Summary

While the Dindshenchas has appeared sporadically within academia, it was not until the turn of this century that the corpus started to earn consistent interest. However, due to its size and continued presence in manuscripts, ranging from the Book of Leinster and Book of Ballymote to newer manuscripts, there are a large number of aspects in need of further investigation. This thesis will address the scribal alterations in Dindshenchas entries across multiple manuscripts, as well as to what extent this has affected the placelore material. Even though it would have been beneficial to analyse a significant amount of the Dindshenchas corpus, this project focuses on three specific Dindshenchas entries in the hopes of developing arguments and conclusions that can connect to the entire corpus. Furthermore, this thesis attempts to advocate for a closer look on the scribal alterations to the Dindshenchas, and questions why such alterations were committed in the first place.

Through this analysis, it is evident that accessing the original placelore is impossible due to these alterations being introduced gradually over time. However, it is important keep in mind that the main purpose of the Dindshenchas might not have been to provide plausible and accurate entries of Irish placelore. Instead, it could have been an attempt to provide a collection of the Irish placelore, without paying attention to truthfulness, believability, or accurateness. Finally, this thesis has been written to provide a glimpse into these three Dindshenchas entries, their scribes and their preservation methods through a selection of extant manuscripts containing this complex and extraordinary Irish tradition.

Foreword

Even though I started studying the Dindshenchas already in the fall of 2019, the process of researching and writing this thesis began in February of 2020. Due to this, the entire thesis has been formed in Norway during Covid-19. It has truly been a pandemic project and provided a way of staying busy by diving into Irish placelore. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my advisors, Kristen Mills and Jan Erik Rekdal, for their patience, guidance, and support in the writing of this thesis. An extra thank-you to Jan Erik Rekdal who oversaw a self-study seminar on the Dindshenchas that secured my interest in the corpus. I would also like to thank Dr. Chantal Kobel for answering questions when I was attempting to make sense of Irish paleography and Dr. Sarah Kuenzler, who read an excerpt of this thesis and was an immense help in navigating memory theory.

My sincere thanks to Robert Erickson, Victor Frans, Asa-Jane Stuart-Campbell, and Bjorn Olaf Vatzlavik for their support and reading through drafts or excerpts of this thesis. Furthermore, my deepest thanks to Georgia Mae Bell and Ragnhild Kristin Roberg for all the emotional support as well as keeping me sane through thesis writing in a pandemic. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents, Marte-Marie S. and Sigmund D. Pedersen, and my brother, Jon-Magnus S. Pedersen, who has always been there for me. Without the support of my friends and family, I would not have been able to finish this thesis.

Table of Contents

Chapter Five: Conclusions

Appendices

To my grandpa, Magnus Sørhus.
You never got to see me finish this thesis,
but I hope you're proud.

1.1 Introduction

Across time, people have always been interested in places and the connection they have to a certain place and its history. In fact, the term "topophilia" was developed by geographer Yi-Fu Tuan as referring to the "affective bond between people and place."[1] This term may be used to describe the Irish, which is visible through their literature and culture as well as the love for their country. In the case of the Dindshenchas[2] tradition, encompassing Ireland's placelore, it provides a way of discovering the extant origin stories, even though the exact geographical location of the placelore entries has not survived into modern knowledge. Furthermore, it is evident that the "despite the almost complete loss of the monuments, the place-names meant that some of the stories endured."[3] It is these stories that are crucial in discovering more about Ireland and in preserving the background for the relationship between a people and their land.

While there has been scholarly interest in the Dindshenchas in recent years such as Dagmar Schlüter, Morgan T. Davies, and Kevin Murray, there are still remaining aspects in need of further study due to its complexity. By investigating this corpus, it is possible to learn more about the placelore and understand why it has been preserved to the extent it has been. In addition, the alterations influencing the Dindshenchas entries have not been extensively covered in the academic discussion. A thesis covering this topic can therefore contribute to the Dindshenchas discussion and provide evidence that there is a need for examining individual entries which in turn can make connections towards the corpus as a whole. There have been doubts on the historical accurateness of the Dindshenchas corpus, and it has been difficult for scholars to discover the physical location for the entries in Ireland's actual landscape and geography. However, it does not seem to be the purpose of the Dindshenchas tradition to create an exact map over Ireland, and instead focuses on gathering all of the Irish placelore. It ceases to be about the placelore being 100 % believable, and places preservation over historical accurateness perhaps due to certain mythological connections and the absurdity of some entries.

It is evident in the Irish culture that there is a large emphasis on the mythological world, which makes sense since: "Countries have their factual and their mythical geographies. It is not always easy to tell them apart, nor even to say which is more important, because the way people act depends on their comprehension of reality, and that comprehension, since it can never be

---

[1] Cresswell, Tim. *Place: A Short Introduction*. (New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004): 20.

[2] When referring to the entire tradition with all three recensions, I will refer to it as the Dindshenchas and not *Dindshenchas Érenn*. This is because this title was used for the prosimetrum recension, and at times to the prose recension, yet not always for the metrical recension manuscripts.

[3] Muhr, Kay. "Place-Names and the Understanding of Monuments." *Landscapes of Cult and Kingship*, ed. R. Schot, C. Newman, and E. Bhreathnach. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011): 237-238.

complete, is necessarily imbued with myths."[4] Therefore, there seems to be a combination of mythological connections, aspects of geography and to some extent overtly Christian elements embedded in texts such as the Dindshenchas. There have been several attempts at providing an accurate description of this tradition, and one of these is by Kay Muhr, who states that "the Irish landscape and the *dindsenchas* 'the history of places,' which was its collective reflex in tribal myth and history served together as an effective mnemonic index and treasury of a great part of native tradition."[5] Describing the Dindshenchas as a treasury of native tradition is quite fitting, and also reflects it being preserved by scribes as collection made from an older tradition.

In the preservation of the Dindshenchas tradition, and in the transmission of Irish literature in general, the texts were frequently altered by the scribes. It is described by Kim McCone as "the monastically oriented literary reworking and invention of saga and other *senchus* as required, within the limits imposed by the need to avoid straining credibility by unduly great of sudden divergences from a received tradition increasingly bolstered by writing."[6] The scribes altered the text to either fit their own preferences or the demands of the contemporary society; however, it was crucial to maintain the purpose and ideas of these texts as well as its importance to the tradition. Investigating these alterations is quite difficult, partly due to not having access to the first written Dindshenchas, or even knowledge of the original oral tradition, and partly due to its vast size. As a result, it is impossible to simply "go and look at them in order to see if the historian has adequately reproduced them in his narrative."[7] Instead it is important to find another way to investigate them.

Seán Ó Coileáin provides another option and states: "A more valid approach … is to test the consistency of the entire traditional *corpus*, establish a basic structure, and attempt to explain any deviations from it."[8] The purpose for studying the Dindshenchas is to execute the proposal by Ó Coileáin; however, that would be too large of a feat for a master's thesis of one hundred pages. This thesis will be an attempt to test the consistency of a small selection of the Dindshenchas corpus and investigate the alterations made by the scribes across multiple manuscripts from different areas as well as a time span of more than two hundred years.

---

[4] Schot, Roseanne. "From Cult Centre to Royal Centre: Monuments, Myths and Other Revelations at Uisneach." *Landscapes of Cult and Kingship,* ed. R. Schot, C. Newman, and E. Bhreathnach. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011): 92.

[5] Muhr, K. "Place-Names and the Understanding of Monuments," 232.

[6] McCone, Kim. *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature:* Maynooth Monographs 3. (Maynooth: National University of Ireland, 2000): 202.

[7] White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding,* ed. R. H. Canary and H. Kozicki. (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978): 88.

[8] Ó Coileáin, Seán. "The Structure of a Literary Cycle." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 25, ed. D. Greene and P. Mac Cana. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1974): 89.

1.2 The Purpose of this Thesis and Research Question

The purpose of this thesis will be to investigate the development and transmission of three Dindshenchas entries: 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba.' These entries were chosen from a list of my favorite Dindshenchas entries, partly due to their interesting plot and partly due to providing different types of Dindshenchas entries. They are a mix of a lake drowning in 'Loch Garman,' an old woman dying in a field in 'Lia Nothain,' and the mythological connections in 'Berba.' In addition, it was important to showcase entries that have different lengths and number of characters. The analysis will be carried out in order to discover how these entries have been altered by the scribes in a selection of the extant manuscripts.

The preservation of the Dindshenchas corpus is quite complex and it seems to have been quite difficult to balance altering the corpus while preserving the placelore through generations. By using articles on theories such as cultural and archival memory. It is also possible to use them as informing the analysis of the development, preservation and transmission of the placelore entries. The main research question will be: How was these Dindshenchas entries altered by the scribes and did the scribes thereby affect the meaning and storyline of the placelore? Attempting to analyse this across an entire corpus is impossible for a master's thesis; therefore, the scope will be smaller. Nevertheless, one can still get a detailed analysis of this smaller scope.

Chapter One:

Thesis Background

2.1 Methods for Analysing the Dindshenchas

This thesis will employ a variety of different methods to analyze 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba' from the Dindshenchas corpus. First of all, most of the material from primary sources will either be from published editions or from my own transcriptions for manuscripts lacking an edition. The main manuscripts[9] used for my analysis will be *Lebor Laignech*[10] (LL), *Leabhar Bhaile an Mhóta*[11] (BB), *Rawlinson B 506*[12] (Bd), and *Leabhar Uí Mhaine*[13] (M), as well as some references to *MS Adv 72.1.16*[14] (Ed) and *MS 1436*[15] (E). These manuscripts are chosen due to their estimated dating and due to being connected to the three recensions. Furthermore, choosing these manuscripts also opens up the opportunity to examine manuscripts such as Bd, Ed, and E which have not been studied as extensively as other manuscripts.

LL has an edition by R. I. Best and Osborn Bergin which will be used for this manuscript, and the edition of Bd by Whitley Stokes is also featured in the analysis. When working with editions, it is important to be careful as it is difficult to be aware of certain editorial changes their authors might have implemented.[16] Only Stokes's edition has a translation included however, where applicable, E. J. Gwynn's *Metrical Dindshenchas* provides a translation which can be used in connection to LL as Gwynn preferred LL for his work. His edition can also support the other manuscripts where relevant, and Stokes's edition of the Rennes manuscript may be used for BB as these two manuscripts are almost identical. When using these editions, they are doublechecked against the facsimile of the manuscript since some of the editions have failed to include certain sections or includes editorial changes. This is to avoid making major mistakes in my own analysis.

---

[9] The abbreviations in parentheses will be used throughout this thesis instead of using the full title, which makes referring to manuscripts easier. Most of them are taken from E. J. Gwynn's *The Metrical* Dindshenchas, unless it is specifically mentioned in a footnote. Their dating will be further discussed in section 4.2.

[10] *Lebor Laignech*, also known as the *Book of Leinster*, is located at Trinity College with the manuscript number MS 1339.

[11] *Leabhar Bhaile an Mhóta*, also known as *Book of Ballymote*, is located at Royal Irish Academy with the manuscript number MS 23 P 12. The abbreviation in this case is BB instead of Gwynn's abbreviation B. This is to avoid confusion with recension B of the Dindshenchas corpus.

[12] The section of *Rawlinson B 506* containing the Dindshenchas material is also known as 'The Bodleian Dindshenchas' and the manuscript is located at the Bodleian Library collection.

[13] *Leabhar Uí Mhaine*, also known as Book of Uí Maine, is located at Royal Irish Academy with the manuscript number MS D ii 1.

[14] The section of this manuscript containing the Dindshenchas material is also known as 'The Edinburgh Dindshenchas' and is located at the National Library of Scotland.

[15] This manuscript contains a small excerpt of the Dindshenchas corpus and is located at Trinity College.

[16] This will be discussed further in section 3.1.1-3.1.4.

Some of the manuscripts do not have a proper edition, translation or even a transcription, and in the cases of BB, Ed and M, transcriptions and translations are supplied by me. After the sections have all been transcribed and translated, they are ready for analysis. The main analysis method is to compare the texts using the transcriptions and translations in order to uncover the alterations occurring over time. This is carried out by analyzing the linguistic markers[17] used within Dindshenchas entry, the textual inconsistencies between the manuscripts and alterations in language and content. I will also include in the analysis an emphasis on the interrelationship between the manuscripts and how the scribes differentiate between the prose and poetry.[18] An analysis of these aspects will show how and why the scribes altered the Dindshenchas tradition, as well as illustrate if these changes majorly affected the placelore material.

When working with this methodology it is important to keep in mind the prevalent pitfalls. Firstly, when analyzing manuscripts from this time period it is important to keep in mind that they have quite complicated paleography and codicology. Therefore, it is important to be quite thorough in making sure that my transcription and translation is accurate and being aware of common abbreviations used across the manuscripts. Secondly, when analyzing changes over time one needs to decide if these changes were common changes that occurred in the time period or if it changed due to something else. Thirdly, it is important to keep in mind that I am only analysing three Dindshenchas entries; therefore, the findings might not correspond with changes in the Dindshenchas. However, it will give an idea of prospective changes by the scribes and how they might have influenced the corpus overall.

2.2 Selected Theories Relevant to this Analysis

Normally in such an analysis, there will be a theoretical lens which the analysis is heavily indebted to; however, in this case, the theoretical lens serves more as an influence and informs the reading of the placelore entries. In Amy Mulligan's monograph *A Landscape of Words: Ireland, Britain and the Poetics of Space, 700-1250*, she states the reasons for not emphasizing theoretical literature in her study of placelore:

> …overreliance on the tools and terminology of a theoretical literature originating in times, places and environmental concerns not necessarily shared with Ireland's spatial poets, or an overly enthusiastic translation of medieval Ireland's processes and

---

[17] Linguistic markers are analysed in section 5.2.
[18] Appendices 4.1-6.4 contains sections on the interrelationship between the manuscripts of each Dindshenchas entry. The appendices put the entries next to each other on a table, making it easier to discover and compare the alterations and textual inconsistencies.

techniques into contemporary frameworks, can obscure the logics of the medieval sources, and those must be the initial focus.[19]

Due to the nature of spatial poetics and the focus of this thesis, I will follow Mulligan's suit and use theories such as memory theory, literary geography and etymological theories to inform my readings and as background information. Ideas that these theories cover, might have lightly influenced the material at some point in time. Within memory theory there are many sub-categories, yet perhaps the most pertinent is cultural memory that has many definitions which have been called "diffuse and contrastive."[20] Cultural memory has been a frequently discussed topic since it was referred to by Maurice Halbwachs in 1925, who investigated the social prerequisites for communal remembering.[21] It is largely based on the memories of a culture, and there have been several attempts to define it with various results.

There is a German term "kulturelles Gedächtnis" that has been used to illustrate the concept; however, it cannot be directly translated into English.[22] "Kultur," according to Dietrich Harth, "stands for the intellectual, artistic, and creative achievements of a community and is used to express the advanced development of humanity" while "Gedächtnis" "stands for the capacity to store not just what is learned but also sensory impressions and 'mental processes,' which can then at an opportune moment be allowed to 'enter one's consciousness' again."[23] By putting these two together it is a valid explanation of cultural memory that is important to be aware of, even though it might not be the most referred explanation in modern scholarship.[24] When it comes to "kulturelles Gedächtnis," it is put into a context by Dagmar Schlüter in her 2017 article "Boring and Elusive? The Dindshenchas as a Medieval Irish Genre." In it, she quotes Jan Assmann, a leading cultural memory scholar, and his view on mediums of cultural memory which can be directly connected to the Dindshenchas: "Sogar und gerade ganze Landschaften können als Medium des kulturellen Gedächtnisses dienen. Sie werden dann

---

[19] Mulligan, Amy. *A Landscape of Words: Ireland, Britain and the Poetics of Space, 700-1250.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019): 15.

[20] Davies, Morgan Thomas. "Cultural Memory, the Finding of the *Táin*, and the Canonical Process in Early Irish Literature." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory,* ed. J. E. Rekdal and E. Poppe. (Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014): 84.

[21] Erll, Astrid. "Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 1.

[22] Harth, Dietrich. "The Invention of Cultural Memory." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 87.

[23] Harth, D. "The Invention of Cultural Memory," 87.

[24] In my opinion, it is important to have a wide knowledge of different explanations or arguments within cultural memory in order to make informed conclusions. This explanation of the German term, as explained by Harth, is important, even though other studies have preferred concepts by Jan Assmann. Maria Tymoczko's article "The Nature of Tradition and Cultural Memory: Evidence from Two Millennia of Irish Literature." in J. E. Rekdal and E. Poppe's *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory* from 2014, brings up the many problems with Jan Assmann.

weniger durch Zeichen ("Denkmäler") akzentuiert, als vielmehr als ganzes in den Rang eines Zeichens erhoben, d.h. *semiotisiert*."[25] In Schlüter's comments, it is clear that Dindshenchas as a literary landscape can be a medium of cultural memory and it exists as a sign of memory as a whole. There is little emphasis on the memorials in the geographical landscape, such as hills or lakes, but more focus on the landscape found in the Dindshenchas entries.

Since the Dindshenchas exists as a whole as a medium of cultural memory, Dagmar Schlüter goes even further and states that "in the *dindshenchas*, the Irish landscape does provide the necessary, unified background; but the pluralistic concept of mediality in the *dindshenchas* favors various separate and independent readings, not a singular one."[26] The Dindshenchas corpus is far from unified as all the entries exists as separate entities, as well as the placelore embedded in larger texts such as *Táin Bó Cúailnge*. In a sense, these create a mental image and an experience of the landscape as a whole. However, since they are separate entities within a whole medium, it is evident that one also needs to provide independent readings in order to get the full view of the corpus. Ann Rigney has stated that "the only way to save such memories is to fix them in writing and in a sustained narrative, whereas words and thoughts die out, writings remain."[27] It is necessary to put the material down in writing in order to cultivate it for survival. However, just because it survives does not mean the memory is the actual reality as argued by Alon Confino, another respected memory studies scholar: "the study of memory undertakes to explore how people imagine the past not how the past actually happened."[28] It simply is the scribes' experiences and might provide insight concerning how they imagined the tradition. Even minor places were gifted a history in the Dindshenchas corpus and embedded them into the cultural history. All of these places are productive for the Irish self-perception due to their ability to provide insight into their culture.

Several scholars discussing memory theory also introduce the concept of a cultural text: "En kulturtekst kan enten betraktes som en enhetlig tekst med en enkelt kode, eller som en kombinasjon av tekster med et tilsvarende sett av koder."[29] The Dindshenchas may be classified

---

[25] Qtd. in Schlüter, Dagmar. "Boring and Elusive? The Dindshenchas as a Medieval Irish Genre." *Journal of Literary Onomastics* 6, ed. J. McMullen and K. Carella. (New York: The College at Brockport, 2017): 25. My own translation: "Even whole landscapes can serve as a medium of cultural memory. They are then less accentuated by signs "memorials") than rather elevated as a whole to the rank of a sign, i.e. seimoticized."
[26] Schlüter, D. "Boring and Elusive," 25.
[27] Rigney, Ann. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory." *Journal of European Studies* 35. (New York: SAGE Publications, 2005): 12.
[28] Confino, Alon. "Memory and the History of Mentalities." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 80.
[29] Børtnes, Jostein. "Tekstanalyse og Kultursemiotikk: Hovedpunkter i Lotmans Litteraturteori.'' *Polyfoni og Karneval: Essays om Litteratur,* ed. J. Børtnes. (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1993): 79. My own translation: "A

as a cultural text, though most likely as a combination of texts with a corresponding set of codes and not the first alternative. This provides the possibility that the Dindshenchas corpus is connected through a certain set of codes. Texts such as those in the Dindshenchas corpus can be referred to as cultural texts, which "remain available for retrieval and for revision or reinterpretation through *commentarius* in order to adapt them in ways that make them suitable for the changing cultural conditions that have once again made them useful or even necessary."[30] This reworking of older tradition was crucial for its survival and illustrates the constraints a culture puts on them to preserve the culture. It is also important to note that when reproducing the past, "our imagination remains under the influence of the present social milieu."[31] While it could provide insight on the scribes, it may also illustrate the social milieu.

According to Jan Erik Rekdal, "culture as a memory and storage of the collective experience of a society is related to historical empiricism – that is experience in the past,"[32] and therefore illustrates that the concepts such as cultural memory are the experience of the past, yet not necessarily a mirror of the actual past. However, a cultural text is more than simply a text: it also has a complex value to its society: "Cultural texts lay claim to an overall social authority; they define the identity and cohesiveness of a society."[33] Therefore, these texts are crucial in learning about a society, and perhaps also in learning about the scribes as well. Another insightful element to these cultural texts is that they are "designed not for a single act of reception, like a message, but for virtually endless acts of retrieval."[34] This signifies that these texts are designed to be transmitted multiple times. If they were not designed for endless acts of retrieval, it would be more difficult to ensure its survival into modern studies. It is apparent in memory theory that the society plays a large part in the survival of memories and their traditions. According to Jeffrey Olick, it is within "a society that people normally acquire their memories. It is also in a society that they recall, recognize and localize their memories."[35]

---

cultural text can either be viewed as a uniform text with one simple code, or as a combination of texts with a corresponding set of codes."

[30] Davies, M. T. "Cultural Memory, the Finding of the *Táin*, and the Canonical Process," 87.

[31] Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory: The Heritage of Sociology,* trans. L. Coser. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992): 49.

[32] Rekdal, Jan Erik. "Memorials and Cultural Memory in Irish Tradition." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory*, ed. J. E. Rekdal and E. Poppe. (Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014): 144**.** This book is hugely important to the cultural memory discussion, and the contributing scholars provide insight on cultural memory theory from medieval Irish texts.

[33] Assmann, Jan. "Cultural Texts Suspended Between Writing and Speech." *Religion and Cultural Memory*: *Ten Studies*, ed. J. Assmann and R. Livingstone. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006): 104.

[34] Assmann, J. "Cultural Texts Suspended," 105.

[35] Olick, Jeffrey. "From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practices and Products." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 155.

This is why memory studies can provide insight to modern scholars concerning the state of past societies by looking at the fruits of its labour. In the process of exchanging memories within a culture, there are dangers to all of these perceptions of the cultural memories, and unfortunately, "the price of communality is the loss of literal accuracy."[36] By everyone participating in this exchange, the literal accuracy might disappear due to the lacking memory in some of the participants. Thereby, certain aspects of the placelore might be lost along the process.

The danger of the exchange of memories is that the exchange of memories is committed in a society with a shared heritage: "The individual memory does not necessarily coincide with the social memory of the group or society to which that individual belongs."[37] The same counts for transferring knowledge between generations as the quality of the transmission gets progressively more difficult due to the new generation not understanding it or valuing it the same way: "In practice, memories constantly disappear as they are transmitted from generation to generation."[38] These disappearances are unavoidable, and one can only attempt to preserve as much content as possible. Furthermore, a removal from the oral transmission is not always a substandard option as certain aspects can be salvaged. Konrad Ehlich defines a text as "retrieved communication" and also that:

> In this definition, what is commented on is not the original form of the text, but the transmitted message. However, the common element, namely the element of retrieval (*Wiederaufnahme*) is obvious. What is decisive for the genesis of texts is the separation from the immediate speech situation.[39]

Despite going through societal or generational transmission, texts such as the Dindshenchas can have plenty of its communication and knowledge salvaged and transmitted anew. When something is retrieved, there is also a need to comment and review prior to transmission: "a text that must be retrieved or recovered, a text that is involved in (in fact, dependent on) the process of transmission, is a text whose compositional context is absent, and thus a text that will require some kind of labor… in order to be rendered usable for a later audience."[40] This is perhaps what the medieval scribes were doing, and could be a possibility as to why they altered the text.

Another element from the Dindshenchas corpus that will be examined is the preservation and transmission and embedded into this aspect is the removal and adding of placelore elements. Aleida Assmann comes forward with a theory of passive forgetting

---

[36] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation," 15.
[37] Rekdal, J. E. "Memorials and Cultural Memory," 109.
[38] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation," 12.
[39] Qtd. in Assmann, J. "Cultural Texts Suspended," 103.
[40] Davies, M. T. "Cultural Memory, the Finding of the *Táin*, and the Canonical Process," 85.

occurring in a society without its members necessarily being aware of it: "The passive form of cultural forgetting is related to non-intentional acts such as losing, hiding, dispersing, neglecting, abandoning, or leaving something behind. Objects fall out of frames of attention, valuation and use."[41] Due to this loss of cultural aspects or knowledge, the scholars of the time needed "a special art of reading … to compensate for the loss of a direct understanding."[42] Therefore, this knowledge needs to be treated more carefully than necessary as opposed to if it was direct knowledge from the source. When putting active and passive remembering together, it is clear that "the institutions of active memory preserve the past as present while the institutions of passive memory preserve the past as past."[43] This is discussed at length by many scholars and theorists, such as Albertus Magnus who "writes that since recollection is of past experience, there is a 'break' between original action of memory that impresses the sensory image and its recollection. This break means the original experience itself is lost, wholly or in part. Recollection thus becomes a reconstructive act."[44] The reconstruction is imperative in trying to salvage the memories of past generations before memories disappear.

There is also an argument for writing being detrimental to a tradition, as Plato in a passage from *Phaedrus* refers to writing being a means to foster forgetting rather than remembering.[45] By committing something to writing there is a chance that the tradition falls out of common knowledge since it is not as necessary to remember the text if it is written down. However, it is necessary to note that "the continuous process of forgetting is part of social normality,"[46] and it is bound to occur in a social community. One could also say that "the printing press strengthens and at the same time overloads social memory, allowing us to remember and simultaneously to forget much more."[47] Even though it might cause more forgetting, this process of strengthening might be easier in a literary society as "in a literate culture, forgetting can be less permanent, displacing the cultural text from the active or working memory to the 'latent' or 'reference memory'."[48] Scholars such as Theodoricus "refers to

---

[41] Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 98.
[42] Assmann, Aleida. "Texts, Traces, Trash: The Changing Media of Cultural Memory." *Representations* 56, ed. R. Starn. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996): 129.
[43] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 98.
[44] Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990): 29.
[45] Esposito, Elena. "Social Forgetting: A Systems-Theory Approach." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 181.
[46] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 97.
[47] Esposito, E. "Social Forgetting: A Systems-Theory Approach," 188.
[48] Davies, M. T. "Cultural Memory, the Finding of the *Táin*, and the Canonical Process," 87.

writing as an aid to memory and as a tool for securing transmission of memories before the leaky bucket runs out of water."[49] This "leaky bucket"-concept could perhaps be connected to the scribes of the Dindshenchas attempting to salvage the tradition by inventing Dindshenchas sections in order to fill the gaps of the corpus.

Ann Rigney brings this aspect up in her "plenitude and loss"-model where "memory is conceptualized on the one hand in terms of an original 'storehouse' and, on the other hand, as something that is always imperfect and diminishing, a matter of chronic frustration because always falling short of total recall."[50] Memory being both an original storehouse and something that is constantly diminishing, illustrates that even though the material and traditions are preserved, they are at the same time in constant danger of losing aspects of themselves. However, it is important to keep in mind that while aspects are certainly lost, there is also the opportunity to gain new ones. The storehouse mentioned by several scholars is reviewed further by Aleida Assmann, stating about the storehouse for cultural relics, such as cultural texts, that

> …these are not unmediated; they have only lost their immediate addressees; they are de-contextualized and disconnected from their former frames which had authorized them or determined their meaning. As part of the archive, they are open to new contexts and lend themselves to new interpretations.[51]

The archive is different from the storehouse in that it does not simply store a tradition, but instead pulls it out from oblivion. Another aspect of memory studies pertinent to this thesis is the emphasis on mentalities, discussed at length in Alon Confino's works. He quotes Robert Mandrou claiming that cultural memory and the focus on the mentalities of the people aims at "reconstructing the patterns of behavior, expressive forms and modes of silence into which worldviews and collective sensibilities are translated. The basic elements of this research are representations and images, myths and values recognized or tolerated by groups or the entire society."[52] These representations of mentality is shown in a culture, and can inform us about how the population at the time behaved: "The history of memory is useful and interesting not only for thinking about how the past is represented in, say, a single museum but also about, more extensively, the historical mentality of people in the past, about the commingled beliefs, practices, and symbolic representations that make people's perceptions of the past."[53]

---

[49] Hermann, Pernille. "Concepts of Memory and Approaches to the Past in Medieval Icelandic Literature." *Scandinavian Studies* 81:3, ed. S. P. Sondrup. (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2009): 292.
[50] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation," 12.
[51] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 99.
[52] Qtd. in Confino, A. "Memory and the History of Mentalities," 80.
[53] Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *The American Historical Review* 102:5, ed. M. Grossberg et. al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997): 1389.

Therefore, it is evident that memory studies may be used to examine the mentality and beliefs of the people during transmission of the texts.

In addition, it is evident that the texts containing this collective mentality can be equated to a form of monument providing fixed points of reference: "They are textual monuments which can be reprinted time and time again in new editions even as the environment around them changes."[54] By being textual monuments, they may illustrate the views and opinions of the time as well as what was important to them. When working with manuscripts, one is able to analyse these texts and as well as the culture surrounding them. While there certainly is variability in the medieval manuscript culture, both in Ireland and elsewhere, it has a clear divergence from print culture. According to Kurt W. Foster, "artefacts either carry meanings that are reconstructed within the context of the society which produced them, or they acquire significance in the thinking of the historian and in the experiences of his contemporaries."[55] It is difficult to state definitively whether or not the Dindshenchas carry meanings through a reconstruction of the Irish society or from the scribes' own belief. This is partly because the memory and mentality of a culture is often affected by that of the individual and vice versa. However, it is possible to state that the Dindshenchas might provide certain knowledge about the individual and societal mentality at the time of writing, even though we cannot separate the individual from the society as easily.

Within memory theory in general, there exists an emphasis on the concept of archival memory. This can be useful here since certain parts of the corpus can lay dormant in the archive, or a group's memory, before they are brought out at a later in the textual transmission. Rigney has stated: "Archival memory is merely a latent form of memory… in that it constitutes a virtual storehouse of information about the past that may or may not be used as a source for remembrance."[56] This latent form of memory and the storehouse mentioned by Rigney can be visible in the Dindshenchas due to its treatment within the corpus: "Many items are dropped from an earlier recension only to reappear in a few late manuscripts of a subsequent one."[57] Due to this, it could be that some Dindshenchas items were left in the archival memory until it was added to a manuscript by the scribes. There is also a possibility that each manuscript presents a

[54] Rigney, Ann. "The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts Between Monumentality and Morphing." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. A. Erll and A. Nunning. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008): 349.

[55] Forster, Kurt W. "Aby Warburg's History of Art: Collective Memory and the Social Mediation of Images." *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 105:1, ed. S. R. Graubard. (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1976): 173.

[56] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation," 17.

[57] Bowen, Charles. "A Historical Inventory of the Dindshenchas." *Studia Celtica* 10/11, ed. J. E. Caerwyn Williams. (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1975/76): 118.

view of the past, while being guided by specific concerns of the present. However, there is a danger to impose such a large trust in the scribes as "any element of cultural production that enters into the archive of cultural memory will itself be dependent on the memory of specific human beings at a number of different stages from production and transmission to reception."[58] This may create some doubt on the scribe and his personal memory, and whether or not elements were added yet again after being retrieved from the archive.

According to Assmann, "the function of the archive, the reference memory of a society, provides a kind of counterbalance against the necessarily reductive and restrictive drive of the working memory. It creates a meta-memory, a second-order memory that preserves what has been forgotten."[59] This counterbalance and result of the meta-memory is an interesting aspect within memory studies that could perhaps provide some insight into the Dindshenchas corpus. However, it is also clear that these archives are not completely inclusive, and memories can easily be lost. Despite this, there was, according to Maria Tymoczko, "a deliberate attempt to establish conditions for the creation of an archive of written materials that would maintain its readability and hence its archival value through time."[60] That would create a place for the Dindshenchas corpus to thrive and be preserved, despite some parts of the tradition being lost.

Even though cultural and archival memory are important, it is also necessary to be aware of etymological theories and theories of literary geography and spatial learning. Since the Dindshenchas tradition is based partly upon etymological explanations, one needs to be aware of etymological theory. When etymology is used in the Dindshenchas it seems as though "one guess was as good as another."[61] Therefore, it is important to treat the etymological aspects not as fact, but as a scholarly creation. Many scholars have stated about the Dindshenchas tradition that there are connections between this and the works of Isidore of Seville, for example the *Etymologiae*. Part of Isidore's understanding of the medieval etymology was that "the analysis of the origin and meaning of a name will throw light on its bearer: Omnis enim rei inspection etymologia cognita planior est" and that "Nisi enim nomen scieris, cognitio rerum perit."[62] It is not only a tool to understand the bearer of the name, but also a way of tracing where the name

[58] Tymoczko, Maria. "The Nature of Tradition and Cultural Memory: Evidence from Two Millennia of Irish Literature." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory,* ed. J. E. Rekdal and E. Poppe. (Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014): 17.
[59] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 106.
[60] Tymoczko, M. "The Nature of Tradition and Cultural Memory," 35.
[61] Ó Coileáin, S. "The Structure of a Literary Cycle," 90.
[62] Qtd. in Baumgarten, Rolf. "Etymological Aetiology in Irish Tradition." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 41, ed. P. Mac Cana, R. Baumgarten, and L. Breatnach. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1990): 115. My own translation: "The examination of everything is clearer when the etymology is understood… For unless you know the name, the understanding of things is lost."

came from. Etymology is, according to Isidore, also used to trace the origin of a name and find where its power lies: **"Etymologia est origo vocabulorum, cum vis verbi vel nominis per interpretatione colligitur."**[63] Interpretation of a place and its history is crucial in receiving more knowledge about its placename and the contribution it provides to the culture and tradition.

One can find plenty of connections to Isidore within the Dindshenchas, and it has been accepted that the scribes and scholars probably had access to his material. However, there also exists some doubt that Isidore's work was as widely available as once believed in the beginning of Irish literature being committed to writing. For example, Marina Smyth states that Irish scholars in the seventh century "were quite unaware of these works, thereby casting serious doubt on the availability of the full range of Isidore's writings."[64] This analysis provides a chance it was not widely circulated during this time. However, in some texts from this time, it seems that the scribe was familiar with Isidore's work, such as the Irish writer of *De duodecim Abusivis Saeculi* written between 630 and 650.[65]

It is difficult to state completely the transmission of Isidorean material, yet it is clear that "the medieval Irish scholars were in the forefront of employing Isidore's work *Etymologiae*."[66] Isidore's work as important to the medieval scholars since it gave them a vault of knowledge from classical sources. This provides give a reason for why etymology and Isidorean aspects were employed in parts of the Dindshenchas and there is a possibility that it became more available for later scribes. Isidore might have been connected to the Dindshenchas tradition closer to when the manuscripts were written. It has also been stated by prominent Irish scholars, such as Proinsias Mac Cana, that "when the authors of the *Dindshenchas* indulged their weakness for etymologizing placenames, we can be confident… that they were in fact following an ancient tradition of onomastic exegesis."[67] While the Irish writers were following an ancient tradition of etymologizing, they would also have been affected by the Isidorean material resurfacing.

---

[63] Qtd. in Davies, Morgan Thomas. "Dindshenchas, Memory, and Invention." *Lochlann: Festskrift til Jan Erik Rekdal på 60-årsdagen: Aistí in ómós do Jan Erik Rekdal ar a 60ú lá breithe*, ed. C. Hambro and L. I. Widerøe. (Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, 2013): 94. Davies's translation: "Etymology is in the origin of words, when the power of a word or name is gathered together through interpretation."

[64] Smyth, Marina. "Isidore of Seville and Early Irish Cosmography." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 14, ed. P. Sims-Williams. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987): 69.

[65] Rekdal, Jan Erik. "Etymology, Wordplay, and Allegorical Reading in Some Medieval Irish Texts." *Etymology and Wordplay in Medieval Literature*, ed. M. Males. (Turnhout: Brepols, 2018): 171.

[66] Rekdal, J. E. "Etymology, Wordplay, and Allegorical Reading," 171.

[67] Mac Cana, Proinsias. "Placenames and Mythology in Irish Tradition: Places, Pilgrimages and Things." *Proceedings of the First North American Congress of Celtic Studies held at Ottawa from 26th-30th March 1986*, ed. G. W. MacLennan. (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1988): 337.

According to Barbara Piatti, the main focus of a literary geography is "the interactions between real and imaginary geographies in literary genres."[68] This means that by looking at both the real and imaginary aspect of the Dindshenchas one can start to understand the geography present within the texts and its relationship to the imaginary world. Piatti also explains further that: "Fictional space don't have to but can feature references to the geospace (first space, actual space). Moreover, it's a fact, that both writers and readers are tempted by the option of anchoring texts somehow in the(ir) real world."[69] In the Dindshenchas, there are certain locations that have been anchored into the real world, but there are just as many places that are not localized. Charles Bowen states in one of his articles that: "The locations of many of the places in the Dindshenchas are unknown to us today, and some of them may well have been unknown even to the learned writers of that time."[70] Attempting to localize these places or even map them would be near impossible; however, one can learn more about these places by reading its placelore. When analyzing and mapping them, one is not talking about actual geography, but *literary* geography, where the Dindshenchas is a literary collection and not actual locations. Even though there are places that have been localized in the Irish contemporary landscape, the majority are not found, perhaps due to placenames frequently being altered through history based on events. It is also possible that they never truly existed in the actual landscape, but that they existed solely in a literary or mythological form.

Several scholars have commented on this possibility, one of these being Francis John Byrne, who stated that the Dindshenchas corpus consists of "artificial learning rather than genuine traditional mythology: very often one suspects *ad hoc* invention of a myth by a *senchaid* in order to explain an obscure name"[71] and Kevin Murray continues, stating that "similar *ad hoc* invention of place names to reinforce extant narratives would also seem to have played a significant role in the creation and cultivation of *dinnshenchas*."[72] Therefore, it is something to be mindful of when studying the Dindshenchas. When looking at spatial learning theories, the Tolmanian spatial learning theory suggests that "the tendency… is to treat space as a mental construct deriving from the exercise of a faculty such as the imagination."[73] This would suggest that space does not always mean literal space, but also space that is created

---

[68] Piatti, Barbara et. al. "Mapping Literature: Towards a Geography of Fiction." *Cartography and Art,* ed. W. Cartwright et. al. (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2009): 178.

[69] Piatti, Barbara et. al. "Mapping Literature," 182.

[70] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 124.

[71] Qtd. in Murray, Kevin. "Genre Construction: The Creation of the Dinnshenchas." *Journal of Literary Onomastics* 6, ed. J. McMullen and K. Carella. (New York: The College at Brockport, 2017): 14.

[72] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 14.

[73] Richards, Paul. "Kant's Geography and Mental Maps." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 61. (Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 1974): 12.

through someone's imagination or influence. When going through the theories that might be useful to be aware of, it is evident that memory theory will probably be the most useful due to its emphasis on the scribal influence. Therefore, concepts such as cultural memory and archival memory might be useful in this analysis; however, it is also important to be aware of literary geography and etymology due to their dealings with aspects similar to the Dindshenchas. The theories that have been dealt with in this section will be used as influence and inspiration for the reading and analysis of 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain' and 'Berba.'

3.1.1 Earlier Research into the Dindshenchas Corpus

The Dindshenchas corpus has been in transmission for a long time, yet it has not been consistently studied as it was stated already in 1975 that "the *Dindshenchas* as a whole has failed to attract scholarly attention since the task of editing it was first undertaken."[74] There was a sporadic interest in the corpus, and it was only around 2000 that it began to consistently be discussed and analysed in academia. When studying this corpus, it is important to get an overview of relevant studies of Dindshenchas material in order to understand what has been previously analysed. The Dindshenchas corpus is quite large and there are countless aspects to examine. All of these contributions to the discussion will be discussed chronologically. The phases in the development of the Dindshenchas scholarship can be divided into three scholarship groups based on their publication year and illustrate the different periods of scholarly interest within the academic world.

The first group is set between 1892 to 1935 and includes the works of Whitley Stokes, Edward J. Gwynn and Rudolf Thurneysen. After a break of forty years, the next group is situated between 1975 and 1990 with publications from Charles Bowen, Tomás Ó Concheanainn and Brian Ó Cuív. Finally, there is the group from 2004 until the present with a more continuous surge of articles from a variety of scholars. One possibility for these publication gaps could be that after the groundbreaking work done by Stokes, Gwynn and Thurneysen the interest faded until Bowen, Ó Concheanainn and Ó Cuív brought new arguments to light. Futhermore, from the early 2000s the popularity rose and has continued rising and there is currently a Leverhulme-funded research project by Máire Ní Mhaonaigh, Marie-Luise Theuerkauf and David McCay studying the medieval Irish Dindshenchas entitled

---

[74] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 113.

"Mapping the Medieval Mind. Ireland's Literary Landscapes in a Global Space."[75] This proves that there is an ongoing interest in the Dindshenchas corpus within the academic world today.

3.1.2 First Group: Stokes, Gwynn, and Thurneysen

The first scholar[76] to publish about the Dindshenchas corpus was Whitley Stokes providing an edition of Bd in 1892, even though it only contains a third of the prose present in other Dindshenchas manuscripts.[77] In the edition, Stokes provides a literal translation for fifty-two Dindshenchas entries; however, he tends to emphasize the prose over the metrical stanzas in the manuscripts. Stokes also omits twenty stanzas from a Dindshenchas entry due to calling them "chiefly composed of stupid strings of place-names" and unnecessary for his edition.[78] Stokes's next contribution was his publication of Ed where he attempted to do the same thing as in the edition of Bd. In this publication he stated that: "Like all other copies of this curious collection of topographical legends, XVI Kilbride is imperfect; but, so far as it goes, it agrees closely, both in contents and arrangement, with the Oxford Dinnshennchas."[79] Since the manuscripts are quite similar, Stokes only prints the twenty-two Dindshenchas entries not found in the Bd and left the rest out. Due to this, he does not provide a complete exploration of the Ed Dindshenchas; however, he does provide a full view of the prose Dindshenchas in Ed and Bd when examining the editions together as one cohesive unit.

Stokes's third contribution is his edition of the Dindshenchas in the Rennes manuscript, considered along with BB to be one of the main manuscripts of the prosimetrum recension, and he attempts to date it as well as provide translations, concluding that: "The part of the codex which contains the Dindṡenchas was probably written in the fourteenth or fifteenth century; but the collection may have been made in the eleventh or the first half of the twelfth."[80] Stokes neglects to state how he came to this conclusion; however, it is nevertheless important to note that the collection itself is most likely older than this extant manuscript. He concentrates

---

[75] "Congratulations to Professor Ní Mhaonaigh." Published on 3 April 2020 at the *University of Cambridge: Anglo-Saxon, Norse & Celtic* website: https://www.asnc.cam.ac.uk/news/2020/04/03/2482/. Accessed on 20.09.20.

[76] The antiquarian George Petrie published in 1839 "On the history and antiquities of Tara Hill" before Whitley Stokes's publications, but it is excluded from this discussion as his project mostly deals with archaeological aspects.

[77] Stokes, Whitley. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas." *Folk-lore: A Quarterly Review of Myth, Tradition, Institution & Custom* 3:4. (London: David Nutt, 1892): 468.

[78] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 469.

[79] Stokes, Whitley. "The Edinburgh Dinnshenchas." *Folk-lore: A Quarterly Review of Myth, Tradition, Institution & Custom* 4. (London: David Nutt, 1893): 471. These manuscript names refer to Ed and Bd respectively and are the distinctions Stokes used in his studies.

