Rhydyl Forbes, Kent, 371, yr awgrym a ganlyni fel esbioniad ar Laloecen, er ei fod yn ystyried mai ei gyflwyno à illogan a'i hesbonia'n fawydd bodd-iaith.

It might at first sight seem that this name for Merlin was a form of Losallach. Of Losallach,¹ the son-in-law of Macbeth, Fordun writes: 'Nomine Lulach ignominia factus.' Lulitch in old Gaelic is 'micmicus, gesticulosus'—Hailes's Annals, vol. i. p. 4; ed. 1779.

Cf. Macdonald & Co., Gaelic Dict., 1922—, luilleach, 'Mimic, Buffoon'; luilleach, -iache, a, 'Mimicking, full of gestures'.

Ceir digon o enghreifftiau o'r enw priod Luloch.² Gw. Skene, Fordun, i. 205, Lulach, cognominia factum; Chron. Picts and Scots, 152, 175, 289, Lulach factus; 206, Lulach le folfe; 32, Dalach factus; Anderson, Early Sources of Scottish History, i. cxx, Lulach, Lulach, Lulach, Dalach, Lusach, Luchach, Luulchach, Gulach, Lughlaigh (gen.); ibid. 603, Lulach fatus, a gw. ymhillach y mynnigaid; Anderson, Scottish Annals from English Chronicles, 3, 86, 100, Lulach.

Cf. hefyd Lawrie, Early Scottish Charters, 2, Luloch; 225, Maenachie mac Lulaig. Yng Nghronicl Ulster (Chron. Picts and Scots, 370) ceir yr flurf fel Maen-nechtac mac Lulaigh.

Dyliel ystydii rhewl enawu hyn gyda chryn betruster.³ Pe cymerym fod Laloocen ym tardd o'r olyflurf ar Luloch, gyda Laloochen yn ddiddieddariad pellach, fe oeddiwch y gweiddi yr ystyr yr burion eithir ni byddai ei hanwaStrua ar ben. Ar wahanir i awastwareu seinyddol byddai'n rhaid esbonio, os yw Lulach yn enw Gaeleg, paham y ceir enw Gaeleg ar brif gymrieriad ganq o chwedd o gwr gwyllt ym y coed sydd yn dwyiaid Pryfoniog ei chofrestrir a'i chysylltiadau, ac sydd yn amlwg ym perthyn yn llawer nes i'r flurufiau Cymerig arni nag i'r flurufiau Gwyddellic. A beth wedyn a ddywedwm am y gairiau Cymered Lalloch, illogan?

Gwyll wedio â datganiarn y rhy bendant ar hyn o bryd. Pe gellid profi'n bendant nad oes unrhyw bethynas rhwng Laloochen a Lalloch,⁴ fe fyddeirn sier ym gyd-ddigwyddiad tra hynod eu cael fel enawu ar brif gymrieriad dwy ganq à'r un chwedd. Ar y llaw arall os tybwiw mai'n un gair ydych chi i ni wynebu amryw anawsterau. Ni wydodd beth yw ystyr illogan, ac os cysylltir ef à llall amoddd yw gwydd ei bwynt fel enw ar Frydolo. Ni chafwyd enghrafiaeth o'i daethogli fel 'gefio' gan o flaen

¹ Bu farw yn 1658; gw. Anderson, Early Sources of Scottish History, I. 603.
² Cf. Lab. Lond., 210-11, luvius; lutius.
³ Cf. awgrym Lot, op. cit. 15, 'Il est impossible de ne pas songer à rapprocher Lalochen du Laki scandinave, dont le plaisir est de moller les dieux . . . .' ²
⁴ Fel y myn De Julainville, R.C. xvi. 240.

FLOATING SECTIONS IN THE LAWS OF HOWEL

That wide divergences in the matter of section-order exist among the MSS. of the laws of Howel is well known. Gwenogryn Evans in cataloguing them continually laments the impossibility of determining exactly the contents of a MS. because its order always differs from that of others and of the edition of Aneurin Owen, which follows the order of no single MS., not even of L (Cotton, Titus D. ix), on which, for the Book of Blegedore (Dull Dyfed), the text is founded. But I am not aware that this phenomenon has ever been studied specially or any reasoned explanation of it put forward.

