inveni unam viam quam queritis contra christianos. Euvangelium christianorum dicit: ‘quisquis christianus habet tantam fidem in Christo sicut est granum synapis et ipse dicit uni monti tolle te de hoc loco et vade ad alium locum quod mons ille obediet christianum,’ unde facite congregari in unum locum omnes istos christianos istarum partium et dicatis eis quod certo termino faciant moveri unum ex montibus nostris. Ipsi hoc facere non potunt et tunc vos dicetis eis quod non habent tantam fidem sicut est unum granum synapis et quod suum euvangelium non est bonum, unde respondeant nobis, aut velint esse saraceni aut mori omnes tam parvi quam magni.’ Quando caliphus hoc consciilium intellexit, ipsum totalis acceptavit gaudenter misit pro christianis illarum partium qui multi erant et fecit eis legi Euvangelium suum predictum ac eos interrogavit si hoc erat verum. Ipsi (F responderunt)(^{801}) quod sic. Caliphus dixit eis precipiendo aut facient infra X dies quod dictus mons tolleretur de loco suo. Aut negarent aut mortem expectarent. Tunc christiani hoc audito valde tribulati sunt et fuerunt sed iactaverunt cogitatum eorum in domino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{801}\) Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwesytecka, IV Fol 103, 8rb first line, has a lacuna here, *responderunt* has been amended from Dutschke’s transcription of the same passage from Florence, BNC, Conventi Suppressi, C.7.1170, ff. 7vb - 9ra. See Dutschke, *Pipino*, 1337-43.
nostro Ihesu Christo omnium salvatore, qui sperantes in se non deserit. Qui deberet eis succurrere in tanto periculo. Et tunc episcopi et sancti patres illius contrate ordinaverunt domino supplicare devote orando et ieunando, ut eos a tanto periculo adiuveret. Finito autem tempore octo dierum unus angelus apparuit uni sancto episco in visione et dixit ei ex parte dei ut dicerent uni calzolario monoculo qui oraret pro christainis et mons iste tolletur ad mandatum dicti caliphi et dixit ei nomen et domum ubi habitabat calzolarius. Hanc visione habuit plures dictus episcopus et tunc termino caliphi propinquante misit pro isto calzolario dicens ei visiones peredictas. Rogavit ut hanc orationem faceret pro christianis liberandis domino Ihesu Christo calzolarius vero monoculus excusando se dicebat, ‘Ego peccator sum et non sum dignus hac gratia.’ Ipse se excusabat propter humilitatem suam. Nam ipse erat homo sancte vite castus et honestus valde omni die audiebat missam et eleemosinas erogabat iuxta posse suum. Ipsum erruerat sibi oculum capitis sui dextrum hac de causa. Nam plures audierat dici legi et predicari quod Evangeliulm Christi dicebat, ‘Si oculus tuus scandaliset te errue eum et proice a te.’ Ipse erat bone simplicitatis homo et credebat quod ista verba sic deberent intelligi et fieri scripta sunt. Contingit enim unus talis casus est una vice. Una pulchra iuvenis venit ad ipsum dicens ei ‘Domine calzolarie facite mihi duos calzarios.’ Respondit calzolarius, ‘ostende mihi pedem
tuum.’ Ipsa vero iuvenis excessit modum et ostendit sibi nedum pedem sed crux ex ista ostensione ex demonis instigatione calzolarius magnam temptationem et delectationem habuit in corpore suo. Ipse vero statim licentiavit ipsam iuvenem et incepit redire ad cor suum et trisati et dolore de temptatione ista et recordatus fuit ubi ubi dicti Euvangelium et statim eruit sibi oculum ipsemet propter contricionem illius talis temptationis et ideo christaini confidentes de eius orationibus rogaverunt eum ut rogaret deum ut eos a dicto periculo liberaret et promisit hanc orationem facere. Adveniente autem die termini prefixi a dicto calipho omnes cristiani surrexerunt tempestive iverunt ad ecclesias, fecerunt dici missas et orationes postea congregaverunt se omnes masculi et femine, parvi et magni et feecerunt portari ante se crucem et iverunt ad pedem dicti montis ipsi multi erant. Et statim caliphus venit cum maxima multitudine sarracenorum armatorum et paratorum ad occidendos christianos predictos non credentes ipsis posse facere quod dictus tolletur iuxta mandatum caliphi. Tunc autem idem calzolarius dei amicus genu flexit devotissime ante crucem, levans manus ad celum rogavit dominum Ihesum Christum ut mandaret dictum montem tolli de illo loco iuxta mandatum caliphi. Statim facta ipsa oratone dictus mons elevavit se sicut avis et ivit ad locum petitum per caliphus quando sarraceni viderit hoc miraculum multum admirati sunt et caliphus cum eis et tunc ob
Cricha na perfida immorro don teine adrait cricha forleathan isidhe cu nocht righuibh fuiri. Eich amhra le. Dá .c. punt for each neoch.

De regione Persarum.
Persida maxima provincia est que olim nobilissima fuit, nunc vero multum est a Tartaris dissipata.

hanc causacaliphus cum multis sarracenis fecerunt se christianos et vita christiana servaverunt. Et quando ipse caliphus obiit non fuit sepultus ut sarracenussed ut christianus et invenerunt in morte eidem calipho unam crucem ad collum.

De regione Persarum.
Persida maxima provincia est que olym nobilissima fuit nunc vero multum est a Tartaris dissipata.
This comparison shows that none of the content from the expanded ‘miracle’ chapter was translated in IMP. Notwithstanding that the Irish author was summarising the content of P, often leaving out entire chapters and sections of text, the simpler explanation for the lack of the expanded ‘miracle’ chapter in IMP is that the exemplar used by the Irish author belonged to the much larger group of manuscripts of P which does not contain this expanded chapter.

Except for Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi Soppressi, C.7.1170 and Skokloster, Folio 67 all manuscripts of the ‘miracle’ group originate from Eastern Europe.802 The Florence manuscript is the only one that was written during the fourteenth century, with all others dating from the fifteenth century. It is also one of the oldest manuscripts of the corpus, and was written during the second quarter of the fourteenth century, most likely in Florence for the Dominicans of Santa Maria Novella, in whose library the manuscript was housed in the late fifteenth century.803 Dominican ownership, combined with the early date of the manuscript and the quality of its production, has led Gadrat to suggest that this version of P may be one of the closest to the original produced by Pipino.804 Dutschke has argued that the ‘miracle’ group represents a second stage in the development of P, a second recension of the text, which expanded on a version of P that was already in circulation.805 Skokloster, Folio 67, on the other hand, was written in Italy during the mid-fifteenth century, but was located in Eastern Europe soon after its completion. This is discernable from the details it contains regarding the coronation of Mathias Corvinus I of Hungary and Croatia in 1458, several acts of Rudolf von Rüdesheim, bishop of Wroclaw between 1468 and 1482, as well as a number of brief essays in German.806

2.3.3. ‘Florence 1442’ Group

The ‘Florence 1442’ group is distinguished by a colophon copied from a lost manuscript written in Florence in 1442. None of the distinguishing features of the ‘Florence 1442’ group of P are discernible in IMP. In fact, due to loss of folios, no explicit or colophon survives in IMP. Discussion of the ‘English’ branch below, will

---

802 Dutschke, Pipino, 254; Gadrat, Lire, 73.
803 Dutschke, Pipino, 569-70.
804 Gadrat, Lire, 75.
805 Dutschke, Pipino, 254.
806 Gadrat, Lire, 73.
prove that IMP derives from a different group of manuscripts of P.

Dutschke has suggested that this Florence manuscript ‘speaks of the hopes and visions’ during the years of the council of Ferrara-Florence, which sought to end the schism between the Greek and Latin churches. 807 The colophon was transcribed by Dutschke and reads as follows:

et sic est finis huius libri completus florentie anno incarnacionis dominice
M cccc xlii pontificatus Sanctissimi in christo patris et domini eugenii
pape iii pontificatus sui anno duodecim quartadecima die mense
decembris et cetera. 808

Two manuscripts, written in Germany and which preserve this colophon, survive. These are: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 5339 and Vienna, Österreichishe Nationalbibliothek 3497. Dutschke, based on limited evidence, has suggested that the Vienna manuscript was copied from the Munich manuscript, and that the Munich manuscript was copied from the Florence manuscript. 809

My study has not investigated the relationship between these two manuscripts, however while compiling transcriptions of the Quinsay chapter from the forty-seven manuscripts examined, I discovered a number of unique readings which these two German manuscripts share with Jena, Universitätsbibliothek, Bosianus 4° 10. These are: firstly, all three manuscripts share the combination of the word *ubique* instead of the more common *circumquaque*, with the loss of the word *conferendum*. These have been underlined and are in bold characters respectively in the transcriptions beneath the two manuscripts of the ‘Florence 1442’ group and the Jena manuscript, and three manuscripts from other parts of the stemma, which have been selected in order to show this variation. All transcriptions are my own except for that from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, which is from Simion.

*cum malleo ligneo percutiunt tabulas ut huius sonitus ubique per terram
eminus audiatur et currunt homines ad auxilium; simile etiam fit si pro
quacumque causa commotio vel tumultus in civitate fiat.*

(Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 5339, 259r.)

808 Ibid., 260.
809 Ibid., 771-72.
Similarly, the two manuscripts of the ‘Florence 1442’ group and the Jena manuscript, share the unique reading *transeunt*, instead of the normal *veniunt*. This variation is in bold characters in the transcriptions below. The same three manuscripts also share the reading *flumen* instead of *fluvius*, which has been highlighted in the transcriptions below. Lastly, the two manuscripts of the ‘Florence 1442’ group share the reading *vadit* instead of *transit*, which has been underlined in the transcriptions below and sets them apart from the Jena manuscript once again.
a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad
civitatem transeunt, quod flumen vadit per plurimas alias regiones.

(Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 5339, f. 259r.)

a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad
civitatem transeunt, quod flumen vadit per plurimas alias regiones.

(Vienna, Österreischishe Nationalbibliothek 3497, f. 102r.)

a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad
civitatem transeunt, quod flumen transit per plures alias regiones.

(Jena, Universitätsbibliothek, Bosianus 4° 10, f. 97v.)

a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad
civitatem veniunt, qui fluvius transit per plurimas alias regiones.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66rb)

a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad
civitatem veniunt, qui fluvius transit per plurimas regiones.

(Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, C.7.1170, f. 50va-b)

a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluminus maximus per quem naves ad
civitates veniunt, qui fluminus transit ad plures alias regiones.

(Glasgow, UL, Hunter 84, f. 234r)

These observations suggest that although there may be a connection between the Jena manuscript and the ‘Florence 1442’ group, the two manuscripts of the ‘Florence 1442’ group share closer ties with each other than they do with the Jena manuscript. In fact, other than not sharing the reading vadit, which is unique to the ‘Florence 1442’ group, the Jena manuscript does not share the unique colophon of the ‘Florence 1442’ group, after which the group is named. It may be suggested therefore, that the Jena manuscript is a cousin to the ‘Florence 1442’ group, and that it was copied from a manuscript which shared the same source as the lost manuscript written in Florence in 1442, from which the Munich and Vienna manuscript were copied. The following stemma displays this theory.
2.3.4. ‘Barbarigo’ Group

The ‘Barbarigo’ group, distinguished by the colophon of Jacomo Barbarigo, is preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6244°, written in Florence between 1439 and 1440, and in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 7317, written in Rome in 1458.\(^{810}\) Below is Dutschke’s transcription of the explicit of P from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6244°, which is shared by the two manuscripts:


Io Iacomo Barbarigo o leto questo presente libro di Marco Paulo e trovato molte cose di quele el dice essere vere e questo retifico per relatione di Ser Nicolo di Conti, venitiano el quale e stato gran tempo in

---

\(^{810}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 839 and 949.
quele parte d’India e simelmente per molti mercadanti mori con i quali o favelato.  

Like the ‘Florence 1442’ group, the Paris manuscript also has links with the Ferrara-Florence council of 1438-1445. Unfortunately, most of the Vatican manuscript is now illegible, however Dutschke was able to infer, by comparing the incipits and explicits of the two manuscripts where possible, that the Paris manuscript served as an exemplar for the Vatican manuscript.

I have not been able to examine Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6244°, in order to describe its relationship to IMP. However, evidence which will be discussed regarding the ‘English’ branch below, suggests that IMP does not derive from the ‘Barbarigo’ group.

2.3.5. ‘Schedel’ Group

The ‘Schedel’ group is comprised of a pair of manuscripts written in the south of Germany during the second half of the fifteenth century. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 249 was written in 1469 by Hermann Schedel (†1485), a German doctor who studied medicine in Leipzig and in Padua. Hartmann Schedel (†1514), Hermann’s younger cousin and also a doctor who had trained in Leipzig and Padua, inherited Hermann’s library after his death. Dutschke has suggested that Hartmann Schedel then produced his own copy of his older cousin’s version of P which now survives in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 850. The ‘Schedel’ version of P is noticeably different from other copies of P, and often paraphrases and summarises the content of the original text. The reasons why it is unlikely that IMP derives from the ‘Schedel’ version of P will be discussed below.

---

811 Dutschke, Pipino, 826-27. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 6244° f.122: [Latin] ‘Explicit of the third book of sir Marco Polo of Venice, of the conditions and customs of the regions of the Orient, which I Helias de Bosco of Florence have written for the noble and prudent man, master Iacobó Finaris and the master ostiarius of our most holy lord Pope Eugenio IV in the ninth year of his pontificate. Deo gracias. Amen. [Italian] I, Iacomo Barbarigo, have read this present book of Marco Polo and have found many of the things that he mentions to be true and this I ratify from the reports of ser Nicolò Dei Conti, a Venetian who has spent a great deal of time in that part of India, and also from the accounts of many Moorish merchants with whom I have discussed.’

812 Dutschke, Pipino, 260-61.

813 Ibid., 848.

814 Ibid., 258 and 743-45: Gadrat, Lire, 75.

815 Dutschke, Pipino, 758-61.
This unique version of P is intriguing for the study of IMP because it offers parallels with the context of IMP. In fact, it has been considered in Chapter I that Aonghas Ó Callanáin, the second principal scribe of L, may have also had a medical background. The contribution of physician-historians to the manuscript corpus of the Travels has been noted by Gadrat, who remarked: c’est une même formation, d’abord à la faculté des Art, puis à celle de médecine (...) qui a dû contribuer à leur donner une culture commune, marquée en particulier par une certaine ouverture d’esprit et une curiosité pour le moulde. Although Aonghas Ó Callanáin made no visible contribution to IMP, his involvement with the creation of L and the cultural milieu behind the manuscript reveal a link between IMP and fifteenth-century medical learning in West Cork.

Below is a Comparison A table of my transcription of the Quinsay chapter from IMP and my transcription of the corresponding chapter from the ‘Schedel’ version of P in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 249. The corresponding details have been underlined and are in bold characters, whereas those sections where the details differ have been highlighted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 249</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[2] cét mile ina timcell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] quinlay a hainm inan son 7 in cathair neamhdha dia teangaid siumh ár ni fhuil for bith cathair is mó inás.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] da mile dhéc droicheat le fo ngabhuit longa dimhora cen trascadhl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

quando autem ignis in urbe accenditur
custodes ligneo percuciant maleo ut
sonitus undique audiri possit et tunc
concurrunt homines ad auxilium
conferendum simile fit si pro quacumque
causa comotio vel tumultus in civitate fit
[18] et vie civitate omnis lapidibus sunt
strate ita quod civitas munda est tota [19]
in hac civitate terme sunt circiter 3.000
pulchre et magne in quibus sepe
balneantur homines multum enim
munditie student corporali. [20] Ultra
civitate ad miliaria 25 ad plagam
orientalem est mare occeanum et supra
mare est civitas Ganfu ubi portus est
maximus ad quem ex India et aliis
regionibus naves in maxima conveniunt
multitudine a civitate autem usque ad
mare fluvius est maximus per quem
transeunt naves. [21] Provinciam Mangi
divisit Magnus Kaam in regna 9
unicuique regem dans proprium iuxta sue
beneficium voluntatis qui annis singulis
de proventibus expensis et suo regimine
officialibus Magni Kaam necessariam
habent reddere rationem in civitate autem
Quinsay unus ex regibus continue
immoratur qui 160 sub sua habet
jurisdictionem civitates. [22] Provincia
enim Mangi habet in universo 1200
civitates. [23] In hac provincia talis est
consuetudo ut cum nascitur puer parentes
diem et horam nativitatis et sub quo
[6] do ronsat palas rigda for loch a meadhon na cathrach sin ni fuil séd na samhail do phalas for bith do

.xx. sluaiîtheach lais

7 *x. mile* do thoimhileadh in gach sluaiîtheach dhíbh 7 tene bithbeo a meadhon gacha bruidhne dhíbh 7 *míle do sheomradhuihbh solusda* fria suan 7 freasdal ina nur thimceall co neimh noir forra 7 co fuath gach anmanna eceannus for bith ar na rinnadh forro do ilbreachtadh gacha datha planeta natus sit scribi faciunt in cunctis enim itineribus et factis suis astrologorum reguntur iudiciis ideo sui ortus diem et horam scire volunt. [24] Quando vero moritur aliquid consanguinei cancipinis induuntur saccum et mortuorum cadavera cantu magno cum imaginibus servuorum ancillarum equorum et denariorum quas ex papiro faciunt conburant creduntque quod in alia vita defunctus hec omnia sibi habeat famulanitia post hec magna cum letitia tangunt musica instrumenta dicentes quod dìi sui tali eum honore suscipiunt quasi comburit corpora. [25]

In hac civitate palatium est mirabile in quo Furfur quondam rex Mangi suam tenebat curiam primo. Locus palatii muris per quadrum est circumspectus. 10 in giro continens miliaria intra quos muros pulcra sunt viridaria cum fructibus delicatis ibi fontes et lacuna sunt multe in quilibet multi habentur pisces. [26] In medio interioris spaci palatium consistit et est maurus quod habet in mundo habet enim aulas 20 eiusdem magnitudinis in quorum qualibet 10.000 homini multa cum commoditate discumbentibus possent qui quidem aule pulcherrimo sunt opere pictae et deaurate 1000 autem vel circa sunt in hoc palacio camere.

[27] In civitate Quinsay sunt ignes sive familie iuxta tomani tomani vero 10.000
Although the ‘Schedel’ version omits the content of P from the second half of section [5] to [8], as well as section [28], these parts of P are not translated in IMP either. Therefore it cannot be ruled out that the ‘Schedel’ version of P was the direct source of IMP as in the case of the ‘Harley’ version and the ‘Melk-Würzburg-Tergensee’ version above. However, sections [5], [6] and [9] of the Quinsay chapter in IMP, which have been highlighted in the comparison table above, show that IMP contains different details to those of the ‘Schedel’ version.

\text{iiii milid ag magnus ac fare for cech ndrorichea dibh,}
\]
where the ‘Schedel’ version reads: \[
in quolibet enim ponte tam die quam nocte 10 deputantur custodes.
\]

do ronsat palas rigda for loch a meadhon na cathrach sin ni fuil séd na samhail do phalas for bith do,
\]
where the ‘Schedel version reads: \[
in hac civistate continet ut earum numerus \text{ad mille milia et xl milia (1.040.000) familiarum ascendat. [28 skipped] [29] in tota hac civistate una tamen christianorum nestorinorum est ecclesia. [30] In hac civistate et tota provincia Mangi oportet ut quilibet pater familias nomen suus uxoris sue et omnium de familia ac numerum equorum suorum supra hostium domus scribi faciet et cum de familia moritur quis vel domicilium mutat oportet ut nomen deleatur discendentis aut mortui et sribitur ibi nomen cuiuscumque de novo nascentis vel superadditi et in hunc modum sciri de facili potest numerus homemin qui in civitate sunt similiter et stabularii seu hospitum receptores in suis scribunt quaternis viatorum nomina quos in sua receperunt hospicia.
\]
palatium est mirabile in quo Furfur quondam rex Mangi suam tenebat curiam primo. *Locus* palatii muris per quadrum est circumcinctus. IMP’s translation of section [25] of P, describing a ‘royal palace on a lake’, is explained and discussed below under the ‘English’ branch. It is due to a scribal error in manuscripts of P from the ‘English’ branch, which contain the word *lacus* instead of *locus*.

Finally in, section [9] of IMP, which corresponds to section [27] of P, IMP reads: *xl. mile tighidhis xl. feacht* is aitreabhthaigh don cathair sin, where the ‘Schedel’ version reads: *mille milia et xl milia familiarum*. The result of IMP’s calculation 40,000 x 40 is 1,600,000 inhabitants, which is the number found in most versions of P. On the other hand, the ‘Schedel’ version of P is unique in placing the number of inhabitants of Quinsay at 1,040,000. This too is probably due to the scribal error of mistaking an original .lx., which is found in most versions of P, for .xl., as is found in the ‘Schedel’ version. This detail is also discussed in relation to a complication within the ‘English’ branch below.

The three details discussed above, and highlighted in the Comparison A table, reveal that it is unlikely that the ‘Schedel’ version was the direct source of IMP.

### 2.3.6. ‘De Ordine Exercitus’ Group

Dutschke discovered a group of three manuscripts which all lack the chapter on Tartar military organisation, found at I.60 of most versions of P.817 All manuscripts of this group were written in Italy; Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Lat. 131. a.s.6.14, during the second quarter of the fourteenth century, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3153, during the fifteenth century, and Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Gud. lat. 3, between the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century.818

Interestingly, IMP also does not translate the chapter on Tartar military organisation. This is striking, given the interest shown by the Irish author in war narrative in other areas of the text.819 On the other hand, the tendency of the Irish translator to omit chapters and content of P has been noted before,820 and it comes as no surprise that certain chapters of P are not included in IMP. However, the

---

817 Dutschke, *Pipino*, 249.
818 Ibid., 721, 929-31 and 986-87.
819 See Chapter II ‘Narrative Styles of IMP’, and Chapter IV ‘Rebellion of Naim and Cadau’.
820 See the comparison between the chapter list of the first book of P from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, IMP and the version of P in Oxford, Bodleian, Digby 196, in the discussion of the ‘Digby’ version of P above.
comparison of transcriptions from manuscripts of this group of P with the content of IMP reveals that the lack of the Tartar military chapter is the only major similarity between this version of P and IMP, and that the resemblance is due to similar editing processes rather than this group of P being the source of IMP. In order to prove that the ‘De Ordine Exercitus’ group of P is not directly related to IMP, it is sufficient to examine the following Comparison A table, which aligns my transcription of the Quinsay chapter in IMP with my transcription of the corresponding chapter from Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Lat. 131. a.s.6.14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Lat. 131. a.s.6.14 ff. 28vb-29vb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[3] quinlay a hainm inan son 7 in cathair neamhdha dia teangaid siumh ár ni fhuil for bith cathair is mó inás.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] cét mile ina timcill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] da mile dhéc droicheat le fo ngabhuit longa dimhora cen trascredh seoil dibh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[8] fil loch a meadon na cathrach sin 7 xxx. mile na uirtimcheall.

di inis fair dun rigda a meadhon gacha
hinnsi dibh ni la neach for bith iat som 7
in as fearr do bhiudh 7 deoch 7 mhainibh
na cathrach cuirid a meadon na nduinte 7
inti dianad aile fleadhughadh do dhemanmh
tiagait dia tochaithimh inntibh 7
foghebha 7 ni la neach don cathraigh

qualibet ipsarum sunt in civitate 12 milia
stationum in quibus ipsarum artium
artifices operantur quelibet autem statio
operarios habet inter magistros et
ministros 10 aut 15 sive 20 et sunt vero in
aliquibus 40. [6] Tanta est ibi artificio
et mercationum innumera multitudo quod
hiis qui non viderunt incredibile penitus
viderentur. [7] Homines civitatis huius
deliciose vivunt divites qui principales in
stationibus artium honorifice valde vivunt
et neque ipsi et neque uxores eorum
manibus propriis operandur faciunt
ministros alios operari ex antiquo enim
statuto consuetudo est ibi ut quilibet in
domo propria teneat stationes et artem
sicut fecit actenus pater eius et si dives
est non cogitur propriis manibus operari.
[8] In hac civitate sunt mulieres formose
valde et communiter sunt multis delitiis
enutrite. [9] Versus meridiem est in ipsa
civitate lacus magnus que 30 miliaria
in giro continet in hoc circuitu supra
lacum sunt multa palacia et multe domus
magne nobilium et sunt interius et
exterius mirabiliter ornate sunt etiam ibi
ecclesie ydolorum in medio lacus illius
due parvue insule sunt et in qualibet
ipsarum est palatium nobile et pulcrum
valde ubi sunt preparamenta et vasa
omnia necessaria pro nuptiis vel solemnni
convivio si quis igitur vult in solemnni
loco tenere convivium accedit illuc ubi

dimn ná caislén da fuil fora feadh acht coimhdheas da gach aen iatsumh 7 as eadh do beir an timat droicheat sin le for srothaibh 7 uisceadhaibh fil si 7 ni bhi an imtheacht for araili acht dibh

[5] 7 tor dithoglaidhi for cech ndroicheat dibh 7 .iii. milid ag magnus ac fare for cech ndroicheat dibh ar omhun a himpóidh fair ór ba cathair oireachuis do rightaidh manguay isidhe feacht riamb.
multum enim student munditie corporali. [20] Ultra civitate Quinsay ad miliaria 25 ad plagam orientalem est oceanum mare et ibi supra mare est civitas Ganfu ubi portus est optimus ad quem conveniunt naves in multitudine maxima de India et de regionibus aliis a civitate autem usque ad mare est fluvius maximus per quem naves ad civitates veniunt qui fluvius transit per plurimas alias regiones. [21] Provinciam Mangi **divisit Magnus Kaam in regna 9 dans** regem proprium unicuique regno iuxta sue beneplacitum voluntatis sunt autem omnes hiis reges potentes valde sed sunt subditi Magno Kaam et oportet eos annis signulis de omnibus regnorum suorum proventibus et expensis ed de suo regimine Magni Kaam officialibus reddere rationem unus autem illorum regum in civitate Quinsay continue immoratur qui sub dictione sua 140 civitates habet. [22] Provincia enim Mangi habet **in universo mille civitas et duecentas** qui singulis ipsarum per Magno Kaam positum sunt custodes ne forte rebellare presumant hominum custodium multitudo est innumerabilis et stupenda non sunt tamen omnes tartari sed sunt de diversis excerptibus et stipendiariis Magni Kaam. [23] In hac civitate Quinsay et in tota provincia Mangi consuetudo est cum statim ut puer nascitus parentes eius scribi faciunt die et
horam nativitatis eius et sub qua planeta
natus est in cunctis enim itineribus et
factis suis reguntur astrologorum iudiciis
ideoque scire volunt sui ortus diem et
horam. [24] Quando in hac provincia
moritur quis canapinis saccis eius
consanguinei induntur et mortuorum
cadavera cum cantu magno et ymaginibus
servuorum ancillarum equorum et
denariorum comburunt que omnia de
papiro fiunt creduntque quod in vita alia
talia veraciter obtinebit defunctus qualia
in similitudine sunt combusta post hec
cum leticia magna tangunt musica
instrumenta dicentes quod dii sui cum tali
eos honorem susciplunt cum quali
coropora comburuntur. [25] In hac
civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile
valde in quo Facfur quodam rex Mangi
tenebat curiam primo. Locus magnus
circumcintus est murus per quadrum
altitudinis magne et in giro continet
miliaria 10 intra quos muros sunt
viridaria pulcra valde cum fructibus
delicatis ibi sunt fontes et lacune in
quibus multi et optimi pisces habentur.
[26] In medio autem interioris spatii
palatium pulcherrimum est et maius quod
in mundo sit habet enim aulas 20
eiusdem magnitudinis omnes in quarum
qualibet simul comederent 10,000
hominum in multa commoditate et debita
congruitate cunctis discumbentibus
meadhon gacha bruidhne dhíbh

7 mile do sheomradhuibh solusda fria suan 7 freasdal ina nur thimceall co neimh noir forra 7 co fuath gach anmanna eceannus for bith ar na rinnadh forto do ilbreachtadh gacha datha

collocats sunt autem aule picte et deaurate pulcherrimo opere in ipso etiam palatio sunt camere 1000 aut circa. [27] In civitate Quinsay sunt ignes iuxta vulgare italicum seu familia tot numero quod ad 160 tomani ascendunt in computatione sumaria tomani uero 10.000 continet sunt igitur tot in universo familie ut earum numerus ad mille milia et sexcenta milia (1.600.000) familiarum ascendet. [28] Palatia in hac civitate multa sunt et pulcre valde. [29] In tota autem hac civitate una sola ecclesia christianorum nestorinorum est. [30] In civitate et in tota provincia Mangi oportet ut quolibet pater familias supra hostium domus sue scribi faciat nominis suum uxoris sue et nomina omni de familia sua et numeros etiam equorum suorum cum autem quis de familia moritur vel domicilium mutat oportet ut deleatur nomen discendentis aut mortui et scribatur ibi nomen cuiuscumque de novo nascentis vel ad familiam additi et in hoc modum sciri de facili potest numeros hominum qui in civitate sunt similiter etiam stabularii seu hospitium receptores scribunt in suis quaternis nomina omnium viatorum quos in suis hospitiis recepiunt et quo mense et quo die in eius hospitio sunt ingressi.
Like the ‘Schedel’ group comparison, sections [5] and [6] of IMP, which correspond to [16] and [25] respectively, contain different details to those found in P from the ‘De Ordinis Exercitus’ group. Specifically, IMP’s .iii. milid does not correspond to P’s 10 custodes, and IMP’s palas rigda for loch does not correspond to P’s palatium mirabile [...] locus magnus circumcintus est murus. My analysis of manuscripts of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, discussed below, has uncovered scribal errors in several manuscripts of English origin, which explain the different details found at [5] and [6] of IMP. The conclusion of this study, therefore, is that the exemplar used by the author of IMP was not a manuscript of the ‘De Ordinis Exercitus’ group.

2.3.7. ‘Fidelissimi’ Group
Dutschke noticed that a group of manuscripts, which she coined the ‘fidelissimi’ group, was distinguished from other manuscripts of P by the reading fidelissimi instead of fidelis, in the prologue of P.821 For example, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, a manuscript of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, begins P thus: librum prudentis honorabilis ac fidelissimi domini Marchi Pauli,822 while Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, which does not belong to the ‘fidelissimi’ group, reads: librum prudentis et honorabilis viri atque fidelis domini Marchi Pauli.823 Most of the manuscripts of this group of P were written in England, but the group also comprises Gheraert Leeu’s 1483-84 printed edition of P, discussed above in ‘Early Printed Editions of P’, and the two manuscripts which were copied from it, as well as a number of other manuscripts which were written in mainland Europe.

Below is the list of manuscripts which contain the reading fidelissimi in the incipit of P. The numeration of the manuscripts is maintained from the list of manuscripts of P found at the beginning of this chapter. This list combines the manuscripts which Dutschke ascribed to the ‘fidelissimi’, with the manuscripts added by Gadrat. I have arranged the manuscripts of the ‘fidelissimi’ group into subgroups according to the country in which they were written. Manuscripts copied from Gheraert Leeu’s printed edition of P have been given their own group:

821 Dutschke, Pipino, 245.
822 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f.51v.
823 Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f.1a. The transcription from the Berlin manuscript is my own.
MSS copied from Gheraert Leeu’s 1483-84 printed edition of P:

10) Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13  
   15th C

42) San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Real monasterio, Q.II.13  
   15th C

MSS written in Italy:

20) London, British Library, Add. 19513  
   14th C

53) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X. 73 [3445]  
   1465

MSS written in France:

13) Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum V.6.8.[458]  
   14th C

MSS written in the Netherlands:

11) Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek 218  
   15th C

MSS written in England:

1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70  
   14th C

3) Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83  
   14th C

4) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.17  
   14th C

6) Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5  
   14th C


19) Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75  
   15th C
22) London, British Library, Arundel 13 14th C

23) London, British Library, Harley 5115 14th C


31) Oxford, Merton College 312 before 1344

The following manuscripts were also written in England, but cannot be firmly ascribed to the ‘fidelissimi’ group since the version of P they contain lacks the prologue in which the word *fidelissimi* is found. For this reason, Dutschke and Gadrat do not group these manuscripts with the ‘fidelissimi’ group. Following this list is a discussion of why the manuscripts have been included in the ‘fidelissimi’ group in this study:

5) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.8.7 14th C

7) Dublin, Trinity College E.5.20 [Abbot 632] 15th C

38) Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University, Garrett 157 c. 1400

In the case of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P, discussed above in ‘IMP and the Latin Abridgements of P’, the prologue was edited out. It has also been suggested above, that the text of P used as a source for the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version, contained the scribal error *lacus* instead of *locus* at section [25] of the Quinsay chapter, spurring the author of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version to omit the corrupt detail entirely. This occurrence, combined with the likelihood that the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version was written in England, suggests that it may also belong to the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, and for the purpose of this study it has been considered thus.

In the case of the Princeton manuscript, the prologue is missing due to loss of folios at the beginning of the manuscript and therefore the reading *fidelissimi* is not
found. However, the manuscript does contain the scribal error *lacus* instead of *locus* at section [25] of the Quinsay chapter, indicating that it belongs to the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group. The Princeton manuscript also shares separative reading 16) *bellare* with four other manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, providing further indication that it belongs in this group.

The rest of this chapter will describe the scribal errors that I have observed in my transcriptions of the Quinsay chapter from manuscripts of the ‘fidelissimi’ group. These separative readings have been numbered and arranged into a *stemma codicum* of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, which is found at the end of this chapter. The numeration of the details discussed corresponds to the numeration given in the *stemma* and it will be useful to consult the *stemma codicum* while reading this chapter. The primary subdivision of this group of P is between the ‘English’ branch and the ‘Italian’ branch, which are referred to in the *stemma* as α and α₂, respectively. This study will also refer to Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, in order to compare textual variants of the ‘fidelissimi’ group with those of most other manuscripts of P.

*‘Italian’ branch (α₂)*

Dutschke noticed that the printed edition of Gheraert Leeu shared a number of readings with Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X. 73. She reached this conclusion by comparing her transcriptions from the manuscripts of P of the opening rubric, incipits of the three chapter lists, incipits of the three books, explicit of the last book and the colophon of P, where present. This study has discovered four more readings in the Quinsay chapter that are unique to the Venetian manuscript and Leeu’s printed edition, reinforcing Dutschke’s theory that the two texts are closely related.

These readings are copied below, from the Venetian manuscript, Ghent Universiteitsbiblioteek 13, which is a copy of Leeu’s edition, and Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983. All transcriptions are my own, except for those from the Florence manuscript, which were made by Simion. The numeration corresponds to that of the details in the stemma at the end of this chapter:

---

825 Ibid., 232-33.
826 Ghent is used because I was not able to gain direct access Leeu’s edition for this study.
In hoc circuitu super lacum sunt multa palatia et multe domus magne nobilium et sunt interius et exterius mirabiliter *ordinate*.

(Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f. 51r).

In hoc circuitu super lacum sunt multa palatia et multe domus magne nobilium et sunt interius et exterius mirabiliter *ordinate*.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13, f. 104rb).

In hoc circuitu sunt multa palatia et multe domus magne nobilium et sunt interius et exterius mirabiliter *adornate*.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 65vb).

3)

Hominis civitatis huius *delitiose* vivunt.

(Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f. 50v).

Hominis civitatis huius *delitiose* vivunt.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13, f. 104rb).

Hominis civitatis huius *delitiosissime* vivunt.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 65va).

4)

Provincia Mangi divisit Magnus Kaam in *quattuor* regna dans regem proprium.

(Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f. 51v).

Hanc provintiam divisit Magnus Kaam in *quattuor* regna dans regem proprium.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13, f. 104va).

Provinciam Mangy divisit Magnus Kaam in *IX* regna dans regem proprium.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66ra).
The ‘Italian’ branch is therefore distinguished by the combination of four unique readings in the Quinsay chapter. These are: firstly, *ordinate* in manuscripts of the ‘Italian’ branch instead of *adornate* in most other versions of P, which is numbered 1) in the stemma; secondly, the reading *delitiose* instead of *delitiosissime*, in most other manuscripts of P, which is numbered 3) in the stemma; thirdly, the reading *in IV regna* instead of *in regna IX*, which is found in most other versions of P, numbered 4) in the stemma; lastly, the reading *XX. miliaria* instead of the more common *XXX. miliaria*, found in most other manuscripts of P, numbered 5) in the stemma. It is not the presence of one or two of these readings which distinguishes the ‘Italian’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, rather the combination of all four scribal mistakes. In fact, it has been discussed above that other manuscripts contain some of the same variations, such as the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version of P containing the reading *in regna 4*, which corresponds to reading number 4) here. However, only the presence of all four of the readings listed above indicates that the manuscript in question belongs to the ‘Italian’ branch.

Two of the four extracts from the Quinsay chapter listed above, namely number 4) and 5), are translated in IMP, numbered in my transcription of the Quinsay paragraphs from IMP as sections [7] and [8] respectively. These are:

---

827 See discussion of the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version above.
These transcriptions from IMP show that the Irish translation does not share the variations present in the ‘Italian’ branch, but contains the same details as those in Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983. In fact, where IMP reads nai riga, Florence reads regna .IX. and Venice reads quattuor regna. Similarly, where IMP reads .xxx. mile, Florence reads .XXX. miliaria and Venice reads .XX. miliaria. Comparison between the details found in IMP indicates that the P exemplar of IMP did not originate from this branch of the stemma of P.

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, was copied in 1465 in Bologna for the Paduan physician Giovanni Marcanova, as indicated by its colophon which reads:

Opus absolutum ad petitionem Iohannis Marchanovae artium et medicinae
doctoris Patavni anno gratiae 1465. Bononiae. 828

Dutschke has suggested that Gheraert Leeu may have been in Venice between 1482 and 1483, in order to acquire a new Venetian style font which he subsequently used to publish his ‘Gouda triplet’, consisting of P, Ludolph of Suchem’s Travels to the Holy Lands and Mandeville, 829 and that during his stay he may also have acquired or made a copy of P, closely related to the copy that was made in Padua in 1465. 830 In addition, Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, contains at least one unique reading in the Quinsay chapter which is not contained in the Leeu version. This is the numbered 9) in the stemma:

828 Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f.74.
829 Dutschke, Pipino, 232-35. See above ‘Early Printed Editions of P and an English Poem’
830 Dutschke, Pipino, 234-36.
Quando aut ignis accenditur in urbe, si **custodes urbis** possunt videre, cum ligneo maleo percutiunt tabulas.

(Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f.51r).

Quando autem ignis accenditur in urbe, si **custodes turris** hoc possint videre, cum ligneo malleo tabulas percutiunt.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbibliotheek 13, f.104va).

Quando autem ignis in urbe accenditur, si **custodes turris** hoc videre possunt, cum ligneo maleo percutiunt tabulas.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66ra).

The reading **custodes urbis** instead of the more common **custodes turris**, found in the Leeu version and in most other manuscripts of P, is unique to the Venetian manuscript. Another reading which shows how Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73 and the Ghent manuscript diverge from each other, and both diverge from all other manuscripts of P is numbered 10) in the stemma, and reads as follows:

10)

Provincia enim Mangy habet in universo civitates **m.cccc**.

(Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f. 51v).

Provintia vero mangy habet in universo civitates **m. .ccc**.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbibliotheek 13, f. 104va).

Provincia enim Mangy habet in universo civitates **MCC**.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66rb).
Where the Venice manuscript reads *civitates MCCCC*, the Ghent manuscript reads *civitates MCCC*. Both of these readings are different to those of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983 which reads *MCC*. In fact most other manuscripts of P agree with the Florence manuscript, and IMP also reads *in da mile decc cathair*. These differences suggest that the copies of P from the Venice manuscript and from the Ghent manuscript derive from a common source, rather than being copies of each other. These scribal errors are underlined under β₂ and γ₂ in the stemma below.

Scribal errors 4) and 10) have also been discussed above in relation to the fifteenth-century English poem *Off the Grete Cane*, which took inspiration from the *Travels* and Mandeville. This study has shown that the poem either used Gheraert Leeu’s edition of P directly or a copy of it as its source. Significantly, scribal errors 4) and 10) are also copied in the English poem, suggesting that it too belongs to the ‘Italian’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group.

*‘English’ branch (α)*

This branch was first distinguished by Dutschke, who noticed that the combination of the reading *fidelissimi* in the incipit and the absence of *seu falcones peregrini* in the explicit of P was unique to manuscripts of English origin, these are:²³¹

2) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70 14th C

3) Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83 14th C

4) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.17 14th C

6) Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5 14th C


19) Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75 15th C

22) London, British Library, Arundel 13 14th C

²³¹ Dutschke, Pipino, 246.
A further three manuscripts also contain these readings, but were not written in England. These are: 20) London, British Library 19513, written in Italy during the fourteenth century; 13) Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum V.6.8. [458], written in France during the fourteenth century; and 11) Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, written in the Netherlands towards the end of the fifteenth century. My study of the various groups of P, based on my transcriptions of the Quinsay chapter from forty-seven of the sixty surviving manuscripts of P, has discovered a number of details in the Quinsay chapter of the manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, which reinforce and advance Dutschke’s theory that England was ‘unique in maintaining its own version of the Pipino translation,’ and that ‘perhaps its island geography provided protection from diverse and contaminating versions of the text.’

The following separative readings distinguish the manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch into a number of subgroups. In the following discussion, each separative reading has been numbered for convenience of reference with the stemma codicum at the end of this chapter. The number of each reading is found next to its transcription.

Lacus vs locus (group α).

An important difference which is common to all but one of the manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch is the scribal error lacus instead of locus, at section [25] of the

---

832 This manuscript begins defectively, therefore it is not possible to ascertain whether it contained the reading fidelissimi. However, the lack of seu falcones peregrini in the explicit, suggests that it does in fact belong to the ‘English’ branch. See Dutschke, Pipino, 881-84.
833 Dutschke, Pipino, 247, 667, 615-17 and 594-95; Gadrat, Lire, 78.
834 Dutschke, Pipino, 248.
Quinsay chapter in P.\textsuperscript{835} This separative reading is numbered 2), the step is given the letter α in the stemma and it is highlighted in yellow. The following transcriptions are taken from Glasgow, University Library, T.4.1 [84], Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218 and Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, which represent the ‘English’ branch, Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73 which represents the ‘Italian’ branch, and Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, which represents manuscripts which do not belong to the ‘fidelissimi’ group.

2)

**English branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangy curiam tenebat lacus magnus est in circuitu muris cuius altitudo magna est valde quem in gyro continet miliaria 9.\textsuperscript{836}

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234v)

In hac civitate est palatium mirabile valde in quo quondam rex Mangy curiam tenebat lacus magnus est in circuitu muris cuius altitudo magna est valde qui in gyro continet miliaria decem.\textsuperscript{837}

(Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218 f. 89ra)

In hac civitate Quinsay est palacium mirabile valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangy curiam tenebat primo lacus magnus est circumcinctus muris altitudinis valde magne que in gyro continet decem miliaria.\textsuperscript{838}

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37v).

**Italian branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

\textsuperscript{835} The only manuscript which does not contain this reading is Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum V.6.8 [458], which will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{836} ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a great palace in which Facfur, who was once the king of Mangy, first kept his court. A large lake surrounds the walls, which are of very great height and have a perimeter of 9 miles.’\textsuperscript{837} ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a great palace in which the once the king of Mangy, kept his court. A large lake surrounds the walls, which are of very great height and have a perimeter of 10 miles.’\textsuperscript{838} ‘In this city of Quinsai there is a great palace in which Facfur, who was once the king of Mangy, first kept his court. A large lake is surrounded by walls of very great height which circle it for a perimeter of ten miles.’
In hac civitate Quinsai est palatium mirabile in quo Facfur quondam rex
Mangi tenebat curiam primo locus magnus circumcinctus est muro per
quadrum altitudinis magne que in giro continet miliaria X. 839

(Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f.52r).

Not ‘fidelissimi’ group:

In hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile in quo Facfur quondam rex
Mangi tenebat curiam primo locus magnus circumcinctus est muro per
quadrum altitudinis magne que in giro continet miliaria 10. 840

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66ra)

These examples show that the reading lacus instead of locus is a feature of the
‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, and is not shared for instance by the
related ‘Italian’ branch or other branches of the manuscripts of P.