[80] Stokes, Whitley. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas." *Revue Celtique* 15, ed. M-H. D'Arbois de Jubainville et. al. (Paris: Librairie Emile Bouillon, 1894): 272.

primarily on the prose material and neglects to provide the metrical sections at the end of the Dindshenchas entries.[81] He does include some stanzas in his edition, but this happens sporadically with little consistency, and provides a great example of prose and poetry being treated separately by scholars. While Stokes's editions of the Bd, Ed, and the Rennes manuscript are valuable for doing scholarship on the Dindshenchas, yet his decisions to change or omit certain sections can create difficulties. Due to this, it can complicate a study if one only has his edition and no access to facsimiles for comparison. According to Marie-Luise Theuerkauf, "Stokes's eclectic approach to the *Dindṡenchas* makes it impossible to appreciate the variation which exists even between various manuscript copies of the same article, let alone the relationship between the prose and poems."[82] I would agree with this statement, as his approach divides the prose and poetry permanently, which continues into later scholarship. This makes it more difficult for later scholars to consider the prose and poetry; however, his contributions are crucial part of the academic history of the Dindshenchas.

Edward J. Gwynn followed Stokes, who between 1903 and 1935 published five volumes of *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, which is an edition encompassing all of the metrical accounts of the Dindshenchas corpus. In this edition, Gwynn states that: "In constructing the text, the reading of LL has generally been followed (when not intrinsically objectionable), even against the consent of all other MSS."[83] Therefore, the content is largely closest to LL, yet he does supply the variants present in the other manuscripts where he finds it pertinent. Throughout the four volumes, Gwynn puts the sole focus on the metrical corpus, hence doing the opposite of what Stokes did to his editions. It has not been proven that it was deliberate from Gwynn's side; however, it is possible that it could have been deliberate in order to fill the void left by Stokes. While Gwynn was in the process of publishing these five volumes, Rudolf Thurneysen published a section on the Dindshenchas in *Die irische Helden- und Köniġsage*, where he was the first scholar to divide the Dindshenchas tradition into separate recensions.[84] Based on his study, the corpus is divided into recension A, B, and C:

> *Dindṡenchas* A is metrical and is found only in L. *Dindṡenchas* B – the prose recension – exists in two versions, Ba and Bb, the former in L, the latter in Bd and Ed…

[81] Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 310.

[82] Theuerkauf, Marie-Luise. "The Death of Boand and the Recensions of Dindsenchas Érenn." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 67, ed. L. Breatnach and D. McManus. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2017): 3.

[83] Gwynn, Edward J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 1. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1903): vi. LL stands for the Book of Leinster. E. J. Gwynn switches between using LL or L signifying the Book of Leinster, but for the purpose of this thesis, LL will be preferred.

[84] Hellmuth, Petra. "The Dindshenchas and the Irish Literary Tradition." *Cín Chille Cúile: Texts, Saints and Places: Essays in Honour of Pádraig Ó Riain*, ed. J. Carey, M. Herbert, and K. Murray. (Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2004): 117.

Thurneysen's *Dindshenchas* C is by far the most extensive. Thurneysen saw in this version the combination of A and B, that is, a prose abstract followed by a poem.[85]

Furthermore, Thurneysen puts the tradition in order where A originated first, then B, and finally C, and thereby A and B led to C being created.[86] His conclusions are important to the Dindshenchas discussion as it further divides up the tradition. This dating of the corpus will be explored later in connection to the examination of Tomás Ó Concheanainn's work. Thurneysen is mentioned in almost every article about the Dindshenchas after the publication of *Die irische Helden und Königsage*, due to scholars preferring his threefold categorization over Gwynn's twofold schema. In later scholarship, his categorization was largely followed and assumed to be correct, until later information surfaced.

Five years after Thurneysen published his study on the recensions, Gwynn published an article focusing solely on M which, according to him, was from the prosimetrum recension yet closely aligned itself with the prose recension.[87] In this study, he provides an arrangement of the first forty-one Dindshenchas entries, beginning with 'Temair' and ending with 'Mag Lifi,' noting that "from this point to Lége the arrangement agrees closely with that followed by the Rennes MS. (R) and the Book of Ballymote (B), and the text of both prose and poems is fundamentally the same."[88] Therefore, it is only this first section of M that is completely different from the other prosimetrum manuscripts. Furthermore, he analyses the order of the entries and notes where the manuscript agrees with Bd/Ed, LL, and the Rennes manuscript. Gwynn's conclusion is that: "…while M generally agrees with Bd.-Ed. where they differ from the R-family, there are particular cases where the relation is reversed, and also somewhere R agrees with Bd.-Ed. against M. We must therefore assume a common ancestor which is represented by the readings which any two of the three branches agree in against the third."[89] Since we do not have an extant archetype, the manuscript might be able to inform about what the common ancestor might have looked like.

A few years later, Gwynn published an article about the texts of the prose Dindshenchas and stated about Ed and Bd that "in their complete form they seem to have contained a selection from the prose Dindshenchas rather than a copy of the entire work."[90] Due to their high

---

[85] Qtd. in Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 3. This is not quoted directly from Thurneysen's article since it is in German and I have not been able to have it translated.
[86] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 3.
[87] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 5: 5.
[88] Gwynn, Edward J. "The Dindshenchas in the Book of Uí Maine." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 10. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1926-28): 70.
[89] Gwynn, E. J. "The Dindshenchas in the Book of Uí Maine," 74.
[90] Gwynn, Edward J. "The Texts of the Prose Dindshenchas." *Hermathena* 22. (Dublin: Trinity College Dublin, 1932): 239.

similarities, the manuscripts are likely to come from a common original.[91] This would either mean that we lost the original prose Dindshenchas or that the manuscript is designed as a selection of the material.[92] Gwynn also states that the common original of these two manuscripts "must have kept pretty close to that of L. But it was not a copy of L"[93] and also that "the original of both texts was illegible and perhaps corrupt at this point. L has omitted what was unintelligible, while the scribe of β[94] has copied to the best of his ability."[95] This possible corruption insinuates that the scribes had a difficult task in preserving and transmitting the tradition accurately. Through his article, Gwynn also identifies where the manuscripts coincide with each other and creates a stemma showing the relationship between LL, the common original of Bd and Ed, and the Reviser.[96] This stemma shows the archetype branching LL, while the other branch goes to "a" originating in a two-branch stemma, one leading to the common original of Bd and Ed, and the other to the Reviser.[97]

In Gwynn's fifth and final volume of *The Metrical Dindshenchas* from 1935, he provides a detailed analysis of the poetry and prose in the manuscripts overall. His scholarship is stated to be "an elaboration of Thurneysen's teaching,"[98] but Gwynn instead divides the Dindshenchas corpus into two recensions: the first including the purely metrical and purely prose version and the second being prosimetrum and belonging to the "Reviser."[99] He provides information about the dating, peculiarities, and paleographic information for each of the manuscripts before focusing on LL. Unlike Stokes, Gwynn provides information about both prose and poetry and publishes a list showing which Dindshenchas entries in LL have prose with no corresponding poem or a poem with no corresponding prose.[100] This analysis of the manuscripts and the relationship between the prose and poetry versions is an important innovation in Dindshenchas scholarship. My analysis is heavily indebted to Gwynn's studies of the texts and the manuscripts despite their early publication year. Together with Stokes, these studies provide an in-depth perspective on both the prose and the metrical recensions.

---

[91] Gwynn, E. J. "The Texts of the Prose Dindshenchas," 239.
[92] Attempts at analysing this common original is unfortunately outside the scope of this thesis.
[93] Gwynn, E. J. "The Texts of the Prose Dindshenchas," 240.
[94] This Greek letter stands for the common original of Bd and Ed.
[95] Gwynn, E. J. "The Texts of the Prose Dindshenchas," 240.
[96] The 'Reviser' is Gwynn's name for the redactor/compiler of the prosimetrum recension.
[97] This stemma can be found in Gwynn, E. J. "The Texts of the Prose Dindshenchas," 252.
[98] Ó Concheanainn, Tomás. "A Pious Redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 33, ed. P. Mac Cana and E. G. Quin. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1982): 85.
[99] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 5: 3 and 29.
[100] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 17

Even though Gwynn's five volumes reveal an emphasis on the metrical Dindshenchas, he also analyses the prose Dindshenchas in another article, and examine the connections between the prose and metrical. Gwynn observes that "there are 64 poems in the verse of the L-Dindshenchas for which there is no prose equivalent, and there are 30 proses for which there is no corresponding poems."[101] He also pays close attention to the prosimetrum recension, stating that "the compiler of the Second Recension had a stricter notion of the meaning of the term *dindshenchas* than the first compiler, and his work throughout is more systematic. He brings together the prose and metrical versions of each legend, usually separated in the older arrangement."[102] This may have contributed to the Dindshenchas becoming a more cohesive corpus in the prosimetrum recension.

Gwynn also points out that the Reviser influenced the corpus: "when either a prose or a metrical version was wanting, he seems to have supplied the deficiency from his own resources."[103] This perpetuates the leniency in former writers to also fill in the gaps in the corpus, yet it becomes a problem for modern scholars to examine the original tradition with the gaps. Furthermore, Gwynn states that "for the most part he either (a) took the poems which he found in the older recension, or (b) composed fresh poems by versifying the prose of the older recension, when this contained no corresponding poem."[104] If his edition was meant as a complete and slightly reworked edition, then it is more acceptable. One cannot say it can be used as absolutely representing the original tradition, but then again can anything accurately represent the original? Nevertheless, Gwynn's arguments are crucial due to the impact of his work in the succeeding scholarship. It is also relevant for my topic because it provides insight on the scribal influence on the Dindshenchas.

Furthermore, Gwynn compares LL to the prosimetrum recension, noting that "the Reviser did not take L as the authority for his text. In many passages, he has preserved the correct reading where it is corrupted in L,"[105] and that there are "many cases where the manuscripts of the Second Recension present corrupt versions of a text which seems to be correctly given by L."[106] These are interesting conclusions as they prove that some manuscripts contain corrupt versions while other manuscripts do not. There have been several criticisms of Gwynn's scholarship, one being Charles Bowen's statement that it "is painstaking and

---

[101] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 5: 23.
[102] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 5: 29.
[103] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 29.
[104] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 32.
[105] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 67.
[106] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 68.

thorough, but the information he offers has not been organized as intelligibly as it might have been. He avoids stating clearly what he considers as belonging to the canon, although he obviously does not consider all the items he has published equal in this respect."[107] Due to both Gwynn and Stokes being selective in their editions, it is important to be aware of this when using certain parts of their edition in an analysis. Nevertheless, these publications are crucial for the Dindshenchas discussion as "the pioneering works of Stokes, Gwynn and Thurneysen are indispensable for any further editorial, literary and philological work on the *Dindshenchas*."[108] This is not to say that there is not reasonable doubt towards some of their arguments and analysis, as has been argued by Tomás Ó Concheanainn and Charles Bowen, yet the importance and significance of their work cannot be overstated.

3.1.3 Second Group: Bowen, Ó Concheanainn, and Ó Cuív

Even though the works of Stokes, Gwynn, and Thurneysen were groundbreaking in their time, there was a forty-year interval until the Dindshenchas again received sustained attention, starting with Charles Bowen's "A Historical Inventory of the Dindshenchas." Bowen seems to prefer Thurneysen's threefold categorization of A, B, and C instead of Gwynn's twofold categorization, yet Bowen changes the metrical Dindshenchas from Recension A to "Collection A."[109] This is a sensible change due to the nature of LL as a manuscript, and its differences to other Dindshenchas manuscripts. To describe LL as a collection further allows for an illustration of its complexity and that the manuscript itself might have been written in different places during different times.[110] Bowen's article further emphasizes the connection between prose and poetry within the corpus, stating that "the division between prose and verse is, of course, an artificial one, belonging to the circumstances of publication rather than the nature of the text."[111] However, a large part of Bowen's work emphasizes the origin of the Dindshenchas. He argues that "the Dindshenchas must have formed a part of the Irish intellectual tradition from the most ancient period, although we cannot be sure in what literary form it was expressed."[112] This makes locating an archetype more difficult, and the focus needs to be on the extant manuscripts and on the information that can be provided about the original archetype. Bowen points out that we cannot fully study the Dindshenchas as something deeply rooted in

---

[107] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 118.
[108] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 7.
[109] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 120.
[110] Duncan, Elizabeth. "A History of Gaelic Script, A.D. 1000-1200." Doctorate Thesis. (Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen, 2010): 205.
[111] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 113.
[112] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 114.

Celtic antiquity, due to the changes made by both the scribes and modern scholars and it being a product of contemporary scribes and their society. Recent scholarship has drawn on Bowen's study of the Dindshenchas, illustrating the importance of Bowen's work in the academic discussion examined in this section.

A major contributor to the scholarly discussion on the Dindshenchas corpus within this second scholarship group is Tomás Ó Concheanainn, who published the groundbreaking article "The Three Forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn." In this study, he is the first one to challenge the works of Stokes, Thurneysen and Gwynn. Ó Concheanainn provides an overview of the arguments and opinions that came before him, before presenting his three-fold view of the manuscript tradition of the Dindshenchas: "Collection A is an anthology which was extracted from an early text of C… B is an abridged recension made from the prose of C… The Book of Leinster text of B contains some items which have been taken from a text of C."[113] This is drastically different from Thurneysen and Gwynn who agreed that recension C was dated later than A and B.

Ó Concheanainn also rectifies some mistakes made by Gwynn, such as discovering that recension A and some stray prose pieces actually derives from a lost text of C.[114] He also provides the example of the prose of 'Ráth Cnámrossa,' which in recension C has three sections, while in the prose recension A only has the second section. The prose entry refers to a poem in the sections present in C, thereby showing that "this section of the prose in the Book of Leinster is clearly an extract from the text of C as it ends with a reference to the whole poem."[115] Ó Concheanainn mainly concentrates on recensions B and C and the relationship between them, which has rarely been analysed prior to his work. He also offers a new conclusion concerning the dating of the Dindshenchas different from that of Thurneysen, Gwynn and Stokes:

> Finally, one clear inference to be drawn from the evidence presented in the foregoing pages is that the earliest extant form of the Dinnshenchas is that represented by the texts of the so-called *Dinnshenchas* C. Gwynn's 'Reviser' is, in fact, the original redactor of *Dinnshenchas Érenn,* though by no means the author of all its components.[116]

This means that recension C was the beginning of the Dindshenchas with recensions A and B following. If recension C is the first recension, it makes it necessary to view the

---

[113] Ó Concheanainn, Tomás. "The Three Forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn." *Journal of Celtic Studies* 3, ed. H. M. Meroney and D. Dumville. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981-82): 91.
[114] Ó Concheanainn, T. "The Three Forms," 92.
[115] Ó Concheanainn, T. "The Three Forms," 93.
[116] Ó Concheanainn, T. "The Three Forms," 131.

manuscripts in a different order than what has been previously done.[117] Ó Concheanainn's pioneering work has been highly influential, and initiated a new discussion engaging with and critiquing earlier Dindshenchas scholarship. Ó Concheanainn also published a second article: "A Pious Redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn," investigating the authorship of what he calls "pious additions." These additions are present in a number of quatrains added to certain entries of recension C, such as 'Loch Dergderc,' 'Áth Luain,' and 'Mag Muirisce.' One example of this tendency is 'Cleitech,' which received an added quatrain emphasizing the power of the King of Heaven: "Iar labrad do flaith cach fir / co fagbar a maith mórdil, / in Rí as noebu ná cach nech / ro scar ria choemu Cleitech."[118] Through his analysis, Ó Concheanainn comes to the conclusion that

> … the author whose style is in evidence in these quatrains obviously was not some late versifier adding devotional items to certain poems in the Dinnshenchas, for these quatrains, while being additional as regards subject-matter, coalesce so well with the poems, both metrically and stylistically, that the poems in question and their additional quatrains clearly represent the work of a single author.[119]

It would be quite easy to assume that a scribe attached the religious quatrains at a later date due to a growing interest in adding more religious material into the Irish texts; however, it might not always be the case in Dindshenchas entries. The final scholar to be mentioned from this second scholarship group, is Brian Ó Cuív who in 1989 published an article called "Dinnshenchas: The Literary Exploitation of Irish Place-names." Upon describing the Dindshenchas and other texts such as *Acallam na Senórach*, he states that in these "the interest in place-name lore exploited to the fullest extent."[120] This exploitation takes advantage of the vast amount of placelore in Irish literature and culture, using it to provide a literary map for the text's readers. Ó Cuív also argues that the metrical is more interesting than the prose: "From a literary point of view the metrical *dinnshenchas* is the more interesting, but the prose material also merits attention, especially since it contains traditions which are not recorded in the extant poems."[121] This is a common view that has been reflected in other studies both before and after Ó Cuív and provides further knowledge about different perspectives on the Dindshenchas.

---

[117] This is especially important if one is viewing the corpus based on the recensions and not on the chronological dating of extant manuscripts.

[118] Qtd. in Ó Concheanainn, T. "A Pious Redactor," 89. Translated as "When the Lord of every man hath spoken, may I receive his exceeding reward! The King that is holier than any hath parted Cleitech from its loved ones" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 202.

[119] Ó Concheanainn, T. "A Pious Redactor," 94.

[120] Ó Cuív, Brian. "Dinnshenchas: The Literary Exploitation of Irish Place Names." *Ainm* 4. (Belfast: Ulster Place-Name Society, 1989-90): 94.

[121] Ó Cuív, B. "Dinnshenchas: The Literary Exploitation," 103.

3.1.4 The Third Group: Modern Scholars from 2000

Finally, the third scholarship group starts fifteen years after the publication of Ó Cuív's article, and almost 100 years after the works of Gwynn, Stokes, and Thurneysen. This is the modern and current period of the academic discussion on the Dindshenchas and begins with Petra Hellmuth's article: "The Dindshenchas and Irish Literary Tradition." In it, she mainly concentrates on the content of the Dindshenchas entry of 'Srúb Brain,' and analyses "how an extant placename was attached by a medieval scribe to a purely fictional location in order to fit a new story-line."[122] This analysis illustrates the potential influence scribes could have on the Dindshenchas material and is relevant to this thesis because it proves that scribes occasionally invented aspects in order to fit their manuscript. Hellmuth also compares the metrical and prose version of Srúb Brain, noticing that "the elegant metrical version stands in sharp contrast to this artless prose account,"[123] and that "the prose account is much shorter, with the focus on events, not on descriptive detail."[124] This analysis clearly sets the prose and poetry as completely different from the other within the Dindshenchas entries such as 'Srúb Brain.' This might also be true for other Dindshenchas entries, and Hellmuth shares Ó Cuív's view that the metrical Dindshenchas might be the most interesting.

Dagmar Schlüter has produced multiple works analysing the Dindshenchas, and in a large study she emphasizes the visible changes in LL, such as the scribes tending to occasionally insert more historiographical topics into sections of the metrical Dindshenchas.[125] Therefore, this evidences the fluid categorization of Dindshenchas poetry where elements are added throughout its transmission. Schlüter also states: "As dindṡenchas is essentially a part of historical poetry as such, it should come as no surprise that these poems display similar features, such as the self-perception of the transmitters of the past."[126] Through this self-perception it is possible that the poets or scribes felt justified to add historical *senchas* into the material, as they were attempting to preserve knowledge of the past. However, Schlüter also emphasizes that it was the narrator's intent to "tell a lively tale that brings the once populous plain back to life in the minds and the memory of the audience."[127] Therefore, it was rather important for the narrator to entertain their audience with their placelore. In that process, the narrator was able to

---

[122] Hellmuth, P. "The Dindshenchas and the Irish Literary Tradition," 116.
[123] Hellmuth, P. "The Dindshenchas and the Irish Literary Tradition," 120.
[124] Hellmuth, P. "The Dindshenchas and the Irish Literary Tradition," 120.
[125] Schlüter, Dagmar. "The Dindsenchas." *History or Fable? The Book of Leinster as a Document of Cultural Memory in Twelfth-Century Ireland: Studien und Texte zur Keltologie* 9, ed. E. Poppe. (Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2010): 147.
[126] Schlüter, D. "The Dindsenchas," 162.
[127] Schlüter, D. "The Dindsenchas," 166.

revive the old tales about the landscape in a new and improved form, which may or may not take the historical *senchas* into account.

Morgan Thomas Davies and his article "Dindshenchas, Memory, and Invention," is another important contribution to the Dindshenchas discussion, especially since he emphasizes the intention of the scribes: "There are many entries that make it clear that truth-value, or even plausibility, was not the chief aim of the composers of these texts."[128] This is not to insinuate that the scribes purposefully steered away from the truth, but that the believability was not necessarily top priority to them. In many cases, scribes also steered their entries into a realm of insecurity due to having more than one explanation for a single Dindshenchas entry: "One derivation is seldom enough in the *Dindshenchas,* and so our poet must come up with what he calls *in cotarsna comthend,* the 'equally valid contrary'."[129] This could affect the Dindshenchas material by spreading doubt on which version is the most plausible one. However, the truth of the tale might not be as important due to the scribes attempting to collect all the material of the places in Ireland. With these countertales, the poets or scribes were able to use a variety of material for the Dindshenchas entries: "the *literati* to whom we are indebted for the *Dindshenchas* and other monuments of early Irish historical tradition… found the different sources of their richly hybrid intellectual world to be mutually interanimating and reinforcing."[130] The scribes were of course an integral part of the cultural survival, and all these sources within the intellectual world provide endless material to study the Dindshenchas with.

Another scholar studying the content of the Dindshenchas tradition is Gregory Toner who analyses "the narrative function of the name in the Dindshenchas collections in an effort to determine what significance names had beyond the merely referential."[131] Toner demonstrates that in some sections of the Dindshenchas, names highlight a connection to the mythological tradition. The entries may be divided into categories such as entries bestowing fame on someone, describing ownership of land or showing the drowning of a victim. Toner focuses on the entries where "death and murder in the *Dindshenchas* result in a physical change to the landscape."[132] This physical change towards the landscape provides an explanation for certain landscape features and supplies yet another way to embed the mythology into the Irish literary geography. He also points out that that "as a result, wicked and depraved acts left an

---

[128] Davies, M. T. "Dindshenchas, Memory and Invention," 97.
[129] Davies, M. T. "Dindshenchas, Memory and Invention," 101.
[130] Davies, M. T. "Dindshenchas, Memory and Invention," 103.
[131] Toner, Gregory. "Landscape and Cosmology in the Dindshenchas." *Celtic Cosmology: Perspectives from Ireland and Scotland,* ed. J. Borsje and A. Dooley et. al. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2014): 269.
[132] Toner, G. "Landscape and Cosmology," 274.

indelible mark on the Irish landscape as a physical expression of the earth's repugnance and these scars memorialise the corruption which gave rise to them."[133] These marks to the landscape stand as a physical memorialization of the actions characters made in the Dindshenchas entries, illustrating how important these tales and the myths were to explain the landscape of Ireland.

In this final scholarship group, another publication of Dagmar Schlüter deserves to be mentioned. In her article "Boring and Elusive? The Dindshenchas as a Medieval Irish Genre," she addresses the criticism that had been directed against the Dindshenchas, and admitted that "the *dindshenchas* might not conform to what we see as an aesthetically pleasing work."[134] However, she also points out that the Dindshenchas "have a historical component in the truest meaning of the term *dindshenchas*, and this historical component could be exploited to its full potential by those who were involved in transmitting them."[135] This historical component is equally as important as the less plausible aspects of the Dindshenchas entries. It provides the possibility that scribes could extract what they desired from the historical tradition and embed it into the Dindshenchas corpus. Schlüter's study also emphasizes the recensions: "In (my) view, it does not amount to a recension when there are different *dindshenchas* items scattered somewhere in a manuscript, as is the case for LL. In order to qualify as a recension of the Dindshenchas corpus, we should at least expect a coherent transmission."[136] Her arguments are persuasive, and also align with Charles Bowen's choice to refer to the LL Dindshenchas as a collection rather than a recension.

Another scholar who has done extensive research on the Dindshenchas is Kevin Murray. In his article "Genre Construction: The Creation of the Dinnshenchas," he provides an analysis of how the Dindshenchas genre functions: "the dinnshenchas corpus thus represents a deliberate fashioning and cohesive structuring of disparate component elements from the late Old Irish period onward and may be viewed … as 'a totalizing genre project'."[137] By approaching the Dindshenchas as a genre, it might be possible to discover the point of departure from the genre qualifications and whether these are intentional or unintentional acts by the scribes. One example that Murray considers is what he calls the linguistic markers at the beginning of entries, such as "canas ro ainmniged,"[138] which sometimes is "absent from many Dindshenchas texts,

---

[133] Toner, G. "Landscape and Cosmology," 282.
[134] Schlüter, D. "Boring and Elusive?" 29-30
[135] Schlüter, D. "Boring and Elusive?" 29.
[136] Schlüter, D. "Boring and Elusive?" 29.
[137] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 12.
[138] Translated as "why is it so called?" in Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 14.

particularly the poetic ones; thus, they act as a general genre guide but are not a necessary part of its construction."[139] This might explain why these linguistic markers change during the course of the manuscripts, since they are not necessarily required to be included, yet they usually occur. It is also clear that the Dindshenchas did not remain static during its transmission:

> As a genre established in the medieval period, the extent of the coherence of *dinnshenchas* has rather been established by medieval authors and redactors, through the presence of multiple *dúnada* in some *dinnshenchas* poems, and the existence of multiple versions of *dinnshenchas* items relating to the same place, should alert us to the evolving nature of the corpus over time.[140]

Murray's conclusion provides the insight that the Dindshenchas corpus was altered, but he does not state how and why. Another scholar with an important contribution to the current discussion is Marie-Luise Theuerkauf. Her study, "The Death of Boand and the Recensions of *Dindsenchas Érenn*," examines a specific strain of the Dindshenchas tradition: 'Boand,' viewed through the different recensions. Theuerkauf analyses the different versions of 'Boand' and argues that while the prose version, Boand I and Boand II surfaces in between most of the manuscripts, the poem named Boand III only exists in LL.[141] This proves that the transmission of such Dindshenchas items may vary in the manuscripts, prompting questions about what the qualification was for a text to be included in a manuscript. Theuerkauf also analyses the different narratives of Boand's death, and notices that Boand A and Boand I "not only feature the same phrases, they also often share them within the same line of the same quatrain."[142] Boand A is a short poem named *A écsiu Fáil fégam sein*[143] and has a close connection to Boand I through this feature. Theuerkauf also points out that: "once we understand how each individual article came to be, be it prose in combination with poems, or simply a prose abstract, we will be in a better position to judge the corpus as a whole."[144] Her work on the Dindshenchas of 'Boand' is insightful and shows that paying close attention to a single Dindshenchas entry can provide important insights on the tradition as a whole. The methods employed in this study provide a useful template that can be applied to analyse other entries in the corpus.

In 2019, Amy Mulligan published her monograph *A Landscape of Words: Ireland, Britain and the Poetics of Space, 700-1250* in which she provides a detailed analysis of the Dindshenchas, while paying close attention to specific entries. One of the Dindshenchas entries

---

[139] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 14.
[140] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 13.
[141] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 11.
[142] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 22.
[143] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 15.
[144] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 35.

she mentions is 'Ceilbe,' which originally lacked a metrical version until the writer Muirches mac Pháidín Uí Máolchonaire composed verses that were eventually "paired with the prose text in four manuscript copies of the *Dindshenchas Érenn*."[145] This shows that there is a desire to have both a metrical and a prose account, leading to the creation of new texts embedded into the Dindshenchas corpus to achieve this. If it occurred with 'Ceilbe,' it could have occurred in other Dindshenchas entries as well. Mulligan also points out that "poets emphasize that their compositions are not mere descriptions of places but are specialized excavations of elements which come from the fertile plains of the imagination."[146] This is not to say that all such texts are invented from the imagination of the scribes, simply that some of them may have been composed to fill a perceived gap in the corpus. She also brings up the important fact that "the subjects of *dindshenchas* accounts span the pre-Christian and post-Conversion periods, and often within the frame of a single poem we can observe a smooth movement between pagan mythologies and Christian theologies – Ireland's places easily accommodate both."[147] This is not brought up in most scholarly articles on the Dindshenchas; however, it is important to take note of this as the Dindshenchas was written down at a time when pre-Christian aspects influenced Christianity and vice versa.

A final article in this group is Kevin Murray's "Sources of Irish Mythology: The Significance of the Dinnshenchas," in which he considers the material behind the Dindshenchas corpus: "There is a significant difference between '*ad hoc* invention of a myth' and reworking and extension of a traditional mythic complex to forge links which may not have existed previously or which are not part of its original iteration."[148] This has connections to Mulligan's argument that new material was composed in order to fill a gap in the Dindshenchas corpus. Through this, it is evident that the Dindshenchas is the result of reworking, altering and preserving a presumably old and valuable tradition. Murray provides plenty of examples which "illustrate some of the ways in which mythological materials were cultivate, re-used and recycled in *Dinnsenchas Érenn* in order to present aetiologies for the places treated of in the corpus."[149] The recycling of mythological materials is evident by Dindshenchas material resurfacing in later Middle Irish texts and manuscripts. In many cases, the Dindshenchas were used in later texts and collection: "In situations where the *dinnshenchas* corpus is the oldest –

---

[145] Mulligan, A. *A Landscape of Words*, 120.
[146] Mulligan, A. *A Landscape of Words,* 118.
[147] Mulligan, A. *A Landscape of Words,* 121.
[148] Murray, Kevin. "Sources of Irish Mythology: The Significance of the Dinnshenchas." *North American Journal of Celtic Studies* 3:2, ed. J. F. Eska. (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2019): 166.
[149] Murray, K. "Sources of Irish Mythology," 167.

and sometimes the only – source for the narratives being related, these issues become much more difficult to resolve."[150] When it is the oldest text or the only text, it is difficult to know if it is part of an older tradition, or simply invented for the purpose of the Dindshenchas corpus. This is important information as it provides insight into which inventions that were possibly created by the scribes.

In the preceding discussion, I have attempted to provide an overview of the most pioneering works analysing the Dindshenchas as well as a selection of other articles chosen based on the different contributions they have made to the academic discussion. In addition, it is necessary to show that the Dindshenchas has progressed over three different time periods, evidencing a consistent popularity. There might be a few articles published in between, but scholars can for the most part be placed within the time periods from 1892 to 1935, 1975 to 1990, and from 2004 until now. From Whitley Stokes until the present, the academic discussion has varied, but the academic works provide the idea that while it is a complicated corpus, it remains a subject worthy of detailed analysis and attention. It is apparent through the discussion that there has been a large focus on mythology and scribal procedures continuing from the 1980s up until modern articles. Through the modern group of scholars, the number of Dindshenchas entries that they analyse has also grown over time, from Petra Hellmuth solely focusing in 'Srúb Brain' to Morgan T. Davies, Gregory Toner, and Amy Mulligan analysing multiple entries. Even though there has been a consistent focus on the Dindshenchas so far, there are still many aspects to be surveyed and analysed due to the magnitude of the corpus. By viewing the scholarship already completed, the gaps in the discussion are revealed, and we can fill in the gaps in the academic discussion by creating new scholarship in its place.

4.1 On the Analysis of the Three Dindshenchas Entries

This section will consist of a three-part analysis of 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba' in order to investigate the development and alteration of Dindshenchas entries.[151] Through this analysis it will be possible to discover how and why the scribes altered the entries and to what extent it affected the entries overall. It might also provide certain conclusions about the Dindshenchas corpus as a whole since "new insights can be gained from analysing individual articles from the *Dindsenchas*, and from paying due attention to the relationship of the

---

[150] Murray, K. "Sources of Irish Mythology," 168.
[151] Due to the large difference in length when it comes to these Dindshencas entries, the analysis of 'Loch Garman' will be considerably longer than 'Berba,' and to a certain extent also 'Lia Nothain.' When comparing them, 'Loch Garman' has 51 stanzas, 'Lia Nothain' has 15, and Berba only has five stanzas.

constitutent parts of an article."[152] Due to this, 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba' will be analysed based on either the manuscript editions, or my transcription from facsimiles. Since this thesis will be analysing changes over time it will be necessary to analyse the manuscripts based on their proposed dating by scholars instead of the original order of the recensions. If one were to follow Ó Concheanainn's study then the prosimetrum recension was originally first, with A and B following afterwards. However, since we have limited manuscripts left of all these recensions, the manuscripts' scholarly dating will take priority. In addition, it is important to note that the scholarly dating of manuscripts will provide more precise results in the analysis of language and content. Because even though a manuscript might belong to the prosimetrum recension, it might still be a rather late manuscript when it comes to its proposed dating.

4.2 Order of Recensions and the Scholarly Dating of Relevant Manuscripts

Prior to providing the dating for each of the manuscripts relevant for this thesis, it is important to state the order of the recensions of the Dindshenchas, because it puts the connection between the extant manuscripts in perspective. Both Thurneysen and Gwynn agreed on the metrical and prose recensions being the origin of the Dindshenchas corpus, and that the prosimetrum recension came last. Thurneysen dated the prosimetrum version to about 1200 and the LL prose version to 1147; however, he does not provide dating for the metrical LL and the prose of Bd and Ed.[153] However, there have been doubts on Thurneysen's dating, as James Carney states that "Thurneysen on the whole, tended to assign rather too late a date to texts."[154] Ó Concheanainn's new study provides the alternative that the prosimetrum recension was the origin of the Dindshenchas corpus with the prose recension being an "abridged recension made from the prose of C"[155] and the metrical LL being an anthology extracted from early text of the prosimetrum recension.[156] Currently, we do not have a manuscript containing this early text of the prosimetrum recension, we only have the later copies of this recension.

In this thesis, these manuscripts will be examined based on their dating, while being aware of the recension order established by Gwynn, Thurneysen, and Ó Concheanainn. Having the distinction of these manuscripts being from different recensions, may perhaps provide insight on some of the changes made to the manuscripts, as well as connections between

---

[152] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 35.
[153] Theuerkauf, M. "The Death of Boand," 3.
[154] Carney, James. *Studies in Irish Literature and History*. (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1955): 210.
[155] Ó Concheanainn, T. "The Three Forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn," 91.
[156] Ó Concheanainn, T. "The Three Forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn," 91.

manuscripts from the same recension. The dating of LL has been discussed at length amongst scholars, and its dating is normally set to the latter part of the twelfth century.[157] However, more detailed dating can be provided by viewing the content and orthography of the manuscript: "It was begun after 1151, the date of the great battle of Móin Mhór, which is mentioned at least twice in the book… We do not know when it was finished in its essentials, but some of the original scribes were still writing in 1166, and one of them (T) appears to have been writing into the thirteenth century."[158] As previously stated, LL is of a compilatory nature and the entire manuscript is not necessarily written during the same time; therefore, the closest we can get to the dating of LL is that it was written after 1151 and ended in the thirteenth century.

The next relevant manuscript is M, which according to Gwynn was written in 1394 by Faelán Mac Gabhann.[159] How he came to this conclusion is not stated in his edition, but according to a note in the manuscript the scribe's death was recorded by the *Annals of the Four Masters* in 1423.[160] Due to this detail, the year 1394 would have some basis since he would most likely be written a certain time before the scribe's death. Shortly after the dating of M is, according to Gwynn, the dating of BB, which is set to around the year 1400.[161] However, based on research provided by Ó Concheanainn and a scribal note in the manuscript, BB "must have been compiled before the end of the fourteenth century, and possibly before 1395."[162] Therefore, it is dated quite close to the date of M, which is interesting since BB is set at the top tier of the stemma created by Gwynn, and M is further down on the stemma. The two final manuscripts are Bd and Ed, where Bd "may have been written at the end of the fourteenth or maybe the beginning of the fifteenth century."[163] In comparison, Ed is dated to the end of the fifteenth century,[164] according to Stokes, and has the newest dating amongst the manuscripts used in this analysis. When viewing all of these manuscripts together, it shows that the estimated dating in the manuscripts of this thesis reaches from the middle of the 12th century until the 15th century.

---

[157] Ó Concheanainn, Tomás. "LL and the Date of the Reviser of LU." *Éigse: A Journal of Irish Studies* 20, ed. T. Ó Concheanainn. (Galway: National University of Ireland, 1984): 213.
[158] Mac Eoin, Gearóid. "The Provenance of the Book of Leinster." *Zeitschrift fur Celtische Philologie* 57, ed. S. Zimmer and J. Uhlich. (Bonn: University of Bonn/DeGruyter, 2009-2010): 82.
[159] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindsenchas,* vol 5: 5.
[160] Gwynn, E. J. "The Dindshenchas in the Book of Uí Maine," 68.
[161] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 5: 4.
[162] Qtd. in Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. "The Book of Ballymote: Scholars, Sources and Patrons." *Book of Ballymote: Codices Hibernenses Eximii* 11, ed. R. Ó hUiginn. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2018): 199.
[163] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 467.
[164] Stokes, W. "The Edinburgh Dinnshenchas," 471.

Chapter Two:
Analysis of 'Loch Garman'

5.1 Summary of 'Loch Garman'[165]

There are two separate versions in the Dindshenchas entry of 'Loch Garman:' one main version and a shorter countertale. The main version states that the lake was named after Garman, a brigand and robber, who stole the golden diadem of Catháir Mór's queen from the banqueting hall during "Feis Temro,"[166] before killing her household. Upon his capture, Garman was drowned by king Cathair, and the lake was supposedly named after the robber. The countertale briefly states that the lake was named after Carman[167] Glass mag Degad, the brother of Dea whose name was given to Inber Dea and Abann Dea. It provides no explanation as to why the lake would be named after this person, but there is extra information on the countertale in the prosimetrum entry. In the countertale, it is written that Garman Glass mac Degad was buried there, and that after the grave was dug "then the lake burst throughout the land."[168] Through this event, the landscape was permanently altered, and made a mark upon the land forever. While the main tale describes the naming coming from the drowning of Garman in an already present lake, the countertale describes it as the lake bursting forth after the grave was dug.

When examining the metrical recension, the scribe has supplied extra content not included in the prose recension. At first there are several stanzas introducing the placelore on Garman and the stealing of the crown at "Feis Temro" during Samhain. It certainly provides more details than the prose account, such as Garman reaching Inber Slane before being overtaken by the king's household. Subsequently, a spring bursts forth when he is captured, and he is drowned in the lake that received his name. Instead of ending the tale here, the entry continues by including the introduction of king Cathair's druid and the interpretation of the king's vision about the character Slane and her son. It is almost as if there is another legend embedded in 'Loch Garman' due to its proximity to the lake in question. There have been interpretations that Slane signifies the river Slane giving birth to Loch Garman, the mighty

---

[165] This summary has been written based partly on the prose recension. Further information that follows in the summary has been added from the prosimetrum recension.

[166] 'Feis Temro' is translated as "The Feast of Tara" and defined as "a pre-Christian ritual celebration marking the inauguration of a new king" in Maier, Bernhard. "Temair." *Dictionary of Celtic Religion and Culture,* trans. C. Edwards. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997): 263.

[167] In the prose recension, this name in the countertale is written as Carman instead of Garman. However, this is not used in the prosimetrum recension when referring to the same person. This could be simply a slip of the pen, or the scribes working from different materials.

[168] Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 429.

son,[169] and thereby connecting the two sections together. Towards the end, the entry includes a stanza praising the collector of the legend, Eochaid Eólach, as well as a religious addition.[170]

5.2 On Linguistic Markers Found in Dindshenchas Entries

A genre trait of Dindshenchas entries is the inclusion of linguistic markers that introduce these entries provides a unified look for the genre. One example is the placename with phrases such as "canas ro ainmniged"[171] or "cid dia tá,"[172] serving as an introductory phrase and a way "to bind this material together as a genre."[173] Following directly after this phrase is usually "ní ansa,"[174] frequently abbreviated in the manuscripts, as the final phrase before the placename explanation. In some Dindshenchas manuscripts, these introductory phrases are placed in the preceding line of the entry in the manuscript, or in the starting line with a capital letter, which seems to be up to the scribe's decision. The linguistic marker occurs in every manuscript in this analysis of the Dindshenchas entries and is deemed by scholars to indicate "the self-awareness, fully developed in historical poetry, of the preserver of the past for whom it is not difficult to answer what is asked of him."[175] The scribe does not have a specific job description, and instead is simply attempting to wander through the countless mountains of cultural material. Through this, he is forced to decide what is worth saving and what is not as necessary for the self-perception of future generations.

Another type of linguistic marker that is occasionally used is "unde" as an abbreviation for the Latin phrase "unde nominatur;"[176] however, it is not used as frequently as the Irish markers. The Dindshenchas entry usually begins with a noun phrase, for example the name of a character, and the "use of V-second order to begin a narrative was traditional in Irish and perhaps also in Insular Celtic as a whole,"[177] which is different from the regular V-first construction also used widely in Irish. Based on Gwynn's analysis, these markers may be a

---

[169] O'Beirne Crowe, J. "Ancient Lake Legends of Ireland – No 11. The Vision of Cathair Mor, King of Leinster, and Afterwards Monarch of Ireland, Foreboding the Origin of Loch Garman (Wexford Haven)." *The Journal of the Royal Historical and Archaeological Association of Ireland* 2:1, 4th series. (Dublin: Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, 1872): 26.

[170] This has been mentioned in section 3.1.3 and will be further analysed in 5.8.

[171] Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish." *Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium of Societas Celtologica Nordica.* Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Celtica Upsaliensa 6, ed. M. Ó Flaithearta. (Uppsala: University of Uppsala, 2007): 55. Translated as "how was it named?".

[172] Translated as "whence is it?" in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae," 55.

[173] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 14.

[174] Translated as "not difficult (to answer)" in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae," 56.

[175] Schlüter, D. "The Dindsenchas," 156.

[176] Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae," 57-58. Translated by Ó hUiginn as "whence is named".

[177] Mac Cana, Proinsias. "Narrative Openers and Progress Markers in Irish." *A Celtic Florigium: Studies in Memory of Brendan O Hehir: Celtic Studies Publications* 2, ed. K. A. Klar et. al. (Massachusetts: Celtic Studies Publications, 1996): 106.

method used in the bardic schools[178] where the Dindshenchas were part of the curriculum in the poets' eighth year.[179] This inclusion into the curriculum of the bardic schools evidences its cultural importance and perhaps also why it was preserved to the extent it has been.

5.3 Linguistic Markers in 'Loch Garman'

In both the metrical and prose section in LL, the Latin version of "unde (nominatur)[180] is preferred when introducing 'Loch Garman.' Dagmar Schlüter states in her studies of LL that the prose Dindshenchas switches between "can asro aimniged" in some Dindshenchas entries,[181] which is interesting since the majority of LL sticks to the Latin phrase.[182] M was written around 200 years after LL and uses "cid dia ta"[183] for 'Loch Garman,' but M does switch between this marker and "canas ro ainmniged" sporadically throughout the manuscript. The same sporadic spreading of markers throughout the manuscript also occurs in BB, but nlike M, BB uses "canas ro ainmniged"[184] for 'Loch Garman.' When it comes to Bd, the usage of linguistic markers introduces a norm where the manuscript shows usage of "cid dia ta," with sporadic usage of "canas ro ainmniged" in between. At a certain point in the manuscript, the scribe switches to using predominantly "canas ro ainmniged" as the main marker with occasional "cid dia ta" in between. However, for 'Loch Garman,' the scribe uses "cid dia ta"[185] for the introduction of this entry. Since the prose recension might have been a branch from the prosimetrum recension, this change in linguistic markers could be due to a change in the scribes' sources. Another possibility is that the scribes prefer to use different markers for different sections in his manuscript.

All of this variation in linguistic markers across the manuscripts does not provide any consistent order of which marker is included where. It does not seem to follow any geographical schema or on the basis of any political influence, and there is no consistency between the same specific markers used in the same places in the manuscripts. When it comes to the Latin

---

[178] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 92.

[179] Qtd. in Ò Cuív, B. "Dinnshenchas: The Literary Exploitation," 93.

[180] Best, Richard Irvine et. al. *The Book of Leinster, formerly Lebar na Núachongbála*, vol 1-6. (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1954-1983): 700 (vol 3) and 909 (vol 4).

[181] Schlüter, D. "The Dindsenchas," 152. The division of words in this linguistic marker differs in both manuscripts and in scholarly articles.

[182] A more in-depth study of the use of linguistic markers might provide some answers to this, but it is outside the scope of this thesis.

[183] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 88 vb 55. When referring to my transcription the footnote includes the folio number, recto/verso, column number and line number to easily locate it in the transcription placed in the appendix.

[184] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 198 vb 26.

