Quintilian (9.1, 14) to be "arte aliqua nova formá dicendí", i.e. a deviation from ordinary speech based on certain rules. The three figures of speech given by the Welsh grammarian are examples of solecism, with which Quintilian (1.5, 51) says: "est eiam solecismus, in oratione comprehensionis unius, sequentium ac priorum inter se inconveniens positio".

The presentation of the figures of speech in the Welsh bardic grammar is, I think, a good example for the compiler's intention to introduce a number of general linguistic concepts and to exemplify these with reference to Welsh. His treatment reveals a certain sensibility for Welsh grammar and its analysis.1 Other cases in point are the omission of the category 'case' from the discussion of the noun, which is not realized in Welsh, and the application of the gender categories 'masculine', 'feminine', and 'common' to the adjective, since some Welsh adjectives have distinct forms of masculine and feminine, such as gwynn vs gwenn, whereas other adjectives have only one form, such as doeth. (GP 4:20-26)

The etymology of afaillt 'abstemt'

In all the redactions of Welsh law the section entitled Tew cofgan cyfrath begins with a list of nau afaillt galanas, nau afaillt ledirn and nau afaillt tan 'the nine abtemts/accessories of homicide, theft and fire.'1 For each offence nine acts of abtemt are listed, usually in order of increasing culpability, which render the accessory liable to a fine. These actions can involve offering advice or information, keeping watch, bringing supplies, accompanying the criminal to or from the place of the crime, helping him carry away the loot, etc. but they always stop short of actually committing the crime.

The sense of 'abstemt, accessory' is only one of the meanings of afaillt and it has generally been accepted that in all its meanings it is a borrowing from Latin affectus. From a formal viewpoint the derivation is unimpeachable. From the semantic viewpoint, the only concession to this view is offered by the editors of GPC who suggest that some of the meanings of affectus can more readily be derived from affectus rather than afaillt. Indeed, if one compares the senses of afaillt in GPC with the senses of the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD) and the Theaurum

1 In the section on faults in a prose (GP 15:21-24) the compiler corrects idiomatically correct aphi=ui '20 men' to passible, but less idiomatic apha=ui (see D. S. Evans, A Grammar of Middle WA, Dublin 1964, p. 45) and ungrammatical ganicen gef=ui ganicen cei 'a strong woman' (however, with unidited initial of the adjective).


Early versions of this paper were presented at seminars in Jesus College, Oxford in June 1988 and at a seminar of Seminar Cyfrath Hedd in Aberystwyth in December 1988. I am grateful to those present for their comments and thoughts.
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Linguas Latinoae (Thee. Ling. Lat.), and allows for some influence from affectus, this view can be upheld with one significant exception:

OLD and Thes. Ling. Lat. (s.v. affectus): GPC (s.v. afaillt):

1. state of mind
2. physical state
3. position of heavenly bodies
4. influence, impression
5. permanent disposition
6. eagerness, zeal
7. feelings
8. intention, purpose
9. (adj.) related to

The GPC definitions correspond to those of Latin affectus except for 2(a) 'participation in a crime, abtemt', etc. An explanation which derives all the senses of afaillt from affectus will need to account for this anomaly.

Our point of departure is Jenkins' discussion of the term in his edition of Llyfr Colen following the comments of J. E. Lloyd,1 he assumes the standard etymology and argues that the sense of 'abtemt' arose after the word already entered Welsh in a non-technical sense of 'something connected to the central matter':

ac ymddeug nos debychaf fod afaillt wedi'i gymorio'n afaillt fel rhan o'i eiriau gyfnodol, da blywy'r ysyt o'r rhywbeth sy'n gysylltiedig â'r prif beth cyn ei defnyddio yn dechnegol yn yr gyfrifath.

