A certain number of Irish personal and other names would seem to be connected with the element lug-.1 Of these, Luignet is of particular interest, not only because it is attested in Osian in the form Lucnnti,2 which probably certifies its derivation from a u-stem,3 but also for the possibility that there may exist a corresponding name in Spain, namely that of the Picardiomentioned by Proleney as inhabitants of the town of Paclomium in Asturia. However, there are two reasons why this correspondence4 is somewhat tentative. Firstly, Proleney does not record the -tu-one would, from the Irish, have expected in the second syllable;7 secondly, the Irish name is a io-stem, not one in -o-.8 In any case, it is perhaps worth observing that there seems to be another onomatonic link between Spain and Ireland involving the element lug-, namely that between the Irish Lugaid, gen. Lui(0)gedach9 and the form Luguadici10 found in a Latin inscription near Segovia.11

Helsingfors and Edinburgh

1 Cf. AoS ii. 345. 18-41.
2 Osam. Gool. 297-8. There is a remote possibility that this name is represented in a Scottish place-name: cf. p. 144 n. 2 above.
3 CIC, nos. 41, 112, 113, and 357; cf. MacNeill (PRFA 25 (1911), 73) for the connection between the Osian forms and later ones.
4 Cf. EIRMM 391-4 and Wagner, ZCPK 32 (1972), 87-9.
5 Also proposed by Schultz (Los Cántabros y Asturias y su guerra con Roma (Madrid, 1943), 97), who notes the reading Anwylyna Baskim selected by Muller (1883, 165) against Anwylyna given in some of the manuscripts. From these two alternatives, Muller’s Latin gen. pl. Luguana, Holder’s nom. pl. Lugur-ana (AoS ii. 347), and Schultz’s nom. pl. Luguen are just as much a matter for conjecture as my Greek nom. pl. Luguana, which was selected because it goes with the Irish form.
6 From a Celtic nom. pl. like *Lugnum or perhaps *Lugnumi (SFHIII 34-5) one would have expected
7 Proleney to write Angeynum.
9 GOF 356, 4, § 178, and § 319; 12, EIRMM, passim, GPN 230. Cf. especially the Osian form Lucenii, -deca, and -cexa (CIC, nos. 4, 236, and 286).
10 CIL 4. 2723. I can offer no explanation for the -u-. On the other hand, although Hübner took this as a gen. sg. (cf. also GPN 220), it seems to me possible that it should be read as a dative (cf. GPN 208), in which case it would seem to be a guttural stem, just like the Irish name. As Schmidt (KGP 233) has pointed out, it is quite possible that CIL 13. 5528 Lucadace(1) belongs to the group of names that contain Lug-; on the other hand, this name is definitely feminine and therefore probably an i-o-stem.
11 Note that this is not far from the Western border in Leijonaro’s (CRAL 1973 (1974), 630) map of the area where Celtiberian inscriptions are found. Proleney’s Anwylyna were probably situated somewhat further north, but again not very far west from this area.

Welsh assewnaw and Celtic Legal Idiom

I

In Kulhwich ac Olaus the hero sets out for the court of Arthur to identify himself and seek the king’s assistance in getting the girl he has been bewitched into loving. There is much in the description of his advent to the court, his admission to Arthur’s presence, and the scene that develops between them that suggests an archaic provenance, conditioned by a concern for legal propriety. Whatever its literary merits may be, and whatever other clues may be adduced in support of the date of the redaction, these survivals are surely indications of the tale’s antiquity, especially where they seem to stem from a common Celtic legal tradition.

First of all, there is the matter of the diabod which Kulhwich threatens to raise against Arthur’s hall. Although this is usually translated as simply a shout (‘shout as much as thou wilt about the laws of Arthur’s court’)—as if Kulhwich were about to throw a tantrum, it is important to remember that the diabod was a formal way of seeking legal redress:

Os e nauset den a dañ y ouyn tyn, dyffydedyc yu e pyroolwr, a hwnnu a dyt dysapat am e ut en mynet o pyrodaur en ampyrodaur. Ac ena e gwerendic e keureth y dysapat honno ac e ryd kynnyus ydau: Sef yu henno, kufyrydyc a kmyrnnt a phob un o'r nyuer e buynet en cysded en y erbyn. A honno a elwy dysapat uuch Annunnu, a chet doter e dysapat o henno allan, byth ny weredwynt. Ac ecreyi a dwytwy na dele e nauset dyn dody e dysapat honno nmen e unnet o pyrodaur en ampyrodaur.4

Kulhwich knows that he has to see Arthur—he is a claimant against him, as we soon discover—and is prepared to summon the authority of native law to endorse that right.

When Arthur admits him, he gives him a choice seat, and says that he will be treated as a gwrthyfheyd (WM 459, 12), an ancient designation for the heir elect, as Professor Binchy has shown.5 Kulhwich then insists on receiving his cyfarres, threatening satirize if it is withheld.6 The precise nature and occasion of the cyfarres is not entirely clear to me,6 but I would guess that it was an occasion and given on occasions such as the recognition of his son by a father: in the case of questionable maternity, the son’s status was dependent upon recognition by the father, and such formal declarations may have been required for other degrees of questionable kinship.6 At any rate, such a formal acknowledgement may

3 Some Celtic Legal Terms’, Celtaica, iii (1956), 221 f.
4 The phrase dyrn cynhy satirize is carefully analyzed by Eric Hemp in ‘mech, iem’ forthcoming in Brec; see also T. M. Charles-Edwards, Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (Session 1970), 277-8.
5 Among other things, cyfarres was an annual stipend, e.g. to the penitens—usually a king’s son or nephew; see Lifyr Iorwerth, § 6, 24.
6 Ausarum Owen, Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales (London, 1814), ii. 316-8: Try chymyryst aryd a sbe: ac eun taswan, e guoatta ac e kymer, y tat shaw yu hemnu ‘Three acceptances . . . and one [method] is the word of the father himself, either rejecting or accepting him’; also AL ii. 528: un y fo, ei daf,
A certain number of Irish personal and other names would seem to be connected with the element *lugu*–¹. Of these, *Laignet* is of particular interest, not only because it is attested in Osma in the form *Lugocinc*,² which probably certifies its derivation from a *-stern*,³ but also for the possibility that there may exist a corresponding name in Spain, namely that of the *Añeyos* mentioned by Prolemy⁴ as inhabitants of the town of Paclontium in Asturia. However, there are two reasons why this correspondence⁵ is somewhat tentative. Firstly, Prolemy does not record the *-stern* one would, from the Irish, have expected in the second syllable;⁶ secondly, the Irish name is a *io-stern*, not one in *-o*.⁷ In any case, it is perhaps worth observing that there seems to be another onomastic link between Spain and Ireland involving the element *lugu*, namely that between the Irish *Lugaid*, gen. *Lúi*gedsc⁸ and the form *Lugudic⁰* found in a Latin inscription near Segovia.¹¹
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1. *Jahrb. ii. 245. 1841.*
2. *Onom. Gc. 207–8. There is a remote possibility that this name is represented in a Scottish place-name: cf. p. 144 n. 2 above.*
3. *CHC nos. 41, 112, 113, and 307; cf. MacNeill (PRIA 22 (1911), 73) for the connection between the Osma forms and later ones.*
5. *Geogr. 3, 6, 32.*
6. *Also proposed by Schulten (Los Cántabros y Asturias y su guerra con Roma (Madrid, 1943), 97), who notes the reading *Añeyos* *Ihukkeun* selected by Müller (1883, 161) against *Añeyos* given in some of the manuscripts. From these two alternatives, Müller’s Latin gen. pl. *Lugumani, Holder’s nom. pl. Langunos (As. ii. 347), and Schulten’s nom. pl. Lugares are just as much a matter for conjecture as my Greek nom. pl. *Añeyos*, which was selected because it goes with the Irish form.*