This sentence is translated in IMP as: [3] do ronsat palas rigda for loch a
medhon na cathrach sin. 841 Therefore, in IMP the palace is situated on a lake (lacus)
in the middle of a city, rather than in the middle of a place (locus), where it is found in
almost all other manuscripts of P. It is easy to see how the Irish author may have
derived this translation from a manuscript of the ‘English’ branch, for example
Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1): in hac civitate Quinsay est palatium
mirabile valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangi curiam tenebat lacus magnus est in
circuitu muris, i.e. ‘in this city of Quinsay there is a spectacular palace, in which
Facfur, once the king of Mangi, used to hold court, a great lake surrounds the walls’.
This analysis suggests that the scribal error lacus for locus was present in the

839 ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a great palace in which Faefur, who was once the king of
Mangy, first kept his court; a great area is surrounded by a wall of great height in a square,
which has a perimeter of 10 miles.’
840 ‘In this city of Quinsay there is a great palace in which Faefur, who was once the king of
Mangy, first kept his court, a great area is surrounded by a wall of great height, in a square,
and which has a perimeter of 10 miles.’
841 The detail regarding the location of the royal palace (palas rigda) is taken from the
following sentence in P: in medio autem interioris spacci palatium pulcherrimum est (P
II.64.26).
exemplar used to write IMP, and consequently that IMP also belongs to this branch of P.

Of the manuscripts examined, *lacus* for *locus* is found in only one manuscript outside the ‘fidelissimi’ group, namely: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 40. This study has concluded that this similarity is coincidental, given that this manuscript bears no other resemblance to manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, lacking both the reading *fidelissimi* in the incipit, and the absence of *seu falcones pelegrini* in the explicit.

On the other hand, Glasgow, University Library, V.6.8. [458], which was written in France during the fourteenth century, is the only manuscript of the ‘English’ branch which reads *locus* at this point of the text. However, the scribe also mistook another reading of *lacus*, at section [9] of the Quinsay chapter, and copied *locus*:

Versus meridiem est **locus** magnum qui in giro .XXX. miliaria continet.

(Glasgow, University Library, V.6.8. [458], f. 76v).

Versus meridiem est in ipsa civitate **lacus** magnus qui .xxx. miliaria continet.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234r).

Versus meridiem est in ipsa civitate **lacus** magnus qui continet in giro.xxx. miliaria.

(Leiden, Bibliotheca der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37r).

Versus meridiem est in ipsa civitate **lacus** magna que .XXX. miliaria in giro continet.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, f. 65va).

---

842 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 40, f.42r: *in hac civitate Quinsay est palatium mirabile valde in quo Facfur quondam rex Mangi tenebat curiam primo lacus magnus circumcinctus est muris per quadrum altitudinis magne qui in giro continet miliaria decem.*

843 For further discussion of this manuscript see Dutschke, *Pipino*, 989-98.

844 Dutschke, *Pipino*, 615.
This scribal error sets a precedent for the scribe of Glasgow University Library, V.6.8. [458] mistaking the word *lacus* for *locus*, which may explain why this manuscript shows similarities with the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group of P, such as the reading *fidelissimi* in the incipit and the absence of *seu falcones pelegrini* in the explicit, but does not read *lacus* at [25] of the Quinsay chapter where all other manuscripts of this branch do. Therefore, with a degree of caution, this study suggests that Glasgow, University Library, V.6.8. [458], also belongs to the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group. Although it was written in France, it may well have been copied from a manuscript of English origin.

Therefore, with the exception of Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 40 and Glasgow, University Library, V.6.8. [458], the presence of *lacus* instead of *locus* at [25] of the Quinsay chapter of P, may be taken as a significant variant which distinguishes the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group from other families of manuscripts of P.

*Quatuor custodes vs decem custodies (group β).*

An important marker of a group of manuscripts within the ‘English’ branch, is the copying of *quatuor custodes* instead of *decem custodes* at [16] of the Quinsay chapter. This separative reading has been numbered 6) in the discussion and stemma below; it can be found at step β of the stemma and has been highlighted in blue. The following first four transcriptions are taken from manuscripts that derive from the β branch. The next three are taken from manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch that do not derive from the β branch. Finally, the last transcription is taken from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, in order to represent the standard found in most manuscripts of P.

6)

**Group β of English branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

In quolibet enim pontem civitatis de die et de nocte iii. custodes sunt.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234r).

In quolibet enim pontem civitatis de die et nocte 4or custodes sunt.
In quolibet enim pontem civitatis de die et nocte.\textit{iii.} custodes sunt.

(Oxford, Merton College, 312, f. 55vb).

In quolibet enim ponte civitatis de die et nocte \textit{iii.} custodes sunt.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f.100r).

**Not part of group β, but still in the English branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

In quolibet enim ponte civitatis de dio et de nocte \textit{x.} custodies sunt.

(Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5, p. 268a).

In quilibet enim ponte civitatis de die et de nocte \textit{x.} custodies sunt.

(Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83, f. 70r).

In quilibet enim civitatis ponte de die et de nocte \textit{x.} custodies sunt.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37r).

**Not ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

In quilibet enim ponte civitatis de die et nocte \textit{X.} custodies sunt.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, f. 66ra).

This scribal error may have originated due to the similarity between the Roman numeral X and the Medieval Arabic numeral 4 (figure 3). A total of six manuscripts of P contain separative reading 6) \textit{4 custodes} for \textit{10 custodes}. These all belong to the ‘English’ branch and are the following:
Further to these six manuscripts of P, IMP also reads: *iii. milid ag Magnus ac fare for cech n-droichet.* This suggests that IMP also derives from group β of the ‘English’ branch. Therefore, separative reading 6) distinguishes group β in the stemma below.

*1,000,000 vs 1,600,000 (group β/γ).*

At this point of the discussion of the ‘English’ group of the manuscripts of P, a problem arises to which there are two possible solutions: all surviving Latin manuscripts of P which descend from group β, i.e. which contain the scribal error 6) *4 custodes* discussed above, put the number of families in the city of Quinsay at 1,000,000, at section [27] of the Quinsay chapter. This has been numbered as scribal error 8) in the stemma. On the other hand, IMP, which evidence suggests also derives from β, at section [9] reads: *xl. mile tighidhis .xl. fecht* is aitreabhthaigh don chathair sin, restoring the number of families in the city to the original number 1,600,000, which is the most common number found in manuscripts of P not descending from β.

---

845 L f.128vb l.23.
846 IMP: ‘forty thousand households, forty times, is the number of families in that city’. A number of manuscripts contain a different number still, these are: the usually reliable Florence, BR 983, which however in this case reads on p. 67a *ad mille milia et .LX. milia familiarum* (1.060.000), Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Hist. 4° 10, which on f. 91r reads: *ut earum numerus ad mille milia familiarum ascendat* (1.000.000), but is unrelated to β; Vatican, Pal Lat 1359, which on f. 69r reads: *ut earum numerus ad mille et lx*
The first possible solution to this problem is that IMP descends directly from \( \beta \), a hypothetical stage in the development of this branch of the ‘English’ group, for which IMP is the only surviving witness. In other words, IMP was copied from a manuscript which contained scribal error 6) \( 4 \text{ custodes} \) instead of \( 10 \text{ custodes} \), but not scribal error 8) \( 1,000.000 \) instead of \( 1,600.000 \). However, no manuscripts of P survive which support the theory that this step existed.

The second solution is that either the author of IMP or the scribe who copied the exemplar of IMP noticed the mistake and recalculated the number of families in Quinsay, based on information given immediately prior to the number 1,000,000. The following extracts show how this is possible:

8)

**Group \( \beta/\gamma \) of English branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

In civitate Quinsay sunt ignes iuxta vulgare ytalicum in universo familie tot numero, quod ad \( .CLX. \text{ comanos} \) conscendit et computacione summaria \textit{comanus vero \( .X. \text{ milia continet} \)}, sunt igitur in universo familia ut eorum numerus ad \textit{mille milia familiarum} ascendat.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), ff. 234v-235r).

**Not Group \( \beta/\gamma \), but still part of English branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

In civitate Quinsay iuxta ignes iuxta vulgari ytalicum seu familie tot numero, quod ad \textit{centum \( .LX. \text{ tomainos} \)} ascendunt in computacione summaria; \textit{tomainus vero decem milia continet} sunt enim ibi tot in universo numero familie ut earum numerus ad \textit{mille milia et ad sexcenta milia familiarum} ascendat.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37v).

**Not ‘fidelissimi’ group:**

\( \textit{milia familiarum ascendat} \) (1.060.000); Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.ch.f.60 which on 293vb reads: \textit{ut earum numeris ad mille milia et \( .62. \text{ milia familiarum ascendat} \)} (1.062.000); the ‘Schedel’ group manuscripts, which in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 850 on f. 54r reads: \textit{ut earum numerus ad mille milia et \( .xl. \text{ milia familiariorum ascendant} \)} (1.040.000); the ‘Würzburg-Tergensee-Melk’ version which in the Würzburg manuscript on 177v reads: \textit{sunt autem in toto decies mille milia et \( .lx. \text{ milia familiarum} \)} (10.060.000).
In civitate Quinsai sunt ignes iuxta vulgare ytalicum sue familie tot numero quod ad centum sexaginta tomani ascendunt in computatione summaria; tomani vero .X. milia continent, sunt igitur tot in universo familie ut earum numerus ad mille milia et sexcenta milia familiarum ascendat.

(Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi C.7.1170, f. 51rb).  

Pipino states that the city of Quinsay contains 160 tomani, and that one tomanus contains 10,000. Given that the number of families will be the same as the number of tomani, it follows that the families of the Quinsay should be 160 x 10,000, resulting in 1,600,000. If this second solution is correct, it is no longer necessary to hypothesise the existence of step β, and the steps β and γ may be fused together. In other words, scribal errors 6) 4 custodes and 8) 1,000,000 may have been made by the same scribe.

It is not possible to discern whether it was the scribe of IMP’s Latin exemplar or the Irish author of IMP who corrected scribal error 8) 1,000,000 back to 1,600,000. However, if this correction was made by the Irish author, it implies that he was actively engaging with the text he was translating, and was interested in restoring the text where possible, instead of mindlessly translating the mistakes and miscalculations of his exemplar. It will be discussed further in Chapter IV how the author of IMP rearranged a great deal of information in his adaptation, combining various episodes and details into his own unique version of the Travels.  

A further two separative readings, namely at sections [25] and [30] of the Quinsay chapter in P consolidate the theory of the β/γ branch, but were not translated by the Irish author and thus are not verifiable in IMP. These are 11) pisces sunt instead of pisces habentur, and 12) ad familium adherentis instead of ad familiam additi:

---

847 ‘In the city of Quinsay there are hearths, as in the common Italian speech, or families in such numbers that they reach one-hundred-and-sixty tomani; tomani contain ten thousand, therefore such is the number of families in total that their number reaches one million and six hundred thousand (1,600,000).’ Florence, BR 983 has not been used to compare this reading, because it does not contain the number most common at this point in manuscripts of P.
848 See Chapter IV, ‘Rebellion of Naim and Cadau’. 
ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi sunt pisces.
(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234v).

ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces sunt.
(Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218, f. 89ra)

ibi sunt fontes et lacune cum quibus multi et optimi pisces sunt.
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f. 100v).

ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi sunt pisces.
(Oxford, Merton College, 312, f. 56rb).

ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces haben tur.
(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37v).

ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces habentur.
(Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University, Garrett 157, f. 37r).

ibi sunt fontes et lacune in quibus multi et optimi pisces habentur.
(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f.66vb).

12)

scribatur ibi nomen cuiusdam de novo nascentis vel ad familiam adher entis.
(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 235r)

scribatur ibi nomen cuiuscumque de novo nascentis vel ad familiam adher entis.
(Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218, f. 89ra).

scribatur ibi nomen cuiuscumque de novo nascentis vel ad familiam adher entis.
(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f. 101r).

scribatur ibi nomen alius de novo nascentis vel ad familiam adherentis.
Provincias septem vs provincias octo (group δ).

A further distinction within manuscripts of the β/γ group exists in two manuscripts which contain scribal error 15) provincias septem instead of provincias octo, which is not found in the Quinsay chapter but at I.52.2 of P. This is group δ, which comprises of manuscripts 11) Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218 and 12) Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1). The variation of these two manuscripts may be observed in the following transcriptions:849

15)

Group δ of English branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:

in brevi vero tempore provincias .vii. cepit.
(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 205r).

in brevi vero tempore provincias .vii. cepit.
(Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218, f. 79vb).

849 Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University, Garrett 157, contains on f. 13v the corruption, in brevi vero tempore provincias accepit, hence it was not included in the above comparison.
Not Group $\delta$, but subgroup of Group $\beta/\gamma$ of the English branch of ‘fidelissimi’ group:

in brevi vero tempore \textit{provincias .viii.} cepit.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f. 69r.).

in brevi autem tempore \textit{provincias .viii.} cepit.

(Oxford, Merton College, 312, f. 14va).

Not Group $\beta/\gamma$ of the English branch of ‘fidelissimi group:

in brevi vero tempore \textit{provincias octo} cepit.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, 13v).

in brevi vero tempore \textit{provincias octo} cepit.

(Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83, f. 41r.)

Not ‘fidelissimi’ group:

brevi vero in tempore \textit{provincias octo} cepit.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, 24rb).

Due to the loss of a minim, this scribal error distinguishes a further subgroup of the ‘English’ branch. Significantly, IMP also contains this variant at paragraph ¶29 of Stokes’s edition, where it reads: \textit{Cidh fil ann acht ro umlaigset ui. righ dho la h-omun a imairec}. This suggests that the manuscripts which IMP shares most details are 11) Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218 and 12) Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1).

The existence of group $\delta$ is corroborated by a further two unique readings found in the Quinsay chapter; however, the nature of these variants, which substitute one Latin synonym for another, does not allow for them to be verified in IMP. These scribal errors have been numbered 13) \textit{transferre} instead of \textit{deferre}, and 14) \textit{subiecti} instead of \textit{subditi}. The following transcriptions show how the two manuscripts of group $\delta$, contain the same unique readings:
quando ignis fortuitus accendit possint convicines res suas ad prefatas turres *transfere* ne comburantur.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234r).

quando ignis fortuitus accenditur possint convicines res suas ad prefatas turres *transfere* ne comburantur.

(Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218, f. 89vb).

quando fortuitus ignis accenditur possint convicines res suas ad dictas turres *deferre* ne comburantur.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f. 100r).

quando fortuitus ignis accenditur possint convicines res suas ad predictas turres *deferre* ne comburantur.

(Oxford, Merton College, 312, 55va).

quando fortunus ignis accenditur possint convicini res suas ad prefatas turres *deferre* ne comburentur.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, 37r).

ut quando fortuitus ignis accendere contigeret possunt vicini res suas ad prefatas turres *deferre* ne comburantur.

(Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83, f. 70r).

quando fortuitu ignis accenditur possint convicini res suas ad prefatas turres *deferre*.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 65vb).

sunt autem omnes reges potentes valde sed sunt *subjecti* Magno Caam.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234v).
sunt autem omnes reges potentes valde sed sunt subiecti Magno Kaam.

(Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek, 218, f. 89ra).

sunt autem omnes reges potentes valde sed sunt subditi Magno Kaam.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, 100v).

Sunt autem omnes reges potentes valde sed sunt subditi Magno Kaam.

(Oxford, Merton College, 312, ff. 55vb-56ra).

sunt autem reges omnes potentes valde sed sunt subditi Magno Kaan.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37r).

sunt autem suis reges potentes valde sed sunt subditi Magno Kaam.

(Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83, f. 70r).

sunt autem omnes hii reges potentes valde, sed subditi Magno Kaam.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f. 66rb).

The presence in IMP of three of the scribal errors and unique readings, namely lacus, quattuor custodes and provincias septem, which distinguish group δ of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, is a strong indication that the Latin exemplar used by the Irish translator belonged to this branch of the stemma of P. Scribal variants 13) transferre instead of deferre and 14) subiecti instead of subditi, further substantiate the existence of group δ, even though the nature of these variants means that they are not verifiable in IMP.

Group δ and Comparison B

The similarities between IMP and the manuscripts of group δ may be observed further in the following Comparison B table which compares the corresponding excerpts from IMP, in the left-hand column, from Glasgow, University Library,
Hunter 84 (T.4.1), in the central column, and from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, in the right column. The similarities shared by the Glasgow manuscript and the Florence manuscript have been highlighted in yellow in the central and right-hand column, whereas the unique readings which show how the Glasgow manuscript bears greater similarities to IMP have been highlighted in green, in the central and left-hand columns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(¶23) [1] Fil cathair naili uidhi dhala allamuigh don cathraigh sin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(¶27) [2] <strong>.aider</strong> la cech naen dibh.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satiu a ainm. Facbais sin mac, Roton a ainm. Facbais Roton mac, Mongu a ainm. Is uadh sin ro chin Cublay.

(¶41)
[5] xxx, beim do luirg dhó nó lx. mad cin is mo indás, nó a x. for cét mad mo in tres feacht.

(¶50)
[6] in tochtmad la déc domí August

(¶84)
[7] in tochtmad la .xx. domhi Decimbr

(¶94)
[8] dá thaisech déc la Cublay 7 as iat bá coimsigh ara canta fris 7 uaidh cethra cricha .xxx.

(¶101)

---

Cublay

I.61 septem vicibus fuste ceditur aut .xvii. aut .xviii. secundum mensuram peccati est percussionum numerus usque ad centum semper addendo decem.

I.66 die autem .xxviii. augusti Magnus Caam

II.14 festum autem natalis magni caam cubay est .xxviii. die septembris.

II.22 habet magnus caam barones .xii. qui .xxiiii. provinciis sunt prefecti

II.36 protenditur

I.66 Die autem .XXVIII. augusti Magnus Kaam

II.14 Festum autem Magni Kaam est die .XXVIII. septembris.

II.22 Habet Magnus Kaam barones .XII. qui .XXIII. provinciis sunt prefecti

II.36 Protenditur autem in
Of the ten transcriptions selected for Comparison B, four show that there is a closer similarity between IMP and the manuscripts of group δ, than between IMP and Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983. In particular, reading [3] .uii. righ, which has been discussed above, is unique to manuscripts of group δ.

The second reading which shows how IMP is closer to the Glasgow manuscript than to the Florence manuscript is numbered [4] above, and concerns the genealogy of the Khans. The versions of the names found in IMP, namely: Caiter, Satiu, Roton and Mongu, are much closer to those found in the Glasgow manuscript, namely: Carter, Satyn, Rothon, Mongu, than to those found in Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, namely: Cui, Bacui, Alau, Manguth.

The most striking of these variants are Florence’s Cui for Glasgow’s Carter, Satyn for Bacui, and Rothon for Alau, respectively. The following transcriptions of this extract are taken from a number of manuscripts across the stemma of P, and demonstrate how these names vary in the different manuscript groups. The first two transcriptions are from manuscripts of group δ, the third and forth are from manuscripts deriving from group ε, a group closely related to δ, which will be discussed below. The fifth transcription represents another manuscript of the ‘English’ branch but which does not descend from the β/γ group. The Ghent manuscript is a copy of the Leeu printed edition of P, and therefore is representative of the ‘Italian’ branch, discussed above. The last three transcriptions represent manuscripts of P not pertaining to the ‘fidelissimi’ group. The three names in question, which show the most variation in the manuscripts of P, have been highlighted, underlined and are in bold characters respectively.
secundus Carter, trius Satyn, quartus Rothon quintus Mongu sextus Cublay.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 206r).

2us cuircer 3us sachui 4us bothon 5us monu 6us cublay.

(Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, f. 80ra).

2us carcter 3us saim 4us roton 5us mongu 6us cublay.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz 4° 70, f. 69v).

2us cartur tertius satiu 4us roton 5us mongu 6us cublay.

(Oxford, Merton College, 312, f. 15rb).

secundus caiter tertius sacui quartus rocon quintus mongon sextus cublay.

(Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/15, f. 231v).

secundus eny 3us bacui quartus Esu quintus mongu sextus cublay.

(Ghent, Universiteitsbibliothek 13, f. 90vb).

secundus cui tercius barchin quartus alau quintus mongu sextus cblai.

(Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Lat. 131. a.s.6.14, f. 11va).

2us scui 3u sbatiu 4us Esu 5us manghu 6us cublay.

(Kórnik Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN, ms. 131, f. 13rb).

secundus Cui, tercius Bacui, quartus Alau, quintus Manguth, sextus Cublay.

(Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, f.25rb).

These transcriptions show that the changes to the Carter/Carter type variant for Cui, appear to be unique to the ‘English’ branch (α), as do the changes to Satiu/Satyn/Sachui for Bacui/Barchin, and the changes Rothon/Rocon/Bothon for Esu/Alau. IMP’s versions Carter, Satiu and Roton are therefore probably due to scribal corruptions that originated in manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, and not innovations of the Irish author.
Another difference between IMP and P is numbered [5] in Comparison B above. Although IMP does not translate this passage precisely as it is found in the Glasgow manuscript, this study suggests that the exemplar used to establish the numbers found in IMP, namely: 30, 60 and 110, contained numbers more similar to those found in the Glasgow manuscript, namely: 7, 17, 18, ‘up to 100, always adding 10’, rather than those found in Florence BR 983, namely: 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, ‘up to 100, adding 10’. In the Florence manuscript, this method of punishment is explained by showing how the number of lashes is increased by 10, from 7 up to 47, before it says that this continues up to the number 100. On the other hand, in the Glasgow manuscript this meaning is lost, because insufficient numerical examples are given in order to convey the pattern by which the lashes are assigned, due to a textual corruption. This confusion may have given the Irish translator the incentive to reinvent these numbers entirely. Thus the numbers 7, 17 and 18 were changed to 30 and 60, while *usque ad centum semper addendo decem* was translated as *x. for cét*. The following examples show how this section of P varies in a considerable number of the manuscripts that I have examined:

septem vicibus fuste ceditur aut .xvii. aut .xviii. secundum mensuram peccati est percussionum numerus usque ad centum semper addendo decem.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 208r)

.xvii. ictibus fusto ceditur aut xvii aut xviii pro mensura peccatum est percussionum numerus usque ad centum semper addendo decem.

(Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, f. 80va).

.xvii. ictibus fuste ceditur aut xvii aut xxvii pro mensura eius peccati est percussionum numerus usque ad .c. semper addendo .x.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz 4° 70, f. 72r).

vii ictibus fuste ceditur aut xvii aut xxvii pro mensura eius peccati est percussionum numerus usque ad .C. semper addendo .x.

(Oxford, Merton College 312, f. 17ra).
The above transcriptions show how another feature unique to the ‘English’ branch is the loss of the numbers 27, 37 and 47, which are substituted by the number 28 in most manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch, and by the number 18 in manuscripts of group δ. This study has suggested that the garbled account of the punishments used by the Tartars, which was present in the exemplar of IMP, confused the Irish author and prompted him to reinvent, or perhaps attempt to reconstruct the original meaning of the text, resulting in the transformation of the numbers 7, 17 and 18 of the exemplar into 30 and 60 of IMP.

Lastly, IMP shows similarities with most manuscripts of P in the number of provinces which are divided amongst the twelve barons of the Khan. This reading is numbered [8] in the Comparison B table above. Several manuscripts of P, including Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, contain the number 24, while most manuscripts
of P contain the number 34. The VA version from which Pipino translated and wrote P, contains the number 34. The ‘English’ group version also contains the number 34 at this point in the text. The following transcriptions display this variation:

habet magnus caam barones xii qui xxxiiii provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 220r)

habet magnus kaam barones duodecim qui xxxiiii provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, f. 84va).

habet magnus kaam barones .xii. qui .xxxiiii. provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz 4° 70, f. 84v).

habet magnus kaam barones xii qui .xxxiiii. provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Oxford, Merton College 312, f. 27vb).

habet magnus kaam barones xii qui 34 provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/15, f. 249a).

habet magnus caam barones xii qui xxiii provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Ghent, Universiteitsbiblioteek 13, f. 97vb).

habet magnus kaam barones xii qui xxxiiii provintiis sunt prefecti.
   (Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Lat. 131. a.s.6.14, f. 20rb).

habet magnus kaam barones xii qui xxx4. or pronvitiis sunt prefecti.
   (Kórnik Biblioteka Kórnicka PAN, ms. 131, f. 22ra).

habet magnus caam barones xii qui .xxiii. provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. app. X.73, f. 35r).

habet rex barones .xii. qui .xxiii. provinciis sunt prefecti.
   (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3497, f. 90r).
Other groups of the English branch

The above discussion has demonstrated how IMP shares several unique readings with group δ of the ‘English’ branch of the ‘fidelissimi’ group of P. The two surviving Latin manuscripts of this group, namely Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1) and Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, were both written in the fifteenth century, the former in England, and the latter in the Netherlands. However, there are a number of manuscripts of P, closely related to group δ, which were written in the fourteenth century. These other groups of the ‘English’ branch will be discussed now:

Group ε.

This group is important because it sets a terminus before which the base manuscript of the ‘English’ branch was written. This is fixed by the text of P found in Oxford, Merton College 312, which was probably the manuscript used by Thomas Bradwardine for his major theological work, *De causa Dei contra Pelagium et de virtute causarum ad suos mertonenses*, completed c.1344. This manuscript belongs to yet another subgroup of group ε, namely group η. The resemblance of P in manuscripts of group η has been previously remarked upon by Dutschke, who noticed that all manuscripts of this group also contain Hayton’s *Flos Historiarum Terre Orientis*. One of the most striking departures of this version of P, and its most distinguishing feature, is the relocation of the Quinsay chapter from the end of the

---

850 This copy lacks the word *prefecti*.
851 Barbieri, Andreose, *Il Milione*, p.186
852 Dutschke, *Pipino*, 807-08.
853 Ibid., 803 and 807.
second book to the end of the third book, specifically from II.64 to III.49. IMP follows the traditional order of chapters found in P, which excludes an immediate relationship with manuscripts of group η. However, the survival of the Oxford manuscript and its location within the ‘fidelissimi’ stemma shows that P was already being widely circulated and edited in England within twenty years of Pipino’s death. The following three manuscripts belong to group η of the ‘English’ branch:

4) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.17  
14th C

22) London, British Library, Arundel 13  
14th C

31) Oxford, Merton College 312  
before 1344

This study has not been able to ascertain the relationship between these three manuscripts, however I have noticed that these three manuscripts are closely related to Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz 4° 70, which constitutes group ζ. The Berlin manuscript maintains the traditional order of chapters and does not relocate the Quinsay chapter at the end of the third book. All four manuscripts of group ε share the unique reading predictas/dictas instead of prefatas in the Quinsay chapter. This separative reading, numbered 7) in the stemma, may be observed in the following transcriptions:

7)

quando fortuitus ignis accenditur possint convicines res suas ad

dictas turres deferre ne comburantur.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz 4° 70, f. 100r).

quando fortuitus ignis accendit possunt convicines res suas ad

predittas turres conferre ne comburantur.

(Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.17, f. 55vb).

quando fortuitus ignis accendit possunt convicines res suas ad

predittas turres conferre ne comburantur.

quando fortuitus ignis accenditur possint convicines res suas ad predictas turres de ferre ne comburantur.

(Oxford, Merton College 312, f. 55va).

quando ignis fortuitus accendit possint convicines res suas ad prefatas turres transferre ne comburantur.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234r).

quando ignis fortuitus accenditur possint convicines res suas ad prefatas turres transferre ne comburantur.

(Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, f. 89vb).

quando fortuitu ignis accenditur contingeret possint vicini res suas ad prefatas turres deferre ne comburantur.

(Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/15, f. 268a).

quando fortunus ignis accenditur possint convicini res suas ad prefatas turres deferre ne comburentur.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, f. 37r).

Although the readings of group η and group ζ do not correspond exactly, the Berlin manuscript having lost the pre- of predictas, this scribal variant does show that the two groups are more closely connected with each other than with the other manuscripts that maintain prefatas, which is the norm in other P manuscripts. Manuscripts of group ε also contain readings, 2) lacus for locus, 6) 4 custodes for 10 custodes, and 8) 1,000,000 for 1,600,000, which are shared by manuscripts of group δ. On the other hand, manuscripts of group ε, do not contain reading 15) provincias septem for provincias octo, which distinguishes group δ, and which is found as .uii. righ in IMP. Group ε is therefore closely related to group δ, however it is unlikely that the exemplar used by the author of IMP derived from any manuscript of group ε.

‘Bellare’ group.

Another testimony to the early circulation of P in England, is the date of London, British Library Royal 14.C.xiii, which was written after 1330, date of Odoric of Pordenone’s Relatio contained within the manuscript, and before 1352, date of the
resignation of Simon of Bozoun as prior of Norwich, to whom there is an ownership note on folio 14 which reads liber fratris Symonis Bozoun prioris Norwiciensis. This manuscript may be related to another four manuscripts which contain reading 16) bellare instead of rebellare in the Quinsay chapter of P, these are:

3) Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83
   14th C

6) Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Acc. 2011/5
   14th C

20) London, British Library 19513
    14th C

    before 1352

38) Princeton, University Library, Garret 157
    15th C

The following transcriptions show the variation of reading 16) in these five manuscripts:

16)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum chaam positi sunt custodes ne forte

bellare presumant.


in signulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte

bellare presumant.


in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte

bellare presumant.

(Copenhagen, Konelige Bibliotek Acc. 2011/15, f. 268b).

---

854 Dutschke, Pipino, 711 and 808.
855 This manuscript begins defectively, therefore it is not possible to ascertain whether it contained the reading fidelissimi. However, the lack of seu falcones peregrini in the explicit, suggests that it does in fact belong to the ‘English’ branch. See Dutschke, Pipino, 881-84.
856 Florence BR 983 is not considered here as it does not copy the word rebellare (cf. 66a).
in singulis ipsarum pro magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
bellare presumant

(Princeton, University Library, Garret 157, f. 36v)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
bellare presumant.

(Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 162/83, f. 70v)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum caam positi sunt custodes ne forte
rebellare presumant.

(Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), f. 234v)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
rebellare presumant.

(Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, f. 89ra)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
rebellare presumant.

(Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußicher Kulturbesitz 4º 70, f. 100v)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
rebellare presumant.

(Oxford, Merton College 312, f. 56ra)

in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
rebellare presumant.

(Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 75, ff. 37r-37v).

in singulis ipsarum per magnum kaam positi sunt custodes ne forte
rebellare presumant.

(Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Conventi soppressi C.7.1170, f. 50vb).
This study has not been able to corroborate the existence of the ‘bellare’ group with other readings unique to these five manuscripts. Furthermore, London, British Library Add. 19513 is one of the only manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch which was not written in England. However, the reading *fidelissimi* in the incipit, combined with reading 2) *lacus* in the Quinsay chapter, suggests that although it was written in Italy during the fourteenth century, its version of P may have been copied from an exemplar of English origin.  

This study has examined surviving manuscripts of English origin save for one, namely the manuscript previously known as Devon, Library of Boies Penrose 23, which was sold before September 1982 to an undisclosed private collector, and is thus unavailable for consultation. It was written in Westminster in 1530, and may therefore be related to the ‘fidelissimi’ group. However, further conclusions will have to be drawn when and if this manuscript becomes available in the future.

### Conclusions

This chapter has shown that scribal mistakes in the exemplar of IMP account for a number of differences evident from a comparison of IMP and P. In particular, a number of these variants are still discernible in the surviving manuscripts of the ‘English’ branch. On the other hand, a great deal of other details are unique to IMP, and it is not possible to establish whether these were innovations of the Irish author or whether they derive from textual corruptions of the exemplar. Such is the case of Comparison B extracts [1] I.46 *dietas tres* translated as ¶23 *dha la;* [2] I.49 *xxx. uxor*es becoming ¶27 *L. ainder;* [6] I.66 *die autem .xxviiii.* becoming ¶50 *in tochtmhad la déc;* [7] II.14 *Septembris* becoming ¶84 *Decimbir;* [9] II.36 *dietas .xx.* becoming ¶101 *xxx. la;* and [10] II.53 *xx. milla* translating to ¶124 *x. mili.* The nature of these changes suggests scribal error, however no surviving manuscript of P displays this precise sequence of details. On the other hand, by examining the similarities between IMP and the versions of P, the manuscripts which bear the closest resemblance to the lost exemplar of IMP are those of group δ, namely: Giessen,
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857 Dutschke, Pipino, 663.  
858 Ibid., 1016-1018.
Universitätsbibliothek 218 and Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1). What follows is a description of the two surviving manuscripts of group δ, which may help to shine oblique light on the context of the exemplar of IMP.

The Giessen manuscript was written in the Netherlands during the mid- to late-fifteenth century, as is suggested by the latest entries of the chronological texts and by the interest in the bishops of Utrecht and the counts of Holland. The latest bishop mentioned in the manuscript is Rodolphus de Diepholt, i.e. Rudolf van Diepholt, on folio 133va, who was in tenure between 1432 and 1455. As well as P, this manuscript contains the Chronicon of Eusebius of Caesarea, Poggio Bracciolini’s De Varietate Fortunae, a unique Chronographia by Johannes de Beke, as well as a number of apochryphal texts and illustrations of maps of the world. The resemblance of the version of P found in the Giessen manuscript to that found in English manuscripts was noticed by Gadrat, who suggested that it was copied from an exemplar of English provenance.

Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), is the most interesting manuscript of the δ group for the study of IMP because it contains a number of other historical and travel texts, many of which also exist in translated Irish versions. The manuscript begins with Historia destructionis Troiae by Guido delle Colonne, with the colophon copied from the Italian exemplar of 1354 by Johannulus de Borrezio of Milan. This is followed by the Epitome of Julius Valerius on Alexander the Great, known as Liber Magni Alexandri. Following this is Pseudo Turpin’s Historia Karoli Magni, which is also found in an Irish translation in L, as Gabhálas Serluis Mhóir (GSM). Similar to the order found in L, in the Glasgow manuscript Historia Karoli Magni is followed by Pipino’s Travels. After which, P is followed by Odoric of Pordenone’s Relatio, and finally by the Travels of John Mandeville in the version of the second Latin translation made in England. Below is a description of each of these texts, with an account of how they relate to the corresponding Irish adaptations.

859 Dutschke, Pipino, 594-95.  
860 Ibid., 595-99.  
861 Gadrat, Lire, 79-80.  
862 Dutschke, Pipino, 603: Glasgow, UL Hunter 84 ff. 1-126.  
864 Dutschke, Pipino, 605-06: ff. 165v-190v.  
865 Ibid., 607-08; P at ff. 191-254; Odoric at 254-268v; Mandeville at ff. 269-340v.
The Irish version of the Troy story, *Togail Troí*, was in circulation by the eleventh century in Ireland, and may have been written by end of the tenth century.\(^{866}\) It was adapted and translated from *De excidio Troiae*, a sixth-century Latin text attributed to Dares Phrygius. On the other hand, Guido delle Colonne’s *Historia destructionis Troiae*, is a Latin chronicle written circa 1287 inspired for the most part by Benoît de Saint-Maure’s poem *Roman de Troie*, which was written circa 1160.\(^{867}\)

The main sources for the *Roman de Troie* were Dares Phrygius and a fourth-century Latin text entitled *Ephemeris belli Troiani*, attributed to Dictys. Therefore, although *Togail Troí* and *Historia destructionis Troiae* share a very distant relationship, they are not connected in any direct way.

An Irish version of the Alexander story, *Scéla Alaxandair*, also existed by the eleventh century, and may have been written as far back as the tenth, making it a contemporary of *Togail Troí*.\(^{868}\) It is a unique Irish version of the Alexander tale, for the most part based on three Latin narratives, namely: Paulus Orosius’ *Historiarum adversum Paganos*; the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*; and the *Collatio Alexandri cum Dindimo Rege Bragmanorum*.\(^{869}\) *Scéla Alaxandair* also incorporates material from Josephus’ *Antiquitate Judaicae*, Jerome’s Latin translation of Eusebius’ *Chronicon*, Prician’s *Periegesis* as well as incorporating material from Isodore’s *Etymologiae*.\(^{870}\) On the other hand, the *Epitome* of Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius’ translation of Pseudo Callisthenes on Alexander the Great, was written either before or during the ninth century, the date of the earliest surviving manuscripts.\(^{871}\) The *Epitome* summarises the content of Julius Valerius Alexander Polemius’ *Res Gestae Alexandri Magni*, a fourth-century Latin translation of a lost Greek ‘Romance of Alexander’ attributed to Pseudo-Callisthenes.\(^{872}\) The *Epitome* survives in sixty-eight manuscripts, greatly superseding the manuscripts of the full text by Julius Valerius, which now survives only in two manuscripts.\(^{873}\) The *Epitome* is not the same as Leo of Naples’ *Historia de Preliis*, written in the tenth century,

\(^{866}\) Fulton, ‘History’, 40.
\(^{867}\) Ibid., 41.
\(^{868}\) Ibid., 43; Miles, ‘Heroic’, 55-57.
\(^{871}\) Ross, ‘A Check-list’, 127.
\(^{872}\) Miles, *Heroic*, 56; Ross, ‘A Check-list’, 127.
\(^{873}\) Ross, ‘A Check-list’, 127.
another summary of Valerius’ work that became widely known during the centuries that followed. I am not aware of any study which compares this ninth century Epitome of Julius Valerius with Scéla Alaxandair, however Miles has inferred that Peters was incorrect in establishing a link between Scéla Alaxandair and Julius Valerius’ text. Furthermore, I am aware of no attempts to link Togail Troí and Scéla Alaxandair with specific subgroups of the Latin texts on which they are based.

There is no surviving Irish translation of Odoric of Pordenone’s Relatio, nor were any of the surviving manuscripts that contain the text written in Ireland. However, FitzMaurice and Little have claimed that one manuscript which contains the Relatio, namely Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 903, written in 1422, was housed in a Franciscan monastery in Ireland until 1529, before being transferred to Regensburg. A curious note for the year 1331, in a manuscript from Udine, names one of Odoric’s companions to the East as an Irish Franciscan friar named Jacobo de Ibernia, which has been anglicised to James of Ireland. However, I am not aware of any other reference to Jacobo de Ibernia, who, if the Udine manuscript is correct, would have travelled with Odoric to Sumatra, India and eastern China between 1316 and 1330. Although there is no Irish translation of the Relatio, Odoric’s account of the East formed the basis for much of Mandeville’s Travels, which are a work of fiction. Specifically, Marchisio has discovered the version of the Relatio that was used to write Mandeville’s Travels, labelled subgroup C9. On the other hand, the version

---

874 Miles, Heroic, 55.
875 Ibid., 56; Peters, ‘Die irische Alexandersage’, 73.
876 Marchisio, La Tradizione, 82-87.
877 FitzMaurice and Little, Materials, 133.
878 Scott, ‘Latin learning’, 981; FitzMaurice and Little, Materials, 133; Yule, Cathay, 7: Venni, Elogio, 27. The note comes from a footnote in Venni’s 1761 edition of the Relatio, in which he claims to have examined a manuscript in Udine, which contains the reference to Jacobo de Ibernia. Venni’s footnote (b) on p. 27 reads: ‘dal cit. libro pubblico d’Udine fol. 207. ter. intendiamo chi fosse il compagno del Beato. ‘Die quinto Aprilis (1331.) dedit de mandato D. Gastaldionis F. Jacobo de Ibernia socio B. F. Odorici amore Dei, & F. Odorici marchas duas denariorum Aquilensium.’’ Venni requotes this passage on p. 149, specifying its location, namely: ‘Dai Libri de’Camerarj del Comune di Udine, Tom. x. fol. ccvil. ter.’ I have not been able to find the current location or call number of this manuscript. All references which I have found regarding Jacobo de Ibernia seem to derive from Venni’s footnote in 1761. A reexamination of and reference for the Udine manuscript is therefore extremely desirable.
880 Marchisio, La Tradizione, 49-53. In her thesis, Marchisio also implies that there may be a connection between Jean le Long who translated a version of the Relatio, from the C9 subgroup, into French circa 1351, and Jean de Mandeville, whose original Travels were written in France, from the C9 version, circa 1365. Cf. Marchisio, La Tradizione, 55-63.
of the *Relatio* contained in Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1) belongs to subgroup C3 of the *Relatio*, a parallel branch to C9 in the development of the various Latin versions of the text. The version of the *Relatio* contained in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 903, belongs to an entirely different branch, labelled D.

*Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* (GSM) is an Early Modern Irish translation of Pseudo Turpin’s *Historia Karoli Magni* (HKM). The earliest datable copy is in the hand of Tadhg Ua Righbhardáin, in Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1304, which he wrote between 1474 and 1475. Walpole has shown, based on the comparisons of the different versions of HKM displayed in Meredith-Jones’ edition of the text, that GSM derives from the C branch of the stemma of HKM, all manuscripts of which were written in England. Although there has been some discussion surrounding Meredith-Jones’ other subdivisions of the manuscripts of HKM, the distinction of the C group is generally accepted as sound. Unfortunately, HKM in Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1) was not examined by Meredith-Jones for his edition, and indeed, another hundred odd manuscript copies of HKM remain unclassified. However, it may be concluded that GSM was translated from a version of HKM, group C, which was most widespread in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. One of the manuscripts to contain this version, namely, London, British Library, Vespasian A XIII, was written by John Mauns, a Franciscan Friar from Hereford during the first quarter of the fifteenth century. It would be interesting, as a follow up to this study, to examine the context of the manuscripts of group C of HKM, and assess their relationship with the various manuscripts copies of GSM. In particular, it would be desirable to learn if the version of HKM which appears at pp. 107-130 of Dublin, Trinity College MS 667 also belongs to group C. This manuscript is also the only source for the Hiberno-Latin text *Gesta Karoli Marchisio*, *La Tradizione*, 46.
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882 Ibid., 68-70.
883 Hyde, *Gabháltas*, x.
885 Hamel, review of *Historia*, 251: ‘The groups B and D should have been subdivided, for the manuscripts named by Meredith-Jones are of several distinct types; C, however, is homogenous’: Smyser, review of *Historia*, 433-38.
886 Walpole, ‘Note to Meredith-Jones’, 261.
888 Colker, *Catalogue* II, 1141.
Magni, from which the Early Modern Irish text Stair Fortibrais was translated. Flower has suggested that it was written in a Franciscan friary in County Clare, perhaps in Ennis, circa 1455.

The version of the Travels of John Mandeville found in Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1), has been identified by Seymour as being an exemplar of the ‘Royal’ version, a Latin translation made from a text of subgroup A of the Insular Version, which is a French recension made in England before 1375 from the original French text. On the other hand, Seymour has noted that the Irish translation of Mandeville (GM), was made from the Defective Version, subgroup A, an English translation made from a text deriving from subgroup B of the Insular Version. It follows therefore, that GM did not derive from a version of Mandeville closely related to the one found in Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84 (T.4.1). The following diagram displays how Seymour describes the relationship between the Mandeville text found in the Glasgow manuscript and GM:
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Seymour used Stokes’s edition of GM to evaluate its relationship with the manuscripts of the Defective version. One of the crucial points of this analysis relies on the following passage from Stokes’s edition, regarding an island off the Indian coast:

Atá do thes innti co tuitit [magairledha] daeine sí s is cossaib innti le mét discáeilti in tesa.

‘from the heat therein men’s ballocks fall down on their legs, with the dissolving power of the heat.’

This passage corresponds to the following section in the Defective version:

But it is so hote þare in þat yle þat menys ballokez hongiþ doun to here schankis for þe grete dissolucion of þe body.

Of the nine manuscripts of subgroup A of the Defective version, only two contain the original reading menys ballokez, where the others all read men. Seymour thought that GM also contained this reading, presumably because he was working from Stokes’s translation, leading him to exclude seven of the manuscripts of subgroup A as being closely related to GM. However, my transcriptions from Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, and London, British Library, Egerton MS 1781 demonstrate that the reading margairledha is not present in either of the two manuscripts which contain GM:

Atá do theas innti co tuitit daeine sís ar a cossaibh inntie le méad discáeiltie in teasa.

Atá do theas innti sin co tuitid daine sís ar a cosuíbh innti le med in teasa.

---

897 Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, f. 63vb.
In his edition of GM, Stokes gives no explanation as to why he has amended his transcription with *magairledha*. However, in the introduction to his edition of GM, Stokes mentions that he used Warner’s ‘recent’ 1889 edition of Mandeville, in order to identify placenames:

> ‘For the sources of *the Buke of John Maundeville*, see Dr. Albert Bovenchen’s *Quellen für die Reisebeschreibung des Johannis von Mandeville*, Berlin, 1888, and Mr. G. F. Warner’s magnificent edition of an English and a French text, printed for the Roxburghe Club in 1889, from which I have borrowed most of the identifications of place-names.’

