

NOTE: \$ = in-curling v

Misunderstanding Old Welsh Orthography and Insular Script in the Jesus College 20

Genealogies

One of the primary objectives of scholars of early Welsh over the past century and a half has been to identify which poems within the voluminous corpus of poetry preserved in later medieval Welsh manuscripts were originally composed and written down during the pre-Norman period. This was one of the chief interests of Sir Ifor Williams, and others have since taken up the baton.¹ Philology, broadly defined, is the essential basis for any argument that the composition and writing of a poem should be dated to a time many centuries before the time of its preservation, though historical arguments of varying quality have also been employed. The philological arguments have hitherto been based mainly on matters of phonology, since far more is known about the phonology of early Welsh than about its morphology or syntax.² But the philological arguments for the dating of poems suspected to derive from the pre-Norman period have proved contentious, partly because of how comparatively slight the verifiable linguistic differences between Old Welsh and Middle

¹ Williams's views about many of the earliest poems are summarised in Ifor Williams, *The Beginnings of Welsh Poetry*, ed. Rachel Bromwich, 2nd ed. (Cardiff, 1980). For some contributions by the following generation, see Rachel Bromwich and R. Brinley Jones (eds), *Astudiaethau ar yr Hengerdd / Studies in Old Welsh Poetry, cyflwynedig i Syr Idris Foster* (Cardiff, 1978); R. Geraint Gruffydd (ed.), *Bardos: Penodau ar y Traddodiad Barddol Cymreig a Cheltaidd, cyflwynedig i J. E. Caerwyn Williams* (Cardiff, 1982); and Brynley F. Roberts (ed.), *Early Welsh Poetry: Studies in the Book of Aneirin* (Aberystwyth, 1988). For some recent approaches, see John T. Koch, *Cunedda, Cynan, Cadwallon, Cynddylan: Four Welsh Poems and Britain 383–655* (Aberystwyth, 2013); Paul Russell, 'Ad\$uyn gaer yssyd: an early Welsh poem revisited', *Celtica* 29 (2017), 6–37; Stefan Schumacher, 'An edition and analysis of Book of Aneirin B.39 (including preliminary chapters on the grammar and poetics of early Welsh poetry)', *ZCP* 64 (2017), 299–420.

² The key work on early Welsh historical phonology is of course Kenneth Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain: A Chronological Survey of the Brittonic Languages, 1st to 12th Century A.D.* (Edinburgh, 1953) [hereafter *LHEB*], though a systematic reappraisal of phonological developments during the Old Welsh period on the basis of epigraphical evidence is offered in Patrick Sims-Williams, *The Celtic Inscriptions of Britain: Phonology and Chronology, c. 400–1200* (Oxford, 2003) [hereafter *CIB*]. For morphology, see Simon Rodway, *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature: Evidence from the Verbal System* (Aberystwyth, 2013).

Welsh are.³ A recent survey of the debate surrounding the poems attributed to Aneirin and the ‘historical’ Taliesin has concluded that no phonological arguments have yet been identified that would serve to *prove* whether the poems were composed as early as the sixth century, even though it remains plausible, from a phonological standpoint, that many of them *could* have been.⁴

Somewhat more promising lines of enquiry have been opened by recent advances in our understanding of orthography and palaeography: in other words, the graphic elements of the written language. While these tools could not tell us when a poem was composed, they could, at least, provide valuable and dateable clues about the circumstances of a poem’s written transmission. Orthography and palaeography have long been components of the discussion about the dating of the *hengerdd*, but more could now be said in light of work published over the last three decades.⁵ Increased understanding of the charters in the Book of Llandaf (written *c.* 1132) has facilitated progress in our knowledge of Welsh orthography in the pre-Norman period due to the recognition that the charters preserve spellings of personal names and place-names that accurately reflect the spelling habits of the seventh to eleventh centuries.⁶ Many aspects of the transition between ‘Old Welsh’ and ‘Middle Welsh’ styles of orthography have also been usefully clarified (and indeed complicated) by Paul Russell.⁷ Likewise, although palaeographical arguments for dating the writing of poems to the pre-

³ For a clear overview of linguistic developments, see David Willis, ‘Old and Middle Welsh’, in Martin J. Ball and Nicole Müller (eds), *The Celtic Languages* (London, 2009), 117–60.