From a Celtic nom. pl. like *Lugumani* or perhaps *Lugumani (Sf. Hb. 24–5)* one would have expected Prolemy to write *Añeyos.*

2. *CH. i. no. 314 and Wagner, ZCPK 32 (1972), 87–9.*
4. *CIL 9: 2772. I can offer no explanation for the *-sc.* On the other hand, although Hübner took this as a gen. sg. (cf. also GPN 220), it seems to me possible that it should be read as a dative (cf. GPN 238), in which case it would seem to be a guttural stem, just like the Irish name. As Schmidt (KGP 233) has pointed out, it is quite possible that CIL 13: 5562 *Lucadeus* (belonging to the group of names that contain *Lug*; on the other hand, this name is definitely feminine and therefore probably an *-stern*). Note that this is not far from the Western border in Lejremses (CRAI 1973 (1974), 630) map of the area where Celtiberian inscriptions are found.
5. *Prolemy’s *Añeyos* were probably situated somewhat further north, but again not very far west from this area.*

8. *Some Celtic Legal Terms*, *Celtica*, iii (1956), 221 f.*
10. *Among other things, *cyfaras* was an annual stipend, e.g. to the *pentadu*—usually a king’s son or nephew; see Llfr Normorth, § 6. 24.*
11. *Ancelin Owen, *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (London, 1841), ii. 356–5: Tri chymrydw aeth a sob; ac om taesut, ac gwastac ac ac hymer, y tat shaw yu honeu. Three acceptances . . . and one [method] is the word of the father himself, either rejecting or accepting him*; also *AL II. 524: un yw o, ei daid, Welsh assewynaw and Celtic Legal Idiom

In *Kulhach ac O’lenn* the hero sets out for the court of Arthur to identify himself and seek the king’s assistance in getting the girl he has been bewitched into loving. There is much in the description of his advent to the court, his admission to Arthur’s presence, and the scene that develops between them that suggests an archaic provenance, conditioned by a concern for legal propriety. Whatever its literary merits may be, and whatever other clues may be adduced in support of the date of the redaction, these survivals are surely indications of the tale’s antiquity, especially where they seem to stem from a common Celtic legal tradition.

First of all, there is the matter of the *diabad* which Kulhwc韓 threatens to raise against Arthur’s hall. Although this is usually translated as simply a shout (‘shout as much as thou wilt about the laws of Arthur’s court’)—as if Kulhwc韓 were about to throw a tantrum, it is important to remember that the *diabad* was a formal way of seeking legal redress:

Os e nauet den a daun y ouyn tyr, dyfodyfue yu e pyroldeler, a hunnu a dyt dysapat am e uot en mynet o pyrodair en ampyrodair. Ac e naegeuden e keureth y dysapat honno ac o ryd kynnuys ydu: Sef yu henne, kefuruydu a kynmet yphub o’n ouy euyet en eysted en y erbyn. A hunnu a eowly dysapat uoch Annuen, a chet doter y dysapat o henne allan, byth ny weredewyr. Ac ecreyl a dwyetty na dele e nauet dyn dovy e dyspat honno namen e uynet o pyrodair en ampyrodair.*

Kulhwc韩 knows that he has a right to see Arthur—he is a claimant against him, as we soon discover—and is prepared to summon the authority of native law to endorse that right.

When Arthur admits him, he gives him a choice seat, and says that he will be treated as a *gwyrthrybyad* (*WM* 459. 12), an ancient designation for the heir elect, as Professor Binchy has shown.¹² Kulhwc韩 then insists on receiving his *cyfaras*, threatening satire if it is withheld.¹³ The precise nature and occasion of the *cyfaras* is not entirely clear to me,⁴ but I would guess that it was sought and given on occasions such as the recognition of his son by a father: in the case of questionable paternity, the son’s status was dependent upon recognition by the father, and such formal declarations may have been required for other degrees of questionable kinship.⁵ At any rate, such a formal acknowledgement may

3. *Some Celtic Legal Terms*, *Celtica*, iii (1956), 221 f.*
5. *Among other things, *cyfaras* was an annual stipend, e.g. to the *pentadu*—usually a king’s son or nephew; see Llfr Normorth, § 6. 24.*
6. *Ancelin Owen, *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales* (London, 1841), ii. 356–5: Tri chymrydw aeth a sob; ac om taesut, ac gwastac ac ac hymer, y tat shaw yu honeu. Three acceptances . . . and one [method] is the word of the father himself, either rejecting or accepting him*; also *AL II. 524: un yw o, ei daid,
Adlam is used in the general sense of 'habitation' or 'refuge', adlamar 'one who takes refuge' or 'temporary inhabitant' as indicated in the Laws. Amyn is a 'petition for protection' or 'entreaty' (see p. 149 n. 3); anynnyn 'temporary tenant'. There are denominative verbs in each case that express the act of entering into such relationships, that is, whereby the pledger, seeker of refuge, or petitioner becomes bound to his contract, or, perhaps, puts it into effect: adlamar, anynnyn, gwaesaf. The last is only attested late (Pugh, eighteenth century), and probably arose through confusion of the original nominal suffix and the 1st sg. pres. indic. ending: gwaes-ac. In any case, it is likely that all these verbs are relocalizations of an earlier idiom involving a verb of 'binding' plus the appropriate noun, as in Irish naidhm foilse (see below).