I present below a conspectus of the section-order in three branches of the MS. tradition of the Book of Blegedore. My basis is the text of O (Penketh 364) and Tr (Trinity College, Cambridge, O.7.1),⁵ which together give

⁵ See B. 1936, 120-4. The statement there made (p. 131) that 6 leaves might be lost at the end between leaves 67 and 68 is shown by a further examination of the MS. to be mistaken. Leaves 67 and 68 are a quire of two, and no text is lost except the last three lines, which are torn off the top of 68r.
the oldest complete text of that code and on which the forthcoming edition by Mr. Stephen J. Williams and myself will be based. This text I divide into sections numbered consecutively, indicating in the columns to the right the leaves and lines of O (or, where that is defective, of Tr—italized) and the pages and lines of Aneurin Owen’s two editions. In the columns to the left is indicated the order in which the sections thus numbered are found in the two other branches of the tradition, namely, L (see above) and secondly IS, which are kindred MSS, selected for this purpose because they alone agree with OTr in omitting the Court Laws (9 A–C), and might therefore be presumed to derive from the same sub-archetype. Portions lacking in OTr and supplied from IS are indicated by heavy figures. The heavy vertical lines mark the sections which these two traditions have in the same relative order as OTr. But before drawing the conclusions to which these vertical lines can lead us, it will be well to consider what must a priori be the cause of such variations of order.

There can, in fact, be only one explanation, provided that a single hypothesis be allowed, the hypothesis, namely, that for a scribe engaged in copying a MS. to transfer a portion of the text from one position in the book to another would be so difficult and thankless as never to occur. Given this assumption, it follows that the ‘floating’ passages are later additions to the text, which have been incorporated in different places in different MSS. Both the length of the floating sections themselves and the wide divergencies of position show that they were originally added not in the margins of the pages, but on separate leaves of parchment. They would then be worked into the text by the next copier either at random or in the place where he thought them most relevant. In Braccon’s De legibus et consuetudinis Angliae, a law-book which presents many similar textual problems to that of Howel, we still can see this process actually at work: ‘In some manuscripts addiciones are found on separate slips of parchment which have been inserted between the regularly bound leaves...of some of the [incorporated] addiciones occur regularly at the same place in all lines [of the MS. tradition], some are found at different places in different families of manuscripts or at different places in representatives of the same family.’

It is now clear at once that by observing the floating sections we shall be able to stratify chronologically our present body of laws and distinguish the original stock (which all MSS. will have in the same relative order) from the earliest additions (in the same position in all MSS. but irrelevant to their context), the later additions (differently placed in different classes of MSS., having been ‘floating’ in the general archetype and incorporated differently in the archetypes of the various classes) and the latest (which will occur only within single classes). And furthermore, since the position of an additional passage was fixed permanently once it had entered the text, MSS. which show the same section-order must be descended from the same sub-archetype.

Looking now once more at the table, we see these theoretical considerations fully borne out. Floating sections have evidently been incorporated differently as seemed to different copyists most appropriate. Thus sec. 25 on accidental fires is placed by IS after sec. 13 on arson, while secs. 27 and 28 on hunting, dogs, hawks, and bees are placed later amongst the values of animals, secs. 41–5. L has the additional sections 47–8 on judges at the end of its Book II, whereas in ISOTr these have been placed after sec. 46 on the appointment of judges, which L incorporated in the part of Book I (sec. 9 A–C) omitted by ISOTr.