This edition of Mandeville was edited from London, British Library, Egerton 1982, which contains a ‘conflation in English based on the Defective Version, subgroup A, and a lost English translation of the Royal Version, with reference to an Insular manuscript’. The passage in question from this edition reads:

> Bot it es so hate þare in þat ile þat men ballokes hyngez doune to þaire schankes for þe grete violence of hete, þat dissoluez þaire bodys.

This study suggests that Stokes’s emendation *magairledha* derives from his comparisons with Warner’s edition of Mandeville, rather than from any manuscript source of GM. If this is the case, Seymour’s arguments about GM’s origin in subgroup A of the Defective version of Mandeville are still valid, but the pool of eligible manuscripts must be widened to include the seven manuscripts which he excluded. These are:
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898 London, British Library, Egerton MS 1781, f. 139vb (fifth line from the bottom). Examined on microfilm.
899 The third manuscript source for GM is a fragment which only contains the first two-thousand words of GM, and therefore cuts off before the passage in question here. It has been edited and published in: Doyle, M. and Seymour, M., ‘The Irish Epitome of “Mandeville’s Travels”’, *Éigse* 12.
901 Seymour, ‘Sir John’, 49.
1) Cambridge, University Library, Dd.1.17

2) Cambridge, University Library MS Ff. v. 35

3) Oxford, Balliol College, MS 239

4) Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 33

5) Oxford, Bodleian Library MS e Musaeo 124

6) Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson D 101

7) Oxford, Queen’s College, MS 383

GM was written by Finghin Ó Mathghamhna in Ros Broin, West Cork, in 1475 and survives in three Early Modern Irish manuscripts, namely:904 London, British Library, Egerton 1781, written in Breifne between 1484 and 1487;905 Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, written in the Franciscan monastery of Cill Créidhe, founded in 1465 by Cormac Láidir Mac Carthaigh, a short distance west of Cork City;906 lastly, a fragment of GM survives in London, British Library, Add. 33993, written in Tipperary in the early sixteenth century.907

GSM instead survives in six manuscripts, namely: L, written for Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhaigh between 1478 and 1505, probably in the Franciscan Friary of Timoleague and is also the only manuscript source of IMP;908 Dublin, University College, Franciscan A9, written in the fifteenth-century;909 Dublin, King’s Inn, MS 10, also written in the fifteenth century;910 Dublin, Trinity College, MS 1304, written

905 Flower, Catalogue ii, 526-545.
906 Maher, Kilcrea, 1.
908 See Chapter IV: Content and Innovations in the Prologue.
by a scribe named Tadhg Ua Righbhardáin around 1475; London, British Library, Egerton 92, which once formed part of Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 E 29, known as the Book of Fermoy, written for the Roaches of Fermoy during the second half of the fifteenth century; and lastly London, British Library, Egerton 1781, written in Breifne, which was introduced above and also contains GM.

Listing these manuscripts, their texts and their locations offers a glimpse into a milieu current in late fifteenth-century Ireland that was fascinated by texts concerning the Far East and tales of the wars between Christians and Saracens. An understanding of cultural context in which these translations and adaptations were generated would be significantly improved by a more precise examination of the relationship between the various manuscripts of GM and GSM, and regarding GSM in particular, its precise relationship with Stair Fortibrais, the fifteenth-century Irish translation of the Hiberno-Latin text Gesta Karoli Magni. This chapter has shown that IMP, like GM and GSM, was translated from a manuscript of English origin which contained a version of P belonging to subgroup δ. Following is a photograph of f. 191r of the Glasgow manuscript, containing the beginning of P, subgroup δ. This chapter has shown that this manuscript contains the copy of P which is closest to IMP:

---

911 Hyde, Gabháltus, x-xi.
912 Flower, Catalogue ii, 505-519.
913 Copeland, From Fierabras, 1.
914 I am especially grateful to the Special Collections Department of the University of Glasgow for their assistance while I consulted this manuscript in January 2017 and for their generosity with this image.
Parkes dated the Glasgow manuscript to the last decade of the fourteenth century, judging from ‘the decoration of large initials’, whereas Dutschke suggests a slightly later date, sometime during the early-fifteenth century.\(^{915}\) It was written by a scribe who signed himself on folio 126 as *Ricardus plenus amoris Frampton*, or Richard Frampton.\(^{916}\) Frampton (fl. 1390-1420)\(^{917}\) was a professional scribe who wrote a number of manuscripts for members of the English ruling class during the early fifteenth century. His work was commissioned by the likes of John Holme, whose son became Baron of the Exchequer between 1446-1459, and John Leventhorp, Receiver General of the Duchy of Lancaster, who commissioned Frampton to make a transcript of the Great Cowchers, i.e. cartularies, relating to the Duchy for Henry IV.\(^{918}\) Parkes has further argued that Frampton must have been working in Leventhorp’s office in Westminster during his employment by the Crown, where he annotated the original copies of the Cowchers.\(^{919}\) It is not known who commissioned the Glasgow manuscript, however a donation note on folio 126 indicates that the manuscript was owned and given away by John Stafford after 1432, while he was chancellor of England and bishop of Wells, but before 1443, when he became archbishop of Canterbury.\(^{920}\) Also in the hand of Frampton is Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.14,\(^{921}\) which Parkes has suggested was written some years prior to the Glasgow manuscript.\(^{922}\) Amongst the contents of this manuscript are *Historia destructionis Troiae* and *Liber Magni Alexandri*, both in Frampton’s hand, which are also found in the Glasgow manuscript. I am not aware of any study which compares the copies of these texts in the Cambridge and Glasgow manuscripts, however if they derive from the same source, it may be suggested that Frampton had access to the same library during the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries, from which he copied material for his clients, and in which there may have been a manuscript containing a copy of \(P\) belonging to group \(\delta\) of the English branch, which Frampton used as his source for the Glasgow manuscript. Parkes’ observations regarding the location of Frampton during the early-fifteenth century may indicate that this library was in London.

With regard to the miscellany of texts which the Glasgow manuscript displays, Dutschke noted that:

\(^{915}\) Parkes, ‘Frampton’, 117; Dutschke, *Pipino*, 610.
\(^{917}\) Parkes, ‘Frampton’, 113.
\(^{918}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 613-14; Parkes, ‘Frampton’, 122.
\(^{919}\) Parkes, *Their Hands*, 51.
\(^{920}\) Dutschke, *Pipino*, 614.
\(^{922}\) Parkes, ‘Frampton’, 117.
The texts of the manuscript appear to fall somewhat outside the normal range for a Marco Polo of the Pipino translation: while Odoric, and to a contemporary reader, possibly even Mandeville could qualify as accounts of actual events, the stories of Troy, of Alexander the Great and of Charlemagne must have had the haze of legend. In the present company, then, even Marco Polo should probably be taken as a pleasureful account, an adventure in faraway lands rather than as a straightforward source of information.\textsuperscript{923}

This observation may also be made in regard to the perception and purpose of IMP, and may help to clarify the manner in which the Irish translator was approaching his exemplar, explaining why the factual and precise information contained in P and valued by many of its readers across Europe, took second place in the eyes of the translator, and was often modified in favour of a simpler or more entertaining version of events, conforming to what Jauss has called the ‘horizon of expectation’ of Medieval audiences.\textsuperscript{924}

IMP is not a direct descendent of either the Glasgow or the Giessen manuscripts, however this chapter has shown that manuscripts of group $\delta$ are the closest surviving relatives of the exemplar used to translate IMP. Group $\delta$ is a subgroup of manuscripts which preserves a unique version of P that was most common in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century England. The approximate date of the Glasgow manuscript and of Richard Frampton’s period of activity sets a \textit{terminus} before which the base manuscript of $\delta$ was written to around 1400-1425. Perhaps one of the most interesting consequences of the study of the Latin manuscripts of P are the parallels between the literary and historical interests of whoever commissioned the Glasgow manuscript in England and the cultural milieu that produced IMP, GSM and GM during the second half of the fifteenth century in Ireland.

Below, is the \textit{stemma codicum} of the ‘fidelissimi’ group, based on the research presented in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{923} Dutschke, \textit{Pipino}, 612-13.  
\textsuperscript{924} Jauss, ‘The Alterity’, p. 182.
CHAPTER IV

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF IMP

The previous chapter has already discussed some of the textual differences between IMP and P, and offered an interpretation of how these may have come about. In particular, it focussed on the fact that IMP shares readings with a number of English manuscripts of P, and that several differences between IMP and P were due to scribal mistakes in the translator’s Latin exemplar. This chapter will focus on the innovations of IMP with respect to P, which are more likely to have been made by the Irish translator, and will offer possible explanations of and sources for these modifications. It will begin with an overview of how the Irish translator summarised the content of P, illustrating those parts of the text which he considered to be more important and the chapters he chose to omit. This will be followed by an analysis of some of the principal divergences from P found in IMP. The chapter will conclude with an examination of a number of secondary variations in the adaptation which indicate that the Irish author was influenced by a number of texts other than P. Such an analysis is important for determining the objectives and priorities of the Irish author, and ultimately for understanding the motivations behind the Irish translation of the Travels. The origins of these motivations may be located in contemporary Cairbre history which parallel elements in the narrative, and which permit us to offer a tentative date for the composition of IMP and to suggest candidates for its authorship.

1. Overview of differences between IMP and P and the reduction of IMP

To understand how IMP relates to P, and in order to provide an overview of the manner in which P was being abridged and translated in IMP, this chapter will begin with the analysis of data based on word counts. Such an analysis will show that the author of IMP was giving particular areas of his translation more attention than others.

IMP is an abbreviated version of the Travels, and is a great deal shorter than P. This may be observed by making several simple calculations based on the word count
of P and IMP. In order for these calculations to be accurate, the final five chapters of P have been removed from the word count, because, assuming they were translated in IMP, they are now missing due to loss of folios at the end of the text. Similarly, the prologue and account of the journey of Matteo and Nicolò Polo, which covers the first ten chapters of the first book of P, have been omitted from the word count of P, because this part is incomplete in IMP due to loss of folios at the beginning of the text. Therefore, the word count in P from the beginning of I.11 *Descripcio Orientalium Regionum et Primo De Minori Armenia* to the end of III.44 *De Quodam Episcopo Christiano Quem Soldanus Aden Circumcidi Fecit*, is 39,293. The word count of the respective part of IMP, i.e. from Stokes’s chapter ¶3 to ¶191, is 13,812. Thus, even taking into account that we are comparing word-counts in two different languages, it remains significant that when the volume of this part of IMP is compared to the corresponding part in P, IMP is revealed to be just over a third the size of P, or 35%.

Despite this reduction in volume of the text, the Irish author was able to maintain the proportion between the three books of P. The first book of P spans 30% of the text, and in IMP it likewise comprises 29%. The second book comprises 46% of P, while the percentage for IMP is 47%. The third book comprises 24% of both P and IMP.\(^{925}\) These calculations are represented in the following chart, which displays the volume of IMP next to that of P, with the corresponding book divisions:

\[^{925}\] P I.11 = 11715 (30% of P) / IMP I = 4028 (29% of IMP).
P II = 18230 (46% of P) / IMP II = 6543 (47% of IMP).
P III – III.44 = 9347 (24%) / IMP III = 3242 (24% of IMP).
Although the proportions of the books in P are maintained in IMP overall, their content has been significantly rearranged and edited. In fact, many of the chapters of P were skipped or edited out of IMP, whereas others were expanded. For example, the episode which deals with the rebellion of Naim and Cadau against Cublay comprises only 3% of P, whereas in IMP it takes up 8% of the text. Similarly, the account of the city of Cambalu comprises 4% of P, but 7% of IMP. On the other hand, the Irish author systematically skipped entire chapters of P, often placing regions alongside each other in IMP that are instead distant from one another in P, ignoring the vast geographical areas which lie in between. This suggests that the Irish author was less interested in transmitting the geographical accuracy of P in IMP, than he was in the accounts of Cublay Khan’s wars and in the descriptions of the palaces in the Far East, which he remodelled in order to suit the expectations and curiosities of his audience.

In order to display the Irish author’s systematic approach to translating and abridging the content of P, the following chapter list of the first book of P, from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana MS 983, contrasts the chapters which were translated and those which were omitted in IMP. Those chapters containing information that was translated in IMP have been highlighted, whereas the chapters

---

926 See below: 1053 words in IMP ¶54-66 (7.62%) = approx 8% of entire IMP; 1295 words in P II.1-7 (3.3%) = approx 3% of P.
that were skipped by the Irish author have been left in normal format. As stated above, the prologue and the first ten chapters of the first book of P have been omitted from the following example because they do not survive in IMP, due to loss of folios.⁹²⁷

XI. Descripcio orientalium regionum et primo de Minori Armenia.
XII. De provincia Turchie.
XIII. De Armenia Maiori.
XIV. De provincia Çorçanie.
XV. De regno Mosul.
XVI. De civitate Baldachi.
XVII. De civitate Taurisii.
XVIII. De miraculo transalicionis cuiusdam montis in regione illa.
XIX. De regione Persarum.
XX. De civitate Iasdi.
XXI. De civitate Cremam.
XXII. De civitate Camandu et regione Theobarle.
XXIII. De campestribus formosa et civitate Cormos et Creman.
XXIV. De intermedia regione inter civitatem Cormos et Crerman.
XXV. De regione que media est inter Creman et civitatem Cobinam.
XXVI. De civitate Cobinam.
XXVII. De regno Thumochayn et arbore solis, qui vulgariter a latinis dicitur Arbor Sicca.
XXVIII. De tiranno qui dicebatur Senex de Montanis et siccariis seu assessinis eius.
XXIX. De morte eius et destructione loci eius.
XXX. De civitate Sopurgan et terminis eius.
XXXI. De civitate Balach.
XXXII. De castro Taycam et terminis eius.
XXXIII. De civitate Seassen.
XXXIV. De provincia Balascie.
XXXV. De provincia Bascie.
XXXVI. De provincia Chesumur.
XXXVII. De provincia Vocam et montibus altissimis.

⁹²⁷ Although IMP does translate part of the prologue of P, it will be argued below that most of it has been lost due to loss of folios at the beginning of the text.
XXXVIII. De provincia Cascar.

XXXIX. De civitate Samarcha et miraculo columnae facta in ecclesia beati Iohannis Baptiste.

XL. De provincia Carchan.

XLI. De provincia Coram.

XLII. De provincia Peum.

XLIII. De provincia Ciarchiam.

XLIV. De civitate Lop et deserto maximo.

XLV. De civitate Sachion et ritu paganorum in combustione mortuorum.

XLVI. De provincia Chamul.

XLVII. De provincia Chynchyntalas.

XLVIII. De provincia Siccuir.

XLIX. De provincia Campicion.

L. De civitate Ezina et alio deserto magno.

LI. De civitate Carochoram et inicio dominii Tartarorum.

LII. De primo rege Tartarorum Chychis et discordia eius cum rege suo.

LIII. De conflictu Tartarorum cum rege illo et victoria ipsorum.

LIV. Cathalogus regum Tartarorum et qualiter illorum regum corpora sepeliuntur in monte Alchay.

LV. De generalibus consuetudinibus et moribus Tartarorum.

LVI. De armis et vestibus ipsorum.

LVII. De cibis comunibus Tartarorum.

LVIII. De ydolatria et erroribus eorum.

LIX. De strenuitate, industria et fortitudine Tartarorum.

LX. De ordine exercitus Tartarorum et sagacitate belli.

LXI. De iudiciis et iustitia eorum.

LXII. De campestribus Bargu et de extremis insulis aquilonis.

LXIII. De regno Ergimul et civitate Sangui.

LXIV. De provincia Egregia.

LXV. De provincia Tenduch et Gog et Magog, et civitate Ciangamor.

LXVI. De civitate Ciandau et nemore regali quod est iuxta eam et quibusdam festivitatibus Tartarorum et magorum illusionibus.

LXVII. De monachis quibusdam ydolatris.
This list shows that a total of nineteen chapters from the first book of P were omitted entirely in IMP. Furthermore, most of the chapters highlighted above were translated only partially, much of their information being condensed into a few lines or a few words. Examples include the translation of chapter I.15 *De regno Mosul* of P, which in IMP amounts to ¶6 *fil crich n-aili innti, rigi Musul iside 7 do Macametus adrait*, or the translation of chapter I.19 *De regione Persarum* of P, which in IMP amounts to ¶9 *Cricha na Perfida immorro, don teinid adrait. Crich forlethan isidhe cu n-ocht righuib fuirri. Eich amhra le, dá cét punt for each n-eoch*. These examples are further indication that the author of IMP was less interested in listing the names of distant lands and describing their most noteworthy features, which is one of the primary functions of P, than he was in adapting the accounts of the battles of the Tartars and in describing the layout of their castles and palaces.

It is possible that this reduction in size and content of the *Travels* in IMP was not made by the Irish author but by the author of his exemplar.928 Regarding this possibility an analogy may be made with *Stair Foftibráisi*, a fifteenth-century Irish translation of the Hiberno-Latin text *Gesta Karoli Magni*,929 which itself is an abridgement of the French epic poem *Chanson de Fierabras*. It is impossible to disprove that IMP was based on an already abridged, and now lost, version of P, however it has been shown in Chapter III that none of the surviving Latin abridgements of P were the source of IMP. There are also a number of variations in IMP that are distinctly Irish in flavour, such as the expansion of action sequences and the incorporation of the Medieval Irish *cath* style.930 This indicates that even if the Irish author was working from an abridgement of P, he was rewriting and reinventing parts of the text with a distinctly Irish flair.

The shift in focus to the more entertaining parts of the *Travels* has been alluded to in Chapter II in the discussion of narrative styles, which argued how certain sections of IMP have been accentuated in the text by the change from a terse, concise and succinct prose to a more fluid and prolix narrative which, in the instance of the battle between Cublay and his relatives, descends into the alliterative and bombastic style of the Medieval Irish *cath*. The reluctance of the author of IMP to translate

---

928 This has been alluded to in Chapter III: IMP and the Latin Abridgements of P.
929 Copeland, *From Fierabras*, I.
930 See Chapter II.
chapter after chapter describing yet more regions in the Far East is made explicit in the third book of IMP, in which he writes:

Righi Cumar 7 righi Melibar 7 righi Gusurach 7 righe Caria 7 righi Cambaech 7 righe Semanach 7 righe Osmacoram, don India moir iat-sumh 7 immat righi immale friu 7 ro badh scith tenga fria tuarascbail do tabairt.\textsuperscript{931}

With this paragraph, the author of IMP condenses four chapters of P. In fact, whereas in P a chapter is dedicated to each of the kingdoms of Cumar, Melibar and Gusurach, namely at III.32, III.34 and III.35, the kingdom of Ely, which is described in chapter III.33 in P, is not mentioned at all in IMP. The source of the Irish author’s, \textit{ro badh scith tenga fria tuarascbail do thabhairt}, is found in chapter III.36, in which Pipino explains that he will not describe the regions of Thana, Cambaeth, Semenath and Resmacoram, in order to avoid ‘excessive prolixity’ in his book:

[1] Post hoc pervenitur per mare \textit{Thana, Cambaeth, Semenath} \textit{et Resmacoram} ad occidentalem plagam; in quibus regnis mercaciones maxime fiunt, unumquotque horum regnorum regem proprium habet et proprium ydeoma et sunt in Yndia Maior. [2] \textit{Non sunt ibi alia, que in nostro libro judicaverim describenda; de Maiori autem Yndia non scripsi, nisi de terris et regnis que mari adiacent, vel de insulis quibusdam que in illo mari sunt, quia terras scribere que in Yndia sunt infra terram laboriosum esset valde et adderetur libro nostro prolixitas nimia}.\textsuperscript{932}

A comparison of these sections of IMP and P suggests that the Irish author took advantage of Pipino’s own reluctance to describe the regions of India Maior and its islands, deciding to add instead a number of other kingdoms to Pipino’s list. Thus,

\textsuperscript{931} Stokes, ‘Gaelic abridgement’, 420, ¶181; 131rb25-30.
\textsuperscript{932} P III.36: ‘After this, by sea one reaches Thana, Cambaeth, Semenath, and Resmacoram on the western side; in which kingdoms, the most transactions are made. Each of these kingdoms has their own king and language and they are all part of India Maior. [2] Here there are no others, which in our book I would choose to describe; of India Maior in fact I have not written, nor of the lands and kingdoms which are adjacent to the sea, nor indeed of those islands which are in that sea, because it would be laborious to write of the lands which are in the land of India, and it would add an excessive prolixity to our book.’
righti Cumar 7 righti Melibar 7 righti Gusurach are added to the list of kingdoms which
the Irish author admits to having shortened in his adaptation in order to avoid
exhausting the tongue, ro badh scíth tenga. These words, combined with the manner
in which the content from P III.32-III.36 is abbreviated in IMP, may be interpreted as
a comment by the Irish author on the toil of translating information about an
interminable list of eastern territories.

On the other hand, several episodes of the Travels are given considerably
more attention in IMP than they are in P. In many cases, the information that they
translate has been reordered significantly, as well as expanded. In fact, the Irish
author was cutting certain parts of the Travels from his translation while expanding
others, resulting in the three books maintaining more or less the same proportions to
each other in IMP as they do in P. Some of the most noteworthy and interesting of
these expansions are found in the treatment of the second book of P.

2. IMP’s expansions in Book II

The first twenty-five or so chapters of the second book of P are not concerned with
the geography of the Far East, rather they give an account of Cublay Khan’s war
against his relatives and a description of his palace, his hunting practices and the
customs and celebrations at his court. This section of P is adapted much more
attentively in IMP, so that the first twenty-three chapters of the second book are all
translated by the Irish author. This approach to the second book of P is significantly
different to that of the first book, discussed above, in which the author skips entire
chapters and large portions of P in the adaptation, in particular regarding the
geographical layout of the East.

In the first twenty-three chapters of Book II, however, there are two accounts
in P which have been given particular attention in IMP, and a comparison of the two
texts reveals that the Irish author put considerable effort into rearranging the material
of P into a new order for IMP. The first of these episodes describes the rebellion of
Cublay’s uncle Naim and cousin Cadau. By calculating the proportions of the
paragraphs of P and IMP which contain the rebellion of Naim and Cadau to the rest of

933 Stokes paragraphs ¶54-96.
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the text, it is possible to envisage the extent of the Irish author’s reworking of P at this point in the text. In fact, while the rebellion comprises only 3% of P, it takes up 8% of IMP. The second episode which has been expanded significantly in IMP is the account of the city of Cambalu, and of Cublay’s palace therein, which comprises 4% of P, but 7% of IMP. For these sections of IMP, the author has not made a straightforward translation, rather he has rewritten and remodelled the structure of the text to suit his own needs in IMP. An analysis of the manner in which the Irish author was rewriting these sections of P as well as translating them in IMP is offered in the following paragraphs.

2.1. Rebellion of Naim and Cadau

The second book of P and of IMP opens with the description of a rebellion against Cublay Khan, initiated by Nayam (Naim in IMP), an uncle of Cublay, and Caydu (Cadau in IMP), a cousin of Cublay. It has been argued in Chapter II that the use of the alliterative and bombastic narrative style of the Medieval Irish *cath* accentuates this section of the text in IMP, however there are also other indications that this part of IMP was given particularly close attention. For example, the account of the rebellion is given between paragraphs ¶54 and ¶66 of IMP, which amounts to approximately 8% of the entire text. On the other hand, the same episode is told between chapters II.1 and II.7 in P, which amounts to approximately 3% of the text. Therefore, the episode has been expanded by about 5% in IMP, the greatest of such expansions in the adaptation. Furthermore, a comparison with its source reveals that the section has undergone an enormous amount of rearrangement, indicating perhaps that the Irish author was attempting to improve the narrative flow of his work after noticing flaws in the structure of P. For example, while Pipino repeats the description of Cublay Khan’s appearance in II.1 and II.8, the Irish author gathers all this information in ¶55.

Below is my transcription of the beginning of the second book of IMP, which corresponds to Stokes’s paragraphs ¶54 and ¶55. Simion’s transcription of P from

---

934 1053 words in IMP ¶54-66 (7.62%) = approx 8% of entire IMP; 1295 words in P II.1-7 (3.3%) = approx 3% of P.
Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 983, is displayed in the footnotes, and shows how information contained in chapters one, two, three, four, five and eight, has been rearranged in the composition of this section of IMP.

Feachtus do Mhagnus Cam a cathair Cambalau con fhacad teaghta dia shaighit. Beamnuighit dò. Fochtus Maghnuin scela dibh. ‘Fuigli ruin againn duit,’ ar na teaghta. Adre Maghnuin as in tsuidhí rigda i mbui co ndeuchsat for leth. ‘Naim’ ol na teaghta ‘i. brathair hatharsa’ ar ndiultadh umla righi duiti. Do roíne 7 Cadau .i. mac a brathar aenta at aghaidhṣi.936 Atat 7 na cethri righ fil fo manus Naim lin a sluaigh ac toigheacht at rigisi .i. Fuci Orca 7 Cailu 7 Barsceel 7 Suchitingni937 7 asbert conad fearr a ndlíghedh forsin righi annaisi.’ Ba tus rigi do Chublay in tan sin938 iar mbriseadh cath n-imdiha lais for iltíribh.939 Ba gaeth in ti fris ar canad sin.940 Gnus rigda lais co n-dercuibh dishoillsidhe.941 Méd 7 calmacht mhílèd lais.942 Do oirdis a bhaill diaraill.943 Róraidh dono nach cuirfeadh a choruín rig dia chind no gu n-aitheadh forro in fuigiul sin.944 Faidhís teaghta for ceann a laech 7 a rig n-imfhoicsi ar ba derb las dia cuireadh togaírm for a shloghu i cianuibh a thís dhífhagbail do Naim 7 triall teitheadh do fo thóiritb 7 daingníbh.945 Faidhís coinmhead ar na conairibh

935 P.II.2.1: patruis eius quidam nomine Naiam etatis annorum .XXX., qui multis regionibus et populis prererat, cogitavit, iuvenili vanitate commotus, contra dominum suum Cublay insurgere subito cum exercito maximo.
936 P.II.2.1: ad hoc autem requisivit regem nomine Caydu, qui nepos erat Cublay regis sed ipsum exosum habebat.
937 P.II.5.2: quatuor igitur provincias tunc obtinuit rex, quarum ista sunt nomina: Fuciorcia, Cailu, Bascol et Sichintin.
938 P.II.1.2: cepit autem regnare anno domini nostri Iesu Christi .MCCLVI.: P.II.2.1: Causa autem hec est propter quam semel ex quo regnavit egressus est ad pudnam: anno Domini .MCCLXXXVI.
939 P.II.1.3: ...nam ante quam regni coronam acciperit, sepe egrediebatur ad bella et in omnibus probiter se gerebat.
940 P.II.2.3: ...concilio pollens et in exercitum ac populi gubernacione providus ac discretus...
941 P.II.8.1: ... faciem habet rubicundam et candidam, oculos nigros...
942 P.II.2.3: Est autem in armis strenuus, virtute robustus.
943 P.II.8.1: ... atque per singula corporis sui membra proporcionis est optime.
944 P.II.3.1: ... iuravit se numquam coronam regiam delaturum nisi de illorum provicione et audacia se vindicare.
945 P.II.3.2: In viginti autem duobus diebus congregavit ... millium et peditum ... de his qui erant vicini civitati Cambalau; causa autem hec fuit quare non convocavit maiorem exercitum: quia subito voluit in hostes ex insperato irrueere, ne si diutius fuisse in congregacione amplioris exercitus immoratus ad Nayam noticiam pervenisset et ex hoc aut retrocessisset omnino aut ad tutiora loca suum exercitum transtulisset.
ar omun scel dfhagbhail do Naim.\textsuperscript{946} Ba he lin in tshaigh do freagair he .i. da chath dhég 7 .xxx. mile marbach in cech cath dibh\textsuperscript{947} 7 di troightech um cech marbach.\textsuperscript{948} Dia toghairmeadh a shloghú i cianaibh ni ria rimh forro.\textsuperscript{949} Ro h-indleadh ceithri helifainti don righ 7 caislen clariug forro.\textsuperscript{950} Teit ann dono i remtus in chatha 7 a meirgi huasa.\textsuperscript{951} Di la for fiichit do oc tinol in morsluaigh sin.\textsuperscript{952} (124ra15-rb1).

2.1.1. Textual analysis

One of the most striking differences between this section of IMP and its corresponding chapters in P is the opening scene in Cublay’s court, with the arrival of messengers announcing to the Khan that his uncle, Naim, is marching towards him in open rebellion. This is not present in P, and is an innovation of the Irish author. In fact, P only mentions that Cublay had become aware of the rebellion: \textit{interea Cublay rex cuncta didicit que per illos fuerant ordinata}.\textsuperscript{953} The Irish author employed dialogue and direct speech to portray this scene, rewriting the episode using a more linear narrative, creating suspense and anticipation for the battle that follows. Similarly, the introduction of the other kings who are fighting for Naim is brought forward to the beginning of the episode in IMP, whereas in P these are named in chapter five, after the battle is won by Cublay, and Nayam has been put to death. Likewise, the physical description of Cublay in IMP is brought forward from chapter eight in P, a chapter which has nothing to do with the battle itself and is dedicated to

\textsuperscript{946} P.II.3.3: Interim autem mandavit rex vias tanta diligentia custodiri ut Naiam preperacionem et adventum ipsius omnino presentire non posset.
\textsuperscript{947} P.II.4.2: Cublay rex ascendit in collem cunctosque sui exercitus milites distinxit in .XII. acies, ita ut quelibet acies triginta millia militum contineret. However, the translation \textit{marbach} derives from P.II.3.2: trecenta et .LX. millia millitum et peditum centum millia; which in Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, representative of group δ reads: .iii.a lx.a militum \textit{equitum} et peditum milia.
\textsuperscript{948} P.II.4.2: pedites vero iuxta milites tali ordine collocavit ut in quibusdam aciebus duo pedites tenentes lanceas hinc inde ad unius militis latera ponerentur donec peditum numerus completur.
\textsuperscript{949} P.II.3.2: nam tantam posset militiam et peditum multitudinem in paucis mensibus congregare quod, pre stupore gentis innumere, quasi incredibile videretur.
\textsuperscript{950} P.II.4.3: Rex autem in mirabili castro ligneo erat, quod ab elephantibus quatuor portabatur, ubi erat suum regale vexillum.
\textsuperscript{951} P.II.4.4: Cum vidisset autem exercitus Naiam insignia et exercitum Cublay vehementer expavit
\textsuperscript{952} P.II.3.2: in viginti autem duobus diebus congregavit.
\textsuperscript{953} P. II.3.1: ‘In the meantime, Cublay learned of the all the things that had been ordered by them (Nayam and Caydu).’
the appearance of the Khan and his family, entitled: *De forma Cublay regis et de uxoribus et filiis et ancillis.* By concentrating the descriptions of Cublay’s appearance and Naim’s generals in the opening section of the episode, and by introducing direct speech, the author creates more anticipation for the battle than is found in P. While there is also a build up towards the battle in Pipino’s account, the Irish author was able to rearrange and exploit the information of his base text to create even more suspense before the battle by the introduction of these narrative techniques.

The perception that the war between Naim and Cublay occurred at the beginning of Cublay’s reign in IMP, *ha tus rigi do Chublay in tan sin,* is probably due to a scribal error in manuscripts of group δ, shown in Chapter III of the present study to be the group of manuscripts to which the Latin exemplar of IMP belonged. In the second chapter of the second book, Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218 contains the scribal error MCCLX instead of MCCLXXXVI of other manuscripts, setting the date of the beginning of the rebellion to only four years after the beginning of Cublay’s reign, which is given in the previous chapter as MCCLVI. Therefore, setting this battle at the beginning of Cublay’s reign is probably not an innovation of the Irish author, but rather a consequence of the inaccuracies of his exemplar.

Similarly, the translation *marcach in da chath dhég 7 .xxx. mile marcach in cech cath dibh,* derives from a variant in manuscripts of the English branch, which in the third chapter of the second book contain the variant *ccc et lx milia militum equitum.* However, the translation of the organisation of Cublay’s army into twelve
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954 II.8.
955 A similar corruption is also present in other manuscripts of the β/γ group, such as Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f. 77r, which reads MMCLXXX, and Oxford, Merton College, 312, f. 20vb, which reads: MMCLXXX. On the other hand, Princeton, University Library, Garret 157, f. 20r, contains the original MMCLXXXVI, as does Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College, 162/83, f.47r, which reads 1286. It is likely that a first mistake was made by the copyist of the base manuscript, namely the omission of VI from MMCLXXXVI, and that a further mistake was made by the copyist of the base manuscript of group δ, namely the omission of XX from MMCLXXX.
956 I only became aware of this scribal error in group δ after consulting Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum T.4.1 [84], and am therefore unable to confirm that it is also present in that manuscript. However, the similarity between the two manuscripts in other readings suggests that this may well be the case.
957 Giessen, Universitätsbibliothek 218, f. 82ra, representative of group δ reads: *iii.a lx.a militum equitum.* For the β/γ group: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 4° 70, f.77r: *ccc et lx milia militiae equitum,* and Oxford, Merton College, 312, f. 21ra: *ccc et lx milia militiae equitum.* For other manuscripts of the English branch, namely the ‘bellare’ group: Princeton, University Library, Garret 157, f. 20r: *trecsentia clx milia equitum,* and Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College, 162/83, f. 47v: 300 et 60 milia equitum. Cf. also the
battalions, *ba he lin in tslúaigh do freagair he i. da chath dhég 7 .xxx. mile marcach in cech cath dibh*, derives from chapter four of the second book, which in Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, reads: *distinxit in .XII. acies, ita ut quelibet acies triginta millia militum contineret*. None of the manuscripts of the English branch, which I have been able to consult for this reading, contain the scribal error *eques* at this point, suggesting that the Irish author condensed the two descriptions of Cublay’s army found in the third and in the fourth chapter into one description in IMP, and in doing so, translated the scribal error *militum equitum*, from the third chapter of the English branch, into *marcach* in IMP.

### 2.1.2. Contemporary significance

An examination of the footnotes to the extract above shows how IMP is a free reinterpretation of P at this point in the text, rather than a word-for-word translation. It has been mentioned above that this episode was expanded significantly in IMP, comprising 3% of P, but 8% of IMP. The motivation behind the reworking of this episode may be that the rebellion of Naim and Cadau against Cublay offered parallels to the wars in late-fifteenth century Munster, specifically to the usurping of the Uí Chairbre kingship from Diarmaid an Dúnaidh Mac Carthaigh Riabhach by his nephew Cormac Mac Carthaigh Riabhach in 1468, and the retaking of the kingship from Cormac by Diarmaid an Dúnaidh’s son Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, patron of the Book of Lismore, in 1477. The following family tree displays the family relationships between these warring factions within the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family during the late-fifteenth century.
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960 These are taken from Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 96-101; Ó Cuív, ‘A Fragment’, 82-96. Domhnall Mac Carthaigh (†1468), Fínghean’s brother, is mentioned in the Carew fragment edited by Ó Cuív. See also the genealogy of Mac Carthaigh Riabhach in *New History of Ireland* IX, 157; and for a general account of the lordship of Mac Carthaigh Riabhach see Butler, *Gleanings*, 157-94.
Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, to whom the poem *Ní théd an éigean a n-aigíde* in the Book of Lismore is dedicated, was the son of Diarmaid an Dúnaidh Mac Carthaigh Riabhach and Aibhilín inion Taidhg Mhic Chárthaigh Mhúscraighe. He was married to Caitilín Fitzgerald, daughter of Tomas Fitzgerald, Earl of Desmond (†1468). Fínghean’s paternal cousin, Cormac mac Donnchaidh Mhic Chárthaigh Riabhach, took the Mac Carthaigh Cairbreach kingship from his father, Diarmaid an Dúnaidh, during the wars which ensued after Tomas Fitzgerald, 7th Earl of Desmond, was beheaded by the Earl of Worcester on 14 February 1468 in Drogheda. After the Earl’s death, Tomas Fitzgerald’s brother, Gearóid Fitzgerald, attempted to succeed to the Earldom of Desmond, and formed an alliance with Cormac Mac Donnchaidh Mhic Chárthaigh Riabhach. Together they campaigned against Diarmaid an Dúnaidh in 1468, *ó Glaislinn go Ros*, i.e from the Bandon estuary to Ros Ó gCairbre, in the heart of the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach lands, overthrowing Diarmaid and capturing key Mac Carthaigh Riabhach castles in Kilgobbin, on the banks of the Bandon east of Kilbrittain, in Monteen, west of Kilbrittain, and in Coolmain, south of Kilbrittain, effectively encircling the territories of the primary Mac Carthaigh Riabhach sept. Cormac also took two of Diarmaid’s sons hostage, Fínghean and Diarmaid. Gearóid Fitzgerald’s campaign against his nephew, Séamas son of the late Tomas Fitzgerald, was not as successful as Cormac Mac Carthaigh Riabhach’s upheaval against his relatives, as Murchadh Ó Briain King of Thomond, Tadhg Mac Carthaigh Mór and Seán mac Uilliam De Barra all came out in support of Seamas’ claim to the Earldom. This arrangement appears to have lasted until 1477, when Fínghean and his brother, who had been hostages of their cousin, managed to capture Cormac mac Donnchaidh Mheic Chárthaigh Riabhaigh, with the help of their maternal uncle, Cormac Láidir Mac Carthaigh Múscraighe, after which, in 1478, Cormac mac
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962 Ó Cuív, ‘A Fragment’, 86.
963 Ó Murchadha, ‘Glaislinn’, 113
965 Ó Cuív, ‘A Fragment’, 93. NB: in the fragment of Irish Annals edited and translated by Ó Cuív, Finghean’s brother is called Donnchadh. However, in the Annals of the Four Masters, Finghean’s brother, who succeeds him as Mac Carthaigh Cairpreach for one year after his death, between 1505 and 1506, is named Diarmaid: AFM: 1506.12: *Mag Carthaigh Cairbreach i. Diarmaid mac Diarmaita an Dúnaidh mic Domhnall Riabhgh d’écc*. It has been suggested to me by Kenneth Nicholls, that the fragment analysed by Ó Cuív is an extract from the lost annals of Domhnall Ó Fítcheallaigh (‘Donald Ó Fihely’), cf. Nicholls, ‘The Development’, 202, n. 111. In the early-eighteenth century genealogy of the Mac Carthaigh family, this brother is named Diarmaid, cf. Lainé, *Généalogie*, 83-84.
Donnchaidh was blinded and deposed. Gearóid Fitzgerald was also killed in 1477, perhaps during the same course of events which saw the capture of Cormac mac Donnchaidh, his old ally in the wars of 1468. The Annals of Connacht and the Annals of the Four Masters (AFM) contain similar entries describing the onslaught and devastation which ensued in the southern half of Munster in 1477:

Coccadh Mumhan amach uile d’erget tresan n-gabháil-sin 7 an leth thes do mhilleadh uile eittir Ghallaibh 7 Gaoidhealaibh.

(Annála Connacht 1477.3)

Cocad Muman imach uile do erget trit sin cur milled uile etir Gall 7 Goidel in leith tes.

(AFM 1477.9)

This scenario shows how both Fínghean and Caitilín’s family had fought with close family members. In Fínghean’s case, his cousin Cormac Mac Donnchaidh, had been Fínghean’s captor for almost a decade and had taken the kingship of Uí Chairbre from his father, Diarmaid an Dúnaíd, by force in 1468. In Caitilín’s case, her paternal uncle Gearóid had attempted to take the Earldom of Desmond from her brother Seamas during the same conflict, and had been killed in the ensuing war in 1477. That this conflict was formative in Fínghean and Caitilín’s reign is commemorated by the poem beginning Ní théd an éigean a n-aígidh on folio 158 in the Book of Lismore, composed by Mathghamhain Ó Dalaigh.

The similarities between the injustices
suffered by Fínghean and his wife Caitilín from their respective families were apparent to Mathghamhain, who remarked upon them in verse 26 of his poem:

\[\text{26} \quad \text{Inann eachtra d’Iarla Mhumhan} \]
\[\text{‘s do Mhágh Carrthaigh nár chaill sídh:} \]
\[\text{nír áil ceachtar díbh ’na dúthaigh,} \]
\[\text{beantar a [d]tír dúthaigh díbh.}\]

Two verses later, the poet again highlights how Fínghean suffered at the hands of his family:

\[\text{28} \quad \text{Dá shlicht féin ag fulang ainbhreach} \]
\[\text{aimsear fhada dá fholt bhug;} \]
\[\text{gérbh umhla iná gach aen oile} \]
\[\text{nirbh umhla a [d]taebh toile thuc.}\]

Mathghamhain’s poem is primarily concerned with defending Fínghean’s retribution on his cousin and justifying the use of force to regain his father’s lands. The annal entries, quoted above for the year 1477, indicate that Fínghean’s victory over Cormac was the result of a devastating war, which saw the destruction of ‘the entire southern half of Munster’. In this context, the highly technical and legal language used in the poem, highlighted by Ó Cuív,\(^971\) serves the purpose of legitimising Fínghean’s bloody conquest, giving it an aura of authority and righteousness. Similarly, paralleling the injustices suffered by Fínghean and by Caitilín’s brother furthers the idea that they were blameless victims in the events of 1468 and 1477. The justice of Fínghean’s cause and his right to come into his inheritance by any means available to him is further asserted in a note which accompanies the poem on folio 150v. The author of considering whether this Eóghan Ó Dálaigh, who wrote for Fínghean’s grandfather, may have been the same Eóghan who is mentioned in the genealogy of Mathghamhan Ó Dálaigh in the accompanying note to his poem for Fínghean. Such a consideration is, of course, speculative in the absence of further evidence.

\(^969\) Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 105. ‘Identical is what happened to the Earl of Munster and to Mág Carrthaigh who lost not peace; nether of them was accepted in his own country; each was deprived of his own native territory.’

\(^970\) Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 106. ‘For a long time the smooth-haired one suffered injustice from his own kin; though he was more modest than anyone else he did not yield in the matter of will.’

\(^971\) Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 98.
this note, who is not necessarily Mathghamhain Ó Dálaigh himself, begins by explaining how Cormac mac Donnchaidh had committed an injustice:

Cuirimid ar ar son and so nach iad clanna Diarmada Még Carrthaigh do-chuaidh le égcóir ar Cormac Mág Carrthaigh, acht sé fén do dhul tar sinnseareacht do bhuaín a thighearnais dá shinnsir bráthar 7 nach dearnadh sin roimhe riabhachd don shinnsir d’éis a chéili acca gu n-uige sin. [...] 7 atá an laidh so thuas do-rinne Mathghamhain mac Domhnaill mhic Eoghain hDháluigh, duba comhthrom do Chormac Mág Carrthaigh, gá dhearbhudh gurab égcóir do-rinne Cormac ar Dhiarmuid Mág Carrthaigh do bhí ’na éndearbhráthair athar aigi 7 ’na chairdeas Crísd 7 ’na altroinn. 7 ar na hágbhuraibh sin do dhlígh Fínghean Mág Carrthaigh tighranas a athar do beannadh de go hégcóir do ghabháil cuigi gu cóir do bhreth Dé 7 a dhlíghidh.\textsuperscript{972}

This note highlights the close relationship between Cormac, Diarmuid an Dúnaidh and Fínghean, explaining that Diarmuid, who was the last remaining brother of Cormac’s father, na éndearbhráthair athar aigi,\textsuperscript{973} had also been a godfather, na chairdeas Crísd, and foster-father, na altroinn, to his nephew Cormac. One conclusion that may be drawn from this is that it is in the context of close family betrayals within the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family and the Fitzgerald family of Desmond, that the rebellion of Naim and Cadau was being rewritten and read in L. The dialogue scene at the beginning of the second book of IMP, set in Cublay’s court, which opens with the arrival of messengers announcing to the Khan that Naim, a brother of his father, brathar h-atharsa, was refusing to acknowledge his right to rule,

\textsuperscript{972} Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 109. ‘For our part we set down here that it was not the family of Diarmaid Mág Carthaigh that wrongly opposed Cormac Mág Carthaigh, but that he [Cormac] infringed the law of seniority and deprived his older kinsman of the lordship, although that had never been done before, for up till then all in turn had acknowledged the eldest. […] And the above poem which was composed by Mathghamhain son of Domhnall son of Eoghan Ó Dálaigh who was unbiased as regards Cormac, establishes that Cormac wronged Diarmaid who was a brother of his father, his godfather and foster-father. And for these reasons Fínghean Mág Carthaigh was entitled, according to the judgement of God and his law, to take over for himself his father’s lordship which was wrongly taken from him.’ L f. 158va.