⁴ Patrick Sims-Williams, ‘Dating the poems of Aneirin and Taliesin’, *ZCP* 63 (2016), 163–234.

⁵ A well-informed early example is John Morris-Jones, ‘Taliesin’, *Y Cymmrodor* 28 (1918), *passim*, at 130–9.

⁶ The key study is Patrick Sims-Williams, ‘The emergence of Old Welsh, Cornish and Breton orthography, 600–800: the evidence of Archaic Old Welsh’, *BBCS* 38 (1991), 20–86. This work was made possible by Wendy Davies’s investigation of the Llandaf charters: see especially her *The Llandaff Charters* (Aberystwyth, 1979). Sims-Williams has reviewed Davies’s arguments at length in his recent book, *The Book of Llandaf as a Historical Source* (Woodbridge, 2019); see my review of Sims-Williams’s book in *Morgannwg* 64 (2020), 225–9.

⁷ Important elements of Russell’s approach are outlined in his *An Introduction to the Celtic Languages* (Harlow, 1995), 213–19; a significant detailed study is his ‘Scribal (in)competence in thirteenth-century North Wales: the orthography of the Black Book of Chirk (Peniarth MS 29)’, *NLW Journal* 29 (1995–6), 129–76. Other detailed studies are referenced below.

Norman period have occasionally been misapplied, a clearer understanding of the development of script in early medieval Wales has arisen in recent decades following work by David Dumville, Helen McKee and others.⁸ Such work is essential for interpreting what can sometimes be presented as an undifferentiated mass of ‘early’ spelling features in the poetry.⁹ The spellings *e* for /ui/ and *gu* for /w/ might both be aspects of so-called ‘Old Welsh’ orthography, but the first dropped out of use by the end of the eighth century while the second is still found in parts of North Wales in the mid-thirteenth century.¹⁰

One of the challenges with assessing the relative merits of orthographical arguments for dating the writing or copying of Welsh poems to the pre-Norman period is the dearth of texts that can be directly observed undergoing the transition between Old and Middle Welsh orthographies. A rare exception has recently been discussed by Paul Russell: *Braint Teilo*, a vernacular statement of the church of Llandaf’s legal privileges, was originally written in the Book of Llandaf in the late Old Welsh orthography characteristic of that manuscript, but was later altered by a fifteenth-century hand in such a way as to make the text more understandable to readers familiar with late Middle Welsh.¹¹ This example is particularly instructive because it can be observed taking place within a single manuscript. The problem

⁸ Dumville warned about the misapplication of palaeographical arguments in his ‘Palaeographical considerations in the dating of early Welsh verse’, *BBCS* 27 (1976–8), 246–51 (repr. in his *Britons and Anglo-Saxons in the Early Middle Ages* (Aldershot 1993), chap. V); this article was ‘lightly revised and somewhat abbreviated’ (Dumville, *Britons and Anglo-Saxons*, V.251) when it was translated into Welsh as ‘Ystyriaethau palaeograffegol wrth ddyddio barddoniaeth Gymraeg gynnar’, *Ysgrifau Beirniadol* 13 (1985), 17–25. The best overview of the development of early Welsh script is Helen McKee, *The Cambridge Juvenius Manuscript Glossed in Latin, Old Welsh, and Old Irish* (Aberystwyth 2000), 1–9. See too David N. Dumville, *A Palaeographer’s Review: The Insular System of Scripts in the Early Middle Ages*, 2 vols paginated as 1 (Suita, Osaka, 1999–2007), i, 122–7; Gillian Conway, ‘Towards a cultural context for the eleventh-century Llanbadarn manuscripts’, *Ceredigion* 13.1 (1997), 9–28; Daniel Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts* (Cardiff and Aberystwyth, 2000), esp. chaps 1 and 7.