But the main cause of divergent order is the insertion of the triads. For all the triads are floating sections. In OTr they occur, with very few exceptions (secs. 194, 25, and 34) all together at the end; in L they are more scattered and no longer at the end, but still a large mass almost in the order of OTr (secs. 54–67) is incorporated intact at an earlier point; finally, in IS the triads have been broken up and scattered over the whole work to positions where they were either relevant or fancied to be so. Now, on the theory that the floating sections represent later additions, this is exactly what would be expected. Just as Professor Hor Williams has shown (Peleir Keis xxiv–xxx) that triads were inserted in the Mabinogion in the twelfth century, so the sententiousness of a later age devised and added to the Laws legal triads which generally add nothing to the older provisions but repeat them in a form easier to remember. The fact that in OTr these triads come at the end, in the natural position for additional matter—for Book III is itself an addition—provides a guarantee that these, the oldest MSS. of Bleddon’s code, do in fact present a sincerer form of text than the rest. Were it possible to determine the final of the triad-form, we should have a termius ante quem for this archetype.

The floating sections characterize themselves in other ways as additions and later matter. Section 27 on hunting, dogs, &c., is a floating section; and it contains the clause: ‘Bittiehad ny oes werth kyfreith amid, kanyt oed y kyfreig gi huonu yu oes Hywel du’ (‘a harrier has no legal value, as this sort of dog was unknown in the time of Howel the Good’). With this

1 G. E. Woodbine, Braccon (1913), i, 326f.; 329.
we now see that it was written after the foundation of the latest of the seven bishop-houses but before the time of Rhys ap Gruffydd.

A word before I finish, on the relationship of IS to OT and L. A priori it would be presumed, as I have said, that IS and OT, being the only MSS. which break off the Court Laws at the same point, have a common sub-archetype. A glance at their differences of order shows that this cannot be so: L and OT are far more similar in order than IS and OT, whose only other agreements against L consist in the position of just those sections which in L occur in the Laws of the Court. There only remains the explanation that IS, though of a different descent from OT, have been influenced by them through collation or contamination; so that the stemma of the five MSS., much simplified, would be this:

---

The conclusion therefore to which a study of the floating sections would seem to lead, is that of the Book of Blegored as found in our MSS. the original core is represented, roughly speaking, by our sections 1-11; 13, 14; 17, 18; 22, 23; 29; 31-3; 35; 39; 41, 42; 44, 45 at the most. It is now possible, with this division as a working guide, to compare the early

---

1 As the law of Howel does not contain anything about appraisal, the words 'herwyd kyfreith Hywel' should follow 'arnaw'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and Literature</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distances of the coast</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cairn's disposal</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing, hunting, and the judge</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion of a man's cause</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other matters</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional laws</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NODIADAU CYMYSG

Cym. troed: HGern. truit: Cern.C. treys: Llyd. troad

Nid yw'r esboniadau a gynigwyd ar y flurt troed yn foddiauol. Yr anhawster a welwyd hyd yn hyn oedd yr o ym yr unigol ym mynyd yr o ym troed; gw. Ped. i, 98, W.W. 85. Eithir cyrffu i darddiur gair o hen flurt *troet*. Mae dâu wrthwneu>b i'r tarddiad hwn. Yn gyntaf nid oes un enghraifft o'r gair troed yn ddeusil, er bod amryw enghreifftiau o 'lluosog troed yn odlu a chwng y flurt *troet*. Felly, ac yn arbennig yn wyneb yr oly'n bwynt, rhaid chwilio am esboniad arall o'r flurtiau hyn.