\textsuperscript{973} I suggest that Ó Cuív’s translation of éndearbhráthair athar as ‘a brother of his father’, may be better rendered as ‘the only brother of his father’ or ‘the one remaining brother of his father’. The probable meaning of this use of én- (<aon->) is that Cormac’s father and other uncles had died by the time Cormac betrayed his father’s brother, i.e. Fínghean’s father, i.e. Diarmaid an Dúnaidh, and that Diarmaid was therefore the only uncle, éndearbhráthair athar, Cormac had left.
ar ndiultadh umla righi duitsi, and that along with a son of Naim’s brother, mac a brathar, he had formed an alliance against him, do roine ... aenta at aghaidhisi, must have sounded familiar to Fínghean and his family. If IMP was written at the same time as Mathghamhain’s poem, the rebellion of Cublay’s uncle and cousin, Naim and Cadau, against him may have been deliberately recrafted to mirror the struggles of Finghean against his cousin Cormac mac Donnchaidh, and the dynastic troubles of Caitilín’s brother, Séamas Fitzgerald, against their uncle Gearóid.

This parallel is not precise in terms of family relationships, in that Naim and Cadau are both related to Cublay through his side of the family, and not through his wife. Yet one does not have to look far in the family trees of fifteenth-century Irish nobility to find relatives at war with each other. A more general interpretation of the expansion of Naim’s rebellion in IMP is that the Irish author knew that his audience would recognise Cublay’s position of being besieged and betrayed by relatives, and that the circumstances of this war would resonate with them. If these parallels are correct, the vivid descriptions of the battles in the Far East between Cublay and his relatives in IMP would have been a stark reminder of the wars of 1477, which the Annals remember as terrible, and the poem in L is concerned with defending. If the author of IMP was working directly for Fínghean, as was Mathghamhain Ó Dálaigh, he may have decided to embellish the episode of Naim’s rebellion in his adaptation in order to maximise its potential as a complement to Fínghean’s triumph over his cousin Cormac, and the victory of Caitilín’s brother Séamas over his uncle Gearóid. If this interpretation is correct, then the date of the composition of IMP must have been very close to the date of the writing of L.

2.2. The City and Palace of Cambalu

Another section of IMP that has a larger proportion to the rest of the text in IMP than it does in P, is the description of the city of Cambalu, modern day Beijing, and of the Khan’s palace therein, found between chapters nine and thirteen of the second book of P, and broadly corresponding to the translated text between paragraphs ¶68

---

974 Yule, Travels, I:362-78.
and ¶83 of Stokes’s edition. This section comprises 4% of P, and 7% of IMP. Here again the Irish author adapted the text rearranging the content of P as he had done previously with the episode of the rebellion of Naim. For example, whereas Pipino begins by describing *de mirabili palatio eius* (Cublay) *quod est in Cambalu* in chapter nine, before moving onto *descripcio civitatis Cambalu* in chapter ten and *de suburbis et mercatoribus maximis civitatis Cambalu* in chapter eleven, the Irish author begins by describing the city of Cambalu and its suburbs, ¶68-¶71, and then recounts the details of Cublay’s palace therein, between ¶72 and ¶83.

The following table aligns the titles of chapters nine to thirteen of the second book of P with the beginning of their respective paragraphs in IMP. The paragraphs of IMP have been rearranged to match the order in which they are found in P. This illustrates the efforts of the Irish author to rearrange and rewrite this section of his adaptation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶72 Palas in righ i meadhon na cathrae sin. (II.9.2 and 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶77 . U. dhoirrsi toebh fria toebh. (II.9.3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶74 Sluaighthec ina meadon. Do marmuir rotocbhadh. (II.9.5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶75 SE .m. no bitis oc tocaithium. (II.9.5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶73 Dinna na ningen 7 na laech. (II.9.6-7).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶81 Fil tuluch ard allamuigh. (II.9.8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶83 Atbath chemchini 7 rofhacuibh macc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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975 P.II.9-13 = 1569 (4% of P) / IMP ¶68-¶83 = 954 (7% of IMP).
976 Except ¶82, which translates parts of P.II.8.4-6.
977 125rbz-vail.
978 125ra18-19.
979 125rb11.
980 125ra29.
981 125rb1.
982 125ra24.
983 125va4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(II.9.9).</th>
<th>¶68 Fil cathair naili la magnus cam.985 (II.10.1). ¶69 Batar .iii. cula forincathraig sin. 986 (II.10.2). ¶71 Ata clog romor fora lar. 987 (II.10.3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Descripcio civitatis Cambalu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶70 Ni deantar creic na cundrad.988 (II.11.3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. De suburbii et mercatoribus maximis civitatis Cambalu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶76 .iii. taisigh imchoimeta fair.989 (II.12.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Qualiter persona Magni Kaam magnifice custoditur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶78 No shuidheadh cublay inashuidhe righ.990 (II.13.1-2). ¶79 No bhidh tunna ordha amedhon an rightoighi.991 (II.13.4-8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. De magnificencia conviviorum eius.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above comparison of Stokes’s paragraph numbers in the left-hand column of the table above, and the number of the chapter and section of P which they translate, shows how the Irish author changed the order in which the information he translated from P appeared in IMP. For example, he started by translating section [3] in chapter ten of the second book, followed by sections [2] and [4] from chapter nine of the second book, followed by sections [6] and [7] from chapter nine, followed by section [5] from chapter nine, followed by section [2] from chapter twelve.992 This reshuffling of the order in which material from P is translated in IMP shows that the Irish author went to great lengths to rewrite this section of P, and was intentionally changing the manner of his translation, avoiding the more straightforward paraphrasing technique that he adopted for the geographical parts of the Travels, and choosing instead to rewrite and reimagine this part of the text. Below is a textual analysis of the manner in
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984 125va24-25. 
985 124vb29. 
986 124vb36. 
987 125va14. 
988 125ra4-5. 
989 125rb5-6. 
990 125rb15. 
991 125rb21-22. 
992 My transcription of these paragraphs of IMP and footnotes to the corresponding sections of P are discussed below under ‘Textual analysis’.
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which the Irish author adapted the chapters of P relating to the city and palace of Cambalu.

2.2.1. Textual analysis

In IMP, the author describes the bronze doors of Cambalu and the impregnable towers in which the Tartars keep their weapons:

\[
\text{Bat\,ar .iii. cula for in cathraigh sin .iii. mile for cech n-ae .iii.a dorus umhaidhi for cech ceathramhain di .iii. dind dithoghlaidhi for cech ndorus .iii. for cech cuil dibh gu ngriananuibh solusda gu halladhaibh righda is annsin dia cuirter a n-airm .iii. a n-eirdidh .ii. a n-eirridh uili dia taiscidh co huair chatha dhoibh.} \quad \text{993}
\]

In P however, the description of the city’s walls and towers is more specific and less embellished:

\[
\text{Habet etiam portas principales duodecim in qualibet scilicet quadratura tres et super singulas portas singula palatia sunt, et in omnibus murorum angulis similiter palatia sunt in quibus sunt aule plurime ubi servantur arma custodum civitatis illius.} \quad \text{994}
\]

In P there is no mention of the doors to the city being made of bronze, as in IMP’s \textit{umhaidhi}, or of the towers being impregnable, as in IMP’s \textit{dithoghlaidhi}. Similarly, P’s \textit{in quibus sunt aule plurime} is translated with \textit{gu ngriananuibh solusda gu halladhaibh righda}, which bears no resemblance to the Latin. These differences are not due to misreadings in the exemplar of IMP, nor are they found in any other versions of P discussed in Chapter II, rather they are deliberate expansions of the Irish author.

Similarly, the account of Cublay’s palace describes its regal halls and its sunlit balconies of pure marble, expanding significantly on the corresponding descriptions in P. In the following extract the descriptions in IMP which are not found in P, or in any of the other versions of P discussed in Chapter II, are in bold characters, allowing for a visualisation of the extent to which the author was embellishing his source text.

993 Transcription is my own from L ff. 124vb-125ra. Cf. Stokes ¶69.
994 P.II.10.2.
The corresponding sections of P are found in the footnotes. My transcription corresponds to Stokes, paragraphs ¶72-¶74:

Palas in righ i meadhon na cathraech sin. .iii. cula lais. Mile fod cech ae dibh.\textsuperscript{995} Istadh oirnimhitreach lasna .iii. riguib fil forro, \textit{cu halladhaibh rigda 7 cu ngriananaibh solusda do mharmair ghloin 7 tuir dhithoghlaidhi} fora muraibh ina taiscthe a cuaiach 7 a n-eascriai 7 a seotu aili.\textsuperscript{996} \textit{Dinna na n-inghena 7 na laech archena for sialait in dúnaidh}\textsuperscript{997} 7 lubhghuirt leasaighthe fria taebhuibh,\textsuperscript{998} \textit{cu topraibh taitneamhucha, cu fiadhmhilibh eceannuis}\textsuperscript{999} \textit{da gach mhonad for bith cu luibhibh ietha cacha teadhma}. Sluaightheach ina meadhon.\textsuperscript{1000} \textit{Do marmar ro tocbhadh}. Adbhul a fhod 7 a leithed. Niamh oir fa ir allastig 7 dia n-eachtair.\textsuperscript{1001} Do rinndadh fair beos do brechtadadh gacha datha imhaigi na cath 7 na congal do ratad is na hiltiribh sin\textsuperscript{1002} 7 \textit{fuath gach amhanna eceannus for bith, curbo dith amhairc do shuilibh dearcadh fair}.\textsuperscript{1003} (125ra18-35).

A comparison of this extract of IMP with the corresponding sections of P shows that P is not the source of many of the descriptions found in IMP. IMP’s regal halls, sunlit balconies of pure marble, impregnable towers, lodgings of the men and women throughout the fort and glittering wells are all inventions of the Irish author which do not exist in P or in any of the other versions of P discussed in Chapter II. Some of these descriptions are repeated throughout the text, as for example \textit{halladha rigda, grianáin solusda} and \textit{tuir dhithoghlaidhi}, found at paragraph ¶69 of Stokes’s edition

\textsuperscript{995} \textbf{P.II.9.2}: Primo tocius palatii ambitus continet miliaria quatuor, ita ut quadratura qualibet unum miliare continet.
\textsuperscript{996} \textbf{P.II.9.4}: Intra palatia vero predicta que in faciebus muri prioris sunt in distantia congrua est alius murus ad modum alterius, qui simili modo octo palatia continet in quibus servantur alia vasa et utensilia pretiosa et iocalia magni regis.
\textsuperscript{997} \textbf{P.II.10.3}: Intra urbem vero multa et pulcra palatia sunt et alie domus multe pulcre sunt valde. P.II.11.1: suntque ibi palatia tam pulcra et magna ut interiora sunt, excepto regali palatio.
\textsuperscript{998} \textbf{P.II.9.6}: Intra muros vero prefatos et intra predicta palatia sunt viridaria pulcra in quibus prata sunt et ligna pomifera optima.
\textsuperscript{999} \textbf{P.II.9.6}: in his viridariis sunt animalia silvestria multa scilicet cervi albi, animalia illa in quibus muscatum invenitur, de quibus in primo libro dictum est, capree, damule, varii et alia animalia valde.
\textsuperscript{1000} \textbf{P.II.9.5}: In spacio autem medio interiori est regale palatium.
\textsuperscript{1001} \textbf{P.II.9.5}: parietes aularum et camerarum omnes auro et argento tecti sunt.
\textsuperscript{1002} \textbf{P.II.9.5}: ibique sunt picturae pulcherime et hystorie bellorum depictae.
\textsuperscript{1003} \textbf{P.II.9.5}: Propter huius autem ornamenta atque picturas palatium splendidum est valde.
and discussed above. These repetitions are found throughout IMP and give the text uniformity in its descriptions.

On the other hand, the idea that the lodgings of the maidens and heroes, *dinna na n-inghena 7 na laech*, are scattered around the fort among the lush gardens of the palace, *lubhghuirt leasaighthe fria taebhuibh*, is not found in the description of the Khan’s palace in P, rather it has been derived from the statement of there being many splendid palaces in the city, *intra urbem vero multa et pulcra palatia sunt*, combined with the description of the gardens of the palace, *intra muros vero prefatos et intra predicta palatia sunt viridaria pulcra in quibus prata sunt et ligna pomifera optima*. By combining these two accounts, which are found in different chapters in P, the Irish author creates a more idyllic and picturesque description of the city of Cambalu, depicting its inhabitants as living amongst the green, fertile gardens of the palace, with its glittering wells, its wild animals of every species in the world and its herbs that can cure any disease: *lubhghuirt leasaighthe fria taebhuibh cu topraibh taitneamhucha cu fiadhmhilibh eceannuis da gach mhonad for bith cu luibhribh ictha cacha teadhma*. The use of alliterating adjectives in *lubhghuirt leasaighthe* and *topraibh taitneamhucha*, illustrates how the author was more concerned with enhancing his prose than accurately translating P. In fact, he is often indifferent to the precise details of his source text, generalising and reimagining the list of animals in the gardens of the palace, translating Pipino’s ‘white stags, goats, does and many other various animals’, *animalia silvestria multa scilicet cervi albi […] capree, damule, varii et alia animalia valde*, into ‘every untamed wild animal of every species in the world’, *cu fiadhmhilibh eceannuis da gach mhonad for bith*.

Similarly, the detail of the *sluaigtheach* being made of marble, *do marmair ro tocbhadh*, is also invented and is not found in the description of the same palace in P. However, a marble palace is described in chapter sixty-six of the first book of P, which describes the city of Ciandu, *in qua est marmoreum palacium maximum et pulcherrimum cuius aule et camere auro ornate sunt et mira varietate depicte*, which is translated in IMP as, *palas marmair fora lar co sluaigtheach rigda lais, co*

---

1004 P.II.10.3.
1005 P.II.9.6.
1006 ¶73.
1007 P.I.66.1.
Therefore, in the same way that the descriptions of *halladha rigda* and *grianán solusda* were expanded in the account of the of the Khan’s royal palace in Cambal, so also was the portrayal of the palace being made of marble. The following three transcriptions illustrate how variations on these descriptions of the palaces of the Far East are found throughout IMP. The first relates to the palace built by Aloadam in Mulete, in Northern Persia, the second to Cublay's palace in the city of Siaudu, the Chinese city of Chengu, and the third relates to the capital city of Sipangu, modern day Japan. The standardised descriptions in question are in bold characters.

Cricha Mulete do Macametus adhrait. Fil ri fuirre. Aloadam a aimm. Do ronta *palas rigda* lais a *nglind dithoghlaíthdhi* for slabh urard co *neimh n-oir* faír co *ngriananuibh solusta* lais cu *lubghortaibh leasaighthe* cu tobraibh *solusda* fria thaebh.

*Palas marmair* for a lar co *sluaigteach rigda* lais co *seomraidhribh solusta* co *neimh n-oir* forro allamuigh 7 thall.

Fil cathair oireachs leou. Do roiine in ri *palas anorach* na meadhon cu *halla rigda* 7 gu *seomraidhribh solusda*.  

---

1008 ¶48.
1010 Ibid., I:304.
1011 Ibid., II:256.
The result of repetitions such as halladha rigda, lubghoirt leasaighthe, seomradha and grianáin solusta, and tuir and gleanna dithoghlaídhí, and their expansion to parts of the adaptation where they do not translate corresponding descriptions in P, is that the description of the cities and palaces in IMP becomes homogenised and the portrayal of the Far East becomes standardised. So it is that the detailed, first-hand account of the palaces of the royal houses of China are omitted. In describing the city of Cambalu the Irish author reverted to his learning and imagination, and relied on the recognition by his audience of more traditional descriptive styles. In many of these descriptions the author quotes himself, using the same adjectives to describe different palaces and cities in different parts of the world, ignoring the distinctions made by Pipino. However, these passages also echo other descriptions of palaces in other Medieval and Early Modern Irish texts, such as the description of the fortress given by Aengus Óg mac in Dagda to the three sons of Lugaid Menn, the King of Ireland in the Agallamh, or the description of the fortress of Aodh Rua, given by Fionn in Feis Tighe Chonáin:

Dúnad 7 dingna 7 báili rigda rómhór co sonnaighib síth-árdá 7 gu n-griananaib gleorda glainidi 7 co tighibh rinn-radharcacha rómhóra isinn inad bus áil dóibh.\(^{1016}\)

\(_{(Agallamh na Senórach)}\)

Dúna riogha ró-mhaiseach 7 pioláit álaind iongantach 7 sunnach iarnaidhe ina tiomchioll 7 móran do chuailibh fada reamur maille ris 7 ceand duine ar gach aon cuaille dhiobh.\(^{1017}\)

\(_{(Feis Tighe Chonáin)}\)

Although these descriptions are not identical to the ones found in IMP, they are written in the same narrative rhythm, using the same formula which is rendered above: a series of conjunctive clauses composed of a noun, in bold, and a series of


\(^{1016}\) Stokes, ‘Acallamh’, 13. Translation from Dooley, Tales of the Elders of Ireland, 15: ‘a fortress and stronghold and great royal estate, enclosed by long and high palisades, with bright luminous sunrooms and great, lofty buildings, wherever they desire.’

\(^{1017}\) Joynt, *Feis*, 28. Translation is my own: ‘a royal, ornate fortress, a beautiful great palace and an iron palisade around it, which had many long thick spikes, and human heads on the end of each of them.’
attributive adjectives, underlined. This indicates how the author of IMP was referencing a specific literary and descriptive style in his adaptation, gaelicising the *Travels* by rephrasing the long detailed descriptions found in P into a format recognised by Early Modern Irish audiences. The interest of the author was not in the accuracy or veracity of his descriptions, nor in staying true to his source and translating a text which might increase his audiences’ understanding of the wonders of the East, rather he used the descriptions in P as a starting point upon which to develop his own representations of the Far East, in order to remain within and conform to the recognised margins of Early Modern Irish literature.

2.2.2. Contemporary significance

This special treatment of the city of Cambalu and of the Khan’s palace in IMP, may reflect an effort on the part of the Irish author to cater to the interests of his patrons in his adaptation. Whether or not IMP was translated for Fínghean Mac Carthaigh (as seems likely), descriptions of the architectural features of castles and of the internal designs of towers and palaces would have been of interest to members of the fifteenth-century Irish ruling class who were involved in the construction of tower houses and other fortifications. In his archaeological survey of the tower houses of Cairbre, Wycliffe dated the construction of two of the major surviving tower houses in Mac Carthaigh Riabhach lands to the period immediately prior to Fínghean’s tenure, namely: Kilgobbin, built in Diarmaid an Dúnaidh’s time, and An Monteen, built during Cormac mac Donnchaídh’s time. Furthermore, in her obit in AFM, Finghean Mac Carthaigh’s wife Caitlín Fitzgerald is remembered as having constructed An Bheann Dubh, identified by Wycliffe as Castle Salem.

Caitilin inghen iarla Desmhumhan .i. Tomas mac Semais baintighearna Ua c-Cairpre ben dercach dejheineigh d'èce, as lé do-rónadh an Benn Dubh, et Dún na m-Bend.

1019 Ibid., 683.
1020 Ibid., 351.
1021 AFM v, 1406.14. Nicholls has suggested that the *et* between Beann Dubh and Dún na mBeand is a mistake for *i.*, and that the two locations are the same. Cf. Nicholls, ‘The Development’, 193, note 261.
Descriptions of the layout of castles and palaces in the Far East in P may have presented the Irish author with an opportunity to tailor his adaptation to the interests of his patrons. In the same way that Irish author expanded the section relating to Naim’s rebellion in IMP, in order to incorporate stylistic features familiar to his audience, namely those of the Middle Irish cath,\textsuperscript{1022} and in order to create parallels between the wars of Cublay against his relatives and the internal struggles of Medieval Irish ruling families,\textsuperscript{1023} rewriting and expanding the descriptions of the palaces of the Far East shifts the emphasis of IMP away from the endless list of distant lands which would tire one’s tongue, \textit{ro badh scith tenga}, to parts of the text which the author’s audience and the patrons of L would have found more interesting. In addition, given that a parallel between Fínghean and Cublay may have been made during the episode immediately preceding these descriptions, namely in the account of Naim’s rebellion, embellishing the description of Cublay’s palace and capital city may have been a way of flattering Fínghean further, by comparing his kingdom and possessions to those of the Great Khan.

3. IMP’s rewriting of the prologue

3.1. The Missing Beginning and Lost Folios

The section of IMP in which the author departs the most from his source is the prologue of the text, which however is also incomplete. In fact, it is clear that the beginning of IMP is missing when it opens mid-sentence on folio 121ra, as is the conclusion of the previous text, \textit{Sdair na Lumbardach (SNL)}, which cuts off abruptly at the end of folio 120vb indicating that at least one folio has been lost, containing the end of \textit{SNL} and the beginning of IMP. Interestingly, the sequence in the Roman foliation,\textsuperscript{1024} on folios 120r and 121r, reads \textit{f. ll.xiii} (113) and \textit{f. ll.xvi} (116), indicating the loss of two folios, originally numbered \textit{f. ll.xiii} (114) and \textit{f. ll.xv} (115), between

\textsuperscript{1022} Discussed in Chapter II: Narrative Styles.

\textsuperscript{1023} Discussed above in ‘Rebellion of Naim and Cadau’.

\textsuperscript{1024} The Roman foliation is found in the upper margin above column b of recto folios until f. 129. Known as foliation A in Ó Cuív, ‘Observations’, 275.
the end of SNL and the beginning of IMP.\textsuperscript{1025} For the purpose of this study, these two lost folios, originally marked 114 and 115 in the Roman foliation, have been numbered 120+1 and 120+2 respectively. A later foliation, which uses Arabic numeration,\textsuperscript{1026} is found in the top right corner of the recto folios of L and numbers folios 120r and 121r as 120 and 121, illustrating how the two folios containing the end of SNL and the beginning of IMP had been removed from the manuscript by the time the Arabic foliation was introduced.\textsuperscript{1027} Ó Cuív also proposed that these missing folios may have contained ‘some other short text or texts of the same genre.’\textsuperscript{1028} In response to this comment, several considerations may be made regarding the content of the lost folios.

Mac Niocaill, the most recent editor of SNL, remarked that, for the most part, the translation remains close to its source, namely \textit{De Sancto Pelagio Papa},\textsuperscript{1029} a chapter of Jacobus da Voragine's (†1298) \textit{Historia Aurea (HA)}\textsuperscript{1030}. Therefore, by calculating the average words of \textit{HA} translated in each column of SNL, it is possible to approximate how many columns the author would have needed to finish his translation. Given that the eight columns between 119ra and 120vb translate an average of 186 words of \textit{HA} per column of L,\textsuperscript{1031} and that SNL cuts off in a section corresponding to a sentence of \textit{HA} which finishes 573 words before the end of the chapter \textit{De Sancto Pelagio Papa}, it would appear that, if the author had continued

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1025} MacAlister, \textit{The Book}, xxi. See also, Ó Cuív, 'Observations', 285.
\item \textsuperscript{1026} The Arabic foliation is found in the right corner of the top margin, and is the official foliation used by MacAlister and this study. It is called foliation B in Ó Cuív, ‘Observations’, 275.
\item \textsuperscript{1027} Ó Cuív, 'Observations', 291.
\item \textsuperscript{1028} Ibid., 285.
\item \textsuperscript{1029} Alias \textit{Historia Lombardica}.
\item \textsuperscript{1030} Alias \textit{Legenda Aurea}; Mac Niocaill, ‘\textit{Sdair}', 89: ‘Freagraíonn an téacs Gaeilge dlúth go leor don chuid is mó den téacs Laidné.’
\end{itemize}
translating the end of HA at the same average rate of words of HA per column of L that he maintained in the previous two folios, the end of SNL would fit into roughly three columns of L.\footnote{573 : 186 = 3. All word count calculations are based on the edition of HA in Graesse, \textit{Historia}, 824-44.} Although this hypothesis does not account for changes the author of SNL may have made to the end of his text, such as the expansions and additions which the author might have incorporated in his text and which are common in IMP and in other Medieval Irish adaptations,\footnote{Cf. Miles, \textit{Heroic}, 103.} it does give a rough idea of how much source material the author had left to complete his translation and how many folios this would have required. On the other hand, such a calculation proves to be much more difficult with regard to IMP, because, as has been discussed above, the translator did not remain systematically close to his source, at times omitting entire chapters of P, and at others rearranging them into a new order, reinventing and expanding their content.

Further speculation regarding the content of the missing folios is made possible by considering how other texts of around the same length as and of a similar genre to IMP, begin in L. Each of the three major texts which precede IMP in L, namely \textit{In Tenga Bithnua} (TB), \textit{Gabháltas Séarluis Mhóir} (GSM) and SNL, begin with large decorated initials in column \textit{a} of the recto folios, 88ra, 96ra and 112ra respectively. Between the end and beginning of these texts the scribe has inserted a number of poems or anecdotes, such as, \textit{ocht n-aerich na ndualuch don roichit for rith}, on folio 94va after the end of TB, the first of four poems which run to the end of 95vb, conveniently ending at the end of the verso of the folio so that GSM can begin on 96ra with a large decorated initial in the top left of the page.\footnote{MacAlister, \textit{The Book}, xx.} A similar editorial technique is adopted in the manuscript between the end of GSM and the beginning of SNL, wherein seven short anecdotes have been inserted, between 109ra and 111vb, none of which take up more than a folio each and which conveniently end on 111vb, so that SNL can begin with a large decorated initial at the top of 112ra. Ó Macháin has argued that this layout is due to the manner in which the manuscript was first conceived, namely as compilation of quires of eight folios, each of which contained at
least one major text, more often than not beginning with an decorated initial at the top of column *recto a*.\textsuperscript{1035}

By following the analogy of the texts which precede IMP in L, and after having considered the amount of *HA* missing from the translation of *SNL*, it may be suggested that IMP began on folio 120+2ra, with a large decorated initial, and that 120+1 contained the end of *SNL*, with the *b* column on the verso possibly containing an anecdote or a poem which concluded at the end of the page, so that IMP could begin at the top of 120+2ra.

### 3.2. Content and Innovations of the Prologue of IMP

These considerations indicate that as many as four columns of IMP are missing, which, based on the average words per folio of Scribe A in the first four folios of IMP,\textsuperscript{1036} would amount to roughly 1,370 words. This would be enough to cover an abbreviated account of the voyage of the Polo brothers, which is missing from IMP, and which is contained in the first ten books of the first book of P. A fragment of the translation of the prologue of P survives in IMP, in Stokes’s chapters ¶1 and ¶2. Whereas in P, the prologue opens the text, preceding the account of the voyage of the Polo brothers, in IMP the prologue precedes the description of Minor Armenia, seemingly omitting the chapters concerned with the description of the voyage of the Polo brothers. Therefore, this analysis suggests that the Irish author began his text with the account of the voyage of the Polo brothers to the Far East, perhaps preceding it with a short prologue of his own, and following it with an adaptation of the prologue in P, the latter part of which survives on folio 121ra. The following table displays this rearrangement, aligning the first three paragraphs of IMP with the prologue and first twelve chapters of P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMP</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prologue ¶1 - ¶2</td>
<td>Incipit prologus in librum domini Marchi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1035} Ó Macháín, ‘Aonghas’, 145.

\textsuperscript{1036} 121ra-121vb = 1318 words; 122ra-122vb = 1408 words; 123ra-123vb = 1355 words; 124ra-124vb = 1399 words.
Pauli de Veneciis de condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Qualiter et quare dominus Nicolaus Pauli de Veneciis et dominus Matheus transierunt ad partes orientales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Qualiter regis maximi Tartarorum curiam adierunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quod apud prefatum regem gratiam invenerunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quod ab ipso rege ad romanum pontificem missi fuerunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Qualiter expectaverunt Veneciis creacionem summi pontificis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Qualiter redierunt ad regem Tartarorum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Qualiter ab eo suscepti sunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Qualiter Marchus natus domini Nicolai crevit in gracia coram rege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Qualiter post multa tempora obtinuerunt regis gratiam ad propria remeandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quod Venecias redierunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Descripcio orientalium regionum et primo de Minori Armenia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>De provincia Turchie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing from IMP. Perhaps translated on 120+2, the second of the missing folios between 120 and 121, and therefore positioned before paragraphs ¶1 and ¶2 of the prologue.

It has already been shown how this kind of rearrangement of the material of P is not uncommon in IMP, especially in sections which were of particular interest to the Irish author, such as the rebellion of Naim or the account of Cublay's palace in Cambalu, discussed above. Similarly to these sections of the text, the Irish author altered both the content of his material as well as the order in which the information is found in the prologue of P. In fact, it is clear from the surviving part of the prologue of IMP that

---

the Irish author made a number of substantial changes to the account of the voyage of the Polo brothers and the circumstances in which the Travels were written.

Below is my transcription of what survives of IMP's adaptation of the prologue of P, with my translation in the footnotes:

... riguibh 7 taiseachaibh na cathrach sin.

Bai brathair righ an aibit san Fronses isin cathraigh in tan sin. Ba eolach dano isna hibhlerlaibh, Fransiscus a ainm. Berur iarum dú a mbatar na maithe ucot 7 cuinghit fair in leabhor do clodh for cula o theangaidh na tartaireadh cusin teangaidh laitanda. ‘Is omun leamsa,’ ol se, ‘saethar na meannmanradh do chaithimh fría gnimhradh idhul 7 ainchreitmeach.’

Guighit he fa an ceadha doridisi. ‘Do geantar,’ or se, ‘ár gidh scela aincriostaigh fhaisneightar sunn, mìrbhuiili in fhirDhia iat-saidhe et gach aen do cluinfe in t-imut sa an aghaidh na hirisí Coimdeta, guighfidh co dichra fa a clodhsum for cula 7 in neach nach guighfe caithfadh calma a chuirp fría clodh. Nisam omhnach-sa riasin leabhor sa Mharcais, or ni fhuíl go ann. Do thadhaill mu roscsa he ac tabhairt mhind na heaclaisi naeimhe lais 7 rofhagaitbh fría blaiseacht mbais gu frír son 7 ba diadha in ti Marcus.’

Cidh fil an tra acht rostinnta Proniscus in leabhor so Mharcuis a Tartairidh a Laitin et fa hiat bliadhna in tighearna in tan sin u. bliadhain dec 7 da fhichit 7 .cc. 7 mile bliadhain.1038

These paragraphs contain some of the most interesting alterations to the content of P in the adaptation. From them, we learn that in IMP, the Travels, known as ‘this book of Marcus’, in leabhor so Mharcais, was written in the Tartar language, rostinnta ...

1038 121r: ‘… kings and leaders of that city. There was a brother of a king in the habit of Saint Francis in the city at that time. He was versed in many languages and Fransiscus was his name. He is brought there to where the nobles were and they ask him to translate the book from the language of the Tartars to the Latin language. “I am hesitant,” he said, “to waste intellectual faculties on the deeds of idolaters and unbelievers.” They beseech him again in the same manner. “It will be done”, he said, “because, although non-Christian stories are reported here, they are miracles of the true God, and everyone who should hear of so much being against the Christian faith, will pray fervently for their conversion and he who does not pray shall dedicate the courage of his body for their conversion. I am not afraid of this book of Marco’s, for it contains no lie. My own eye saw swearing it by the relics of the holy church (giving the relics of the holy church in support of it); and he declared while tasting death (on his deathbed) that it was true and that Marco was a godly man.” In any case, Fransiscus translated this book of Marco’s from Tartar into Latin, and it was the year of the lord at that time 1255.’
in leabhor ... a Tartairidh. This book is then handed to Pronsiscus\textsuperscript{1039}, a Franciscan friar, an aibit san Fronses, versed in many languages, ba eolach dano isna hilbherlaibh, who is the brother of a king, brathair righ, so that he could translate the text from Tartar into Latin, in leabhor do clodh for cula o theangaidh na tartaireadh cusin teangaidh laitianda. Furthermore, since the use of the third person plural cuinghit in the phrase berur iarum dú a mbatar na maithe ucut 7 cuinghit fair in leabhor, indicates that the nobles, maithe, are in possession of the book, it would be logical to assume that these are the same nobles mentioned in the opening lines of the text, riguibh 7 taiseachaibh na cathrach sin, and that this sentence may have originally described how they came into possession of Marcus’ book. In order to fully comprehend the extent of the Irish author’s innovations in what remains of the prologue of IMP, it is necessary to examine and compare it with the prologue of P, which appears as Appendix II. Comparison between the prologues of IMP and P reveals several innovations of the Irish author which have intrigued previous scholars of the adaptation, such as De Benedetto and John Carey. Interpretations as to the origin and significance of these departures from P, as well as a discussion of previous scholarship, are offered in the following paragraphs:

3.2.1. Bráthair righ an aibit san Fronses
One of the main points of interest in the prologue of IMP is the identification of Franciscus Pipino with a brother of a king in the habit of Saint Francis, bai bráthair righ an aibit san Fronses isin cathraigh in tan sin. Ba eolach dano isna hilbherlaibh, Fransiscus a ainm. This is a reinterpretation of P’s ego, frater Franciscus Pipinus de Bononia ordinis fratrum predicatorum, a plerisque patribus et dominis meis veridica et fidelis translacione de vulgari ad latinum reducere. The depiction of Pronsiscus as the brother of a king is a deliberate departure from P at this point which I have not found in any version of P examined for this study and which might be explained in a number of different ways.

A first interpretation of bráthair righ is that either the Irish translator or the copyist of his exemplar misread Pipinus for principis, resulting in the corruption: ego, frater Franciscus principis de Bononia, ‘I, Franciscus, brother/friar of the prince of

\textsuperscript{1039} Henceforth, the character of Franciscus Pipino in IMP will be referred to as Pronsiscus, in order to distinguish him from the author of P.
Bologna.’ However, in my examination of forty-seven of the sixty manuscript copies of P studied during the course of this doctorate, I have found no distortion in the copying of the name Pipinus. Furthermore, given the other changes made by the Irish author in his adaptation of the prologue of P in IMP, such as the portrayal of Pipino as a Franciscan and the change of the original language of the Travels from the vulgar to Tartaric, which is discussed below, it seems likely that bráthair righ was a deliberate adjustment of the text rather than a consequence of a garbled exemplar.

The choice of the word bráthair may be a direct imitation of the Latin frater, and therefore used in a religious sense. However, in the section regarding Naim’s rebellion, discussed above, the Irish author uses the word bráthair to indicate a family relationship between Cublay and his uncle and cousin, namely: brathair h-atharsa, ‘a brother of your father’, which translates P’s patruus,\textsuperscript{1040} and, mac a bhrathar, ‘a son of his brother’, which translates P’s nepos.\textsuperscript{1041} The fact that the author did not use the unambiguous dearbháthair in these instances may indicate that bráthair was still understood as signifying ‘brother’ in the non-religious sense. On the other hand, the use of éndearbháthair athar in the explanatory note to Mathghamhain Ó Dálaigh’s poem beginning Ní théd an éigean i n-aigidh, dedicated to Finghean Mac Carthaigh and discussed above, may suggest that bráthair was considered to be too ambiguous for the description of Cormac mac Donnchaidh’s relation to his paternal uncle, foster father and godfather Diarmaid an Dúnaidh, Finghean’s father. However, since the author of the note uses éndearbháthair athar in a sentence that draws attention to the closeness of the family relationship between Cormac and Diarmaid, gurab égcóir do-rinne Cormac ar Dhiarmuid Mág Carrthaigh do bhí ’na éndearbháthair athar aigi 7 ’na chairdeas Crísd 7 ’na altroinn,\textsuperscript{1042} in order to chastise Cormac for having turned on such a close family member, the adjective dearbh, ‘sure’ and ‘certain’, in éndearbháthair may have been employed to emphasise even more the closeness of their kinship, rather than being an attestation of dearbháthair replacing bráthair as the normal word for ‘brother’.

A further consideration of this change in IMP was offered by De Benedetto, who suggested that the modification bráthair righ was due to a conflation of IMP with elements from the life of Hayton of Corycus:

\textsuperscript{1040} P.II.2.1.
\textsuperscript{1041} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1042} Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 109.
‘ci parla infatti del libro di Marco come di un libro tartarico e fa di colui che lo tradusse in latino, associandolo confusamente ad Aitone l’armeno, un fratello di re.’

Hayton of Corycus (†1320) was an Armenian prince, monk and historiographer, nephew of King Hethum I of Armenia and author of *Flos Historiarum Terre Orientis* (*FHTO*), composed c.1307, which offers a historical and geographical survey of Asia, with an account of the Muslim conquests and the Mongol invasions. The high regard in which De Benedetto’s pioneering work in the field of Polo studies is held, has caused this theory to be repeated in subsequent studies that mention the Irish adaptation. However, as far as I can tell, De Benedetto’s analysis was limited to the prologue of IMP, and I have found no trace of *FHTO* in the rest of the text. Furthermore, though Hayton was a member of the Armenian royal family, he was not himself the ‘brother of a king’. It would appear therefore, that the evidence for IMP’s being a conflation with *FHTO* is not as robust as De Benedetto suggested.

Another interpretation of *bráthair righ*, is that the author of IMP decided to modify the personal details of the Latin author of the *Travels*, in order to align them with those of a specific member of his community, or even his own personal details, thus leaving a dedication or personal signature of sorts in the prologue of IMP. As John Carey has suggested, this was possibly the motivation behind the transformation of Pipino from a Dominican into a Franciscan friar. There is no shortage of references to members of the clergy being of royal line and closely related to the *ceann fine* during the Early Modern period. For example, the annals record a friar Brian, son of Diarmaid Mac Donnchaidh, *tánaiste* of Uí Oilealla killed at Cuirrech Chinn Eitigh in 1397; and the bishop Ua hEidirsceoil, brother of Mac
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1046 Carey, *forthcoming*. I am grateful to Professor Carey for allowing me to read a lecture on IMP which he prepared for the exhibition of the Book of Lismore in University College Cork in 2011. This lecture appears in summary form in Carey, ‘The Travels’, 22-25.
1047 AFM iv, 1316.6: Mainistir Sliccigh do cumhdach (iarna losceadh feacht riamh) lá Brian brathair mac Diarmada Mec Donnchaidh. ‘The monastery of Sligo was re-erected (having
Con Ua hEidirsceoil, who died in 1418. Ulster and Connacht instances include: Rudhraighe Mac Donnchaídh Uí Dhomhnaill, grandson of Aodh Ruadh Mac Néill Ghaibh Uí Domhnaill (†1505), bishop of Doire and bráthair ar aoí ttoile; Connbráthair Ó Ruairc, bráthair mionúr d'fhuil ûasuil, son of Brian Ballach Ó Ruairc (†1561), and brother of Brian na Múrtha (†1591), rulers of West Bréifne during the second part of the sixteenth century. Nor was it unusual for the ceann fine to abandon secular life and take religious vows, or to be buried in the habit of a friar, as for example, Murchadh Ó Conchubhair Failghe (†1421), who joined the Franciscans at Killeigh (Cill Achain) taking the habit of a Franciscan, aibitt brathar do ghabháil dó uimme, a month before he died, and Aodh Mac Aodha Ruaidh Uí Dhomhnaill (†1537), who died in the Franciscan friary of Donegal, iar n-dol i n-aibítt San Froinséis. A similar custom is described by Friar Francis Matheus O'Mahony regarding Cormac Láidir Mac Carthaigh (†1494), Fínghean’s maternal uncle, who was buried in the Franciscan habit in the choir of the Franciscan friary of Kilcrea, which he had founded in 1465.

Therefore, it ought to be considered whether by transforming Francesco Pipino from a Dominican friar from Bologna into a brother of a king in the habit of Saint Francis, the author of IMP was referencing the social structures of fifteenth-

been burned some time before) by the Friar Brian, the son of Dermot Mac Donough.’ For references to Diarmaid Mac Donnchaídh, see AFM iv, 1397.6.

AFM iv, 1418.1: An t-epscob Ua h-Eidirsceóil, 7 Mac Con Ua h-Eidirsceoil (a dearbhhrathair) tighearna Corca Laighge, 7 Diarmaid mac Mhég Cáithaigh Cluasaigh thanaisi Ua Cairpri d'ècc. ‘The Bishop O'Driscoll, Maccon O'Driscoll (his brother), Lord of Corca-Laighge, and Dermot Mac Carthy Clusach, Tanist of Hy-Cairbre, died.’

AFM v, 1550.5.

AFM v, 1550.1: Rudhraighe mac Donnchaídh mic Aodha Ruaidh I Domnaill epscop Doire, 7 brathair ar aoí t-toile d'ècc an .8. October, 7 a adhnacal i n-Dún na n-Gall i n-aibítt S. Froinses. ‘Rury, the son of Donough, son of Hugh Roe O'Donnell, Bishop of Derry, and a friar by his own will, died, and was buried in the monastery of Donegal, in the habit of St. Francis.’

AFM v, 1561.1.

AFM vi, 1591.1.


AFM iv, 1421.12: O Conchobhair (.i. Murchadh) do thecht dia thigg iar sin, & galar anbhail dia ghabhail, & a dhul isina brátharbh i c-Cill Achaird, & aibít brathar do ghabhail do uimme. ‘O'Conor (Murrough) then returned home; but he was attacked by a dangerous disease, whereupon he retired among the friars in the monastery of Killeigh, and took the habit of a friar.’

AFM v, 1537.2: i Mainistir Dún na n-Gall iar n-dol i n-aibítt San Froinséis. ‘In the monastery of Donegal, having first taken upon him the habit of St. Francis.’

Jennings, ‘Brevis Synopsis’, 156 (p. 35-36 of MS).
century Ireland. It is conceivable that the author had a specific individual in mind in writing *bráthair righ an aibit San Fronsse*, such as a relative of his patrons, an important figure in the community, or perhaps even the author of IMP himself. During the latter part of the fifteenth century, three ecclesiastics of noble families succeeded one another to the See of Ross, a bishopric whose boundaries roughly coincided with those of the ancient Corcu Loígde and which was central to the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach territory, from Courtmacsherry Bay to Cape Clear, and had its episcopal centre at Ross. These were: Aodh Ó hEidirsceoil (Odo O’Driscoll), Tadhg Mac Carthaigh (Thaddeus McCarthy) and Edmund de Courcey, all of whom had been or were Franciscans.