⁹ What Ifor Williams called ‘olion hen destun’ (‘remnants of old text’): Ifor Williams (ed.), *Canu Aneirin*, 2nd ed. (Cardiff, 1961), lxiii–lxvii; cf. Ifor Williams (ed.), *Canu Llywarch Hen* (Cardiff, 1935), lxxvii–lxxix. For a more constructive approach to the Old Welsh orthographical features in the poetry of the Book of Aneirin, see G. R. Isaac, ‘*Canu Aneirin* awdl LI’, *JCL* 2 (1993), 65–91, at 83–90.

¹⁰ Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 58–9; Russell, ‘Scribal (in)competence’, 141, 165 and 168; Paul Russell, *Welsh Law in Medieval Anglesey: British Library Harleian MS 1976 (Latin C)* (Cambridge, 2011), xxvi–xxvii.

¹¹ Paul Russell, ‘*Priilegium Sancti Teliaui* and *Braint Teilo*’, *SC* 50 (2016), 41–68, at 45–57. Russell argues (pp. 57–63), *pace* Wendy Davies, that *Braint Teilo* was translated from a Latin version in the early twelfth century: cf. Wendy Davies, ‘*Braint Teilo*’, *BBCS* 26 (1974–6), 123–37 (repr. with the same pagination in her *Welsh History in the Early Middle Ages* (Farnham, 2009), chap. III).

with the majority of the Old Welsh corpus, however, is that most Old Welsh texts have no surviving counterparts in the Middle Welsh corpus.¹² This is the case, for example, with the only Old Welsh poems surviving in contemporary manuscripts: the sequences of englynion known as the ‘Juvencus three’ and ‘Juvencus nine’, written down in the late ninth or early tenth century, and the St Padarn englyn, written down in the late eleventh century.¹³ One wonders what, say, the Juvencus nine might have looked like had a version of them been preserved in the Red Book of Hergest (c. 1400).

Genealogical texts and chronicles are the only other texts that can be directly observed undergoing the transition between a pre-1200 ‘Old Welsh’ style of orthography and the ‘Middle Welsh’ style of orthography found in manuscripts from c. 1250 onwards. Admittedly, most of the vernacular words in these texts are names, which do not necessarily behave in the same ways as other words, either in speech or on the page. Old spellings of names are more likely to become fixed, even if they do not reflect contemporary pronunciation or spelling habits.¹⁴ A classic example is provided by the well-known dynastic founder of Gwynedd, Cunedda, whose name probably derives from **kuno-dagos* (‘good-hound’).¹⁵ Curiously, all extant spellings of the dynastic founder’s name, from the ninth

¹² The remains of Old Welsh are effectively summarised in Alexander Falileyev, *Llawlyfr Hen Gymraeg* (Carmarthen, 2016), 1–6. There is an earlier French edition of the latter: Alexander Falileyev, with Hildegard L. C. Tristram, *Le vieux-Gallois* (Potsdam, 2008), translated by Yves Le Berre from the original Russian version, *Древневаллийский язык [Drevnevalliskiy yazyk]* (Moscow, 2002). See too Alexander Falileyev, *Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh* (Tübingen, 2000), xiv–xvii.

¹³ For the Juvencus englynion, see Williams, *Beginnings*, chap. 7; T. Arwyn Watkins, ‘Englynion y Juvencus’, in Gruffydd (ed.), *Bardos*, 29–43; Marged Haycock, *Blodeugerdd Barddas o Ganu Crefyddol Cynnar* (Llandybïe, 1994), 3–16. All twelve englynion were copied by scribe C, writing perhaps not very long after 874: McKee, *Cambridge Juvencus Manuscript*, 15–18. For the St Padarn englyn, see now Paul Russell, ‘The englyn to St Padarn revisited’, *CMCS* 63 (2012), 1–14. The St Padarn englyn is preserved in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 199, the ‘Llanbadarn Augustine’ manuscript, which is conventionally dated to 1085 × 1091; for valid criticism of these precise *termini*, see Sarah Elizabeth Zeiser, ‘Latinity, manuscripts, and the rhetoric of conquest in late-eleventh-century Wales’, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 2012, 162 n. 4.