One must assume that there is very little difference in the relationships described here in so far as the legal principle is concerned. They all concern garwgaeth, a contractual relationship in which the protection of a larger or more powerful proprietor or freeman is 'invoked' by one of lesser rank. If the contract is abrogated, if the petitioner retreats from the 'refuge' of his 'protector', then a fine is set, the amount of which is dependent upon the nature of the contract, itself, perhaps, established by the rank of the principals involved.

The system described is paralleled in early Irish tradition, where again the amount and kind of relationship contracted depends upon rank; the lexicon of that system reinforces our understanding of the Welsh passages cited above, and gives us a glimpse into a common system inherited by both Irish and Welsh tradition. I have already mentioned OIr. foileam 'protection, safeguard', etc., which is well attested. To this belong such phrases as cél foileam 'a tenant under the protection of his lord' (RiADict. s.v. foileam).

Adlam does not readily yield an Irish cognate, but Professor Hamp suggests we ought to look for some such form as aithlech (for his arguments, see pp. 153 f. below). Indeed, such a word exists, but with but a single attestation in the RiADict. It is uttered in a poem recited by Derbogarfaig:

La Coineilainn la Lugaid.  
risarom òth na hòmone:  
menbad athbhe co nialbheoch.  
ni bad aithbreach ar comal.1

The sense of the passage is by no means clear, but Derbogarfaig is regretting the fact that she must dissolve her union with Lugaid. It is a safe bet that aithlech here refers to that relationship, meaning perhaps 'habitation, dwelling' like Welsh adlam, and that the compact (comal) between Derbogarfaig and Lugaid was characterized in legal terms (in the next stanza the obscure legal phrase leaca tis is used; see RiADict. s.v. lecc).

OIr. saigid and its various compounds, ad-saig, ind-saig, provide a wealth of variations on the theme of 'seeking' appropriated to a specific legal use. The Irish examples show that, like its Welsh cognate (a)nywyn (see Professor Hamp's analysis below, pp. 154 ff.), saig-
refers to the 'implementation' of a contract, which, as in Welsh, depends upon the rank of the principals:

iss ed saiges a naidm, a rith, a fiaidnaisce, a aitire ('that is [the amount] that enforces his naidm, his rith, his fiaidnaisce, and his aitire [various forms of suretyship]').

is ar chinn saich Fergus for a ghnna amna briaté fir fir for Coin Culaind [LU 529] ('It is there that Fergus claimed of his securities that faith should not be broken with Cuchulainn')—Paraday, p. 82.

Saigid has also the sense of 'reveal, evoke, lay bare'. It is in this sense that the poet gifted with the powers of divination 'seeks' and 'reveals' or 'implements' knowledge:

Saerann Sinna saidg dán, dáig rofaimid a lom-thúr ('the noble name of Sinann, search it out for us since ye venture to lay bare its origin'; tair: 'act of seeking, searching for, investigating').

This perfective meaning of saigid is paralleled in Welsh (e)mynym, for in addition to the general meaning of 'seeking, invoking' and its legal implications, it can mean 'manifest, reveal, charm into existence':

ac or ei hynny awwynnwr yr un norwyn decaf (WM 100, 34–51; and from those things [Math and Gwydon] fashioned, evoked, the fairest maiden').

In Cat Goddeu (BT 25, 25) the same materials used to create Blodeuaddd occur in the list of elements used in the 'creation' of the speaker of the poem: from them, says the speaker, am sgwyndy i rith ... am sgwyndy sioitin, that is, Math and Gwydon 'charmed, created, brought into existence' the persona of the poem.

What this comes down to then, is that on the evidence in both Irish and Welsh, just as the inherited Indo-European word meaning 'shape' had been appropriated to the special poetic function of composing (W. prydd, Ir. cruth 'a shape'; pryddyd 'poet', cruth 'poetry'), so did they continue an inherited word meaning 'seek' in both legal and poetic senses. In the former case, a lesser man sought a refuge in the protection of a greater; words for the refuge or habitation, warranted protection, and the act itself fulfilled the paradigm. In the latter case, it was the perfective of 'seek', that is, 'find' and 'reveal' that became specially relevant to the poetic craft, and referred to the process whereby the poets evoked special knowledge (imbal) and physical shapes, however unstable their forms might be (e.g. Blodeuaddd).

This network of associative words in Irish and Welsh poetic tradition is strengthened by a parallel construction with aswynnwr that occurs in the fourth branch of the Mabinogion. A few lines before Blodeuaddd is brought into existence, Math says to Gwydon, heisun ... huddaw greweic iddo yntes (WM 100, 26–8). Hudaw is used earlier in the same tale when Gwydon manifests his magic and summons forth steeds, bridles for them, etc., to trick the

hapless Pryderi. The root of the word is perhaps *sotó- (Pokorny, IEW s.v. 3. *sotó- 'Band'; Skt. stūḥ 'bindend, fessend', ON. sérld h's Band, Seil', Lith. sūtis 'Band, fessle'). In Irish we would expect *sath, and it is striking that imbas' magically retrieved information' is glossed *i. saidecht (Stowe Gl. 453, and cf. RIAConstr. s.v. saidecht 'skill, mastery'). Imbas was one of those three things that distinguished the poetic art, a special property of the poets that was practised through a ritual of divination, as Cormac recorded in his famous Glossary, and saith-echt 'magical evocation' would be an accurate gloss.

Professor Hamp has pointed out that the old idiom for 'protection' in Irish, involving something like 'grasping something' (*fíom: OIr. do-móen), was relexicalized in naidm 'binding' and fóesam 'protection': can naidm a fóesma foirm. The question céd ná ronais do fóesma-sa ecilts the 'almost etymological' response gab tu lámh mo fóesam. In the Bretha Airechte we have a clear description of the manner in which the hand is the instrument of binding protection:

Atha aitire gaibhes gníoru nadma aitire són do beir lámh im brollach feilechman (‘It is the a. who undertakes acts of naidm. The a. puts a hand on the breast of the’).

Compare with this the manner of pledging described in the Welsh laws:

Pwybbynac a wygylo gwyyst y arall: ny dylwy n y gwystwr idaw namyn y grmyr yu law ac ddi ar y sgwyrd, ac odyna y ddi yn lle y catwri: ari hynny yw teir gwanas gwyystl (‘Whoever shall pledge a pledge with another: the person, to whom it is pledged, is only to take it in his hand and place it on his shoulder, and thence put it in the place where it shall be kept: and those are called the three stays of a pledge’).

If the pledge be a living person:

Ac e a me yaw rody mach ar kryreth ac y sef yu heene gwyto y dlym bynu a henwy on lawwswaethwr er arglwyd (‘and then it is right to give surety in law: which implies pledges of living persons, and that into the hands of the servants of the lord’).

In each instance, the hand is the instrument with which the obligation is bound.