John Carey has argued that the change of Francesco Pipino from a Dominican to a Franciscan may reinforce the suggestion that L was produced in the Franciscan Friary of Timoleague, where some of its contents were copied by Míchéal Ó Cléirigh in the summer of 1629. Further indication that the compilers of L were working in a Franciscan context is found in the complimentary quatrain to Saint Francis in the poem beginning *Ní thèd an éigean a n-aísgidh*, discussed above, which was composed by Mathghamhain Ó Dalaigh for Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach. The significance of the Friary of Timoleague for the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family, and the role which the latter played in the development of the Franciscan community there must also be considered. The Annals of the Four Masters (AFM) report that Fínghean, his son Domhnall (†1531) and his grandson Donnchadh (†1576) were all buried in the family tomb in the Franciscan Friary of Timoleague. This information may have been based on Friar Francis Mattheus
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1058 Holland, *History*, 302. Alias Ros Ó gCairbre (Rosscarbery).
1059 Aodh Ó Eidirsceoil had apparently entered and opted out of the Franciscan order during his early career. See Bolster, *A History*, 454.
1061 See note 1051 above.
1064 AFM v, 1531.2. It is repeated at AFM v, 1528.6.
1065 AFM v, 1576.1.
1066 See also AFM iii, 1240.7: ‘Mainestir Tighe Mo Laga h-i c-Cairpre isin Mumhain i n-episcopaldecht Ruis do shonnradh do thóghhail do braithrigh S. Franseis lá Mag Carthaigh Riabhach tighearna Cairpreacht 7 a tumba fein do denomh h-i e-corraidh na m-Brathar. As innte fos adnaíther an Barrach Mor, 7 Ó Mathghamha Cairpreacht, 7 barún Cúrsach.’ For a discussion on this date see Holland, *History*, 346-47.
O’Mahony’s\textsuperscript{1067} *Brevis synopsis provinciae Hiberniae FF. Minorum*,\textsuperscript{1068} which was used by Michéal Ó Cléirigh as the source for many of the Franciscan entries in AFM.\textsuperscript{1069} Friar O’Mahony states that the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family tomb was still discernible in his time and was located in the choir of the Friary.\textsuperscript{1070} Whether a member of the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family had actually founded the Friary, or whether this was done by a member of the de Barra family, was evidently a matter of contention already by the early seventeenth century, when Friar Donatus Mooney and Friar O’Mahony were writing their histories of the Franciscan order in Ireland in Saint Anthony’s college in Louvain.\textsuperscript{1071}

Holland has since made a strong case for the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family not being involved in the foundation of the Friary, which he fixes to the first half of the fourteenth century, and, relying on an citation by James Ware from a now lost ‘Book of Obits of Timoleague’, indicates Uilliam de Barra\textsuperscript{1072} (†1373) as the likely founder.\textsuperscript{1073} In any case, the fact that the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family was strongly associated with the Friary, so far as to lead Early Modern historians to believe that they had been its founders, is testament to the family’s involvement with the Franciscan community of Timoleague. Ware reports the addition of a steeple, dormitory, hospital and library\textsuperscript{1074} to the Friary while the Franciscan Edmund de Courcy was Bishop of Ross between 1494 and 1517; and his burial in the Friary of Timoleague in 1518 along with that of his successor, John O’Murrilly, a Cistercian buried in the habit of a Franciscan in 1519, is a further indication of the central role of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item Fr. Francis Mattheus alias O’Mahony, cf. Jennings, ‘Brevis Synopsis’, 139, n. 1.
  \item Written in Saint Anthony’s College, Louvain, between 1629 and 1630. cf. Jennings, ‘Brevis Synopsis’, 139-142.
  \item Ó Clabaigh, *The Franciscans*, 18. Ó Cléirigh consulted Friar Maurice Ultach MacShane’s Irish translation of the *Brevis synopsis*.
  \item Jennings, ‘Brevis Synopsis’, 148 (p. 12 of MS): ‘Primus hujus Conventus fundator censetur D. Willelimus Jacobi Barry, ab aliis autem et verius asseritur D. mac Carthy Riabach, Princeps Caribrisientium, ejus familie sepulchrum in choro cernitur.’ I have not been able to precisely locate a Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family tomb in the remains of the Timoleague Friary. There are however several unmarked tomb niches built into the north and south walls of the choir. Cf. Power et al, *Archaeological Inventory of County Cork* 1, 351.
  \item Jennings, ‘Brussles MS 3947’, 67 (p. 48 of MS): ‘Fundatus per Dominum de Barry pro familia Observantiae in ipso loco in quo antea ipse habebat castrum.’ For O’Mahony’s entry regarding the founders of Timoleague, see previous footnote.
  \item alias William de Barry (†1373). AFM iii, 1240.7.
  \item Holland, *History*, 346-47.
  \item Ware, *De praesulibus*, 223: *caenobii illius campanile, dormitorium, noscomium, & bibliothecam is de novo construi curavit*.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the Friary played within the Diocese of Ross and the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach territories.\textsuperscript{1075}

The likely Franciscan origin of L is also suggested by its selection of texts. As was discussed in the conclusion to Chapter III, manuscripts written in Franciscan communities in Ireland during the late-Medieval period display a fascination with travel writing, ethnography and geography. Worthy of note are: Rennes, Bibliothèque de Rennes Métropole, MS 598, written after 1475 in the Franciscan monastery of Kilcrea, which was founded in 1465 by Cormac Láidir Mac Carthaigh, and which contains GM and In Tenga Bithnua (TB) along with a collection of various homilies and treaties on religion;\textsuperscript{1076} Dublin, Trinity College MS 667, which was written circa 1455 in a Franciscan friary under the patronage of the Úi Bhriain of Thomond, perhaps in Ennis, Nenagh or Limerick, contains the Latin Historia Karoli Magni, from which GSM was translated, and also the only copy of the Hiberno-Latin text Gesta Karoli Magni, from which the Early Modern Irish text Stair Fortibrais was translated, among a plethora of other apocryphal, anecdotal and religious texts.\textsuperscript{1077}

Two manuscripts which cannot be anchored to any particular Franciscan community in particular but whose choice of texts is similar to the manuscripts listed above are: Dublin, University College, Franciscan A9, a fifteenth-century codex containing GSM and Beatha Finchua, two texts which are also found in L;\textsuperscript{1078} and Dublin, King’s Inn, MS 10, also written in the fifteenth century, which contains, amongst its religious matter and lives of saints, Stair Fortibrais and GSM.\textsuperscript{1079} Similarly, Ó Clabaigh has drawn attention to Dublin, Trinity College MS 347, a late-thirteenth century manuscript which belonged to an Irish Franciscan house, which contains the only surviving copy of Descriptiones Terrarum, an introduction to a now lost history of the Tartars, with a geography of the known world, written by an Eastern European missionary, perhaps a Franciscan or a Dominican, between 1255 and 1263.\textsuperscript{1080}

\textsuperscript{1075} Holland, History, 347; Ware, De praesulibus, 222-223. Although the friary was important for the ruling families of Cairbre during the fifteenth century, the episcopal centre of the diocese remained in Rosscarbery during this period, cf. Holland, History, 302-03.
\textsuperscript{1076} Vétault, Catalogue, 255-260; Ó Clabaigh, Franciscans, 137-38.
\textsuperscript{1078} Grosjean, ‘MS. A. 9’, 160-169.
\textsuperscript{1079} de Brún, Catalogue, 20-24.
\textsuperscript{1080} Górski, ‘The Author’, 254; Colker, ‘America Rediscovered’, 713 and 719-20; Ó Clabaigh, Franciscans, 122.
Likewise, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 407 preserves *Itinerarium Symonis Semeonis*, a travelogue written by an Irish Franciscan named Simon Fitzimon, describing his pilgrimage to Jerusalem between 1323 and 1324. Lastly, among the books listed in the library catalogue of the Franciscan friary at Youghal, compiled in 1491, is Jacobus da Voragine’s *Historia Aurea*, the source of *SNL*, which precedes IMP in L. Bhreathnach and Ó Clabaigh have drawn attention to the ‘proximity of castle, friary and school of learning’ in Ireland during the fifteenth century and to the rise of the Observant movement after the erection of the Observant vicariate in 1460. In particular, Ó Clabaigh has indicated how the Observants were keen promoters and fosterers of Third Order communities during the fifteenth century and has argued that ‘secular tertiary groups were established as a matter of course wherever there was an Observant friary’ in order to associate ‘lay-people with the reformed Franciscan movement.’

The implication of these considerations regarding the modification in IMP of *bráthair righ in aibit San Fronses*, is that the author of IMP may have been alluding to a Franciscan who was the brother of a king within his milieu, perhaps a member of a Third Order community around Timoleague after it was refounded as an Observant Franciscan house in 1461, or perhaps even himself. Finghean did in fact have a brother, Diarmaid, who succeeded to the lordship of Cairbre for one year after his death, although I am not aware of any record which associates him with a mendicant order or a school of learning. Similarly, it ought to be considered whether the modification was a reference to one of the three Franciscan bishops of Ross during the second half of the fifteenth century, namely: Aodh Ó hEidirsceoil, Tadhg Mac Carthaigh and Edmund de Courcey. In particular, Tadhg Mac Carthaigh, who died on 24th October 1492 in a pilgrims’ hostel near Ivrea in Italy on his return from
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1082 Alias *Legenda Aurea*.
1083 Chapters and excerpts of *HA* were the source of six independent Early Modern Irish translations, including *SNL*. See Mac Niocaill, ‘*Sdair*’, 89-90. For discussion of the Youghal library catalogue see, Ó Clabaigh, *Franciscans*, 133-36 and 158-160.
1085 Ó Clabaigh, *Franciscans*, 58.
1086 Ó Clabaigh, *Franciscans*, 85. Third Order communities consist of individuals who followed the rule of Saint Francis in their daily lives while retaining a lay status, and who can therefore hold land and property and raise families. Cf. Ó Clabaigh, *Franciscans*, 82-85.
1087 Bolster, *History*, 432.
1089 Alias: Blessed Thaddeus Mac Carthy.
Rome where he had secured a papal mandate for the See of Cork and Cloyne,\(^{1090}\) may have been a member of the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family, and therefore closely related to Fínghean, for whom L was written. In fact, in 1483, Tadhg was accused of removing his predecessor, Aodh Ó hEidirsceoil, from the bishopric of Ross, with the help of lay power.\(^{1091}\) It seems unlikely that this could have happened without the involvement of Fínghean, whose territories included the diocese of Ross. Similarly, Fínghean’s name is not found in the papal bull from 1492 which mentions the leaders of the opposition to Tadhg’s appointment to the bishopric of Cork and Cloyne.\(^{1092}\) In conclusion, whether *bráthair rígh in aibit San Fronses* is a direct reference to Fínghean’s brother Diarmaid, Tadhg Mac Carthaigh or the author of IMP, are theories which will have to remain in the realm of informed speculation.

### 3.2.2. *A Tairtridh a Laidin*

Another interesting modification in the prologue of IMP is found in the original language from which Pronsiscus translates *leabhar Marcuis*, namely the language of the Tartars: *cuinghit fair in leabhor do clodh for cula o theangaidh na tartaireadh cusin teangaidh laitianda*. This is a significant departure from the prologue of P, in which Pipino writes that he translated Marco Polo’s book from the vernacular: *compellor ego [...] veridica et fidelire translacione de vulgari ad latinum reducere*. In all manuscripts of P examined during the course of this study, no examples of a corruption *de tartari* were found and in light of the other differences between IMP and P in this section of the prologue, discussed above, it seems likely that this was also a deliberate adjustment by the author of IMP. By changing Marcus’s book into a Tartar book, the Irish author gives his adaptation a more exotic and outlandish feel, perhaps in an effort to impress his audience and enhance the authority of his text.

It has been discussed above how this imaginative approach to the factual information of P is found throughout IMP, in regard to the battles fought by the Khan, in the description of his palaces and cities, and in the identity of Franciscus Pipino. The modification of *de vulgari* to *o thengaidh na tartairedh* is consistent with the Irish author’s imaginative approach in adapting other sections of P, and should not be taken as a consequence of a corrupted exemplar.

\(^{1091}\) Ibid., 451-52.
\(^{1092}\) Bolster, *History*, 455.
3.2.3. Pipino’s justification for translating the *Travels* in IMP

Another subtle but important modification in the prologue of IMP is found in Pronisiscus’ reluctance to translate Marcus’ book and his hesitancy in accepting the nobles’ request:

> Berur iarum dú a mbarat na maithe uct 7 cuinghit fair in leabhor do clodh for cul o theangaidh na tartaireadh cusin teangaidh laitianda. ‘Is omun leamsa,’ ol se, ‘saethar na meanmanradh do chaithmh fria gnimhradh idhul 7 ainchreitmeach.’ Guighit he fa an ceadhna doridisi. ‘Do geantar,’ or se, ‘ár gidh scela ainctiostaighi haisneightar sunn, mirbhuili in fhirDhia iat-saidhe…’ (121ra4-12)

This is an expansion of Pipino’s statement that he was compelled by his superiors to undertake the translation: *compellor ego, frater Franciscus Pipinus de Bononia ordinis fratrum predicatorum, a plerisque patribus et dominis meis veridica et fideli translacione de vulgari ad latinum reducere.* Dutschke has shown that Pipino’s statement of being compelled by his superiors is a typical rhetorical device which appealed to Christian writers since it echoed ‘biblical recognition of man’s smallness in front of God,’ and was ‘a modesty or humility topos which reflects no objective reality.’ It was especially common in religious works written in Italy during Pipino’s time, but may be traced to the *de minutio* device described in *Rhetorica ad Herrenium*, written c.80 BC. On the other hand, the Irish author’s description of the nobles of the city first requesting Pronisiscus, *cuinghit fair*, and then begging him, *guighit hé*, to translate Marcus’s book, does not have the same undertones of compulsion or humility which are found in P. If anything, Pronisiscus’s initial refusal of the nobles’ request to translate Marcus’ book creates the impression that he is their equal, if not their superior. He is, after all, the brother of a king. Similarly to the modification of Pipino’s identity, which transforms him into the brother of a king in the habit of Saint Francis, the manner in which the nobles interact with Pronisiscus is more a reflection of the bond shared between secular rulers, learned classes and
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1094 Ibid., 209.
1095 Ibid., *Pipino*, 209.
mendicant orders in fifteenth-century Ireland,\textsuperscript{1096} than a faithful adaptation of Pipino’s admission of humility to his superiors.

Pronsiscus’s moral struggle as to whether it is right for him, a holy man, to waste his intellectual faculties, \textit{saethar na meanmanradh do chaithimh}, in translating the deeds of idolaters and unbelievers, \textit{fria gnímhradh idhul 7 ainchreitmheach}, may also have parallels in the \textit{Agallamh}. The author of the \textit{Agallamh}, a copy of which is also contained in L, often portrays Saint Patrick ordering his scribe Brocán to write down the tales recited by Cailte, so that they might entertain good people and nobles until the end of time:

\begin{quote}
‘Ad-rae buaid 7 bennacht, a Cháilte!’ ar Pátraic; ‘7 caidhi Brocan? Scribhthar in scéil út lat, gomba gairdiughadh do fhlaithibh deridh domain é.’ Ocus do scríbh Brocan.\textsuperscript{1097}

‘Ocus maith, a Brogain’, ar Pátraic, ‘scribhthar 7 lesaigther let scela Caílte nach dechat a mudha, corub gairidiugud do drongaib 7 do deg-dáinib deirid na h-aimsire iat.’\textsuperscript{1098}
\end{quote}

In these examples from the \textit{Agallamh}, Saint Patrick’s request for Brocán to write down the tales of the \textit{féinnidi} for the entertainment, \textit{gairdiughadh}, of future lords and good people, \textit{do fhlaithibh deridh domain} and \textit{do drongaib 7 do deg-dáinib deirid na h-aimsire}, represents the endorsement of \textit{fiannaíocht} literature by the Church for the benefit of a lay community. The same literary topos, whereby secular and non-Christian literature receives backing from a holy or a devout figure,\textsuperscript{1099} is found in IMP, in Pronsiscus’s agreement to translate Marcus’ book for the nobles of the city. Furthermore, although Pronsiscus’s decision to translate Marcus’ book because it contains evidence of the miracles of the true God, \textit{mirbhuili in fhir-Dhia}, has its origin in Pipino’s, \textit{consideravi ex huius libri inspectione fideles viros posse multiplicis gracie meritum a Domino promereri}, it too offers parallels to Saint Patrick and Brocán’s decision to commit Caílte’s tales on the \textit{féinnidi}, who, although pagan, understood that there was a God: \textit{do thuicemar-ne uili cu raibhi Dia ann tré urchra aenoidche}

\textsuperscript{1096} Bhreatnach, ‘mendicant orders’, 375.
\textsuperscript{1098} Ibid., 217.
\textsuperscript{1099} Murray, \textit{Early Finn}, 31.
adconncamar.\textsuperscript{1100} The implication of this statement in the \textit{Agallamh} is that although Fionn and his warband were pagans, their tales are validated by the fact that they were aware of the existence of God. Similarly, in IMP, although Marcus’ book deals with the stories of pagans in far eastern countries, the wonders described in IMP are works of the one true Christian God, and are therefore worth documenting.

The effect of Pronsiscus’s initial lack of enthusiasm for translating Marcus’ book is twofold: it underlines his social status amongst the nobles of the city and reinforces the perception that he is of equal rank to them. But it is also a way for the Irish author to create parallels with other Medieval Irish texts, in this case perhaps the \textit{Agallamh}, thus creating an echo between his translation and native Irish literature, and Gaelicising his adaptation. This process of gradual enhancement of the translation with new themes and allusions to Medieval Irish literature is discussed below.

\section*{4. Secondary Variations in IMP}

IMP contains a number of variations from P which are inspired by other Medieval and Early Modern Irish texts. Miles has observed that the practice of incorporating new elements from other texts into Medieval Irish translations, in order to suit the tastes of the Irish audience, may be connected with the exercise of \textit{amplificatio} of the Latin literary tradition, defined by Lausberg as ‘a graded enhancement of the basic given facts by artistic means, in the interest of the party’.\textsuperscript{1101} In the context of Irish literature, the practice of \textit{amplificatio} therefore, describes the tendency of Medieval Irish translators and authors to expand their texts by integrating new material from scholia, commentaries and from the wider corpus of Medieval Irish literature. O’Hogan has shown how \textit{In Cath Catharda}, the twelfth-century Irish adaptation of Lucan’s \textit{Bellum Civile}, incorporates a great deal of explanatory material in the translation, much of which is traceable to the collections of scholia on Lucan known as \textit{Commenta Bernensia} and the \textit{Adnotationes super Lucanum}.\textsuperscript{1102} Miles has argued that the enrichment of \textit{Togail Troi} and the \textit{Táin}, via the incorporation of details from

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1100} Stokes, ‘Acallamh’, 41. \\
\textsuperscript{1101} Lausberg, \textit{Handbook}, 259: Miles, \textit{Heroic}, 103. \\
\textsuperscript{1102} O’Hogan, \textit{Reading}, 22.
\end{flushright}
late-antique commentaries, not only displays ‘the author’s reading, but also conveys a humanist’s enthusiasm for ancient tradition’.

The variations in IMP are minor compared to the *amplificatio* found in the various recensions of *Togail Troí* or the *Táin*, and discussed by Miles. They are, however, consequences of an analogous approach to translation and adaptation of foreign material, which sought to enhance the base material of P by incorporating elements from other texts and translations into IMP. By analysing the sources of these expansions in IMP, the literary influences of and sources referenced by the Irish author emerge.

The following discussion has been divided into two parts, in the first I will examine the Irish author’s expansions in IMP which have been sourced from foreign material, or Irish translations of foreign material. In the second part I will discuss the Irish author’s incorporation of native elements in IMP which echo expressions and passages found in a number of Medieval Irish texts, and which provided him with ready-made tools in his adaptation of the *Travels*, tools which simultaneously facilitated the act of translation/adaptation and created familiar resonances for readers or listeners. It is beyond the immediate interest of this study to conduct a survey of all the instances in which the Irish author modifies his source by incorporating variant information based on other material. However, the analysis of several occurrences of these secondary variations, three from foreign material and three from native material, can shine light on the Irish author’s approach to translating P and on the purpose which he envisioned for IMP.

4.1. Variations based on foreign material

4.1.1. *Alan* and *Balan*

In IMP, during the episode which recounts the siege of *Baldasi* (Bagdad) by *Alan*, king of the Tartars, against *Calipus*, king of the Saracens, the Irish author uses the names *Alan* and *Balan* interchangeably to indicate the same individual:

> Fil cathair n-aili innti rigi Musul iside 7 do Mhacemus adrait. Fil cathair oirdnidhi innte Baldasi a hainm. Airdri na Sairrisineach as ri fuirri-seic.

---

\(^{1103}\) Miles, *Heroic*, 94.

\(^{1104}\) Ibid., 95-144 and 145-193.
Calipus a ainm. Imat oir 7 maine lais, or ni hál dó laeich naid curaidh fora inchaibh.

Luidh Alan i. ri na Tarraidhí do irlabhail a chathrach fair a nirt catha. Bai tor dithoghliði lais arna livadh d’ór 7 do mhainibh. Gabhthar Calipus guan thor 7 cona chathair ar ni rabhutar laeich oca imdhitean. ‘Gia thucais anoir 7 airmhidin don or,’ ol Balan, ‘ni fhil anoir na airmhidin aigi fort aniu.’ .u. la cona n-oighthibh do Chalipus gin digh gin biúdh euro mhoidh a chraibh na clíabh do cumhaidh 7 doilghius a oir 7 a mhaine.\(^{105}\)

In a later episode in IMP, namely during the description of the war between Aloadam and the king of the Tartars, this character is again named Alan: ot clos do Alan i. do righ na Tarraidhí.\(^{1106}\) Thus we have two occurrences of the name Alan, and one of the name Balan, to indicate the same character. This character is known as Alau throughout P,\(^{1107}\) and is said to have been the fourth king of the Tartars: Primus igitur rex Tartarorum fuit Chinchis, secundus Cui, tercius Bacui, quartus Alau, quintus Manguth, sextus Cublay.\(^{1108}\) It has been discussed in Chapter I\(^{1109}\) how this part of P is corrupt in manuscripts of the English branch, and that the name Alau is replaced by Rothon,\(^{1109}\) thus explaining the Roton found in the respective section of IMP.\(^{1110}\) However, in the instances where the name Alau was not corrupt in the Irish author’s Latin exemplar of P, the name is rendered twice Alan and once Balan. The change of Alau in P to Alan in IMP is easily explained by the confusion of minims for u and n. On the other hand, the equation of Alan and Balan, and the modification of the name by adding an initial b is less intuitive, since Alau is never referred to as Balau or Balan in the English branch of P, nor in any version of P which I have examined.\(^{1111}\) The fact that the author used the name Alan twice, a name which closely resembles the Alau found in P, and Balan once, suggests that translator made a conscious choice to supply his audience with an alternative name for this character.

---

\(^{105}\) Transcription is my own, L 121rb; Stokes, ‘Gaelic abridgement’, 249. ¶6-¶7.
\(^{107}\) P.1.16.4: magnus rex Tartarorum Alau obsedit eam: P.1.16.5: Nam Alau civitatem obtinuit:
\(^{108}\) P.1.54.1; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana MS 983.
\(^{109}\) Glasgow, University Library MS Hunter 84 (T.4.1), 206r.
\(^{110}\) 123ra36.
\(^{111}\) E.g., Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz MS lat. 4° 70, 57v: Alau; Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek MS 218, 76va: Alau; Oxford, Merton College MS 312, 6ra: Alau; Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University MS Garrett 157, 5r.
This alternation between the names *Alan* and *Balan* may be explained in two ways: firstly, that the spelling of *Balan* was a mistake for *Alan*, and that a *punctum delens* beneath the *b* has been either eroded by time or that the scribe simply forgot to insert it. Secondly, a solution may be offered by *Stair Fortibras* (*SF*) and its Latin original *Gesta Karoli Magni* (*GKM*), in which *Admirandus*, the legendary king of the Saracens and father of Fortibras, is also referred to by his proper name, *Balan*. In *GKM*, the name *Balant* is found as an alternative to the more common *Admirandus* a total of six times,¹¹¹² whereas in *SF* the author uses *Admirandus* in every instance except for one, where he is named *Balanc*.¹¹¹³ The name *Balan* does not feature in either *GSM* or *SNL*, texts which precede IMP in L, however the character *Admiranntus*,¹¹¹⁴ *i. ri na Baibliloine*,¹¹¹⁵ does appear in *GSM*. In P, *Alau* is first introduced in the first two chapters of P,¹¹¹⁶ during the account of the journey of the Polo brothers which does not survive in IMP. *Alau* in fact corresponds to the historical Hûlagû Khan, whose ambassadors accompanied Matteo and Nicolò Polo on their first expedition to China, an event which is described in the prologue of the *Devisement* and of P.¹¹¹⁷ It has been argued above that this section of P may have existed in the original version of IMP but was lost when folios 120+1 and 120+2 were removed from the manuscript. The facility with which the Irish author alternates the names *Alan* and *Balan* to indicate the same character in IMP raises questions as to whether the translator explained the links between *Admiranntus* of *GSM*, *Alan* of IMP, and *Balan* of *GKM* and *SF* in a now lost part of IMP, perhaps the prologue. Such a theory would indicate that the author of IMP had read or was aware of a tale containing the character *Balan*, perhaps *SF* or *GKM*, and was making a connection between the world described in the *Travels* and the world depicted in this other text.

4.1.2. *Prespiter Seon*

*Presbiter Iohannes*, known as *Prespiter Seon* in IMP, was the title of a legendary ruler of a Christian kingdom in the East. The legend surrounding the character grew

---


¹¹¹⁶ P.1.1.4 and P.1.2.1.

out of an account from Otto of Freisingen’s _Historia de duabus civitatibus_, written in the twelfth century, which mentions a great Asiatic ruler, _qui ultra Persidem et Armeniam in extremo oriente habitans_, who routed the Persians, Medes and Samiardi, fighting in aid of the Church of Jerusalem, and was descended from the Magi of the Bible.\[1118\] During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the legend of _Presbiter Iohannes_ grew, and he soon became associated with a Christian kingdom of India, and with the legend of the shrine of Saint Thomas there.\[1119\] _Presbiter Iohannis_ is of interest to IMP because although he features prominently in P, he is never directly connected with India by Pipino. In fact, in describing the origin of the Tartars, Pipino mentions that they were originally tributaries to a king named _Uncham_, known in Latin as _Presbiter Iohannes_: _sed tributarii erant magni regis qui dicebatur Uncham, quem Latini Presbiterum Iohannem vocant, de quo totus loquitur orbis._\[1120\] In his translation of this section of P, the Irish author adds a note specifying that _Prespiter Seon_ was _rí na hIndia_: _ni raibhi ri dhibh fein forro acht iat fo chis 7 chanachus do Prespiter Seon .i. do righ na hIndia et robui ainm aile fair .i. Unccam._\[1121\] This is part of a wider trend in IMP which specifically associates Prespiter Seon with the kingdom of India. Further to the example above, the Irish author writes that Prespiter Seon raised the ‘Indian rent’ on Simsis, king of the Tartars: _faidis Prespiter Seon nech do chuinghidh in chis Innecda fair._\[1122\] This is an expansion from the Latin original in which Pipino mentions that the Tartars paid a _tributum_ to _Uncham_, it is not however an ‘Indian’ tribute: _transierunt desertum ad aquilonarem plagam et pervenerunt ad locum ubi prenominatum regem timere non potuerant, cui postea tributum reddere noluerunt._\[1123\] Similarly, when Prespiter Seon is defeated by the Tartars, IMP notes that Simsis took sovereignty over the Indians as a result: _ro marbadh Preispiter Seon 7 gabhais Sisim righe for Innedhaibh in tan sin._\[1124\] On the other hand, in P, the lands over which Uncham gains power are not specified as being in India: _Chinchis tum victor extitit et Unchan rex occisus fuit. Regnavit vero Chinchis post mortem Unchan annis .VI., in quibus multas provincias_.
acquisivit. Likewise, while Pipino describes the river Caromora as flowing through the lands of Presbiter Iohannes, *quod de terris regis illius qui dicitur Presbiter Iohannes fluit*,\(^{1126}\) the Irish author writes that it flows through India, *sruth Coramora for teibersnaigh fora fedh, san India tochhais cenn ar tus.*\(^{1127}\)

These examples indicate that the Irish author made a conscious effort to connect Prespiter Seon with India in IMP, even though this was not done in P. In fact, though he is mentioned nine times in P,\(^{1128}\) Presbiter Iohannes is never connected directly with India by Pipino. Two other Early Modern Irish translations mention Prespiter Seon as the king of India: these are the Irish translation of the Letter of Prester John, which survives in London, British Library MS Egerton 1781 written in Bréifne during the 1480s,\(^{1129}\) and the Irish translation of Mandeville, written by Fínghean Ó Mathghamhna in Ros Broin in 1475.

Et madh aile libh techt 7 ar cumachtaine 7 ar tirne d’fhechain, tuic 7 creid can cunntabairt *gurop misi righ na hInndhia*. i.e. en dhuine as saibhre i ngach uile innmus ata fo neimh 7 a talmain.\(^{1130}\)

(Irish Letter of Prester John)

**Preter Iohannem i. ri na h-Innía,** is imdha oilein 7 righdhacht fáei, 7 a Pintosgsór bís a comnuighi fein.\(^{1131}\)

(GM)

This comparison indicates how the translation of the *Travels* into Irish was not an isolated project, but was part of a wider intellectual consciousness which was current in fifteenth-century Ireland. It is possible that the author of IMP had read the Irish Letter of Prester John or GM, or even had them at his disposal while writing IMP. On the other hand, the Irish author may have learned that Presbiter Iohannes was the king of India from other sources, perhaps via an oral account. The fame and popularity of this eastern king is in fact laid bare in Pipino’s statement about him, in his first

\(^{1126}\) P.II.52.1.

\(^{1127}\) Stokes, ‘Gaelic abridgement’, 394, ¶122.

\(^{1128}\) P.I.51, once; P.I.53, once; P.I.65, twice; P.II.30, four times; P.II.52, once.


\(^{1130}\) Greene, ‘Irish Versions’, 121.

appearance in P: *de quo totus loquitur orbis*.\textsuperscript{1132} Though it is not certain that the information regarding Prespiter Seon being *ri na hIndia* in IMP was taken directly from the Irish translations of the Letter of Presbiter Iohannes or from GM, the expansion in IMP to include information about Prespiter Seon which is not found in P, shows how details regarding the Far East were finding their way into IMP from sources other than P, and that the author did not intend to create an Irish translation or abridgement of Pipino’s work alone, but was open to incorporate other information which was available to him concerning the Far East, thus creating a new Irish version of the *Travels*, based on Pipino’s translation.

4.1.3. Salamanders

Another section of IMP which shows influence from sources different from P is that which describes the fabric made from salamanders. Following is my transcription of the description of salamanders from IMP:

Iar *cur* chuil *frisin* *crich* *sin* *fosgebha* *fasach* *fodai* *uidhi* .ui. la ndec eisiumh. Sing singcalas don taebh araith de. *Crich forleathan* isidhe. Fil sliabh urard isin *crich* *sin* 7 salmandair fair. Beathadhuigh beacca iat-sumh. Fogniat snáth do thuumheadh *forsin* talamhain a n-inaduibh inglana 7 no timairethe la hoes na cринe 7 no *berthea* dia nighi cu srothaibh 7 topraibh 7 no brisdtia i leasraibh 7 i soithighibh prais. No aduigthhea tendte leo dia cur *fora* lar 7 geal do thiceadh don gris iar loscudh a inglain. Do gnithea eduighi de as a haithli 7 ba uasal airmhitneach-somh 7 in tan no ghabhadh sal no dorchatu he. For an ngris no cuirthe dia glanadh 7 glan no thiceadh di.\textsuperscript{1133}

This is loosely translated from chapter forty-seven of the first book of P which describes the province of Chynchyntalas, and in which Pipino describes ‘the mines of *calibis*, *andanicus* and *salamandra’*: *in hac provincia mons est ubi sunt minere calibis et andanici et salamandre, de qua fit pannis qui, si proiciatur in ignem, comburi non potest*.\textsuperscript{1134} In the same chapter, Marco Polo clarifies this description of ‘the mines of

\textsuperscript{1132} P.I.51.1.
\textsuperscript{1134} P.I.47.4.
salamandra’, stating that he found no evidence of the serpent known as the salamander during his travels, which is found in Pipino’s translation as: de salamandra vero serpente que in igne vivere dicitur, nichil audivi in orientalibus partibus.\textsuperscript{1135} Pipino further states that the salamander is a mineral and not an animal, in his description of how a garment is made from the earth, fit autem pannus hoc modo de terra,\textsuperscript{1136} by extracting a fiber from the salamandra which is similar to wool, que fila quedam habent lane similia.\textsuperscript{1137}

Pipino’s description of the salamander as a mineral and not an animal disagrees with the medieval depiction of salamanders as magical lizards which could extinguish and live in fire. This description is found in Isodore’s \textit{Etymologiae}:

\begin{quote}
Salamandra vocata, quod contra incendia valeat. Cuius inter omnia venenata vis maxima est; cetera enim singulos feriunt, haec plurimos pariter interimit. Nam si arbori inrepserit, omnia poma inficit veneno, et eos qui ederint occidit; qui etiam vel si in puteum cadat, vis veneni eius potantes interficit. Ista contra incendia repugnans, ignes sola animalium extinguit; vivit enim in mediis flammis sine dolore et consummatione, et non solum quia non uritur, sed extinguit incendium.\textsuperscript{1138}
\end{quote}

A similar description of salamanders is also found in the Irish translation of the letter of Prester John, and in its Latin original. The Irish translation is copied from Greene’s edition and the Latin from that of Zarncke:

\begin{quote}
Atá ingnadh eile anar time .i. piast 7 salamanndra a hainm 7 ni fedunn beth na bethaidh ach tar lar teinedh do gres 7 doni denadh ingantach na timchell amail doniad um an peist berus in sida. Et do clum 7 do canach na peisti sin .i. salamandra, donid bainntighema edaighi dingbala damsa ar lar mo
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1135} P I.47.5. Cf. also the VA version: ‘quella salamandra della quale e’ digo non è bestia ni serpente.’ Andreose, \textit{Il Milione}, 152.
\textsuperscript{1136} P I.47.4.
\textsuperscript{1137} P I.47.4.
\textsuperscript{1138} Isodore, \textit{Etymologiae}, XII.iv.36 (ed. and trans. Lewis, 257): ‘the salamander is so named because it prevails against fire. Of all the venomous creatures its force is the greatest; the others kill people one at a time, but the salamander can slay many people at once – for if it should creep in among the trees, it injects its venom into all the fruit, and so it kills whoever eats the fruit. Again, if it falls into a well, the force of its venom kills whoever drinks from it. This animal fights back against fire; it alone of all the animals will extinguish fire, for it can live in the midst of flames without feeling pain or being consumed – not only because it is not burned but also because it extinguishes the fire.’
rightighi moir fein; 7 is amlaid doniter int egusg righa sin do nighi, ar lar teinedh do gres.\textsuperscript{1139}

In alia quadam provincia iuxta torridam zonam sunt vermes, qui lingua nostra dicuntur salamandrae. Isti vermes non possunt vivere nisi in igne, et faciunt pelliculam quandam circa se, sicut alli vermes, qui faciunt sericum. Haec pellicula a dominabus palatii nostri studiose ope ratur, et inde habemus vestes et pannos ad omnem usum excellentiae nostrae. Isti panni non nisi in igne fortiter accenso lavantur.\textsuperscript{1140}

Although the Irish author does not add information to IMP regarding the salamander’s ability to extinguish flame and withstand fire, as is found in the Letter of Prester John and in the *Etymologiae*, he does not accept Marco Polo’s idea that salamanders are minerals rather than animals, and writes, *beathadhuiigh beacca iat-sumh*. This is a rejection of new information offered by the *Travels*, in favour of a return to conservative and mainstream medieval descriptions of salamanders such as those found in the *Etymologiae* and the Letter of Prester John.

The mineral described by Marco Polo in the *Travels* is asbestos, from which a fibre is extracted that is renowned for its incombustible qualities still today.\textsuperscript{1141} It is uncertain when the fibre extracted from asbestos became confused with the amphibian known as the salamander, however the legend of the salamander being unhurt by fire is at least old as Aristotle.\textsuperscript{1142} Yule suggested that the origin may lie in a Persian pseudo-etymology of the word *samandar/samandal*, which was borrowed from Greek σαλαμάνδρα, as being composed of the elements *sam* ‘fire’, and *andar* ‘within’.\textsuperscript{1143} In any case, the fireproof fabric made from asbestos became associated in the Medieval mind with the salamander and was understood to derive from the wool or the skin of the animal. Thus in the Irish Letter of Prester John, clothes are made from the fur and wool of the salamander: *do clum 7 do canach na peisti sin .i. salamandra, donid bainntigherna edaighi*. By correctly giving a mineral origin to this fire-resistant fabric in the *Travels*, Marco Polo was going against mainstream Medieval learning.

\textsuperscript{1139} Greene, ‘Irish Versions’, 123.
\textsuperscript{1141} Yule, *Travels*, I:216.
\textsuperscript{1142} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1143} Ibid.
However, the author of IMP did not include Marco Polo’s identification of the salamander as a mineral, specifying instead that the salamander was a small animal. This description of salamanders in IMP, and its variation from the information found in P, exemplifies the Irish author’s approach to his adaptation of P and illustrates how he valued the information he was adapting. For the author of IMP, P was not a source of scientific and precise information which could develop and improve Medieval learning, rather it was the source of pleasurable accounts and entertaining anecdotes which could be modified and improved in order to conform to an already established picture of the Far East.\footnote{Jauss, ‘The Alterity’, p. 182.}

4.2. Variations based on native material

4.2.1. \textit{For cliathaibh fis}

In the paragraphs describing the scene immediately preceding the battle between Maghnus Cam and Prespiter Seon in IMP, the Tartar hosts ask their druids to prophesise the outcome of the battle, \textit{fiafraighd dib faitsine 7 celmaine in chatha nó cinnus no biath doib 7 do Preispiter Seon}.\footnote{Stokes, ‘Gaelic abridgement’, 265, ¶32.} In response, the druids went onto their ‘wattles of knowledge’, \textit{luidhset na druidh fora cliathaibh fis}, and summoned around them the devils and gods of the air, \textit{ro thoghairmset demhna 7 dei aerdha na n-docum}. After having gone on their ‘wattles of knowledge’, the druids split a large bulrush in two and name one half of it Prespiter Seon and the other Sisim, i.e Maghnus Cam, \textit{do berat bhoicshimhin n-dimoir leo, 7 ro scoiltset 7 do ronsat dá leth di, 7 do berat Preispiter Seon d’ainm for leth di 7 Sisim for in leth n-aill}. Through wizadry and cunning, \textit{draidheacht 7 tuaichleacht}, the druids cause the two halves of the bulrush to contend with each other, and the half named Sisim is victorious.

Though the splitting of the bulrush and the use of incantations to make the two halves contend with one another is translated directly from P,\footnote{P.I.53.2: Tunc Chinchis rex Tartarorum precepit incantatoribus et astrologis suis ut predicerent qualem eventum futurum prelium habiturum erat; tunc astrologi in partes duas scindentes arundinem divisiones ipsas interposuerunt, unamque vocaverunt Chinchis, et alteram Unchan.} this section of IMP contains an addition which is distinctly Irish in flavour, namely the use of \textit{cliatha fis}.
in order to prophesise the outcome of the battle. John Carey\textsuperscript{1147} has drawn attention to similar depictions of druids on wattles in Medieval Irish literature, in \textit{Cath Findchorad}, in which druids go onto hides of old hairless bulls and on wattles of rowan tree, \textit{do cuadar as a h-aithle ar seicheadhaibh seantarbh mael loar 7 ar cliathaibh caorthainn},\textsuperscript{1148} and similarly in the Irish Life of Saint Berach, where druids go onto their hurdles of rowan tree, \textit{dochúiatar na draoithe ara ccliathaibh cáerthainn}.\textsuperscript{1149} This use of c\textit{liath\a} in prophetic rites is described in detail by C\textit{e}itinn who mentions that the druids of the ancient Irish used hides of sacrificial bulls spread on round wattles of rowan tree in order to summon up the demons upon which they would lay geasa in order to obtain information from them:

\begin{quote}
Dála na ndruadh is é feidhm do-nídís do sheicheadhaibh na dtarbh n-iodhbarta a geoinnheadh ré hucht bheith ag déanamh \textit{conjuration} nó ag cur na ndeamhan fá gheasaiibh,agus is iomhá céim ar a gcuirdir geasa orra, mar atá síleadh ar a scáile féin i nuisce, nó ré hamharc ar néallaibh nimhe, nó ré fóghar gaoithe nó glór éan do chos. Gidheadh an tan do cheileadh gach áisig diobh sin orra, agur fá héigean dòibh a ndicheall do dhéanamh, is eadh do-nídís cruinnchliathra caorthainn do dhéanamh agus seicheadha na dtarbh n-iodhbarta do leathadh orra agus an taobh do bhiodh ris an bhfeoil do chur i n-uachtar diobh, agus dul mar sin i muinighin a ngeasa do thoghaimh na ndeamhan do bhuaín scéal diobh, amhail do-ní an togharmach san chiorcaill aníú; gonadh de sin do lean an sean-fhocal ó.shoin adeir go dtéid neach \textbf{ar a c\textit{li}athaibh fis} an tan do-ní dicheall ar scéala d'fhagháil.\textsuperscript{1150}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1147} I am grateful to Professor Carey for having shared his unpublished talk on IMP with me, which he gave in University College Cork in 2011.

\textsuperscript{1148} Dobbs, \textit{`The Battle'}, 398-9.

\textsuperscript{1149} Plummer, \textit{Bethada}, i.34.

\textsuperscript{1150} C\textit{e}itinn, \textit{Foras}, ii 348-51 (ed. and trans. Ua Duinnín): `As to the druids, the use they made of the hides of the bulls offered in sacrifice was to keep them for the purpose of making conjuration, or laying geasa on the demons; and many are the ways in which they laid geasa on them, such as to keep looking at their own images in water, or gaze on the clouds of heaven, or keep listening to the noise of the wind or the chattering of birds. But when all these expedients failed them, and they were obliged to do their utmost, what they did was, to make round wattles of the quicken tree, and to spread thereon the offered in sacrifice, putting the side which had been next the flesh uppermost, and thus relying on their geasa to summon the demons to get information from them, as the conjurer does nowadays in the circus; whence the old saying has since been current which says that one has gone on his wattles of knowledge when he has done his utmost to obtain information.'
Céitinn’s statement that such incantations were still practiced by conjurers in circuses during his day, *amhail do-ni an togharmach san chiorcaill aniu*, and that going *ar chliathaibh fis* was a proverb meaning ‘to do one’s best to obtain information’, suggests that the Irish author’s expansion in IMP does not derive from any Medieval Irish text in particular, but is rather a trope inserted by the Irish author in order to render the material of P more familiar to his Irish audience. By depicting a druidic ritual amongst the incantations of the Tartar wizards while retaining the original description of the spell on the two halves of the bulrush, the Irish author both Gaelicises the portrayal of the Far East and describes a foreign method of acquiring omens. This process of incorporating distinctly Irish elements into an adaptation of foreign material, produces a unique version of the *Travels*, which to a Medieval Irish audience would have contained numerous parallels between the Irish and the Eastern worlds, and would therefore enhance their interest in and connection with the text.

4.2.2. *Firu, macu, mná*

The sentence *firu, macu, mná*, is used twice in IMP to indicate an indiscriminate collective of people, much like English ‘men, women and children’. In the first instance the Irish author is describing the people of Canhgigu, (Laos), and their custom of drawing tattoos on the bodies of their ‘men, sons and women’: *do níatt a rinnadh forro, firu, macu, mna*. This is a translation of Pipino’s description of the ‘men and wives of this region’ who paint their bodies with a needle: *viri et mulieres huius provincie cum accubus pingunt facies suas, colla, manus et ventrem ac crura*. In the second instance they are the object of a slaughter: *tiagait fuirre la nert lann 7 sciath, cu ro lásat ár for aes na cathrach, firu, macu, mna*. This translates Pipino’s: *de mandato ipsorum baronum decapitati sunt omnes*. In the first example the Irish author expands Pipino’s ‘men and wives’, *viri et mulieres*, to include also ‘sons’, *macu*, in IMP. In the second example, the Irish author expands Pipino’s *omnes* into *firu, macu, mna*, in order to more vividly depict the indiscriminate nature of the slaughter.

---

1153 P.II.46.7.
An explanation for the Irish author’s preference of *fírú, macach, mna* over more accurate translations of Pipino’s *viri et mulieres* and *omnes*, may be that it was a set literary formula which echoed other Medieval Irish texts. It is in fact found in the *Agallamh*, in a verse of a poem recited by Cael Ua Neamhnainn in his effort to woo Crédhe ingen Cairbhi cnes-bháin ingen righ Ciarraigí Luachra.

Aibinn in tech ina tá

*ídir fhíra is macach is mná,*
*ídir dhruídh ocus aces ceoil*
*ídir dháiliumh is doirseoir.*

This verse was certainly familiar to the scribe of IMP, i.e. Scribe A, since the *Agallamh* is also in his hand in L. The same expression is used also by the author of *Riagail na Céle nDé*, to describe the duties of members of the Orders to hear the confessions of all the tenants of their church:

Nach fer graid gáibhse clais for a chubas is do dlegar anmchardine
mhanach na heclaise sin, *fírú, macach, mna sceo ingena.*

The sense in these examples is that the expression *fírú, macach, mna*, was an idiom signifying ‘everyone, indiscriminately’. The significance of this phrase in IMP is that it illustrates how the Irish author could employ native, sometimes formulaic, expressions in his adaptation of the *Travels*, by molding the information of P to fit established formulas of Medieval Irish literature at the expense of a precise rendering of Marco Polo’s account of the Far East.

For the author of IMP the importance of the detail that only *viri et mulieres* used to tattoo their bodies in the province of Canhigigu falls into second place when presented with the opportunity to incorporate a linguistically archaic idiom in the adaptation. Similarly, when Pipino writes *decapitati sunt omnes*, the Irish author seizes the chance and inserts the same expression.