¹⁴ For discussion, see Paul Russell, ‘Old Welsh *Dinacat*, *Cunedag*, *Tutagual*: fossilised phonology in Brittonic personal names’, in J. H. W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford, 2004), 447–60.

¹⁵ For the etymology, see G. R. Isaac, ‘Cunedag’, *BBCS* 38 (1991), 100–1; cf. John Thomas Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin: Text and Context from Dark-Age North Britain* (Cardiff, 1997), cxxi–cxxii; Koch, *Cunedda*, 72–3; Sims-Williams, ‘Dating the poems’, 197.

century onwards, reproduce a form most appropriate for the sixth or seventh centuries, with the vowel quality of the first syllable intact and the composition vowel written in a reduced form (for both features, compare Gildas's *Cuneglase*); there is also one instance with the final *-/γ/* preserved, spelled *g* (*Cunedag* in the *Historia Brittonum*, written 829/30). This probably occurred because Cunedda became known to myth-makers in the eighth or early ninth century by means of an earlier written (and probably Latinate) text. If this alleged dynastic founder had also been known continuously in oral tradition, it is conceivable that the archaic-looking spelling *Cuneda(g)* could still have been pronounced /kənða/ in the ninth century, with the correct sound changes applied, despite not being spelled in up-to-date Old Welsh orthography as *Cinda*.¹⁶ But by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is clear that the revived sixth/seventh-century-type spelling *Cuneda* had been re-analysed as /kuneða/ and was being used as a personal name in its own right.¹⁷ This process may well have begun already in the ninth century. Although this example is exceptional, it shows that the textual fates of personal names cannot necessarily be taken as representative of other words. On the other hand, most of the examples discussed below concern obscure Old Welsh names with a much lower profile than *Cuneda*. The treatment of these names by later scribes was perhaps more akin to the treatment of obscure words found in early Welsh poetry.

One of the more substantial members of the Old Welsh corpus is the Harleian genealogies (= HG), which contains hundreds of Old Welsh personal names as well as epithets and familial terms. Although the Harleian genealogies are preserved in a manuscript

¹⁶ A possible instance of the Old Welsh name *Cinda* < **kuno-dagos* occurs in the ninth-century Surexit Memorandum: Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen, 'The Welsh marginalia in the Lichfield Gospels', *CMCS* 5 (1983), 37–66 and 7 (1984), 91–120, at ii, 109; cf. Koch, *Gododdin*, cxxi; Koch, *Cunedda*, 73. However, Sims-Williams has suggested that the second element of *Cinda* could be **tamos* instead: 'Emergence', 45 n. 3; 'Dating the poems', 182 n. 112.

¹⁷ The new name may have been popularised by the ruling dynasty of Gwynedd, several members of which in the twelfth century were given rare names that deliberately evoked the early medieval rulers of Gwynedd: note Gruffudd ap Cynan's two grandsons Cunedda ap Cadwaladr and Cunedda ap Cadwallon. Lower down the social scale, one finds the witnesses 'Ioru(er)ht decanus filius Howeli et Cunedda frater eius' listed in a document of Maredudd ap Rhobert of Cedewain dated to 1216 × c. 1226: Huw Pryce (ed.), *The Acts of Welsh Rulers 1120–1283* (Cardiff, 2005), 161.

(BL Harley 3859) written probably in south-eastern England around 1100, the scribe has faithfully preserved the spellings of the mid-tenth-century Welsh exemplar before him.¹⁸ Most of the contents of the Harleian genealogies are reproduced in two later, textually related genealogical collections: one uniquely witnessed in Oxford, Jesus College, 20 (the Jesus College 20 genealogies = JC), discussed below, and another redacted in Gwynedd between 1216 and c. 1223 and preserved in many late medieval and early modern manuscripts (the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies = LIIG).¹⁹ Although these later genealogical collections do not draw on the Harley manuscript itself, it is clear that they draw on closely related versions of the same text. The textual relationships between these three collections are complex and multifarious, though in many instances the two later collections are closer to one another than either of them is to the Harleian genealogies.