What Professor Hamp was referring to was an act of protection, wherein the obligation to protect one man was contracted by another; it was, as the text shows, a gnym naidm fóesma, and it was done i lámh. The Welsh text cited speaks of unspecified gwyston and the act gwysto (cf. OE. gifel, and the Ir. Airgialla and W. Arwysht—‘subject tribes’ originally). Yet there are instances in which naodd ‘protection’ is contracted in Welsh too. Erchi naodd is a common expression for ‘seeking patronage, protection’: when Arthur went into Ireland in pursuit of Twrch Trwyth, dywod sênt for Arwysht attu y erchi naodd iddo. Ac yrodys yntes naodd adant hes (WM 499, 17–19). Erchi naodd has no doubt replaced the older aswynnwr naodd, preserved in the intentionally archaic work of the Gwyfeyddr.

---

1 D. A. Binchy, Critíc Goldbluch (Dublin, 1941), II. 43 f.
3 Gwynn, Mervyn Dodinghamas ill. 486, 1.
4 For the orthographical confusion of voiced and unvoiced final sprants, v. GOI, p. 777; sath Match 'trouble', and Hap, Erul, xxiv (1973), 171–2.
5 Erul, xxiv (1973), 172 f.
7 AL ii. 198–9.
8 AL ii. 139–1.
It occurs, in fact, as a repeated increment in the poem to Rhys ap Gruffydd by Cynddelw.

Although I'r nadol and W. naddol must be kept apart, as Professor Hamp shows below (pp. 128–90), on both formal and semantic grounds, their superficial resemblance is emphasized by the fact that they are employed similarly in idioms of legally bound protection.

Tri naddol ac amddiff gwerddol: naddol bywyd a chorf; naddol meddiant ac adder; a naddol breint geniadau ('Three protections and securities of a social state: protection of life and person; protection of possession and dwelling; and protection of natural privilege'). AL ii. 482–3.

Tair breint wahanandrau pencenedi ... braint naddol mab allt a gaer gan ei genciawn, val na cafo gam a thang na dylit o gywrraith a chyddwybod ('Three peculiar privileges of a chief of kindred ... privilege of protection to an allt who shall be obtained by his kindred, so that he may not receive any wrong or task that ought not to be by law and conscience') [cf. Conchobar extending 'naddol' to Cuchulainn, who is clearly a 'mab allt'] AL ii. 330–1.

'Three lawful things the most extraordinary which one person shall do for another, without thanks to him, without the law compelling him, and yet bearing with him after doing it, and awaiting his coming to do it ... third, the becoming an arwasaw of theft in hand' [Prydydd mynet yn arwasaw llledrty yn llaw; an arwasaw llledrty was one who acted as guarantor that a piece of property was lawfully possessed and not stolen; the phrase mynet ... yn llaw means 'to act in the capacity of'] AL ii. 660–1.

In the list of marvels that Kulhvec must achieve, Yshadaden maintains that Arthur will not help the hero because dan y lloes i y mae ef, i.e. Arthur is a 'man' of his (WM 485: 8). The passage does not occur in RB, and is a rare instance of disagreement between the two manuscripts in this section of the tale. In the catalogue of characters in the same story, we read a huel mab lloes, mydd oswynnoes eiroyt yn llaw argebyd (WM 462: 8–9), translated quite accurately by Jones and Jones, 'he never submitted to a lord's hand.'

T. M. Charles-Edwards has pointed out that in the act of homage in medieval feudalism a man placed his hands in those of another, and declared that he was becoming the other's man.

The point he makes is that while that may have been typical procedure according to Anglo-Norman feudal protocol, it need not suggest a later provenance for the tale. The hand as instrument of the pledge is undoubtedly as archaic as the pledge itself.

The significance of the hand as symbol of contract has not been missed, and Professor Dunéil long ago drew our attention to the significance of the episodes in which Mucius Scaccola and Tyfr playing leading parts. What has been neglected is the connection between

1 Llwydrug Hendwulwedd, 64*. Interesting, too, is the following passage from an awdl in praise of Owain by Ehwelyn Farrié:

Py arghwhyd y phyrhywodd y gwylchedaf iddu ps law dros amry yl awyntaf. O ddubh dewis byth y gwasawf. a dewises gyst a dewisa. y gwr awclwir y tir geir faf. byth y dyr get tren yn trin penhaf.

2 *LlHy 88*, 46–51

The word gwasawf is difficult here. Lloyd-Jones notes that the line is too long by a syllable, and he rejects rendering it as wasawf or a wasawf (Gjerufa, b.v. gwasawf). Still, it is tempting to consider gwasawf (= wasawf) AL ii. 42: gwasawf for gwasawf as an emendation. The sense would be perfectly right, but byth y would remain a problem.

3 The Mabronion, p. 101.


5 Welsh adlam has every appearance of being an old verbal noun of a compound verb *ad < *ate-{lam}(m). The simplex *llam is well known as an equivalent of OIr. *laimm, to ling 'leap'. The original shape must therefore have been *lng-{sn}, where *lng is a stem ending in -n or -m. As I show elsewhere, however, at some length, such a verbal noun formation would be expected only with a simple verb; a compound verb might be expected to form a verbal noun with a different, and shorter, stem structure, e.g. an old neuter o-stem. However, this correlation had been lost by the historical period of Welsh, and in British Celtic we find only the etymological debris of this old rule of word formation. Thus we also have invasion of the


3 Ed. and trans. by Stokes, Revue Celtique, iii

The hand as instrument of the binding of protection and the obvious and ultimate role of the king (or 'diu-chief' on another plane) as 'protector' of his people. Hence Nodons the protector (to the same root as naddol), whose symbol was the bronze arm, and whose temple was appropriately located 'commanding a view of the Severn estuary'. Hence, also, when Nuadha had his arm cut off, his people were deprived of their leader-protector, and a new king had to be chosen.

Elsewhere in early Irish tradition, we encounter such views as Nuadha Deaghlama (ch) and Lámh Gúbháltaí (C), Concerning the latter we are told that when Cet invaded the province of Ulster, dofraghair Lámh é ('Cet [hand] answered him'). Then, tuc Cet biaile cloiðthimh don charaidh un tóinbrace, gur bhí a leithláthi d. . . Is de sin tréith asbor Lámh Gúbháltaí fair. The meaning of the epithet (trans. 'Hand of Danger') is not entirely clear to me from this context, but we know that Cet was indeed the arch-enemy of the Ulaid, and the one most likely to deprive them of their protection.