[185] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.

linguistic marker "unde" which is used in LL, it was rarely used in later manuscripts that include 'Loch Garman.' Perhaps this was because the Irish linguistic markers were preferred over the Latin when introducing entries as a way of providing a more Irish ambience to the corpus. The Latin phrase might not be used as consistently when introducing placelore entries; however, it was for example used in BB[186] when introducing a Latin sentence present in both BB and LL. The scribe of LL, and also occasionally scribes of other manuscripts, uses Latin markers; however, in those cases usually without the "unde"-marker. This seems to indicate that the Latin marker was preserved in the manuscripts, but the way it was preserved probably depended on which sources the scribes used or the elements the scribes wanted to include.

There is a possibility that these varying markers was used as a way of straying from the regular genre traits of the Dindshenchas, thus providing the placelore collection a sense of variation. Therefore, preserving the markers was preferred in these sections, instead of sticking to just one as there are no extant rules on which distinct markers to include. These markers became a trademark of the Dindshenchas corpus and are also used in some manuscripts to introduce the poems as well. In 'Loch Garman,' the linguistic marker "unde poeta" is employed right before the single-stanza poem in the prose entries of LL[187] and Bd.[188] It would have been useful to compare this with the only other extant manuscript in the prose recension, yet this is not possible since there is no prose account for 'Loch Garman' in Ed. The other manuscripts mentioned in this section do not use such a linguistic marker as "unde poeta" in 'Loch Garman.' The textual traces located in 'Loch Garman,' such as the linguistic markers and other genre traits, have little to no chance of surviving "without cultural institutions of memorizing and continuous appreciations"[189] and their survival in shows the variety of the markers.

5.4 On the Developmental Aspects of the Irish Language

Before one can analyse the language of these Dindshenchas entries, it is necessary to provide a background and overview of how the Irish language developed. Scholars studying the beginning of the Irish language have divided it into four main phases: "*Archaic Irish* (before c. 700 A.D), *Old Irish* (from roughly the beginning of the 8th to the middle of the 10th century A.D), *Middle Irish* (c.mid-10th to late 12th century A.D) and *Modern Irish* (late 12th century onwards)."[190] The dating of these periods are rather fluid, as the different stages of Irish tends

---

[186] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 198 vb 42.
[187] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 3: 700.
[188] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.
[189] Assmann, A. "Texts, Traces, Trash," 128.
[190] McCone, Kim. *The Early Irish Verb: Maynooth Monographs* 1. (Maynooth: An Sagart, 1987): 176.

to bleed into one another. During the Old Irish period, the spoken language evolved more rapidly than the written language, and these innovations were embedded into an established written language from the tenth century onwards:

> This resulted in the rather permissive hybrid medium termed Middle Irish, in which innovatory forms reflecting changes in normal current usage could be freely mixed with a virtually full range of forms retained from Old Irish, a number of them doubtless no longer current in ordinary speech but hallowed by longstanding literary usage.[191]

Due to this, the Middle Irish presents as an intermediary stage of Irish language development and "gives an impression of confusion, with old forms and constructions still in use alongside others which had developed in the recent past and which were destined to become normal in the following centuries."[192] Therefore, it is quite difficult to define and categorize a linguistic period in the Irish language due to all the different elements coexisting.

Middle Irish is visible in manuscripts from the 10th to 12th centuries, and the learned class continued to use a combination of Middle Irish and Old Irish.[193] In manuscripts, the scribes both corrupted and modernized the earlier documents, and according to Kim McCone, the "medieval Irish texts were much more prone to develop variant versions than their classical counterparts."[194] Archaisms remained in use for a long time, showing that while the scribes were receptive to changes, they still preferred to include parts of the older linguistic variants. This usage of archaic language is, according to Kevin Murray "a mechanism by which narratives were shown to be long-established, learned and reliable."[195] By including hints of the archaic language, a text can serve as a connection and reminder of the traditions and earlier culture of Ireland. This is perhaps why archaisms are particularly frequent in texts of the late Middle Irish period and Early Modern Irish periods.[196] Differentiating between these stages of linguistic development may be difficult, but Kim McCone has developed three linguistic strata to which texts from the Middle Irish period can be analysed:

> The first of these comprises forms compatible with standard Old Irish usage, the second forms that anticipate Classical Modern Irish norms, and the third forms

---

[191] McCone, Kim. *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader: Including an Introduction to Middle Irish.* Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 3. (Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, 2005): 174.

[192] Ó Cuív, Brian. "The Linguistic Training of the Mediaeval Irish Poet." *Celtica* 10, ed. M. Dillon. (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1973): 15.

[193] Greene, David. "Irish as a Vernacular Before the Norman Invasion." *A View of the Irish Language,* ed. B. Ó Cuív. (Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1969): 19.

[194] McCone, Kim. "Prehistoric, Old and Middle Irish." *Progress in Medieval Irish Studies*, ed. K. McCone and K. Simms. (Maynooth: St. Patrick's College, 1996): 27.

[195] Murray, Kevin. "The Reworking of Old Irish Narrative Texts in the Middle Irish Period: Contexts and Motivations." *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland,* ed. E. Boyle and D. Hayden. (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press Limited, 2014): 298.

[196] Mac Gearailt, Uáitéar. "Middle Irish Archaisms in Early Modern Irish Prose." *Studia Hibernica* 38, ed. C. Mac-Muirchaidh and W. Murphy. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012): 57.

consonant with neither. Although this last category presumably includes natural developments that failed to gain acceptance into the Classical Modern… a good number of such phenomena may well be due to literary hypercorrections resulting from tension between the conservative first and innovatory second stratum.[197]

Based on these strata, one can generally conclude that the first stratum is consistent with Old Irish and the second forms similar to Classical Modern Irish. McCone states about the third strata that "the term Middle Irish can accordingly be reserved for texts combining at least two of the diagnostic strata in question – even if the first or second should be quite dominant, there should be an appreciable admixture of one or both of the remaining strata."[198] After the Middle Irish period came the Modern Irish period, but these periods blur into one another. There are many changing features of the language that become apparent from Old Irish through Middle Irish and into Modern Irish, and some of these will be important also in the Dindshenchas. One example is the change of "fer" in Old Irish to "fear" in Modern Irish,[199] which will be noticed in the Dindshenchas entries analysed in this thesis. Another example is the consonant system which has undergone little change besides the Old Irish "ln," "ld," "nd," and "mb" turning into Middle Irish "ll", "nn," and "mm."[200] There seems to be a general confusion or indifference to vowels and consonants throughout this time period. In addition, some disyllabic proclitics were reduced to monosyllables, and "thereafter this rapidly became the rule rather than the exception,"[201] such as the article "inna" being written as "na." These are slight changes in the written language that can be visible in manuscripts of this time period.

Another major development from Old Irish to Modern Irish is the overhaul of the verbal system, as "all varieties of Modern Irish are clearly differentiated from Old Irish by a far-reaching overhaul of the verbal system."[202] Firstly, according to Kim McCone "Middle Irish shows a strong trend towards use of absolute endings with independent simple verbs in both relative and non-relative contexts outside the third singular."[203] There is also a major development of "ro" where the range of it as an augment was expanded,[204] but Kim McCone also argues for a triple equation of "ro" = "do" = "no" which was perhaps a reason why "the only pretonic preverbs to survive vestigially into Modern Irish were *do* and *ad*."[205] Kim

[197] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 180.
[198] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 180.
[199] Translated as "man" in "Fer." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/21665. Accessed on 17.03.21.
[200] McCone, K. *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader,* 177.
[201] McCone, K. *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader,* 176.
[202] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 179.
[203] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 196.
[204] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 202.
[205] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 214.

McCone also states that "the tendency to spread proclitic *do* was not confined to the range of the verbal particles *ro* and *no* but that *do* also tended to replace pretonic preverbs of similar shape such as *ro* or *fo*."[206] In Middle Irish there is a distinct spelling confusion between *o* and *a*, which in turn affects words such as the pretonic preverbs: "do," "fo," "ro," and "no." One example of the language being altered in manuscripts in the Middle Irish period is discussed in an article by Uáitéar Mac Gearailt comparing the language of *Lebor na hUidre* and LL. He shows the language being changed in two poems of *Breslech* and the corresponding section of *Lebor na hUidre*'s *Táin*, where the verb is changed from "dofócrat" in LU to either "forthocbat" or "ras furcbat" in LL.[207] This illustrates that both preverbs and verbs were altered in texts, and that this occurs even in manuscripts from the same time period. All of these aspects of linguistic development evidence how complex the Irish language is, and it is important to be aware of these factors when analysing texts.

5.5 Changes in the Language of 'Loch Garman'

This analysis will examine the linguistic developments discussed above that occur in 'Loch Garman.' There have been numerous studies on LL, and Kim McCone states that "the spelling system used down to the end of the twelfth century, notably in *LU, LL,* and *RawlB502*, is essentially that of Old Irish apart from the relatively minor changes and fluctuations."[208] Therefore, LL should be the closest manuscript to the Old Irish spelling and the later manuscripts should have more linguistic developments. As mentioned in the previous section, one of the major vowel changes of the Irish language is the change of "e" to "ea" (as in "fer" to "fear"). This change occurs at a high frequency in the metrical stanzas of 'Loch Garman,' such as "ruidles" in LL, "ruidhleas" in M, and "ruidhles" in BB.[209] Another example is "do nertsu" in LL, "do neartsu" in M, "do nertsu" in BB, and "do neartsu" in Ed.[210] These examples show that both M and Ed illustrate this development, while LL and BB preserve the older language, even though M and BB were written around the same time. Ed was written a while after, therefore this change from "e" to "ea" coincides with this later dating. When it comes to BB, the scribe does not always use "e" and occasionally changes it to "ea," such as using "neam"

---

[206] McCone, K. *The Early Irish Verb,* 214-215.
[207] Mac Gearailt, Uáitéar. "The Language of Some Late Middle Irish Texts in the Book of Leinster." *Studia Hibernica* 26. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992): 171.
[208] McCone, K. *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader*, 177.
[209] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 909. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 4. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 27.
[210] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 914. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 rb 24. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 25. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 2 ra 22.

while the scribe of LL uses "nem."[211] This could perhaps have been done due to the scribe using different materials, or simply an error in writing.

The same change occurs occasionally in the prose versions of LL and Bd, as well as the prose introduction of M, which is quite similar to the other two. In the beginning of 'Loch Garman,' the change is shown through the verb "robaded" in LL, "robaidead" in M, and "robaidedh" in Bd,[212] illustrating that the scribe of M seems to prefer using this linguistic development. However, even though Bd is written a long time after LL, it is different from M and retains similarities to LL. Another frequent feature of these linguistic changes is the confusion of "o" and "a," and an example of this occurs in LL the word "airetsain" is written, which is changed to "oreadsin" in M and "aireadsin" in BB.[213] This concurs with the previous observation that BB seems to mostly follow the language of LL while M does the opposite. These deviations of the manuscripts illustrate in some ways how cultural memory interacts with the Dindshenchas as "one central presupposition of the theoretical framework of cultural memory is that there is no reconstruction of the past for the past's sake, but for the use of the present."[214] This is because these deviations show that the scribes made alterations in order for the placelore to better fit into the cultural constraints. The reconstruction of 'Loch Garman' and its language seems to make it a better fit for contemporary usage, and part of this reconstruction will eventually lead the language and phrasing to be altered in the process.

The consonants in 'Loch Garman' seem to illustrate a sense of indifference from the scribes in their usage of "c/g" and "n/d/t." It could be due to the first pair being velar and the second alveolar, making them and almost interchangeable in a manuscript. This confusion is shown for example in the verb "tancatar", which in two consecutive stanzas is spelled as "tancatar/tancatar" in LL, "tangadar/tancatar" in M and "tangadar/tangandar" in BB.[215] The indifference occurs frequently throughout these three manuscripts and there does not seem to be a system to it. Furthermore, the same can be said about the alveolar "n" and "d" where the scribe of LL uses the spelling "firinne," while M uses "firinde" and BB "firinne."[216] This

[211] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 913. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 46.
[212] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 700. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 88 vb 56-57. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 198 vb 31.
[213] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 911. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 35. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 9.
[214] Schlüter, Dagmar. "Medieval Manuscripts and Cultural Memory: The Case of the Book of Leinster." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory,* ed. J. E. Rekdal and E. Poppe. (Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014): 68.
[215] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 920. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 22 and 24. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 46 and 48.
[216] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 909. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 9. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 32.

continues in these manuscripts, with M consistently using the *nd*-spelling and BB continuing that of LL. There is also a difference in the usage of "t/d" in 'Loch Garman' where the pairing of LL and BB continues, while Ed is more similar to M. One of the many examples occurs in stanza 38 where the scribe of LL writes "Eirnifetsa," M writes "Eirnfead," BB writes "Eirnifeatsa," and Ed writes "Erennfead."[217] This analysis of the consonants supports the assumption that there is slightly more of a correlation between BB and LL, and also between M and Ed. However, due to all the manuscripts in some capacity belonging to the same original, there are understandably connections between them. Therefore, there will be aspects that remain the same, yet also smaller changes that have occurred to the material.

In the analysis provided above, a confusion of "o" and "a" is mentioned, which can in turn affects the preverbs such as "do" and "ro." One example of this is the verb "do ringni" in LL, which is written "da righni" in M and "do rigni" in BB.[218] This may cause confusion since the preverb "da" can either stem from vowel confusion or the masculine/neuter singular infixed pronoun, based on Old Irish grammar. The same occurs later in 'Loch Garman' where the scribe of M frequently uses "da," while BB and LL uses "do:" such as "do chorcair" in LL, "da corcair" in M and "do chorcair" in BB.[219] There are of course exceptions to this, for example when BB occasionally uses "da" instead of "do;" however, the majority shows M as the only one using this version of the preverb in 'Loch Garman.' As previously mentioned, the preverb particle *do* has a tendency in the Middle Irish period to replace the pretonic preverbs such as "fo," "ro," and "no,"[220] which occurs frequently in 'Loch Garman.' One of such examples concerns the verb written as "ro bae" in LL, which is altered to "da bhi" in M and "ro bai" in BB,[221] showing that this overtaking by "do" has already occurred in M. In some sections of BB, the "do" preverb such as "do bai" occurs instead.[222] Another example occurs later in 'Loch Garman' where the scribe of LL writes "no benad," while "da beanadh" is written in M and "no benad" in BB,[223] further illustrating that BB is more similar to LL while M has more linguistic changes.

---

[217] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 913. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 rb 10. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 9. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 2 ra 2.
[218] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 910. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 31. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 4.
[219] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 912. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 57. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 35.
[220] This is examined by Kim McCone and discussed further in section 5.4.
[221] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 911. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 37. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 13.
[222] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 21.
[223] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 913. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 68. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transciption fol 199 rb 48.

In addition to preverb developments, there are also changes to frequently used verbs in 'Loch Garman.' One of these is the disyllabic proclitics being reduced to monosyllables such as the Old Irish "inna" being written as "na," which often occurs throughout 'Loch Garman' in LL, M, BB and Ed. Another frequently altered word between the manuscripts is "cen" in LL, which is altered to "gan*"* in both M and BB,[224] showing a confusion between both vowels and consonants on the scribe's part. This occurs throughout 'Loch Garman' in the metrical, prosimetrum and prose entries. However, there are also a number of prepositions that changed in spelling between LL, M and BB: "fria*,"* "dar," and "dia." "Fria" was written as "ria" in LL, "re" in M, and "fria" in BB,[225] while "dar" was written in LL, "ar" in M, and "tar" in BB[226] and lastly "dia" was written in LL and "da" in M and BB.[227] All of these findings seem to illustrate that while all the manuscripts have influences from both Middle Irish and Old Irish, there does not seem to be a certain set of rules that each manuscript follows when it comes to the language of 'Loch Garman.' This is perhaps due to the hybridity of manuscripts from this period, and the tendency to prefer the Old Irish spelling across the manuscripts. It is also evident that some of these findings could be based on scribal errors or due to varying sources preferred by the scribes to best preserve 'Loch Garman.'

5.6 Historical Background on Prose and Poetry in Irish Literature

There is plenty of research being done on prose, poetry and prosimetrum by a variety of scholars and especially on the usage of prose and poetry:

> Broadly speaking, verse was the appropriate medium for lyrical expression as well as for ritual or didactic texts which depended on more or less verbatim transmission for their efficacy. Prose, on the other hand, was the natural medium for telling a story, presumably because the recounting of its events and the fate of its characters seemed to require flexible rather than a fixed form of speech.[228]

Due to the majority of the Dindshenchas consisting of prosimetrical texts, it is crucial to provide a brief historical background on this aspect. Based on a study by Gregory Toner, one can divide the usage of verse into three categories: testimonial, authoritative and

---

[224] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 909. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 14. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 38.

[225] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 909. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 7. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 29.

[226] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 909. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 12. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 36.

[227] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 911. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 40. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 16.

[228] Mac Cana, Proinsias. "Prosimetrum in Insular Celtic Literature." *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse,* ed. J. Harris and K. Reichl. (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997): 102-103.

corroborative.[229] However, the primary function of verse is stated to be the evidential and "serves to corroborate what has been told or mentioned in the preceding prose."[230] It may therefore be viewed as an eyewitness account of an event, a person or a place. In *Senchas Már,* a collection of law texts from the eighth century, it is asked in the text what has sustained the "senchas" of Ireland to which the legal text responds: "The joint memory of the old men, transmission from one ear to another, the chanting of the *filid…*"[231] This proves that already from the eighth century the transmission of "senchas" and chanting of the poets protected the old tradition and provided new material**.** A large number of early Irish "senchas" is preserved in verse, as it was a "medium for encoding and transmitting historical knowledge, and later scholars frequently cite earlier verse to authorize and authenticate their own work."[232] Verse is widely used in Irish literature and especially prominent in texts such as the Dindshenchas.

Prosimetrum was popularized in the Middle Irish period, and these Middle Irish prosimetrical narratives were termed "scélugud co laídib" and surfaces in different forms in texts such as *Senchas Már.*[233] *Senchas Már* has been dated to the Old Irish period, proving that while prosimetrum was popularized in the Middle Irish period, it was already being used in texts from the Old Irish period. This perspective of "scélugud co laídib" continues into the sixteenth century where a poet makes the following statement about the Dindshenchas of 'Ceilbe' missing verse section accompanying the prose: "ris cen aisde is inglinne… ni thig ris cen a dúan 'na dechair."[234] This shows that the prose and poetry complement each other in a text and need to coexist in order to be complete. However, even though they go together, there are stark contrasts between them as described by scholars. According to Toner, verse tends to be "enduring and reliable" while prose appears "transient and ephemeral."[235] These perspectives may have existed in the medieval period; however, it has been stated that "while verse enjoyed a special status as the appropriate vehicle for fixed, sacred texts, there is nothing

---

[229] Toner, Gregory. "Authority, Verse and the Transmission of Senchas." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 55, ed. L. Breatnach, R. Baumgarten, and D. McManus. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2005): 60.
[230] Mac Cana, P. "Prosimetrum in Insular Celtic Literature," 111.
[231] Stevenson, Jane. "Literacy and Orality in Early Medieval Ireland." *Cultural Identity and Cultural Integration: Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. D. Edel. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1995): 13.
[232] Toner, G. "Authority, Verse, and the Transmission," 59.
[233] Ní Mhaonaigh, Máire. "Poetic Authority in Middle Irish Narrative: A Case Study." *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland*, ed. E. Boyle and D. Hayden. (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press Limited, 2014): 264. Ní Mhaonaigh translates this term as "storytelling with poems."
[234] Qtd. in Mac Cana, Proinsias. "Notes on the Combination of Prose and Verse in Early Irish Narrative." *Early Irish Literature – Media and Communication: Mundlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit in der fruhen Irischen Literatur,* ed. S. N. Tranter and H. L. C. Tristram. (Tubingen: Narr, 1989): 133. Translated by Mac Cana as "A tale without verse is insecure….A tale without a lay to follow it is incomplete."
[235] Toner, G. "Authority, Verse and the Transmission," 60.

to suggest that prose, whether oral or written, lacked respectability."[236] This may explain why they were included in both fixed texts and newer contributions. They might stem from different sources, but "it is not surprising that the prose and its poem are not always in total harmony but occasionally reflect the disparities between the authorities from which they derive."[237]

The specific standard with poetry and the emergence of prose into the literary world illustrates that there must have been a deliberate concentration from the scribes and poets on prose and poetry coexisting. Based on a study executed by Brian Ó Cuív, there seems to have been "a formal study of the Irish language on the part of the secular poets, and we may suppose that from an early period this included grammar and related subjects, such as metrics."[238] This was most likely an education with set standards and rules they needed to follow. Due to these specific rules, the language of poetry will have different rules than the spoken language: "He would have to learn to use henceforth two forms of the Irish language: his ordinary speech for normal communication, and for poetry the standard language with all its range of forms and the anomalies in its pronunciation vis-à-vis the current spoken language."[239] The education of an Irish scribe was quite extensive, and he was required to follow these rules in order to be an accomplished poet and scribe.

5.7 Differentiating the Prose and Poetry in 'Loch Garman'

It is important to analyse how the prose and poetry are treated across the selected manuscripts because it can provide insight on the scribes' treatment of the Dindshenchas material. Before one is able to to this, it is important to be aware of the dating of prose and poetry within prosimetrical texts. This is to provide a foundation for understanding how they might be connected to each other within the Dindshenchas corpus. When examining prosimetrical texts, Murray states that "there is often a discrepancy in date between the prose and the poetry, with the poetry commonly being older than the prose."[240] This means that in the Dindshenchas entries such as 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba,' there is a chance the poetry was written first and then the prose was written to match. Despite of the prose and poetry possibly being written at different times, it is clear that they "are intended to be read as a single unit."[241] Through my research it is evident that most of the scribes followed a specific visual norm in

---

[236] Mac Cana, P. "Prosimetrum," 100.
[237] Mac Cana, P. "Prosimetrum," 114.
[238] Ó Cuív, B. "The Linguistic Training," 1-2.
[239] Ó Cuív, B. "The Linguistic Training," 4.
[240] Murray, K. "The Reworking of Old Irish Narrative Texts," 299.
[241] Qtd. in Murray, K. "The Reworking of Old Irish Narrative Texts," 299.

writing manuscripts. For the most part, this norm shows the entry on the manuscript page as a large capital letter introducing the prose or metrical section, and these capital letters can either look the same, or the metrical section might have a more detailed capital letter. In the metrical section, each stanza has a slightly larger capital letter introducing the stanza and uses on average two manuscript lines for each stanza.[242] In addition, the entry follows the standard with the first line in the manuscript being written as the first two lines of the stanza, and the second line in the manuscript being the final two lines of the stanza.[243] This is not followed in the prose entry in LL, which contains just one stanza where the capital letter has no larger font; however, it separates the stanza from the prose[244] with the critical sign "phi."[245]

Meanwhile, in M the prose and poetry are separated by the scribe, who ends the prose introduction mid-line on fol 88v and waits until fol 89r to start the first stanza of the poem.[246] The visual system found in LL is also visible in M where the capital letter or ligature of each stanza also has a larger font than the rest of the text. Furthermore, the first line of M contains the first two lines of the stanza and the second manuscript line has the final two lines of the stanza.[247] Compared to LL, the scribe of M does not always uphold this division and seems to put the main emphasis on filling out the manuscript lines, and occasionally uses "ceann faoi eite" to do so.[248] In BB, there is even less emphasis on following this standard, and the scribe either uses three lines of manuscript for one stanza[249] or puts one stanza in the middle of a manuscript line instead of at the beginning of the line.[250] Both Bd and Ed follow the same standard as the other manuscripts, but the scribes have varying successes: In Bd, the scribe follows the system to a certain extent, which is interesting since the LL prose of 'Loch Garman' does not divide the stanza as properly as the Bd scribe. In Ed, where the entry is only metrical, the scribe is not as successful as the other manuscripts in following this standard, but he does use the "ceann faoi eite" to fill the lines to the best of his ability.

---

[242] This system is followed in the LL facsimile, with each stanza being marked with a capital letter larger than the normal font.

[243] This is followed throughout the manuscript, for example on fol 196 b 1-2 in LL. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

[244] One example is on fol 159 a in LL. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

[245] "Phi." *Tionscadal na Nod, CODECS Vanhamel*: https://www.vanhamel.nl/codecs/Phi_(critical_sign). Accessed 15.01.21. Usually tends to mark verse in a manuscript.

[246] Fol 88v to 89r in M. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

[247] Fol 89 rb 18-19 in M. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

[248] Fol 89 ra 60, 59, 61 in M. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

[249] Fol 199 rb 29-31 in BB. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

[250] Fol 199 rb 50 to fol 199 va 1 in BB. Viewed through ISOS-facsimile: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

Another important aspect to be considered is whether or not the scribes differentiated between the prose and poetry, and if they added more new content to the prose or to the poetry. If more content was added to one of the two, it can signify that it was deemed more necessary to preserve it as accurately as possible. In the single-stanza poem embedded in the prose version of LL and Bd, it remains the same with little to no changes, even though the manuscripts have 200 to 300 years between them. In the prose entry of 'Loch Garman,' the scribes of LL and Bd wrote it down almost identically; however, the scribe of M has altered or added some sections at the same time as some sections are similar to the entry in LL and Bd. The prose introduction of 'Loch Garman' in BB has a large amount of new content added. Furthermore, it is evident that due to their tendency to make more alterations, then the the prose of BB and M might belong to a different standard than the prose of LL and Bd.

Apart from these large deviations from the standard, there are stray phrases in some stanzas that add new information. Most of the new content is either added in the beginning or the end of the stanzas. It seems evident that the prose and poetry might have been viewed differently based on earlier traditions, especially since the poetry had more of a set standard compared to the prose. Despite this, prose and poetry were both preserved in the Irish literary tradition, and especially in the Dindshenchas. Even if they are both preserved equally, the scribes were still encouraged to make alterations and additions. Those additions would either stem from the scribe himself or perhaps from the archive belonging to this vast tradition. In reality, cultural memory generally exists in two modes which are also reflected in the Dindshenchas corpus: "first in the mode of potentiality of the archive whose accumulated texts, images, and rules of conduct act as a total horizon, and second in the mode of actuality, whereby each contemporary context puts the objectivized meaning into its own perspective, giving it its own relevance."[251] This is perhaps what occurs in 'Loch Garman,' where the prose and poetry coexists both in the archive containing all placelore and texts. It also exists in the context inflicted by the scribe in order to fit into the manuscript for the message he wants to convey.

5.8 Textual Inconsistencies in the Metrical Stanzas of 'Loch Garman'[252]

Due to its length and the complexity of the entry, 'Loch Garman' has a large number of textual inconsistencies among all of the manuscripts. Through the Dindshenchas, the majority of

---

[251] Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65, ed. D. Bathrick and M. Hansen et. al. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995): 130.

[252] As previously mentioned, the "Textual Inconsistencies"-section of 'Loch Garman' will be split into metrical and prose due to the length of this Dindshenchas entry. In addition, the analysis of the metrical stanzas will have subsections without numbering in order to divide it further for ease of reading.

material is consistent throughout the manuscripts, but the scribes have occasionally deviated from the norm. Since we do not have an archetype, it is difficult to know which version is the most accurately preserved. However, it might not be as important to know which one is the most accurately preserved as it is far more important to understand why these inconsistencies occurred in the first place. Since 'Loch Garman' is a product of scribes, they made individual decisions about the phrasing instead of simply copying everything down as they are read it. Due to this, there is bound to be a certain number of changes to the original material, especially since we are studying "some 1300 years of scholarly activity devoted to the redaction and cultivation of this body of literature."[253] Sometimes these changes do not have any change in lexical meaning, but the scribes use different phrasings or words in their manuscripts.

Such alterations might not be major influences on the narrative, yet they illustrate smaller ways the scribes affect each entry. One example is from stanza 13[254] where both LL and BB uses "allib"[255] in the phrase "ic rigaib allib hErend."[256] As previously mentioned, these two manuscript versions of 'Loch Garman' are the most similar out of all the manuscripts. M usually differs from them in smaller or larger ways, and in this case uses the adjective "uaisli"[257] in the place of "allib." This is a slight change in meaning and could have occurred due to the scribe either preferring a certain word or taking a word from a different source than that of LL and BB. Another example is when LL and M uses the word "caem sein"[258] in the phrase "is do chorcair ba cáem sein,"[259] whereas BB differs and uses "suairc sin"[260] in its place. This illustrates a slight change from using the adjective "pleasant" to one meaning "beloved," and does not interrupt the main content of the stanza. Instead, it illustrates what the scribes were influenced by, and also a rare example of LL coinciding with M over BB.

---

[253] Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. "Adapting Myth and Making History." *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland,* ed. by E. Boyle and D. Hayden. (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press Limited, 2014): 2.

[254] Stanzas are not numbered in the editions or in my transcriptions, but they are numbered in the "Interrelationship"- appendices to provide an easy way to reference to stanzas within my analysis.

[255] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 3: 171. Translated by Gwynn as "noble." Gwynn's translation will be used as much as possible in this analysis, but my own translation will be used in the places where Gwynn uses phrasing not relevant for this thesis.

[256] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 910. Translated as "by the noble kings of Erin," in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 171.

[257] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 30. Translated as "high, noble, honourable," in "Úasal." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/42796. Accessed on 09.12.20

[258] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 912. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 57. Translated as "precious, beloved" in "Cáem" *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/7590. Accessed on 09.12.20.

[259] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 912.

[260] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 35. Translated as "pleasant" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 175. Gwynn uses the phrase from BB in his edition, making the full line translated as: "and purple – the sight was pleasant."

Next, there are alterations to words that further separates the meaning of phrases to a larger extant than previous examples. In the beginning of 'Loch Garman' at stanza 11, all three manuscripts diverge in the sentence "Is and tancatar na slóig / i purt Chóelrenna in chomóil,"[261] here from LL, where "chomóil" originates from "comól."[262] This is quite different from the scribe of BB who uses a descriptive word: "comcoir"[263] instead of "in chomoil," which seems to be a combination of "com" and the adjective "coir."[264] It provides another way of describing Port Chóelrenna, which means the scribes had either heard multiple descriptions of this port, or that they were using material from different sources. Compared to these two, M strays from them in this stanza as the scribe prefers "a chedoir,"[265] which might be a version of "céadóir,"[266] resulting in a different translation from the other manuscripts. In that way, this example evidences the slight difference of emphasizing the time of arrival instead of following the description of the port in LL and BB.

Another similar example occurs in the beginning of the next stanza: "Dorigne Catháir clemnach / feis racháeim na ríg Temrach."[267] However, when comparing LL to BB, the BB scribe wrote the word "rechain,"[268] which might be a confusion or scribal error from LL's "racháeim," since LL and BB are quite similar overall. Finally, in M the scribe uses "ramhor,"[269] which is quite similar to LL and BB, in the sense that it describes the feast. The only difference is that the scribe of M uses a different adjective to describe it. Preserving the narrative of the placelore is crucial, and details such as these are seemingly often changed. This, in turn, contributes to a proper tradition being created around the placelore. The Dindshenchas corpus is based on exchanging memories and "the price of communality is a loss of literal

---

[261] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 910. Translated as "It is there the hosts arrived, at Port Coelrenna of the carouse," in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 171.

[262] Translated as "of the carouse" and refers to drinking, based on "Comól." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/11575. Accessed on 09.12.20.

[263] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 48-49.

[264] Together, these may be translated as "very straight/proper," based on "com" and "coir." "Com-" *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/10554. Accessed on 09.12.20. "Coir." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/10380. Accessed on 09.12.20.

[265] MS D ii 1 fol 88 vb 24-23. This citation is written this way because the beginning of the word is on line 24, while the end of the word is on the line above in the manuscript.

[266] Translated as "at once" in "Céadóir." *Teanglann*. Dictionary Entry: https://www.teanglann.ie/en/fgb/céadóir. Accessed on 09.12.20. Furthermore, this aids my translation of "It is there the hosts arrived / at Port Coelrenna at once."

[267] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 910. Translated as "Cathair of the many kinsmen held / the right pleasant feast of the kings of Temair" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 173. The sentence is almost identical in Gwynn's edition, except for Gwynn writing "racháim" instead of "racháim" in LL. He might have used LL for this, but chose to alter this word.

[268] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 4. I have been unable to find a translation for this word.

[269] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 31. Translated as "thick/fat" in "Ramhar." *Teanglann.* Dictionary Entry: https://www.teanglann.ie/en/fgb/ramhar. Accessed on 10.12.20.

accuracy."[270] Therefore, the preservation of texts such as 'Loch Garman' lost the literal accuracy of the original sources; however, the main aspects were preserved and mattered more than the smaller details that were ultimately lost.

Alterations to Characters

In 'Loch Garman,' there are certain scribal alterations directed at characters of the Dindshenchas entry. The first example to be discussed concerns the frequently mentioned Slane. In both LL and M, she is described by the adjective "sen" is applied to her ("sean" in M[271]), while in BB the scribe has used the adjective "saer."[272] This alteration in the stanza shows that there is a slightly different perspective in BB which describes Slane as free or noble instead of the word "ancient" as used in LL and M. Another example is even more prevalent in the context of 'Loch Garman,' which is the mention of king Cathair's druid, Brí mac Baircheda. In both LL and BB, his name is written as "Brí mac Baircheda,"[273] yet it is completely different from M and Ed wbere this name is written as "ri mac Mareadhada" in M and "ri mac Mureada" in Ed.[274] It is possible that this was a scribal error, but it is interesting that the same scribal error was committed by two scribes.

In addition, it is possible that both scribes fell for the same mistake when copying down the placelore. Due to the speedy process of copying, there is also a possibility that the scribes simply did not notice errors in their manuscript source, thereby continuing this error in their own manuscript. Locating this second version of the name is impossible, since the only remotely similar attestation may be found in *Macgnimartha Find*: "mic Muiredaig."[275] However, this spelling is not identical to M and Ed and might be another character completely. It is interesting that the character of king Cathair's druid has his name changed since druids were quite respected in Irish culture. It is possible that it was intentional, yet more likely that it was a slip of the pen or a scribal error. Another possibility is that the scribes of M and Ed were working from different sources than LL and BB.[276]

---

[270] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation," 15.
[271] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 909. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 14. Translated as "ancient" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 169.
[272] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 38. Translated as "free, noble of birth" in "Saer." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/35899. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[273] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 913. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 10.
[274] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 rb 11. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 2 ra 3-4.
[275] Meyer, Kuno. "Macgnimartha Finn inn so sis." *Revue Celtique* 5, ed. H. Gaidoz. (Paris: Libraire a Franck, 1881-1883): 197.
[276] The example of the druid's name was compared to 'Loch Garman' in Stowe₃, Book of Lecan, MS 1317 and Rennes an in all of these the scribes used the same spelling as in LL and BB. This makes M and Ed the only ones with the alternate spelling.

There are a considerable number of instances in 'Loch Garman' containing differences in the phrasing or content of the metrical stanzas. As previously mentioned, there are many similarities between LL and BB that are not shared with M. The first example occurs in stanza 28 where the scribe of LL writes: "cid ingnad fria innisin,"[277] and BB has the same line with a slightly different spelling that shows consonant confusion. However, in M the line reads "acht ge ingnad re imluadh,"[278] making significant alterations compared to LL and BB. Even though these changes do not majorly affect the narrative of the stanzas, they are still significant to the analysis of scribal alterations in the Dindshenchas. The second example occurs later in the LL and BB versions of 'Loch Garman,' where the manuscripts are identical in the phrasing of these two lines: "airfitiud fer ndomuin de / atchloss do baurr in bile."[279] However, when comparing to the same two lines in M, there have been obvious alterations committed to the material by changing both nouns and verbs.

In M, the scribe has written "oirfideadh sluaigh domhain de / tigidh da barr in bile,"[280] and while it retains the same sentence structure as LL and BB, is markedly altered in this manuscript. Despite these differences, the word "oirfideadh" likely comes from "airfitiud,"[281] "sluaigh" is the genitive plural of "slóg,"[282] and "domhain" from "domun."[283] These words are markedly different from the line in LL and BB, further illustrating the separation between M and LL with BB. Furthermore, the scribe of M also changes the phrasing by choosing "tigidh" from the verb "do-icc,"[284] and due to vowel confusion, "da" is most likely a misspelling of the preposition "do."[285] The phrase "barr in bile" is quite similar to the phrasing in LL and BB, with only slight spelling differences. Compared to the translation of LL and BB translation, the

---

[277] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 912. Translated as "though strange it be to relate," in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 177.

[278] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 59. My translation is "but although strange to stir up," based on the conjunction *ge* with the translation "although" (originally coming from *cía*), the adjective *ingnad* meaning "strange," *re* being a different spelling of the preposition *fri* and *imluadh* containing many possible translations, but based on context, "stir up" is a reasonable suggestion. "Gé." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/25467. Accessed on 10.12.20. "Ingnad." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/28675. Accessed on10.12.20. "Imlúad." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/27629. Accessed on 10.12.20.

[279] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 913. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 45+47. Translated as "thence the music of the men of the world / was hear from the tree's crown" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 177.

[280] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 65 and 67. My own translation: "music (of the) armies of the world / comes to the top of the tree-trunk," and will be explained further in this section.

[281] Translated as "music" in "Airfitiud." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/1969. Accessed on 10.12.20.

[282] Translated as "host, army" in "Slóg, Slúag." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/37981. Accessed on 17.03.21.

[283] Translated as "world" in "Domun." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/18161. Accessed on 10.12.20.

[284] Strachan, John. *Old-Irish Paradigms and Selections from the Old-Irish Glosses,* 4th edition. (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2014): 95-96. Translated by Strachan as "to come."

[285] Stifter, David. *Sengoídelc: Old Irish for Beginners.* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2006): 367. Translated by Stifter as "to/for."

main alteration is M's focus on the noun "slog" instead of "fer," perhaps hoping to emphasize the warrior- or army-aspect of Irish texts. However, it could also be simply a scribal preference as Irish texts frequently use the word for man and army almost interchangeably.

The third example occurs towards the end of 'Loch Garman,' where the scribe of LL: "do nertsu os chach is mochen / cen traithad is cen tairnem."[286] In comparison to M as well as Ed, whose excerpt of 'Loch Garman' includes this stanza, certain aspects of the two lines have been influenced by the scribes. The lines in both M and Ed are almost identical, which continues throughout all of Ed's stanzas, due to this section in the manuscript being almost identical to M and further shows deviations from the version found in LL and BB. These two lines are written by the scribe in M: "da neartsu os talmhain na tor / gan toirneamh is gan traethodh."[287] Before going into the phrasing of M, it is important to mention that the final line of this section has the reverse order compared to the other manuscripts. Firstly, "da neartsu" is the same phrase as in Gwynn[288] with the preposition "os,"[289] yet after this, M and Ed is different from BB and LL. Instead, these scribes use "talmhain," the genitive singular of "talam,"[290] and "na tor."[291] Similar to the previous example, these might not be groundbreaking alterations; however, the usage of "talam" in M and Ed seems to be one of the most significant. "Talam" has commonly been used as part of the triad of "nem, talam, muir" in many texts from early Irish literature, for example the text *Táin Bó Cuailnge*.[292] In this case, there is a chance the scribes of M and Ed were influenced to make this inclusion of "talam" due to this connection. However, it is also possible they preferred including this word without intending to make it overtly Christian.

In this section of the analysis, it is important to note that BB does not always have direct similarities to LL. In the middle of 'Loch Garman,' there is a section where the beginning of the stanza differs widely among LL, M and BB. In LL, the first line of a stanza is "tan rogabsat

---

[286] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 914. BB has almost identical spelling: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 25, 27. Translated as "thine own might over everyone, good luck to it / unbroken, unsubdued" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 177.

[287] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 rb 24-26. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 2 ra 22-23. My own translation: "thine own might over (the) multitude of the earth / is without abating and without subjugation." I have chosen different translations from Gwynn for "toirneamh" and "traethodh" since I am using the *eDIL*-translation since it is not specifically stated by Gwynn what he based his translations on. Therefore, I am using the translations from *eDIL* in my own translation instead of leaning solely on Gwynn.

[288] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 177. Translated by Gwynn as "thine own might."

[289] Translated as "above" in "Ós." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/34047. Accessed on 10.12.20.

[290] Translated as "of the earth" in "Talam." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/39932. Accessed on 10.12.20.

[291] Translated as "the multitude" in "Tor." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/41416. Accessed on 10.12.20.

[292] Mac Mathúna, Liam. "Irish Perceptions of the Cosmos." *Celtica* 23, ed. F. Kelly and M. O Riordan. (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1999): 175. Translated by Mac Mathúna as "the sky, the earth and the sea."

Garman ngarg"[293] and it is the only manuscript mentioning the nameGarman in this stanza. BB takes a different direction and writes "odha gabadh ba gnim gargh,"[294] where "odha" seems to be originating from "óthá/ótá,"[295] "gabadh" originating from "gábud,"[296] "ba" is the past tense of the copula, "gnim" is the verbal noun of "gniid"[297] and "garg"[298] is an adjective. Despite of the standards of BB and LL being similar, there remains cases like this where the scribe of BB makes the decision to alter the material according to his preferences. Furthermore, BB's version of the stanza avoids mentioning Garman and focuses on the theft and death instead. The reason for this in unclear and it seems to make the stanza vaguer than the version in LL.

M takes this a step further with "In treth ro gabsat gnim garg,"[299] where the scribe uses the same verb as in LL with "rogabsat" from "gaibid,"[300] yet the beginning is different as the scribe uses the phrase "in treth." In my opinion, the "in" in this case is not the article, but a misspelling of the copula "is," and "treth" is the adjective from "tréith."[301] Therefore, it seems the scribe of M does not do the same as BB and instead focuses on the action over mentioning Garman, and also comments further on this act by calling it cowardly. Furthermore, this illustrates that the scribes seem to redact and rework the material when writing these manuscripts: "Any element of cultural production that enters into the archive of cultural memory will itself be dependent on the memory of specific human beings at a number of different stages from production and transmission to reception."[302] Through these stages, the scribes tend at times to alter the text based on their memories from the archive instead of the literary standards of the time.

Stanzas Added or Omitted

Within 'Loch Garman,' there are some sections showing stanzas added or omitted. When discussing the reason for why there is no theft or murdering during the feast of Tara, one stanza mentions the consequences of someone breaking this rule. This stanza is omitted in M, which

---

[293] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 911. Translated as "when they took fierce Garman" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 3: 175.
[294] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 22. My own translation: "from danger was the doing of the fierce action."
[295] Translated as "from" in "Ótá." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/34102. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[296] Translated as "danger" in "Gabúd." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/25066. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[297] Translated as "doing/executing" in "Gniid." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/26217. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[298] Translated as "fierce" in "Garg." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/25403. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[299] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 ra 46. My own translation: "it is cowardly that they took (the doing of) the fierce action."
[300] Translated as "to take" in "Gaibid." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/25119. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[301] Translated as "weak/cowardly" in "Tréith." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/41760. Accessed on 10.12.20.
[302] Tymoczko, M. "The Nature of Tradition and Cultural Memory," 17.

means that the scribe either found it superfluous or that he was working with sources that did not include it. However, this is highly unlikely since the stanza exists in LL, BB, and other manuscripts. In addition to the stanza not being in M, the beginning of this stanza has different phrasing between LL and BB. In LL, the first line of the stanza states "cip é doneth ní dib sein,"[303] which seems to be a warning to anyone reading this section of the poem. However, the scribe of BB provides a more abstract interpretation: "Cebe neoch doni mar sin,"[304] where "cebe" is a way of writing "cía bé"[305] and the scribe also adds "neoch" from "nech."[306] Furthermore, "mar" can be used as an adverb, describing the acts of theft and murder as actions of greatness. When copying this placelore, it is possible that the memory of the scribes and the society greatly affect the material. However, it is important to realize that "the first task memory performs is actually not to preserve the events, but to select the few aspects that are considered remarkable…forgetting everything else."[307] Due to this, the main points of narrative of 'Loch Garman' are preserved, but other aspects are forgotten or altered, leading them to return to the archive and essentially disappear.