---

1156 Cf. L f. 206va 1.15.
1157 Gwynn, ‘The Rule’, 84-85: ‘It is the duty of any one in Orders who undertakes the charge of a church to hear the confessions of that church’s tenants, men, boys, women and girls.’
4.2.3. **Bonn fria meidhi**

In the description of the battle between Niscardyn, general of the Tartar army, and Bagul, king of of Miena, the Irish author makes use of a formula found in a number of other Medieval Irish texts, namely: *ba calma do cuired in cath soin leo alliu 7 anall, co m-benadh bonn fria meidhi 7 méidhe fria bonn doibh*. Similar expressions used to describe the carnage of battle are found in the first recension of the *Táin*: *dobert föbairt bidbad fo bidbadaib forro co tochratár bond fri bond 7 mède fri mède;* and in *Imtheachta Aeniasa*: *co mbenadh bond fri medi 7 medi fri aroile acu;* and *gu mbenad bond fri medi aigi*. It is also found in a verse in *AFM*, commemorating the battle of Fochart in 732:

> As don cath cedna at-rubhradh:

> Ar n-Uladh im Aodh Róine
> la h-Aodh Allán ri Ere
> Ar coinnimh do Chill Chonna
> Cuir-siom **bonna fri médhe**.

The Irish author’s use of this expression in *IMP* to translate Pipino’s *fuit autem prelium durum valde*, is yet another indication of his approach to translating P and his incorporation of native elements into the adaptation which evoked the idioms and passages common in Medieval Irish literature.

This discussion has illustrated that the author of *IMP* was altering the details of P and expanding on the information which he encountered in the *Travels* in two ways: firstly, he was incorporating additional accounts of the Far East in *IMP* from texts other than P. I have suggested that the author of *IMP* may have been familiar with *Sdair Fortibrais* in the case of the alteration between *Alan* and *Balan*, and that

---

1159 O’Rahilly, *Táin*, 70:2309-10: ‘And he made upon them the attack of a foe upon his foes so that they fell, sole of foot to sole of foot, and headless neck to headless neck.’ Cf. *ibid*, 118.
1161 *ibid.*, 144:2315-16.
1162 *AFM* I, 732.8: ‘Of the same battle was said: “The slaughter of the Ulidians with Aedh Roin was made by Aedh Allan, King of Ireland; For their coigny at Cill Cunna he placed soles to necks.”’
1163 *P*.II.42.7.
the ideas of Prespiter Seon being *rí na hIndia* and of salamanders being *beathadhuigh beacca* may have found their way into IMP from Mandeville’s *Travels* or the Letter of Prester John, or their corresponding Irish translations. Secondly, the Irish author was incorporating elements from native Irish literature into his adaptation, subtly Gaelicising his depiction of the Far East and giving IMP a distinctly Irish feel. This approach to translation is not unique to IMP and is found in other Medieval Irish adaptations of foreign material. For example, the Irish author of *In Cath Catharda* (*CC*) expanded Lucan’s *tot cecinere tubae*,\(^{1164}\) to include instruments more familiar to a Medieval Irish battlefield, *ro seinnit a sturgana ocus a cuirn comhairc ocus a n-adurca furfocra ocus a cuislendai cathai*.\(^{1165}\) Similarly, Harris has noted that Pompey arms himself in a distinctly Irish manner in *CC*, with two spears, and has suggested that the descriptions of his multi-coloured clothes and beautifully decorated armour are parallel to representations of Cú Chulainn and Fer Diad in the second recension of the *Táin*.\(^{1166}\) Stanford has pointed out analogous depictions of Hector in *Togail Troi* which, along with a number of other ‘Gaelicisms’, lend the text a decidedly Irish tone.\(^{1167}\)

Herbert has summarised the process of Gaelicising foreign material in Medieval Irish literature by remarking that ‘the public of early narrative did not seek to discover the unique world-view of a particular author, but rather, sought recognition of familiar codes and conventions shared from one work to another.’\(^{1168}\) This analysis of the secondary variations in IMP has shown that the Irish author was in places, altering *P* by aligning it with established and familiar Medieval Irish axioms and ideas. Whether this entailed equating Alan of the *Travels* with Balan of *Sdair Fortibráis* or specifying that Prespiter Seon was *rí na hIndia* and that salamanders were small animals and not minerals as Pipino suggested, or whether it meant incorporating Irish depictions of magic in the description of Maghnus Cam’s druids going *for cliathaibh fis*, or the inclusion of archaic idioms such as *firu, macu, mna* or the saga formula *bonn fria meidhi*, the Irish author was creating a new version of Marco Polo’s *Travels*, in a recognisably Irish idiom.

\(^{1164}\) Lucan, BC VI.130 (ed. Braund, Civil War, p. 110): ‘so many trumpets sounded’.

\(^{1165}\) Stokes, In Cath, p. 266-67: ‘their trumpets were sounded, and their noisy bugles, and their warning horns, and their battle-pipes.’


\(^{1167}\) Stanford, Ireland, p. 74-75.

\(^{1168}\) Herbert, ‘Fled’, p. 75.
This approach recalls a remark in Cicero’s preface to his translation of the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines: ‘I have translated not as an interpreter but as an orator, preserving the sentiments and their forms (so to say ‘figures’) from the original, but adapting the words to our own usage. I have not thought it necessary to translate word for word, but I have kept to the same kind of words, preserving their general meaning.’ With regard to a specifically Irish context, one is compelled to agree with the comment of Boyle and Hayden: ‘When a vernacular text draws on Latin sources and vice versa, it can be difficult to disentangle the concept of “adaptation” from the process of translation.’

5. Conclusions

This chapter has shown that the Irish author significantly reduced the size of the Travels in his adaptation, creating a text that is just over a third of the size of P, or 35% of it. At the same time however, the author of IMP was also re-proportioning sections of the text to suit his own interests and those of his audience. In particular, I have illustrated how the Irish author was not as interested in accurately translating the geographical information of P, as he was in adapting and rewriting the accounts of the battles of the Tartars and the descriptions of the Khan’s royal palaces in the text. In one section of IMP the Irish author even expresses his reluctance to translate the geographical details of the regions of the Far East with the sentence: ro badh scíth tenga fria tuarascbáil do thabhait.

The sections of IMP which the Irish author expanded the most are the paragraphs relating to the rebellion of Naim and Cadau, Cublay’s uncle and cousin respectively, and the passages describing the city and palace of Cambalu. I have suggested that these parts of P were given particularly close attention in the Irish adaptation because they offered an opportunity to incorporate native narrative styles and formulaic descriptions which echoed other Medieval Irish texts. In addition, I have offered a historical interpretation as to why the Irish author chose to focus on these specific sections of IMP. It is possible in fact that the Irish author used the account of Naim’s rebellion against Cublay to draw parallels with family conflicts in

1169 Russel and Winterbottom, Ancient literary criticism, 253.
1170 Boyle and Hayden, Authorities and adaptations, xxiv.
fifteenth-century Ireland. In this respect, it is interesting to consider Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach’s struggle against his cousin Cormac mac Donnchaidh for power in Cairbre during the 1470s, and the rebellion of Caitilín Fitzgerald’s uncle Gearóid against her brother Séamus Fitzgerald, during the same conflict. However, as interesting as this parallel is, I do not believe it can be used to secure a date of composition for IMP, since family conflicts such as these were routine during the Early Modern period in Ireland.

One of the parts of IMP that has been modified most heavily by the Irish author is the prologue of the text, in which the Dominican friar Francesco Pipino is transformed into a Franciscan who is the brother of a king, *bai brathair righ an aibit san Fronses isin cathraigh in tan sin […] Fransiscus a ainm*. I have offered several interpretations as to the motivations behind these modifications to Pipino’s character, and while I do not feel that any of them can be argued conclusively, the portrayal of Pronsiscus as a Franciscan who is the brother of a king in IMP embodies Bhreathnach’s argument of the ‘proximity of castle, friary and school of learning’ in Ireland during the fifteenth century and suggests that the adaptation may have been written in a Franciscan context. What the adjustment of these details in the prologue of IMP does show however, is that the Irish author was not interested in creating a precise translation of P, rather he was re-telling the story of the *Travels* by incorporating details which had a contemporary relevance to fifteenth-century Ireland.

This same approach of the Irish author in adapting P is also found in his incorporation of elements from secondary sources in IMP, such as the equation of *Alan* with *Balan*, which I have argued may derive from *Sdair Fortibrais*, and the explanation that Prespiter Seon was *rí na hIndia*, which may derive from Mandeville’s *Travels* or the Letter of Prester John, or their corresponding Irish translations. Similarly, the author of IMP was Gaelicising his descriptions of the Far East, by using the same language as and quoting passages from native tales. The portrayal of Cublay’s druids *for cliathaibh fis* and the use of stock Irish saga formulas such as *bonn fria meidhi*, nativise and render familiar the *Travels* and create a new picture of the Far East, which blends elements of Pipino’s account with components from Medieval Irish literature, thus establishing common ground between the two.

---

This textual analysis of IMP has shown how the Irish author approached the adaptation of P, using it as a starting point from which numerous expansions could be made which incorporated information from other sources. Similarly, the Irish author’s lack of enthusiasm for the geographical descriptions of the eastern regions indicates that he did not intend his adaptation to be an accurate and factual account of the Far East. In this context it is interesting to recall Dutschke’s comments on how the composition of texts in Glasgow, University Library of the Hunterian Museum T.4.1 [84], which I have shown in Chapter III to contain the same version of P as the exemplar used to translate IMP, shines light on how the Travels were categorised in the mind of whoever commissioned the manuscript, indicating that it was considered ‘a pleasureful account, an adventure in faraway lands rather than a straightforward source of information.’

Dutschke has shown that this is at odds with the acceptance of and conviction in Marco Polo’s accounts expressed by Medieval readership in annotations and colophons to the Travels found in many fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts. However, Gadrat has shown that tales of travel and of exploration were also read purely for entertainment by Medieval audiences, and that the Travels may have been considered by some of its fourteenth- and fifteenth-century readers to be ‘recreational’ texts. In relation to the increasing popularity of Mandeville’s Travels during the fifteenth century in England, at the expense of Marco Polo’s Travels, Dutschke remarked that ‘a gradual shift, during the course of the fifteenth century, in the proportions of the reading audience away from a strictly academic public, towards one that included more individuals reading for pleasure could account for a movement from Marco Polo towards a preference for Mandeville.’

Although L contains no marginalia or annotations which capture an Early Modern Irish reaction to the IMP, this chapter has discussed the various ways in which the Irish author was redesigning P in his adaptation, so as to focus on the more entertaining aspects of the Travels. This indicates that IMP was conceived by its author as a recreational voyage text and not as a factual account of the Far East. When

1172 Dutschke, Pipino, 612-13.
1173 Ibid., 43-99. Dutschke first analyses the reaction of readers who believed in the veracity of Marco Polo’s account, pp 59-94, before mentioning the instances in which they express disbelief, pp.94-99.
1174 Gadrat, Lire, 156-57.
1175 Dutschke, Pipino, 243.
examined beside the texts which surround IMP in L, which range from lives of saints, to *fiannaiocht* literature, to historical and ethnographical texts such as *Gabháltas Serluis Mhóir* (GSM) and *Sdair na Lumbardach* (SNL), to apocryphal and anecdotal texts such as *In Tenga Bithnu* and *Scél na Samhna*, IMP comes within the broad categoray of *seanchas* and may be identified also within the family of wisdom literature, or ‘*litriocht na gaoise*’.\textsuperscript{1176}
CONCLUSIONS

The objective of this dissertation was to conduct a general study of IMP both as a contribution to Early Modern Irish literature, and as a contribution to the textual tradition of the *Travels*. Each chapter has approached IMP from a different perspective in order to give a rounded view of the text. Chapter I began by describing the relationship between IMP and the broader textual tradition of the *Travels*, showing how it is a translation of P, Francesco Pipino’s Latin translation of Marco Polo’s account written between 1310-1324. It continued with an overview of L, discussing the various scribal hands and the milieu in which it was created. The collaboration between Scribe A, who wrote most of L, and the relief scribe on f. 125rb is suggestive of a scholastic milieu, and of an interaction between a tutor and a student. The potential family connections of Aonghas Ó Callanáin, the second most important contributor to L whom Ó Macháín has shown to have been working in tandem with Scribe A, with the Ó Callanáin medical family of Cairbre offers further insight into the cultural context in which IMP was received.

In Chapter II it was shown how the *Travels* were adapted to match well-established literary styles that were current in fifteenth-century Ireland. My linguistic analysis of IMP revealed how the Irish author enhanced the language of the text by blending archaic language with Early Modern forms. In this way, the author of IMP was able to adapt the *Travels* to a style that was reminiscent of an Old or Middle Irish narrative that had been recast in the Early Modern period, thus, perhaps, imparting a status of venerable antiquity to his abridgement. The archaic language of IMP displays the linguistic sophistication of both its author and its intended audience. In this respect IMP may be compared to Tadhg Ó Cianáin’s *Turas* written in 1609 and Lughaidh Ó Cléirigh’s *Beatha*, written after 1616,\textsuperscript{1177} which were composed with learned court audiences in mind. Furthermore, three distinct narrative styles alternate in the text: the first is a clipped, succinct style evocative of the prose of many Old and Middle Irish texts; the second is a fluid, continuous narrative style used for the description of anecdotes and events; the third is the style of the late Middle Irish *cath*.

\textsuperscript{1177} Mac Craith, ‘The *Beatha*’, 36-37.
The author of IMP alternated these styles to highlight particular sections of the narrative. The third of these styles, the bombastic and alliterative prose of the *cath* is used exclusively in one instance in IMP, that describing the rebellion of Naim, which I have argued in Chapter IV was expanded in the Irish adaptation because it mirrored events in Fínghean Mac Carthaigh’s personal and political life.

In Chapter III it has been shown that the exemplar used to create IMP is closely related to the English version of P, and in particular, that the version of P most closely related to IMP survives in Glasgow, University Library, Hunter 84, a manuscript written by a professional scribe named Richard Frampton between the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries, probably in London. This indicates that the exemplar used by the Irish author was probably either written in England or copied from a manuscript of English origin. Another manuscript in the hand of Frampton is Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.14, probably written some years prior to the Glasgow manuscript, which contains *Historia destructionis Troiae* and *Liber Magni Alexandri*, also found in the Glasgow manuscript. If Frampton used the same source to copy these texts as he did for the Glasgow manuscript, it may be suggested that Frampton had access to the same library during the late-fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries from which he copied material for his clients, in which there may have also been a manuscript containing a copy of P belonging to group δ of the English branch, which Frampton used as his source for the Glasgow manuscript. Parkes’s observations regarding the location of Frampton during the early-fifteenth century may indicate that this library was in London. Chapter III also showed that the contents of the Glasgow manuscript bear striking resemblance to those of L and of a number of other fifteenth-century Irish manuscripts which contain translations of European texts, such as the history of Troy, the adventures of Alexander the Great, the wars of Charlemagne, Mandeville’s *Travels* and Marco Polo’s *Travels*. These texts show that the literary and historical interests of whomever commissioned Richard Frampton to write the Glasgow manuscript at the beginning of the fifteenth century were alligned to those of Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach, patron of L, of Fínghean Ó Mathghamhna who wrote GM in Ros Broin in 1475, of the patrons of Egerton 1781, written in Bréifne in 1484, and of the Roches of Fermoy, for whom the Book of Fermoy was written. A book such as the Glasgow manuscript,

---
containing a selection of texts concerned with European and Oriental history, may have been the source of IMP and of a number of other fifteenth-century Irish translation texts, such as GSM and GM.

In Chapter IV I compiled an in-depth textual analysis of IMP in order to evaluate which parts of the Travels the Irish author omitted and which he expanded in his adaptation. IMP is a much reduced account of Marco Polo’s Travels, amounting to just over a third the size of P, roughly 35%. The section which has been expanded the most in IMP is the account of Naim’s rebellion, which describes the war between Cublay and his uncle Naim and cousin Cadau. I have argued that the motivation behind the development of this part of IMP is that the war between Cublay and his relatives was being rewritten as an allegory for the war between Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach and his cousin Cormac mac Donnchaidh Mac Carthaigh, who had usurped the title of Mac Carthaigh Riabhach from Fínghean’s father in 1468 and held it until 1477, when Fínghean was restored to power. If my argument is correct, it allows us to date IMP to shortly before the writing of L.

I will conclude this study of IMP by offering a narrative of how and why the Travels were translated into Irish during last quarter of the fifteenth century which can be inferred from the discoveries and arguments advanced in this dissertation.

1. At some stage during the fifteenth century, a copy of P, of subgroup \( \delta \), was brought from England, perhaps London, to Ireland. This copy of P may have been in a manuscript that contained a number of other texts that dealt with European and Oriental history, some of which, such as GSM and GM, were being translated and adapted elsewhere on the island. This rise in popularity of texts dealing with the Far and Middle East, describing the wars against Saracens and the customs of Muslims was not unique to Ireland, but was part of a surge in popularity of the genre all over the Christian world. The Travels in particular were copied and rewritten into a multitude of different versions, and P itself was being translated and adapted all over Europe. The ‘Digby’ version, the ‘Cambridge-Dublin’ version, the ‘Harley’ version and the manuscripts of group \( \varepsilon \) show that abridgements and rearrangements of P were already common in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and that the Travels was a popular candidate for retellings and abridgements.
2. Sometime after 1478, when Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach took back the lordship of Cairbre from his cousin and foster brother Cormac mac Donnchaídh, an erudite and learned writer translated P into Irish, recasting the text in a distinctly Irish literary style, incorporating archaic language and native narrative styles which placed the text firmly within the canon of Medieval Irish literature. In this new Irish version of the *Travels* he molded sections of the text to reflect political events which were formative in the life of his patron, Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach and his wife Caitilín Fitzgerald.

3. He may have even included a personal signature of sorts in the prologue of the text, signing himself as *bráthair righ an aibit San Fronses*. His transformation of Francesco Pipino from a Dominican into a Franciscan may indicate that IMP was written in the Franciscan friary of Timoleague, an hour’s walk from Fínghean’s home in Kilbrittain and location of the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family crypt. L, the manuscript in which IMP is contained, was also probably written here, between 1478-1505. The addition of a steeple, dormitory, hospital and library\(^{1180}\) to the friary of Timoleague between 1494 and 1517 shows that a significant investment was made in the establishment during the later years of Fínghean’s lordship of Cairbre. This may have been a response to an expansion of the Franciscan movement in the Diocese of Ross and in the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach territories, and perhaps even to the fosterage of a Third Order community around the friary.

4. The scribes of L and who worked for Fínghean included: Aonghas Ó Callanání, a learned historian who probably had a medical background and who was charged with copying *seanchas* and *fiannaíocht* texts in the manuscript; and Scribe A, who availed of the help of relief scribes, perhaps his student, and who wrote almost all of L. Known court poets of Fínghean Mac Carthaigh Riabhach during this period were Mathghamhain mac Domhnaill mheic Eóghain Í Dhálaigh, whose inaugural poem for Fínghean, *Ní théd an éigin a n-aisgidh*, survives on f. 158 of L, and An Giolla Dubh mac

---

\(^{1180}\) Ware, *De praesulibus*, 223.
Conchubhair Í Dhuinnín, who wrote a caithréim poem for Fínghean beginning *Ris féin is measda Mac Carthaigh*,1181 commemorating Fínghean’s victory over his cousin Cormac. Fínghean’s political influence in Cairbre during the 1480s may be seen in the appointment of a relative as the bishop of Ross, Tadhg Mac Carthaigh, a Franciscan. Although Tadhg’s precise family ties to Fínghean are unknown, and he is not mentioned in any of the genealogies of the Mac Carthaigh Riabhach family, it is interesting to consider whether *bráthair righ in aibit San Fronses* is a reference to him.

5. In conclusion, however, the author of IMP must remain anonymous. This investigation of the text has shown that he was an extremely well-read individual, an able writer of upper-register Classical Irish prose with a European mentalité who incorporated linguistic, stylistic and thematic elements of native literature into his adaptation in order to create a uniquely Irish version of Marco Polo’s *Travels*.

---

1181 Ó Cuív, ‘A Poem’, 96; preserved in four later manuscripts: RIA 23 G 25 f.269a; RIA 23 M 33 f. 13; RIA 23 C 21 f. 88; RIA 23 H 28 f.64. Cf. *RIACat*, 492.
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APPENDIX I

*Transcription and transliteration of the Irish Marco Polo from The Book of Lismore, ff. 121–131*

*Principles of transcription*
The foliation followed is that of the facsimile and of the description on Irish Script on Screen.

Expansion of all abbreviations is indicated in italics. Tall e is represented by *ea*, unless (a) followed by an *i* or an *o*; (b) where a following slender glide is implicit as in *tEndte > tendte* (121vb27); (c) where occurring in the *ae* ligature (e.g. 123ra1, 126ra24, etc.), or in non-ligature formations such as in *roen* 123ra5, and *noen* 123va12. Roman numerals not transliterated. An attempt has been made to reproduce the word division of the manuscript, and also punctuation and capitalisation; the *ceann fo eite* is represented by //.

For convenience, Stokes's paragraph-arrangement of the text is referenced in the form [¶]
f. 121ra
1. riguibh 7 taiseachaidh na cathrach sin. Bai brathair
2. righ[iu expuncted] anaibit san fronses isin cathraig
3. intan sin. Ba eoluch dano isna hilbherlaibh
4. Fransiscus a ainm. Berur iarum du a mbatar
5. na maith ucut 7 cuinghit fair in leabhor
6. doclodh for cula otheangaidh na tartaireadh
7. cusinteangaidh laitianta. IS omun leamsa ol
8. se saethar na menmannradh do chaithimh fria
9. gnimhradh idhul 7 aincheirim. Cuighit he fa
10. an eata doridisi. Dogeantar or se ár gídh
11. scéla ainctristaidhthi thaismhearter sum. mirbhulí
12. in fhirdhia iatsaidhhe et gac aen doclinfe
13. in timutsa a nagaídh na hírsí coimdeata guighfidh
14. co dicra fadaclodhsun for cula 7 in neach nac guigh
15. in faíchfídh calma a cuirp fria clodh. Nó
16. sam omhachsa riasinleabarsa mharcais or
17. ni fuil go ann. Do thadhail muroscsa he
18. ac tabháirt mhínd na heaclaisi naímeis lais 7 rofhag
19. aibh fria blaisecht mbais gur fhirson 7 ba
20. diaidha inti marcús. [2] Cidh fil ann tri acht ros
21. tinnta pronsiscus inleabarso mharcais a tar
22. tairidh a laitin et fahiat bliadhna in
23. tigerna in tansín u. bliadna dec 7 d[a on erasure] fhicit 7
24. 7 cc. 7. m. bliadan. // si. tir isidhe conimh
25. [3] IN airméin beac ceatamus fochis do magnus fil
26. cathrach 7maine nanaithnidi fria creic 7 cund
27. radh. Glaisia is cathair oireachais di 7 ar muir
28. ata si. tursie i. proibhimmí fuil innti. tir
29. sléibtíghí isidhe 7 do macumetaí adhruid
30. eich amra leo 7 imat sida. // mhamis
31. [4] IN airméin mhír immórro tir forlethan isidhe. Fo
32. magnús fuil sí. imut cathrach 7maine leo
33. da chathair oirdnídli le. agiron 7baririm
34. a nanmuine 7 isintirsin ata slaib ar
35. menia. IS aírsaidro arís ináirc iar ternam
36. ohilín. [5] IS friataobhshíde ata proibímsi sor
37. anorum 7sruith ola for teibírisn insidhe do
38. gers dia lintar longa 7barcu na ceannnúr foicsi

f. 121rb
1. 7 neamhfìoci 7fuath aicuile argualuimm cach
2. ae dib ar na tusmedh. Do isa adhrait. Fil
3. mainister isin crich sin 7 loch fríataeab. Sruth eof
4. prís acteibirgin a pardhus in. imat isècc
5. o ini coisaisc in. 7garabheith niis síre.
7. macumetus adrait. Fil cathair oirdnídli innti
8. baldasi a hainn. aídrí na sairrisineach
9. as ri fuirriseic. calipus a hainn. imat
10. oir 7 maine laois. or ni hal do laeic naid
11. curaid fora inchaibh. // a chathrac fair a
12. [¶7] Luídhd alan .i. ri na tarraidhí do ighabhail
13. nírt catha. Bait tor dithoghlaídi lais arna
14. linadh dor 7dómhairíbh. gabhthar calipus
15. gunathor 7 cona chathair ar ni rabatur laeich
16. oca imdhítean. Gia thucais anoir 7 airmidín
17. don or ol balan ni phíl anoir na airmidín
18. aigi fort aniu .u. la conanoighcib do chal
19. ipus gin digh gin biadh curomhoidh a chathaidh na
20. cliab do cumaidh 7 doilghius a oir 7 a mhaíne
21. [¶8] FIL cathair naili isi in cathair na slógh 7 sliabh dónaeb
22. anaill. Gu cualat ar na hiudaidh i laithi nae
23. amal adeir in soiscel diadhá. // dicetis
24. Si abueritis fidem ut granum sinapis
25. huic monti transi 7 transibit 7 nichil in
26. Si abueritis fidem ut granum sinapis
27. possibile erit uobis .i. dia mbeirh aireat
28. in graine musdaird do sheirc isa lat do
29. thogluaisfea in sliabh ar in sliabh araill
30. diamad ail dhuit. IS fáid guach intissa
31. dia nadharthai ol na geinti 7 as bhrat a goo
32. lasí ár dia cuingheadh sibh for an sliabh ucut
33. togluasacht for an sliabh aile ni dingnad foraih itir
34. Tiaghuit na cristaidh for aenchai 7guigit in taen
35. ndia uman sliabh doclaechlód. A is a oul
36. sit na leic idhuil 7 aincreitimhghír diar
37. bhforracne. Adre insliabh intansin for an
f. 121va
1. sliabh naill a freacnarcus na slógh 7air
2. isis air coidhche et rogabsat araidí
3. donagentib baisded lasin mirbúil sin
4. [¶9] Cricha na perfida immorro don teinid adrait
5. crich Forletan isidhe cunocht righuib fuirri
6. eich amhra le dá .c. punt for cach neoch
7. [¶10] Cricha camandi ubla 7toirthi parrdhais
8. nomelit. Daimh gheala gu cluim foda
9. leo. reithidha leo meidhthir fria hasal cech ae dúb
10. Tir náili fríahor gurigh fuirrí. do bereat la
11. amhainsi 7teachthla dorcha for dreich ngrene
12. amal budh agaidh. lecit sirthi focrichaib na ca
13. mandi 7 in lamh acharoili dhiubh .x. .m.
14. a slogh. toglaír andínna 7anduinti 7
15. marbhuit asin 7doniat gialla da nocaib
16. et atconnuic marcus fesín in dishoolslí sin
17. na timthocht 7no rig for luas ator ditho
18. ghlaídhi dia anacal fuirri. Fri re .uii. la
19. airisis in ciaichsin // duinti 7 cathraí
20. [¶11] Timocauim ummorro tir forleathan isidhe conimat
21. fonn cain le gin puinn toirtithe. uisceada serbha
22. le. crann greine ina tuaisceart. crand direach eside
23. coremhe dermhair. Adbul a fhod. Duille gael
24. for leth de culerhi ingaithigh. Duille uaine for
25. in leth naill. nithurcaibh crand tria uir .c. .m.
26. friataebsaibh // aloadam a ainm. Doronta
27. [¶12] Cricha mulete do macumetus adrait. Fil ri fuirre
28. palas rigda lais a nglind dithoghlaíd for slaibh
29. urard coneim noir fAIR congrimanaibh solusta
30. lais culubhortaibh leasaigthe. cutobraibh
31. solusda friathaebh amal budtoil la menmanad gac aein
32. laeich 7ingentad imdha leo. cluitheda 7cleasa imda
33. leo. asaire do ronta sin leo. macametus diachan
34. tain friu amail bethi abhus beithi thall am righsiu
35. iarmlaísceáibh bhais. conidhairi sin rochaids a
36. bhfleagha 7abfuireaca 7 ba calma icathaibh
37. iatsom ár niraibh omhun bás foru uair ba derb
38. leo beith iarnec amlaid sin // nistadh sísin 7do
39. Parrthus talmhaidi domamadum adrait do berta foran
40. ronad tor dithoghlaíd fora bheol gin tsligid ind
41. acht treimit. noberthe oig na criche leo ind

f. 121vb
1. 7 no berthe andaethain fealgh 7 fuireac dhoibh
2. co tuiteadh asuan forto do nertad anamna do maca
3. metus 7 ro chanad a bhfhís friu. Fón bfhleaghugadh
4. út doronabair abhus forbia mufhledhsa tall daibh
5. [¶13] Otclos do alan .i. do righ na tartraidh insaibh
6. dligeád sin aru roibí aloadam doronad sligheadh
7. lais 7 ro mharbh é cona righui 7 taisecaibh 7 do
8. chuir a chathair darceann conarfhacoibh cloch for cloich di
9. [¶14] Bassia ummorro tir iside co nert ngreine fuirri. daim
10. dubha le. domamadum adrait. toghairmit na demna
11. aieardha dia nimacallaíom le draidheach 7tuachlecht
12. 7 do berat dorcha fordeirech grene. Feoil 7righele nostoim
13. lit. imat torc 7muc nalltaighi leo cutreagdúid
14. acou 7 a cuanarta don finna ghoisidec fuil for
15. dromunnbh 7 toebuih dhoibh et ni uimhigít do righ
16. for bith. Fileat ditreabaíg a mainistribh 7 apsepailb
17. a mbeannuíubh sliabh actrosac 7ac idhbuirt do Macametus
18. conaíonad 7airmhíthin moir ocna maithibh uccut
19. forto. [¶15] Fil sliabh urard isin críchsin 7 gleann aluinm fria
20. a ucht. airtfíthir dosheibhtib inbeatha. imut caerc na 7reithed
21. isin glindsins .ui. basa a leiri gacahadhairce damhí
22. for na reithidib sin condenta miasa 7 soithigh dhoibh
23. dia toimhialte proinu 7 fealgha 7 gur dhin dia naedh
24. airtbh foráthiigh 7 aitrehu for sneacta 7 derdan et ni
25. lamhat conu na fiadhmhíliu ceana beith for an
26. sliab sin la fuacht 7adhuath et gia adaighthe
27. tendte fair ni berbhtha biadh leo la tormac fuacaí
28. [¶16] Sermacum ummorro cathair oirdníd isidh le la mac magh
29. nus cam. do macumetus adrait. ro batur ile crisaidí isin
30. cathraíg sin. atbath inri. ro bui líc marmuir fó
31. anadhnaíthe nagennte acnuc urard alla
32. muigh frísín cathraíg 7ro hadhnachta inri foithi. Gabhús
33. a mac rigi dia eis. sigotan a ainm 7rocreid
34. dochoimdhidh nandul 7roghabh baised na
35. heacleásti noime et ba doirb a gentiu sin. [¶17] Conudhe
36. aireac meanman for uair sigotan laanaen. sép
37. el airmhíntseek dothurcabail isin cathraíg ananoir
38. eoin. baistid. Noberthea cuigi anisdeach foraír
39. doshaeruigb fíagi 7 neamhthaíci 7 ro forcaill forro
40. dicitum asaeirsi 7 a nealadan do chaithimh fris
41. Ro iarsat a shaerisiumh an ail dimhor
f. 122ra
1. fo ro hadhnachta a athair 7sin na niubhaidhe
2. dothoghluasacht cusín du ambarat. dobersiumh
3. sin daibh. Ba galar lasnagénti sin 7 ni roleíc
4. oman inriagh dhoibh cron fair. Cidh fil ann tra acht ro
5. turcabhadh inoibrísin la healadain ingantaigh amail
6. budh toil la meanmain gac acín. Columhain marmair
7. foalair dhiadhmachar cu saír gaca gresa far
8. robhatar díblinaíbh for an lig reamhraiditi. [¶18] At
9. bath in ri focetoir 7gabús a mac righi diaeis
10. et ni ro an for lugr aathar acht ro adhair do Macamétus
11. Otclos donageintib inri do adhrad do Macameatus
12. cuigeit forna crístaigib in ail foroładhnaichta
13. asin. Nato itir ol na Cristaidí nothoitfeed eaclais
14. Eoin diciuirthe togluasacht foranligsín. maith
15. ol na gíntite. Rosia maine imdh a dúib tuirí
16. olna cristaidi. Lig as díth duin ol nageinti 7ni
17. máine. donertuigh inri lasna geinti 7 dobered
18. fuirmeadh forsin cloich gu rucset for culai hi
19. Aitchit na cristaidí eoin 7sá arna fásín sin. Airisíus
20. didiu an eaclais amail as deach bui riam. cobhfuil .iii.ra
21. traigead uas talam anius 7bíaidh coforcan mbratha
22. [¶19] PEIN ummorro tir forlehan isidhe conimad cathrac. uidhe
23. .u. laithi fora fot. Diandecadh neach dibh fórset
24. no siubal damba .xx. la gin toighecht forcula foi
25. fidh a sheitic la fer naílie. uisceda serbha le. sruth
26. fora feadh conimad cloch mbaudh. iaspideis 7cal
27. sidion anamunna // mhoir. imad gaca mainly
28. [¶20] LOP didieu cathair oirndidi isidhe for bel fhásaigh dhí
29. allamuich di contaidi sin is port aìrisim dagac aen
30. fría creic 7cundrad 7maine hi. Do Macamétes adhruit
31. Camhail 7sail berár a loibríubh lagac naen
32. dia teit foran fasac sin. uisceda serba fair. magha
33. gaismhídi 7seibti uisceda foran conuir. uidh bliadna
34. fora fot. uihdá .xxx. la fora leithed gin fhadhmhíla
35. gin innile. Ticínt na demnu dhacallaim na ndáine
36. foran conair. Daibhfhaghat nech dhibh anuathaí o
37. a fheadhain goirit he naaimm fein 7nashlonnadh
38. 7 leanaid na deamna ár ni fhidir nac dia aes cumtha
39. iat 7 níthic forcula triabithu. seindit nademna
40. cruitti 7 timmpana dia cur na suan cum aimsighi forro

f. 122rb
1. [²²¹] Larbhfachbhall na ndhthrub sin do gabar crich
2. forlerhan 7cathair oirdnidi innti conamait gaca
3. måine. Do macametus adrait. 7 do nither oirisium
4. cian innti iar scís infhasaigh ucút og creicc
5. 7 cumnrad. Sasion a haimn. Dátuismghitter mac
6. do neoch innti berar da idbáirt dona deeb 7r
7. cith maraen frís 7berar forcula aræin in
8. naideh 7 inretthe 7dobarur comultus bliadna forto
9. 7berur cohaltoir na hídbarta diblnaibh 7f
10. onather inretthe 7 doberur diathomhailt do
11. ghaeltuibh 7cairdib na naidhiun conaírmhíthin nder
12. mhair dona deebib 7 curter a chnama for taiscidh
13. naninargáibh. [²²²] Gach marbh lasin cathraigsin no
14. cuirthe anéilitum nordhai co ntaigib sida 7
15. sirecdha for slis arighthoighi conanair dermair
16. faire gac noighthi do bhiudh 7dhig 7 gac ni nothoimhleádh
17. fecht riam ár ni hadnacter nec iscathraighsin culathi
18. athuismeadha. Conadhaire sin rocúirthe luibh
19. 7 balsamam uaislí triáthimthocht. gu caithdis
20. a laeich 7a inginrad 7aas cumtha a proinn ma
21. roean frís amail budh beo et noloiscthe a corp
22. iar toidhecht in laithisín cu fleagacus 7 airmittin nder
23. mhair dona déibh // do cathraig sin. do macametus
25 non adhrumi. Camul a haimn. Diaticead aidhi
26. no echtarcrich dia [stain] taisdiul. indinn no
27. indun di co [stain]aroich. arnafacsin don
28. laech no don taisec bhís faire adre amach dar
29. beolu in duin 7 no berur a shetig diashaighd
30. dena dho so ol se amhuil budh mhisi no
31. anfudh isindunad 7cuírid eipísti scribhtha
32. forsin comlaid 7triaillaid fein for set 7fáidh in
33. ben lasin naighidh. Gac is deach dobiudh 7étgad
34. induin ataighd fora chomus. Dercaidh inlaech
35. gac laithi forsin comlaid diafhís in triaillad in taidhi
36. for set ar issed ba bes ineipsidil dothochbáil
37. dia triallad 7dia bhfásceadh níthechfad tria bithu
38. [²²⁴] Faidhús magnus cam feacht naílí teachta co
39. neipístil leo doncathraigsin 7 issed bhi innti. For
40. chongrain foruibh ol se clodh for cula on

f. 122va
1. tsaeibhdliged forataithe or isahimuat taebh
2. as dochar he ár nideimhin la neach acaiibh in
3. lais in toighre [fhaibais dia eis inserted] 7ís dith arbur seotuibh 7arbhar 4. mainib
   atabairt for breith 7comus aidhedh no eichtarcrich
5. [²²⁵] Faiditsiúm teachta for cula comagnus la feirg
6. 7lonnus conceipistlib leo 7issed bui innta. A magnuis
7. cam ol siat aitchimit fort for dheirc 7 troighi
8. gin ar eldhi forcula do dliged ar sean. ár dia
9. ndernta dobeanfadh in talam a thoirthi foirm
10. 7 masadhthoir no ilmaine nanaitinte
11. fil fort dohebha gin chumca fruti. Foemuis
12. magnuis. doibh oirisium for dliged asean. [‡26] IAr cur
13. chuil frisin crichsin fosgebha fasac fodaí
14. uidhi .ui. la ndec essium. Sing singcalas don
15. taail de. crich forlethan isidhe. Fil sliabh
16. urard isincrichsin 7salmandair fair. Beathaduigh
17. beacca iadsom. Fogniat snáth dothuismheadh
18. forsin talam aninaduibh inglana 7notimaircethe
19. la hoes na criche 7 noberthea dianighi cusro
20. thaiibh 7topraibh 7 nobrisdte 7leastraibh 7
21. isoithigibh prais. no adaighthea tendte
22. leo diacur foralar 7geal dothiced don gris
23. iarloscad a inglain. Do gnithe eduighi de
24. asa haitli 7 ba [flaw in vellum] usal airmhít
25. neachsom. 7 intan no gabhad sal nodorcatu
26. he. foran ngris nocuirthe diaglanad. 7 glan
27. no thicd di. // Campisio is cathair oirecus
28. [‡27] Cricha cambu ummorro crich fhairsing forlethan isidhe
29. di. Do macametus adrait acht uathad cristaidí lé. Atfsisid
30. siumn arimir reann 7reatlann .i. ainder la cech naen
31. dibh. claelaither cele lagach naindir mad doin he
32. Nibhi rimh mis na raithi leo acht ainm forleth
33. for cech laithi don bliadain. Coic laithi airmhdineca
34. leo gin anmunna gin fhiadhmhila domharbhud
35. cin tomhuilt feola leo. gin tsiaethr gin obair
36. Nibhi col fría seitic doib acht siur no mathair
37. Roairis didiu marcus bliadain isincathraig sin

f. 122vb
1. [‡28] Caracorum ummorro cathair oirechuis isidhe
2. do tharraidibh feact riam ar isaisdi ambunadas
3. Niraibhi ri dhib fein forro acht iat fochis 7 chan
4. achus do prespiter seon .i. do righ nahindia et
5. robuí ainm aile fair .i. unccam. Cidh fil ann
6. acht rofhas cineadh na tartairdeg acaracorum
7. curba linmurus alaeich 7 athaisigh cumbair om
8. an animaireac fornamenntaruibh ciana 7 faicsi
9. Ba lan dia nomhun prespiter seon oc faircse
10. na tarraidhini antum cutad sin. Asbert friu. scaillid
11. olse anile cricha ciana 7loesi ar nichumuing
12. la caracorum bar congaille. Robatar fasaighe
13. foda moncatraig intansin gin duinti gin
14. istada leo. Conadh comairli rocratiea la maithibh
15. na tartraigh triall forin fasac uct dia aitreadadh
16. Doronsat amlaid. [‡29] Bui laech amra intansin duais
17. lib na tartraigeç 7 rohoirdned irighi leo he ár
18. ni raibhi rí forro feact riam. Simisis a ainm
19. airisit fornadroibhelaib 7 fornadithubaib sin gin nert
20. righ forbith forro. Gac neach diachru bui seachnnon
21. in domain rothimaircset colairm imbhi Sisimis
22. Ba amra inri eisidhe. noberedh adhliged dagac aen
23. Cidh fil ann acht roumlaigseat .uii. righ dho la [h above]oman
24. aimaireac ar nilamhtha slad na sarugad for dhun
25. na cathair diatabradh umla dheonuch dhó
26. [¶30] Faidis prespiter seon neach dochuinghidh inchisa inn[ecda]
27. fair. Diultaigh frís ár ni bui oman righ fair
28. Clodhuit nateachta forcula 7 airisidh sisim ina
29. righi budesin et faidhis teachta laanaen do
30. chuimghidh a ingine fair iarndiultad a chisa dho et
31. issed isbert friú is baisce doloiscedh a ingin ana
32. do beradh dosisim hi 7 fóghebha bas dochrudh
33. aracinghidh olse 7 dorat dimhicin fór na
34. teachta 7 clodhuit forcula co sisim 7 adfedhut
35. do archansat 7 arcanad friú. [¶31] Ba lan dferg 7 londus
36. sisim dona haithiscib sin 7 rogairmit arigha
37. 7a thaisigh diashaigid. ISed isail damhsa ol se

f. 123ra
1. ar ndula dibлинаibh for aenchaei re preis
2. piter seon diaithiu fair in dimhicin dorad formd
3. ISail dünne amlaid olseat amail bidh a haen
4. ghin friscartsat. [¶32] Gabhuit nasloigh chechtardhasin
5. in roen foranagaíd cin anad cinairisium doib gu
6. magh tandu 7 faidhit teachta corigh na
7. hindia dochuinghidh chatha fair 7dó berar a ndraithi
8. dia saigid 7 faífраighidh dib faitsine 7 celmane
9. inchatha nó cinnus nobiath doib 7 dó preispiter
10. seon. Luidhset nadruidh foracliathaib físh 7 ro
11. thoghairmset deamhna 7dei aerdh na ndocum
12. 7 doberat bhociochmhin ndimoir leò 7 ro scoilt
13. seat 7 doronsat dá leith di 7 doberat preispiter seon
14. daimf forleth di 7 sisim forinleth naíil 7 cuirid
15. ladraidechi 7 tuaichlecht di leith na simhne do co
16. lunn tríaraili 7 beridh inleth foratuscat sisim bu
17. aidh. Triallait nadraithi forcula cu tartraighibh fá
18. luth 7 ghairedeus indarleo isiat bidhoscraich isin cath
19. [¶33] Preispiter seon ummorro ocelos dó cath do chuimghidh fair
20. 7 sluaig diairmhidi dotoighecht tathaebh rogairmitt
21. chuigi arigh 7 thaisigh 7 acaruid focei 7 chiana
22. Cidh tra otcnnccar na sluaíg ceachtardhasin aceli ro
23. ghbasat aneirred imairc 7 anidhna aidh forro 7
24. rosinidit a sduic 7 rogairstit acaismaerta
25. catha 7 gabhuit na slóigh ceachtardha oceasarcuin
26. araill aic scoitad mhind 7 siath cu mba hár
27. diairmhidi leo alliu 7 amall. Acht ata ni cheana
28. muidhís for na hindedhaibh 7 roládhan anar
29. 7 romarbadh preispiter seon et gabhuis sisim righe
30. for innedhaibh intansin 7 foriltirib aile et
31. ba hesin in cema ri dohtarhairbh [¶34] et in .ui.ed bliadain
32. dia fhaithius rodbraiseadh doshoighthid he icatraighe
33. fora raibi ic forbhaic cu rofaicuibh cin annmain
34. et ro hadhnacht for sliabh alcahi. [¶35] Facbuis mac
35. di eis. caite aainm. Facbuis sin mac. satiu
36. aaim. Facbuis sin mac. roton aaim. Facbuis
37. roton mac. mongu aaim. IS uadha sin ro
38. chin culbaly 7 roderrscaigh culbaly tarna
39. .u. righuib aile 7roderrscaig a righi tar righthacht