Gellir yn ddigon haedd esboniu pon y bu naid yr feithioedd Brythoneg gynrych gair gwaethol fel hyn yn unigol i'r Cym. troed, &c. Cynyrchiola *troed* yn rheolaidd y flurt luosog IE. *tragetes, cw. Gw. trawigl. Yr hen gyfrw enwol unigol oedel IE. *traget-s a roes yn rheolaidd Gw. trwaigl, ac a roesau mewn Cym. traw. O'r ond gyflwyn traws unigol gwreiddiol cauadd Cym. *troed. Prin y buasai *tra, neu *troed 'foot' ym llwch a diamwys, oblegid bod i troa ystyr on cau, a bod troed befyd yn golegu 'feet'. Byddi'n ddigon naturiol iddiyst gynrych gair gwaethol o ystyr weddyl ddeug a'i arfer yn unigol ar gyfer troed 'feet'. Cyfrifiâu amwyseidd cyfelyb am yr un peth mewn Cern. a Llyd.; y mae'r rhain yn ddwyoddwrach wedi newid y flurt luosog etifeddol (ddigwyliod Cern. *tres, cw. mere 'maes', Llyd. *tread, dream 'draen') i Cern. treys (cw. dreuy 'drain'), Llyd. treid (cw. drein) trwy gydweddad â'r enwau a'u bôn ym *o-, gan newid y llafraniad mewnol. Ymbellach, byddai tobygwyllyd flurt y gair gwaethol ym cyflog o *truit i'r geiriad lluosog a lledwch o *tragetes ym hoff ychwanegol i'r iethoedd Brythoneg i'w fabwysiadu'n air i olygu 'foot'. Mae'r esboniad hwn yn taro'r seimiau yn y gwaethol iethoedd yn llawer gwll na'r hen un. Erys perthynas Indéo-Europeg y flurt dybieidig *truit* yn gwbl dywyll.

Y rhagom personiol i.

Yn WG, 282 dywedir: The form of the 1st sg. [auxiliary affixed pronoun] is *i, in Early Ml. M. *e = (g)'; in Late Mn. W. it is written *fj after *fj, but this is an error, though sometimes found in ML. W. Ar dud. 282 terdiur yr *i' < *i = *eg'. Ar sail y gosodiadu hyn y ma'r rhai wedi mynd i golfartaredi *flurt fj ar yr rhegenw ategol, ac ymgweddir rhag ei ysgryfennu fel petain wenwyn! Eithir y ma'r gosodiad uchod yn camarweiniol, ac ni allaf dderbyn y tarddiad o gwbl.

Yn y lle cyntaf, fe ddigwydd yr enghraifft hynaf o'r rhegenw hwn ym naw englyn y Jwesneg: ric pascua ni ddisiuntat B. 6206. Fel y sylwyr golgywyd, nid yw'r rhegenw'n cyfrif ym y mydor, ond arfer gyfrifon yn yr holl hyn en wawrion yw ysgryfennu'r rhegenw ategol pan bo ni angen o gwbl. Y wth pwysoig serch hynny yw mai ni a gair yma ym yr ddeglef ganrif, ni *fj. Gan fod y rhegenw ategog gan amfali ym rhoi a'm, dafawd o'n gydant a'm. Yn dugwyd hefyd yr rhegenw'r aill berson unigol. Felly mae'n deg cwyso y gellid darllen *pachson fj, a chwrad *fj ym dra chwannon i golli fe gafwyd o'i ddigwydd *pachson i. Gwyddys mai peth arferol ym llywgrifion yw rhoi gair diacem yn un â'r gair ym bo'n perthyn yn agos âddo, ac ni oes angen codi enghreifftiau i brefi y gellid digwydd peth fel *pachsoni yn un gair. Mae flurtiau fel geofael, a o'n ymgyratsu tudalenaur y llywgrifion.

Pan fymnodd ysgryfennu'r rhegenw ar wahân, ni chodi chodiwr arfer pan ddigwyddiwr feri diflwyddu ym *fj. Buasai flurt HGern. *gulas ni-* *gulas fj i gulas i ym ddigon naturiol; ni oedd dim yma i hen adfer yr *fj-goll, ac feyddu yr ymsefioedd yr *fj. Ond ar ôl geofael, byddid y gwahaniau rhwng *fj ac i. Mae'r enghreifftiau Cymraeg Canol o *fj ar ôl *fj ym anghyffuriau'r gosodiad uchod o WG. Ceir ni ac * (a) ar ôl *fj gan yr ysgryfennwr; gw. L. & P. 206. Sylwer hefyd y gallu'r un math o amwyseidd ddigwydd gyda rhegenw'r aill berson unigol. Er enghraifft os mynnir rhannau arduirema BBC, 37, 10, ym adarwedigaeth i, ac ym rhannau anoleist, ym ocherheist 21, 5, 6, dynholesi 23, 7; ym y welais i, ni pherchaist i,