Towards the end of 'Loch Garman,' a stanza is added to BB that is not included in LL, M or Ed: "Tegait cura daingni dho / re luach dfaghail in ganh lo / mar da chataidh tall na taigh / ri redaib mar dacuindigh."[308] In BB, the scribe uses different prepositions than what is found in other manuscripts and uses "redaib"[309] instead of "séta" from Gwynn's edition that is based off other manuscripts. It should also be mentioned that both words have the same meaning. If Gwynn used another manuscript for this section, then the original source for the manuscript

---

[303] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 911. Translated as "whoever should do any of these things" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 3: 173.

[304] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 rb 11. My own translation: "whoever anyone should make greatly," which insinuates someone doing something great or making a certain great act such as stealing or murdering.

[305] Translated "whoever" in "É, Hé." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/19325. Accessed on 12.12.20.

[306] Translated as "anyone" in "Nech." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/33014. Accessed on 12.12.20.

[307] Esposito, E. "Social Forgetting: A Systems-Theory Approach," 184-185.

[308] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 11, 10, 12. These line numbers are listed this way since the stanza begins on line 11, continues at the end of 10 and due to "ceann faoi eite," finishes on line 12. In Gwynn's edition there are slight differences from what is written in BB, and he did not use BB or the Book of Lecan manuscript. Either way, what is written in his edition still corresponds with BB to the extent that his translation can still be used for my analysis: "firm covenants are given to him / for receiving award every day / and for honour there in his house / and for wealth, as he demanded." Taken from Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 3: 179.

[309] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 12. The translation of "redaib" is not found in any dictionaries to my knowledge, but it is translated as "wealth" in Todd, James Henthorn. *The Irish Version of the Historia Britonum of Nennius*. (Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1848): 30-31. In Mommsen, Theodorus. *Chronica Minora Saec. IV.V.VI.VII*. (Berlin: Berolini Apud Weidmannos, 1898): 148, an edition of the Latin original of *Historia Brittonum*, the Latin word used is "divitiis," which is likely what Todd used when translating the Irish version. According to Mørland, Henning. *Latinsk* Ordbok, 3rd edition. Oslo: J. W. Cappelens Forlag, 1965: 181, the translation of "divitiis" comes from "divitae" which in Norwegian is "rikdom," meaning "wealth" in English. It is interesting that the scribe of BB would use such a rarely used adjective in his manuscript. It would be interesting to analyse this further, but it is outside the scope of this thesis.

could have had different versions of this stanza and perhaps even 'Loch Garman' as a whole. This stanza does not contribute any new information to the plot; however, it does add information and praise directed at the druid, Brí mac Baircheda. Perhaps the scribes of the other manuscripts felt this stanza put too much emphasis on Brí over king Cathair or Garman, and therefore eliminated it to maintain the narrative flow. Another option is that the scribes of the other manuscripts had no awareness of this poem and worked from other sources or elements from the archive. This stanza also includes a number of examples of the linguistic changes, such as the scribe of BB writing "re" instead of "fri" and switching the preverb "ro" with "do."

The High-King and Slane

Towards the end of 'Loch Garman,' there is a point after stanza 46 where both M and Ed cuts out in the middle the stanzas describing Cathair's vision of Slane, interpreted by the king's druid. These are not a part of the main legend concerning the lake, but it seems to be a major part of the entry due to the amount of information about her and her connection to king Cathair. Through 'Loch Garman,' there seems at times to be a larger focus on king Cathar than Garman, whom the lake was named after. In LL and BB, the interpretation of Cathair's vision has a longer section, and has more stanzas than the amount in M and Ed.[310] Through these stanzas, the phrasing and language of LL and BB are quite similar, apart from expected spelling differences and smaller linguistic changes. These stanzas also seem to provide connections to Christian aspects in the text and emphasize the concept of a sole king of Ireland, a High-King.

Within Irish literature and culture, it is quite popular to have a focus on the concept of a sole king of Ireland, the "ardrí," and the position is described as "once overlord of the provincial kings, the ultimate enforcer of order within the realm, and the highest appeal judge in law."[311] These specific connections to Christianity are interesting, but they are not surprising due to the time period manuscripts were written in. Christianity was already well-established in Ireland, and it is quite normal to find overt Christian connections in Irish texts set in the pre-Christian period. When describing for example *Táin Bó Cuailnge,* James Carney describes it as consisting "in part of traditional material, in part of imaginative reconstruction of the remote pagan Irish past in form and terms that belong to the mixed culture of early Christian Ireland."[312] An example of this reconstruction of the past is featured in stanza 49: "Dait atá a breth bunaid

---

[310] These stanzas can be read either in the Book of Ballymote transcription or in the appendix on interrelationship of manuscripts.

[311] Kelleher, John V. "Early Irish History and Pseudo-History." *Studia Hibernica* 3. (Dublin: St. Patrick's Training College, 1963): 120.

[312] Carney, J. *Studies in Irish Literature and History*, 321.

/ na fisi ar cach primthulaig / ni fuil do chreidim it chri / ar Herind corbat oenrí."[313]
"Chreidim"[314] is often used in connection to the Christian religion in medieval Irish texts. In this case, this usage might reflect that the scribe was familiar with Christian texts and that "the learned version of the past has acquired a seal of Christian approval."[315] This supposed seal of approval shows the reworking of texts where Christian aspects are embedded into the earlier placelore and further alters the memories within the corpus.

Directly after the interpretation of Cathair's vision about Slane and her son, there is a stanza included in BB and LL referring to Eochaid Eolach. This person is, based on a line in LL, the supposed scribe of the metrical account of 'Loch Garman.'[316] In LL, this is the final stanza of 'Loch Garman' and is written as: "Eochaid eolach diarb assa / fofuair suithi senchassa / do loch garman tall na thir / ic adnad rand do rorig."[317] BB has almost identical phrasing and spelling for this stanza, and insinuates that it was Eochaid who gathered and wrote 'Loch Garman.' It is possible that the writer of this legend knew of Cathair's vision and felt it was necessary to add to the entry even though it was meant to be about Garman. However, the king of Tara has always had a special place within Irish literature and there would of course be a large focus on him in any legend located at or near Tara. Despite of this large importance, the term "ardrí" was not established in the Irish law, even though it was largely connected to the culture and literature: "though it was put forward by Adamnán … at the beginning of the seventh century, had no more basis in law than it had in fact."[318] It has later been established by Liam Breatnach that the term does exist in the law-tracts but that it is "outside the law of status."[319] Therefore, it would seem that while it is not established by law, it is a concept widely used both in pseudohistory and Irish literature in general.

One would think that 'Loch Garman' ends here, but there is actually a final stanza in BB that sets itself apart from all the others. According to Gwynn, this stanza is only found in

[313] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 915. Translated as "To thee pertains the peculiar import / of the vision on every chief hill / thou shalt not believe the Faith in thy life-time / till thou art sole king over Erin" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 183.
[314] Translated as "belief, faith" in "Creitem." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/12843. Accessed on 13.12.20.
[315] Ní Mhaonaigh, Máire. "The Peripheral Centre: Writing History on the Western Fringe." *Interfaces*: *A Journal of Medieval European Literatures* 4, ed. P. Borsa et. al. (Milan: Universitá Degli Studi di Milano, 2017): 73.
[316] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 909.
[317] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 915. Translated as "Eochaid the Learned, to whom it was easy / found legendary lore / for Lough Garman yonder in his country / while kindling the light of verse for a great king" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 183.
[318] Doherty, Charles. "The Kingship and Landscape of Tara." *The Kingship and Landscape of Tara,* ed. E. Bhreathnach. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005): 12.
[319] Qtd. in Doherty, C. "The Kingship and Landscape of Tara," 12.

BB, Rennes, Stowe₃ and H.[320] It is quite a rare stanza, and it is interesting that the stanza only exists in these four manuscripts, especially since both Rennes and BB was written at the same time, while both S₃ and H were written around 16th or 17th century. Since this stanza has been preserved through this time period until the writing of these manuscripts, it is interesting that it is not found in the other manuscripts written between them. This could be due to the stanza being removed from the general frame of memory, before being recommitted, thereby evidencing that memories are rarely destroyed completely but tend to disappear: "In these cases the objects are not materially destroyed; they fall out of the frames of attention, valuation, and use."[321] It is also possible that the scribes of the other manuscripts did not find it necessary to have this addition to 'Loch Garman,' due to it not including anything about Garman, king Cathair, or Slane. Instead, it focuses on religious concepts such as the soul, sin in the flesh, and God: "Cuinnghim id chi ar Dia dam / co rop maith imthus manman / na ruslena cin i crí / gun fhir ac narba haithri."[322] These religious stanzas at the end of Dindshenchas entries are quite rare overall; however, there is a small group of entries that contain these religious additions.

Gwynn briefly mentions that these additions "are obviously due to the Reviser, and do not call for further comment,"[323] but Ó Concheanainn wrote an article further analysing this subject. These stanzas are found by Ó Concheanainn to, among other things, as referring to "king of heaven" in the Dindshenchas, in a similar manner to stanzas found in *Saltair na Rann*.[324] In his opinion, these prominent pious features in *Saltair na Rann* of "the religious content, metrical character and stylistic features … would naturally mark these quatrains as models for imitation by an author who wished to add devotional final quatrains"[325] to the Dindshenchas. 'Loch Garman' is not specifically mentioned in Ó Concheanainn's discussion, but the prevalence of these religious additions overall shows the desire by some scribes to include overt Christian aspects into the Dindshenchas narrative. In 'Loch Garman,' there is no specific mention of "king of heaven;" however, it does feature some overt Christian concepts. One example of this occurs in the beginning of the stanza where the scribe asks for "a boon for

---

[320] Mentioned in a footnote in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 183. S₃ is the nickname for Royal Irish Academy MS B iii 1 and H stands originally for Trinity College MS 1322 which is now lost with a copy existing in Trinity MS 1317. All of these may be viewed through facsimiles in the ISOS-database.
[321] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 98.
[322] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 va 39-41. Translation as "I crave a boon for myself from God / that good may be the fortune of my soul / may no sin in the flesh do it harm / with Him who had no father's kin" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 3: 183.
[323] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 5: 74.
[324] Ó Concheanainn, T. "A Pious Redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn," 87.
[325] Ó Concheanainn, T. "A Pious Redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn," 88.

myself from God" and referencing "soul," "sin," and "Him who had no father's kin."[326] All of these elements provide a verse in honour of God and a distinct prayer to him from the scribe.

By examining 'Loch Garman' in the metrical and prosimetrum manuscripts, it is evident that these scribes end the entry at different places. Both LL, M, and BB start at the same place in the beginning of 'Loch Garman,' but Ed is a special manuscript in this group. It is categorized within the prose recension, but it has no prose account of 'Loch Garman.' Instead, the scribe has only included part of the final line of stanza 37, and the next nine stanzas of the metrical account. This choice by the scribe is interesting because the scribe does not mention 'Loch Garman' at all, but the stanzas written down contain the introduction of Cathair's druid and the interpretation of his vision about Slane. It could be a possibility that this scribe found evidence of 'Loch Garman' and decided to include it in this position in the manuscript. However, according to the analysis of Ed on *Irish Script on Screen*, there is a missing leaf prior to this excerpt from 'Loch Garman,' making it an acephalous entry.[327] Therefore, it is possible that 'Loch Garman' once included the entire prosimetrum account of 'Loch Garman,' or at least the metrical stanzas. However, why would the scribe include this non-prose Dindshenchas legend? Why not include the prose account instead? Many manuscripts within the Dindshenchas corpus have elements from the other recensions which might be due to a common original or simply scribal alterations. As mentioned earlier in the analysis, Ed and M have quite similar language, and cuts off at the same place in 'Loch Garman:' in the middle of the interpretation of Cathair's vision. It seems as though LL and BB have the most complete metrical account, with LL cutting off right before the religious addition in BB. This would most likely, in my opinion, be due to the religious addition either being the invention of scribes or something being influenced by the already established culture and traditions. However, it is difficult to find the origin for such sections in the metrical stanzas, due to not having access to the original tradition.

5.9 Textual Inconsistencies in the Prose Versions of 'Loch Garman'

Now that the metrical stanzas of 'Loch Garman' have been analysed, it is necessary to also examine the prose recension entries and the prose introductions of the prosimetrum entries as well. The prose entries of 'Loch Garman' are set up differently than the prosimetrum and metrical entries. These entries begin with the main tale about Garman mac Bomma Licce,

---

[326] Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 3: 183. These are quoted in English from Gwynn's edition since the stanza in Irish has been quoted above.
[327] "Adv. MS 72.1.16." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21.

avoiding any mention about king Cathair's vision of Slane. In fact, the vision is not mentioned at all except for in the prose introduction of BB. This would perhaps support a theory that the prose recension was intended as a summary of the prosimetrum recension: "B is an abridged recension made from the prose of C."[328] Furthermore, due to the recension possibly being created as a form of summary on C, there would be no need to include the extra content about Cathair, his druid, and the vision. Meanwhile, the scribes of both LL and Bd put the most emphasis on the character of Garman and that he was drowned due to murder and theft.[329] This main tale is issued first in the manuscript and the writing is preserved almost equally in these two manuscripts. Towards the end of this section of the entry, it is written that "nomarbadh a mmuintir, arb a dibergach 7 foglaid hé,"[330] thereby emphasising that he was both a brigand and a robber by stealing the diadem and killing her household. Compared to the prose account in LL, there is no usage of the noun "foglaid," and Garman is described only as a "dibergach."[331] The single stanza-poem is normally placed after the main tale, where LL and Bd provide a short summary: "Mac Bomma Licci luadmi / in rí Cathair ron bádi / Garman a ainm in ardfir / tria bardnib combad ri."[332] This is a typical style of prose Dindshenchas entries with the stanza describing the content of the place in question. However, it is also customary to provide a countertale, if there is one on this placename.

In the case of 'Loch Garman,' the countertale is quite short with very few details: "No comma Carmman Glass mac Degad on n-ainmnigder, cuius frater Dea a quo Inbir nDea 7 Abann Dee hi crich Cualann."[333] This sentence with the short Latin phrase occurs in both LL and Bd, as well as in M and BB in their prose introductions. In LL, the prose recension entry provides a nod to the first line of the metrical stanzas as well: "Is dosein ro chan in senchaid."[334] This gives the idea that the scribe was familiar with the metrical account and felt it was

---

[328] Ó Concheanainn, T. "The Three Forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn," 91.

[329] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 700. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.

[330] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.

[331] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 700. It is not translated in the Bd edition, yet it is translated amongst other things as "marauder" or "bandit" in "Díbergach." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/16021. Accessed on 14.05.21.

[332] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 700. Translated as "Boimm Lecce's son we announce; / Catháir the king drowned him / Garman was the high man's name / Thro' bardic poems - so that he might not be king" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.

[333] Translated as "Or maybe it was named from Carman Glass, son of Dega, whose brother was Dea, from whom (are named) Inber Dea and Abann Dea, in the district of Cualu" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.

[334] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 700. My own translation: "it is for that the senchaid recited." "Canaid." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/8126. Accessed on 16.12.20. I have chosen to not translate "senchaid" in the translation, since I prefer using this term instead of the translation. If one wants a translation for this word, it is in "Senchaid." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/37122. Accessed on 16.12.20.

necessary to provide a direct reference to it. In such a process of reworking, there is bound to be some elements of the text that disappear. It may also show an example of the "leaky bucket"-concept representing "a decline from an original plenitude of memories to a paucity thereof."[335] Certain aspects may leak out of the archive over time and disappear from the tradition, yet at the same time, aspects can also be clung to by the scribes in order to maintain aspects deemed worthy of preservation for the next generations.

As previously mentioned, the prosimetrum manuscript of M is also in some respects quite similar to the prose recension in LL and Bd. The scribe follows the same organization as LL and Bd, containing a short summary with a few details on how Garman died. Afterwards, the scribe of M provides the countertale with the same phrasing yet adds more lines after the countertale: "Mac Bamha Leice luaidme in ri Cathair rosbaide Garmam a hainm tre bairdmem…"[336] These lines are not found in prosimetrum versions of 'Loch Garman,' since it is the first part of the single-stanza poem in the prose recension. It is very interesting that this verse is found here, since this section explains the countertale and not the main tale. However, there is a possibility that the scribe either knew of the poem or found it in a source and decided to place it wherever it could fit. There should not be a reason to have this stanza in this section since the entire metrical poem is found after this prose introduction; however, the scribe decided to include it either way. This similarity to the prose could be due to the scribes using the same sources, or that it was an attempt to preserve certain placelore over other aspects in the archive. Preservation of this material was crucial in order for it to be incorporated into the cultural identity and memory; however, what was preserved depended directly on the sources available to the scribe and his own preferences.

M, as well as one of the Stowe manuscripts,[337] have been referred to as one of the more peculiar manuscripts where the scribes have made many changes to the Dindshenchas entries. Another peculiarity of M is that it has a second entry on 'Loch Garman' later in the manuscript: "Loch nGarman cid dia ta. Ni handsa. Garman Glas mac Deaid roadnacht and ocus intan foclais aeat in ea souan bais an loch fotir and loch Gaman ocus i tasascbtha i leabair."[338] First of all, it is quite rare that a manuscript contains two placelore entries on the same placename. It is also

---

[335] Hermann, P. "Concepts of Memory and Approaches to the Past," 290.

[336] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 88 vb 65-67. Translated in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474, due to its similarities: "Boimm Lecce's son we announce / Catháir the king drowned him / Garmam was the name… through bardic poems."

[337] This manuscript has the official name of MS D ii 2 from the Royal Irish Academy.

[338] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 93 vb 23-25. Translated as "Loch Garman, whence is it? Easy to say. Garman Glas son of Dega was buried there, and when his grave…" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 429. The translation for this account in its entirety is unclear, besides what is written in the Rennes and Ballymote manuscipts. Furthermore, it does reference Garman's grave and the "lake into the earth."

a rare placement of this shorter account as it has no overt connection to the placelore surrounding it. Why would the scribe not include it in the original place since he included part of the single-stanza poem in his compilatory account of 'Loch Garman' earlier in his manuscript? However, this placement of the tale does hold water when comparing it to the order of placelore in BB and Rennes where 'Loch Garman' is featured right before 'Loch DaCáech,' which is the placement of this shorter prose in M. This short account contains additional information on the countertale that is different from what is mentioned in LL, Bd and earlier in M. However, if one looks to BB, part of this section is found in the introduction of 'Loch Garman:' "Garman Glas mac Dedaidh ro adnacht and hocus intan foclas afheart ocus is an meber in loch fotir,"[339] which occurs right before the Latin phrase mentioned earlier in this analysis. M is one of those manuscripts that serve as a bridge between the different recensions, showing that the manuscript might have been an attempt at bringing both recensions together.

The prose found in BB, which has the longest prose introduction out of them all, is the final text to be analysed. It reflects the norm of the prosimetrum entries of 'Loch Garman,' where M is the exception due to its similarities with the prose recension. In the case of BB, the countertale is mentioned before the main tale, which might have been the scribes' preference to get the countertale out of the way before focusing solely on the main tale. Due to the length of BB's introduction, there is a large amount of new content added to the entry when comparing it to the shorter prose in other manuscripts. The majority of content in the introduction is the same as in the metrical entry, which would make the prose written with the intention of cooperating with the metrical and providing both the prose and the poetry. Due to this, there is little to analyse about the content that has not already been stated; however, there are some peculiarities about the organization of the introduction.

First of all, right after the countertale, the introduction of the main tale starts with the same as the prose introduction of the prosimetrum entries: "Garmun Garb mac Boma Licce robaideadh andh la Cathair…"[340] Afterwards, it continues with more information about Garman, his eventual death, and the mention of Port Caelrenna. This port is mentioned in the metrical recension, but not in the prose recension entries. The scribe then begins the story of Slane and the druid's interpretation of Cathair's vision. This entire introduction is almost identical to the Rennes manuscript, strengthening the view that BB and Rennes are the most

---

[339] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 198 vb 26, 25, 27-29. Translated as "Loch Garman, whence is it? Easy to say. Garman Glas son of Dega was buried there, and when his grave was dug then the lake burst throughout the land" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 429.
[340] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 98 vb 31-32. Translated as "Garman, son of Boimm Lecce, was drowned therein by Cathair" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 474.

similar. However, one major peculiarity in BB's 'Loch Garman' is that towards the end of the introduction, the scribe starts the sentences using the beginning of stanzas from the metrical account, such as for example "Ise ín mac bai na broíndh .dccc. bliadan"[341] and "Is e ín cnocc mor osa cindh do donertsu os chach."[342] This provides evidence that the scribe could be deliberately attempting to make similarities between the prose introduction and the metrical stanzas. However, it would seem that it was the purpose of the scribe to be more specific in the summary of the entry and he possibly had the metrical stanzas in front of him to make it as similar as possible. It is possible that the scribe would write down as many details as possible in an attempt to extract the material from the archive and move it into continued preservation.

5.10 Concluding Remarks on the Analysis of 'Loch Garman'

'Loch Garman' is an excellent example of alterations occurring in Dindshenchas placelore, either intentionally or unintentionally committed by the scribes. The entries in the manuscripts provide the framework of the main tale about Garman mac Bomme Licce, the countertale of Garman Glas mac Dedaid and the accompanying tale of king Cathair's vision of Slane. The beginning of these entries starts with formulaic markers that vary in language and type, with little to no consistent order. It might be the case that the scribes were using different sources in writing their manuscript, perhaps it was their personal preference. The linguistic analysis shows that there were plenty of consonant and vowel confusion, as well as a change in preverbs, spelling of prepositions and the changing "inna" to "na." However, due to a preference for archaic spelling, there is not a clear divide between Old Irish, Middle Irish, and Early Modern Irish as they occasionally were muddled together. In the difference between prose and poetry, the scribes seemed to show more of a set standard when it comes to the poetry over the prose.

Most of the analysis focuses on the textual inconsistencies between the manuscripts where it was discovered that there are many different ways these alterations were made. Some of these are simply preferring different words or phrases with the same meaning, while other alterations are words and phrases being altered by changing the meaning. This could be due to using different sources for 'Loch Garman,' or the scribe choosing to change it on his own accord. There also seems to have been certain Christian influences being incorporated into

---

[341] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 12. Also found in Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 914. Translated as "This is the son who was in her womb for eight hundred years" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 431.

[342] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 199 ra 16-17. Also found in Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 914. Translated as "This is the great hill above their heads, thy power over all" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 431.

'Loch Garman' with the usage of "talam" and "creitem," which are terms generally used in Christian contexts. There were also larger alterations such as stanzas being added or omitted; however, this did not fully alter the tale as the content was not significantly altered by it. Between the prose and metrical/prosimetrum, there is also information added about the vision about Slane. It also seems that the prose entries were created as a summary of the prosimetrum, and aspects from the recensions cross into each other. This creates the possibility that scribes perhaps had a large number of sources for each tale, and either wrote down everything or picked what they wanted to include to fit their intended purpose. Alterations were bound to occur in the reworking and preservation of this material due to the scribal process. Items were pulled out of archive and returned to the archive in order to create some sort of a collection. 'Loch Garman' includes a lot of textual inconsistencies, but one can still see where content or information has been preserved across time, scribes and manuscripts.

Chapter Three:
Analysis of 'Lia Nothain'

6.1 Summary of 'Lia Nothain'

The Dindshenchas entry of 'Lia Nothain' revolves around an old woman from Connacht, named Nothain, who had never seen a field in her life. She is brought by a family member, either her father or her sister, to a field at the end of her life and passes away on this field, either unexplainably or self-inflicted. However, there are two points in the plot where the different manuscripts diverge. The first point of divergence concerns the family members, who in some manuscripts is her father and, in the others, it is her sister and brother-in-law. The second point of divergence concerns her death which in some accounts occurs when she plants a rock on the field and strikes her head against it. In the other, she instructs her father to plant a rock as her headstone and the circumstance of her exact death is more unclear.[343] In the metrical stanzas of 'Lia Nothain,' it is added that her father searched for her and that everyone she knows is dead. The field she encounters is named Mag nÁrach, and death seizes her with a rock or headstone depending on which account. There are also hints in the prose recension of connections to the legend of "Cailleach Berre," concerning Nothain's sister Sentuinne.[344]

6.2 Linguistic Markers in 'Lia Nothain'

As previously mentioned, a frequent genre trait of the Dindshenchas tradition is the usage of linguistic markers[345] introducing the placelore. Similarily to other entries, 'Lia Nothain' has varying linguistic markers in the different manuscripts. However, upon analysing them it is clear that they do not vary as much as 'Loch Garman,' and that all entries of 'Lia Nothain' contain the phrase "ni handsa."[346] LL has in its prose account generally more Latin linguistic markers than other manuscripts and starts 'Lia Nothain' with "unde nominatur."[347] However, in Bd, M and BB, the scribes seem to prefer "canas rohainmnigedh,"[348] and for the most part uses the abbreviation "canasro" with a nasal stroke above it. This supports Ó Concheanainn's argument that the prose recension originated from the prosimetrum recension as they tended at

---

[343] These inconsistencies will be discussed later in this analysis in more detail.
[344] The connections to this legend will be discussed later in this analysis.
[345] For further information on the linguistic markers see the Loch Garman analysis in section 5.2.
[346] Translated previously as "not difficult" in the *Loch Garman*-section.
[347] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 3: 746.
[348] For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 va 53. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 19. Translated as "how was it named?" in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish," 55.

times to follow the same linguistic markers. Based on Ó Concheanainn's arguments, the metrical recension also originated from the prosimetrum recension; however, it seems that the scribe of LL preferred using the Latin phrases over the Irish. This is just one example of the usage of linguistic markers and cannot count for the entire tradition as further research needs to be done in order to make a substantial statement about the corpus.

Something special about 'Lia Nothain' is that there are two single-stanza poems in the entry, instead of only one. Therefore, the prose recension manuscripts of LL and Bd include two linguistic markers for introducing the single-stanza poems. In this case, LL continues with Latin markers and uses "unde poeta."[349] This is not surprising, but what is surprising is the case of Bd where the first single-stanza poem is introduced with "unde poeta dixit"[350] and the second single stanza with "unde Lia Nothain."[351] It is interesting to see a manuscript using two different linguistic markers, and it provides a sense of variation in the genre. Due to this example, there is a possibility that there were separate genre markers for the prose and the poetry. It has been stated by several scholars that verse has an evidential and corroborative function in prosimetrum texts,[352] thereby showing the need for having verse in the text. Furthermore, it is significant that the scribe uses different markers for prose and poetry, one example occurs in the first single-stanza where the linguistic marker connects the stanza to the poet more than in the second in-text linguistic marker. This would perhaps be the case since the stanza does not describe Nothain herself but puts an emphasis on her sister Sentuinne. It is possible that the scribe located a stanza describing this character and included it into the placelore of 'Lia Nothain' or that he felt it necessary to separate the stanzas from each other by choosing different linguistic markers. Since it does not describe the main character, it is more likely it was embedded into the tradition by a scribe at some point. Therefore, the scribe uses this linguistic marker to mark this stanza as belonging to the poet instead of directly mentioning Nothain.

In the next single-stanza, the Bd scribe uses "unde lia nothain,"[353] which could have been an attempt at altering the linguistic marker in order to separate the two single-stanzas from each other. It was a regular feature of Irish scribes to add and alter elements of the manuscript texts: "Originality is, after all, a scarce commodity and it is easier to recycle old material, put it

---

[349] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 3: 746.
[350] Translated as "hence said the poet" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504.
[351] Translated as "whence Lia Nothain" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504.
[352] Mentioned in Mac Cana, P. "Notes on the Combination," 138, and Toner, G. "Authority, Verse and the Transmission of Senchas," 60.
[353] Translated as "Whence Lia Nothain" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 505.

to new uses and new purposes, than to invent afresh."[354] Therefore, it is possible that elements were gathered into the tradition from older material or knowledge. As previously mentioned, there is "often a discrepancy in date between the prose and the poetry, with the poetry commonly being older than the prose."[355] With this in mind, it is evident that the usage of these linguistic markers might be based upon what it was introducing. However, it should be mentioned that, as opposed to Bd, LL uses "unde poeta" in both single-stanzas, which might be an attempt at adhering to the scribe's system in spite of previous traditions, in an attempt to make both single-stanzas have identical markers. It could be that the scribe of Bd either used earlier material with extra information that the scribe of LL did not have access to, or that the scribes had different prioritization in the creation of their manuscripts. However, it is difficult to make substantial arguments when only analysing a few Dindshenchas entries, when it would be necessary to analyse the tradition itself to get a complete perspective.

When it comes to 'Lia Nothain' in M and BB from the prosimetrum recension, both of these include a linguistic marker prior to the metrical stanzas. In BB the scribe uses "unde lia nothain nonitur," which is a rare phrasing of a linguistic marker.[356] Meanwhile, the scribe of M prefers "unde Lia Notain dicitur."[357] In his article, Ruairí Ó hUiginn discusses that the linguistic marker found in M is frequently used for ending entries.[358] By using these linguistic markers, the text provides a connection between the recensions and the possible assumption that the scribes used the same linguistic markers in their manuscripts. It also illustrates the assumption from scholars, such as Murray,[359] that these were genre markers to the Dindshenchas that were preserved through the recensions and manuscripts. Latin was frequently used in Irish manuscripts, and the preservation of the Latin version of the linguistic marker by the scribes further illustrates this. Furthermore, it serves as a way of preserving the material and preventing it from ending up in an archive and being forgotten. Through this, the markers become a trademark of this corpus and become the texts discussed by Ann Rigney, which "can be reprinted time and time again in new editions even as the environment around them changes."[360] Thereby, the linguistic markers remain despite of other elements changing around them.

---

[354] Ó Corráin, Donnchadh. "Historical Need and Literary Narrative." *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Celtic Studies, held at Oxford from 10th to 15th July 1983,* ed. D. E. Evans et. al. (Oxford: International Congress of Celtic Studies, 1986): 143.

[355] Murray, K. "The Reworking of Old Irish Narrative Texts," 299.

[356] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 30. In the manuscript it could be a scribal error and the scribe meant to write dicitur.

[357] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 va 63.

[358] Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish," 57-58.

[359] Discussed further in Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 13-14.

[360] Rigney, A. "The Dynamics of Remembrance," 349.

6.3 Changes in the Language of 'Lia Nothain'

In order to understand the linguistic alterations, it is necessary to examine the language of 'Lia Nothain' and there are many linguistic changes visible in the manuscripts of 'Lia Nothain.'[361] Firstly, the linguistic changes in the prose recension of 'Lia Nothain' in LL and Bd will be analysed as well as the prose introductions of the prosimetrum entries of M and BB. Secondly, the language of the stanzas of the metrical recension and prosimetrum recension will be analysed for the entries in LL, M and BB. As previously mentioned in the section on scholarly dating, LL has been dated to the late twelfth century to early thirteenth century, while both M, BB and Bd are dated to around 1400.[362] However, even though these manuscripts are from around the same time there are still changes between them and especially when comparing them to LL, which was written earlier.

Similarly to the alterations visible in 'Loch Garman,' the 'Lia Nothain' of LL and Bd contains the change from *e* to *ea*, which is visible in LL with "caillech"[363] and in Bd with "cailleach."[364] Another frequent alteration is the vowel confusion of "o" and "a" with the word "srofais"[365] in LL and in Bd with "srafaiss"[366] in Bd. The change of "e" to "ea" is visible in manuscripts after LL, which includes the most Old Irish tendencies out of all the manuscripts. Therefore, the other manuscripts seem to include more Middle and Modern Irish tendencies. The vowel confusion seems to occur without any set system and can show the varied usage in manuscripts. Finally, there are also larger changes to the verbal system visible in 'Lia Nothain.' For example, in LL, the scribe uses the verbs "genair" and "clannais"[367] while the scribe of Bd uses the verbal particle "ro" to create the verbs "rogeinir" and "roclann."[368] This is an example of frequent alterations to the verbal system in manuscripts such as this. Apart from these linguistic changes, there are limited changes between LL and Bd for 'Lia Nothain.' This could be due to the prose recension being a result of the prosimetrum recension and the scribes were working off the same material with few changes. There is also a possibility that directly copying the text exactly as written was prioritized, rather than updating to a newer language.

In BB and M, the linguistic changes in the prose introduction of the prosimetrum entries are more visible than in the prose recension, and some of these changes is the vowel and

---

[361] For more information on the background of changes to the Irish language, see section 5.4.
[362] For further information on the dating of manuscripts, see section 4.2.
[363] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 3: 746.
[364] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504.
[365] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 3: 746.
[366] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504.
[367] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 3: 746.
[368] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504.

consonant confusion. This confusion can also be referred to as a general indifference to vowels and consonants, illustrating the variety and complexity of Irish spelling and the pronunciation system. The consonant confusion may be illustrated in this case by the change of "thuc," "indat," and "druin" in M[369] into "tug," "indad," and "druim" in BB.[370] Here the confusions could be due to the consonants being similar in pronunciation, or the scribes working from material using different spelling conventions. The occurrence of the consonant confusion is consistently affecting most of the consonants throughout 'Lia Nothain,' while the vowel confusion is mostly restricted to "e," "i," and "a" in 'Lia Nothain.' In M, examples of the words with vowel confusion are written as "dan," "ndaine," and "leatsu,"[371] while in BB they are written as "din," "ndaini," and "latsu."[372] However, this is not a major alteration and could be due to a scribal error or a certain preference by the scribes. As previously mentioned, the verbs were affected by the linguistic changes, which is evident through the prose introduction of M's 'Lia Nothain' in the verb "domheilead," which was changed to "nomeiled" in BB.[373] This shows the changes and confusion in verbal particles that occur in this time period, and also that preverbs were altered even in between manuscripts written around the same time.[374]

While there were plenty of linguistic changes in 'Lia Nothain,' most of them are found in the metrical stanzas between LL, M, and BB. BB tends to be quite similar to LL for the most part, as opposed to M that normally deviates. However, it is important to keep in mind that with every rule there is an exception, and there are deviations from this shown in 'Lia Nothain' even if it does not happen that often. There is clear evidence of vowel confusion, for example in the change from "e" to "ea" such as "mmoringen" in LL, "moringean" in M, and "moiringhean" in BB.[375] LL tends to contain more Old Irish tendencies; therefore, it is understandable that both M and BB adopted a newer spelling method. There is an interesting example in 'Lia Nothain' where the scribe of LL wrote "nerbullech," while the scribe of BB wrote "nertbuilleach" and the scribe of M wrote "neartbuilleach."[376] While BB only changes "e" to "ea" in the final part of the word, the scribe of M changed "e" to "ea" in both places. This is interesting because it shows the scribe seeming selective about where to change the spelling of words and where to

---

[369] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 va 54, 58, 60.
[370] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 21, 25-26, 27.
[371] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 va 59, 61.
[372] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 26, 28-29.
[373] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 va 55. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 22.
[374] For more information on the changes in verbal particles, see section 5.4.
[375] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1054. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 20. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 51.
[376] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 1053. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 33. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 3.

refrain. The vowel confusion is further evident in the second stanza with the word "prainne" in LL, which is written the same in BB; however, in M it is written as "proindi."[377] Such an example provides evidence that BB is similar to LL in the spelling, perhaps because the metrical recension is argued by scholars to originate from an earlier version of the current prosimetrum recension. Due to this, it is highly likely that both manuscripts originate from the same source manuscript. M is part of the prosimetrum recension, but the scribe seems to make several alterations from the other prosimetrum manuscripts. However, the similarities between BB and LL is not always prevalent, such as in the word "saire" in LL, "sairi" in M, and "saeri" in BB,[378] which provides examples of the vowel confusion.

There are many occurrences of consonant confusion as well, and while these are not major linguistic changes, it illustrates how the scribes treated the language in the Dindshenchas entries. One may also consider whether or not the scribes of the newer manuscripts followed the Old Irish language or if they used the newer linguistic methods. In the analysis of 'Loch Garman,' it was evident that BB often agreed with LL, and in 'Lia Nothain,' there are cases of consonant confusion where BB agrees with LL while M deviates from them. One example of this occurs in stanza 12 where the scribes of LL and BB write "tiagsa" and "tiaghsa" respectively, while the scribe of M writes "tiadsa."[379] Another example occurs in stanza 13 where the scribe of LL and BB write "sceol" while the scribe of M writes "sgel,"[380] showing the division between LL and BB as identical, while the scribe of M alters the spelling.

There are also cases where M and BB agree in changing the consonants against the writing in LL. For example, in stanza four the scribe of LL writes "tuc," while the scribes of M and BB writes "tug."[381] This could have been due to the linguistic changes, which would be visible in these two manuscripts, while in LL these might not have been properly included yet. There was also an overhaul of the verbal system during this time period, and one part of this were the changes done to preverbal particles.[382] This is evident in stanza five where the scribes

---

[377] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1053. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 35. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 5.

[378] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 1053. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 46. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 14.

[379] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 1054. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 va 5. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 24.

[380] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 1054. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 va 7. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 26.

[381] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 1053. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 39. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 9.

[382] More information on this can be found in section 5.4.

of LL and BB wrote "co fuair," while the scribe of M wrote "da fhuair."[383] *Do* became an increasingly used preverbal particle, and this is shown in M, while the scribe of BB preserved the same particles found in LL. These linguistic changes are not major alterations to the material and do not drastically change 'Lia Nothain;' however, it does show that alterations were made to this Dindshenchas entry. Furthermore, it may provide indications at linguistic changes occurring in the corpus overall.

6.4 Differentiating Prose and Poetry in 'Lia Nothain'

In examples such as 'Lia Nothain,' the scribes use both prose and poetry to convey the placelore. In order to get a more complete view of the scribes' treatment of the material in the entry, it is important to analyse how the poetry and prose is perceived across the selected manuscripts. One way of carrying out this analysis is by examining the manuscript facsimiles in order to examine the scribe's visual decisions, and the first to be considered is BB. In the entry, there is a physical separation in the layout of the prose and the poetry. The prose introduction is written with little punctuation or separation between the lines, while the metrical stanzas are separated with the first word of each stanza having a larger capital letter. These capital letters are placed primarily at the beginning of a manuscript line in all cases except for the tenth stanza. The tenth stanza, beginning with "And sin adbert,"[384] is placed mid-way through the bottom line of the manuscript instead of on its own line. This decision by the scribe is interesting, because it deviates from the cleaner setup. It is especially odd due to the fact that if the scribe had started it at the beginning of a line, it would be the first line of the next manuscript page instead of having the next manuscript page start mid-stanza. However, it could have been done to save space and in an attempt to make the rows on the manuscript page appear as square as possible.

Meanwhile, in M the capital letters of the metrical stanzas each begin on a new line and there is also a continued use of "ceann faoi eite" in order to fill up the manuscript lines. Furthermore, the scribe of M writes the prose introduction similarly to BB; however, since the first row of the manuscript page ends with the prose introduction, the scribe uses swirls to fill up the line in order to begin stanzas in the next row of the manuscript page. This could have been a deliberate decision in order to separate the prose introduction and stanzas further, or it could have been the scribe attempting to make the manuscript look tidier. The LL facsimile in

---

[383] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1053. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 41. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 11.
[384] Book of Ballymote facsimile fol 220 rb 51 in *ISOS – Irish Script on Screen*: https://www.isos.dias.ie/english/index.html.

the metrical recension section for 'Lia Nothain' is quite blurred and smudged, and it is difficult to make out the details, yet it seems to follow the same norm as BB and M.

It is also important to analyse the differences between prose and poetry in the prose manuscripts of LL and Bd. As previously mentioned, 'Lia Nothain' stands out in that it includes two single-stanza poems instead of one. These two single-stanza poems are preceded by a "phi"[385] in LL, a feature frequently found in this manuscript as well as other manuscripts and is intended to mark out verse. However, while these stanzas are marked with this symbol and a larger capital letter, it does not follow suit with the prosimetrum/metrical manuscripts. The scribe does not place it at the start of a line, and instead starts the first stanza in the middle of a line. The second stanza begins at the beginning of a line, and the linguistic marker occurs at the end of the preceding line. Bd does the exact same as LL and places the first stanza in the middle of a sentence and the second at the start of a line, yet it does not include the "phi"-marker. This would strongly suggest, due to these similaries, that the scribes of these manuscripts were working from the same material, and perhaps even from the same manuscript.[386]

When analysing the alterations in the prose and poetry, it is possible to analyse whether one has been altered more than the other in 'Lia Nothain.' In the prose recension entries of LL and Bd, there are no alterations made to the two single-stanza poems between the two manuscripts. However, in the prose surrounding them there were alterations and details added to the prose prior to the stanzas. This could signify that the poetry was preserved more accurately, while the scribes were freer to add and alter the prose as they pleased. There were stricter rules to the poetry, especially also since there was a "preference for verse as a general medium"[387] by the authors and scribes of this time period. When analysing the prosimetrum recension, it is interesting to find that the prose introductions were not altered between M and BB at all, and there were only slight linguistic alterations to the text. In the metrical stanzas of 'Lia Nothain,' found in LL, M, and BB, there were alterations made to the stanzas in the form of shorter phrases or lines. There is a religious addition added at the end of 'Lia Nothain;' however, this was a regular trait for a group of specific Dindshenchas entries.

All in all, it is clear that it seems to have been up to the scribe if he wanted to preserve the prose and poetry or make alterations, and it often occurred that elements would be dropped

---

[385] "Phi." *Tionscadal na Nod, CODECS Vanhamel*: https://www.vanhamel.nl/codecs/Phi_(critical_sign). Accessed 15.01.21.

[386] In order to verify this as an argument for the Dindshenchas as a whole, one would need to examine a larger part of the corpus. However, this is outside the scope of this thesis.

[387] Knott, Eleanor. *Irish Classical Poetry: Commonly Called Bardic Poetry.* (Dublin: Cultural Relations Committee of Ireland, 1957): 15.

in early manuscripts yet reintroduced in later manuscripts.[388] It is possible that the single-stanza poems were copied more accurately than the longer poems, perhaps because those were shorter and easier to get written down correctly. By examining the prose and poetry in 'Lia Nothain,' it is clear that certain changes were made by the scribes, and we can see how that affected the preservation of the material. Some of the material might have been taken out of the memory studies archive and put into the placelore to be further preserved for the next generations. However, this is only possible due to the fact that archival memory "constitutes a virtual storehouse of information about the past that may or may not be used as a source for remembrance."[389] Dindshenchas entries such as 'Lia Nothain' might have had such elements stored in the storehouse until the scribes felt it necessary to include them in their manuscript.

6.5 Textual Inconsistencies in 'Lia Nothain'

In 'Lia Nothain,' there are both minor and major textual inconsistencies, and these will both need to be analysed in order to make a complete view of the scribes' treatment of the 'Lia Nothain'-material. The prose entries in LL and Bd will be examined first, and there are definite changes between these two manuscripts of the prose recension. Between the two single-stanza poems in 'Lia Nothain,' the scribes have avoided making alterations to the stanzas, limiting the changes to the prose directly before to the stanzas. Prior to the first single-stanza, the scribe of LL writes "Sentuinne dano atacomnaicside 7 Seisss Srafais ainnm a fir,"[390] while the scribe of Bd writes "Sentuinde a hainm, Sess Srafais a fer .i. Senbachlach ainm ele dó."[391] LL seems to place more importance on repeating that Sentuinne meets Nothain and includes an infixed pronoun class B "-a" after the prefix "ad-," meaning that Sentuinne met her specifically. However, in Bd the scribe did not use "atacomnaicside," and instead puts importance on the names of Nothain's sister and brother-in-law. The scribe of Bd also includes an alternative name for the brother-in-law, which does not exist in the prose of LL, only in the single-stanza poem. The necessity of such an emphasis on the brother-in-law is interesting, since these names are not mentioned in the prosimetrum recension.

In a footnote of his Bd edition, Stokes mentions that "the former of the two quatrains is cited in Cormac's Glossary," showing that this poem was not created for 'Lia Nothain,' and

---

[388] Bowen, C. "A Historical Inventory," 118.

[389] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation," 17.

[390] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 746. My own translation: "Sentuinne then encounters (her/the person just mentioned) and Seiss Srafaiss was her husband's name." Atacomnaicside from the particle at + infixed pronoun and comnaic coming from "Comrac." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/11625. Accessed on 21.01.21. Suide comes from "Suide." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/39195. Accessed on 21.01.21.