However, the proposed starting point, namely sense 9. above in OLD and Thes. Ling. Lat. (related to), is only rarely attested and therefore is a dubious source. He also suggests that this sense would fit LIDC 38:40 (= BBC 106.3 = H 47a8); Y diwym van kymbrl al y afaillt but it is not clear exactly what is intended.2 In the glossary to his edition of LIDC Jarman translates affectus as 'afaillt, cannylll' and there would seem to be no objection to translating the line as 'Great is the consequence of it in putting right a wrong'. Jenkins also mentions the saying... as afaillt 'afawer, afawer... in the wide world...'. It occurs as a variant of the more common... as wythw yr afawer... and is restricted in its literary attestations to the works of Daniel Owen.3 We shall return to the phrase below but at this point it is certainly not clear how this usage of afaillt can be derived from 'rhywbeth sy'n gysylltiedig â'r prif beth'.

Subsequently, doubts have been expressed in the glossary to The Welsh Law of Women:

1 In most examples in the lawbooks, the meaning is clearly accessory, and the word has been accepted as derived from Latin affectus (rather than afaillt), though the recorded meanings in classical and later Latin do not suggest accessory.1

2 Daefydd Jenkins, Llyfr Colen (Cardiff, 1963) [abrb. LCG] 87-9.

3 J. E. Lloyd, Introduction to Dehilion o'r Hen Gwyddroen Gymog wedi eu dderwiddaru gan S. J. Williams (Llandyssul, 1954), xii.

1 Op. cit. (n. 1 above), 88

2 J. Venyres, 'Trais godolos Cymdeithas', EC, 4 (1948), 1-47, translates the line (p. 33) 'pour réparer ses torts, si jamais le sa sait leurs effets'.

3 E.g. Hafanfael Rhy Llwyd, gwnninc Bethel (Yr Wyddgrug, 1885) 115, 156, 170, 326; Gwen Toms, merch y Wensla (Wrecsam, 1894), 199.

4 See below, p. 116, n. 3.

5 The Welsh Law of Women edited by Daefydd Jenkins and Morfydd Owen (Cardiff, 1980) [abrb. WLW, p. 107].
These doubts derive from an excursus to a paper by Morfydd Owen in the same volume. In Latin B in addition to the standard list of *nau affixit* a variant set of *affiethun* ‘according to the men of Powys’ is found for *âth* and *galanos* (but not for *lledrys*). Rather than offering a graded system of different types of abetment they seem to interpret *affixit* as ‘grounds, cause’ and thus offer a series of causes or grounds for *galerbis, lledrys*. Morfydd Owen suggests that this usage is early since the items in this version of *nau affixit galanos* require an interpretation of *galanos as ‘ennity’ or ‘kin feud’. Jenkins has subsequently characterised this usage of *affixit* as ‘archaic’ and as ‘originally applied to anything which created enmity between kindreds’.

There are, however, a number of difficulties with this analysis. First, as a general point with regard to its supposed origin, there is no doubt that ‘grounds, cause’ is the sense in this passage but, if this was the original sense, why did the meaning of ‘accessory’ arise, since ‘grounds, cause’ can be satisfactorily extracted from *affixit/affiectus*? There is no obvious semantic avenue by which the meaning of ‘accessory, abetment’ could have developed. In other words, it would seem likely that the sense of ‘accessory’ was prior on the grounds that it is very difficult, given the range of other meanings of *affixit*, to see how it could have arisen later.

Secondly, it is striking that almost all the variant forms for *âth* in Latin B can be found in *Ior* in the subsidiary material following the *nau affixit âth*:

1. *tan peath*: $118/1 a thyn gewy.
2. *tan y ty neusaf*: $117/1 a liebly e huona ty arail (cf. $118/3).
3. *dâu ym tan hêf yswyt*: $120/3-4 na dyceft nep tan hêf hygynyt... na rodet nep tan hêf yswyt pa hêf a wether ac of (cf. $118/5).
5. *paratûs tyysi*: $113/19 gwealess a bemorbu gwenu neu pellenus.
6. *gweucara mun y tan*: $120/1 o dryewyd mawch y ty a gweuncara e tan.
7. *y enducty*: cf. $120/5 o dryewyd y dyn en dau tan... .