f. 123rb
1. crisaidh 7 shairrisinec. Insliabh urad sin
2. in ro adhnhacht sisim isann rosadhnachta ar
3. ghein do righuib foralurg. Gac neach idir laech
4. 7 taisec dogheibhdis forsin conuir ac dul dia
5. nadhnacl romarbhtha leo 7tissed rocanduis
6. friu. Deanaid umhla 7 immcoimet inrigh isin
7. beathaid naili amail doronsabaí feacht riamh
8. et inri deighinec dohadhnacht dibh. isar. da
9. .m. laech romarbhtha dia cur lais 7romarbsat
10. anas deach foruaradar do eachraidh inrigh diacur lais
11. [¶36] Natartraighidh unmorro cinedh linmar iatsein ar nibhi
12. rim for mnaibh na ingenia la nec dhib acht inmheit
13. ascumhuining leo do freasdul dobhiudh 7etgad
14. acht asi incetna ingen laafaisi fer dhibh as for
15. tille fortha 7araill dib ladrnucene 7lamhhdai
16. 7alaecich fria seilg 7gaissced 7 indun forcomus
17. dontseighigh. scéith le/hair laalaechaidh. ba
18. do sheichhidib buabhall arnambruith iatsom et ba
19. dofhulaing dochath naile dibhracad a soigheat
20. forro ár isair no [h above]ailtea iat asambratuibh
21. beaca. Feoil 7bauni nornfolktea leo gin
22. coicill fheola dam nagraidhedin nachuantaírt
23. acht nomeiltis ceech féoil for bith. Ba mian
24. leo bauni angroigheadh 7alaireathch dothochaitim
25. fín fínd nobertis fair 7 nothoghadtit gaca sam
26. raith a mbeanaibh slí 7anochtiaibb ald laa
27. ngroighibh 7indilibh. Pupla for foluamhun
28. uasta. ameic 7aningena leo guelodhatais
29. for cula la toighecht naduibhshine geimhrata
30. 7 a pupla maraen friu. [¶37] Natay indee dia
31. nadrait do nitet afluath do rindudh ingach
32. dhind irighi na tartraigec 7fuath a mhna for
33. aghualainn cli 7 fuath a mheic ina fheacnaircc
34. 7 friatochaithium dhoibh nocomailtean an is
35. deach da mbiadhaib foghin 7ghlomhar dhó 7
36. damhnaí 7da mac et doirtid an bruíthi na
37. proinne tar beolu induin dia blaisecht diandéibh
38. adhartha Ar is derbh leo gurube natay fhollam
39. nuighis neam 7talam. [¶38] Dia teasadáidí oglach cin sheitig
f. 123va
1. a crícheib na tartraidh 7 ingen gin chele doniter
2. a snaidm friaraili iar mblaisecht bhais doibh
3. 7 is aire doniathair dianbeith dibliniabh a fheic
4. nairc nataui 7doberur crogh do mhathait nah
5. ingin ăr nitabhar crogh la seitigh icrichuibh
6. natartruigeac 7 anuit acaruitisium a ngael
7. 7 chaidrius friaraili amail budh bheo no
8. bheitis. [39] ni bhi col do sheitig leo acht mathair no
9. siur no ingen cunadair sin as limhhairití alaeich
10. imat seicced lagac aen. [40] at ferdha acathuibh
11. 7atlaechdha anairm 7acumaing lagac
12. noen dibh beith x. la for set no sluagad cin
13. bhiaigh gindigh acht toirthi craebh 7cru aneach
14. [41] dianderna nech cin noguim gin dliged a oig
15. eadha dhe .xxx. beim do luirg dhó no .lx. mad cin
16. ismo indás no a x. for .c. mad mo in treas feacht
17. no mod cin búis lais anaíe naireat uadha 7
18. saeiri dhó // la forafhod. mcrít incinedh
20. aitreabhús ann. sealg nostoiinhliit. ní
21. thurcaib arbar na fineamaín os úir and
22. IS ann som ro citer polus arcticus i. araill
23. doretlanduibh oirismhe na firmaminti
24. imud camhall 7gribh 7elifaineadh isnacrichaib
25. sin. Doim dhimora leo gucluin foda .iii.ra
26. boss abhfot gaca finna dhibh. [43] Fil anmann
27. naili ann adbul a mheit. deallrad fiadh
28. lais. Geinter balsamam anorac uadha. musc
29. atum a ainm. suail nac icshaiinti eisiumh
30. di fhiaucil incech dheid dó .iii.ra bosa abh
31. fhoc cech ae. [44] Niteascthar folt na ulcha
32. laeich isincrichisín. Aille domhnaibh a ngingen
33. Ni ar uaisli na airmhitin fhaidit laaseit
34. chib acht ar cruth 7meit. [45] Ni tabhar crog lahingin
35. icrichaib na tartraigeac. nalaecich nosber crogh dia
36. maithrecu // no ndhrot. doridacht na hinnia
37. [46] Tenduc ummorro crich forleth an isside 7 issu
f. 123vb
1. isidhe 7fomhamas do magnus cam doibsimh
2. O domarbad respiter seon feacht riam do berat na
3. righa fora lurug aningena duaislighbh na tartraidec
4. marcleith forabhfich 7naimdinus. [47] Corra dubha
5. isincrichisín. aedul anmet. Corra naili leo
6. conilbrcnächtraid gacadartha itur uaine 7 derg 7ghorm
7. Corra naile coneim noir forro. Corra
8. aile ti dubghlas 7tí derg dhibh // .iii.ra la
9. [48] IArbhfacbál na crichisín doneoch diaeis uidhe
10. fobhghu cathair siaudu forin conair 7lacubla
11. uy .i. magnus cam roturcbadh. palas marmaid
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12. fora lar cosluaigtec rigda lais coseomradaib
13. solusta co neim noir forro allamuigh 7
14. tall. [¶49] Figh dithoglaidi fiahor induin condiguibh
15. 7mhúráibh aelta na urtomicill .u.m. dec inatim
16. thocht. doim 7fiaadh imdha lais 7iuili fiadmil
17. arceanach. maga solusta 7srotha gáinmhídi forsin
18. bhfhig sin. Bagnath lacublay commorad selga
19. forsin bfig soin. Doronad istada rebroinn seilgi
20. lais andiamhair instraga 7 badoboischimnibh do
21. ronad .u. ceme dec fód gacasibhne 7 .iii. ra bosa for
22. alethe 7 is la reidhfeedhuiuib sidu rosnaíomhtha
23. iarna niamad do or allastig 7 amuigh cunac
24. derrnad doineann naderdun dith do na donfhiallach
25. bite foralar. [¶50] Tri misa don bliadain bí foranseilgín
26. .i. iunius iulius augustus. Toctbait inteachsin
27. leo intochtmad la dec domhi august. cotríaill doibh
28. doridisi. Teacat for cula beos cuthair sia
29. udu. Triallait saaithil sin cosliabh urard
30. do dhenam idburtu dona déibh. macaibh mnaibh
31. innilibh .x.m. lair gheal aroen fris. iarndenamh
32. na nidburt sin no berthe bainni nalairtce ngealsin
33. aleantraib 7asothgib togadi co magnus 7no
34. rannadh fair budhesin 7 forsin ful rigda dia
35. ol 7 nithabhrad dochinedh naili nadodhaescarshluagh
36. Nodhoirted magnus in baindisin forinraen dia
37. blaisacht dona déibh. [¶51] Diamarbthur laech no

f. 124r
1. neach dodliged bais toimhlit he forsinidbairtsin
2. 7 ni thoimlit diamad doshoeth no galar no dhighbaeadh
3. [¶52] Do niter latuaichlecht 7amuinski freasul irrigh gin
4. faircse neich do neoch dia denumh acht namiása
5. 7 na heasradu for foluamain fria ucht. IS d asberitsium
6. beos conudhiait nadei nosfreasdlait iat 7in ri
7. et dobearbhtha immat reithe leo acumndhbaitsin 7
8. doberthe infheoil dona déibh 7 nodoirtte intan
9. bruithi forsin talmain indarleo isairi noberedh a torad doibh
10. [¶53] FIL mainister lacublay. da .m. manac lé
11. oc freasud dona deibh 7ocidbairt doibh. Filet manuign
12. aili isinrichcin 7droing acu icamhít seiceda 7a
13. raill ac congbaíl a riagha dona deibh. // partis
14. Explicits prima pars istius libri. Incipit sequunda
15. [¶54] FEACHTUS domhagnus cam acathair cambalau
16. confhacad teachta dia shaigid. Beannuigíth dé. Fochtuis magnus
17. scela dibh. Fuigli ruin againn duit arna taeicha. Adre
18. magnus. asin tsuidhi rigda imbui condecasat forleth
19. Naim ol nateachta i. brathair hatharsa arndiultad
20. umla righi duiisi. Doroine 7cadai .i. mac abrathar
21. ainta atagaidsi. atat 7naceti righ fil fomamus
22. naim lin a sluaig ac toighecht at rigisi .i. fuci
23. orcra 7cauli 7 barsceel 7suchitingni 7as
24. berit conad fearr andliged forsinrighi annaisi
25. [55] Ba tus rigi dochublay intansin iarmbrised cath
26. nimdba space lais for iltirihb. Bagaeth inti friis
27. ar canad sin. Gnuis riga lais condercuibh dis
28. hoillsidhe. mét 7 calmacht mhiled lais. Do oirdis
29. a bhaill diaraili. Roraith dano. nac cuirfead
30. a choroin rig diachind nogunaithed forro in
31. fuihhiulsin. Faidhis teacht forseann alaech 7a
32. rig nimhfoicsi arbadhriu lais diauireadh
33. togairm forashloghu icianuibh aghis dfhaghbail
34. do naim 7triail teithed do fó rhoitrib 7daingnib
35. Faidhis coimhét arna conairibh aronun scel dfhaghbail
36. donaim. Bahe lin insleaig dho reagain he i.
37. da chath dec 7 xxx.m. marcach incech cath dibh
38. 7 di troightec um cech marcach. Diatoghairmeadh
39. a slhoghu icianaib niri righ forro. Rohindledh
40. cetrí helifainti donrig 7caislen charuig forro
41. Teit ann dano i remtus in chatha 7amergi huasa

f. 124rb
1. Di la forfhicht do octinil inmorsluaig sin
2. [56] Naím ummorro gluaisís coslogh ndermhair lais a
3. ndal cadau for mag forlethan coshiba
4. urard friathaeib irighi cublay. niraibhi
5. cadau forsinmagsoin amail rogeall. Ro
6. niatsom airisiumh risinagaigsin isindu sin
7. Toicbait apula 7sreachait fortaraebuibh
8. ni bhui omhun forro ar nir shailseat asc
9. ela dobeith lacublay. Cublay didiu roghluais
10. inagaigsin for set indail inmorshluaig sin ar
11. nir bho ail doibh in aithi do ilmuladh ar
12. omun afaicrsina gureirigh ruithned ngreine forro
13. araenchahei frinaim. [57] Cofacatur namergeda
14. aillí eitheca 7nasceith corcora cobradhacha 7
15. nacathaib airinleacha cruaidehrighne
16. osnamiledar unrod cambula. Cotucsat aithni
17. ar mergei cublay osnacathaib. Conadh eadh
18. rosdíseigh inslégh asasuan. fógur na
19. sdocc 7 nasdurgan 7nalaech acgaimh
20. a caismert catha. [58] Faidhis cublay a
21. draidhe uadha diathis insoinmigi no doinmhihi
giri
22. nobhithd dó doncath. Gabhsat na laeich
23. ac snas asleagh 7aglimad a lann 7a loirc
24. fhearsat fria licuibh 7 tuinidib in talman
25. Tecuit na draithi for cúla cu celmaine maithusa
26. dho onchath. [59] Naím didiu u.c.m. lin a sluaig
ta
27. Ba forlehan forro inuairsin ār nibui omun forro
28. [60] Bai cadau foraconair Gin toidecht intansin
29. u.c.m. laeich 7nirofinnset fis lacublay
30. forro. Cidh fil ann tra ní artime dodheachaide
31. do naim sin. [61] Gabhait nasluaig sin anas
f. 124va
1. 7 damuinciidib dualacha dergoir cor
2. ba soighnen solust a clethe nime oscinn
3. nacurad ceachtardha sin. Roeirig dano glasnel
4. uathmar oigrita dontaeb araili donaer
5. idir mhinn 7asa idir shleigh 7tuaigh. Moigid
6. dona cathaib andail araili amail easa
7. fría halluibh gurbra breasmaidr brathla i nallaib
8. 7 inuamhunnaib mongur nacurad accomghabail
9. a bheadhmann catha 7fuaim asoighit asa
10. sreanguibh 7 foluaman abfhagadh 7grechach
11. angreag aganguin 7 oiccfeach ananruth
12. oc blaisecht bhais. [62] Oiris naim anairinec
13. inchatha 7toigne arig 7a thaisc gumbroin
14. ndoimsciath ndealldrada na urtinchell
15. cundoiri sleagh coinrigin cruadha ima mergi
16. uasa Co fighuir nacroichi cesta arna tinnad
17. fuirri. [63] Ar bhfaicsin mergi naim dochublay
18. tocbais cath coimthiugh lais dia riguibh 7
19. amradaibh curoscail incath naili diadheis
20. 7cli conderna giail donaim iarcur áir
21. a mhiied lais. muidhis fora shloghuiub iarsin
22. cuna riact rímh anecht. [64] Batar crisdaidi
23. forna cataibhsin diblainib. Doradsat nagennti
24. tallann forandia 7 forsinn figuir bui i merge
25. naim 7gin furtacht fair. curofhas coin
26. blict mor itir in sluaig sin condecatur gennte
27. 7 crisaidi indail chatha fría raili a hucht
28. andee. Otoonnuc cublay innisin ro
29. raithd. Fos a dheagmhuintner. ole nata
30. bhraithd dimhici for ihesu ar ni guth do
31. gin furtacht naim ár crisaidi nochanadh
32. fein fris 7 nirbo gnima diadhais lais ar
33. do impa fora thigerna. [65] Sldhuighit na
34. sluaig lasanathiuscsin 7 doberur naim a
35. fiadh[vellum flaw]nuise in righ amedon inoirechta
36. Cidh asni do so olsiat. Bas adhligheadh
37. ol magnus cam 7 nihilil damsa achrud do dh
38. or[7]ad fonuir la homan natoirheadh do
39. clod forculu. Nitol dam beos grian
40. na esca dhfaicsin a bhas. Gurubí oighid do
41. radad faír: soidheach do clar[aib above] comdlutha

f. 124vb
1. do cheangal do reifedhaibh 7 fhonnsaidibh
2. doceanglad naim dádhur foralair 7gluaisecht
3. dochur faír cumbhth octeacmaing diathaeabhuiubh
4. alliu 7anall co fuair bas amlaid. [66] Oirisí
5. cublay inarighi iarsin gin shlaid gin sharugad
6. gin triall cathaigthi do acht arigha 7athaisigh
7. do chur laamacu aongaluibh 7 in mac noberedh
8. buaidh dhibh doberedh ardagad flaitiusha 7 múime dó
9. Doberedh beos clar aircidi 7aimm magnuis caim arna
10. scribhadh doltríbh ordha faír 7 leomhan 7 gribh
11. arna rinnad dontaeibh araill de icomurtha
12. coscair. Dorinda roth grene 7 esca faír 7 gac
13. neach oca faciithi inclar sin icrichaib na tar
14. traighi doberthi umhla dó ogac aen 7inneach nach
15. tabrad dogheibedh bas doliged in righ ==
16. [67] Magnus cum ummorro .iii. rigna lais 7 in cetbean
17. laa faieann dib así is fortaillí faír 7 ase
18. in mac thuismes isoigiri air dia eis. Bit beos
19. ceatra dinna anorchu acu soin 7 x.m. incech
20. dhinn dhibh dia freasdal itir ingin 7oclách .C. ainder
21. naile lais 7 mna gu ngaeis 7gunaeis
22. criochtigh leo diaeir diafreasal ag
23. cublay ar saethaib 7gallraib 7 dotheacasc
24. druinecais 7bescna doibh. Madh ec dhdin
25. don .c. soin doberar ainder na hínat [no ait above] doburgo
26. guna .i. cineadh dhuaislib natartraigec iatsomh
27. conaindribh cruthacha leo 7 ni flaieann ainder
28. dhibh lacele naile acht feitim for inrigh ==
29. [68] Fil cathair naíli la magnus cam cathair camba
30. lu ahainm. As iside cathair oirecais nanuili
31. thartraigec. Bui didiu sruth fora feedh feacht riam
32. cofacuidh cublay arbaicais neoil 7rotha
33. grene 7 esca celmaine dochtur do beith do de dia
34. mbeith insruth thri thurostocuibh in cathair
35. don taeb araill don tsruth la tuaithleacht
36. 7amaindry. [69] Batar .iii. cula forincathraig sin
37. 7 .ui.m. for cech nae .iii. ra doruis umhaidi for
38. cech ceathramain di 7dind dithoghlaidh for cech
39. ndorus 7tor cech cuil dibh gu ngrianaunuib
40. solusda guhalladaiibh rightá. isann sin didiu
41. cuirter anairm 7aneideid 7 a neirred uile

f. 125ra
1. dia taiscind co huain chatha dhoibh. Mili laech
2. cech naigithi octaire inrigh for gac ndoras
3. dondá ndoirrsib décsoin. ni bi oman arbibh
4. faír. Acht mogh na righi docoiméit. [70] Ni deantur creic
5. na cunrad isincathraigsin acht duinti 7 cathraca
6. allamuich di inandentur Ni hadluicter
7. marbh inri beos. A meadon na tartraidh fuil si
8. as coimdhneas na hiltire dhi. Nihurus arim
9. indiull na cathraicin 7 a tie innti do clochadh biúda
10. 7do eduighibh sircedha 7 [vellum flaw] dagac maithius
11. arcna asna hiltirthe i cein 7 i bhfhocus
12. Nibhi in cathairsin tre bithiu gin .m. roth for fenaih
13. 7 damhuibh 7asanaibh ac togluasach shida
15. 7docluinte rafhogh isna cetri cúlaib fil le
16. Ni lamhann neach asiuabal atús oídeche o beantar é
17. gin sutarla solusda lais curuithned ngrene
18. ara bharrach. [7]72 Palas in righ i meadhon naca
19. thrascin .iii. cula lais .m. fod cech ae dibh
20. Istdadh oirmítnec lasna .iii. riuib fil forro
21. cu halladaíb rigád 7 cungrianaib solusda
22. domharmair glioin 7tuir dhithoglaídi forá
23. muraib in taicethe acuach 7a neascraí
24. 7 a seotu aili. [7]73 Dinna na ningen 7 na laech
25. arcna for fíarlait indúnaidh 7 lubghuitr leas
26. aigthe fríataebhuiibh cutopraibh tait
27. neamhacha cufríadmhnilaib eceanus dagach
28. mhoand for bith coluiibhob ictha cacha teadma
29. [7]74 Sluaighthtec ina meadon. Do marmuir rotocbhadh
30. adhbul a fhod 7 a lethal. Niamh oir faro all
31. astigh 7 dia neachtair. Dorinnadh faro beos
32. dobrechtad gaca datha imhaighi na cath 7
33. na congla do ratat isna hiltiribsin 7fuaith
34. gac anmanñna eceanus for bith curbho dith
35. amhairc doshhuílibh dercadh fair. [7]75 Seinistre glain
36. idhe lais cusduaghaib caemha cumdachta
37. forro. Seomra 7sellada fríataebhuiibh fonn

f. 125rb
1. ninnus sin. SE .m. no bítis oc tocaithium
2. immorn rígh isinsluaightec sin duaíslib
3. na tartraiigc 7 da .xx. mili dia láech
4. aibh 7 dia nanraidaib nothochaitidhis is
5. na tighibh fríataebhu [7]76 .iii. taighim im
6. choimeta faír 7 .iii.m. laech la gac taisce
7. tri hoighthi dagac taisce dib diaigh and
8. iaidh ac faire inrigh conadhmlaid sin no
9. chaithdis a reameas. Don mhogh righdha tra
10. rognithe laissium sin 7 ni ar omon cheana
12. in dorus meádomaí bibh sduagha aille
13. amlacha far. ár ni triallann neach inn acht
14. irri 7 a sliugc ac gabáil na ndorus fría thaebh
15. [7]78 Noshuidhdei clbualy inashuidhe righ 7a druiim
16. budthuaidh 7 a agaídhu budheas 7 in mac ba
17. sine lais foraláimh dheis 7arigha 7 a
18. theoisigh diaigh andiaigh forinleth sin do reir
19. a ndualgus 7 irrighan batogha laiss
20. forací 7narighna eli na deagaid 7 mná
21. [na rígh marg.] 7 na taighsec for aneagair cubaid nandeagadh. [¶79] No [+ marg.]
22. bhi tunna ordha amedhon an rightoighi 7 cetri
23. tunna ordha buadh lugha inassom fria ataobhaibh
24. 7fin actoihecht [indth above] assum righa 7baruin ac freast
25. al na bruighne sin doshainne gaca bidh for bith
26. Eirgídh dona foireann ele dia toi secaibh
27. cosna tunnaibh 7 eascrada dimhora doderg
28. Ír leó. Fedhm desilaoch animchar. Sreachaid
29. lasnaheascadaibh sin for culaib 7 cearna
30. ibh na bruigni 7 linaid cuach no cupa órdadh
31. as naheascraibh [dimora transp.] sin for fiairlait
32. na bruighni do gac aon curobhad meascda medh
33. arcaire. Seinnnter gac fodur 7 gac ceól for bith do
34. ibh combi antistad uile nacairchí ciuil. Do
35. gnìad foireann eli cleasaideacht 7amuinsi do
36. ibh. Nibhi danno .ri. na taighsec dibh gen a ghlun
37. fria iar incen bis cublay fora chuid. [¶80] Tri mhissa

[lower marg.: + No bhídh in rí uas na sloghaibh oca bhfhaircisi cur bhó comhard fria a bhondsumh mullach gach aein dia mhuinntir.]

f. 125va
1. gnathaighit bheith amhlaid sin .i. Decim
2. ber. 7 ianuarius 7februarius. Ni
3. samhail doib rigu nait slúaig for bith
4. [¶81] Fil tuluch ard allamuigh don cathraigsin
5. cufighbaidh foda natimecheall cendichuir
6. a duilli di triabithu 7 luibhi cen claech
7. lodh andatha samlaid curbha miadh
8. menman lagac noen a bhfégad. In tuluch
9. uaine atberar fria. [¶82] Batar didiu .uui. meic
10. for .xl. lacublay. Doronad palas
11. rigdha forsin tulaig sin don mac roderrr
12. scaigh dib. Chemchini aainm. Ba
13. laech amra eiseide. Do ratad indun do a
14. comartha oigrechta et rocur ascribe
15. 7 a sheotu fine don dunsin dianimcoimet
16. Ba gnath lais dono iar facbail cathrac cam
17. balu triall don dunsin 7oirisium ann la
18. toil a menman. Bui tra diliged aigi fora
19. raibhi dotharviaghibh tricha mile for cach toeb
20. dondunsin. sealg dodeanam for mucaibh 7 aigibh
21. 7 forcech fiadhmil eceanus olcena 7 a mb
22. reith dondunsain gin dith forro. Baa
23. croicinibh nabhfiadhmilisn notaisced an
24. ri airm 7 eirred a muindteri 7 a mhiiled. [¶83] At
25. bath chemchini 7 rofhacuibh macc
26. temin aainm. Dorat cublay indun do
27. Ár bá arlurg araili nogabhtha righi
28. na tarraidh. [84] Dogniter dono festa lacu
29. blay a laithi athusmeda. Tri festada
30. dec airmhitneca dobeiread dotartraigib isin bliadain.
31. Da .m. dhec dia righaibh 7 toiseachaitbh nobhi
32. dis for in bhfeilsin condeisi naluinn nór
33. dha um gac an dib. IArneair intslóigthighi
34. sin leo doleicdis a ngluine fria huir
35. 7doghuiuged gac an dib in dia dia nadhrad im
36. shoinmhighi fhaithiusa dfhagbaile dochublay
37. In tochtmad la .xx. domhi decimbr doghniat in
38. fleadugad sin. Doberedh inrí tidlaicthi dermhaire

f. 125vb
1. da gac an feith do 7mhaínibh anaithtintiu
2. doshuídhdis foranaitibh comoil doridhisiu
3. dotheighdis diuic 7iarlada dia freastal for
4. culuibh 7taebhuibh na bruidhne sin. Nobidh
5. in ri na shuidh righ uaisdibh ocfaírce for
6. na slogu. coscaíldis fosheallaidibh 7sheomradadaib
7. tarcéolaib 7cleasrad imdha // do ronta he
8. [85] Araile festa lacublay in .c.na laithi don bliadain.
9. is fris atbertissium sin. frisin láithi toisec domi Febra
10. Ni oiriseadh rí [velium flaw] nataisec dibh in laithisin
11. gintrialand andail cublay 7 eerred geal umgac
12. naen dibh uair in dar leo ba solus in bliagain
13. doibh samlaid on bliadain co araili. Nirbho ál
14. doib glacad na fairsí neith for bith in laithí
15. sin acht ní solusta. Bui rigdacht na tartraigi
16. macu mna fon ninnus sin. IArndul dona
17. maithbhsin isin sluaithecte. teit cublay na
18. shuidhí rig uaisdib 7 a agad ar in solus ngrianda
19. budhdehas 7 a druim fho tíath na righu for a dheis
20. 7na righna fora clí. eirgheidh ocláich i meadhon
21. nabrudhne conabair. éirgídh olse 7adhruidh
22. inri amail dia. Lecit uile angluine 7 a
23. cinn fría huir. Eirget iarsin a bhfiadhnuise in
24. righ. Dobeir gac ri 7gac taiseach dhibh each bua
25. dha dhó. conadh .u.m. each do berit dó 7siait uili
26. geal. [86] Altoir onorach ameadon in righthighsin
27. clár corcar fuirri. Ainn irigh arna rinnadh
28. fair dolitrib ordha. Tuis aschensaidib
29. ordha ac righuibh 7ac taisecuibh oca crothad
30. forculaibh 7 taebuibh in tighi. Dobeir gac aen
31. dona maithbhsin paxa conumhla dermhair
32. daimn irigh. Scailid gac aen dibh na inadh
33. chomoil iarsin. [87] Nitocaibhter cuach na cupa
34. na corn na eascra diafreasdul in laithi sin
35. nac gel uili bhít conadhaire sin gairid in fesda gel
36. de 7 iseirred gel bis impa uili inlásin
37. [88] Do berur leomhain isteach ibhfiadhnuisi inrigh
38. intan sin. doniat umla dhó amail doronsat
f. 126ra
1. na maithe ucut. Mi dhoibh forsin fleigh
2. sin. [89] Do thigiat forseilg asaithithe 7dias
3. brathar aig na conmaeruibh 7bataisech gac
4. aen dib for x.m. conmaer 7 u.m. cu
5. lagac conmhaer dib. Baym 7nuncam a nan
6. manna. in cailli selga noghabhdais do
7. sreathdais na uirtimciill lamh fria laim
8. cunac facbais dam natorc isin cailli gin
9. glusacht 7marbad. Inri didiu. cu maithibh a
10. righ 7athaisec for tulaig aird oca feitim samlaid
11. 7 leomuin forcuanairt lais onac teidhedh fiadh
12. forth na annann e.ceannus arcena or isforro
13. ronalt iat. Finna gaisitec forru amail igin
14. no faiscuil oo culai. [90] Dogniter selg eli
15. la cublay for enuibh 7ealtaiòb lahilcenen gaca
16. sebac for bith. Ár batar ocht ngríbha ingneca for .xl.
17. lais ar naseolad for seilg nannumnum nae
18. erdha et ata taisec dia muintir con.x.m. lais fria
19. seilg 7 imcoimét ashebac curius u.m. dhibh for tol
20. chuibh 7 tuaithebraibh na crich a cein 7 a bhfoicsi
21. conac dighsitis ashebaíc i tiriib ciara iarnealecan
22. for enuibh. Ceolan beag nordha forcois gacasebaic
23. dibh 7aimn inrigh arnainndad fair conaithneann gac
24. aen he diacur for cula diandighseadh itirib ciara
25. [91] IN ri didiu is amhlaid bis ocuntseilgisin aseomra co
26. neim noir fair 7 rotha fena fai oca imchur
27. for elifaintibh 7croicne leoman fair immuigh ica dhin
28. for fhuaict 7derdun. beridh inri elta diagribhruibh
29. lais isinteagdussin. A righa 7 athoisigh 7a shlogha
30. ina sreathaibh 7 ina neisibh allamaugh de. iar fásin
31. na neltad naerdha dhoibh tocibaid nacroicne don
32. tseomra 7lecidh inri na gribh fúthaiibh 7oirisíd
33. fein na shuidhi oc feithim nacleas 7naclutedsin
34. gurub gairdigad menman laissium 7 lairighaibh dercadh
35. fora nenluith dib linaib. [92] Acasi mordin dao
36. doniter naselga sin. Magh forlethan eside 7ni
37. lamthar fiadh na eltada domarbad la tartraidibh
38. uidi .xx. la friathaebhuiubh. Rocumdaigid teagduise
f. 126rb
1. la Cublay forin maghsoin friabroinn sealga
2. x.c. pupall allin. M. laech nothochaited apu
3. paill inrigh. niam óir fuírí. croicne leoman ngel
4. 7 dub 7 derg inatithib fuírí diadin ar shneacta 7 derdan
5. reifedha sida allamaugh dibh. Pupla na
6. hingentaide sida uili nos ditneann. Pupla narigh 7na
7. miledh inasreathubh 7inasraitibh friataebhuiubh fonminnus
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8. robháituir acathraig cambalau. [93] Friami Marcius doibh
9. amlaidh sin. Triallaid forcul gocathair cambalau. [94] Dá
10. thaisec d'c la clab 7asat bacoimsigh aracanta
11. fris 7 uadh. cethra cricha .xxx. doshaeri gaca taebhui don
12. cathraigsins. is lasnataiseachain sin dosudhighte iat
13. do shoeiri no do dohoire dhosom. [95] Teora fighbhuidh
14. no fhasat imoncathraigsins 7is diacroicnib sin do níthear
15. monad dorriagh friacreic 7 cundrad na crichi 7 ni do
16. dhith óir nó in idhmhus doniter son laissium ár ba lia
17. doór 7 innmhuis é ina arobhí dorgaib forbith
18. [96] IN tan doniter nos no dlidig donuaidiged dobereth
19. in da taisec dhécsin chuigi 7 do bereth scribhne dhoib
20. diacur fonrich dfhoillsiugad na nós soin. Do
21. chuirdisius teachta lasnascrobhniais for eachaibh luatha
22. ar bumino ina .u.c. each bui ocontúigh arna sreathad
23. forsnacathraic ain 7 ifoicsi anoirichill teachtadh. 7
24. niscuiridh inteach dira rith cumbascith
25. hi. nofachbaitéis inteachsimilar 7fogheibhit each
26. ele isincathraig foracind 7 teigheadh fuiire gu
27. luas 7 dënmine. Bui dui luassom cuceangailthea
28. amarcaig iasndailthibh orda arman nac leanfhit
29. dib. Conadh ar .x.m. cathach doshiubaighdis techta
30. magnús cam la scéla a dlidig 7 ans omaduín co feascor
32. orse eirg laammaroibhisi for fiarlát nacrich
33. 7 tuc afhis lat gac dal forambiat. trialluis
34. foraset cutarla sruth dimhor dhoibh forsin conair
35. 7d'roicheat do marmair tairis .c.c. cubat ina
36. fhot .x. cubhait ina lethedh .xxx. uithne ful
37. aing fai cusaine gaca gresa forró. sduagha
38. cama cumdachta onuairthe cò araili dibh
f.126va
1. Fuatha leoman 7 gac anmanna eceannus foradhibh
2. taebhuiubh. da .m. d'c leoman arnarinnad amarmair
3. fàir. Fuli saingium aimn introtha sin. [98] Triallait
4. iarsin gucyi cai. cathair oirdnidi isidhe do tochbad
5. ladarius ri feacht riam forbeluibh prespiter seon
6. .i. ri nahindia. iarnacur andaeiri dodharius
7. Acceinis prespiter seon laanaen frishloghaibh indaceirse
8. iarcbhi odarius. Batur moirseiser dia muintir ococis
9. teac fris intainsiu. Diatucща alogh dhúinne olsiat
10. dobhermais indarius sin angiallaicht duit. Gellaissium sin
11. Triallaittsium cohairm imbái darius 7oirisit fora
12. theaglach. bliadain doibh aigi. Teid darius laanaen do selig
13. co rucsat na laicsin fàir anuathad oí muintir. berit he
14. coprespiter seon amail roguealsat. Bliaidain dó nagiall
15. aigi curus leic forcula diathigh fein for forciull shidha
16. 7caencomtaic dhoibh firiaraile 7 batar smalaid airiuit
17. ba beo iat. [99] Tiaguit iarum cucathair fun
18. di fa .xx.m. irahuirtimcheall. iar nec inriigh
19. baifuirri rannait atri meic in cathair eatarra atri
20. Tairrmgit múir aeltea trithe iarna toruinn doibh
21. Cuiris magnum cam faasmacht he. [\[100] Sruth quiánfa
22. foralar. uidhi ochtmadat la fora flot. Fil droicheat
23. aconchathraig sin. marmur essidhe itir sduaga 7f
24. ostada .u.c. cubat inaf hod.x.cubait fora lethed
25. Din dhighbadaib uaisli uasa cuseomradhuibh
26. 7sellaidhib futhibh anandeanuid creic 7cunnrad
27. [\[101] P\[ro\]binnsi tebeit didiú. tir isidhe cobhhasac bhfada
28. friahucht. uidhi .xxx. la ina fot. lointi imchuibh
29. de nosberat leo dia siubal for damuibh 7asanaibh
30. Boisshimhne isfighbadh forsín conaír sin.u.cubhait
31. dec fot cacha simne dhib 7 .iii.a basa fora lethed
32. IAr nairisium agaigh dhoibh foranconair adaighter ten
33. te doib docrínach nasimín sin. iar fáiscín natcúnted
34. dona fadhnilaib neme rithait culuath diand
35. ithugad. Gurube furtachá fóghebhtis lucht na
36. tennted fuaimm dobein acrínach námboischibean
37. ocambrised cu teithdis nafailadhmbhila ón

f. 126vb
1. onbreasmaidhm sin gindith dodenam do[ib]
2. [\[102] IArfacbail inhasaisgindoibh foghhabhat
3. probinsii c.o.uii.riguibh le foaemnhod
4. Nifhaicann cele lahingin dibh gidh imdha
5. cele leo gurus amhlaid ellinghter aningina
6. gac dream doeachtarcrichaib triallus foraset friacreic
7. nogail. tiagait a maithreca 7 angaelta
8. co haírm ambit 7na híngena maraen friú
9. dia nathchar forto. Foidhit lasnaceilbh sin
10. incein airisit isna ceannturuiibh sin 7nithiaghath
11. leo niisiriú. Bidh didiu. clar aircídís forucht
12. gacahaindre dhibh 7aimm gac cele lasafáeit
13. arnarinnadh ann arísmoideí foghabat ceileda
14. isin crich gac méit lasafáeit. indarleo isara
15. maith roghghsait iat. [\[103] Cureil ismonad doibh
16. friacreic 7 cunnrad. doniat cuma crutachfair
17. Imut tore 7 adh nallaid leo 7imut cuanart
18. fria seilg. Meidithir frihasal cach cú dhibh
19. Et is dothimthachtuibh abhfiadnnil doniad eirreda
20. oirmítneca 7bucarem allastigh frís. ///
22. rigachta fuiti. Mac dochublay isri fuirri
23. Cúisentemus aaim. Nithocuib fineamhuiin
24. amullach tria úir fora feadh. cunad do ri[\[g below]le
25. 7 doluibhibh dognait a bhfleaga. measc
26. dha fria fír doib he. [\[105] Fil loch isin crích cettia sin
27. c.m. natimcheall. inimmh holdhann 7 cloch
28. mbudha lais. dialeiced cublay ateacar
29. dothifead dia nimut nac biath anoir forro
30. Ór diairmiúin inalluibh 7bruachaithe inlochasín
31. diandenuit caera 7 tinneadh oir 7 nirann
32. uid níshlugha he acht a creic aratruma. [106] Ni cron
33. la neach isin righi sin diabhfaíe abean la fer
34. naíle et diatsat aídhigh no eachtainn dothigh
35. no do dhun dib dia carait é nosmuirbhfít
36. or darleo ni triallfa a anum tarbel induin
37. gin beith aræin fríu. Et rotaírmísc magnús cam ingnathag sin

f. 127ra
1. [107] Prouinns[ë] chogam didiu. Mac do magnús
2. cam is rí fúirr. iáci aainn. imut
3. donatracaib dimhora fora feadh x. cubhuid
4. for ceth nathrac dhibh x. troíthei fora lethat
5. Tóimhldh in loech no in leoman taragín
6. no gac anmánn ecceannus archena. a fídhaicbh
7. talman oirísit ceth laithí 7gabait secnon
8. na criche gancoighthí oc tomuit acruídh
9. 7ahindle. Gurub amlaid dhíth[aigh]íit laeich na
10. criche nanathraca sin. Dul arbeluíabh
11. na fidice talman dia neis 7 berá tarnaídh
12. do inniull fair. oc impod donanathachaib
13. for cula gusin fídhicín teacmaínt nábera dhoibh
14. cotreaghdat acuirp. cufarcat cin anmain
15. Doniat nálaich aímhíhuine 7a hindeonad
16. Foiridh adomblas aei gac neim forbith. Do
17. beraid afeoil dorighuíbh 7 uaislib
18. na criche 7dógeibhít anoir dhí áirmhídh fúirrí
19. Cabhraidh sin beos ingína rí nídhmúibh
20. [108] Niberbhar feoil isin rigísín acht salann do
21. chaitim le omh // dhí. dia lamhnaighthe
22. [109] Prouíndí as aroandum didiu. do rigi magnús caiam
23. ingen fora feadh loighidh in laeich frí a re .xl. la
24. 7a-gaig. tiaghait acharait 7aghaelte dia
25. fhis 7 bidh an ingen oca fhríthailim. [110] Seínsear
26. gacaduine as dia adhartha dhoibh. Níbí
27. liaigh na fisidh leo. Diangabhu searg
28. no teidim galair neach dúb fiafraighít dia
29. ndraithib inmbia fertacht fair. Tiagait na druid
30. dothogairm nandee ndechnáidh ína nd
31. ail dfaghail chélmhuintí in tedhmasín. diandeach
32. didiu. indisit nac fuil fertacht fair no dambia
33. fertacht fair indisit do fearg nandee
34. dobeicth frí 7asberait idberta dodenam doibh
35. Beruit leasdar doch[?r]ú an ealásain leo 7 reith
36. eadhca cu ceannuibh dubha leo 7dibraiccit
37. inchru anaier anairdi arae na redec[ed?]n
38. nahidberta. Ticíít nadee dianacallaimsíum

f. 127rb
1. idhraítaisumh in toth[ar] doibh siú 7 ta[ll above
2. [111] FIL crich ele friahor ncrichesir mienahainm
3. nírábha ri furtiseíc. rofas contblicht iter
4. in cricsin 7prouindsi orandum. Faidhius
5. magnus cam taisec dia muintaír cuslog ndear
6. mhair lais dfturacht prouindsi orandum
7. ár nír umhul miena dho. niscardin ainm
8. intaisigh. da mili dhec marcach lin ashlóig
9. cen mothat troighthigh. Otclós do bagul
10. i. dorigh miena slogh natartraigec do
11. thoidheacht friathaebh faidhis teachta ar
12. ceann arigh 7athaiscech 7amhilead diatabairt
13. cuigi ar bahoman lais tartraiged dinnned
14. a críchea fair. Bahe lin dofreacair he
15. lx.m. laech .m.m. elifint cocaísléanain
16. claraídh forro iambitis láeich friadeabhuidh
17. osnasloghuibh. Tiagait insliag sin co
18. uocia cathair oirecuis miena isidhe. Gabáit
19. longport friaetae. [112] Niscardyn ummorro otclos
20. do intiam slóigheadh sin ac triall nadhail
21. sreathais ascora friaetaebh dheagha dithoghlaide
22. bhi fria taeb na cathráid doibh doibh. Gin
23. toighecht da [no for above] ndruim don tslóg romhór sin
24. Gairis athaisigh 7 alaeich gaili cuigi. Na
25. [vellum flaw] heaglaighdh na slóigh dimhora uc
26. [vellum flaw] ut olse ar is fertha bar laeich in
27. naid 7 is friagalaidh ronaltad sib. [113] M
28. oídhit naslóigh cechtardha sin andail aroií
29. amail toma friatraigh. Natartraigid ummorro iar
30. faísinin nancéilfaint. dhoib nirfhéisit ceim
31. foranagaid dianeachuibh [vellum flaw] lahomun na
32. neilfaint. Gur impoisit forcula cuinsinigh
33. remhraiti gín comus marcach nasrein
34. forro. Gabhlius bagul conashloghuibh fora
35. long. Oirisit natastraigid foran figh
36. 7 snadmaít aneocho don fhighbaid 7 do
37. beruit ucht ar bagul conashlogaib. [114] Ba calma
38. docuired in cathsoin leo alliu 7anall

f. 127va
1. combeanadh bonn fíria meidhi 7meidhe fíria bonn
2. doibh. Goanait na tartraigid na helifainnte
3. diasgoigdeir ár nírbbha for bith friadiabra
4. cadh soigheat sloc budh fear indat. Gabait
5. na helifainte for miri 7dasacht condecsat foncoill
6. gín comus dialeacaib foro. Curostrascrait
7. ladairghibh 7ommuiub infhéagha acaislena deb
8. [tha] cuisín bhfiailuch ngaiscíd buí nambroidh
9. innuus gurthihaiged slocigh miena amlaid sin
10. [115] Natartraigidh ummorro niornoasamh for fors
11. naheilfaintib. cutscsat saeire diangialaibh
12. illgoch a ceannsagithi. Gabhui na geil
13. .cc. elifant doib sium. Bériis niscardyn iat
14. comagnus cam ár nir aitheandh dia sloghuibh
15. beith for eilifaintibh riam cosin. [¶116] Ata magh
16. isin crichsin. uidhi da la fora fot 7 fora lethed
17. fasac eisium combeannuib 7seibhiti ur
18. arda natimcheall. Airdhirt friacelthe
19. nimhe iatsom. is anamullach sin aitreambat
20. aes nacriche. Inmut oir leo. Ticit laithi
21. airigthi anuas forin maghsin docrec anoir
22. for gac ni iseasbaidh doibh. Ticit didiu na hiltiri
23. acein 7 a foicsi na comdhaill forsin magh an
24. laithisin do ceannach inoir. iar scarad dhoibh
25. friaraili ni leicit lucht na [vellum flaw]
26. criuche neach forbith leo do dhecsain a
27. naitreamb. Conadhaire sin nac eolach nec for bith
28. foramduibh na forambescnadaib. Ata ummorro
29. dhairdi na haiit anairsit cumbit a noes
30. calma da la 7 oidche ag teacht anuas
31. cus in magh nuccut // ri amra fuirri
32. [¶117] Provindsi cangigu fil fria theabhsidhe. Bui
33. 7 nir bo miadh lais magnus cam do beith na
34. righ fair. Faidhis cublay slóg dia ir
35. ghabail anirt chatha. Gabuis serg galuir
36. ri cangigu co tánic athighlaithhe