[391] Translated as "Sentuinne ("Old Woman") was her name: her husband was Seiss Srafais, and Senbachlach ("Old-Churl") was another name for him" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnsenchas," 504.

existed prior to the writing of Bd. It is evidently created much earlier, especially since *Sanas Cormaic* has been ascribed to Cormac mac Cuilennáin who died in 908.[392] Prior to the second single-stanza poem in 'Lia Nothain,' there is additional information added to Bd, which is absent from LL. In LL the end of this paragraph states: "…7 clannais liic and sin i talmain 7 benais a cend fria combo marb"[393] which provides a short, straightforward description of her death. However, in Bd, the scribe has written: "7 roclann liic annsin hi talmuin, 7 benais a cenn fria conattuil imm 7 ba marb. Bid sim o ecnairc lasa muinntir asberim foclannaim do raith mo anma."[394] Whitley Stokes points out in a footnote that there is a blank space between "imm" and "7 ba marb," hinting that there could at one point have been even more details in the original sources. This excerpt from Bd includes a dialogue supposedly from Nothain herself and which might provide a secure way for Nothain to be remembered after her death.

This information added to 'Lia Nothain' is not crucial information; however, it does illustrate an intention from the scribe to provide more than a simple description of this stone in the field. The different description illustrates a possible attempt at preserving another version of the tale that had perhaps existed in the archive, or that resurfaced later. It is also possible that it was an attempt to alter the tale in order to make the character of Nothain more deliberate in bringing about her own death. In cases like these, it is difficult to understand the history of such entries due to the alterations. Therefore, it might be helpful to look to theories, such as memory theory which "undertakes to explore how people imagine the past not how the past actually happened."[395] This in turn has connections to the Dindshenchas entries in the sense that these entries are the preserved versions of the scribes' impression of the placelore. That is not to say that they have not preserved the entries accurately, but that they had the opportunity to influence the material as much or as little as they desired. In this process, the scribes would also be affected by the social environment surrounding them,[396] which in turn cause unknown consequences to the corpus.

Surprisingly, there are no textual inconsistencies found in the introduction of the prosimetrum recension in M and BB. It is possible that the scribes were working from older material and therefore made quite few alterations. However, when comparing M and BB to LL

---

[392] "Sanas Cormaic." *Oxford Reference. Oxford University Press*. Dictionary Entry: https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100439797. Accessed 20.01.21.
[393] Translated as "and she planted a stone there in the earth and struck her head against it until she was dead" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnsenchas," 504-505.
[394] Translated as "and she planted a stone there in the ground, and struck her head against it and... and was dead. "It will be my requiem ... I plant it for the sake of my name" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnsenchas," 504-505.
[395] Confino, A. "Memory and the History of Mentalities," 80.
[396] Halbwachs, M. *On Collective Memory*, 49.

and Bd, it is evident that there is one major alteration between the prose and prosimetrum recensions. In LL and Bd, Nothain is meeting her sister Sentuinne and brother-in-law Senbachlach, whereas, in M and BB it is her father Conmaer who meets her: "Notan ingen conmaer docnnachtaib robai os gach dubthair diaraile tri .l. bliadan… Luid din a hathair a crich berre do iarraid a ingine."[397] There is no mention of any other relatives being alive at this stage in the entry of M or BB; however, it is not immediately apparent why this divergence occurred. One possible answer for the emphasis on Sentuinne in the prose recension is the connection to another well-known character in Irish literary tradition: the Caillech Bérri. She is the speaker of the Old Irish poem "The Lament of the Old Woman of Beare," written in Old Irish around 900, but "there is no consensus, however, either on the exact dating, author or meaning of the poem."[398] Even though Nothain herself is described as a "caillech," it is Sentuinne who is at the focus of the present comparison due to her name, where she is from and her description as being an old woman.

The word "caillech" is "a derivative in -ach of Irish caille, borrowed from the Latin word pallium 'veil.'"[399] This term has been understood as 'old married woman,' 'uncivilised, threatening supernatural figure;' and 'nun' in various sources.[400] There was at a point in time a change from Sentainne Berri to Caillech Berri in the legend's tradition, which "doubtless first occurred colloquially among the illiterate. When it had firmly established itself, the learned may have invented the legend that the Old Woman of Beare became a nun."[401] The legend of the Caillech Berri seems to have been well-known throughout the early Irish literary tradition and survived into modern Irish folklore, which Proinsias Mac Cana has pointed out.[402] The connection between this and Sentuinne in 'Lia Nothain' might have been a reason why Nothain's sister was preserved here. It is strengthened not only by her name, but also the fact that Sentuinne and Senbachlach travelled from Berre to Nothain in the placelore entry.[403] This

---

[397] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 20, 19, 21, 22-23. Translated as "Nothain, Commaer's daughter, of Connaught, was wandering for thrice fifty years… So her father fared forth of the district of Berre to seek his daughter" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 37. This translation is used due to the similarities between R and BB.

[398] Ritari, Katja. "Images of Ageing in the Early Irish Poem Caillech Berri." *Studia Celtica Fennica* 3. (Finland: Finnish Society for Celtic Studies, 2006): 57.

[399] Ní Dhonnchadha, Máirín. "*Caillech* and Other Terms for Veiled Women in Medieval Irish Texts." *Éigse: A Journal of Irish Studies* 28, ed. P. A. Breatnach. (Dublin: The National University of Ireland, 1994-5): 71.

[400] Ní Dhonnchadha, M. "*Caillech* and Other Terms," 94. It has also previously been translated in this thesis as "old woman".

[401] Ó Crualaoich, Gearóid. "Continuity and Adaptation in Legends of Cailleach Bhéarra." *Béaloideas* 56, ed. P. Ó Héalaí. (Dublin: An Cumann Le Béaloideas Éireann, 1988): 159.

[402] Ó Crualaoich, G. "Continuity and Adaptation," 153.

[403] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnsenchas," 504.

could of course simply be a coincidence, but it might also be a possible solution to the preservation of this countertale of 'Lia Nothain.'

Compared to 'Loch Garman,' there are not nearly as many alterations to the material in the metrical stanzas found in 'Lia Nothain' of LL, M and BB. This could be due to 'Lia Nothain' being shorter, or that it was perhaps not deemed as necessary to alter the content of this Dindshenchas entry. However, there are four specific examples from these stanzas that will be analysed here. The first example comes from stanza five where the third line in LL is written as "dond fir diarb áil a déicsin."[404] The scribe of BB has written the line almost identically: "don fhiur diarf ail a decsin,"[405] with the only changes being an "f" instead of a "b" and the lack of an "i" in the final word. However, in M, the scribe writes "anuair rob ail a deiscin"[406] which is quite similar to BB and LL and deals with Conmaer's desire to see his daughter. The scribe introduces the word "anuair"[407] as a way of specifying the time Conmaer located Nothain.

This scribe also writes the remainder of the sentence differently by using the particle "rob" instead of "diarb." It does not affect the plotline of the legend; however, it does show that the scribe was probably either working from other material or that he rewrote the line. The second example occurs in the next stanza where the scribe of BB wrote "ar scis oca scelbhaile;"[408] however, the scribe of LL altered the sentence to "ar scis a comasib gaile,"[409] providing a different emphasis than what is visible in BB. The scribe of LL seems to provide further background on Conmaer, Nothain's father, and his ability with the spear by using "gaile," deriving from the noun "gae."[410] He has previously in the stanzas been described as "cen gnim nguil inna gormdail ngabulduib,"[411] which emphasizes him being or having been a type of warrior. This phrasing is quite different from M, which is almost identical to BB: "an sgis aga sgelbhaile,"[412] but with some consonant confusion such as writing "aga sgelbhaile"

---

[404] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1053. Translated as "to the man who longed to see her" in Gwynn, E. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 27.

[405] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 40, 42.

[406] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 10. My own translation: "(at) the evil hour be desiring to see her." "Áil." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/959. Accessed 07.01.21. "Déicsiu." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/15143. Accessed on 07.01.21.

[407] Translated as "the evil/witching hour" in "Anuar." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/3832. Accessed on 07.01.21.

[408] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 44. Translated as "forspent at their parleying" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 26.

[409] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1053. My own translation: "on account of his ability (of the) spear" Comasib comes from "Commus." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/11534. Accessed on 07.01.21.

[410] Translated as "(of the) spear" in "Gae." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/25080. Accessed on 07.01.21.

[411] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1053. Translated as "doer of deeds unlamented, that blue-clad dark-forked terror" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 27.

[412] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 14.

instead of BB's "oca scelbhaile." Although this is not an example of a major alteration, it shows the consonant confusion frequenting such Dindshenchas entries.

A third example is found in stanza eleven where the scribe of LL wrote "ui. bliadna bágid"[413] in the beginning of the stanza while the scribe of BB has written "tri .l. bliadain baighidh"[414] and the scribe of M "tri .l. bliadan baidhidh."[415] There is a vast difference between walking around for six years or 150 years, and the entry mentions that Nothain has been walking for a long time. Therefore, it is possible that the scribe of LL made an error or that he was working from a completely different version of 'Lia Nothain.' Unfortunately, this section in the LL facsimile is quite difficult to read and one needs to consult Best and Bergin's edition of LL, which mentions the shorter time span. The fourth and final example occurs in the thirteenth stanza where the scribe of LL wrote "in ben co ndoirche nár duail,"[416] while the scribe of BB wrote "in ben co ndoisci nar duail."[417] The main difference between these two manuscripts is BB's "ndoisci" versus LL's "ndoirche."[418] However, when compared to M, the scribe of BB has made further alterations to the line: "an bean co toirthi monuair"[419] which uses another phrase in "co toirthi" and the interjection "monuair,"[420] changing the meaning of the line slightly. However, while there are alterations, it does not affect the main plot, but it illustrates the small changes that were periodically done to the Dindshenchas corpus.

Furthermore, it is necessary to analyse the stanza added to BB after the other manuscrpts end the 'Lia Nothain'-entry: "Nomsaer ar imnedh ar olc a ri fingeal firedrocht nirbam truagh sin dail tall tra iar luagh chaich ata sunna."[421] Similarly to the addition in 'Loch Garman,' this is a religious stanza that provides an obvious Christian connection to the Dindshenchas entry. The addition in 'Lia Nothain' includes the phrase "a rí fingeal firedrocht,"[422] which could only

---

[413] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1054. Translated as "six years, tell it forth" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 4: 29.

[414] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 va 3. Translated as "Thrice fifty years, tell it forth!" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 4: 29.

[415] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 23. The *d* in baidhidh is likely a consonant confusion or a spelling error.

[416] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1054. Translated as "the woman lies, in darkness undeserved" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 31.

[417] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 va 6+8.

[418] Doirche comes from "Dorchae." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/18304. Accessed on 15.01.21. I have been unable to find a translation for "doisci."

[419] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 102 vb 25, 27. My own translation: "the woman is sleeping, alas".

[420] Toirthi from "Tairthím." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/39816. Accessed on 15.01.21 or "Toirchim." *Teanglann*. Dictionary Entry: https://www.teanglann.ie/en/fgb/toirchim. Accessed on 15.01.21. Monuair is the interjection "woe/alas" used in "Monuar." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/32544. Accessed on 15.01.21.

[421] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 va 11-13. Translated as "Save me from sorrow and suffering, O King whitely fair, truly radiant! let me not be sorrowful in yon session hereafter when I have praised every one that is here!" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 31.

[422] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 va 11. Translated as "O king whitely fair, truly radiant" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 31.

be directed at God and would not be used for describing a human king. These types of phrases are frequently found in these religious additions of the Dindshenchas, especially the ones including the word "rí."[423] There is little usage otherwise in the stanzas of overtly Christian phrases, placing more emphasis on Nothain herself.

Besides the alterations to specific lines of the stanzas, I will further examine two scribal alterations to the 'Lia Nothain' material that seem to serve as representatives for deviating traditions within the Dindshenchas corpus. The first concerns the remaining relative of Nothain who are mentioned in the entry, where the only remaining relative of Nothain in the metrical and prosimetrum recension is her father Conmaer. Conmaer even states in one of the stanzas that "Ina facca thiar 'cot tig… dot chairdib, ni mair dib i tresse treb acht messe, a móir-ingen."[424] Therefore, there is no mention in M, BB, or LL about anyone else being alive, since that is one of the reasons for why she decides she wants to die. However, in the prose recension in LL and Bd, Nothain is instead met by her sister Sentuinne and Sentuinne's husband Senbachlach/Seiss Srafais. Yet, the question remains: if all other relatives were dead according to the prosimetrum recension, how can the sister and brother-in-law be alive in the prose recension? Most likely there was an alternate version of 'Lia Nothain,' included in LL and Bd. While Conmaer is mentioned in Bd and LL in the single-stanza poem, there is no mention of Sentuinne or her husband in the prosimetrum/metrical recension.

The other major alteration to 'Lia Nothain' concerns the manner of Nothain's death. In the metrical/prosimetrum of BB, M, and LL, her death is perceived as more of a passive act due to Nothain stating in a stanza towards the end: "Tiagsa ibarach latt immach / i mMag nArach n-ilchrothach / ni fail m'áige ni bas sía / coro saidea mo laechlia"[425] The phrasing is peculiar and provides similarities to other old characters in Irish literary tradition such as Fintan mac Bóchra in *Suidigud Tellaig Temra*. In this tale, Fintan provides all his knowledge to king Diarmait mac Cerball and the Uí Neill before he dies of old age: "Is mé intan, am beó búan / is am seanchaidh sen saerslúag / nirotimart gáes ná gním glé / co romteacht áes is críne."[426] While there are only slight connections between Nothain and Fintan, it shows an example of a

---

[423] Ó Concheanainn, T. "A Pious Redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn," 87 and 90.

[424] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1054. Translated as "Of all thy friends… none is left in their strong habitations but myself, tall daughter mine!" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 4: 29.

[425] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1054. Translated as "Let me go with thee to-morrow to Mag nÁrach, variously beautiful, - my span of life lasts no longer – till thou set up my warrior-stone" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 4: 29.

[426] Best, R. I. "The Settling of the Manor of Tara." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 4, ed. K. Meyer and O. Bergin. (Dublin: School of Irish Learning, 1910): 160. Translated by Best: "I am Fintan, I have lived long / I am an ancient shanachie of the noble hosts / Neither wisdom nor brilliant deeds repressed me / until age came upon me and decay."

character dying of old age after outliving most of his family. In the next stanza of 'Lia Nothain,' it is stated that "Rosfuc bás, nír bét co mblaid,"[427] which makes her death a passive act with her life passing quickly. It is interesting that the entry mentions it not being a deed of glory, despite of Nothain describing her gravestone as a "mo laechlia"[428] in the previous stanza. By describing her gravestone in this way, it provides hints that she could have had a connection to the warrior-culture, or it may provide references to her father's possible status as a warrior.

In the prose introductions to the prosimetrum recension, her death is not even properly explained, the scribe only mentions that: "Tiaghsa latsu imarach ar in mag cor saidi mo lia ocus coro claidh mo fheart."[429] The task of digging her grave falls to her father, perhaps that is why he is featured to such an extent in the stanzas of 'Lia Nothain.' In a sense, it is almost as if Conmaer has a larger part in her death than she does, similarly to 'Loch Garman' where the other characters take up more space than Garman himself. However, this is quite different from the description in the prose recension of 'Lia Nothain' in LL and Bd. In this case, Nothain has a far more active role in her own death. In LL and Bd, the focus is more on her desire to see a plain since she has not seen one before: "O'tcondarc sí in mag more uaidhi rofeimdes uaidi dul arculu, 7 roclann liic annsin hi talmuin, 7 benais a cenn fria conattuil imm 7 ba marb."[430] Since she planted the stone herself and struck her own head against the stone, it becomes a more active act. In the next single-stanza poem, Nothain is described as "is i fo(f)huair in ardlicc,"[431] which again puts the majority of the focus on Nothain playing an active role. The differences between these two versions provide varying details surrounding her death, and while she dies in both, it provides deviating accounts of 'Lia Nothain.' The preservation is quite interesting, and perhaps it was up to the scribes themselves to choose which one to use in their manuscript.

6.6 Concluding Remarks on the Analysis of 'Lia Nothain'

'Lia Nothain' appears to be a special Dindshenchas entry for many reasons. Firstly, it stands out for having two single-stanza poems included instead of just one. Secondly, it is special since one of the single-stanzas provides information of the main character's relatives and the second

---

[427] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 1054. Translated as "Death seized her – it was no deed of glory" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 4: 31.
[428] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster*, vol 4: 1054. Translated as "my warrior-stone" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas*, vol 4: 29.
[429] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 220 rb 28-30. Translated as "Tomorrow I go with thee on the plain that thou mayst set my gravestone (lia) and dig my grave" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 38. The Rennes translation is used due to the similarities between BB and R.
[430] Translated as "When she beheld the great plain, she was unable to go back from it, and she planted a stone (lia) there in the ground and struck her head against it and… and was dead" in Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504.
[431] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 504. Translated by Stokes: "She found the high stone."

one provides information about the main character. Thirdly, 'Lia Nothain' does not feature larger alterations to the material except for the religious addition placed at the end. When viewing 'Lia Nothain' in a broader perspective, it is remarkable that two alternate versions of her story are preserved: one in the prose recension and the other in the prosimetrum and metrical recension. While they both illustrate a relative meeting Nothain and her eventual death in a plain, they diverge in how the events unfold. One of the major deviations concern her death with one being more passive and the other having her play a more active role. It is also interesting that in one version there are no remaining relatives alive but her father, while in the other there are mostly only mentions of her sister and brother-in-law. In conclusion, it is clear that while the two alternate versions deviate from each other, both were slightly altered by their scribes. However, the fact that both versions of 'Lia Nothain' have been preserved shows the willingness by scribes to preserve multiple versions of the Dindshenchas entries in order to maintain multiple elements of the placelore. Due to this, these entries can be read over and over again and preserved for future generations.

Chapter Four:

Analysis of 'Berba

7.1 Summary of 'Berba'

The Dindshenchas entry of 'Berba' is one of the shorter entries within the corpus and contains characters from the mythological world in Irish culture. It also includes short explanations of several placenames, more than what is normal in Dindshenchas entries. 'Berba' revolves around the character of either Mac Cecht or Dian Cecht killing Meche, son of Morrigan, and a monster at the Mag Mechi, previously called Mag Fertaigi. The monster Meche has three hearts, each containing a serpent continually growing in size. Furthermore, it is stated in the entry that if Meche was not eliminated, the serpents would have decimated every living thing in Ireland. The hearts were burned on either Mag Luathat or Ard Luaithrid by Mac Cecht or Dian Cecht who subsequently threw the ashes into the river Berba. For the most part, the entry does not provide extensive details, and shows that even small entries such as 'Berba' can contain enough information to understand such a place. There are multiple and differing accounts, and in one of them the river boiled when the ashes were thrown in, which dissolved the animals within Meche's hearts. At the end, there also is a countertale in the prosimetrum recension, where the name 'Berba' may also come from a compound of "water" and "dumb," meaning "dumb water."

7.2 Linguistic Markers of 'Berba'[432]

Similarly to both 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain,' the linguistic markers do vary in 'Berba.' There seems to be a majority of scribes preferring the "cid dia ta"-linguistic marker[433] as it is preferred as introducing the 'Berba'-entry in Bd, M, BB and Ed. It is quite interesting that one can see such a consistency in a Dindshenchas entry, especially since there are about 100 years separating these four manuscripts. The only manuscripts that deviate from this linguistic marker are LL and E.[434] In LL, the scribe prefers the Latin phrase "unde nominatur"[435] over the Irish

---

[432] In this analysis, I will use more manuscripts since they all show certain alterations that are important to highlight. These manuscripts will be M, BB, E, Ed, Bd and LL.

[433] Translated as "whence is it?" in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish," 55.

[434] This abbreviation stands for Trinity College MS 1436 dated to 15th or 16th century based on Abbott, T. K. and E. J. Gwynn. *Catalogue of the Irish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Dublin.* (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co, 1921): 312. This manuscript is included in this analysis due to its irregularities compared to the other manuscripts concerning 'Berba.' It does not include 'Loch Garman' or 'Lia Nothain' as the manuscript is only an excerpt of the Dindshenchas is mainly categorized as containing medical and physical treatises. To my knowledge, there have not been many publications on MS 1436 and its Dindshenchas elements.

[435] Translated as "whence is named?" in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish," 57-58.

phrase, which is unsurprising as it seems to be a regular feature of Dindshenchas entries in LL. However, it is interesting that the scribe of E uses "canas rohainmniged"[436] instead of the linguistic marker used by the other scribes. This linguistic marker has been used to a large extent in Dindshenchas, yet it deviates from the norm prevalent in the other manuscripts describing 'Berba.' This could perhaps be due to the scribe preferring this linguistic marker, or that he was working from other material preferring this marker.

Furthermore, when examining the linguistic marker in the preceding stanzas in M, BB, and E, all three of them chose "unde dicitur."[437] If the scribe of E did not follow suit with the linguistic marker introducing 'Berba,' why did he use the same linguistic marker as the others to introduce the stanzas? It could be due to the material the scribe was copying from, but it could also be that he was following different systems for preserving prose and poetry. In the cases of "unde dicitur" introducing the stanzas, both M and BB includes all three placenames: "Unde dicitur bearba ocus magh methi ocus ard luithridh" in M and "Unde dicitur berba ocus magh meichi ocus aird luaithrid" in BB.[438] However, compared to the others, the scribe of E neglected to do this and only wrote down "Unde dicitur Berba."[439] This might have been a conscious decision by the scribe to put more emphasis on the placename of Berba instead of the other placenames, since only Berba is mentioned in the stanzas following the prosimetrum introduction. Another option is that the scribe of E needed to cut down the 'Berba'-section for some reason or was working from other material containing this shorter sentence.

Moving onto the prose recension version in LL, Ed and Bd, they all use Latin linguistic markers to introduce the single-stanza poem. This is not an unusual trait in these manuscripts, yet it is interesting to see this consistency shown in all the manuscripts of the prose recension. In LL, the scribe introduces the single-stanza poem with "Unde Mag Luadat 7 Mag Méchi 7 Berba,"[440] thereby giving credit to all three placenames even though only one is at the focus of 'Berba.' The scribes of Bd and Ed seem to prefer "unde poeta dixit," which is the same marker used in the 'Lia Nothain'-entry. It is a quite well-known linguistic marker in the Dindshenchas

---

[436] Translated as "how was it named?" in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish," 55.

[437] Translated as "whence is said," in Ó hUiginn, R. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish," 57-58. This linguistic marker has been briefly discussed in section 6.2 of the analysis on Lia Nothain.

[438] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 24. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 38. Translated as "Whence Berba is said, and Mag Méchi and Ard Luaithrid." in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 304. The Rennes translation is used due to the Berba entry in M and BB being identical to Rennes.

[439] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 18-19. Translation should be "whence Berba is said," based on translations of other manuscripts. This could also be a way of writing *bir ba*, which will be explained in "Textual Inconsistencies."

[440] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. My own translation: "Whence Mag Luadat and Mag Méchi and Berba."

corpus and shows that the Latin phrase frequently occurred in the markers, though for the main part as in-text markers. Based on this analysis, these linguistic markers are seemingly chosen by the scribes where they can pick and choose which ones they decide to include in their manuscript. There are of course set rules, perhaps engrained into their memory and the memories of the society, yet it is not obvious that one is more preferable than the others. The requirement is simply to use a marker, and some manuscripts put the marker at the line above before the official placelore entry starts. In some ways it is similar to the "once upon a time" of fairytales: a formula normally introducing the plot itself. Futhermore, the changes of these markers can provide insight on the scribes and the corpus.

7.3 Changes in the Language of 'Berba'

In order to get a complete picture of the scribal alterations, it is important to analyse the changes of the language in 'Berba.' The change from "e" to "ea" that was found in 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain,' does not occur as often in 'Berba.' It is found in the prose version of this entry where in LL and Bd, a word is written "chned" or "cned" respectively, while in Ed is written as "chneadh."[441] This change occurs in the prosimetrum entries of 'Berba' as well, yet in a different way. In M, the scribe has written the word "condealbaib;" however, in BB and E they are both written as "condelbaib."[442] In the analysis of 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain,' it was discovered that BB, and also to a certain extent E, seems to preserve the Old Irish spelling more often than M. This is supported further when examining the metrical stanzas, for example in the first stanza where LL, BB and E all write "Berba" while in M the scribe writes "Bearbha."[443] This is especially surprising in the case of BB, since it uses the "Bearba"-spelling[444] at the beginning of the prose introduction. This could simply be a spelling error, or the scribe of BB choosing to not alter the poetry as the scribe of M did. Another frequent linguistic change between the 'Berba'-entries is the alteration of shorter words such as the word "cech"[445] in LL, as opposed to Bd and Ed ("cach" and "gach" respectively).[446] This means that the scribes possibly steered away from the "cech"-writing and started altering it more and more from the grammar and spelling in LL.

---

[441] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 23.

[442] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 16. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 30. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 11.

[443] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 26. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 40. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 20.

[444] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 27.

[445] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702.

[446] For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 20.

In the metrical stanzas, the same occurs where LL uses "cech," while the scribes of M and BB use "gach," while E uses "can."[447] Later in the poem, the scribe of LL uses "cach," M "ghach," BB "cach," and E uses "can."[448] Therefore, it seems as though there is not necessarily a set system with these smaller words, making it more up to the scribes' preferences. Another minor alteration in the language is the vowel and consonant confusion visible in 'Berba.' In the prose recension manuscripts, there is evidence of both consonant and vowel confusion, for example in the single-stanza poem where LL writes "loscud," Bd writes "loscadh," and Ed writes "losgudh."[449] It seems that both Bd and Ed have some of the same elements as LL, but they all differ slightly in spelling throughout. In the introduction of the prosimetrum entries, there is evidence of vowel confusion where M writes "mhuighi," BB writes "maige," and E writes "muigi."[450] In this case, it seems that E and M are quite similar in aspects of vowel confusion, which makes sense since it has previously been established that BB is more similar to earlier manuscripts such as LL.

In the metrical stanzas, it is interesting to find that there are also cases of vowel confusion, for example where M agrees with LL, while BB agrees with E. One example of this is by the scribe of LL writing "salchur," M writing "salcur," and the scribes of both BB and E writing "salchar."[451] There is also evidence of the consonant confusion overall, for example in the prosimetrum entries concerning the name of the monster killed in 'Berba.' In LL, the name is written in the stanzas as "Mechi,"[452] while in BB it is either written "Meichi" or "Meci."[453] Furthermore, in M it is written "Meth," "Methi," or "Meith"[454] and in E as "Miach" or "Meich."[455] This indicates that there were either several different ways of writing this placename or that getting the exact name correct was unimportant in the preservation of the placelore. Since the placename of 'Berba' describes the location where the monster was killed rather than the name of the monster, it might not be as important for the scribes to write the monster's name in a specific way. It also indicates that a "ch" could be equal to "th" in the

---

[447] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 28. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 42. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 21.

[448] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 34. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 49. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 28.

[449] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 24.

[450] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 17. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 31. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 12.

[451] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 30. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 44. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 22.

[452] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858 and vol 3: 702.

[453] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 29 and 43-42.

[454] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 14, 24 and 29.

[455] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 9 and 23.

manuscripts describing 'Berba.' Another example of the consonant and vowel confusion is the word "cride"[456] being written in M as "crighi," BB as "cridi," and E as "cride."[457] The exact way of writing a word might not have been as important to the scribes due to the complexity of the Irish language as well as the consonant and vowel confusion.

In such a short Dindshenchas entry as 'Berba,' there are more limited occurrences that illustrate the changes committed to the placelore entry. However, it is possible to locate two occurrences that illustrate the alteration of preverbal particles. In the prose recension manuscripts, there is a case of the verb "ro batar" in LL, which is written without a particle in both Bd and Ed as "batar" and "bhadar" respectively.[458] There were plenty of changes occurring to the preverbal particles during this time period, and occasionally this could also lead to the deletion of the particle. In the single-stanza of the prose recension manuscripts, the verb "ro baded" in LL is written in Bd as "robaided," yet in Ed it is altered to "do baideadh."[459] "Do" often replaces the "ro"-particle; therefore, this is not a rare occurrence to discover in Dindshenchas entries such as 'Berba.' For the most part, the linguistic changes present in 'Berba' are mostly slight alterations that normally follow the overall development of the Irish language. In order to preserve the Dindshenchas corpus within Irish literature, the scribes committed entries such as 'Berba' to writing. The scribes were able to alter and add as much or as little as they wanted as long as the placelore was preserved. Linguistic changes did not affect this placelore, yet they provide insight on how the language was used by the scribes in copying the Dindshenchas corpus.

7.4 Differentiating the Prose and Poetry in 'Berba'

Even though it is a short entry, it is still possible to make certain conclusions on the presence and preservation of prose and poetry in such a Dindshenchas entry. For 'Berba,' the metrical stanzas in LL are split between the manuscript pages 216 and 191; however, each stanza starts on its own line, making each stanza visually stand out.[460] The scribe of M follows suit and places each stanza on its own line, putting a "ceann faoi eite" where it is necessary to

---

[456] Translated as "heart" in "Cride." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/12925. Accessed on 31.01.21.
[457] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 15. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 28. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 10.
[458] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 11.
[459] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 24.
[460] "Book of Leinster." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21: 216 and 191.

fill up the line. Due to this, each stanza on average takes up two lines.[461] Similarly, the scribe of E places each stanza on its own line and fills up each line using the "ceann faoi eite." Occasionally, some stanzas take up three lines instead of two in E.[462] The prose in these manuscripts has not gone through extensive alterations and is not written in an abnormal way. Compared to LL, E, and M, it is BB that seem to stand out the most due to the scribe's visual decisions. In BB, he makes the capital letter starting the poem more visually detailed than the one introducing the prose introduction. This might provide an indication of the poetry having a higher importance in the placelore. He has continued the practice of putting each stanza on its own line, except for the final stanza which starts in the middle of a line and continues onto the next column in the manuscript.[463] This decision is interesting because it deviates from the norm found in the other 'Berba'-entries, ultimately showing that the scribes were more interested in filling up the columns.

In the prose recension, the scribe of LL clearly separates the prose and poetry by placing the single-stanza poem separately from the prose, on its own line with the Greek letter "phi" marking the poetry. In addition, he also places the final section of the single-stanza poem on an extra line below the manuscript column. This is done in order to finish off 'Berba' on the same manuscript page instead of putting the end on the next manuscript page.[464] This illustrates that the scribe wanted to keep the entire single-stanza poem together in one place, and to clearly mark the poetry as separate from the prose. Furthermore, keeping the whole entry on the same page shows the need for prose and poetry to be kept together, if at all possible, in the Dindshenchas entries. When it comes to Ed, the scribe neglects to mark out the single-stanza poem properly in the manuscript and starts the single-stanza in the middle of a line.[465] This shows that the scribe did not put as much emphasis on starting everything on its own line and separating the prose from the poetry. Finally, in Bd, the scribe has separated the single-stanza poem from the prose by putting the capital letter of the stanza into the margin instead of at the beginning of the line, thereby marking it as separate.[466] Viewing all of these together, it seems to have been up to the scribe on how to set up the manuscript and whether or not the poetry

---

[461] "Leabhar Ua Maine." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21: 89 v.
[462] "MS 1436." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21: 85.
[463] "The Book of Ballymote." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21: 192 v.
[464] "Book of Leinster." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21: 159.
[465] "Adv. MS 72.1.16." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21: 3r.
[466] "MS. Rawl. B. 506." *Digital Bodleian*: https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk. Accessed 31.01.21: 12v.

should be specifically marked as separate from the prose. In spite of this, the prose and poetry seem to remain closely connected through Dindshenchas entries.

When comparing the changes within the prose and poetry of 'Berba,' most of the textual inconsistencies have occurred in the prose sections. Therefore, it seems that the scribes have generally more freedom to influence and alter the text in prose section. Futhermore, there is no mention of the alternate explanation for 'Berba' in the poetry. In the single-stanza poem of the prose recension, there were no inconsistencies between LL, Bd, and Ed and they all contained the name Mac Cecht, even though LL had previously named him as Dian Cecht in its prose entry. In the five stanzas of the metrical and prosimetrum recension, there are also not as many inconsistencies as those found in the prose. Overall, there are more details added to the prose than the poetry in 'Berba,' illustrating further that poetry might have had a higher standard than the prose when it comes to its transmission and preservation.

In both the metrical stanzas and the single-stanza poem, there were only mentions of the placename of 'Berba' and not the other placenames referred to in the prose and prosimetrum recension. The prose and poetry of 'Berba' are interesting to look at because they highlight that the poetry seems to have been treated differently than the prose. For the most part, the poetry seemingly undergoes fewer alterations while the prose provides more freedom for the scribes to make said alterations. In some cases, it is possible that the prose material came more from the archive or was developed by the scribes, while the poetry came from a more established system with more rules to follow. In a sense, the function of the archive "provides a kind of counterbalance against the necessarily reductive and restrictive drive of the working memory" [467] and preserves what has been forgotten, which could have occurred with 'Berba.'

7.5 Textual Inconsistencies of 'Berba'

Despite being a short Dindshenchas entry, there are plenty of textual inconsistencies present in 'Berba.' Beginning with the prose recension manuscripts, one of the first inconsistencies is the disagreement on the name of the main character. In LL, the scribe writes Dian Cecht, while in both Bd and Ed the scribes write Mac Cecht in the prose section.[468] What is even more peculiar is that in the single-stanza poem following the prose, all three scribes have written it down as Mac Cecht.[469] Therefore, there seems to have been either an error

---

[467] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 106.
[468] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 12.
[469] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 25.

committed by LL's scribe, or a general disagreement on which person actually committed the act. As previously mentioned, poetry seems to have had stricter rules connected to it and scribes seemed to be more hesitant in altering the poetry. It is therefore unclear what has occurred; however, since the majority of the manuscripts prefer Mac Cecht, it is highly likely that this is the correct name. While they do have similar names these two characters are, according to Irish mythology and pseudohistory, two completely different persons. Dian Cecht is one of the gods in the Tuatha De Danann and the physician with a major role in *Cath Maige Tuired* and Irish culture in general, while Mac Cecht is most famously connected to being Conaire's protector in *Togail Bruidne Da Derga*. In his edition, Stokes provides two options for the origin of Mac Cecht: "*Mac cecht* one of the Tuatha dé Danann kings or, more probably Conaire's champion."[470] It is more likely that it is Mac Cecht who killed Meche in 'Berba,' but it questions again why the scribe of LL would use the wrong name in the prose.

Another interesting textual inconsistency is connected to names and mythology occurs in E, which is the only manuscript describing 'Berba's connection to Dagda: "Miach mac na Morrigna ocus in Dagda."[471] In M and BB, the sentence in this section includes Morrigan/Morrigna, but not Dagda. The Morrigan can be categorized as a war goddess,[472] and is widely featured in Irish mythology. Even though most sources on the Morrigan, do not mention any children, it is highly likely she birthed children at some point in the tradition. In fact, there are scholarly articles analysing for example *Acallam na Senórach,* the *Banshenchas* and *Lebor Gabala* mentioning these supposed children. In those cases, these children are either from incest or otherwise, and most of them are somehow connected to bloodshed or conflict.[473] In some sources, it is mentioned that the Morrigan mated with Dagda during the *Cath Maige Tuired*, but there are also sources naming her as his wife.[474] Due to this, the mentioning of him in connection to the Morrigan make sense in E, in spite of varying information on these two characters. It is possible that scribes knew of this connection due to the huge emphasis on mythology in Irish culture, and thereby the scribe of E could have found it more important than the other scribes to include. However, there is no way to know exactly how much knowledge the scribes would have of such characters and texts.

---

[470] Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales of the Rennes Dindshenchas," 305.

[471] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 9, 8. My own translation: "Miach/Meche son of Morrigan and the Dagda."

[472] Maier, Bernhard. "Morrígain." *Dictionary of Celtic Religion and Culture*, trans. C. Edwards. (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997): 198.

[473] Epstein, Angelique Gulermovich. *War Goddess: The Morrígan and her Germano-Celtic Counterparts*. PhD Thesis. (California: University of California, 1998.)

[474] Ó hOgain, Daithi. "Mór-Ríoghain." *Myth, Legend & Romance: An Encyclopædia of the Irish Folk Tradition*. (New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1991): 307.

When comparing all three recensions, it is interesting to note that there is an inconsistency with which placenames are mentioned by scribes in 'Berba.' In the prose recension and prosimetrum recension, Mag Luadat, Mag Fertaigi, and Mag Mechi are all mentioned while the metrical stanzas only mention 'Berba.' Futhermore, in the prose introduction of the prosimetrum recension, Ard Luaithrid is mentioned as a second option of where Mac Cecht burned the ashes of Meche.[475] This could perhaps occur on account of the scribe deciding which placenames to include, or that he decidedto include the added placenames in order to add further information to the prosimetrum entries of 'Berba.' Mag Fertaigi is described as the former name of Mag Mechi, which illustrates the regular Dindshenchas trait of including information on the former placename of a place. Through this, the scribes were also able to include more details in their placelore entries. This trait was discussed by Mac Cana describing 'Cruach Phádraig':

> It is interesting that the Metrical Dindshenchas… does not use the name Cruach Phádraig even when referring to the saint's period of fasting on the mountain, but has simply used *Cruach*, which is used elsewhere in the Dindshenchas as the abbreviation of Cruach(án) Aigle. Moreover, another text in the Dindshenchas states that the mountain had once been called Cruachán Garbrois.[476]

This feature occurs in several Dindshenchas entries and illustrates a desire to provide all available information about each placename, and the surrounding placenames, if it is relevant to the entry. It also attaches a history to each placename and solidifies the mystery that is the Irish landscape.

In the prose recension manuscripts of 'Berba,' there are occurrences of verbs being altered, such as in LL where the scribe wrote "iarna marbad," while in Bd it is written "iarna bass" and in Ed "iarna bhas."[477] This might show the scribes using different phrasing, or a preference of later scribes to use a different word instead. Futhermore, the prose section in LL is written by the scribe as "Coron loisc Dian Cecht iarna marbad. 7 coron lá a lúaith lasin sruth út. coro mberb 7 coro dilég cech n-anmanna boí inti."[478] There is no mention of placenames in this section, as opposed to Bd where the scribe wrote: "Coron loisc Mac Cecht iarna marbad i

---

[475] For example MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 182 va 37. Translated as "Or maybe it was on Ard Luaithrid that he burnt the hearts," in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas," 304.

[476] Mac Cana, P. "Placenames and Mythology in Irish Tradition: Places, Pilgrimages and Things," 332.

[477] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 12. "Marbad" tends to be translated as "killing/slaying" while "bas" tends to be translated as "death". Therefore, the translation here would he "after his death/slaying." "Bás." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/5444. Accessed on 31.01.21. "Marbad." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/31572. Accessed on 31.01.21.

[478] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. My own translation: "So after slaying him Dian Cecht burned them and cast their ashes with yon stream, it boiled and it dissolved every animal that were there." This translation has been made by combining Stokes's Bd translation and doublechecking with *eDIL*.

Maig Luadat, 7 coro la a luaith lasin sruth út, co rom-berb 7 coro dileag cach n-ainmidi do anmandaib bai inti. Conadh desi nata Magh Lu(ad)at 7 Magh Méichi 7 Berba."[479] Compared to LL, this section in Bd includes the placename Mag Luadat where Mac Cecht killed Méche, and includes extra details not found in LL. While LL does have all three placenames within the next linguistic marker, it is peculiar that the scribes of Bd and Ed decided to alter this section. It is of course possible that they had access to other manuscripts, now lost, containing this alternative setup. Ed has some slight differences from Bd which are here marked in cursive: "*Cona sloeig* mac cech iarna marbad muigh luadad goro la a luaith *isin* sruth ut goro mberbh ocus goro dheleach ach nanmanna baí *in tibh friu* coned de sin ata mag luagadh ocus magh meche 7 berbha."[480] These are not major alterations to the plot of 'Berba,' yet it changes the beginning of the section, and the scribe uses "isin" instead of "lasin" in Bd. However, it shows an inconsistency in the corpus overall, especially since the scribe changes the opening phrase and eliminates the detail of burning the hearts.

Apart from these inconsistencies, there are also smaller inconsistencies in spelling, such as the word "forbértais" in LL, which is written as "oirbeordais" in Bd and "forbeordais" in Ed.[481] When it comes to the prosimetrum introduction of 'Berba,' there are some smaller and some larger textual inconsistencies. One of the smaller inconsistencies concerns the word "treotho" in M, written as "treithibh" in BB, yet surprisingly in E it is written as "forro."[482] Both "treotho" and "treithibh" are forms of the preposition "tre,"[483] and has been mostly referred to as third plural in various modern sources, while "forro"[484] is a form of the preposition "for" and describes the three hearts of Meche. It would seem that the scribes had the opportunity to make these smaller changes to the text as they pleased.

There are also larger textual inconsistencies that might not directly affect 'Berba,' yet illustrates different ways the scribes copied the Dindshenchas material. One of the larger textual

---

[479] Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. Translated on the same page as: "So after slaying him on Mag Luadat, Mac Cecht burnt them (the hearts) and cast their ashes with yon stream, and it boiled, and it dissolved every one of the animals that were therein. Wherefore thence are 'Mag Luadat', and 'Mag Méchi', and 'Berba'."

[480] Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 17-22. My own translation: "Whence the battle, Mac Cecht after the slaying at Mag Luadat cast the ashes in the yon stream (and) it boiled (and) it dissolved everyone of the animals that were there with them. Wherefore thence are Mag Luagad and Mag Meche and Berba." This translation has been made by combining Stokes's Bd translation and doublechecking with *eDIL. Cona* most likely comes from "Cuin." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/13592. Accessed on 02.02.21.

[481] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 3: 702. For Bd: Stokes, W. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas," 483. For Ed: Adv MS 72.1.16 Transcription fol 3 rb 16. In Stokes' edition of Bd he has translated it as "would have grown," which would fit with LL and Ed. This is the sec. fut. 3. pl of for-beir. "For-beir." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/233374. Accessed on 31.01.21.

[482] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 17. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 30. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 12.

[483] Translated as "through" in "Tre." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/41608. Accessed on 02.02.21.

[484] Translated as "upon, attached to" in "For." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/23272. Accessed on 02.02.21.

inconsistencies occurring in this section describes that if Meche had not died he would have killed everything in Ireland. In M, it is described as: "Mina thorsed don donieth ar ro foirbreadair nat natracha ind nochnaidhfidis a fuighdis beo an Erenn."[485] In this case, no names are mentioned; however, it does mention something, or someone being seized, with a death being implied. This is slightly different from BB, where the scribe writes: "Meni toirised din bas do meice ar forberdais na natrach ind ocus focnafedh a na fhuigbheadh beo in hErenn."[486] Here, the text mentions Meche's name, as opposed to M, and shows a desire by the scribe to focus on Meche instead of the serpents, which is very similar to E. In E, the text is altered even further towards the end of the sentence: "Mene thorsed din bas to miach ar forbairt na natrach nocha nucfed can nuncfed beo an Erinn."[487] Shortly after this section, following an explanation that Mac Cecht burned the hearts on Mag Luagad, the scribe of M has added the phrase "nó a muig luathat,"[488] which is not included in the other manuscripts. Due to this, it would seem that there are two possible ways of writing the additional placename. This is highlighted by the scribe of M, at the same time as it is deemed unnecessary by the scribes of BB and E. Towards the end of the introduction, there is a section including both the linguistic markers preceding the poetry; however, in M, BB, and E it also includes a second explanation for the placename of 'Berba.' It is peculiar that this second explanation of the name occurs after the linguistic marker, and not before, since that is the norm in Dindshenchas entries.