The parallels in the wording of most of these pairings are striking. It is not possible to tell which version of *Ior*. They derive from; clearly, 9, *lâs* is too general to adduce any specific parallel. *Paratûs tyysi* is difficult; the suggested parallel does not contain the phrase in question and *tyysi* is otherwise unknown. However, there is a noun *tyryn* ‘ball of yarn’ and perhaps a noun *taw* of a similar sense which may suggest a connection with the passage in *Ior*. Apart from *paratût*, which must remain doubtful, the parallels might suggest that, rather than being a separate and archaic group of *nau affixit âth*, this set ‘according to the men of Powys’ in Latin B may represent a secondary compilation which was put together from the subsidiary material in the *Ior*-worth redaction after the term *affixit* had acquired a secondary sense of ‘grounds’ or ‘cause’.

This subsidiary material in which these parallel phrases are found only occurs in the *Ior*-worth redaction. It occurs in all the mas. so it is not possible to specify the source further except to note that the wording of Col. probably precludes it as the source; for item 3, *hef wesit* it has *43b. ong yswyt* and for item 7 *y enducty* it has *39b. y dyn dau tan*. Given the range of material on *galanos* and its causes and consequences it is far harder to produce the same type of parallel listing for the *nau affixit galanos* ‘according to the men of Powys’. Morfydd Owen has discussed this group in great detail and, although direct parallels may be lacking, many of the terms are well known in law texts and it may be significant that a number of them occur in Col. though not in *Ior*.

Finally, while the men of Powys are endowed with a variant set of *nau affixit for galanos* and *âth*, their *nau affixit lledrys* is in general tone identical to the standard listing. It differs in that it offers a list which is specifically related to the theft of livestock, while the standard list is content to give a list of actions which are to be regarded as abetment to any act of theft.  

2. *bradlwydr yr teipdyr* ‘giving provisions to the thief’ (cf. *Ior*. $111/3).
3. *aethwech y lledryn* ‘accompanying the thief’ (cf. *Ior*. $111/4).
4. *aethwech y lledryn* ‘meeting with the thief’.
5. *se hebhun* ‘and leading him’.
6. *dau ym llydaw* march ‘bringing a horse fetter’.
7. *addubh lludyn y gympdaus gan y lledryn hef y sligion* ‘recognizing a beast of his neighbour in the possession of a thief and not setting it free’.
8. *gweuc yr llydaw* or *wlad hef y wenygi* ‘seeing a beast being led from the land and not informing on it’.

The point here is that, if we are dealing with a genuine relic from a period before *affixit* came to mean ‘accessory, etc.’, we might expect to list a number of causes and grounds of *lllydaw* parallel to the lists for *galanos* and *âth*. The fact that what we find is different from the usual list, but only different in that it makes the list of abetments specific to a particular, but probably very common, type of theft, might prompt us to suspect that all the *nau affixit* ‘according to the men of Powys’ are secondary adaptations.

In conclusion, then, it seems more likely that the original sense of *affixit* in these legal contexts was ‘accessory, abetment’ and not ‘grounds, cause’; the latter could have arisen from a re-interpretation of *affiectus* on the basis of its range of non-legal meanings. To return to the original question, it still remains unclear that *affixit* in the sense of ‘accessory, abetment’ can be satisfactorily extracted from Latin *assertus*. There is no objection to the other senses of *affixit* being connected with the Latin form but the legal sense remains a problem. In view of these doubts it may be appropriate to look elsewhere for a solution.

Within Latin, there is no obvious alternative source. One plausible possibility which has to be rejected is that *affixit* is a reflex of Latin *aspectus*. In initial position an original *sp* > *ff*, but there are no examples of Latin *-sp* > Welsh *-ff* because *-sk- > *sp* (see 19b/1) and thus Latin *sp* > *sb-*, e.g. *yssad < spatium, gosber < costerom*. This possibility is worth mentioning.

2. For the possibility that a verb of seeing is involved, see below, p. 119.
because there is a striking absence of Latin loanwords in Welsh with internal -yp, i.e. reflexes of, for example, derptetus, conspectus, inspecuta, etc. Our knowledge of the development of these clusters is not as clear as it might be and it may well be that internal -ouwp- gave -"yp-.

Even if that had been the case, such forms would have then fallen together with the reflexes of defactus (defactus, confactus > defactus), etc.

Failing a Latin solution, it may be that a native origin for affath is to be sought. If so, there seems to be no alternative to analysing affath as *af-paith. Now an element paith/paith- figures in three apparently unrelated semantic areas.