Another early genealogical text that is relevant for the present discussion is *De situ Brecheniauc* ('Concerning the Establishment of Brycheiniog'), which is found in BL Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, part i, written in the last third of the twelfth century in Monmouth priory.²⁰ Although *De situ Brecheniauc* employs Latin as its matrix language, it contains many Welsh personal names, place-names, epithets and even occasional phrases written in a form of late Old Welsh orthography reminiscent of *Braint Teilo*.²¹ Yet this text (and indeed this manuscript as a whole) has generally been overlooked in published discussions of Welsh

¹⁸ *LHEB* 56. For a full study of the manuscript and text, see Ben Guy, *Medieval Welsh Genealogy: An Introduction and Textual Study* (Woodbridge, 2020) [hereafter *MWG*], 51–79. The text is edited, with additional readings from several other witnesses, in *MWG* 333–7.

¹⁹ *MWG* chaps 3–4. These texts are edited respectively in *MWG* 338–44 and 349–89. References to 'LIIG' refer to the latter edition rather than to any particular manuscript. This edition is based on the best manuscript witness (Cardiff, Central Library, 3.77) with some emendations taken from other witnesses. Peter Bartrum arranged the same genealogical collection (alongside later material) into four different texts, to which he attributed the names *Plant Brychan*, *Bonedd yr Arwyr*, *Achau Brenhinoedd a Thywysogion Cymru* and *Hen Lwythau Gwynedd a'r Mars*: Peter C. Bartrum, *Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts* (Cardiff, 1966) [hereafter *EWGT*], 75–120. For a table showing the correspondences between Bartrum's editions and LIIG, see *MWG* 161.

²⁰ The manuscript has been dated to this period by Teresa Webber following a fresh reassessment of its palaeography, as reported in Ben Guy, 'The Life of St Dyfrig and the lost charters of Moccas (Mochros), Herefordshire', *CMCS* 75 (2018), 1–37, at 6 n. 17.

²¹ For some discussion of the orthography of *De situ Brecheniauc*, see *MWG* 134–5.

orthography.²² For example, in a discussion of the origins of the letter *k* in Welsh orthography, Simon Rodway has commented that ‘pe bai mwy o lawysgrifau’r ddeuddegfed ganrif wedi goroesi, efallai na fyddai ffyniant <k> yng nghanol y drydedd ganrif ar ddeg yn ymddangos mor sydyn’.²³ Yet Cotton Vespasian A. xiv (which is not mentioned by Rodway) dates to the late twelfth century and, partly thanks to *De situ Brecheniauc*, contains many Welsh personal names and place-names spelled using *k*.²⁴ As with the Harleian genealogies, part of the interest of *De situ Brecheniauc* lies in the fact that we have multiple versions of it. *De situ Brecheniauc* is a version of the ‘Brychan tract’, which in its fullest form includes a Latin narrative concerning the births of Brychan Brycheiniog and his son St Cynog alongside lists of Brychan’s sons, daughters and wives. Some combination of these elements is found in six different versions: two full Latin versions, called *De situ Brecheniauc* (= *DSB*) and *Cognacio Brychan* (= *CB*);²⁵ a brief Welsh version of the narrative, called *Sarth Marthin gynt, ynawr Brycheiniawc*;²⁶ and three Welsh versions of the lists of sons and daughters: one preserved in the Jesus College 20 genealogies (JC 1–3), a second in the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies (LIIG 1), and a third in the independent tract *Llyma Frychan Brycheiniog a’i Blant* (= *LIFB*).²⁷ None of these six versions derives directly from any other, and some of

²² The manuscript was included in Meinir Lewis’s unpublished thesis: ‘Disgrifiad o orgraff Hen Gymraeg gan ei chymharu ag orgraff Hen Wyddeleg’, unpublished MA thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1961.

²³ ‘if more manuscripts of the twelfth century had survived, perhaps the success of <k> in the middle of the thirteenth century would not appear so sudden’: ‘Cymraeg vs. Kymraeg: dylanwad Ffrangeg ar orgraff Cymraeg Canol?’, *SC* 43 (2009), 123–33, at 130.