Finally, the death of Cuchulainn, whom Marie Sjoestedt-Jofvall describes as 'protector' of his people (a role he assumed at the moment he assumed his name, the Hound of Cooley, protecting the life and property of Cualan), is culminated in the most striking way:

Iarson tra dorchorair a claidheall air an daimh, aconceimhnaid air ainm duit dilgaidh corrobhr forfar. Benair airm duit dana dhoichocaill mar deag. Documant ass iarum intiselh 7 doberat leo eiscon calculainn 7 airm duit caintachair temrain. Comaid atá oibrigh acudh 7 air ilu naínne acuth di air. ('And then fell the sword from Cúchulainn's hand, and smote off Lugaid's right hand which fell on the ground. And then Cúchulainn's right hand was cut off in revenge for this. Lugaid and the hosts marched away, carrying with them Cúchulainn's head and his right hand, and they came to Tara, and there is the Sickbed of his head and his right hand, and the full of the cover of his shield of mould.')
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II

adlam

Welsh adlam has every appearance of being an old verbal noun of a compound verb *ad < *ate-{lam}(m). The simplex *llam is well known as an equivalent of OIr. *laimm, to ling 'leap'. The original shape must therefore have been *lng-{sn}, where *lng is a stem ending in -n or -m. As I show elsewhere, however, at some length, such a verbal noun formation would be expected only with a simple verb; a compound verb might be expected to form a verbal noun with a different, and shorter, stem structure, e.g. an old neuter o-stem. However, this correlation had been lost by the historical period of Welsh, and in British Celtic we find only the etymological debris of this old rule of word formation. Thus we also have invasion of the


3 Ed. and trans. by Stokes, Revue Celtique, iii

(1886–8), 188.
vocalism by that of the simplex even where the descendant of the old formation persists for an original compound. So, apart from the very new cyfrwynt ‘bind’ which is taken from rhywuno ← rhywun (raumwolin gl. iachla Cod. Juv.) ← *přy-oun, we find cyfrwy ‘saddle’ and arowy ‘chain, collar’ ← *hom-reigu, *ad-reigu ← Org. cuinrech drach and Bret. er Yann. ari (Plemel argg) ‘lien, binding, tether’ he huercen (Bërbe 569) ‘ei rhwywun’ ← *rñogetic, the expected state of the root in a compound. 

Now we know that the root of lingid/llam contained an inherent nasal, i.e. the verb did not have a nasal present as did bongdi ‘breaks’ for dor-fing ‘oppresses’; cf. Lingusn ‘Langress’. Therefore etymologically the compounded morpheme of linmmt should not have the configuration of combach (con-bearing) or cumdach (con-taking) ‘builds’), but actually appears as cuinmeng (cuinmeng gl. congressus MI 1128). That is to say, we have *hom-lingo.

But we see within the verbal morphology the traces of a dual, or inconsistent, treatment of roots of this shape. In the formation of the z-subjunctive, roots with internal nasal, whether in present stem or inherent, drop the nasal and lengthen the vowel (GOJ §§ 616-17). It may be noted in passing that I show elsewhere that the lengthening and vowel quality in the nasal-present type (§ 616) are a secondary result of levelling. Such a treatment of the inherent nasal (e.g. ic ← *mih ← *is; *siem ← *sies) is of course historically regular. But, as Thurneysen notes (§ 617), this resulting e is sometimes diphthongised to ia. That is to say, the non-low vowel of the root is taken as basic (leaving the nasal out of account) and is expanded to full grade e/ia, which comes historically from *ei. Such roots then find themselves treated like con-reig ← rerno-eissua. Now we find that lingid belongs precisely to this small subclass (3 sg. rel. iaas MI 378). Therefore in its subjunctive lingms is seen to behave as if it were at least in part an underlying liog.

On this basis we are justified in looking for a possible verbal noun as if *ati-ligo- > aith-lech, to be placed beside cuinmeng and liemmt = llam.

aseyn

Now that the attestation, contextual meaning, and use of amyn aswonym, etc., have been elucidated by Professor Ford, we may turn to the formal shape of the stem as we find it in Welsh in order to account for its background and possible relation to other forms. Not only is a Latin source unsuitable on formal grounds; on principle we should always favour an inherited development where nothing stands in the way simply on the ground that linguistic continuity is the normal expectation. As we shall see, such an explanation is not merely possible; it is instructive in ways that we could not suspect in advance.

Professor Ford has succeeded in putting amyn into semantic relation with OR. saigad and ad-saig in the meanings of ‘seeking’, ‘revealing’, and ‘shaming into being’. If we consult Pokorny’s IEW 876-7 we find notably under the entry *saig- ‘nachpuren’ a possible Greek stem, a close-knit Latin group, an important Germanic set (ON. sork, OE. sicken, OS. soklan, OHG. suochen; ON. sork ‘Rechtsache’, OE. succa fem.; Goth. sokra ‘Striftrage’, sakan sok ‘ich streiten’, gatashan ‘strafen’), and the Celtic groups represented by Ir. saigim, Welsh haeddu ‘deserve’, cyr-haedd ‘reach’, the denominative formative Ir. -aigim, Welsh

-iauia (see also GOI 338, § 524 note and Fleuriot, DGYB 268 s.v. -heath, -heat), and Ir. súr masc. ‘muria’ ← *sugro- with the derived súrugul (Welsh saubh ‘hat’, presumably). Except for the Greek stem these forms appear to have a clear cognacy.

We will actually get a clearer and more exact picture of the range of cognates by inspecting the entry of the customary prudent Ernout–Meillet (4th edn.) 589. Here we find the Latin set saigis, saigus ‘sorcerer’ (note the meaning!); saigis ‘fire’ (→ praes.), for which the sense ‘sentire acutus’ (sages cens) attested by Cicero Div. i, 31, 65 is relevant; and saigis ‘actus’, peut-être saigna ‘devineriesse’ (which Priscian adduces). For the short vowel of saigis Ernout compares contagiun: tâgas and diceti: dicaxis; it is not clear to me whether this represents an internally developed Latin alternation or whether we have here a formation taken from the zero-grade of the base, but for our present argument it is not essential for us to reach certainty on this purely Latin question.

Ernout–Meillet then offer a range of cognates for comparison: saigis besides Ir. saigim is supposed to point by their alternation to an athetic *saigiz*, while Greek διαγώνιος διαγώνιος ‘conduis’ is an iterative; on the question of the present formation see further below. They are undecided whether to assign Goth. sokian ‘seek’ to the Latin or to the Greek formation. Hitt. sokiyu– ‘presage’ gives us a derivative verb ‘pronounce an oracle’, on the authority of Benveniste, BSL 33, 141. It is noteworthy that the etymology is not found in Indo-Iranian. Ernout–Meillet conclude that the root basically meant ‘avoir du flair, avoir du nez (sages naseun) and that it was a terme de chasse applied to dogs. In the context of our present discussion I believe that Ernout–Meillet settled on much too restrictive a semantic reconstruction, biased strongly in the Latin direction. To anticipate our total argument, I would attribute to the etymology an earlier meaning of the order of ‘seek, elicit (in a perhaps non-obvious way)’; the notion of ‘seek’ led to the Germanic emphasis on ‘prosecution, legal concern’, while ‘elicit, charm’ turns up in Celtic, Latin, and Hittite (especially by oracular means) and could lead to a Latin hunting specialization of ‘sniff out’.