Latin paenitentia, Latin paenitentia - 'shingle, tile' is the base of peithyn 'shingle, tile', peithynu 'shingle roof', peithynwyd, a warrior' (with plated armour)', etc. Jarmo also suggests that CA 246 of gynmas ar beithyn peithyn arwnwydus contains a form of this root, taking it as literally 'layer upon layer of slaughter'. Presumably, he is taking peithyn/peithin as a spelling of peithyn. Jackson translates the line 'he used to make destruction of destruction with many blows', probably assuming that this was peith- discussed below meaning 'destruction, etc.' Alternatively, peithyn could be analysed as paith + the tribal suffix *-yp- /-yp/, in which case we may be dealing with the Picts. There is another paith, which is probably ultimately unrelated, with the sense of 'lay waste, destroy, destruction'. These forms have been discussed by Williams and it is clear that such a meaning will cover most of the examples satisfactorily. Dr. John Davies gives the meaning deertas, vastatus. Pughe gives a range of meanings an opening; a stratfoward course; a glance; a prospect; a scene. Some of these owe something to the next meaning of paith and it is possible to see how the rest may have arisen through mis-interpretation of some of these difficult early examples. As for the etymology of paith, Loth rather doubtfully follows Gruffydd Robert in deriving it from Latin paenitium., although he acknowledges that the semantic fit is less than perfect. Williams sees its origin in Latin paeso, which generally means 'to comb, to card (of wool)' but also 'to thrash' in certain contexts. However, it is important to note that the latter meaning is restricted to Plautus and, while this can sometimes indicate that one is dealing with a sub-literary usage, there is no evidence from the Romance languages that this meaning of paeso was continued in the vulgar language. Even so, Williams quotes the parallel of Welsh *cib *comb' : cibedl, 'plunder, extortion' to show that the semantic shift is independently justifiable. Indeed, Eurnout-Meilet also quote French donner une peignée 'give a thrashing (lit. a combing). Moreover, etymologically paath is related to Old English paethan, German paethen 'right' so it is possible that we are in the right semantic field. The difficulty is the derivation via Latin which is necessary to account for the initial p-, i.e. a native form from this root would have lost its initial p-, but, if the semantic shift can be accepted as an independent development, then its Latin origin may not present an insuperable obstacle to this theory. If so, the semantic merging of paith and peithyn is perhaps less surprising; within Welsh peithweddyn, as someone who causes paith, seems to be the direct link but the general connection of 'something flat' and 'degenerated land, etc.' is clear.

The third form containing a paith is guwath 'hope'. This is clearly to be analysed as ge + paith with the latter element likely to be a verb of perception. Loth analysed this in this way and followed Pughe in interpreting the second element as 'glance, prospect, scene'. It is difficult to see how the form could be otherwise analysed but there is much more to be said about both elements. There is evidence both in Welsh and Irish, though I have never seen it collected, for a prospective use of Welsh ge-irish & compare gewesgylgyn 'meditate, prepare', geceisogog 'avoid, shun', geceisogog 'threaten, warn', geceisogog 'hope, expedite', geceisogog 'counsel, promise' and in Irish, geceisogog 'warn', geceisogog 'tell (g. praeceus MI.), geceisogog 'prepare, provide for', geceisogog 'prepare, provide'. As for the etymology, it must, if it is native, go back to an earlier *kev- to account for the initial p-. If so, its cognates are probably found in &keil, kevastan, *kevastan 'see', Greek kevastos, kevastos 'mark, evidence'.

I would suggest that affath > *afpaith also belongs to this root. Further support for this etymology is supplied by a probable Breton cognate: Middle Breton eezv eezv 'attention, view' is without etymology and so Old Breton form is attested but, if the ~-v ~-v is the outcome of the secondary lention of -f- which is frequent in Middle Breton, and the initial e- is the result of vowel assimilation, then it could on formal grounds be identified with Welsh affath. The semantic side of the etymology remains to be discussed.