²⁴ A brief inspection of Wade-Evans’s index for Welsh names beginning with *C-* or *K-* that are found in texts edited from the Vespasian manuscript reveals thirty names spelled with initial *K-* (counting as a single instance a name found repeatedly in a single text, and treating the two Lives of Carannog as a single ‘text’ and the two Lives of Cybi likewise). These thirty names are comprised of three with initial *Ka-* (not including *Kanauc*, a variant of *Kynauc* in *DSB*), twenty-four with initial *Ke-* and three with initial *Ky-*: A. W. Wade-Evans, *Vitae Sanctorum Britanniae et Genealogiae: The Lives and Genealogies of the Welsh Saints*, new ed. by Scott Lloyd (Cardiff, 2013), 326–8 (for names on pp. 1–15, 24–287, 313–15 and parts of 319–20). Presumably, this encouraged readers who were used to Old French orthography (where *ce* = /se/) to pronounce initial /k/ correctly when reading texts like saints’ Lives aloud. Rodway seems to dismiss the value of Latinized texts (123 n. 4), yet they may provide the answer to his question about the origin of *k* in thirteenth-century Welsh orthography.

²⁵ Both edited in Wade-Evans, *Vitae*, 313–18.

²⁶ Edited for the first time, with discussion, in *MWG* 292–3.

²⁷ Edited respectively in *MWG* 339–40, 354–6 and 421–6.

them (especially *CB* and *LIFB*) seem to have been produced through the conflation of two or more pre-existing versions.²⁸ For present purposes, they can all be treated as independent witnesses to a lost archetype.

Comparison between different versions of a text often reveals that the common archetype of the versions used a more archaic orthography than any single surviving redaction, and that this archetype's orthography was later misunderstood in a variety of different ways.²⁹ Consider these two phrases in versions of the Brychan tract:

DSB 12.20 yGrugc Gors Auail
CB 15.18 in monte Gorsauael
LIIG 1.3.15 yGrug Gorsabawl
LIFB 3.22 yng Kraic Orseddol

DSB 12.21 ythr auil Ogmor
CB 15.21 apud Teraslogur
LIIG 1.3.16 yn Trigabaelognar

In both cases, *De situ Brecheniauc* probably reproduces the archetype most faithfully, yet it seems not to preserve the earliest orthographical features in all respects. In the first case, the phrase seems to mean 'on the hillock of the grasping swamp', an interpretation supported by a Latin gloss on the Vespasian manuscript that reads 'i. in ag[g]ere lacus caltionis [*?recte* captionis]'.³⁰ The first *g* in *ygrugc* would appear to represent the nasalisation of the voiceless

²⁸ *MWG* 131.

²⁹ This has been systematically demonstrated by Paul Russell with reference to poems in the Black Book of Carmarthen that are also preserved in other manuscripts: 'Scribal (in)consistency in thirteenth-century South Wales: the orthography of the Black Book of Carmarthen', *SC* 43 (2009), 135–74, at 161–5.

³⁰ For the glosses on *De situ Brecheniauc*, see Patrick K. Ford, 'Llywarch, ancestor of Welsh princes', *Speculum* 45 (1970), 442–50, at 446 n. 22 and Alderik H. Blom, 'The Welsh glosses in the *Vocabularium Cornicum*',

stop /k/ in *crug* following the preposition *yn*, but copyists of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies quite reasonably assumed that it represented the nasalisation of the voiced stop /g/ in *grug* ‘heather’.³¹ The last element of the phrase (*Auail*) is probably the lenited form of the verbal noun *gafael* ‘to hold, grasp’. The spelling in the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies (*Gors-abawl*) suggests that the archetype spelled the word with etymological *b* for /β/ (cf. OIr *gabál*). This spelling was understood and appropriately updated to *u* in the late-twelfth-century *De situ Brecheniauc* or its exemplar, and similarly in *Cognacio Brychan*, whereas the thirteenth-century compiler of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies (like later copyists) lost sight of this and copied the *b* as if it meant /b/. The same can be seen in the second example, which means ‘within the fork of the (river) Ogmor’.³² The corrupt form in the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, when re-divided as *yn Tri-gabael-ognar*, suggests that the archetype again spelled *gafl* ‘fork’ with its etymological *b* for /β/ (cf. OBr *gabl*, OIr *gabul*) and did not spell the initial lenition.³³ In *De situ Brecheniauc*, by contrast, *b* for /β/ has been correctly updated to *u*, and the lenition has been correctly spelled by the omission of the initial *g*. Other corruptions in later renditions of the second example stem from confusion about the preposition *ythr* ‘between’, which is otherwise attested in Welsh only among the Old Welsh glosses to Martianus Capella.³⁴