Similarly to 'Loch Garman,' 'Berba' also includes a countertale with a second explanation for the placename: "Nó combad berb .i. ber nó bir ocus ba .i. balb dicitur .i. usce balb."[489] It is a regular Dindshenchas trait to have a countertale accompanying the main version, and despite of the shortness of 'Berba,' it is no exception. However, this countertale contains quite few details and the scribes seem to have preferred a literal translation of the placename, which occurs regularly in Dindshenchas entries. An example of this type of explanation occurs

---

[485] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 18-20. My own translation: "Now if (it) had not been seized, the snakes would have grown (and) what they left alive in Ireland would have wasted away." This translation has been made by combining Stokes's R translation and doublechecking with *eDIL*. "Donieth" likely comes from an infixed pronoun class C and "eth" from "Ethaid." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/20834. Accessed on 02.02.21.
[486] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 31-33. Translated as "Now if death had not befallen Meche the serpents in him would have grown and what they left alive in Ireland would have wasted away" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales of the Rennes Dindshenchas," 304.
[487] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 13-14. My own translation: "Now if death had not befallen Meche the serpents in him would hae grown and yet …alive in Ireland." This translation has been made by combining Stokes's R translation and doublechecking against *eDIL*'s translation. "Noch." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/33216. Accessed on 02.02.21.
[488] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 21. My own translation: "or at Mag Luathat."
[489] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 38-39. Translated as "Or Ber-ba may be (a compound of) *ber* or *bir* 'water' and *ba* 'dumb'. Whence is said *Berba* is, 'dumb water'" in Stokes, W. "The Prose Tales of the Rennes Dindshenchas," 305. Stokes's translation is used due to these two manuscripts being almost identical.

in the Dindshenchas of 'Cnogba' where one explanation for the placename consists of "cnó-guba," originating from *Tochmarc Ètaine* where Óengus casts the "cnói cro-derga na caille" to the ground after Englecc was abducted.[490] These explanations provide a simpler reason for a place receiving its name. In M, there are a few slight alterations to the explanation of 'Berba:' "Nó comadh berba eo[491] .i. beir bir ocus ba ocus balb dicitur .i. usce balbhi."[492] These do not affect the meaning of the sentence, but they do raise the question of why these two manuscripts were written at the same time, yet differs from the others.

Furthermore, in E this explanation is shortened even further, to the point that the scribe only writes "Unde dicitur berba balb .i. uisce balb."[493] The first section is the linguistic marker, but the "berba" in this line could either be the placename or a way of writing "bir ba" which is featured in the other manuscripts. Either way, it mainly provides the second explanation, and it might have been the scribe's intention to add this as an afterthought. It seems that their process is more concerned with preserving the message of the Dindshenchas and providing all available information. This is done even though the corpus might consist more of a type of artificial learning than a genuine traditional mythology.[494] However, when attempting to collect all the placelore material, the scribe might have needed to invent a placename "to reinforce extant narratives."[495] There is a possibility that this is the reason for including this short explanation of 'Berba;' however, this is difficult to prove due to only having a limited number of manuscripts containing Dindshenchas entries.

Within the metrical stanzas of 'Berba,' both the metrical and prosimetrum manuscripts contain textual inconsistencies. Compared to 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain,' there are not as many alterations between the manuscripts containing 'Berba.' When it comes to the metrical stanzas, one example of textual inconsistency is the usage of prepositions in the first stanza where the scribe of LL writes "In Berba búan *a* bailbe / saiges *dar* sluag sen-Ailbe," while both

---

[490] Davies, M. T. "Dindshenchas, Memory, and Invention," 101. "Cnó-guba" is translated by Davies as "nut-wailing," and "cnói cro-derga na caille" as "blood-red nuts of the wood."

[491] "Eo (digraph)." *Tionscadal na Nod – CODECS Vanhamel*: https://www.vanhamel.nl/codecs/Eo_(digraph). Accessed on 20.01.21. The translation of *eo* is uncertain. In *eDIL* there are plenty of possible translations, but based on context, it should mean either "straight" or "tomb" as an added adjective or noun of Berba. A more fat-fetched translation would be "salmon," due to it being a river. "1 eó." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/20128. Accessed on 02.02.21. "6 eó." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/20133. Accessed on 02.02.12. "?5 eó." *eDIL*. Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/20128. Accessed on 02.02.21.

[492] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 24-25. My own translation: "Or Berba tomb/straight/salmon may be *beir* (or) *bir* and *ba* and *balb* it is said dumb water." This translation has been made by combining Stokes's R translation and doublechecking with *eDIL* translation. For the possible translations for "eo," see above footnote.

[493] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 18-19. My own translation: "Whence Berba is said dumb it is *dumb water*."

[494] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 14.

[495] Murray, K. "Genre Construction," 14.

M, BB, and E all use the preposition "co" both the cases set in cursive above.[496] This different preposition usage could be a scribal preference and creative decision or show changes in the usage of pronouns over time. Another small textual inconsistency occurs in the final stanza where the scribe of LL writes "fófuair focht i saerBerba. Berba,"[497] while in M, the scribe writes "forfuair focht i sairbearba. In Bearba."[498] This is quite similar to the scribe of BB who writes "fofuair socht ar saerberba, in berba,"[499] but in E the scribe writes "for rocht i saerberba."[500] M, BB, and LL are almost identical to each other apart from smaller inconsistencies, but there is an obvious textual inconsistency in E. There is a chance that the scribe of E was shortening this line of the stanza, or that perhaps it was incomplete in the manuscript he was copying from. In this case, the etymological explanation does not make proper sense in the context, yet it does emphasize the river as being described as noble.

The second stanza of 'Berba' contains the most textual inconsistencies among the manuscripts. In LL, the scribe has written: "Ni fualfed focheirdd inti / luaithred Mechi mormilti / ros balb ros berb cen athbach / salchur serb na sennathrach."[501] Meanwhile, M and BB maintain the same verb by either writing "ni buailfeadh foceird inti" in M or "ni fuailfedh focheird inti" in BB.[502] In comparison, the scribe of E has completely altered it by writing "nosfúid set co feig inti,"[503] which is quite a stretch from the other manuscripts. Furthermore, the third line of the stanza also contains some textual inconsistencies. BB is practically identical

[496] For LL: Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 26. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 40. For E: MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 20. Translated as "The Barrow, enduring its silence, / that flows through the folk of old Ailbe," in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 2: 63.

[497] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. Translated as "found silent burial in noble Barrow," in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 2: 63.

[498] MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 35, 37. My own translation: "found silent in noble Barrow, the Barrow." "Focht" is likely a way of writing "socht," since "focht" is translated as "act of enquiring." "Focht." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/22514. Accessed on 03.02.21. "Socht." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/38264. Accessed on 03.02.21. "Fofuair" is a form of "fogaib" translated as "finds," according to "Fo-gaib." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/22696. Accessed on 03.02.21.

[499] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 vb 1-2. My own translation: "found silent in front of noble Barrow, the Barrow." Another possible translation for "ar" is "on account of," based on "Ar." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/3902. Accessed on 03.02.21.

[500] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 30. My own translation: "upon silence in noble Barrow." "For." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/23272. Accessed on 03.02.21. For translation of "socht," see above footnote. It also does not have the extra "in berba" as the other manuscripts do.

[501] Best, R. I. et. al. *The Book of Leinster,* vol 4: 858. It is quoted from LL because it is the first manuscript of the analysis and is a good starting point for the metrical stanzas since it tends to contain Old Irish tendencies. Translated as "No motion in it made / the ashes of Mechi the strongly smitten: / the stream made sodden and silent past recovery/ the fell filth of the old serpent" in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 2: 63.

[502] For M: MS D ii 1 Transcription fol 89 va 29. For BB: MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 43. Translated as "No motion in it made," in Gwynn, E. J. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 2: 63.

[503] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 23. My translation is "--- path to the clear in it." I have been unable to find a translation for "nosfúid." "Set." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/37322. Accessed on 03.02.21. "Féig." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/21474. Accessed on 03.02.21.

to LL with the scribe writing: "ros balb ros berb cen atbach,"[504] while the scribe of E made some alterations: "ocus ros balb cach atbath"[505] Since E has shown frequent similarities to BB, it is unclear why this sentence was written this way. One option is that the scribe was working from a now lost manuscript containing this line, or that it was rewritten by E's scribe when completing his manuscript. Most of these textual inconsistencies within 'Berba' are on the smaller side, with only slight changes overall between the manuscripts. However, all of them illustrate that, in the task of preserving the material and engraining it into memory, the scribes made slight alterations in the process while maintaining the material.

7.6 Concluding Remarks on 'Berba'

When it comes to 'Berba,' it is evident that the scribes made slight alterations to the material that mostly affected single words or phrases. One can also find linguistic changes; however, these linguistic changes were mostly focused on changes in spelling and preverbal particles that in turn affected the verbs. One of the major alterations was the confusion over whether or not it was Dian Cecht or Mac Cecht slaying Meche; however, this analysis has shown that it was most likely Mac Cecht. Either way, this inconsistency does not take away from the fact that Meche was killed, and the hearts thrown into the river Berba, which was how the place got its placename. It is merely a small detail in the scheme of this Dindshenchas entry. 'Berba' also introduced the short alternative explanation of the name, which in turn illustrates the scribal trait of including a literal explanation for a placename. It is evident that the scribes managed to make all these alterations without compromising the main aspect of Dindshenchas: the sharing and preserving the placelore into the memory of the future generations. Even though 'Berba' is quite short, it provides the story behind the placename as well as the mentioning of three additional placenames with mythological connections. These placenames are important to keep in mind in order to prevent them from being forgotten. The fact that they are all mentioned in all the manuscripts, makes it evident that it was important to preserve all the placenames in 'Berba' since they might not be preserved in other texts.

---

[504] MS 23 P 12 Transcription fol 192 va 44. Translated as "the stream made sodden and silent past recovery," and taken from Gwynn's edition cited above, due to the close similarities.
[505] MS 1436 Transcription fol 85 b 22. My own translation: "And silences (the stream) past recovery." It is likely that "rosbalb" comes from "Balba(ig)id." *eDIL.* Dictionary Entry: dil.ie/5290. Accessed on 03.02.21.

<div align="center">

Chapter Five:

Conclusions

</div>

8.1 Final Conclusions on 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba'

When comparing these three Dindshenchas entries, the analyses show that there are both similarities and differences as to how they are altered or not altered by their scribes. When it comes to the linguistic markers featured in the entries, I have not been able to locate a definite system to their usage. However, I believe that is because there was no definite system created on which marker to use where or when. There seems to have been an agreement that such a phrase was required as an introduction to the Dindshenchas entry when introducing or concluding poems or prose sections. In both 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain,' there were varying linguistic markers in each manuscript, indicating that the scribes had a large amount of freedom in choosing which marker to use in their work. Meanwhile, in 'Berba' there is a surprising consistency where most of the scribes use one marker while two scribes used differing markers; however, this is most likely a coincidence. This further indicates that the scribes were able to pick and choose which linguistic marker they wanted to use and that there was not one more favorable than the other. However, this conclusion has been based on only three Dindshenchas entries. Therefore, it would be crucial for further studies on the linguistic markers in the Dindshenchas to use a larger section, or the entire section, of the corpus.

By analysing the language in these three Dindshenchas entries, it is evident that there are both smaller and larger linguistic alterations. There seems to be a consistent change from "e" to "ea" in the majority of the manuscripts as well as consistent consonant and vowel confusion. In addition, there were alterations to smaller words such as prepositions and words such as "cen" or "cech." There were also consistent alterations in the verbal system and with the preference of the preverb "do" over preverb particles such as "ro." These alterations do not change the entry drastically; however, they show the linguistic alterations made to the material as well as the general language development between manuscripts. Furthermore, it illustrates that while the Dindshenchas was preserved within the memory of the scribes, but one can see that the language still changed over time. This means that the linguistic changes are important when studying the transmission history of early Irish literature as it provides insight on the scribe's methods and how he treats the material. In addition, it means that the memory of the scribe and the culture can affect the Dindshenchas material in the process of preserving it for future generations.

When differentiating between prose and poetry, the scribes seem to have a large amount of freedom in whether or not to focus more on one over the other. Poetry has generally been deemed older than the prose, but in the understanding of these Dindshenchas entries it is crucial that they are read as a single unit. Poetry is usually marked differently than the prose in the Dindshenchas entries, as the prose is written with a large capital letter being the only marking in the beginning. Meanwhile, the poetry usually has each stanza being divided over two or three lines with the beginning of each stanza having its own small capital letter. This illustrates that the scribes wanted to show the poetry as having more of a set standard than the prose. There are of course deviations from this, such as scribes using more lines for a stanza or getting a delay in the sentences due to using "ceann faoi eite." For the most part, the scribes commit more alterations to the prose than the poetry, as the poetry largely stays the same except for stray phrases and words being added or removed. One of the reasons for this could be that the scribes attempted to include as much material as possible, in order to cultivate it as it was previously outlined that "the only way to save such memories is to fix them in writing and in a sustained narrative, whereas words and thoughts die out, writings remain."[506] In the prose, there are a larger number of alterations with larger sections being altered, added or removed. If the poetry of the Dindshenchas belong to more of a set system, it would make sense that the prose is more based upon the scribe's memory or influence. Therefore, it is clear that while the scribes differentiate between prose and poetry, the Dindshenchas still requires to be analysed together.

The largest part of the analysis has been devoted to the textual inconsistencies. In a general sense, BB is the most similar to LL, while manuscripts such as M and E deviate more. However, there are exceptions to this, especially when including more manuscripts in the analysis. The prose recension manuscripts of LL, Ed, and Bd, are quite similar as well; however, one can still find alterations between them, as shown in the analysis of 'Berba.' Sometimes, the scribes use different words with the same meaning or alter the meaning with added or altered phrases. One can also find textual inconsistencies in the characters such as the inclusion or removal of Slane in 'Loch Garman,' the confusion between Mac Cecht and Dian Cecht in 'Berba,' Nothain's surviving relatives, or the mention of Dagda in 'Berba' of E. Scribes seem to have undergone a process of redaction and reworking of the Dindshenchas material in order to produce these entries; therefore, the scribes alter the text based on their own preference and not necessarily according to a set system. In BB, there are often stanzas added towards the end

---

[506] Rigney, A. "Plenitude, Scarcity, and the Circulation," 12.

of the poem, for example in 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain,' and also with the religious additions found in some entries.

There are also some connections to Christianity in 'Loch Garman' and 'Lia Nothain' in their religious additions, as well as references to Irish mythology in 'Berba' such as Mac Cecht and Morrigan. The countertales present in these three Dindshenchas entries are generally short and mostly featured as an afterthought in the manuscripts. In BB, the countertale of 'Loch Garman' is written down first; however, in the other manuscripts the countertale is mentioned last. This could have been done based on the scribe's preference or an attempt to deviate from the norm by placing the countertale last. The most leeway seems to be found in the prose, where the scribes have more freedom to make alterations while in the poetry one can find generally less inconsistencies. Overall, the textual inconsistencies occurred more in 'Loch Garman' due to it being considerably longer than the other two entries. The shorter the entry, the smaller canvas the scribes had available. Despite the differences in length of these Dindshenchas entries, they all have in common that they are texts in the process of transmission and "thus a text that will require some kind of labor… in order to be rendered usable for a later audience."[507] The process of altering such texts is unavoidable, and these analyses illustrate that there was a general consensus that the scribes had the freedom to influence the texts. However, it was on the condition that the placelore was preserved as accurately as they could manage.

8.2 Concluding Remarks on Scribal Alterations of Dindshenchas Entries

When it comes to the Dindshenchas corpus, the scribes had the crucial task of preserving the placenames and origin stories to ensure they did not fall into a cultural forgetting, which is related to "non-intentional acts such as losing, hiding, dispersing, neglecting, abandoning, or leave something behind."[508] People might not be aware of this occurring to their literature, culture, and memories. Over time, it seems as though the Dindshenchas entries have to a certain extent lost part of the literal accuracy from the original sources. However, the main portion and ideas have been preserved, and also seems to have mattered more than the smaller details. Through the analysis of 'Loch Garman,' 'Lia Nothain,' and 'Berba,' it is evident that they are valuable examples for obtaining a better grasp of the alterations occurring in the Dindshenchas corpus. The scribes seemingly make these alterations to the material based on their preference or influences, while at the same time manage to preserve the true message. With the hypothesis of this thesis in mind, the analysis clearly shows that the scribes do not affect the material in a

---

[507] Davies, M. T. "Cultural Memory, the Finding of the *Táin*, and the Canonical Process," 85.
[508] Assmann, A. "Canon and Archive," 98.

larger way, since the foundation and main aspects are thoroughly preserved in the placelore entries. Some aspects were likely preserved over time, while others seem to have been taken out of the archive in the memory theory and are given new life by the new inclusion in the Dindshenchas. It would have been interesting to have worked with more manuscripts and more Dindshenchas entries in order to get a more complete conclusion on the tradition and its alterations. Perhaps in the future, it could be interesting to analyse these changes on a larger scale in the Dindshenchas tradition and discover further how the scribes influenced and affected the corpus over time. After all, the corpus illustrates the magnificent work of the scribes and how the Dindshenchas becomes a representation for how they shared, and preserved, the art of preserving Ireland's placelore.

-

Bibliography

Abbott, T. K. and E. J. Gwynn. *Catalogue of the Irish Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Dublin.* Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co, 1921.

"Adv. MS 72.1.16." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen.* School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21.

Assmann, Aleida. "Canon and Archive." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

--------------------- "Texts, Traces, Trash: The Changing Media of Cultural Memory." *Representations* 56, ed. Randolph Starn. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65, ed. David Bathrick and Miriam Hansen et. al. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.

----------------- "Cultural Texts Suspended Between Writing and Speech." *Religion and Cultural Memory*: *Ten Studies*, ed. Jan Assmann and Rodney Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Baumgarten, Rolf. "Etymological Aetiology in Irish Tradition." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish* 41, ed. Proinsias Mac Cana, Rolf Baumgarten and Liam Breatnach. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1990.

Best, Richard Irvine. "The Settling of the Manor of Tara." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 4, ed. Kuno Meyer and Osborn Bergin. Dublin: School of Irish Learning, 1910.

Best, Richard Irvine et. al. *The Book of Leinster, formerly Lebar na Núachongbála*, vol. 1-6. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1954-1983.

"The Book of Ballymote." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen.* School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21.

"Book of Leinster." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen.* School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21.

Bowen, Charles. "A Historical Inventory of the Dindshenchas." *Studia Celtica* 10/11, ed. J. E. Caerwyn Williams. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1975/76.

Børtnes, Jostein. "Tekstanalyse og kultursemiotikk, hovedpunkter i Lotmans litteraturteori.'' *Polyfoni og Karneval: Essays om Litteratur,* ed. Jostein Børtnes. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1993.

Carney, James. *Studies in Irish Literature and History*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1955.

Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *The American Historical Review* 102:5, ed. Michael Grossberg et. al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

----------------- "Memory and the History of Mentalities." *Cultural Memory Studies: An*

International and Interdisciplinary Handbook, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

"Congratulations to Professor Ní Mhaonaigh." Published on 3 April 2020 at the *University of Cambridge: Anglo-Saxon, Norse & Celtic* website: https://www.asnc.cam.ac.uk/news/2020/04/03/2482/. Accessed on 20.09.20.

Cresswell, Tim. *Place: A Short Introduction.* New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.

Davies, Morgan Thomas. "Cultural Memory, the Finding of the *Táin*, and the Canonical Process in Early Irish Literature." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory,* ed. Jan Erik Rekdal and Erich Poppe. Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014.

----------------------------. "Dindshenchas, Memory, and Invention." *Lochlann: Festskrift til Jan Erik Rekdal på 60-årsdagen: Aitsí in ómós do Jan Erik Rekdal ar a 60ú lá breithe,* ed. Cathinka Hambro and Lars Ivar Widerøe. Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, 2013.

Doherty, Charles. "The Kingship and Landscape of Tara." *The Kingship and Landscape of Tara,* ed. Edel Bhreathnach. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005.

Duncan, Elizabeth. "A History of Gaelic Script, A.D. 1000-1200." Doctorate Thesis. Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen, 2010.

eDIL 2021: An Electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language, based on the Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language: http://www.dil.ie. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1913-1976.

"Eo (digraph)." *Tionscadal na Nod – CODECS Vanhamel:* https://www.vanhamel.nl/codecs/Eo_(digraph). Accessed 20.01.21.

Erll, Astrid. "Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Epstein, Angelique Gulermovich. *War Goddess: The Morrígan and her Germano-Celtic Counterparts.* PhD Thesis. California: University of California, 1998.

Esposito, Elena. "Social Forgetting: A Systems-Theory Approach." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Forster, Kurt W. "Aby Warburg's History of Art: Collective Memory and the Social Mediation of Images." *Daedalus: Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 105:1, ed. Stephen R. Graubard. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1976.

Greene, David. "Irish as a Vernacular Before the Norman Invasion." *A View of the Irish Language*, ed. Brian Ó Cuív. Dublin: The Stationery Office, 1969.

Gwynn, Edward J. "The Dindshenchas in the Book of Uí Maine." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 10. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1926-28.

----------------------. *The Metrical Dindshenchas,* vol 1-5. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1903.

----------------------. "The Texts of the Prose Dindshenchas." *Hermathena* 22. Dublin: Trinity College Dublin, 1932.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory: The Heritage of Sociology,* trans. by Lewis Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Harth, Dietrich. "The Invention of Cultural Memory." *Cultural Memory Studies: An*

International and Interdisciplinary Handbook, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Hellmuth, Petra. "The Dindshenchas and the Irish Literary Tradition." *Cín Chille Cúile: Texts, Saints and Places: Essays in Honour of Pádraig Ó Riain*, ed. John Carey, Máire Herbert and Kevin Murray. Aberystwyth: Celtic Studies Publications, 2004.

Hermann, Pernille. "Concepts of Memory and Approaches to the Past in Medieval Icelandic Literature." *Scandinavian Studies* 81:3, ed. Steven P. Sondrup. Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2009.

Kelleher, John V. "Early Irish History and Pseudo-History." *Studia Hibernica* 3. Dublin: St. Patrick's Training College, 1963.

Knott, Eleanor. *Irish Classical Poetry: Commonly Called Bardic Poetry.* Dublin: Cultural Relations Committee of Ireland, 1957.

"Leabhar Ua Maine." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen*. School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21.

Mac Cana, Proinsias. "Narrative Openers and Progress Markers in Irish." *A Celtic Florigium: Studies in Memory of Brendan O Hehir: Celtic Studies Publications* 2, ed. Kathryn A. Klar et. al. Massachusetts: Celtic Studies Publications, 1996.

------------------------. "Notes on the Combination of Prose and Verse in Early Irish Narrative." *Early Irish Literature – Media and Communication: Mundlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit in der fruhen irischen Literatur,* ed. S. N. Tranter and H. L. C. Tristram. Tubingen: Narr, 1989.

------------------------. "Placenames and Mythology in Irish Tradition: Places, Pilgrimages and Things." *Proceedings of the First North American Congress of Celtic Studies held at Ottawa from 26th-30th March 1986*, ed. Gordon W. MacLennan. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1988.

------------------------. "Prosimetrum in Insular Celtic Literature." *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse,* ed. Joseph Harris and Karl Reichl. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1997.

Mac Eoin, Gearóid. "The Provenance of the Book of Leinster." *Zeitschrift fur celtische Philologie* 57, ed. Stefan Zimmer and Jurgen Uhlich. Bonn: University of Bonn/DeGruyter, 2009-2010.

Mac Gearailt, Uáitéar. "Middle Irish Archaisms in Early Modern Irish Prose." *Studia Hibernica* 38, ed. Ciarán Mac-Muirchaidh and Will Murphy. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2012.

------------------------. "The Language of Some Late Middle Irish Texts in the Book of Leinster." *Studia Hibernica* 26. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1992.

Mac Mathúna, Liam. "Irish Perceptions of the Cosmos." *Celtica* 23, ed. Fergus Kelly and Michelle O Riordan. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1999.

Maier, Bernhard. *Dictionary of Celtic Religion and Culture*, trans. Cyril Edwards. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997.

McCone, Kim. *A First Old Irish Grammar and Reader: Including an Introduction to Middle Irish:* Maynooth Medieval Irish Texts 3. Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish, 2005.

------------------. *Pagan Past and Christian Present in Early Irish Literature.* Maynooth Monographs 3. Maynooth: National University of Ireland, 2000.

------------------. "Prehistoric, Old and Middle Irish." *Progress in Medieval Irish Studies*, ed. Kim McCone and Katharine Simms. Maynooth: St. Patrick's College, 1996.

------------------. *The Early Irish Verb: Maynooth Monographs* 1. Maynooth: An Sagart, 1987.

Meyer, Kuno. "Macgnimartha Finn inn so sis." *Revue Celtique* 5, ed. Henri Gaidoz. Paris: Libraire a Franck, 1881-1883.

Mommsen, Theodorus. *Chronica Minora Saec. IV. V. VI. VII.* Berlin: Berolini Apud Weidmannos, 1898.

Mørland, Henning. *Latinsk Ordbok,* 3rd edition. Oslo. J. W. Cappelens Forlag, 1965.

"MS 1436." *Meamram Páipéar Riomhaire: Irish Script on Screen.* School of Celtic Studies: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies: https://www.isos.dias.ie. Accessed 31.01.21.

"MS. Rawl. B. 506." *Digital Bodleian*: https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk. Accessed 31.01.21.

Muhr, Kay. "Place-Names and the Understanding of Monuments." *Landscapes of Cult and Kingship*, ed. Roseanne Schot, Conor Newman and Edel Bhreathnach. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011.

Mulligan, Amy. *A Landscape of Words: Ireland, Britain and the Poetics of Space, 700-1250.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019.

Murray, Kevin. "Genre Construction: The Creation of the Dinnshenchas." *Journal of Literary Onomastics* 6, ed. Joseph McMullen and Kristen Carella. New York: The College at Brockport, 2017.

------------------. "Sources of Irish Mythology: The Significance of the Dinnshenchas." *North American Journal of Celtic Studies* 3:2, ed. Joseph F. Eska. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2019.

------------------. "The Reworking of Old Irish Narrative Texts in the Middle Irish Period: Contexts and Motivations." *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland,* ed. Elizabeth Boyle and Deborah Hayden. Dundalk: Dundalgan Press Limited, 2014.

Ní Dhonnchadha, Máirín. "*Caillech* and Other Terms for Veiled Women in Medieval Irish Texts." *Éigse: A Journal of Irish Studies* 28, ed. Pádraig A. Breatnach. Dublin: The National University of Ireland, 1994-5.

Ní Mhaonaigh, Máire. "Poetic Authority in Middle Irish Narrative: A Case Study." *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland*, ed. Elizabeth Boyle and Deborah Hayden. Dundalk: Dundalgan Press Limited, 2014.

------------------------. "The Peripheral Centre: Writing History on the Western Fringe." *Interfaces*: *A Journal of Medieval European Literatures* 4, ed. Paolo Borsa et. al. Milan: Universitá Degli Studi di Milano, 2017.

O'Beirne Crowe, J. "Ancient Lake Legends of Ireland – No 11. The Vision of Cathair Mor, king of Leinster, and Afterwards Monarch of Ireland, Foreboding the Origin of Loch Garman (Wexford Haven)." *The Journal of the Royal Historical and Archaeological*

Association of Ireland 2:1, 4th series. Dublin: Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, 1872.

Ó Coileáin, Seán. "The Structure of a Literary Cycle." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 25, ed. David Greene and Proinsias Mac Cana. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1974.

Ó Concheanainn, Tomás. "A Pious Redactor of Dinnshenchas Érenn." *Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning* 33, ed. Proinsias Mac Cana and Ernest Gordon Quin. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1982.

-----------------------------. "LL and the Date of the Reviser of LU." *Éigse: A Journal of Irish Studies* 20, ed. Tomás Ó Concheanainn. Galway: National University of Ireland, 1984.

-----------------------------. "The Three Forms of Dinnshenchas Érenn." *Journal of Celtic Studies* 3, ed. Howard M. Meroney and David Dumville. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981-82.

Ó Corráin, Donnchadh. "Historical Need and Literary Narrative." *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Celtic Studies, held at Oxford from 10th to 15th July 1983,* ed. D. Ellis Evans et. al. Oxford: International Congress of Celtic Studies, 1986.

Ó Crualaoich, Gearóid. "Continuity and Adaptation in Legends of Cailleach Bhéarra." *Béaloideas* 56, ed. Pádraig Ó Héalaí. Dublin: An Cumann Le Béaloideas Éireann, 1988.

Ó Cuív, Brian. "Dinnshenchas: The Literary Exploitation of Irish Place Names." *Ainm* 4. Belfast: Ulster Place-Name Society, 1989-90.

-----------------. "The Linguistic Training of the Mediaeval Irish Poet," *Celtica* 10, ed. Myles Dillon. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1973.

Ó hOgain, Daithi. "Mór-Ríoghain." *Myth, Legend & Romance: An Encyclopædia of the Irish Folk Tradition*. New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1991.

Ó hUiginn, Ruairí. "Adapting Myth and Making History." *Authorities and Adaptations: The Reworking and Transmission of Textual Sources in Medieval Ireland,* ed. by Elizabeth Boyle and Deborah Hayden. Dundalk: Dundalgan Press Limited, 2014.

--------------------. "Onomastic Formulae in Irish." *Proceedings of the Seventh Symposium of Societas Celtologica Nordica.* Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Celtica Upsaliensa 6, ed. Mícheál Ó Flaithearta. Uppsala: University of Uppsala, 2007.

--------------------. "The Book of Ballymote: Scholars, Sources and Patrons." *Book of Ballymote: Codices Hibernenses Eximii* 11, ed. Ruairí Ó hUiginn. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2018.

Olick, Jeffrey. "From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practices and Products." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

"Phi." *Tionscadal na Nod, CODECS Vanhamel*: https://www.vanhamel.nl/codecs/ Phi_(critical_sign). Accessed 15.01.21.

Piatti, Barbara et.al. "Mapping Literature: Towards a Geography of Fiction." *Cartography and Art,* ed. William Cartwright et. al. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2009.

Rekdal, Jan Erik. "Etymology, Wordplay, and Allegorical Reading in Some Medieval Irish Texts." *Etymology and Wordplay in Medieval Literature*, ed. Mikael Males. Turnhout: Brepols, 2018.

--------------------. "Memorials and Cultural Memory in Irish Tradition." *Medieval Irish*

Perspectives on Cultural Memory, ed. Jan Erik Rekdal and Erich Poppe. Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014.

Richards, Paul. "Kant's Geography and Mental Maps." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 61. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 1974.

Rigney, Ann. "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation of Cultural Memory." *Journal of European Studies* 35. London: SAGE Publications, 2005.

---------------- "The Dynamics of Remembrance: Texts Between Monumentality and Morphing." *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook,* ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nunning. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Ritari, Katja. "Images of Ageing in the Early Irish Poem Caillech Berri." *Studia Celtica Fennica* 3. Finland: Finnish Society for Celtic Studies, 2006.

"Sanas Cormaic." *Oxford Reference.* Oxford University Press: https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100439797. Accessed 20.01.21.

Schlüter, Dagmar. "Boring and Elusive? The Dindshenchas as a Medieval Irish Genre." *Journal of Literary Onomastics* 6, ed. Joseph McMullen and Kristen Carella. New York: The College at Brockport, 2017.

---------------------. "Medieval Manuscripts and Cultural Memory: The Case of the Book of Leinster." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory,* ed. Jan Erik Rekdal and Erich Poppe. Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014.

---------------------. "The Dindsenchas." *History or Fable? The Book of Leinster as a Document of Cultural Memory in Twelfth-Century Ireland: Studien und Texte zur Keltologie* 9, ed. Erich Poppe. Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2010.

Schot, Roseanne. "From Cult Centre to Royal Centre: Monuments, Myths and Other Revelations at Uisneach." *Landscapes of Cult and Kingship*, ed. Roseanne Schot, Conor Newman and Edel Bhreathnach. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2011.

Smyth, Marina. "Isidore of Seville and Early Irish Cosmography." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies* 14, ed. Patrick Sims-Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Stifter, David. *Sengoídelc: Old Irish for Beginners*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2006.

Stevenson, Jane. "Literacy and Orality in Early Medieval Ireland." *Cultural Identity and Cultural Integration: Ireland and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Doris Edel. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1995.

Stokes, Whitley. "The Bodleian Dinnshenchas." *Folk-lore: A Quarterly Review of Myth, Tradition, Institution & Custom* 3:4. London: David Nutt, 1892.

--------------------. "The Edinburgh Dinnshenchas." *Folk-lore: A Quarterly Review of Myth, Tradition, Institution & Custom* 4. London: David Nutt, 1893.

--------------------. "The Prose Tales in the Rennes Dindshenchas." *Revue Celtique* 15, ed. Marie-Henri D'Arbois de Jubainville et. al. Paris: Librairie Emile Bouillon, 1894.

Strachan, John. *Old-Irish Paradigms and Selections from the Old-Irish Glosses,* 4th edition. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2014.

Teanglann: Dictionary and Language Library: https://www.teanglann.ie/en/. Belfast: Foras na Gaeilge, 2013-2021.

Theuerkauf, Marie-Luise. "The Death of Boand and the Recensions of Dindsenchas Érenn,"
        Ériu: The Journal of the School of Irish Learning 67, ed. Liam Breatnach and Damian
        McManus. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2017.

Todd, James Henthorn. *The Irish Version of the Historia Britonum of Nennius.*
        Dublin: Irish Archaeological Society, 1848.

Toner, Gregory. "Landscape and Cosmology in the Dindshenchas." *Celtic Cosmology:*
        Perspectives from Ireland and Scotland, ed. Jacqueline Borsje and Ann Dooley et. al.
        Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2014.

-------------------. "Authority, Verse and the Transmission of Senchas." *Ériu: The Journal of the*
        School of Irish Learning 55, ed. Liam Breatnach, Rolf Baumgarten and Damian
        McManus. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 2005.

Tymoczko, Maria. "The Nature of Tradition and Cultural Memory: Evidence from Two.
        Millennia of Irish Literature." *Medieval Irish Perspectives on Cultural Memory,* ed. Jan
        Erik Rekdal and Erich Poppe. Munster: Nodus Publikationen, 2014.

White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." *The Writing of History: Literary*
        Form and Historical Understanding, ed. R. H. Canary and H. Kozicki. Wisconsin:
        University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Appendices

1.1 Transcriptions of 'Loch Garman'

The line numbers from the manuscripts have been preserved, and it is noted prior to the transcriptions if it is a metrical or prosimetrum entry. In the case of the prosimetrum entries, the prose has been written as a paragraph; however, in the metrical, the transcription has been left according to the lines in the manuscript. This is because the scribes frequently put the end of one line in the line above. Abbreviations are put in cursive font, and capital letters have been written in the transcription based on what has been written in the manuscript. The scribe uses a variety of different characters to denote "ceann faoi eite," marking the continuation of the text from the next line. This has been marked in the transcription as "//" no matter which character the scribe uses. Some words have been divided in the manuscripts, with one section being on one line, and the rest of the word on the next. This feature has been kept in the transcription but will be marked with an underlined font.

1.2 Adv MS 72.1.16 (Ed)
Metrical entry

fol 2 ra 1cest adconnairc // am rab*h* log bás lan
2Er*enn*fead duid ar in dra*í* da*í*d dian
3mait*h* le cataid id odclí cena adb*er*t rí
4m*ac* m*ur*eada // fir*ch*oír amail rug rí
5Iar si*n* bérid in drai dóib*h* breat*h* na físi go
6am in mbreat*h* mbil da es co cian com
7aillfid*h* // garg in aband fuil a tír t*h*e
8Is i ingen adbol ard adconnairctu a rí ro
9dianad ainm sirbuan slaine // hingine
10Is iat na data aderí a nedgud na
11aes gac*h*a dana bai fo nim gon ím*us*
12in anaisdib // ingín fi*n*d talam ar i*n* d*r*i
13Is e in brugaid .cét.ac*h* ci*n*d. rob at*h*air don
14da deoin tresa .cet.gac*h*a ceneoil // bagaim
15Is e in m*ac* ro bai na broind .oc*h*t.c*et*. bli*adna*. mar
16loc*h* genfes uait*h*í ar gort glas *ocus* re
17t lindsiu let*h*fas // abaind nimslaín
18In lla genf*h*es cona gaír bait*h*fid in
19cach da holsi dara hor *acht* gid*h* morsi
20bad morson // aís osa cind
21Is e in cnoc mor mor gac*h* nind atconnarc
22do neartsu os talm*h*an na tor gan
23toirneam is gan tret*h*ad*h* // toirt*h*ech tu
24Is e in bilí oír feac*h* gegac*h* let*h*an lan
25su at i rig*h* for banb*h*a mbi*n*d is ar gac*h*
26adb*h*a in eri*n*d . in na loc*h* .i.

1.3 MS D ii 1 (M)
Prosimetrum entry

fol 88 vb 55 Loch Carman cid dia ta .ni handsa. .i. 56Carman mac momandleice l*och* garman robaid57ead and la cathair or .i. rig*h* erenn dane 58arnaig*h* án reacht ar feis tig*h* teamrach

104

.i. mind oir na rigna do tall a tigh midchuarta **⁶⁰**romarbad a muínter ar ba di<u>bearg</u>**⁶¹**ach ba fodlaig coned uad*h* ainm níchear **⁶²**loch carmar no domad garmam glás **⁶³**mac deagad ainm nic*h*eac*h*ear cuíus frater **⁶⁴**erad dee a quo inber nee 7 abann dee a crich **⁶⁵**cualand anm atberat Mac bámha **⁶⁶**leice luáidme ín ri cathair rosbaide <u>gar</u>**⁶⁷**<u>mam</u> a hainm tre bairdmem agair gneb co ros**⁶⁸**baide conad de sin fos a dubrad an duan **⁶⁹**sa sis

ᶠᵒˡ ⁸⁹ ʳᵃ ¹Ri na loc*h* ín loc*h*sa teas loc*h* garman na <u>ng</u>
²<u>laíneis</u> cuan crabac*h* leathan na long <u>aen</u>
³<u>ac*h*</u> na neatar nedrom // mortír dun ar níc
⁴Inad*h* is ruíd*h*leas da rig a comraig muir is
⁵idal as suairc rosilad in seancus // <u>aib.</u> er*enn*.
⁶Cia dib robo taesca treall fiarfaitear <u>deolc*h*</u>
⁷mág*h* na sluag*h* re tadall toir. no ín aband <u>f*h*u</u>
⁸<u>ar</u> roíndsaig*h* // idm na haband gan ail co <u>m</u>
⁹Imcian atorro malle mad*h*a fec*th*ar fírínde o <u>ma</u>
¹⁰<u>aid*h*m</u> in loc*h*o líndglaín // bi ín loc*h* morg*h*lan
¹¹In abánd atrac*h*t ar tus am eolac*h* ína t*h*imthus ní rai
¹²mall co cian ar eis na haband // glánfuair fri
¹³Fri re cát*h*air na cath cruaig*h* maíd*h*m loc*h*o garman
¹⁴re fer mbolc gan baine maíd*h*m sunda na seanslaíní
¹⁵Tri fog*h*la for fearaib bolc gid*h* ga nimrad ni <u>h</u>
¹⁶<u>anord*h*</u> gabsad eiríind íar nead*h*aib co tren a tri ninberaib*h*
¹⁷Aentrian dib arimt*h*ar and a nínber daíneac*h* <u>domn</u>
¹⁸<u>and</u> in darna trian gan taisi i ninber dian <u>dub*h*gl</u>
¹⁹<u>ais*h*i</u> // láig*h*i re gairm nar gand o fiul ainm
²⁰In treas trian taíníc alle co hinber sluagac*h* slaíne. im
²¹na haband // co port caelranda na ceil uaír
²²Is ead*h* tangadar a tir loingeas fer mbolc mbriatharmín
²³ba he a hainm an uairsein // <u>oir</u> ona ramhaib*h*
²⁴Is and tancatar na sloig*h* co port caelranda a <u>c*h*ed</u>
²⁵rucad*h* and is uaid*h*ib*h* raiter ram*h*and //
²⁶Seancas anma ín lac*h*a lain da tucam a <u>tuarasc</u>
²⁷<u>bail</u> re aisneis gid*h* mor in mod*h* is e á m*h*aith a <u>m</u>
²⁸<u>íníug*h*ud*h*</u> // agla daníthi in tansin co teand ag
²⁹Feis team*h*ra gac*h* treas bliadna do comall reac*h*ta. is <u>ri</u>
³⁰rigaib*h* uaislí er*enn*e // <u>rach</u> teagaid man feis
³¹Darig*h*ní cath*air* cleamnac*h* feis ram*h*or na rig <u>team*h*</u>
³²fear di de fir er*enn* an aenbaile // <u>id*h*bes</u> dan
³³Tri lá re samaín buan bes tri lá na diaid*h* b*h*a <u>de</u>
³⁴sluag*h* robo dimor daig*h* ag sirol rusín seac*h*tm*h*aín
³⁵Gan gaid is gan g*h*uínn duíní aco ín oireadsin uilí. gan
³⁶íimírt airm gan alad*h* gan eac*h*raid*h* da imrag*h*ad*h* //
³⁷Da b*h*i trenfear ra tig. t*h*all for cur cath*air* ní c*h*elam
³⁸garman mac boma leice da sluag*h* dagluag*h*
³⁹bearba barrbrice // eisce mind oir na rig
⁴⁰Da tarlla d*h*o san tig*h* t*h*e diamai an morsluag*h* ar <u>m</u>
⁴¹<u>na.</u> da g*h*id nirba gnim coir da c*h*aroid // co ric*h*t
⁴²Eloid*h* amac*h* le mínd oir ota teamraig*h* ín tromsloíg*h*
⁴³íinber slaíní seang i noirt*h*ear*h*deiscert ereann
⁴⁴Teagaid atuaid na deadaig*h* muintear cathar <u>c*h*orr</u>

⁴⁵sno nos fairsid*h* con tibrait tall dobi an inber na habann
⁴⁶In tret*h* rogabsat gnim garg. muíg*h*id*h* ín tibrá trenard odá
⁴⁷carraig co muir más o sin ís loc*h* leat*h*áng*h*lás
⁴⁸Báitear gármán sa loc*h* lán ná heoláig*h* aca imrad*h*
⁴⁹cuan na sgean is na sgoth nglan is uad ro lean
⁵⁰loc*h* garman // aebd*h*a hi acá nanand gac*h* e rí //r//?
⁵¹Is e sin seancus ceart coir in loc*h*a raglain romoir isi i nabann
⁵²Feác*h*t robi cath*air* ciall glan a tosac*h* buan a beath*air*?
⁵³co tarfas do fis // gan ceas// tuc sluag*h* er*enn* a nairdceas //
⁵⁴Ingean brugád*h* cetaig*h* caín co ndeilb*h* lucair co lanaib
⁵⁵da docbáil a cind gan col dan curaid*h* ina c*h*allad*h* // is da
⁵⁶Gac*h* dat*h* caem*h* dac*h*i duíní da gorm dá beac da buig*h*i
⁵⁷corcair. ba caem sin na hedg*h*ud*h* umon ingín// cet. bl*iadan* buan
⁵⁸Is amlaig tarla in bean torrac*h* is a bru bit*h*glan co ceand .ocht.
⁵⁹*acht* ge íngnad reimluad*h* // atheg ín tan rucad*h*
⁶⁰Co ruc m*ac* ba maith a med do cuir mor laec*h* a llu
⁶¹ní saeb sin. troisi in m*ac* ina math*air* // nífuair conair cuiread*h*
⁶²Triallaig*h* in math*air* os mnaib toc*h*t uad*h* ara imgabail
⁶³gleic *acht* tre oman in m*h*oirm*ac* // leir da mullac. in bith
⁶⁴Cnoc alaind osa c*h*índ caem na mna gus a m*ac* maroen
⁶⁵buan níba meíníc gan morsluag // oirfidead*h*
⁶⁶Bili oir ra c*h*noc .gan. cath roicead*h* a barr neam*h* nellac
⁶⁷sluaig*h* dom*h*aín de tigid*h* da barr in bile // da b*h*id*h*
⁶⁸In trat*h* da beanad*h* gaet*h* dur risin mbílí mbog mbarrur
^fol 89 rb ¹lán adbal a f*h*ir fer clar talman da doirt*h*ib // aig*h*
²Gac torad*h* da c*h*aithdis sluaig*h* anoir aneas is atu
³am*mar* tuili m*h*ara moil tigid*h* duact*ur* in aencroind //
⁴Is e sin fis fir in áid*h* ma nendais laigín luatgair. ca
⁵their m*ac* feídl*imthe* find airdrig*h* er*enn* os aillínd // ceand sloig*h*
⁶Iar sin musglaig*h* in fláith fial asa roc*h*ollad*h* roc*h*ian
⁷laigean umalle daíndis a aislínge // coros eirníd*h*
⁸Goirtear cuigi draii dam*h*ach barat*h* m*ur* ba rogradac*h* do
⁹dia ailt na huílí ceist dacondairc // le cataig*h*
¹⁰Eirnfead dind ar drai dait*h* dia f*h*agur lod*h* bus lánmait*h*
¹¹odc*h*lí c*h*eana adb*er*t ri m*ac* m*ar*ead*h*ada // ruc rim in
¹²Iar sin beirid*h* in drui doib*h* breath na fisi co fircoir am*mar*
¹³mbreith mbil da eis co cian comaillfid*h* //
¹⁴Is í íngean adbal ard atconncais a ri rog*h*arg in
¹⁵aband fuil a tir t*h*e dianad ainm sirbuan slaine
¹⁶Is iad na data adeiri a nedgud na hingeain
¹⁷aes gac*h* d*h*ana bai fo nim con imas a na uaist*h*ib
¹⁸Is e in brug*h*aid*h* .cet.ac*h* cínd dob adair don ingin find
¹⁹talam*h* ar a drai da deoin treasa ceoil gac*h*a ceineoil
²⁰Is e ín m*ac* da bi na broind. s*echt*. .cet. bl*iadan* mar bagoim. loc*h*
²¹ganf*h*eis uaithi ar gort glás *ocus* red líndsiu
²²leathbus // cac*h* ga holsi tara hor *acht* gid*h* morsi
²³In lá geínfeas cona g*h*air baitfid*h* i nabaind imslain
²⁴ba morson // da neartsu os talm*h*ain na tor. gan
²⁵Is e ín cnoc mor mor gac*h* ndind adcondarcais osa cínd
²⁶toirneam*h* is gan traet*h*od*h* // tusu ad rig for banba

106

²⁷Is e in bili oir oínfeac*h* gegac*h* leathan lantoirrt*h*eac
²⁸bínd is ar gac*h* adb*h*a an er*enn* // ri na loc*h* inloc*h* //

Prose entry
^{fol 93 vb 23}Loch ngarman cid dia ta. Ni handsa. garman glas m*ac* ²⁴deaid roadn*acht* and *ocus* intan
foclais aeat in ea souan ²⁵bais an loc*h* fotir and .l*och*. gaman *ocus* i tasascbt*h*a i leabair.