f. 127vb
1. Roorduigh a adhnaclu cohanorach
2. 7tor dothobail for gac taebh dhe x. cubait
3. inairdi cechae dib. Ceann coclaradh oir
4. for tor dibh 7 di ordlach forathighi. Cluic
5. ordha uassa cutoghluisedh gaeth
6. a ceol. Cluic airgit forintor naild.
7. [¶118] Natartraigid ummorro gabuit forloscad 7 innted
8. antiri curiachtsat adlucad cangigu
9. Otconncatur in tor 7 namaine di airmhidhi
10. forsa toraihb faidhth teachta co magnus
11. cam dia fhis coidh doghendais friu.
12. ár ba toil doibhium aroin eatarra. Acc
13. ol magnus cam ni toil damsa anoir righ
14. for bith bias fora adnaclu dothurnamh
15. Doberait na slóig saeir donadnacul
16. for fuiglib magnus caim 7gidh adhnaclu carat
17. no namhat bis i crichba natatraîgec niturn
18. tar a anoir foralurg sin. [¶119] Umhlaigidh didiu in
19. ri[g above]sin [d]ocublay iar sin tri .c. rigan lasan
20. rig bis fuirre. Imat oir leo. mi fhás
21. ann fineamain tre úir innti. Feoil 7righle
22. nostoilmit. Doniat balsamam onotac
23. doleomanuibh 7draicibh 7 ammanait eceannuis
24. Cuirit saine gaca datha fair. doniatt
25. arinnadh forto firu macu mna cunach
26. scarad fris triabithu cumbi saine gaca
27. datha foramballaib 7 fuatha na nanmunn
28. neceannuis ar narindad forro 7gac meit bhias
29. for neach dhe sin is moidi a anoir leosom
30. [120] Gac marbh theit isinrighi sin doniat luath
31. dia churp 7cuirit a crannoic chumhdacha
32. hi ambeannuish sliab 7anochtuibh all cunac
33. faiceat daíne na eathaite he triabhithu
34. [121] Prouindsi singuy didiu. doniat earrda anór
35. cha docroicneibh 7 timhachtuibh abhfígbhuidi
36. imat leoman fora feadh cunac fetann neach
f. 128r
1. siubal a nuathad tharrsa. Fria [spiritus asper h]or in
2. mara fil si. Nileiceann omhon na
3. leoman doluing na dobharc oirisium
4. agaig. fria[sp. asp. h]or in puirt naacarsoitt
5. doshnaidm friair. Nidheanan eis na
6. buidin dib suan fora conairib. Dingmad
7. di coin isinirsin inleoman. Conadhair sin
8. nacl togluasinn laec dochois na dheoch
9. gan dachoin 7glac lais or daileadh na
10. soigidi forinleoman incein bit nacoin
11. ac comhrac fris. Gurubamlaide sin dhithaigid
12. laech naicrichi iat // teib[er]snaiigh for
13. [122] Prouindsi cayguy. Sut cora mora for
14. afeadh. Sanindia tocbhuis ceann ar tus
15. Adbhul a fod .x.c. cubat foralethed. loinigis
16. inrig foranacarsoibh fair inatriallunn
17. formuir .u.m. dec [long] a lin .xx. laec
18. ingac luing dibh fria freasduil .u. eich .x.
19. in gach luing ica freasdal la magnus cam
20. dobhudi 7 dig 7 edgad no ecasc ár níhal
21. do ganbheith urlum do shléig 7 loingis dia
22. trial lait for oílenaibo insibh muitidi dia nír
23. ghabail a nírt catha. [123] Fil prouindsi ele fria
25. Prouinsí mangua isidhe. Stactur ainm
26. in righ fil fuitiri. Ni fhil isin uilí domon
27. ri isfearr innás cennotha cublay
28. ár níraibhi omhon righ forbith fáir do lin
29. maire aiche 7dodaingne adhúintedh
30. 7acathraec ar níraibhi dun forbith lais
31. gin dic uiscidhi natimchell conurcur saigte
32. a fídhríac foralrhi. [124] Batrocar essium frigae naen
33. 7inlantha slad nasarugad for fod arighi
34. níadhitha teagh formuinib na setaibh
35. leo. Dochuired teachta arfod a righi dia
36. athchar forro cech doini nostraugh nobhiad
37. leo atidlacad diadunsom 7 geach naide
f. 128rb
1. dobhiath cenathair nomathair abreith chuigisium
2. dia freasdal 7doshnadhmad re arailí a
3. meic 7aníngena cumainib leo intan ba [spir. asp. h]aes
4. mhur iat. cur mho ina x.m. dib sin no
5. bhí dh do shir ocambilathad 7 eided acscactur
6. [¶125] Bai cathair oirecais aigi cuinglай ahainn
7. Daingne do chathracaib betha dhi. Rothircansat
8. faidhe di feacht tiam gin dul fuiri la feraib
9. domain cu tised neach ara mbiadh . c. suil dainm
10. suil ti diatogail. Dochuirsiúm amenma do
11. righ forbith dobeith fortill fuiri ár baderbh lais
12. nartusmhedh 7nactusmhíghfhe nec ocambiadh
13. . c. suil. [¶126] Stactur ummorro dochuir omhon
14. a imairec fornáililtirib icein 7fioicsi cuanch
15. tabairte cath na conghal dó 7nac leiceadh a
16. omon claenad foradhliged. ar ni claenadsom for nec
17. arbith. Oirisitsium isin tsíníngmíighi sin
18. nach raibe for meanmain righ nathaisigh
19. dhíbh acht feldacus 7 cleastad 7 ceola condeachaid
20. a ngail for bathad cunac raibhi arm na
21. earred imairic la laech nale milid dibh
22. [¶127] Magnus cam ummorro ba galar croidhi lais ri forbith
23. fríathaebh gingiallad dho. Dogairít cuigu
24. arigha 7a toisigh 7alaithi gaile 7 gaiscid. IsEd
25. is ail dama slóig bhíairmidí acubhse
26. do triall a prouinsi minguay diahirghhabail
27. anírt catha ár ní miadbhi limsa stac
28. tur fríam theabh gín ghialladh dam. [¶128] Bui toisec
29. amra dia muintírsium accoistecht fris 7ba
30. toisech imghona lacublay esium baiam
31. aainm. irmánson aberla natártraigec 7 cetsuil
32. asín bérla scoiteacda. Díbhfhaghasa sloigh
33. limsa olbayam triallfút amanguay
34. 7dober angialla duítsi. Faidis cub
35. lay slóg labayam amanguay Gabsat
36. oc argan nacríchi 7ac brísed aduinte 7acathrac
37. gur gabsat di chathair dèc diandinDaib dithoghlaidh

f. 128va
1. [¶129] Stactur didiú. balan domun intsolighsin
2. he fein 7arigha 7athosígh árba seanda a
3. churaid cum gaiscid 7nrochúirsiet a noice
4. gugail lá saime intsíadh conad hi comairí ro
5. craítéa leó. triall doíbh for innisibh muiridhe
6. bai leo onar thualaing cathaíghthi iat. Condecaidh
7. inrí lucht .m. long fornahindsibh sin iar
8. bhfaeobile choímhéa foradhuintíb. [¶130] Gabuid slóig
9. na tártraigec forbhuí himaungiallay 7sinit a
10. scora fríataebehui b 7 bahisidhe ríghchathair
11. stactur isidhe. Gabait na slóig foratógail
12. Otclos do shlóig nacathrac gurbaíam a táis
13. each togla 7gur inann son 7 cetsuil dotucsat
14. celmhaine nandrúadh feact riabh 7do
15. *berait incathraig.* [¶131]Triallaid inslóg tartraigecc gu
16. *siangfu. cathair dhithoglaidí lastactur is[i]dhe*
17. *7muir fritaeabh 7 nir bhá tualaiing nam*
18. *ais fuitiri acht for cuil mbic dhi ar doticedh*
19. *loingius onrigh donahindsibh dfurtacht fuitiri*
20. Cidh fil anntra. badith laech for naslogaibsin
21. alliu 7anall actogail nacathrac et nir
22. *háedt sat tartraigid dul fiurre friare .iii.ra*
23. mblaidan. batar oc for bais for incathraig sin
24. *[¶132] Faidit teachta co magnus cam dia innisin*
25. *do quinglay do dhul dibh. Bai marcus*
26. *7aes cumtha araeen frí magnus cam iccois*
27. *techt frisnateachtuibsin. Badoirbh la*
28. *magnus na haithiusca sin. Cuingit in da*
29. *marcus 7 niclaus sais fair 7 doniat*
30. *.iii.ra sasi diandiubraicfidi aili*
31. *dimhora donfhighbaid bui nafreachnairec*
32. *ár bateolughsium i togail cathrac fecht*
33. *riamh. *[¶133] Faidis magnus cam nateachta for cula*
34. *doridhisi lasnasasaibh gucuinnglay*
35. *1Ar rochtain doibh cuslogh baiam ro*
36. *gabsat [imat marg. cloch 7 ile ndimhor asta*
37. *forsin cathraig gur brised a taithbli 7atighi.*

**f. 128vb**
1. Gabais omhan lucht na cathrach lasna
2. *hairdhibh anaithinti sin cotucsat incathraig*
3. *umlaighid cathraca manguay do magnus*
4. *Cam intansin 7oirisis stactur forna*
5. *hindsibh muiridí gen umhlugad do magnus*
6. *cam ar nir mhiadh lais umhla dorig*
7. *forbith. *[¶134] Ata sruith for fod prounnse*
8. *manguay quian a aímn. uidi .c.*
9. *la fora fot .x.m. foralethed. Dá .c.cathair*
10. *foradhribh taebuibh. is lia dolingius dó*
11. *innt srotha in betha. *[¶135] Fil cathair naile*
12. *isin crichsin sín tuy ahainm. .lx.m. ina tim*
13. *ceall .uii.m. droicheat for a feadh fo a*
14. *ngabhurn bárct cu seol fiúiri. dar leosum*
15. *nifsulub arbith cathair islia laech innas*
16. Cathair singyu didiu inann son 7cathair na talman*
17. *[¶136] Fil cathair naílí uidhi .u. laithe friaataebh*
18. *sin [.c.m. inatIMUM. quinlay a haimm*
19. *inan[n] son 7incathair neamhdha diateangaidismu*
20. *ar ni fhuil forbith cathair ismó inas Da*
21. *m. dhce droicheat le fongabhait longa*
22. *dimhora centrasradh seol dibh 7tor*
23. *dithoglaidí forcech ndroicheat dhibh 7 .iii.m.*
24. *ag magnus ac fa[i]re for ceach ndroiceat dibh*
25. *ar oman a himpóid fair órbacathair*
26. *oireachuis dorighraid manguay isidhe*
27. feacht riam. [¶]137 Doronsat palas rigda
28. forloch ameadhon na cathrac sin. nifuil set
29. na samail dophasal forbith do .xx. sōg
30. theach lais 7.x.m. dothoimhledh in gac
31. slōgthech dhībh 7 tene bithbeo ameadhon
32. gaca bruidhne dhībh 7.m. dosheomradhuibh
33. solusda friasuan 7 freasdal ina nur
34. thimecall conein noir forra 7cōfuath
35. gac anmannea eceannuis for bith amarrinadh
36. forro do ilbrechtadh gaca datha. [¶]138 INtan
37. roirghabh. maghnuis cāim in cathraisin 7 p'oindsi

f. 129ra
1. manguay. rohoirdneadh nai righa
2. dotarraidibh forro 7 doronad forro in da
3. m. decc cathair bai isin rigisin OCCUS
4. niraibhi cathair dhībh gan drong do mil
5. eadhuiub maghnuis cāim ocathaimcoimet aromhun
6. a himpōdh fair [¶]139 Fil loch ameadon na
cathrac sin 7.xxx.m. na uirtnicheall. Di inis
8. fair dun rigda a meadhon gacahinnsi dhībh
9. Nila neach for bith iatsom et inasfearr do
10. bhuiudh 7dig 7mnabindh na cathraic cuirid
11. a meadon nanduiin 7inti dianadh fεldh
12. ughadh dodhennam tiagait dhiaitachaiminh
13. inntiub 7foghhebha et nula neach doncathraic
14. dinn na caislēn daful fora feadh acht
15. coimhdeas dagac aen iatsom et aeseadh dobeir
16. antimat droicheatsin le. For srothaisb 7uscedaib
17. Fil si 7nilibi anímthecht forarailli acht dhībh
18. xl.m. tighidhis .xl. feac[t] isaitreabthaiigh
19. donchathaerisin. [¶]140 Nitisumidet geininti
20. nac scribthfar a ainm 7ineruth forσambi in
21. re 7reanna nime ocatusmhed 7diandec
22. neach dhībh as beanfar a ainm as 7scribh
23. thar aris he 7ainm a each 7amaine 7
24. a aesa cumtha 7 loisctet diblinubh ar
25. aen riachorp 7dar leo gacascribtha dho
26. do beidis araen fris isinbeathaidh naile
27. [¶141] IMut eclas noirmhitnec isin cathraic sin et
28. nifthi acht aen caelas dhībh ag fognam [no adhrad above] dodia
29. [¶142] Cidh fil ann tra diameith gan dorigh
30. la Cublay acht na nai righa rohoirdned
31. for righi stactur dorachad os fhorbha
32. righ in beatha // crich Stactur. crich
33. [¶143] Fil crich naili iarfacbáiil quinlay frī taebh
34. steguy iside. imat duinti 7cathraic le
35. laeich amra le. Toimhilit feoil ailaech
36. 7amiled 7ibhith abshful icathaidh 7toghuit
37. hi tar gac ndigh ittan forbith 7nithoimhlit

f. 129rb
1. madh doshaeth no dhigsed. Doproutuninsi man
2. guay iside. Explicit secundus liber. INci
3. puint capitula tercii libri // ia ann so
4. [¶144] Tinoscnamh for mhachtnad 7tuaruscbail nahinn
5. la marcus foraloingius ceatamus. [¶145] Faidhit din
6. claraigh usasbarcuibh diandin ar na
7. tonnuibh muiridhe. Ni chuiridPic forto acht
8. ola 7caic 7caib do mhingearrad tritha 7acur
9. fuithib leanuidh dhibh tre bhithu condineann
10. abhfhcaenscuil for inmuir. Cetra seolta
11. forgac luing dhibh. Cuirid clar foranelar
12. nailing dhibh gaca bliadna. fri re. uii. mbla adan gum
13. bit .uui. clar druim ardruium forgac clair dhibh
14. 7 ni ascnamhait for muir leo niissire
15. [¶146] Sipangu didiu. inis mhuirid isidhe 7ri fuirri
16. ginumlugad dorigh for bith. imad óir leo
17. nileic arigh dhoib achur acrichaib naile
18. acreic naa cunrad. A fudhomhuin fairge
19. fuil aninis Si[n] gurub uathad long na
20. barc darubeolah chi. [¶147] Fil cathair oirecuis leou
21. doroine in ri palas anorac nameadhon
22. cuhalla rigda 7gu seomrhadhaib solusda
23. Ba doclairuibh óir aithleagtha ros din
24. diblainaib. niraibhi forles fora fedh nach
25. le hor dohiatta 7fahedh sin diahurlar
26. [¶148] LA naon rofhaidh magnus cam slogh do
27. irghabail nahinsisin gunda taiseachuiubh
28. forra. abatam 7uosanchim anammunna
29. ascnaif for muir inloingius sin. Gabsat
30. port asipangu. Facbhait alonng in
31. sin 7gabsat oc innred nacrice gur gabsat
32. inchathair dithoglaoidi bui isin ninis. tiagaift
33. fuirre lanert lann 7sciath curolasat
34. ar for aes nacathrac firu macu mna
35. acht aenochtar nanma as nar fhaelsat braen
36. diacru dia reannuibh nadiafaebhraib
37. ar batair upthada deamhnaiig leo arnacur

f. 129va
1. ladruidecht 7 deamhnaighecht tria tuai leact
2. aclochuibh allastig diacroicnib gur iadhsat
3. na nhalad a da neis gurubaire sin nar fetad
4. anguin. Iar faghbaib a fheasa sin dona tartraigib
5. gabsat doloreuibh 7tunidibh in talman forro
6. curo coimbriseadh acamhma 7acuirp. gur
7. fhacis sin anmain iat. [¶149] Na taisigh ummorro f
8. asais imfhorrac nura catarr fa seath
9. 7 mainibh nacathrac 7 nacrice archena cunac
10. tuc nec dhibh umla daroiil gurbha
11. miscaig lasnasloghuibh sin acheli ina
12. aes nacrice. Guroclodsat forculai
13. cusin loingis do ridhisi. IArndul doibh
14. inambarcuibh seathais ainbhteine dermair
15. fríaróili iat. Bai inis friatoeibh. Buailís
16. in ainbhteine forbha in loingis fíra taebhaíbh
17. 7tractaíbh nahínnsi conar facbhadh clar
18. for clar dhibh cumbatar álæich 7amilid for
19. innbathad. Gabhuid inceit ele don. loingus
20. icrichaíb natartraighi foranadайдh. Tiagait tricha
21. mile don tslogh loingsi sin atir isin nínis
22. forclaruibh 7seaibiith along iarngait
23. cheillí dianannmain. Niriaacht rhim fh
24. ar badhdeh dhibh. Batar tartraidí ag foraninis
25. intan sin gin biadh gin dig. [150] Ri sipangu
26. didiu. odclos do insaabhudh sin forloingius
27. natarraiddec dobeir ashloghu diashaighid
28. triailluitt inambarcuibh 7gabuit port
29. saninis ambatar natarraidí Tiaguid
30. atir diandithigad. Natarraidí ummorro
31. gabait conair aili dianéis curancatur
32. a mbarcu 7luighset atir aninineisp
33. angu. tiaghait for beol na righcha
34. thrach. Osluicid aes nacathrac na
35. doirrssi cuhoibheil or nirfhinnasad
36. nar iat slooph na c Richie atconnacatur

f. 129vb
1. Gabhuit natartraíghg incaithair et triallait sloigh
2. nahínnsi ambloigh diambarcuibh 7gabh
3. aid iarain for lurgh natartraidec. [151] Arbhfaícsin
4. doibh nacathrac do ighabail gairmter accu
5. a milid 7alaieich gait 7icein 7ibhoícsí 7doniad
6. forbhaís fúrrri. Gabhait ag deabhthaiibh 7ag
7. tuaréin achelí gur bhó ár mile déo illiu 7anall
8. uii. misa dhoibh forsanabartsín ár bhi
9. suil natartraidec fíra magnus com diabhfurtacht
10. doberuit incaithair iarain 7rotinlaiced iatsom
11. go cublai. Scarsat friaíailí fosadh 7
12. chaencomhrac. // laechuibh diaslogaib
13. [152] Sipangu didiu. righi forlethan isidhe. ailli de
14. 7dianainmribh. Do idhlaibh 7arachtaíbh creidit
15. 7rinntar abhfuatha leo cuteora ceannuibh
16. forro. no gu ceatra naíghthiibh forainceann. nó
17. gu ndeich lamhuiibh for aen corp no gu c. lam
18. beos. In dar leosom gacimad cruth bias fora
19. ndees is liaidi acumhachta. Diangabhthar
20. gialla aheachtarcrich isin nínisí di tutchar múine
21. diaeis fogeibh saeire. diambe ginfh
22. uaslucaíd lais marbhuit he 7do niat aber
23. bhudh 7a thomailt conanair moir. [153] Docursid
24. lucht taistil imnhara innedha ríimh fora
25. innsibh feact riamh. Conadh seact ninnsi for
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26. xl. 7 .u.ii.m. inis frith fuirri 7is uathad dhibh
27. sin gin aitrebadh forro 7asimdh aighi forfeithan
28. dibhsom. [*154] Ciamba ummorro inis mhuitrid iiside
29. gu righ fuirri. Pibar geal fhasas isinriighisín
30. [*155] Nibi acht da ghaeith isin bliadain fornainnisibín
31. leith na bliadna cen clódh for cula dhi 7 in lefh
32. aili nahadhaigsium cen clódh // gu
33. [*156] Faidis magnus cam fect naill toisec dia muintir
34. sloghuibh ndermhalic lais acychaind dia
35. hirghabail anirt chatha. Bai dia daingne
36. 7dochalmacht aallach narfhaelsat toghuil

f. 130ra
1. for dhun na for cathair dhibh. Gabsat
2. inslogh iarsin octeascad angort 7abhsfinema
3. Faidis acupius .i. ri na hinnisi teachta
4. do athchar chisa do magnus cisogatu .i.
5. an toisec 7 basheanda in ri intansin ár bai
6. dhimhad cheileadh lais feacht riam curaibhi .xxx.
7. for .iii. ra .c. do claind lais 7 bamilidh calma
8. acathaibh tri.l. dibsom. Cidh fil ann tra acht do
9. beir umhla do magnus cam 7doberedh .xx. elefaint
10. do forro gaca bliadna. triabhithu. Scarraid 7 insoág
11. re araile foshidh 7caencheomhrac. [*157] IAna
12. mor fría huur [vellum flaw] na righisín 7ri fuíiri cin comus
13. rígh for bith fair. Trícha .c.m. atimcill nari
14. ghisín. is lan dagac uili mhaithius forbith hi
15. [*158] Gendur 7gondur friahor narighi sin. dá
16. inis muintidi 7iatsum conimmat gacamaíne leó
17. INIS leocah allamuigh dhibh sin. ríghí forfeithan
18. isside 7ri fuíiri naccáiannaa doígh for bith
19. As ferðha línmar a laeich. immut oir 7ele
20. finnted forafeadh // theach le 7 muir forthana
21. [*159] INIS peantam didiu. tir isidhe conimad fheagh toir
22. natimeheall. ceatra troighe foradoimne .c.m.
23. gaca taebha dhi naí sac tálaing barac seolaid na sd
24. iuraíd for ín muirsin // .uí. righaib fuíire
25. [*160] INIA iana beg didiu. tir fhoirlethan iside co
26. Dobhadhussa fein armarcus a se righacht aívbh
27. dhibh. xx.c.m. atimecell naíhrdsi sin. ~~~
28. [*161] Ríghi fear lech didiu. incheata ríghi dhibh ina
29. rabhadhus do macanetsus adrait et in .c. ainmhídi
30. atcithfe gac aen dibh atús lai ásé is
31. dia adhartha dho cuheirghi grene arnamarac
32. Toimhlit foil con 7 daine. 7 gac eataide for bith
33. [*162] Basman didiu. indara ríghi dhibhsein. Tir shléib
34. tighi iside gin dliged forbith leo acht a mbetha
35. dochaithimh amail gac nanman mceandsa
36. no biasdu et adervíd gurub do magnus cam adhráit
37. 7 nithbraith cain nádliged do. Imat onocorn

f. 130rb
1. for fed narighi sin. Clúmh buabhuill lais
2. 7 ceann muice 7 cosa elefinni. Beann dimor
3. acomhroin adhá shul 7 teanga conimit
4. reann fuirri. Así isarn dithaigthi lais. lmat
5. gaca ceneoil napad forthib isin crichsin. Doniat
6. sealg forcenel donapaib beca dhibh 7cruth dain
7. torro 7 beruit iat diacreic anilithirthaib 7ised
8. asberait conadh òicc iatt 7isanorac larigaibh
9. na nitire in fheoil sin [yellow flaw] friomhuilt
10. [¶163] Samaria didiu. intreas righi dhibh. nifhasann
11. fineamain nacruithneacht tre uir innti conadh arán
12. righe 7foil chaithit. Ata coill isin crichsin
13. 7ceanglait acroinn cusnígeann sigh friu
14. amail chusleanna uis[flaw]cidhe derg 7fínn isdath dortsugsin
15. Timuircter sin asoithigibh cumdachta la haes na
16. criche cunad lor dhoibh dodhig abhfaegat samlaid
17. 7 isferr oldas infin // dia ngabha serg
18. [¶164] Dragoaism didiu. in ceathramad [flaw] righacht díbh
19. galair aen díbh fiafraight diandraidhí inmb
20. ia furtacht fair. Tiagait na dra[ide] dhfhagail chelmaine
21. onadeibh. dia neitb gin furtacht dobheith
22. fair. timsaighg a ghaelata 7acharait chuige
23. conabrait frís. nach fearr duit olsiat dotomuill
24. duimne incein bias doocruth 7ttfoiil fort
25. ina dothomhuilt do phiasdaib na talman
26. iarnateilneadh dontsaeth fil for. marbtur
27. leo he 7 caithit a fheoil gunonair moir
28. [¶165] Lambrii. In .u.ad righi dhibh. Fil figbaidh isin
29. crichsin. birsí ahainn. Beanaid aes nacriche
30. a croinn ahuir dianathcur doridhisi 7bid
31. .iii.ra bliádan osuir gen acur. ticit iarum co
32. torad anorac forro. Fil blogh daes na cri[che]
33. sin ambeannuibh sliab 7anochtuib all 7fa
34. sait earball foraseanaibh amhail chonu
35. [¶166] Fanfur inseised righi dhibhsein. nifhasann
36. arbhur for bith na fineamain tre uir imte
37. conadh righle nos toimhilit. Suighi na fidhbaide

**f. 130va**

1. as fleagha dhoibh amail roraidsium romuinn
2. Fíl figbaidh isin crichsin coremhe nderrnhair. Dogheibh
3. lucht nacrichisín andáithn bhig domin 7 do
4. phughdar onorac allastigh do croicniibh nacrannsin
5. [¶167] IArgcur chuíil risin cri[ch]sin fogebha inis muirdhi
6. necuram ahainm. do macametus adrait. Ni bhí
7. timthach arbith la laech na ingin díbh acht a
8. mbethi leanocht amail thuismiter iat // si sin
10. [¶169] righi forlethan isidhe conadhrait do macametus. Bai
11. .c. 7 tri .m. domhilihb. initimeell feact riambil
12. guros caith imghluaisecht mara lagaeith hi
13. conach fuil acht .xx.c.m. inatimcheall inniu
14. Toimdit aes na cri[che] sin nách fil forbith inis is
15. fearr innás. Níbhí edac acht lauathad dia dainib
16. Tobcaidh nert gaéithe imut dibh isin muir gu
17. mbaidhter iat. ni umhlaigimn arigh dorigh for
18. bith. Ni [flaw] theit lucht na cri[e]sin a gcathuibh
19. acht dambe conblicht forro doberuit eachtarachricha
20. dia cabair 7 doberuit ceandac diamanib dhoibh
21. Imad leag mbuaadha inntí. IS ocunrigh sin
22. ata incloch isfearr forbith. derg iside. métithir
23. fíra laim laeichhí 7reisi forafedh. glainithir
24. friagris gancríthir hi. CUIRIS magnus cam teachta
25. dochuinghid naclochi buadasin for inrigh sin. Ro
26. raidh in ri gur sét fine do rightaidh seylam in
27. cloch sin 7 nac raibhi neart atidlaicthi aige fein
29. abar is fóicsi dhi .u. righa fiurri in cetna ríghi dib
30. Buaar scuderba ainm inrigh fil fiurni. Lom
31. nocht trebithu chaithit ambetha. imut cloch
32. mbuada isin crich sin et is mod lasín ríghsin cheathra
33. leaga buada for .c. foabrghait tre bithu 7atuilled
34. dibh foralamhuibh 7chosaibh. Gabaidh .iii. hor
35. thana for .c. frisna deibh gac laithi 7 inoiret
36. cetna gac noicdhi dobheith furtachta nandee
37. fair .u. aindre sirdha lais. [¶171] Uar dano

**f. 130vb**
1. in dara ríghi dhibh. damh is dia adurtha
2. doibh. Nimharbuid dam 7nithoimhhit
3. afhéoil diamarbhthar. Doniat balsamum
4. anorac diafheoil 7 diagheir 7coimhít
5. fochulaib 7cearnuibh inbrogha ardaigh comad
6. naemthá inbrugh ogheir indaim naeim
7. dochomailt fair. [¶172] Madh éc donrigh no
8. do thaisec dhibh. marbhthar leo aae set cumtha
9. 7 aes gac ofisce bui lais diacur da
10. freastul isin beathaid arail 7marbhuit
11. a sheitig diacur lais ar oman chéi aili do
12. beith le 7 loiscid acuirp diblinaibh
13. [¶173] IS annasairchisín domatrath tomas apstail
14. iar teact doproiceapt breithri dé doibh et
15. nitualang aen diamarand diarsma na
16. mbasaireadh sin triall isteach tar beolu
17. nahecuiisi in rohadnacht corp tomais
18. et inaít inarmarsat he fil derg aniu
19. dia chrú amail bui in .c.la. Doghni an
20. úir sin ieshlainti dagac aen nos toimliunn
21. bec no mor dhi for dhigh. Ata beagan cristaidh
22. inmon cathraig mbic inabhfhuil corp tomais.
23. As mór domhirbhuilibh in thirdhia foillsighther
24. and sin. [¶174] Uar didiu. nipeacad laneach dhibh
25. peacad for bith do pecthaibh na mban. [¶175] Loighit aes
26. nacríchesín forsanaltain 7íssed aterat. don
27. talmain sinn ar siat 7atalmain rachmait. Nithoim
28. lit tria bithu 7ni gabuid aer ná aithis
29. in neich dhibh nos ibeann. Dogniat osaic
30. gac laithe. Nibhi arm la neach dhibh acht gai 7
31. sciath. Nigadtar ní forbith leò. Nímarbh
32. thar aen aneisimale leò. nífhasann each
33. diangoighibh conadh x.m. each gaca bliadhna
34. cheannghaid. Coic righ maabar. Feoil berbhthi
35. uighi 7righle thomlit aneice. et is lom
36. nocht thiaighuid lucht nacríchesín for sèt
37. latormac teasa nagrene or nifettar

f. 131ra
1. siubal na crichi sin acht atri misaibh san bliadain
2. .i. iunius iulus augustus .i. damh deridh
3. in tsamhraidh 7.c.mhi in fhoghmxair. doberedh
4. bas iatsom lasna ruithnibh grianda. m
5. una bheth furtacht na missoin forro. is
6. suail dianeachuibh nac faghuiibh bas gaca
7. bliadain. lasinnbeathaídh nanaithnóth Sebhuc
8. dhubha leò. anas fearr dosheabhcaibh
9. dhoibh. Fialtoca leò meidhthir fre fiachu
10. [¶176] Righi na paghanac didiu in .u.ed righi do prounn[si].
11. Maabar. damh is dia adhartha dhoib 7ísed
12. asberuit conadh gel fíu faíth indiabail
13. conadaire sin rindaitsium faíth anuicg dubh
14. 7cuirit uíndiminte 7oladh duba futhaibh
15. badhesin cumbid foraen ndath friandeibh
16. 7mad gel aen dibh ocá thuismed níoirisid
17. cu mba disholus he. [¶177] Diandecuit icath no
18. aconghal berit leò clúmhm indaim dia nadrait
19. amail dia 7 nibhi leò máine isairmítiníghi
20. in nassom // fhuil si 7ni umhlaigh dorgigh
21. [¶178] Righi Musili didiu. fríor ríghí napaganac
22. for bith. Nifhuilet srotha nait aibhne for
23. feadh nacri[ce]sin acht tobar sholusda ag
24. snighi afudhoman thalman leò. Foghabhuid
25. imat cloch mbuada inntibh iartragad doib la turcábail
26. ngrene. Sleibhte 7 beanna urarda isin cricsin
27. gunaquiibh geala forthaibh 7 conimut nathrac
28. neimhe conadiat nanatracca sin thoimhliit
29. nahaquile dimhora 7 cruthaigter leacca
30. buada inntibh dibsom nach faghthar a nait
31. ghn for fot inbeta acht annsom adhamoin
32. anannanna. inannson 7diamont
33. Oirisid nahaquile sin amblibh dimhora
34. gurubomhun lahaes na criiche triall ina ngaire
35. la acalmacht comudh foelbaighe berait isin glind
36. [flaw] dithoghlaídí fil futhibh. Tecut na
37. haicile anuas iarbhfaicsin nafeola

f.131rb
1. Tiaghait dano aces na criche dia neis 7 fogabhit
2. naclocha buada inanalinglanuibh iarcur nanaiquiled
3. dhibh 7anas fearr dhibh bit ocna righuibh
4. imfhioici 7dogabur in chuid ele dibh fría creic
5. far físhairt in betha // amini insloinreadh
6. [179] Righi Lae didiu. ni chanuit gó trí bhithu. abrai
7. aitreabhus innte. ni thoimhliit fin na feoil tre
8. bhithu 7ní marbhthar duine naanmanda
9. ailli leo. aecnshétigh snadhhta la gac naen
10. dibh. Nibeainuit crann na duille ur a
11. ndoigh anna do beith [a exp.]imtibh. Lomnocht bhid
12. tria bithu 7dam in dia dianadhrait. Iar nég
13. [don marg.] damhsin doniat luaith diachnamhaibh 7
14. crothait forro hi. ISaintec troiscetc dona deibh
15. iatsom. Bith fuath daim arnarinnadh a
16. nedan gac aecin dibh 7duiliedha crand parduis
17. na misa fortoimhliit. // nigiallann do
18. [180] Crich coylus didiu. ríghi fhoirléathan isidhe
19. righ for bith 7nífhiaecn neach laecí dibh
20. muna rabhut in treas glun dfhialus
21. diblinaibh nó seitig [flaw]a athar no abhrathar
22. dianeis. Immat leomman ndubh isincrichsin
23. Docithir polus articus innti cubeit ar
24. turcail ús muir // surach 7 tighi
25. [181] Righi cumar 7ríghi melibar 7ríghi Gu
26. Caria 7 tóigh cambaeche 7 tóigh semanach
27. 7 tóigh osmacoram don in Índia moir iat
28. sumh 7immat ríghi immale fríu et robadh
30. scith Úngarta friatuarasbacail doatabáirt
32. .c. for da .m. dhhec inssi forin muir nind
33. [flaw] eagdasin. Genmootha innaeadha na hind
34. ia Bice et ticfamait tar beagan
35. dibh annso. [183] Atat di inis afu
36. domhuin inmara sin 7 isé isxu adhrait
37. Oílín nanIngen 7oilín nabhfhear doberar forro
38. Níghluaísit na hingena asa niniss fein

f. 131va
1. tria bithu acht na laech ag triall co hairm ambit
2. trí la conoigithí [transp. in gach mis] doibh ic namus fríaraili
3. gac laech laashetigh dhibh inanaraglaib badhesin
4. frísín re sin. Impóidhit nafiru forcula dia ti
5. ghibh iarum cussin mis náill conadhamlaid sin do mhe
6. lit ambeathaidh. In tan lamhnaigid namna
7. mad ingena nos berat nonalad frí druine 7gresa mad
8. maceu dano berat coaintribh diatabáirt frílaechdacht
9. [184] Fíra amhains iat fríaseilg for fidhmhila
10. mara 7tiri. Loimm 7carna 7gac cenel toraidh
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11. do thir 7mhuir nomelit firamnaa
12. eascop as cean forto. [¶185] Inteascopsin didiu
13. fil inis lais Scoria ahaimn .u.c.m.
14. uaidhuisium conilibh do dhainibh lais fria
15. creidium 7araill friahidhlacht. Gin tlact na edac
16. leo friambeathaid. Impoidhid nahidhla na longa
17. cona seola anagaidh ghacithi laangeinntleacht
18. curanrait catarra iat iarlangabail. [¶186] IAr
19. bhfacail scoria iar uim uidhi .x.c.m. foghe
20. bha inis ndimoir [flaw] is mo dooilenuibh
21. talman. da.xx.c.m. nathimcell. madei a ailm
22. ILI chenela daine le. do macametus adrait. car
23. na camnull mhelit. Nihurusa arimh ina fil
24. do chamhullaib leo. Gealason dano. 7 ni fil
25. for talmain ceneil frisasamalta iat ar mheit
26. Feagha dimhora leo. Dergason dano. idir duille
27. 7 rüs cu. lalla imdha leo do ilcenel én idir
28. gnath 7ingnath. Ealtada dimhora forroside
29. ba móomh do enuibh intalman. Rúc anan
30. manna tocbhúit nahelíntí inacrobhaib
31. isin firmamint coleicit anuas dor
32. idhisi condenann briscbruar diamballaib
33. cutoimhlit iat iatum // mheitsidhe
34. [¶187] Faghebha oile naill iarsuidhiu. Adhbhul a
35. xx.c.m. natimcheall. Samsibár a ailm
36. ilchenala eathachdha nosaitreabann

f. 131vb
1. Srona dímhora atulaibh anetan
2. aruisc for tuaithbhil. fuit dubha leo
3. 7beoil lethna. Lethightir friagac ceathtar don
4. droing dhaenun a bhfhir 7a mna 7 nihairdi
5. oldair nadaine ele. calma oldas c
6. eathrar for neart 7chathugad. ni bhit eich
7. leo acht for elifinntibh 7camhallaib cathaigít
8. Ni bhi tlacht na édaco leo. carna 7 loim
9. 7righle chaithid. cogniter fleagha leo do
10. shiucra 7righle 7 luibhribh imdha archeaná
11. or nibi fineamain leo. Coleicid deocha
12. dia nelíntibh 7 dia camullaib dona fleòbhis
13. domhétugad a meannan 7andasachta doncathugad
14. [¶188] Cidh ni fuil sunn budhesta acht oirisiumh
15. dosceulibh inseadh 7cerich nahindia iar
16. toidhecht tar beag dib ár níthicfadh linn
17. a rimh. acht asiat so crichaidhechta inda
18. india friahiltiribh Anindia mhor didiu.
19. adotha probinnsi maabar guros
20. macorum et anindia beag adotha cai
21. amba gumechile // righaibh fuirre
22. [¶189] Abaschia didiu. rígh dimhor isidhe co .uii.
23. .iii. righa dhibh ochadhraid don fhirdhia 7
24. cros óir atul eduin gacaein dibh 7 as
25. feardha acathuibh iat ár is friu ron
26. naltadh oc imaireace friagenntiu. Na .iii.ra
27. riga aili dano. fileat fria haincreidiumh 7
28. idlacht [¶190] Et rigi aden .i. soudan isri
29. forrosom. [¶191] Conadhi aireac meanman for
30. hluair riabascia feacht naen. triall
31. cuhairm irraibhe isu arnaadlucadh
32. Nato idir olamhaithe 7amhild fris ár
33. robudh omhun linne gennti dotmarbad
34. foranconair ár istritha noghebtha
35. Fileascop naemhtha lat olsiat 7 [flaw] c
36. uir cohadhmucul isu he conimat oir lais
APPENDIX II

Transcription and translation of the prologue of P

The following transcription of the prologue of P was made from Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, by Dr Samuela Simion in preparation of a critical edition of the Travels. I am grateful to Dr Simion and Professor Burgio for providing me with a full transcription of P from this manuscript ahead of publication. The translation in the footnote is my own.

Dr Simion’s Transcription of Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, 983, ff. 1ra-2ra:

Incipit prologus in librum domini Marchi Pauli de Veneciis de condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum.

[1] Librum prudentis et honorabilis viri atque fidelis domini Marchi Pauli de Venetiis de condicionibus et consuetudinibus orientalium regionum, ab eo in vulgari fideliter editum et conscriptum, compellor ego, frater Franciscus Pipinus de Bononia ordinis fratrum predicatorum, a plerisque patribus et dominis meis veridica et fidei translatione de vulgari ad latinum reducere, ut, qui amplius latino quam vulgari delectantur eloquio, nec non et hii, qui propter vel linguarum varietatem omnimodam aut propter diversitatem ydeomatuum proprietatem lingue alterius intelligere ommino aut faciliter nequennt, aut delectabilius legant seu liberius capiant. [2] Porro per se ipsos laborem hunc, quem me assumere compulerunt, perficere plenius poterant, sed altiori contemplacioni vacantes et infimis sublimia preferentes sicut terrena sapere ita terrena describere recusarunt. Ego autem eorum obtemperans iussioni libri ipsius continenciam fideliter et integraliter ad latinum planum et apertum transtuli, quoniam stilum huiusmodi libri materia requirebat. [3] Et ne labor huiusmodi inanis aut inutilis videatur, consideravi ex huius libri inspectione fideles viros posse multiplicis gracie meritum a Domino promereri, sive quod in varietate et decore et magnitudine creaturarum mirabilia Dei opera aspicientes ipsius poterunt virtutem et sapientiam venerabilius admirari, aut, videntes gentiles populos tanta cecitatis tenebrositate tantisque sordibus involutos, gratias Deo agant, qui fideles suos luce veritatis illustrans de tam periculosus tenebris vocare dignatus est in admirabile lumen suum, seu illorum ignorancie condolentes pro illuminacione cordium ipsorum Dominum precabuntur vel indevotorum christianorum desidia confundetur, quod infedeles populi prompctores sunt ad veneranda simulacra quam ad veri Dei cultum prompti sunt plurimi ex hiis, qui Christi sunt caracterre insigniti; sive etiam religiosorum aliquorum corda provocari poterunt pro ampliacione fidei christianae, ut nomen Domini nostri Ihesu Christi in tanta multitudine populorum oblivioni traditum
deferant, spiritu favente divino, ad accecatas infidelium naciones, ubi messis quidem multa operarii vero pauci. [4] Ne autem inaudita multa atque nobis insolita que in libro hoc in locis plurimis referuntur inexperto lectori incredibilia videantur, cunctis in eo legentibus innotescat prefatum dominum Marchum horum mirabilium relatarem virum esse prudentem, fidelem et devotum atque honestis moribus adornatum, a cunctis sibi domesticis testimonium bonum habentem ut multiplicis virtutis eius merito sit ipsius relacio fidedigna; pater autem eius dominus Nicolaus tocius prudentie vir hec omnia similiter referebat; patruus vero ipsius dominus Matheus, cuius meminit liber iste, vir utique maturus, devotus et sapiens, in mortis articulo constitutus, confessori suo in familiaris colloquio constanti firmitate asseruit librum hunc veritatem per omnia continere. [5] Propter quod circa translationem ipsius laborem assumpsi, conscencia tute, ad consolacionem legentium et ad laudem Domini nostri Ihesu Christi, cunctorum visibilium et invisibilium creatoris. [6] Liber autem iste in tres libros dividitur, qui per propria capitula distinguuntur, quorum librorum principiis ad faciliorem contentorum in ipsis invencionem sunt capitulorum tituli prenotati. Explicit Prologus.

Translation (my own):

Here begins the prologue in the book of master Marco Polo of Venice, regarding the circumstances and customs of the eastern regions. [1] The book of the prudent and honorable man and truthful master Marco Polo of Venice, regarding the circumstances and customs of eastern regions, edited and composed by him in earnest in the vernacular, I, brother Franciscus Pipinus of Bologna, of the order of the Friars Preachers, am compelled, by many of my seniors and superiors, to make a truthful and accurate translation from the vernacular into Latin, since more are able to understand Latin than the vernacular, and moreover for the benefit of those, who, on account of the diversity of all languages, on the one hand, or the variety of idioms, on the other, can not easily or at all understand the property of another language, so that they can read it more easily and understand it more freely. [2] Furthermore, this work, which they compelled me to undertake, they would have been able to complete more satisfactorily themselves, however, since they are dedicated to a higher contemplative state and prefer sublime matters to lowly concerns, in the same way that they refused to know earthly matters, likewise they refused to transcribe such earthly matters. Therefore, I, in compliance with their command, translated the content of this book faithfully and in totality, into a clear and understandable Latin, a style which the subject matter of such a book required. [3] And, so that labour of this kind seem not in vain and pointless, after inspecting this book, I considered that truthful men might be worthy of the merit of the Lord’s many graces, and that they might either admire the virtue and wisdom of God, by seeing his wondrous works in the variety, beauty and size of the creatures, or, upon discovering the pagan populations enveloped in such blind misery and squarors, they might thank God, who by enlightening those faithful to him with the light of truth deigned himself to call (them) from such dangerous darkness into his glorious light, or, empathising with their ignorance, they might pray to the Lord for the enlightenment of their hearts, or, the idleness of undevoted christians might be interrupted, because the infidel populations are more
ready to venerate idols than many of these, who are marked with the sign of Christ, are ready for the worship of the true God; or, furthermore, they might call the hearts of certain believers for the advancement of the Christian faith, so that they might bring to the blind nations of unbelievers the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, which has been lost in the oblivion of such a great multitude of peoples, with the help of the Holy Ghost, ‘the harvest, indeed, is great, the workers few,’ (Matthew 9:37). [4] So that the many unusual and unheard of things which are referred to in many parts of this book do not seem unbelievable to the inexperienced reader, let it be known to all who read this book that the aforementioned master Marco, relator of these wondrous things, is a prudent, trustworthy and devoted man, equipped with an honest character, having a good witness from all his servants so that by merit of his multiple virtues, this account of his is reliable; indeed, his father, master Nicolaus, a man of complete prudence recalled all these things in a similar way; master Matheus, his uncle, to whom this book is dedicated, a man by all means mature, devoted and wise, of sound mind on the point of death, in a friendly conversation with his confessor, assured with unremitting firmness that this book contained the truth in every aspect. [5] Wherefore, I have undertaken the work of this translation, with a more resolute conscience, for the benefit of the readers and the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, creator of all things visible and invisible. [6] This book is divided into three books, which are divided into chapters and whose chapter titles are noted down at the beginning of the books, for an easier organisation of the content. Here ends the prologue.