CMCS 57 (2009), 23–40, at 38–9. The emendation of *caltionis* to *captionis* was suggested in J. Lloyd-Jones, *Geirfa Barddoniaeth Gynnar Gymraeg*, 2 vols (Cardiff, 1931–46), ii, 518.

³¹ This is contrary to the usual practice in Old Welsh, where the nasal mutation of initial /k/ is unmarked (and thus spelled *c*): Arwyn Watkins, ‘Yr arddodiad HG. (*h*)i, in; CC. *y* (=yn), *yn*’, *BBCS* 17 (1957), 137–58, at 145–50; T. Arwyn Watkins, ‘Dulliau orgraffyddol Cymraeg Canol o ddynodi’r treigladrwynol’, *BBCS* 23 (1968), 7–13, at 7–8. On the other hand, internal /ŋh/ could occasionally be represented by *g* in Old Welsh sources, as in *Segenid* in the Book of Llandaf: Jenny Rowland, ‘An early Welsh orthographic feature’, *BBCS* 29 (1981), 513–20, at 515; J. Gwenogvryn Evans and John Rhys, *The Text of the Book of Llan Dâv: Reproduced from the Gwysaney Manuscript* (Oxford, 1893) [hereafter *LL*], 255.

³² Again, this interpretation is supported by a Latin gloss on the Vespasian manuscript, which reads ‘i. bifurgatione illius fluuii’.

³³ The nature of the corruption that led to the *-asl-* reading in *Cognacio Brychan* is uncertain. Possibly *f* for /β/ was misread as a long *s*.

³⁴ Falileyev, *Etymological Glossary*, 98; *GPC Online* s.v. *ythr*.

The orthographical evidence offered by the Welsh chronicles is of a similar type. One chronicle survives in its mid-tenth-century form, again in Harley 3859: this is the Harleian chronicle, or A-text of *Annales Cambriae*, which uses Latin as its matrix language but contains many personal names, place-names and occasional phrases in Old Welsh. In its latest stage of development, the Harleian chronicle was redacted in the ecclesiastical community of St Davids, and its last annotated annal pertains to the year 954.³⁵ However, the chronicling tradition represented by the tenth-century Harleian chronicle was continued in St Davids and elsewhere up to the thirteenth century, as is now manifested in a variety of Latin and Welsh chronicles preserved in manuscripts of the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.³⁶ If the spellings of personal names and place-names in these chronicles were carefully compared with one another, and due allowance were made for the updating of the orthography during copying, these chronicles could furnish significant orthographical evidence for an otherwise sparsely attested period in the history of Welsh.³⁷

The present article primarily concerns spellings found in the Jesus College 20 genealogies, and asks what these spellings can tell us about the orthographical challenges faced by scribes of the Middle Welsh period who sought to copy texts written during the Old Welsh period. Jesus College 20 was written in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, probably somewhere in Glamorgan or Gower.³⁸ The collection of genealogies in the manuscript is a loose assemblage of genealogical tracts that were originally redacted at various points during the period *c.* 850–*c.* 1250, including tracts that are otherwise reflected

³⁵ For the development of the chronicle, see Ben Guy, ‘The origins of the compilation of Welsh historical texts in Harley 3859’, *SC* 49 (2015), 21–56 and Henry Gough-Cooper, ‘How was the chronology of the earliest Welsh Latin chronicle regulated?’, *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 39 (2019, forthcoming).