1.4 <u>MS 23 P 12 (BB)</u>
Prosimetrum entry
^{fol 198 vb 25}_____ //man
²⁶Loch garman canas ro*ainmniged*. ni *handsa*. gar
²⁷glas m*ac* dedaid*h* roadn*acht* and*h* ²⁸*ocus* intan foclas af*h*eart *ocus* is and meb*er* ín ²⁹loc*h* fotir. Un*de (nominatur)*. L*och*.g*a*rm*an*. Et cui*us* fr*ater* erat dea m*ac* ³⁰deand a quo inb*er* nd*en*d i crich cualann *ocus ara*i*l*e.
Alit*er*. ³¹.l*och*.g*a*rman .i. garmun garb m*ac* boma licce robaidead*h* ³²and*h* la cat*h*air mor hi tipraid p*h*uirt <u>c*h*ailren</u>³³<u>na</u> ar ba he a .c*et*.ainm *ocus* is and*h* m*h*ebaid ín loc*h* ³⁴t*un*c feis temr*ach* fognit*h*e la cat*h*air ar samhain ³⁵tri laith. riam. *ocus*. tr*í*. iar*um* cen g*h*aid *ocus* is cen g*h*uin ³⁶gan aib*r*iud*h* gan atgab*ai*l gan ecraite gan ³⁷ait*h*ed*h* c*on*id and dofall g*a*rman mi*n*d oir ³⁸mna cat*h*air iar mbet*h* dun ts*h*log*h* ar mes*cuir* ³⁹m*us*luí garman le mínd*h* noir na rig*h*na ⁴⁰*ocus* muínt*er* cat*h*air frís co ruc*ad* fair ic tipraid ⁴¹c*h*ailr*en*na c*on*id ic ga bad*h*ud*h* rom*h*eb*h*aid*h* in ⁴²loc*h*. Un*de (nominatur)* loch.g*a*rman.
O s*h*laine m*ac* dela o ri fer ⁴³mbolg ai*n*mnig*h*t*er* í naband*h*. .i. slaine *ocus* ⁴⁴inb*er* sl*aine* in aimsir cat*h*air. Im*arro* ainm meb*er* in loc*h*a ⁴⁵am*ar* asb*er*t hi fis cat*h*air.
Fe*ach*t i tossaig*h* a ⁴⁶bet*h*ad do c*h*at*h*air ína c*h*odlud*h* co facca ingin in <u>bri</u>⁴⁷<u>ug*h*ud*h*</u> cond*h*elb*h* caem*h* *ocus* gac*h* dat*h* ina timtaig*h* si ⁴⁸torrac*h*. dccc. b*liadan*. di sam*h*laid co ro t*h*ae gen m*ac* ⁴⁹*ocus* ba tressam olda mat*h*air in lait*h*i rofuccad*h* ⁵⁰cuirid*h* *ocus* ni fuair in m*h*athair inad*h* dia imgab*ai*l ⁵¹*acht* te*ach*t tre me*don* .i. in m*ac*. Cnoc oeb*h*ind*h* osa ^{fol 199 ra 1}cínd*h* dib línaib*h* airde gac*h* tul*aig* co slog*h*aib*h* ²and*h* bili edroc*h*t am*ail* or isin c*h*nuc cosniad ³co niulu ara airdi gac*h* ceol ina duilliub <u>brec</u>⁴<u>tais</u> a toirt*h*i in talam*h* intan na mb*h*enad*h* ⁵gaet*h* rog*h*a toraid*h* do gac*h* aen
M*us*duiscue la ⁶sodain conagart a drui .i. brí m*ac* <u>bairce</u>⁷<u>da</u> ínad*h* ocum *ocus* adfed scela do. <u>Eirníníf</u>⁸<u>etsa</u> insin ar bri is si in ing*h*en .i. i nabann <u>dia</u>⁹<u>níd*h*</u> comainm slaine. Is iat na dat*h*a ina <u>treg</u>¹⁰<u>ud</u> aes gac*h*a dana gan ind*us* fodla no aisde. ¹¹Ise ín brig*h*u ba hairde .i. talam triasa ta .c*et*. gan ¹²gen*emain*. Is e ín m*ac* bai na broínd*h* .dccc. b*liadan*. Loch gen¹³fes a srut*h*air na slaine *ocus* id lindsiu <u>m*us*luid*h*</u>¹⁴<u>fe</u>. Tresiu ín m*ac* olda m*a*thair ín la genfes ín ¹⁵loc*h* baid*h*fid*h* in aband uilí. Sloig*h* ímd*h*a ann. ¹⁶Cac*h* ca hoilsi *ocus* ga holsom*h*. Is e ín cnocc mor ¹⁷osa cind*h* do don*er*tsu os c*h*ach. Is e ín bili c*o* ndath oir ¹⁸c*on*a t*h*oirt*h*ib*h* tusu os b*h*anb*h*a ína flait*h*ius. Is e ¹⁹ceol bai í mb*ar*raib ín b*h*ilí t*h*urlabra i coma ²⁰*ocus* ic oigeart breat*h* ngaid*h*eal. Is i gaet*h* no <u>tras</u>²¹<u>crad*h*</u> in torad*h* hene*ach*su fri fod*h*ail set *ocus* ²²maine *ocus* rot*h*oimle ar bri bret*h* na fissi se *ocus* *ara*i*l*e.

²³Ri na loch in lochsa t*h*eas. Loc*h* <u>gar</u>
²⁴<u>man</u> na nglaneges. cuan <u>craeb*h*</u>
²⁵<u>ach</u> let*h*an na long aenac*h* na net*h*ar
²⁶netrom // raig muir is mort*h*ir.
²⁷Inad*h* as ruid*h*les do rig*h* i com
²⁸dun iar nd*h*ic*h*ur id*h*al as. suairc ro
²⁹silad*h* a senc*h*as. // <u>E</u>r*enn*. Loc*h* na sluag*h* f*ria* <u>tad*h*</u>
³⁰Cia dib robo tuscu treall iarfaig*h*t*er* deolcaib*h*
³¹<u>all</u> t*air* .no in nabann uar noninsaig*h*.// o m*h*aidm

[32]Imgian et*ur*ru maalle mad*h* da f*h*egt*h*ar firinne
[33]na habann gan oil. Co maidm in loc*h*a <u>lind</u>
[34]<u>g*h*loin</u>. // rab*h*i in loc*h* morg*h*lan mall co cia*n*
[35]In abann adr*acht* ar t*us*. am eolac*h* ina himt*us*. na
[36]tar eis na habann. // <u>man</u> glanfuair. fri re
[37]Fri re cath*air* na cat*h* cruaid*h* maid*m* loc*h*a <u>gar</u>
[38]fer mbolg gan baine. maid*m* sunna na saer slaine
[39]Tri fogla for feraib*h* bolg. gan <u>anim</u>
[40]luag*h* fri hanord. gabsat. h*erind*. Iar ned*h*aib*h* co tren
[41]a tri hinb*er*aib*h*. // <u>dara</u> t*ri*an gantaissi. Inb*er* <u>dí</u>
[42]Oent*ri*an dib a*ir*im*h*ter ann in inb*er* data domnann. <u>In</u>
[43]<u>an</u> dub*h*glaisi. // slaíne. Im s*laí*ni gan ga*ir*m bad
[44]In treas trian tainig ille. Co hinb*er* sluag*h*ach
[45]gand o fail a hain*m* na hab*er*. // <u>mín</u>. co port
[46]Is tangadar i tir loínges fer mbolg <u>mbriat*h*ar</u>
[47]caelrenna na ceil. uair robe a ai*n*m inn uairsin.
[48]Is and*h* tangandar na sloig*h* i port cael*r*enna <u>com</u>
[49]<u>coir</u>. ona ramaib rucsat ann. is uaid*h*ib <u>ain</u>
[50]<u>mníg*ter*</u> ramann. Senc*us* anma ín loc*h*a láin
[51]dia tugam a t*h*uar*us*gbail. re aisneis gid*h*

fol 199 rb [1]mor in mod. is e a m*h*aith a minig*h*od*h*. // <u>g*h*la</u>. fo
[2]Feis tem*rach*. gac*h* tres blia*dan*. do c*h*om*h*oll re*acht* is <u>ria</u>
[3]gnit*h*i in tansin co den ag rig*h*aib*h* aillib erend*h*.
[4]Dorig*ni* cath*air* cleamnac*h*. fes rac*h*ain na rig*h* t*h*em*rach*.
[5]tangandar mon feis fess de. fir er*enn* co <u>*h*aen</u>
[6]<u>baile</u>. // deg*h*bes. dun ts*h*luag*h* rias ba dimor
[7]Tri la ria sama*i*n buan bes. Tri la na diaid*h* ba
[8]daig*h*. ac sirol risin se*acht*m*h*aín. // gan imirt
[9]Gan gaid is gan guin duini acco inn aireadsin uilí
[10]airm gan alad*h* gan ecaird di*m*rag*h*ad*h*. // neím*h*
[11]Cebe neoc*h* doni mar sin dobo g*h*nim troc*h* co trom
[12]ní gebt*h*ai or arand uaid*h* *acht* a anam fri aenuair.
[13]Robai t*r*enfer sin tíg t*h*all fer cur cath*air* ní c*h*elam.
[14]carma*n* m*ac* boma licce do s*h*luag*h* b*h*anb*h*a <u>bairr</u>
[15]<u>b*ri*cce</u>. // ar mesce mind oir na rigna da g*h*oid
[16]Da tarla do sin tig*h* diambai in mors*h*luag*h*
[17]nírbo gni*m* coir do c*h*aroid. // co react inber
[18]Eloid*h* amac*h* le mind oir od*h*a tem*rach* in troms*h*loig.
[19]slai*n*e seang in noirt*h*iur desc*er*t er*enn*. // s*h*leg*h*aid*h*
[20]Tegait atuaid*h* na d*h*egaid*h* muindt*er* c*h*ath*air* c*h*orr
[21]nosfairset con tib*ra* tall. dobai in inb*er* na haban*n*.
[22]Od*h*a g*h*abad*h* ba gni*m* garg*h* muig*h*id*h* i tibra trenard
[23]od*h*a c*h*arraig co muir mas o s*h*in is loc*h* <u>let*h*an</u>
[24]<u>glas</u>. // loc*h* na sgiam is na sgot*h* nglan . uad
[25]Bait*er* ca*r*ma*n* sa loc*h* lan. na heolaig aga i*m*rad
[26]riam*h* ro len loc*h* ca*r*man. // is na haban*n* <u>aeb</u>
[27]*Is* e sin senc*us* c*er*t coir ín lacha raglai*n* romhoir
[28]<u>da</u> hi ica nanan*n* gac*h* aenrí. Ri. // a beth*ad*
[29]Feac*h*t robai cath*air* ciall glan i torraig buan
[30]co tarfas do fis rofess tuc sluaig*h* ere*n*d

31*i*n n*air*dceass. // co lanai*bh* da *th*oc*bh*ail ci*nn* <u>nir</u>
32Inge*a*n brug*h*ad*h*. .*c*etaig*h* caem*h* c*o* *n*deilb luc*h*air
33<u>b*h*o</u> *ch*ol don *car*aid ina *ch*ohodlod*h*. // do buid*h*e.
34Ga*ch* dat*h* caem adc*h*i dui*n*e do *gh*orm do b*h*riuc
35is do *ch*orcair ba su*air*c si*n* ína het*gh*ud*h* mon <u>in</u>
36<u>gin</u>. //. <u>lan</u>. co cend. *Ocht cét*. bli*adan* bil gid*h* <u>íng</u>
37Is aml*aid* robae in b*er* ban torrac*h* is a bru <u>bit*h*</u>
38<u>nad*h*</u> re índ*h*isin. // i lluat*h*ég. ín la rugad*h*.
39Co ruc m*ac* ba mait*h* a m*h*ét roc*h*uir mor laec*h*
40ba saeb si*n* tressi ín m*ac* ína m*athai*r. // gabail
41Triallaid i*n* m*athai*r *os* m*h*naib te*ach*t uad*h* *ar*a im
42ní fu*air* c*o*nairc cuirit gleic *ach*t tre m*edon* .i. a <u>mor</u>
43<u>m*ac*</u>. // <u>raen</u>. ler da mullac*h* in bit*h* buan.
44Cnoc aebi*n*n osa *ch*i*n*n caem*h* na mna *ocus* a m*ac* <u>ma</u>
45nírbu me*n*ic gan mors*h*luag*h*. // nell*ach* <u>*air*fíd</u>
46Bili oir sin *ch*nuc g*an* *ch*at*h* ric*h*ed*h* a b*arr* nea*m*
47<u>ed</u> f*er* ndo*m*un de adc*h*los du b*h*arr i b*h*ile. //
48In t*rath* *no* benad gaet*h* gur risi*n* mbilí mbog <u>m</u>
49<u>b*arr*ur</u> no bid*h* lan ad*h*ball a f*h*ír *ar* lar talm*han*
50dia t*h*oirt*h*ib*h*. Ga*ch* torad *no* *th*ogdais sluaig
51an*air* a*n*nes is atuaid*h* ím*ar* tuili m*ar*a <u>ma</u>
fol 199 va 1<u>ill</u> tig*h*ed*h* diac*h*tur ín aenc*r*aind*h*. // <u>t*h*g*air*</u>. cat*h*air
2Is si sin fis f*h*ír in aig*h* mo ndentais laigi*n* <u>lua</u>
3m*ac* fedl*imthe* f*h*ind *air*dri er*enn* a hailli*nn*. // *ch*ian. ce*a*nn
4I*ar* sin duis*air*d*h* ín fl*aith* fial asa roc*h*odlad*h* roi
5sl*uag* laig*en* ímolle di*n*nisin a aisli*n*ne. // <u>g*rad*ha*ch*</u>
6G*air*mt*er* *ch*uige ín druí dama*ch* igon rí ba <u>ro</u>
7do co roerne*adh* dia ailt na huili *ch*est*a* <u>atc*o*nn</u>
8<u>airc</u>. // b*us* lanmait*h*. lat *ch*ataid it *ch*rí <u>*ch*e</u>
9Eirnife*a*tsa *ar* ín d*r*ai dait*h* diano*m* raib luag*h*
10<u>na</u> asb*er*t brí m*ac* b*air*rc*h*eda // lo m*ar* da *ch*ataid*h*
11Tegait cura dai*n*gní d*h*o re luac*h* dfhag*h*ail in ga*nh*
12tall na taig*h* rí redaib m*ar* dacui*n*dig*h*. // ímar
13I*ar* sin b*er*id ín d*r*ai doib breit*h* na fisi co firc*h*oir
14rug i*n* mb*r*eít*h* co mbl*aid* di eis cid*h* cian c*o*mailtír.
15Is í i*n* inge*a*n ad*h*b*h*al *ar*d adc*o*nn*ar*cais a rí rog*h*arg.
16i*n* aban*n* fil i tir t*h*e. dianíd*h* ai*n*m sirb*h*uan sl*a*ne
17Is iat na dat*h*a adb*er*e í net*h*g*h*ud*h* na hí*n*gi*n*e. aes
18ga*ch* dana nuí fo ni*m* gan i*n*and*us* na naístib*h*.
19Is e ín briug*h*u ca*ch* cínd. rob at*h*air don i*n*gin f*h*ind
20tal*am* *ar* in d*r*ai dia d*h*eoi*n* tresa ta .*cet*. ga*ch* ceneoil.
21Is e in m*ac* ro bai na b*ro*ind. oc*h*t.*cet*.bli*adan*. m*ar* bag*h*om
22lo*ch* genfes uaidi *ar* gurt glas *ocus* frit <u>lind*h*</u>
23<u>siu</u> let*h*f*h*as. // <u>slain</u>. ca*ch* ca hoilsi dara <u>h</u>or
24In la geenfes c*o*na gair baid*h*fid*h* in abaínd*h* <u>ím</u>
25a*ch*t gid*h* morsi ba morsom*h*. // *ch*índ*h* do n*er*tsu
26Is e in cnoc mor mo gac adc*h*onn*ar*cais osa
27os ca*ch* is mo*ch*ean gan t*r*aet*h*ad is gan t*air*neam*h*.
28Is e in bili oir ainbet*h* gega*ch* let*h*an lantoirt*h*eac*h*
29<u>t*us*</u>su id rí *ar* banb*h*a mbi*n*n is *ar* ga*ch* adb*h*a

[30]der*enn*. // <u>aín</u>. hurlab*ra* f*h*ial aebd*h*a de i <u>sid*h*u</u>
[31]Is e ín t*air*fidead*h* c*o* *n*uail ro bai í mb*h*a*r*r bili <u>bu</u>
[32]<u>gud*h*</u> soc*h*aid*h*e. // <u>t*h*i</u> a*n*nuas. hene*ach* a d*h*edg*h*il
[33]Is i ín gaet*h* cobsaid gan c*ru*as ro t*ar*sc*air* na <u>toir</u>
[34]d*h*uanaig*h* ic dail c*hru*id*h* do c*h*aemsl*u*ag. // <u>t*h*ulaig</u>. ní
[35]Daid*h* atá bret*h* bunaid*h*. na fisi ín gac*h* <u>p*ri*mh</u>
[36]f*h*ail d*o* c*re*tim id c*h*ri a*r* er*enn* gurbat enrí. Ri
[37]Eoc*h*aid eol*ach* dia*r*b usa fofu*air* suit*h*i se*anchus*a du
[38].*loch*.g*arman*. tall na t*h*ir ic andad*h* ra*n*n dia rorig*h*. R.
[39]Cu*inngh*im idci a*r* dia dam. co rop mait*h* <u>im</u>
[40]<u>t*h*us</u> ma*n*man na r*us*lena cin i crí gun f*h*ir
[41]acnarba hait*h*rí . Ri. n.

2.1 Transcriptions of 'Lia Nothain'

The line numbers from the manuscripts have been preserved, and it is noted prior to the transcriptions if it is a metrical, prose, or prosimetrum entry. In the case of the prosimetrum entries, the prose has been written as a paragraph; however, in the metrical, the transcription has been left according to the lines in the manuscript. This is because the scribes frequently put the end of one line in the preceding line. Abbreviations are put in cursive font, and capital letters have been written in the transcription based on what has been written in the manuscript. The scribe uses a variety of different characters to denote "ceann faoi eite," marking the continuation of the text from the line below. This has been marked in the transcription as "//" no matter which character the scribe uses. Due to space in the manuscript, some words have been divided up with one section being on one line, and the rest of the word on the next. This feature has been kept in the transcription but will be marked with an underlined font.

2.2 <u>MS D ii 1 (M)</u>
Prosimetrum Entry

fol 102 va **[53]**Lia not*h*ain canas ro*h*ainmniged. *ní handsa*. Not*h*ain ínge*n* conmaer do <u>c*h*on*n*</u>**[54]***ach*t áib*h* robae as ca*n* dub*h*t*h*air ia*r*aile. t*ri*. .*l*. bl*iadan*. *ocus* ní t*h*uc **[55]**a liaigid*h* ar mac*air*e *ocus* p*r*oind .*cet*. dom*h*eilead. lind*h* da*n* **[56]**a hat*h*aír a c*rich* be*r*re do ia*r*rair aí nge*n*íe co mbae blia*in* **[57]**lai*n* fo*r*a foc*h*m*air*c *con*id a*n*n fosfuair is*in* f*h*idbaid*h* *ocus* **[58]**ba leor do g*r*aín a dealb*h* *ocus* ba head roraid*h* f*ri*s i*n*dat bí **[59]**fo*r* ndai*n*e .i. mo mui*m*e *ocus* mo m*athai*r *ocus* mo bratír *ocus* ca*n* **[60]**ar f*h*ag*us* oc dru*in* cai*n* m*ar*b inle *ach*t meisse *ar* co*n*maer **[61]**basa m*ar*bsa dí sod*h*ain ol sisi *ocus* tíagsa leatsu <u>imb*ar*</u>**[62]**a*ch* ar ín maig*h* coro suid*h*i mo lia *ocus* coro claid mo **[63]**feart unde lia notaín dicitur …

fol 102 vb **[1]**Atá sund fo c*hair*te c*h*ruaig*h* bean co ndoirc*h*e
[2]is co ndimbuaid*h* ga*n* *g*air*m a soc*h*air foseach
[3]diarb *h*aínm notha*í*n neartbuilleac*h* // <u>d*h*ael</u>
[4]Ing*h*ean c*o*nm*h*air con gním*h* ngail ína <u>gorm</u>
[5]dob*h*arduib furt*h*aín .*cet*. a cuid p*r*oíndi an duib*h*t*h*ear
[6]d*h*et deacoilli // <u>ea*n*d</u> dif*h*is na mna ba huathmur
[7]Ceac*h*aing conm*h*aer cenn go ceand a c*rich* berra na <u>mbeim</u>
[8]blad*h* go cric*h* c*ru*ac*h*an na curad*h* // .bl*iadan*. ar bíní ag iarraíd*h*
[9]Tug mor ceímeand go ng*air*bi a*r* fut er*enn* ímaiblí da c*h*áit*h*
[10]a íng*h*íní // <u>coir</u> anu*air* rob ail a deisci*n* ba leor ng*ru*in
[11]Da f*h*u*air* ín mnái mot*h*laig*h* moir a f*h*idb*h*aidh c*h*oc*h*tlaig*h* <u>c*h*leat*h*</u>
[12]is ng*air*bd*h*eisdín // dead*h* mnai ro b*h*adar a ndis ale
[13]Fead*h* na haithi doib ga*n* *gh*ai dan f*h*ir f*h*oirfi ís dan

110

¹⁴an sgis a gasgelb*h*aile // anat bi f*ri*a s*air*i son b*h*ar

¹⁵Is e *.cet.* ní daraid*h* si ín be*a*n ga *n*baid*h* mbuanb*h*reithri

¹⁶ndaíní *ocus* b*h*ar ndearbc*r*od*h* // <u>ruag*h*</u> dic mo c*h*arad ag

¹⁷Mo buímí mo m*h*ath*air* m*h*uad*h* mo s*h*iur mbrath*air* <u>bith</u>

¹⁸drui*m* chain an marat leat a c*h*onm*h*air // it a t*r*eísi t*r*eab*h*

¹⁹Ana f*h*aca thiar cotaig*h* *ar* c*on*m*h*aer ciar dod c*air*dib ní m*air*

²⁰*acht* mad*h* meisi a mori*n*gean // <u>luad*h*</u> t*r*uad*h* an f*h*och*a*ín da

²¹And sin adb*er*t in b*h*ean b*h*uan a haitheasc mear co <u>mor</u>

²²<u>ria</u> d*h*e nac bia not*h*oín da neise // faca mín morm*h*uígi

²³T*ri* *.l.* bl*i*ad*an* baid*h*id*h* ní hiarm*ur* in hi*m*airi*m* atu fo d*h*ín gac*h* d*air*i ní

²⁴Tiadsa amarac*h* lat amac*h* a mag*h* nad*h*ac*h* nilc*r*ot*h*ach ní f*h*uíl

²⁵m*h*uígi ni b*h*as ia cora saig*h*i mo laec*h*l*í*a // <u>thair</u> an bean

²⁶Rosfug bas nír bed co mblaid*h* dan sgel adfead a <u>ha</u>

²⁷co toirthi monu*air* ata fo coirt*h*e com*h*cruaid*h* //

²⁸Is isi*n* focoín da fuail lia notaín ga*n* i*m*reasuín

²⁹a hai*n*m ana bailib*h* d*h*e m*a*raid*h* gid*h* marb ata se //

2.3 <u>MS 23 P 12 (BB)</u>
Prosimetrum entry

^{fol 220 rb 19} ……. // maer do con*n*achtaib robai os gach

²⁰Lia notaín canas rohaimniged. ní *handsa.* notan i*n*gen con ²¹dub*h*tair diaraile t*ri* *.l.* bl*i*ad*an* *ocus* ní tug <u>ahaig</u>²²id *ar* mac*air*e *ocus* proind *.cet.* nomeiled. luid di*n* ²³a hath*air* a cric*h* b*er*re do i*ar*raid a ingíne co mbaeí ²⁴bl*i*ad*ain* lai*n* fora foc*h*marc co*n*id and fosfu*air* isin fidbaid*h* ²⁵*ocus* ba leor du g*r*aín a dealb*h* *ocus* ba head roraid fris in²⁶<u>dad</u> bi f*or* ndaíní *.i.* mo m*h*uíme *ocus* mo m*a*thair *ocus* mo brath*air* ²⁷*ocus* gac*h* ar fagus og druim cain m*ar*b uile *acht* mese ar ²⁸*con*maer ba*m*sa marba di sod*h*aín ol sisi *ocus* tiag*h*sa <u>la</u>²⁹tsu imarac*h* *ar* in mag cor saidi mo lia *ocus* coro claid*h* ³⁰mo f*h*eart *unde* lia not*h*ain noni*tur* //is co *n*dimb*h*uaid.

³¹Ata sund fo coirti i cruaid b*en* *co* *n*doirchi

³²gan g*air*m a soc*air* moaseac*h* di*ar*b ain*m* <u>no</u>

³³t*air* n*er*tbuilleac*h*. // <u>dael</u> gobuilduib <u>fur</u>

³⁴Ing*h*en c*on*m*air* gan g*h*nim guil ina <u>gorm</u>

³⁵<u>taín</u> *.cét.* a cuid prai*n*ne in dubt*h*air d*h*et degcaille.

³⁶Cec*h*aing *con*maer ceím co ceand a críc*h* b*er*re na <u>m</u>

³⁷<u>beimbe*nn*</u> df*h*is na mna ba huatm*ar* blad co c*r*ich

³⁸cruacan na corad // <u>it*h*</u> bl*i*ad*ain* fo biní og iarraid*h*

³⁹Tug mor ceme*nn* *co* *n*g*air*be *ar* fut er*enn* ímaidble ro <u>ca</u>

⁴⁰a íng*h*iní. // <u>laig*h*</u> cleatcoir. don f*h*iur di*ar*f*h* ail

⁴¹Co fuair i*n* mnai mot*h*lag*h* moir i f*h*idbaid*h* <u>c*h*och</u>

⁴²a decsin ba leor grain is gairbdeistin. // degmnai

⁴³Ead*h* na haidc*h*í doib*h* gan gaei dun f*h*ir f*er*b*h*t*h*i don

⁴⁴ro bad*ar* a ndis moalle. *ar* scís ocascelb*h*aile.

⁴⁵Is e *.cet.* ní roraid*h* si ín b*en* ga nbaig*h* mb*h*uanbreit*h*ri

⁴⁶ínad bi fri saeri son f*or* ndaíne *ocus* f*or* nd*er*bc*h*rod.

⁴⁷Mo muímí mo m*a*thai*r* muad*h*. mo s*h*iur mo b*h*rath*air*.

⁴⁸b*h*it*h*ruad*h* óg mo carat oc druím chain i*n* ma

⁴⁹<u>rad</u> lat a c*h*onm*h*air. // <u>dib*h*</u> ní m*air*end*h* i tressi t*r*eab*h*

⁵⁰Ina facca ti*ar* coa tig *ar* c*on*m*h*aer ciar dot <u>c*air*</u>

⁵¹*acht* ma messi a moiríng*h*ean. And sin adbert

^{fol 220 va 1}ín b*en* b*h*uan ait*h*esc mear coa miluag*h* truag*h* ín

111

[2]*f*ho*ch*aín duria de na bia no*th*aín dia neise.
[3]T*ri* .l. bl*iada*n baig*h*idh cid*h* i*a*rmar ní hím*air*im*h* atu fo di*n* ga*nh*
[4]daire ní faca mín mormaig*he*. // ní fail <u>maí</u>
[5]Tiag*h*sa ímara*ch* lat ima*ch* í mag nara*ch* nil*ch*ro*th*ach
[6]<u>gi</u> ni bas sia coro saidi mo lae*ch*lia. // a*th*air ín b*en* co <u>*n*</u>
[7]Rosfuc bas nir bet co mblaid dun sceol adfet a
[8]<u>doisci</u> n*ar* duail ata fo *ch*oir*th*í com*ch*ruaid. Ata.
[9]Isi isin fo*ch*aín dia fail. lia no*th*aín gan ímre*s*aín.
[10]a hai*n*m ína mbailib de. m*ar*uid*h* gid marb ata se.
[11]Nomsaer *ar* ímne*dh* *ar* olc. a ri fi*ng*eal firedroct
[12]nirbam truag*h* sin dail tall t*ra* iar luag*h* *ch*ai*ch* ata
[13]su*n*na . Ata. s.

3.1 Transcriptions of 'Berba'

The line numbers from the manuscripts have been preserved, and it is noted prior to the transcrip*ti*ons if it is a metrical, prose, or prosimetrum entry. In the case of the prosimetrum entries, the prose has been written as a paragraph; however, in the metrical, the transcription has been left according to the lines in the manuscript. This is because the scribes frequently put the end of one line in the preceding line. Abbreviations are put in cursive font, and capital letters have been written in the transcrip*ti*on based on what is written in the manuscript. The scribe uses a variety of different characters to denote "ceann faoi eite," marking the continuation of the text from the line below. This has been marked in the transcription as "//" no matter which character the scribe uses. Due to space in the manuscript, some words have been divided up with one section being on one line, and the rest of the word on the next. This feature has been kept in the transcription but will be marked with an underlined font.

3.2 <u>Adv MS 72.1.16 (Ed)</u>
Prose entry
[fol 3 rb 9]….B*er*b*h*a cid dia ta. .Ni *handsa*. [10] Berba dona is i*n*te ro laíte na t*ri* <u>nat*h*[11]racha</u> b*h*ad*ar* i crid*h*i mece m*ac* na *mo*ríg*h*na [12]i*ar*na b*h*as do m*ac* cec*h*t i*n* muig*h* mec*h*e mag*h* [13]fortaíg*h*e do*n* ai*n*m i*n* muíg*h*esi*n* *ar* tus <u>del[14]ba</u> t*ri* cend nat*h*rach bad*ar* forna t*ri* cr*i*de [15]bad*ar* for na t*ri* eche i mine toirsed a [16]bas forbeordais na nat*h*racha*si*n i*n*a b*r*oind [17]*con*a fagbaidis an a*n*ma*n*na beó an er*enn* *con*a [18]sloeig m*ac* cec*h* i*ar*na m*ar*bad muig*h* [19]luadad go ro la a luait*h* isi*n* srut*h* ut [20]go ro *m*b*er*b*h* *ocus* go ro d*h*elea*ch* gac*h* na*n*ma*n*na [21]báí i*n* tib*h* f*ri*u *con*ad de si*n* ata mag <u>lua[22]gad*h*</u> *ocus* mag*h* mec*h*e 7 berb*h*a un*de* poeta [23]dixit.

Cr*í*de mec*h*i cruaíd*h* an *ch*nead*h* isi*n*
[24]b*er*ba do baid*h*ead*h* a luait*h* *ar*na losgud*h*
[25]b*er*b*h* ro *ch*uir m*ac* cec*h*t. .*cet*guin*n*ích. …..

3.3 <u>MS D ii 1 (M)</u>
Prosimetrum entry
[fol 89 va 13]...... // is and ro <u>b*h*</u>
[14]Be*ar*b*h*a cid dia ta .ni *handsa*. Meth m*ac* na morrig*h*na
[15]<u>adar</u> na t*ri* crig*h*i corod m*ar*b m*ac* cec*h*t a muig*h* m*h*et*h* [16]i saml*aigh* ro bad*air* na t*ri* cr*i*gi si*n* condealbaib tri <u>nat*h*[17]rach</u> treot*h*o. Mag. f*er*taig*h*i do*n* ai*n*m ín m*h*uig*h*i [18]cosi*n* mina t*h*ors*ed* do*n* doniet*h* *ar* ro foirbread*air* [19]nat nat*rac*ha ind no*ch*naid*h*fidis a fuig*h*dis beo an [20]er*enn* ro loisc iaro*m* m*ac* cec*h*t na c*ri*geada sin a muig*h* <u>lua[21]gad</u> *nó* a muig luat*h*at coro la a luaith risi*n* ruth [22]coro marb aes i*n* srotha *ocus* cor marb gac*h* an ai*m* bai [23]and *ocus* co ro bearb *nó* co*m*ad*h*

anard luaithrig*h* ro loisc [24]un*de* d*icitu*r bea*r*ba *ocus* mag*h* methi *ocus* ard luithrid*h* nó co*mad*h [25]be*r*ba. eo .i. beir bir *ocus* ba *ocus* balb .d*icitu*r .i. us*ce* balb*hi*. //

[26]In bearba buan co mbailbi saig*h*is co sluag*h* se*an*
[27]ailm*hi* is fis fe*a*dma i*n* fath ma fuil bearb*h*a. bl
[28]ait*h* ga*c*h blad*h*foc*h*uil // morm*h*ilti rosearb*h* ro b*h*al
[29]Ni buailfead*h* foceird inti luait*h*read*h* meith. na
[30]b*h* gan at*h*ba*c*h salc*u*r searb na se*a*nnathra*c*h // cnaid*h*
[31]Nath*ir* fo t*ri* foceird cor dataig*h* umbeirt a brondad*h*
[32]fid*h* dia falaig*h* ga neill slog*h* sadail na sei*n*e*r*enn //
[33]Airsin ros marb and m*ac* cec*h*t ba fotha g*ar*b don g*h*lai*n*
[34]ec*h*t do cosc co buan don b*r*ondad*h* os g*h*a*c*h cuan da
[35]co*m*long*a*d // ga a luait*h* olc gan aeb ne*ang*h*a for
[36]Eol dam a lea*c*ht le*ath* re la feart gan tea*c*h is gan tu
[37]fu*air* foc*h*t i sairbearba // ín be*ar*ba // ….

3.4 MS 23 P 12 (BB)
Prosimetrum entry

[fol 192 va 27]Bea*r*ba cid dia da. ni *handsa*. meic*h*i m*ac* na moir[28]rigna is an*n* ro badar na t*ri* cridi corod [29]marb m*ac* cec*h*t i maig*h* meic*h*i amlaid ba[30]dar na t*ri* c*ri*di sin *con*delbaib nat*r*ach treit*h*ib*h* [31]Mag f*er*taidi di*n* a ainm *in* maige cosi*n* meni [32]toiris*ed* di*n* bas do meice *ar* *for*berdais na na[33]t*r*ach. ind *ocus* focnafed*h* a na f*h*uig*h*ead*h* beo in h*erenn*. ro [34]loisc iar*um* m*ac* cec*h*t na c*ri*di sin i maig*h* luat*h*ath [35]coro la a luait*h* risin srut*h* co ro m*ar*b*h* es in tsro[36]t*h*a *ocus* co ro m*ar*b*h* ca*c*h na*n*manda ro bae and *ocus* co[37]ro mberb*h* nó comb*h*ad*h* ín *ar*d luat*h*rid no loisc [38]un*de* d*icitu*r b*er*ba *ocus* mag*h* meic*h*i *ocus* aird luait*h*rid nó comb*ad* [39]b*er*ba .i. b*er* nó bir *ocus* ba .i. balb d*icitu*r .i.us*ce* balb.

[40]IN berba buan co mb*h*ailb*h*i saig*us* co slu*ag*
[41]senailbi is fis fedma *in* fat*h* dia fuil
[42]b*er*ba blait*h* ga*c*h bladfocail. // cí na mor
[43]Ni fuailfed*h* foc*h*eird inti luait*h*red*h* me
[44]millti ros balb ros b*er*b cen atba*c*h sal*c*ar s*er*b*h*
[45]na se*n*natr*ac*h. // nad*h* cnaifed*h* dia alaid*h* og
[46]Nat*h*air fo t*ri* foc*h*erd cor tat*h*ig*h* in mberg a b*ro*n
[47]nell slog*h* sad*h*al na sener*enn*. // glane*c*ht do
[48]Airisin ro m*ar*b m*ac* cec*h*t ba fota garb du*n*
[49]cosc co buan don bro*n*nad os ca*c*h cuan dia
[50]co*m*long*a*d. Eol dam a le*c*ht let*h* ri la f*er*t cen te*c*ht
[fol 192 vb 1]is cen tiugba a luait*h* olc *con* aib enga fo f
[2]uair so*c*ht ar saerb*er*ba. in b*er*ba. ….

3.5 MS 1436 (E)
Prosimetrum entry

[fol 85 b 8]…… // rígna *ocus* in dagda is an*n* bad*ar*
[9]Berba can*as* roh*ainm*niged. ni *handsa*. Mia*c*h m*ac* na mor
[10]na t*ri* c*ri*de. co ro m*ar*b m*ac* cec*h*t a muig meic*h* [11]hé. Aml*aid* bad*ar* na t*ri* c*ri*de sin condelbaib c*h*enn [12]nat*r*ach *for*ro. Mag fertaigi ainm *in* muigi sin. [13]Mene t*h*ors*ed* di*n*. bas do mia*c*h *ar* *for*bairt na nat*r*ach [14]noc*h*a nucfed ca*n* nuncfed beo an er*inn*. Co ro lo[15]isc iar*um* m*ac* cec*h*t na t*ri* c*ri*de a muig luat*h*ad co ro [16]la a luait*h* lasi*n* srut*h* cor m*ar*b eas in tsrot*h*a [17]*ocus* co ro m*ar*b

113

can an*mann* bói and *ocus* gur*u* berb. *Nó* [18]com*ad* anand luait*h*rid no loiscfed. Un*de* d*icitu*r. <u>Ber</u>[19]<u>ba</u> balb .i. uis*ce* balb // senailbe : is fis <u>fed</u>

[20]In berba buan co m*h*bailbe. saig*h*es co slu*ag*
[21]<u>ma</u> i*n* fat*h* dia fuil. b*er*ba blait*h* ca*n* <u>bladfoc</u>
[22]<u>ail</u> // <u>millti</u> : *ocus* ros balb cac*h* atbat*h*. salc*h*ar
[23]Nosfúid set co feíg i*n*ti. luait*h*red meic*h* in <u>mor</u>
[24]serb na sennat*rach* // <u>ad</u> : claefed dia halaid
[25]Nat*h*air fo t*ri* foc*h*erd cor . tat*h*aig i*n* m*h*b*er*t do <u>br*o*nd</u>
[26]óg nell. slog sedail na sener*inn* // gla*n*eac*h*t :
[27]Araísin ro m*ar*b m*ac* cec*h*t. ba fat*h*a g*ar*b don
[28]do c*h*oisc co buan do*n* br*onn*ad. os ca*n* cua*n* dia c*h*oml*o*ngad
[29]Eól dam a leac*h*t let*h* ro lá f*er*t ca*n* teac*h* is ca*n* tugu :
[30]a luait*h* olc ga*n* aib (-)enga . f*or* roc*h*t i saerb*er*ba: …

4.1 Interrelationship of 'Loch Garman'

This is compiled as a worksheet and additional aid for analysis as it shows the interrelationship between the manuscripts. It also puts each stanza next to each other in the manuscripts when it comes to the metrical account. Following the metrical account of 'Loch Garman,' it puts the prose accounts next to each other, dividing them into these categories: formulaic markers, first tale, the single metrical stanza, any references to metrical, and countertale. M is added in this section due to its similarities to the prose recension. Finally, there is a section on BB with its prose introduction, divided into formulaic marker, countertale and first stanza. This is provided in order to get a more organized view of 'Loch Garman' in these manuscripts.