The notion that the accessory to the act or the act of abetment itself is associated with words to do with seeing and watching should not a priori cause us any difficulty; after all, it is precisely that they stand and watch but do not take part which defines their role. More precise support comes from the role of the sithal in Irish law who is the counterpart of Welsh affath. The clearest statement of his role is to be found in a short text which in some versions is embedded in the long tract on distress, Cetharichlacht Aithghbhola. The sithal is liable to a graded series of penalties depending on the degree of his involvement; the crucial point, however, is that he should not commit the deed himself.


3. See Pokorny, IEW 638. For the Greek forms, see also P. Chantre, *Dictionnaire dymoegogique de la langue grcc* (Paris, 1969-80), s.v. *paath*. This root may have been eliminated in Irish on account of its similarity to *râuatai*; however, traces may have survived in the irregular future which is apparently restructured but could be derived from *cêd* (GDD 853).

4. See BH 574 and 580 respectively.

5. For full references see Ferguson Kelly, *A Guide to Early Irish Law* (Dublin, 1966), 279-80. On the sithal, see ibid., 154-7 and 352 for the text itself. That the sithal text is an insertion may be indicated by the marginal gloss: CHI 489-5.6. For the siofhionnach see *dumusio- or ciosiuat, siothairh*; 'we have united this collection of material for the sake of appearances, even though it may not be correct; it is an old text'. However, this may apply to all that precedes rather than to the sithal text alone.
Gleanings from the Gododdin and other Early Welsh texts

The present paper is in nature a miscellany and an interim report, comprising gleanings gathered in the course of the preparation of a monograph-length diachronic study of the text and a historical grammar of Old Welsh, the completion and appearance of which work being imminent. The various categories examined are those which have a bearing upon the linguistic archaism of portions of the text and, in particular, will suggest underlying oral and written material of pre-Old Welsh date. In a number of instances, the upholstery of my proposal will be to indicate a new reading and/or meaning for the line(s) in question. As a rule, I have avoided recapitulating examples of like features which were already discussed in my articles in Studia Celtica, xx, xxi, Early Welsh Poetry; Studies in the Book of Aneirin (ed. Brynley F. Roberts, National Library of Wales, 1988), and Études Celtiques xxvi.

1. Phonology and orthography

§ 1. Archaic phonology reflected in metrical ornamentation. Under some such unsatisfactory term as cyffydylch, protobyth, or compound alliteration we may treat the common feature of sound correspondences—line-internally or, better, between adjacent lines—which involve more than the initial consonants. Often this will take the form of the repetition of initial syllables (these frequently representing one and the same etymology or etymology having some special semantic relationship) as in, e.g., CA 159-60 ευδ μεθονυται | yw ei winaicturn < OW i med melawt | i bwin gwiriant. In some instances (such as the preceding) these imply an older phonological and/or orthographic state of the diction of the text. Thus, in 106 nedual leuws ganwch y cerbydd ymdodo 'he drank a mead feast at midnight', mod-medhaed' had once echoed mod in the reflexes of Celtic *meosucig* 'at midnight'. In the same words, 116 of slasu saeun saesruit yd beth was won to kill Saxons each seventh day' is likely to go back to an original with . . . Suchom nehiaet . . . , thus with compound alliteration of s-+ ch. Cf. my suggestion (in Early Welsh Poetry) that 771-2, ennir th lawr adu tylwynt | ructor liwicder mar phop kwyrbol 'most truly art thou called for thy rightful deeds, rector, helmsman, rampart of every frontier' should be read annau lit-giliau o-it-euwr ygrych | wychen smytir, mwr pob conyacht to recover the cyrc-gemierad between gywch < British *teg-xiau* 'acta' and rector. Similarly, the formula nego i ni olyfwr 'rather than his nuptials' is underlyingly mect i trothgyf in repetition of N-O-C-T, with the generic harmony of radical and mutated values as in Early Irish consonance.

In CA 202-203(A), a cyrc-gemierad links mordri < *mawroryn 'in the great house' (dative/locative) with mawer < mawro indicating that the composition of this segment goes back before the reflex of Celtic long 2 had diverged to eu and o in Old Welsh tonic and atomic environments. Cf. my remarks on the phonological figures in CA 26(A) yw auadach Gododdin o lauer mordri in Early Welsh Poetry, pp. 25-26.