There is important additional evidence to be gleaned from the slender Gaulish remains which fails to appear in the most general handbooks. This is conveniently assembled now by D. Ellis Evans, GPN 251, under the heading SAG-. It will be noted from an inspection of Ellis Evans’s collection that so far as the element saig- appears in compounds it never seems to occur as first element. This fact may be correlated with the special use that led to the status of saig- as a denominative verb-forming suffix in Insular Celtic and to *sugro- > *aige as an agentic suffix in Irish. In view of the meanings established by Professor Ford for ad-aig in Insular Celtic perhaps we may offer some alternative interpretations for a pair of problematic Gaulish names, Curmiagius and Deprosagisio. Instead of following Loth, Thurneysen, and Ellis Evans (GPN 80-1) in reading Deprosagisio as ‘food chaser, glutton’ (disregarding for now the problems with OBrec. diprim, etc.), we may rather recall the value of Ir. saig- as the invoking of a claim to which one is entitled, and also Welsh haeddu in

1 The comparisons offered for saig- ‘cemen’ and saigias ‘revel’ by Friedrich, Rechtliches Wörterbuch, 179. Gurnan, Il legio titos (Napoli, 1968), 64 and 70, and Kammenhuber, Altkelns. Sprachen (Leiden, 1699), 189, simply repeat what is here summarized. The correlation of stem class does not seem to be noticed.
the sense 'deserve'. Then Deprosagios and Curmisagios may become instead the much more formal 'food claimant' and 'beer steward' vel sim.

Geographically within Indo-European, the configuration of retention by Italic, Celtic, and Germanic is a noteworthy aspect of our etymology which is to be added to the growing list of Western Indo-European areal elements, e.g. joining the socially important morphological formation whereby chiefs of social units are designated by the suffix -au- (Goth. piudan, etc.). Both on geographic and on semantic grounds I am not at all persuaded that the Greek verb is to be retained under this etymology.

In the realm of word formation let us further note a remarkable correspondence: Goth. sōða sōhei (sāgōji sāgeis), Lat. sāgere, I Hitt. sab-iiya-, and OIr. saigid (a class B II present) all reflect a *se-go- or *s- stem formation. The Gaulish remains also abundantly reflect this stem formation: Con-sagi-om, Curmi-sagi-us, Depro-sagi-los, Sagi-ilia, Sagi-ro, Sagi-us.1 In view of this notable agreement we are inclined to analyse the Welsh stem haedd- as *sāgere-. The agreement in representation of states of the base is also good: *sāgere- is found in Lat. sāgōs and sāges, Goth. sōbān ON. sōba and Goth. sōdes; *sēg- underlies Goth. (g)ajakan, OE. sēca, ON. sēk, OIr. saigid;2 Welsh haedd- and OBrct.-sām, and perhaps Lat. sāges; Gaulish and Hititice, of course, cannot inform us on this point. In brief, we find, especially in Germanic, representation of both *sāgere- as *H₂S₄, and *sēg- as *H₁S₄. Specific formations found are *H₁S₄-g- (Germanic, Latin, Celtic, and Ititic), *H₂g₄-g- (Germanic, perhaps British Celtic), *H₂S₄-go- or *H₂S₄-go- (Latin), *H₂S₄-g-á (Germanic), *H₁S₄-g- (Celtic), and *H₂S₄-g- (Germanic). It would therefore be quite reasonable to find a representative of *H₁S₄-g- also in Celtic.

Amidst the confusing testimony a few words may be said regarding the present stem formation of these verbs. Rather than assuming an old athenatic present, for which there is really no direct evidence, I see instead two pre-existing formations, one of which is an old *sē-go- present. Though Latin and Germanic show reflexes of *sē here (and note too that OIr. saigid behaves partly as a B I verb), we may see the Celtic vocalism as the earlier zero grade. It is consistent then to find that the Old Irish denominatives in -sēg- are inflected as so-called deponents, i.e. as original strong deponents equivalent to old middles (cf. GOI §549).

We are now ready to turn to the analysis of açeyn, which we may immediately equate in general with the Old Irish compound ad-saig. Therefore the initial ad- is explained as *ad-+s-. The central problem is of course the vocalism try. It is not possible to see in *ncy a reflex of *sēg-, for the latter sequence is surely to be found in graen 'grief' (Ir. grāin 'disgust'; CCCC 32, §96). Jackson expects (LHEB 461 and fl.) as the result of ag in this position, but he supplies examples only be x and r none before x. This

1 Jackson has in my opinion correctly recognized the plural number of this place-name, but there remains something to be said on the form class and gender of pmd. wein. Jackson reconstitutes *magm- (HPB 157 151, 162), pl. *magm- (HPB 157, 132, 79), but there is an anomaly in the Bretain noun which is well known and still operative in the Vannetais which I know best (that of Plomel). Although not an apppellative of a person, this masculine noun has the peculiarity of being locative in the plural; see Guillaume and Le Goff, Grammaire structurale du breton de la Fin de Crée (1970), 138-9. In Croix we find as a plural to mean the syntagm *wy-g bo 'les pierres'; from Plomel I have in-men 'une pierre', deli con 'les pierres' (also deli con, as if fem., from an acculturated speaker obviously misled by the tricky con- root), but *wy-g bo 'les pierres'. I have also heard from a fluent speaker from Guémené pmen 'une pierre', bōt meun 'beaucoup de pierres', dëw con 'les pierres', evel 'les pierres, calcaires'. To summarize, we have Article-I-men (m.sg.), deum+ men 'a stone', Article-I+ men (f.sg.), men+ men 'a stone'.
2 On the interesting behaviour of Latin -er verbs depending on whether the stem is a short monosyllabic or not, see L. R. Palmer, The Latin Language, 281. Hence sagit- -sē but fāgit- fāgere.
3 This makes one wonder whether the local and ethnic names Abyronyka, Aurelongia, Squagna might not reflect some different root. Is it possible that the divine name Squana GOD 2. 731 is simply Latin 'witch'?
4 The Irish s-subjective a-s- contains a secondary lenition, as Culvert Watkins (IE Origins of the Celtic Verbal, 132) has seen.
5 Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (London, 1965), Louvain, 1969, 370-1. I take this opportunity to correct the genitive plural reconstructed p. 271, lines 9 and 16, from *œdric to *œritic; on p. 270 last line, for *œ- read *œ-.
harmony with this general picture that we should find *’un > *’un yielding an i-affectation product that ultimately became wun. It is, moreover, understandable that the second element of the resulting diphthong did not show up as a rounded segment in the case of the non-affect ed eu, for in the sequence of two [i+hig] segments any such carry-over of rounding would have been dissimilated to promote the distinctive identity of the diphthong components; i.e. a rounding to [ii] would have risked monophthongization or else fallen outside the rounding restrictions which were developing for Welsh diphthongs (see the inventory in Simon Evans, GMW 3-5, §§ 6-7, and also §§ 8 and 10). However, the w segment of wunyn gives us one more piece of evidence that the *’un which resulted from an original *’un was in fact a phonetically rounded vowel.