4.2 Metrical Stanzas

	LL	M	BB	Ed
1	Ri na lloch in lochsa thess / Loch Garman na nglanéices / cuan craibach lethan na llong / oenach na n-ethar n-etrom.	Ri na loch in lochsa teas / loch garman na nglaíneis / cuan crabach leathan na long / aenach na n-eatar n-edrom.	Ri na loch in lochsa theas / Loch Garman na nglaneges / cuan craebhach lethan na long / aenach na n-ethar n-etrom.	
2	Inad is ruidles do ríg / i comraic muir is mórthir/ dún iar ndichur idal as / suairc ro **s**ilad a **s**enchas.	Inadh is ruídhleas da rig / a comraig muir is mortír / dun ar níc idal as / suairc ro silad in seancus.	Inadh as ruidhles do righ / i comraig muir is morthir / dun iar ndhichur idhal as / suairc ro siladh a senchas.	
3	Cia dib ropo thusciu threll / iarfaigther d'eolchaib Herend / Loch na slúag ria thadall tair / inda ind aband úar ro n-insaig.	Cia dib robo taesca treal / fiarfaitear deolchaib erenn / mágh na sluagh re tadall toir / no in aband fhuar roindsaigh.	Cia dib robo tuscu treall / iarfaighter deolcaibh erenn / Loch na sluagh fria tadhall tair / no in nabann uar no ninsaigh.	
4	Imchian eturru moalle / mad dia fegthar firinne / o maidm na haband cen ail / co maidm in locha lindglain.	Imcian atorro malle / madha fecthar firinde / o maidm na haband gan ail / co maidhm in locho lindglain.	Imgian eturru maalle / madh da fhegthar firinne / o mhaidm na habann gan oil / co maidm in locha lindghloin	
5	Ind aband attract ar tús / amm eolach na n-imthús / ni rabi in loch morglan mall / co cian dar eis na haband.	In aband atracht ar tus / am eolach ina thimthus / ni raibi in loch morghlan mall / co cian ar eis na haband.	In abann adracht ar tus / am eolach ina himtus / na rabhi in loch morghlan mall / co cian tar eis na habann.	
6	Fri ré Cathair na cath crúaid / maidm Locha Garman glanúair / fri ré Fer **m**Bolg cen bane /	Fri re Cathair na cath cruaigh / maidhm locho garman glánfuair / fri re fer mbolc gan	Fri re Cathair na cath cruaidh / maidm locha garman glanfuair / fri re fer mbolg	

	maidm sunna na sen**S**láne.	baine / maidhm sunda na seanslaíní.	gan baine / maidm sunna na saer slaine.	
7	Tri fodla for Feraib Bolg / cid a n-imluad ní hanord / gabsat Herind iar n-edaib / co trén a trí hinberaib.	Tri foghla for fearaib bolc / gidh ga nimrad ni hanordh / gabsad eirínd íar neadhaib / co tren a tri ninberaibh.	Fri fogla for feraibh bolg / gan animluagh fri hanord / gabsat herind iar nedhaibh / co tren a tri hinberaibh.	
8	Oentriar dib ármidir an / i nInbiur doínech Domand / indara ind can gaeisse / i nInbiur dian Dubglaisse.	Aentrian dib arimthar and / a ninber daíneach domnand / in darna trian gan taisi / i ninber dian dubhglaishi.	Oentrian dib airimthter ann / in inber data domnann / indara trian gantaissi / Inber dían dubhglaisi.	
9	In tres trian tanic ille / co hInber sluagach Slane / im **S**láne cen gairm bad gand / o fail ainm na haband.	In treas trian tainic alle / co hinber sluagach slaíne / im láighi re gairm nar gand / o fiul ainm na haband.	In treas trian tainig ille / co hinber sluaghach slaíne / im slaíni gan gairm bad gand / o fail a hainm na haber.	
10	Is *ed* tancatar i tír / lo**n**ges Fer **m**Bolg **m**riathairmín / co Port Caelranna na ceil / uair ba hé a ainm ind úairsin.	Is eadh tangadar a tir / loingeas fer mbolc mbriatharmín / co port caelranda na ceil / uair ba he a hainm an uairsein.	Is tangadar i tir / loínges fer mbolg mbriatharmín / co port caelrenna na ceil / uair robe a ainm inn uairsin.	
11	Is and tancatar na slóig / i Purt Chaelrenna in chomóil / ona ramaib rucsat and / is úad ratir Ramand.	Is and tancatar na sloigh / co port caelranda a chedoir / ona ramhaibh rucadh and / is uaidhibh raiter ramhand.	Is andh tangandar na sloigh / i Port caelrenna comcoir / ona ramaib rucsat ann / is uaidhib ainmnígter ramann.	
12	Senchas anma in locha lain /dia tucam a thuarascbáil / ria aisnéis cid mór in mod / is é a maith a minigod.	Seancas anma in lacha lain / da tucam a tuarascbail / re aisneis gidh mor in modh / is é a mhaith a miniughudh.	Sencus anma in locha lain / dia tugam a thuarusgbail / re aisneis gidh mor in mod / is é a mhaith a minighodh.	
13	Feis Temra cech thres bliadna / do chomoll recht is riagla / dogníthi in tansin co tend / ic rígaib allib Herend.	Feis teamhra gach treas bliadna / do comall reachta is riagla / daníthi in tansin co teand / ag	Feis temrach gach tres bliadan / do chomholl reacht is riaghla / fognithi in tansin co den / ag	

		rigaibh uaisli erenne.	righaibh allib erendh.	
14	Doringni Cathair clemnach / feiss racháeim na rígThemrach / tancatar moan feiss ferr de / for Herend co hoenbaile.	Darighni Cathair cleamnach / feis ramhor na rig teamhrach teagaid man feis fear di / de fir Erenn an aenbaile.	Dorigni Cathair cleamnach / fes rachain na righ Themrach / tangandar mon feis fess de / fir erenn co haenbaile.	
15	Tri laa ria samain buan bés / tri la ana diaid ba dagbés / din slúag riasba dímór daig / ic síról fri sechtmain.	Tri lá re samaín buan bes / tri lá na diaidh bha deidhbes / dan slaugh robo dimor daigh / ag sirol rusín seachtmhain.	Tri la ria samain buan bes / tri la na diaidh ba deghbes / dun tshluagh rias ba dimor daigh / ac sirol risin seachtmhain.	
16	Cen gait cen guin duine / occu ind airetsain uile / cen imbeirt n-airm na halud / cen ecraite d'imradud.	Gan gaid is gan ghuínn duíní / aco in oreadsin uili / gan imirt airm gan aladh / gan eachraidh da imraghadh.	Gan gaid is gan guin duini / acco inn aireadsin uili / gan imirt airm gan aladh / gan ecaird dimraghadh.	
17	Cip é doneth ní dib sein / ba bidba troch co tromneim / ni gebtha or arand uaid / acht a anam fri hoenuair.	(Omitted in M)	Cebe neoch doni mar sin / dobo ghnim troch co trom / ni gebthai or arand uaidh / acht a anam fri aenuair.	
18	Ro bae trenfer sin taig thall / for cur Cathair ni chelam / Garman mac Bomma Licce / di sluag Berba barrbricce.	Da bhi trenfear ra tig thall / for cur Cathair ní chelam / Garman Mac Boma Leice / da sluagh dagluagh Bearba barrbrice.	Robai trenfer sin tíg thall / fer cur Cathair ní chelam / Carman Mac Boma Licce / do shluagh Bhanbha bairrbricce.	
19	Dia tarla dó sin tig the / diam bae in mórsluag ar mesce / mind óir na rígna do gait / nirbu gnim cóir do charait.	Da tarlla dho san tigh the / diamai an morsluagh ar meisce / mind oir na rigna da ghid / nirba gnim coir da charoid.	Da tarla do sin tigh / diambai in morshluagh ar mesce / mind oir na rigna da ghoid / nírbo gnim coir do charoid.	
20	Élaid immach ra mind n-óir / ótá Themraig in tromsloig / co ruacht Inber Slane seng / i n-	Eloidh amach le mind oir / ota teamraigh in tromsloígh / co richt inber slaíní seang / i	Eloidh amach le mind oir / odha temrach in tromshloig / co react inber slaine seang / in noirthiur descert Erenn.	

	airthiurdescert Herend.	noirtheardeiscert Ereann.	
21	Tecait atuaid na degaid / munter Chathair chorrberaig / na fairthet con tiprait tall / ro bae i n-inbiur na haband.	Teagaid atuaid na deadaigh / muintear Cathar chorrsno / nos fairsidh con tibrait tall / dobi an Inber na habann.	Tegait atuaidh na dhegaidh / muindter Chathair chorr / nosfairset con tibra tall / dobai in Inber na habann.	
22	Tan ro gabsat Garman **n**garg / maidid in tipra trenard / otá charraic co muir mas / o **s**ain is loch lethanglass.	In treth ro gabsat gnim garg / muighidh in tibra trenard / odá carraig co muir mas / o sin is loch leathánghlás.	Odha ghabadh ba gnim gargh / muighidh i tibra trenard / odha charraig co muir mas / o shin is loch lethanglas.	
23	Báttir Garman sin loch lán / na heolaig aca imrad / cúan na scen is na sciath **n**glan / is uad ro len Loch Garman.	Báitear Garman sa loch lán / na heolaigh aca imradh / cuan na sgean is na sgoth nglan / is uad ro lean Loch Garman.	Baiter Carman sa loch lan / na heolaig aga imrad / loch na sgiam is na sgoth nglan / uad riamh ro len Loch Carman.	
24	Is ésin senchas cert cóir / ind lacha raglain romóir / is na haband aebda hí / ica n-anand cach ardrí. R	Is é sin seancus ceart coir. / in locha raglain romoir / isi i nabann aebdha hi / acá nanand gach e rí. R.	Is é sin sencus cert coir / in lacha raglain romhoir / is na habann aebda hi / ica nanann gach aenrí. Ri	
25	Fecht ro baí Cathair ciall glan / i tossuch búan a bethad / co tarfas dó físs rofess / tuc slúag Herend i nardchess.	Feacht robí Cathair ciall glan / a tosach buan a beathair / co tarfas do fís / //gan ceas// / tuc sluagh Erenn a nairdceas.	Feacht ro bai Cathair ciall glan / i torraig buan a bethad / co tarfas do fis rofess / tuc sluaigh Erend in nairdceass.	
26	Ingen briugad cétaich cáem / co ndeilb luchair co lánaeb / do thocbáil chind nirbu chol / don churaid na chotlod.	Ingean brugádh cetaigh caín / co ndeilb lucair co lanaib / da docbáil a cind gan col / dan curaidh ina challadh.	Ingean brughadh cétaigh caemh / co ndeilb luchair co lanaibh / da thocbhail cinn nirbho chol / don charaid ina chohodlodh.	
27	Cach dath cáem atchí duine / do gurm do bricc do buide / is do chorcair ba cáem	Gach dath caemh dachi duíní / da gorm da beac da buighi / is da corcair ba caem sin	Gach dath caem adchi duine / do ghorm do bhriuc do buidhe / is do chorcair ba suairc	

	sein / na étgud moan ingein.	/ na hedghudh umon ingin.	sin / ina hetghudh mon ingin.	
28	Amlaid ro buí in ben bán / torrach is a brú bithlán / co cend ocht cét **m**bliadan **m**bil / cid ingnad fria innisin.	Is amlaig tarla in bean / torrach is a bru bithglan / co ceand ocht cét bliadan buan / acht ge ingnad reimluadh.	Is amlaid robae in ber ban / torrach is a bru bithlan / co cend ocht cét bliadan bil / gidh ingnadh re indhisin.	
29	Co ruc mac ba maith a mét / ri chuir mór laech i lluathéc / in lá rucad ba saeb sain / tressiu in mac inda a mathair.	Co ruc mac ba maith a med / do cuir mor laech a lluatheg / in tan rucadh ní saeb sin / troisi in mac ina mathair.	Co ruc mac ba maith a mhét / rochuir mor laech i lluathég / in la rugadh ba saeb sin / tressi in mac ina mathair.	
30	Triallaid in mathair os mnaib / techt uaid ar imgabáil / ní **f**uair conair curit gleicc / acht tria medón a mórmeic.	Triallaigh in mathair os mnaib / tocht uadh ara imgabail / ní fuair conair cuireadh gleic / acht tre oman in mhoirmac.	Triallaid in mathair os mhnaib / teacht uadh ara imgabail. / ní fuair conairc cuirit gleic / acht tre medon .i. a mormac.	
31	Cnocc óebind osa cind cháem / na mná 7 a meic maroen / léir dia mulluch in bith búan / nirbo menic cen mór**s**lúag.	Cnoc alaind osa chind caem / na mna gus a mac maroen / leir da mullac in bith buan / niba meinic gan morsluag.	Cnoc aebinn osa chinn caemh / na mna ocus a mac maraen / ler da mullach in bith buan / nírbu menic gan morshluagh.	
32	Bile óir sin chnucc cen chath / riced a barr nem nélach / airfitiud fer **n**domuin de / atchloss do baurr in bile.	Bili oir ra chnoc gan cath / roiceadh a barr neamh nellac / oirfideadh sluaigh domhain de / tigidh da barr in bile.	Bili oir sin chnuc gan chath / richedh a barr neam nellach / airfided fer ndomun de / adchlos du bharr i bhile.	
33	In trath no benad in gaeth gúr / frisin **m**bile **m**boc **m**barúr / no bid lán adbal a **f**ir / ar clar talman dia thorthib.	In trath da beanadh gaeth dur / risin mbili mbog mbarrur/ da bhidh lán adbal a fhir / fer clar talman da doirthib.	In trath no benad gaeth gur / risin mbili mbog mbarrur / no bidh lan adhball a fhir / ar lar talmhan dia thoirthibh.	
34	Cach torud no thogtais slúaig / anair anes is atúaid / immar thuile mara maill / ticed	Gac toradh da chaithdis sluaigh / anoir aneas is atuaigh / ammar tuili mhara moil /	Gach torad no thogdais slauig / anair annes is atuaidh / imar tuili mara maill /	

	d'uachtur ind oencraind.	tigidh duactur in aencroind.	tighedh diachtur in aencraindh.	
35	Is ísein fís fir ind áig / moa ndentais Lagin luthgáir / Cathair meic Feidlimthe **f**ind / ardríg Herend a hAlind.	Is é sin fís fir in áidh / ma nendais Laigin luatgair / Catheir mac Feidlimthe find / airdrigh Erenn os aillind.	Is si sin fís fhir in aigh / mo ndentais Laigin luathgair / Cathair mac Fedlimthe fhind / airdri Erenn a hailinn.	
36	Iar sain dúscid in flaith fíal / asa rochotlud rochían / cend sluaig Lagen immoalle / d'innisin a asli**n**ge.	Iar sin musglaigh in flaith fial / asa rocholladh rochian / ceand sloigh Laigean umalle daindis a aislinge.	Iar sin duisairdh in flaith fial / asa rochodladh roichian / ceann sluag Laigen imolle / dinnisin a aislinne.	
37	Garthir chuci in druí dámach / acan ríg ba rográdach / dó coro earned di ailt / na hule cesta atchondairc	Goirtear cuigi draii damhach / barath mur ba rogradach / do coros eirnidh dia ailt / na huili ceist dacondairc.	Gairmter chuige in druí damach / igon rí ba rogradhach / do co roerneadh dia ailt / na huili chesta atconnairc.	---cest adconnairc.
38	Eirnifetsa ar in druí daith / dianom raib lóg bas lánmaith / lat chátaid it chrí chena / atbert Brí mac Baircheda.	Eirnfead dind ar drai daith / dia fhagur lodh bus lánmaith / le cataigh odchlí cheana / adbert ri mac Mareadhada	Eirnifeatsa ar in drai daith / dianom raib luaghbus lanmaith / lat chataid it chrí chena / asbert Brí mac Bairrcheda.	Erennfead duid ar in draí daíd / dianam rabh log bás lanmaith / le cataid id odclí cena / adbert rí mac Mureada.
38b			Tegait cura daingní dho / re luach dfhaghail in ganh lo / mar da chataidh tall na taigh / rí redaib mar dacuindigh	
39	Iar sain beirid in druí dóib / breith na físi co fírchóir / feib ruc riam in **m**breith co mblaid / dia eis cid cían comailtair.	Iar sin beiridh in drui doibh / breath na fisi co fircoir / ammar ruc rim in mbreith mbil / da eis co cian comaillfidh.	Iar sin berid in drai doib / breith na fisi co firchoir / ímar rug in mbreith co mblaid / di eis cidh cian comailtir.	Iar sin berid in drai dóibh / breath na físi go firchoir / amail rug ríam in mbreath mbil / da es co cian comaillfidh.
40	Is hí ind ingen adbul ar / archonnarcsu a rí rogarg / ind aband fail it tír the / dianid ainm sírbuán Slane.	Is í ingean adbal ard / atconncais a ri rogharg / in aband fuil a tir the / dianad ainm sirbuan slaine.	Is í in ingean adhbhal ard / adconnarcais a rí rogharg / in abann fil i tír the / dianidh ainm sirbhuan slane.	Is i ingen adbol ard / adconnairctu a rí rogarg / in aband fuil a tír the / dianad ainm sirbuan slaine.

41	Is iat in datha atbere / i n-étgud na hingine / áes cach dána nui fo nim / cen immus na n-astib.	Is iad na data adeiri / a nedgud na hingeain / aes gach dhana bai fo nim / con imas a na uaisthib.	Is iat na datha adbere / i nethghudh na hingine / aes gach dana nui fo nim / gan inandus na naistibh.	Is iat na data aderí / a nedgud na hingine / aes gacha dana bai fo nim / gon imus in a naisdib.
42	Is é in briugu cétach cind / rop athair don ingin find / talam ar in druí dia deoin / triasa tá cét cech ceneoil.	Is é in brughaidh cétach cind / dob adair don ingin find / talamh ar a drai da deoin / treasa ceoil gacha ceineoil.	Is é in briughu cach cind / rob athair don ingin fhind / talam ar in drai dia dheoin / tresa ta cet gach ceneoil.	Is é in brugaid cétach cind / rob athair don ingin find / talam ar in dri da deoin / tresa cet gacha ceneoil.
43	Is é mac ro buí na broind / ocht cét bliadan mar bagoim / loch geinfes uaidi ar gurt glass / 7 frit lindsiu lethfas.	Is é in mac da bi na broind / secht cet bliadan mar bagoim / loch ganfheis uaithi ar gort glas / ocus red lindsiu leathbus.	Is é in mac ro bai na broind / ocht cét bliadan mar baghom / loch genfes uaidi ar gurt glas / ocus frit lindhsiu lethfhas.	Is é in mac ro bai na broind / ocht cét bliadna mar bagaim / loch genfes uaithi ar gort glas / ocus ret lindsiu lethfas.
44	In lá geinfes cona gáir / baidfid in n-abaind n-imsláin / cach coa ólsi dara hor / acht cid morsi bid morsom.	In lá geínfeas cona ghair / baitfidh i nabaind imslain / cach ga holsi tara hor / acht gidh morsi ba morson.	In la geenfes cona gair / baidhfidh in abaindh imslain / cach ca holsi dara hor / acht gidh morsi ba morsomh.	In lla genfhes cona gáir / baithfid in abaind nimslain / cach da holsi dara hor / acht gidh morsi bad morson.
45	Is é in cnocc mór mó cach dind / atchonnarcais osa cind / do nertsu os chach is mochen / cen traithad is cen tairnem.	Is é in cnoc mor mor gach ndind / adcondarcais osa cind / da neartsu os talmhain na tor / gan toirneamh is gan traethodh.	Is é in cnoc mor mo gac / adchonnarcais osa chindh / do nertsu os cach is mochean / gan traethad is gan tairneamh.	Is é in cnoc mor mor gach nind / atconnarcais osa cind / do neartsu os talmhan na tor / gan toirneam is gan trethadh.
46	Is é in bile óir ainbthech / gégach lethan lantoirthech / tussu it ríge ar Banba bind / is ar cach adba i nHerind.	Is é in bili oir oinfeach / gegach leathan lantoirrtheac / tusu ad rig for Banba bind / is ar gach adbha an Erenn	Is é in bili oir ainbeth / gegach lethan lantoirtheach / tussu id rí ar Banbha mbinn / is ar gach adbha dErenn.	Is é in bili óir feach / gegach lethan lantoirthech / tusu at i righ for Banbha mbind / is ar gach adbha in Erind .in na loch i.

47	Is é in t-airfitiud co n-úaill / ro buí i mbaurr in bile búain / t' aurlabra **f**ial oebdu de / ic sidugud sochaide.		Is é in tairfideadh co nuail / ro bai i mbharr bili buain / hurlabra fhial aebdha de / i sidhugudh sochaidhe.	
48	Is hí in gaeth chobsaid cen chruas / ro thascair na toirthi anuas / th' einech a deitgil duanaich / ic dáil chruid dia caemslugaib.		Is í in gaeth cobsaid gan cruas / ro tarscair na toirthi annuas / heneach a dhedghil dhuanaigh / ic dail chruidh do chaemsluag.	
49	Dait atá a breth bunaid / na físi arc ach primthulaig / ni **f**uil do chreidim it chrí / ar Herind corbat oenrí. R.		Daidh atá breth bunaidh / na fisi in gach primhthulaig / ní fhail do cretim id chri / ar Erenn gurbat enrí. Ri	
50	Eochaid Eolach diarb assa / fo**f**uair suíthi senchassa / do Loch Garman tall na thir / ic adnad rand do roríg. R		Eochaid Eolach diarb usa / fofuair suithi seanchusa / du Loch Garman tall na thir / ic thir ic andadh rann dia rorigh. R	
51			Cuinnghim idcí ar dia dam / co rop maith imthus manman / na ruslena cin i crí / gun fhir acnarba haithrí. Ri. n.	

4.3 Prose and Prosimetrum Introduction

	LL	M	Bd
Formulaic markers	Loch Garman unde *nominatur*. Ni handsa.	Loch Carman cid dia ta. Ni handsa. .i.	Loch Carman, cid dia da? Ni hansa.
Main tale	Garman mac Bomma Licci ro báded and la Cathair Mór ríg Herend. Uair ra choill in Garman a recht 7 a dirgidetaid in ríg oc feiss Temrach. .i. mind óir na rigna thall a Tig Midchuarta 7 dano no marbad a muntir in ríg. uair ba dibergach é. Unde poeta	Carman mac Momand Leice Loch Garman robaidead and la Cathair Or .i. righ Erenn dane arnaigh an reacht ar feis Tigh Teamrach .i. mind oir na rigna do tall a Tigh Midchuarta romarbad a muinter ar ba dibeargach ba fodlaig coned uadh ainm níchear	Garman mac Bommallecce robaidedh ann la Cathair Mor ri Erenn (uair rochoill in Garman) a rechtga 7 a dirgedetaid imme oc Feiss Temrach .i. mind oir na rigna tall a Tig Midcuarta, 7 nomarbadh a mmuintir, arb a dibergach 7 foglaid he. Unde poeta.
Single stanza	Mac Bomma Licci luadmi / in rí Cathair ron bádi / Garman a ainm ind ardfir / tria bardnib combad ri.		Mac Boma lecce luaidmi / in ri Cathair romm-baidi / Garmman a ainm in ardfir / tria bairdnib cona bad ri.
Intro to metrical	Is dosein ro chan in senchaid		
Reference to metrical	Rí na loch in lochsa thes / Loch Garman na 7c.		
Countertale	Uel aliter secundum alios .i. Combad ó Garman Glas mac Dedad. Cuius frater erat Dea a quo Aband Dea 7 Inber **n**Dea i crich Cualand.	loch Carmar no domad Garmam Glas mac Deagad ainm nicheachear cuius frater erad Dee a quo Inber Nee 7 abann Dee a crich Cualand anm atberat mac bámha leice luáidme in ri Cathair rosbaide Garmam a hainm tre bairdmem agair gneb co rosbaide conad de sin fos a dubrad a duan sa sis.	No comma Carmman Glass mac Degad on n-ainmnigder, cuius frater Dea a quo Inbir nDea 7 Abann Dee hi crich Cualann.
Separate prose entry		Loch nGarman cid dia ta. Ni handsa. Garman Glas mac Deaid roadnacht and ocus intan foclais aeat in ea ro uanbais an loch fotir and Loch Gaman ocus i tasascbtha i leabair.	

	BB
Formulaic markers	Loch Garman canas roainmniged. ni handsa.
Countertale	Garman Glas mac Dedaidh roadnacht andh ocus intan foclas afheart ocus is and meber in loch fotir. Unde nominatur. Et cuius frater erat Dea mac deand a quo Inber ndend i crich cualann ocus araile.
Main tale	Aliter Loch Garman .i. Garmun garb mac Boma Licce robaideadh andh la Cathair Mor hi tipraid Phuirt Chailrenna ar ba he a cét ainm ocus is and mhebaid in loch tunc. Feis Temrach fognithe la Cathair ar Samhain tri laith riam ocus trí iarum cen ghaid ocus is gen ghuin gan aibriudh gan atgabail gan ecraite gan aithedh conid and dofall Garman mind oir mna Cathair iar mbeth dun tshlogh ar mescuir. muslui Garman le mindh noir na righna ocus muinter Cathair fris co rucad fair ic tipraid Chailrenna conid ic ga badhudh romhebhaidh in loch. Unde nominatur Loch Garman

O shlaine mac Dela o ri Fer mBolg ainmnighter i nabandh .i. slaine ocus Inber Slaine. in aimsir Cathair. Imarro ainm meber in locha amar asbert hi fis Cathair.

Feacht i tossaigh a bethad do Chathair ina chodludh co facca ingin in briughudh condhelbh caemh ocus gach dath ina timtaigh si torrach. dccc. bliadan di samhlaid co ro thae gen mac ocus ba tressam olda mathair in laithi rofuccadh. cuiridh ocus ni fuair in mhathair inadh dia imgabail acht teacht tre medon .i. in mac. Cnoc oebhindh osa cindh dib linaibh airde gach tulaig co sloghaibh andh bili edrocht amail or isin chnuc cosniad co niulu ara airdi. gach ceol ina duilliub. brectais a toirthi in talamh intan na mbhenadh gaeth. rogha toraidh do gach aen

Musduiscue la sodain conagart a drui .i. Bri mac Bairceda inadh ocum ocus adfed scela do. "Eirninifetsa insin" ar Bri. "is si in inghen .i. i nabann dianidh comainm slaine. Is iat na datha ina tregud aes gacha dana gan indus fodla no aisde. Is e in brighu ba hairde .i. talam triasa ta cét gan genemain. Is e in mac bai na broindh dccc bliadan. Loch genfes a sruthair na slaine ocus id lindsiu musluidhfe. Tresiu in mac olda mathair in la genfes in loch baidhfidh in aband uili. Sloigh imdha ann cach ca hoilsi ocus ga holsomh. is é in cnocc mor osa cindh do donertsu os chach. is é in bili co ndhath oir cona thoirthibh tusu os Bhanbha ina flaithius. Is é ceol bai i mbarraib in bhili thurlabra i coma ocus ic oigeart breath ngaidheal. Is i gaeth no trascradh in toradh heneachsu fri fodhail set ocus maine ocus rothoimle" ar bri "breth na fissi se" ocus araile. |

5.1 Interrelationship in 'Lia Nothain

This is compiled as a worksheet and additional aid for analysis as it shows the interrelationship between the manuscripts. It also puts each stanza next to each other in the manuscripts when it comes to the metrical account. Following the metrical account of 'Lia Nothain,' it puts the prose accounts next to each other, dividing them into these categories: formulaic markers, first tale, the single metrical stanza, any references to metrical, and countertale. M and BB are added in this section due to its similarities when comparing the contents of both prosimetrum and the prose recension. This is provided in order to get a more organized view of 'Lia Nothain.'

5.2 Metrical Stanzas

	LL	M	BB
1	Atá sund fo choirthe chruaid / ben co ndoirche is co ndimbuaid / cu gairm sochair moasech / diarbo ainm Nothain nerbullech	Atá sund fo chairte chruaigh / bean co ndoirche is co ndimbuaidh / gan gairm a sochair foseach / diarb hainm nothaín neartbuilleach.	Ata sund fo coirti i cruaid / ben co ndoirchi is co ndimbhuaid / gan gairm a socair moasech / diarb ainm notair nertbuilleach.
2	Ingen Chonmair gen gnim nguil / inna gormdail ngabulduib / furthain cet a cuit prainne / in dubthair det degcailli.	Ingen conmhair con gnímh ngail / ina gormdhael dobharduib / furthain cet a cuid proindi / an duibthear dhet deacoilli.	Inghen conmair gan ghnim guil / ina gormdael gobuilduib / furtain cét a cuid prainne / in dubthair dhet degcaille.
3	Cechaing Conmair cend co cend / a Crích Bérri na mbemend / d'fis na mna ba huadmar blad / co Crich Crúachan na corad.	Cechaing conmhaer cenn go ceand / a crich berra na mbeimeand / difhis na mna ba huathmur bladh / go grich cruachan na curadh.	Cechaing conmaer ceím co ceand / a crich berre na mbeimbenn / dfhis na mna ba huatmar blad / co crich cruacan na corad.
4	Tuc mor cemend co ngairbe / ar fut Herend imaidble / ro caith bliadain fo bine / oc iarair na hingine.	Tug mor ceimeand go ngairbi / ar fut erenn ímaiblí / da cháith bliadan ar bíní / ag iarraidh a inghini.	Tug mor cemenn co ngairbe / ar fut erenn imaidble / ro caith bliadain fo bini / og iarraidh a inghini.
5	Co fuair in mnai mothlaig mair / i fidbaid chochloich clethmóir / dond fir diarb áil a déicsin / ba leor gráin is gargdestin.	Da fhuair in mnái mothlaigh moir / a fhidbhaidh chochtlaigh chleathcoir / anuair rob ail a deiscin / ba leor ngruin is ngairbdheisdin.	Co fuair in mnai mothlagh moir / i fhidbaidh chochlaigh cleatcoir / don fhiur diarfh ail a decsin / ba leor grain is gairbdeistin.
6	Ed na haidche doib cen gae / dond fir foirbthe don degmnáe / ro bátar a ndes moale / ar scís a comasib gaile.	Feadh na haithi doib gan ghai / dan fhir fhoirfi is dan deadh mnai / ro bhadar a ndis ale / an sgis a gasgelbhaile.	Eadh na haidchi doibh gan gaei / dun fhir ferbhthi don degmnai / ro badar a ndis moalle / ar scis ocascelbhaile.
7	Is e cet ni roraid de / ben co mbáig mbuanbrethe / indad bi fri saire son / far ndaene is far nderbcrod.	Is e cet ní daraidh si / in bean ga nbaidh mbuanbreithri / anat bi	Is e cet ní roraidh si / in ben ga nbaigh mbhuanbreithri / inad bi fri

		fria sairi son / bhar ndaini ocus bhar ndearbcrodh.	saeri son / for ndaine ocus for nderbchrod.
8	Mo mummi mo mathair muad / mo siur mo bráthair bidruad / óg mo charat ac Druim Chain / in marat laat a Chonmair.	Mo buimi mo mhathair mhuadh / mo shiur mbrathair bithruagh / dic mo charad ag druim chain / an marat leat a chonmhair.	Mo muimi mo mathair muadh / mo shiur mo bhrathair bhithruadh / óg mo carat oc druim chain / in marad lat a chonmhair.
9	Ina facca tiar cot tig / ar Conmaer cia dot chardib / ní mair dib fri tressi treb / acht mad meise a mmóringen.	Ana fhaca thiar cotaigh / ar conmhaer ciar dod cairdib / ni mair it a treisi treabh / acht madh meisi a moringean.	Ina facca tiar coa tig / ar conmhaer ciar dot cairdibh / ni mairendh i tressi treabh / acht ma messi a moiringhean.
10	And sain atbert in ben búan / a haithesc mer co milúad / truag in fochain doria de / ná bia Nothain dia n-eise.	And sin adbert in bhean bhuan / a haitheasc mear co morluadh / truadh an fhochain daria dhe / nac bia nothoin da neise.	And sin adbert in ben bhuan / aithesc mear coa miluagh / truagh in fhochain duria de / na bia nothain dia neise.
11	Ui. bliadna bágid / ni iarmar ind himáirim / atu fo din cach daire / ni facca min mormaige.	Tri .l. bliadan baidhidh / ni hiarmur in himairim / atu fo dhin gach dairi / ni faca min mormhuigi.	Tri .l. bliadain baighidh / cidh iarmar ni himairimh / atu fo din ganh daire / ni faca min mormaighe.
12	Tiagsa imbarach latt immach / in mMag nArach n-ilchrothach / ni fail m'áige ni bas sía / coro saidea mo laechlia.	Tiadsa amarach lat amach / a magh nadhach nilcrothach / ni fhuil mhuighi ni bhas ia / cora saighi mo laechlia.	Tiaghsa imarach lat imach / i mag narach nilchrothach / ni fail maigi ni bas sia / coro saidi mo laechlia.
13	Rofuc bas nir bét co mblaid / don sceol adfét a athair / in ben co ndoirche nár duail / ata fo choirthi chomchruaid.	Rosfug bas nír bed co mblaidh / dan sgel adfead a hathair / an bean co toirthi monuair / ata fo coirthe comhcruaidh.	Rosfuc bas nir bet co mblaid / dun sceol adfet a athair / in ben co ndoisci nar duail / ata fo choirthi comchruaid. Ata.
14	Is ísin fochain dia fil / Lia Nothain cen imbresain / a hainm innar mbailib de / mairid cid marb ata se.	Is isin focoin da fuail / lia notain gan imreasuin / a hainm ana bailibh dhe / maraidh gidh marb ata se.	Is isin fochain dia fail / lia nothain gan imresain / a hainm ina mbailib de / maruidh gid marb ata se.
15			Nomsaer ar imnedh ar olc / a ri fingeal firedroct / nirbam truagh sin dail tall tra / iar luagh chaich ata sunna. Ata. s.

5.3 Prose

	LL	Bd
Formulaic markers	Lia Nothain. Unde nominatur. Ni handsa.	Lia Nothain, canas rohainmnigedh. Ni ansa. .i.
Main tale, first section	Nothan caillech di Chonnactaib. Ni ruc a gnúis riam for machaire o genair. batar lana trí coícait bliadan. Dolluid a siur fecht and dia acallaim. Sentuinne dano atacomnaicside 7 Seiss Srafais ainnm a fir. Unde poeta.	Nothain cailleach di Chonnachtaib, 7 ni ruc a gnuiss riam or machairi o rogeinir 7 batir lana tri coicait bliadan di. Doluid a siur fecht n-ann cuici dia hacallaim. Sentuinde a hainm, Sess Srafais a fer .i. Senbachlach ainm ele dó. Unde poeta dixit.
Single stanza	Sentainne 7 Senbachlach / rop seis srofais a crínfess / acht nocon adrat Mac Dé / nocon fagbat a primless.	Sentuinne ocus Senbachlach / rop seiss srafaiss a crinfess / acht nocon adrat Mac nDé / nocon fagbat a primless.
Main tale, second section	A Berri dano lotar dia insaigid dia idnacul for machaire dia cetsamuin. O'tconnaircsi in mag mór. ro feimdes uadi dul ar culu 7 clannais liic and sin i talmain 7 benais a cend fria combo marb. Unde poeta.	A Berri dano lotar dia hindsaigidh dia hidnacul for machairie dia cetamuin. O'tcondarc sí in mag mor uaidhi rofeimdes uadi dul arculu 7 roclann liic annsin hi talmuin 7 benais a cenn fria conattuil imm 7 ba marb. "Bid sim o ecnairc lasa muinntir asberim foclannaim do raith mo anma." Unde Lia Nothain
Second single-stanza	Nothain ingen Chonmair chain / callech di Chonnactaib / i mmís cétamuin glúair glicc / is sí fofúair in ardlicc.	Nothan ingen Chonmair chain / caillech cruaidh di Connactaib / a mis cetemuin, ngluair nglic / is i fofhuair in ardlicc.

5.4 Prosimetrum Introduction

	M	BB
Formulaic markers	Lia nothain canas rohainmniged. ní handsa.	Lia notaín canas rohaimniged. ní handsa
Main tale	Nothain íngen conmaer do chonnacht áibh robae as can dubhthair iaraile. tri. .l. bliadan. ocus ní thuc a liaigidh ar macaire ocus proind .cet. domheilead. lindh dan a hathaír a crich berre do iarrair aí ngeníe co mbae bliaín lain fora fochmairc conid ann fosfuair isin fhidbaidh ocus ba leor do graín a dealbh ocus ba head roraidh fris indat bí for ndaine .i. mo muíme ocus mo mathair ocus mo bratír ocus can ar fhagus oc druin cain marb inle acht meisse ar conmaer basa marbsa dí sodhain ol sisi ocus tíagsa leatsu imbarach ar ín maigh coro suidhi mo lia ocus coro claid mo feart	Notan ingen conmaer do connachtaib robai os gach dubhtair diaraile tri .l. bliadan ocus ní tug ahaigid ar macaire ocus proind .cet. nomeiled. luid din a hathair a crich berre do iarraid a ingíne co mbaeí bliadain lain fora fochmarc conid and fosfuair isin fidbaidh ocus ba leor du graín a dealbh ocus ba head roraid fris indad bi for ndaíní .i. mo mhuíme ocus mo mathair ocus mo brathair ocus gach ar fagus og druim cain marb uile acht mese ar conmaer bamsa marba di sodhaín ol sisi ocus tiaghsa latsu imarach ar in mag cor saidi mo lia ocus coro claidh mo fheart

Formulaic markers	unde lia notaín dicitur	*unde* lia not*hain* no*niter*

6.1 Interrelationship in 'Berba'

This is compiled as a worksheet and additional aid for analysis as it shows the interrelationship between the manuscripts. It also puts each stanza next to each other in the manuscripts when it comes to the metrical account. Following the metrical account of 'Berba,' it puts the prose recension accounts next to each other, dividing them into these categories: linguistic markers, main tale, linguistic markers for the poetry, and the single-stanza poem. Finally, there is the prose introductions of the prosimetrum recensions. This is provided in order to get a more organized view of 'Berba' in these manuscripts.

6.2 Metrical Stanzas

	LL	M	BB	E
1	In Berba búan a bailbe / saiges dar sluag senAilbe / is fis fedma fath dia fail / Berba blaith cech bladfocail.	In bearba buan co mbailbi / saighis co sluagh seanailmhi / is fis feadma in fath. ma fuil / Bearbha blaith gach bladhfochuil.	In berba buan co mbhailbhi / saigus co sluag senailbi / is fis fedma in fath dia fuil / berba blaith gach bladfocail.	In berba buan co mhbailbe / saighes co sluag senailbe / is fis fedma in fath dia fuil / berba blaith can bladfocail.
2	Ni fualfed focheirdd inti / luaithred Mechi mormilti / ros balb. ros berb cen athbach / salchur serb na sennathrach.	Ni buailfeadh foceird inti / luaithreadh meith na mormhilti / rosearbh ro bhalbh gan athbach / salcur searb na sennathrach.	Ni fuailfedh focheird inti / luaithredh mecí na mormillti / ros balb ros berb cen atbach / salchar serbh na sennatrach.	Nosfúid set co feíg inti / luaithred meich in mormillti / ocus ros balb cach atbath / salchar serb na sennatrach.
3	Nathir fo thrí forcheird chor / taithig in mbeirg dia bronnud / cnaifed dia álaig óg n-ell / slóg sádal na senHerend.	Nathir fo tri foceird cor / dataigh umbeirt a brondadh / cnaidhfidh dia falaigh ga neill / slogh sadail na seinerenn.	Nathair fo tri focherd cor / tathigh in mberg a bronnadh / cnaifedh dia alaidh og nell / slogh sadhal na senerenn.	Nathair fo tri focherd cor / tathaig in mbhert do brondad / claefed dia halaid óg nell / slog sedail na senerinn.
4	Airisin ro marb Dian Cecht / ba fatha garb din glanecht / dia chosc co buan dia bronnud / os cach cúan din chomlongud.	Airsin ros marb and mac cecht / ba fotha garb don ghlainecht / do cosc co buan don brondadh / os ghach cuan da comlongad.	Airisin ro marb mac cecht / ba fota garb dun glanecht / do cosc co buan don bronnad / os cach cuan dia comlongad.	Araisin ro marb mac cecht / ba fatha garb don glaneacht / do choisc co buan don bronnad / os can cuan dia chomlongad.
5	Eol dam a lecht leth ro lá / fert cen tech is cen tuga / a lúaith olc cen aeb	Eol dam a leacht leath re la / feart gan teach is gan tuga / a luaith olc gan aeb neangha /	Eol dam a lecht leth ri la / fert cen techt is cen tiugba / a luaith olc con aib enga /	Eol dam a leacht leth ro lá / fert can teach is can tugu / a luaith olc gan

	enga / fófuair focht i saerBerba. Berba.	forfuair focht i sairbearba. in bearba.	fofuair socht ar saerberba. in berba.	aib enga / for rocht i saerberba.

6.3 Prose

	LL	**Bd**	**Ed**
Formulaic markers	Berba unde nominatur.	Berba, cidh dia ta. Ni ansa.	Berbha cid dia ta. Ni handsa.
Main tale	Berba ís inti ro láttea na trí natracha ro batar i cridi Mechi meic na Mórrigna iarna marbad do Dían Cécht i Maig Méchi. Mag Fertaige ainm in maigesin ar tús. Delba tri cend natrach bátar forsna trí cridib batar i Mechi. 7 meni thairsed a marbad forbértaís na natrachasain ina broind conna farcbaidis anmanna beo i nHerind. Coron loisc Dian Cecht iarna marbad. 7 coron lá a lúaith lasin sruth út. coro mberb 7 coro dilég cech n-anmanna boí inti.	Berba his inti ro laitea na tri natracha batar a cridib Meichi maic na Morigna, iarna bass do Mac Cecht im-Maig Meichi. Mag Fertaigi dano ainm in maige sin prius. Delba tri cenn natrach batar forsna tri cridib batar im-Meichi, 7 mina tairsedh a bas no oirbeordais na natracha na broind cona facbadais anmanna beo i nErind. Coron loisc Mac Cecht iarna marbad i Maig Luadat, 7 coro la a luaith lasin sruth út, co rom-berb 7 coro dileag cach n-ainmidi do anmandaib bai inti. Conadh desin ata Mag Luadat 7 Mag Méichi 7 Berba.	Berba dona is inte ro laíte na tri nathracha bhadar i cridhi mece mac na moríghna iarna bhas do mac cecht in muigh meche magh fortaighe don ainm in muighesin ar tus delba tri cend natrach badar forna tri cride badar for na tri eche i mine toirsed a bas forbeordais na natrachasin ina broind cona fagbaidis an anmanna beó an erenn cona sloeig mac cech iarna marbad muigh luadad go ro la a luaith isin sruth ut go ro mberbh ocus go ro dheleach gach nanmanna bái in tibh friu coned de sin ata mag luagadh ocus magh meche 7 berbha
Formulaic marker	Unde Mag Luadat 7 Mag Méchi 7 Berba.	Unde poeta dixit	Unde poeta dixit
Single stanza	Cridi Méchi cruaid in chned / isin Berba ro baded / a lúaith iarna loscud lib / ro chuir Mac Cecht cetchuining.	Cridi Meichi, cruaidh in cned / isin Berba rob aided /a luaith iarna loscadh lib / rocuir Mac Cecht cétguinigh.	Cride mechi cruaidh an chneadh / isin berba do baidheadh / a luaith arna losgudh berbh / ro chuir mac cecht cetguinnich.

6.4 Prosimetrum Introduction

	M	BB	E
Formulaic markers	Bearbha cid dia ta. ni handsa.	Bearba cid dia da. ni handsa.	Berba canas rohainmniged. ni handsa.
Main tale	Meth mac na morrighna is and robhadar na tri crighi corod marb mac cecht a muigh mheth i samlaigh ro badair na tri crigi sin condealbaib tri nathrach treotho. Mag fertaighi don ainm in mhuighi cosin mina thorsed don donieth ar ro foirbreadair nat natracha ind nochnaidhfidis a fuighdis beo an erenn ro loisc iarom mac cecht na crigeada sin a muigh luagad nó a muig luathat coro la a luaith risin ruth coro marb aes in srotha ocus cor marb gach an aim bai and ocus co ro bearb nó comadh anard luaithrigh ro loisc.	Meichi mac na moirrigna is ann ro badar na tri cridi corod marb mac cecht i maigh meichi amlaid badar na tri cridi sin condelbaib natrach treithibh. Mag fertaidi din a ainm in maige cosin meni toirised din bas do meice ar forberdais na natrach. ind ocus focnafedh a na fhuigbheadh beo in Herenn. ro loisc iarum mac cecht na cridi sin i maigh luathath coro la a luaith risin sruth co ro marbh es in tsrotha ocus co ro marbh cach nanmanda ro bae and ocus coro mberbh nó combhadh in ard luathrid no loisc.	Miach mac na morrigna ocus in dagda is ann badar na tri cride co ro marb mac cecht a muig meich hé. amlaid badar na tri cride sin condelbaib chenn natrach forro. mag fertaigi ainm in muigi sin. mene thorsed din bas do miach ar forbairt na natrach nocha nucfed can nuncfed beo an erinn. co ro loisc iarum mac cecht na tri cride a muig luathad co ro la a luaith lasin sruth cor marb eas in tsrotha ocus co ro marb can anmann bói and ocus guru berb. nó comad anand luaithrid no loiscfed.
Formulaic markers introducing the stanzas	Unde dicitur bearba ocus magh methi ocus ard luithridh nó comadh berba. eo .i. beir bir ocus ba ocus balb dicitur .i. usce balbhi.	Unde dicitur berba ocus magh meichi ocus aird luaithrid nó combad berba i. ber nó bir ocus ba .i. balb dicitur .i. usce balb.	Unde dicitur. Berba balb .i. uisce balb.

130