The foregoing line of reasoning forces us to a reconstruction of wunyn as *ad-si’mi or *ad-si’mi’. Morphologically this procedure is interesting since we find once again the pervasive suffixal -*i’. Perhaps the *-i’ already recognized above for haedd- was carried over on to the nominalization matching Goth. *sóns, ON. sónn, OHG. suhmi, etc.

Apart from the interest in finding an internal Celtic explanation for wunyn and in paralleling within Celtic the ablaut grade seen in Lat. sēgō and Goth. sōkim, we have also enriched our inventory of British Celtic diphthongal phenomena by identifying the first example of ultimate i-affectation of original *un.

nawdd ‘protection’ and nes

The Indo-European and Celtic connections of nawdd are highly ambiguous, and the standard handbooks have scarcely done much to improve the situation.

British Celtic itself shows good consistency in the etymology. Old Breton attests the simplex as a component of proper names: Nod-hail, Nod-uworet, etc. A closely related, perhaps partly synonymous, derivative appears in the name Nodet-hail. This derivative is also attested as a common noun nodet gl. ‘sacellum’ BN. lat. 20490; see Fleuriot’s fine account DGVB 271 s.v., where he also moots some of the problems in finding connections for nawdd = nod. Welsh matches this Old Breton near-synonymy in the passage (HGC xl. 25-6) cited by Fleuriot:

nawd annaf y dodaf y detwydion
nodule o’er parish a’m pherbhyon.

In turn, the British forms have been equated with Olfr. *nā (CCCG 24, § 26; 9); cf. the false i-subjective *māstium ‘may he protect me’ (GOI 271, § 430). There can thus be no doubt of the Celtic root *nād- ‘protect’; the Irish guarantees the initial.

Fowkes’ attempt (Language, xxiii. 420-1) to link the etymology with a root *nā- ‘help’ and to Skt. nātha- must be viewed as unsuccessful, or at any rate unexplanatory; the presumed source lacks the dental and fails to explain the s-, as well as neglecting the rich cultural semantics.

Fleuriot goes on to ask whether a connection with the supposed root *ned(h)- ‘lie’ would be possible. Within Old Breton this root has been added for nes-ham ‘the nearest’ (Angers

477, fol. 56b hand A); see DGVB 266. For the comparative, cf. Med. Bret. nes, and note further re nes ‘ceux-là’ Mirouer 206, which may be placed beside Welsh nes. The stock comparison for this set is Olfr. nessa, Gaul. neddamon gen. pl. ‘des voisins’, Osc. nesisms ‘proximae’. For the Irish comparative one should note the vocalism in nessa assa nessa Whb. 1243 ‘nearer and nearer’, although this does not bear upon the present question.

Vendres, Lexique N-12 s.v. nesu, adds essentially the above forms, adding notably to the list Skt. nāth ‘voisin’, nākyati ‘il attache’, Lat. nāces ‘necul’. The root is given as *ned-, this is quite acceptable up to this point, with one reservation: we must delete nāth from this list as a probable ghost word in the common lexicon. It seems likely that this Vedic entry is really a proper name; see Myhrkofer, KEWA ii (1963), 147. But then Vendres also refers to naid and nes.

When we turn to nes ‘lien, anneau’ (Lexique N-3-4) we are immediately offered the root *ned- which is supported by Skt. nāṭḍhā- ‘attaché’, the participle to nākyati. The verbal root nes- (N-4), with its verbal noun naid and its Breton cognate nasku, is likewise referred to the root *ned-. The vocalism of naid and nes can simply not be reconciled, so far as I know, with *ned- or with nes, and Vendres offers nothing to bridge this difficulty.

Pokorny’s (IEW 758-9) adds Goth. nati OHG. nessi OE. net, plus some other Germanic forms and supposed *sk- and *st formations, as well as a set of ‘nettled’ words whose reliance is not immediately clear; these additions certainly do not clarify the basic issue. Moreover, Pokorny’s root becomes *ned-, which simply shifts the focus without solving anything.

The central problem with all these juxtapositions is clear: there are simply too many possibilities for partial similarities. The Celtic *n may be *n or *n, and these in turn (at least in the case of *n) may be either laryngeal-bearing or *rdh. The initial in Latin and British Celtic may be *n or *m; the dental in Celtic and Latin may be *d or *dh; forms with sibilant may have assimilated many things. Finally, much semantic looseness seems to have been allowed, permitting any imaginable pairing.

It seems to me that in all these attempts one important potential correspondence has been overlooked. One of the impressive aspects of the paradigm of nes in all of Celtic is its suppletive character. Therefore we would do well to seek a match for this feature, or at least a paradigm whose one member might easily suffer loss. The clearest candidate is the Avestan set which we find cited by Meillet, Introduction 270: ašna ‘de prés’, nāz-yah- ‘plus proche’. Now the latter is precisely matched in Indic by nāṭḍhā- ‘nearest’, and the non-comparative meaning of Khotanese nāyada- and Mod. Pers. nāz ‘near’ could reflect a paradigmatic innovation; Pokorny, IEW 886 credits it to *sed- on grounds that are quite opaque to me, and Myhrkofer, KEWA ii (1963), 179 simply reports this dubious segmentation in fine print. Likewise Pokorny analyses așnət as *ásdua-, but Meillet with much more sophistication (even if it should prove incorrect) reconstructed this last as *azd-na-. I know of no way at present to decide how such a form would be expected to turn out in Celtic, but certainly it would produce a decided anomaly. A comparative/ intensive *sed-s- would, however, produce precisely British nes-. I therefore propose that the comparative forms of
Indo-Iranian, Osco-Umbrian, and Celtic rest on a base *nèd-. (I take up the entire question of the Celtic comparatives elsewhere.)

We may now sort out the remaining mentioned forms with a good deal less trouble. Latin nídus would be a normal-grade nominalization *néðhō- or *néðhō-, while Ir. náid- and Bre. naskha would be the expected zero-grade of a -sk- present, *néðhō-sk- > [naskh-]. Then Skt. náhya- nádāti would represent equally a zero-grade, but with vocalism revised along the lines of the aī opposition developed in Indo-Iranian; this vowel variation is to be seen elsewhere in Indo-Iranian, e.g. in the etymology for 'nose', which I have discussed elsewhere, Baltistika x (1974), 69-72, and Éria xxv (1974), 275-8.

The above sets must further be formed in form nádāt(u) 'hew, chip', nédēf (fem.) 'adze, OW, nedēm gl. ascia, Bret. (n)eze (masc.) (perhaps *nádēmat -mon-), Ir. snād- 'chip, cut', insnād 'graffs'. Here we have a Celtic base *nād-. In sum, I propose the following etyma:

*néðhō- 'protect' (Celtic only) > nādāt;
*néðhō- 'tie' > Ir. náid-, Lat. nīdus;
*nád- 'chip, hew' > nādāt;
*nād- (ap)proximate > nēr.

It is just possible that Celtic *nād- and IE. *néðhō- are ultimately related by *s-mobile; but for the present on formal and semantic grounds we do well to keep the two distinct. Pokorny, IEW 759, leans heavily on the alternant of nādām in sn- that Irish shows; this later variant snáidh, however, is, as RLAContr. S. (1953), 295, s.v. remarks, merely the Middle and Modern Irish form of nādām. It probably reflects rather a contamination based on the special semantic relation that Irish continued to show between nādām and the notion of 'protection' (Éria, xxiv (1973), 172-4).4

ERIC P. HAMP

Chicago

2 Mayrhofer, KEWA ii (1956), 147-8 reviews earlier views, including Wackernagel's doubts which I do not find conclusive. He too limits possibilities to a root *néðhō-.

3 Whatever the ultimate Indo-European segmentation of this lexeme may be.

4 These studies result in part from work done under National Science Foundation Grant GSS-228-56, and from the much appreciated opportunity for unhurried thought afforded by a Fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, to which the hospitality of many Aberystwyth and other Welsh friends contributed no little.

Cymmerodion Series, No. 4, 1900-32.

2 Ibid. 91.5. Y mae'r llarg, mewn ddywyll, ac fu'r ceigol ar wahân 'ir gyflyd ar wahân 'ir gwyllt gan awduridorau Amghuedaf Brydain. Yn ôl nodyn pensel ar ddechrau llarg. Add. 19313, fu'r perynydd yn anwthawri Bywydall enwog Heber yn ein Owain Cadwfaer, 1836. Mympywyd yw barn Edward Owen ac eu gwrthir: 'The entire collection is of no critical or textual value.'

5 Gelîr ystyrwyd i llarg, hon yn gymer i llarg. Caderyd 84—o gysylltir mwyaf o farddoddeth gymeriadaeth a luniwyd gan Dews Davies. Yna llawer o debywyllod rhwng y naill llarg, a' llall. Rhawnydd llarg a Caderyd 84, fel Add. 19313-14, yn ddywyll. Defnyddwyd yr un lleidr pwyslog i'r ffordd o ddywyll. Yn yr ei olyw a wnaeth o debywyllod a ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o ddywyll, yna o debywyllod ac o ddywyll. Yna mae'r oriff a debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall.

6 Gwen, e.e., BRCS xxiv. 497. Nid dynyn a unig walli camarwsio, o bell thord, yng nghymeriadau Edward Owen a Cymrydd a dweudodd Afan Hebron gymeriad gymeriad yna. Noddownau 438, ac oemhau o’r arfodd y mae'r oriff a debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall. Yna mae'r wlad o debywyllod ac o ddywyll, a' llall.

Un Arall o Lawysgrifiw Dewi Fardd

Ff diychon y dylwn fod wedi galw sylw ers blynyddoedd at un o'r gwellau niferus sydd yn ngwybod Edward Owen, A Catalogue of the Manuscripts relating to Wales in the British Museum.1 With disegigrifio'r llagran BM Add. 10313 a 10314, o dan yr un rhif 10313,2 dywed y catwyd y ma'i copiwyd oedd Robert Thomas, clochyd ych i chlicer plwyf Llanfair Talhaearn. Seiliodd Edward Owen ei oesioad ar ddau gofnod (yn dyfnnur rhannau ohonynt ganddo) yn llarg. Add. 10314 am gyfambyn o beddydiadau, o priodasau, a’r claddiegudaeth a Llanfair Talhaearn yn ystad y cyfnod yb y Robert Thomas yn chludo gynh, hyd at y ffluwyd y 1764. Yn llaw gwyffredyn Davydd Jones o Drefriw (Dewi Fardd) y mae o'r llarg, gyfern ystyriaf fud o ddywyll gyflunio ar un llarg, ac a chofnodid Edward Owen yn dal i gwmarsaith pob, priddol, mi dyfisau, dyfisau dywir o'r unig.

Yna mae o'r gwyf ych i law Robert Thomas y copiwyd Dewi Fardd y cofnodion am Llanfair Talhaearn. Yst i bynnag yr gwyf i’r (meid) Robt. Tho: aci dalaen 193 yr ail gyflunio (Add. 10314). Dyfynnwyd y gyflun yng Nghymru wedi gwybod i'r ddiddor, ond o'r meid o danw daeth y sylweddolwed ar hwydweddol, Copiwyd Dewi Fardd gan wahanol fuanonlas, yn ôl ei arfer, ond nid yw’n nodi ei gysonlas. Danosoddi Mr. Davydd Hanfto'i llarg, Broad Welsh e. 2 wy cynaill rhon oho, a diadai o’r un o’r llargau Robert Thomas ac y copiwyd Dewi Fardd rai o’r cerdi sydd yn llarg. Add. 10314. Credaf y gellir ybycio tu boddol fflwyddigod dal dalaenau 193-198 yn adran a gopwlyd o law Robert Thomas. Yna mae o’r dalaenau hon yw ddywlych eu llw yna dalaenau erall y fflwydd fel eu bod bellach yng nghymuned yna. Fel pei baent wedi bod ar wahân i’r

1 Cymmerodion Series, No. 4, 1900-32.

2 Ibid. 91.5. Y mae’r llarg, mewn ddywyll, ac fu’r ceigol ar wahân ‘ir gyflyd ar wahân ‘ir gwyllt gan awduridorau Amghuedaf Brydain. Yn ôl nodyn pensel ar ddechrau llarg. Add. 19313, fu’r perynydd yn anwthawri Bywydall enwog Heber yn ein Owain Cadwfaer, 1836. Mympywyd yw barn Edward Owen ac eu gwrthir: ‘The entire collection is of no critical or textual value.’