³⁶ Chiefly, the witnesses to the complexes of texts known as *Annales Cambriae* and *Brut y Tywysogyon*. For a review of scholarly opinion on these texts, see Ben Guy, ‘Historical scholars and dishonest charlatans: studying the chronicles of medieval Wales’, in Ben Guy, Georgia Henley, Owain Wyn Jones and Rebecca Thomas (eds), *The Chronicles of Medieval Wales and the March: New Contexts, Studies, and Texts* (Turnhout, 2020), 69–106. See the book’s appendix for a list of texts and manuscripts.

³⁷ I intend to pursue this in the future.

³⁸ *MWG* 102–6. For the date, see Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, 60.

in the Harleian genealogies and *De situ Brecheniauc*.³⁹ At some point, possibly in the thirteenth century, these tracts were brought together and rearranged slightly, reaching the form in which they would be copied into the manuscript around 1400. This collection of genealogical tracts is particularly useful for present purposes because successive copyists of the tracts seem to have struggled to ascertain how to update certain aspects of Old Welsh orthography appropriately. In addition, there is occasional evidence that one or more copyist struggled to understand the Insular letter forms in the exemplar(s). Many, if not most, of these difficulties should not be attributed to the scribe of Jesus College 20 itself, since some of the same resulting errors can be found in texts sharing a common exemplar with the Jesus College 20 genealogies (especially *Gwehelyth Morgannwg*, discussed below).⁴⁰ Instead, the errors indicate the struggles of the successive scribes who copied the text during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In many instances, these struggles can be understood more readily than the struggles of scribes who copied early poetry, because Old Welsh versions of the same genealogies survive elsewhere. The instructive mistakes arising from this process are addressed in turn. The discussion of orthographical features is divided into three parts: (1) spellings of voiceless fricatives; (2) spellings resulting from lenition; and (3) spellings of vowels. A further section then discusses misunderstandings of Insular letter forms. For each form discussed, comparable readings from textually related genealogies are listed below the form from Jesus College 20. Any other relevant forms that are not textually related are preceded by ‘cf.’.

SPELLING VOICELESS FRICATIVES

³⁹ For a full analysis of the Jesus College 20 genealogies, see *MWG* chap. 3.

⁴⁰ For a sense of the orthography of other texts in Jesus College 20, see Ifor Williams, ‘Ymddiddan Arthur a’r Eryr’, *BBCS* 2 (1923), 269–86, at 272–8; Haycock, *Blodeugerdd Barddas*, poem 30 (also *Ymddiddan Arthur a’r Eryr*); R. M. Jones, ‘Y rhamantau Arthuriaidd’, *BBCS* 15 (1952–4), 109–16, at 114–16 (*Owein*).

By the Old Welsh period, the three voiceless fricatives /f, θ, χ/ had arisen through spirantization.⁴¹ In Old Welsh orthography, it was possible to spell all three voiceless fricatives with the graphs for the corresponding stops: thus *p* = /f/, *t* = /θ/, *c* = /χ/. It is plausible that this practice derived from a sixth-century orthographical tradition that predated the advent of spirantization.⁴² However, since *p*, *t* and *c* were more regularly used for the voiceless stops and, in medial and final positions, for the corresponding voiced stops /b, d, g/, some other means of representing the voiceless fricatives had to be found. One method was to add a *h* to the relevant graphs for the stops: thus *ph* = /f/, *th* = /θ/, *ch* = /χ/. This type of spelling arguably arose in an early Brittonic or Irish context, though it was never consistently applied during the Old Welsh period.⁴³ The inconsistency was not generally a problem in the case of /f/, since the inherited Latin graph *f* could also be used to distinguish that phoneme. On the other hand, there was considerable uncertainty about how to spell /θ/ and /χ/, for which there were no inherited Latin graphs. Thus, in Old Welsh, /θ/ could be represented by various combinations of the letters *t*, *h* and *d*, and similarly /χ/ could be represented by various combinations of the letters *c*, *h* and *g*.⁴⁴ The same uncertainty is found in the various hands of the Black Book of Chirk, especially in relation to /θ/, showing that the uncertainty

⁴¹ The environments in which spirantization occurred and the debates (to 2004) surrounding the ordering of the relevant sound changes are summarised in Willis, 'Old and Middle Welsh', 129–31. The debate continues: see Patrick Sims-Williams, *Studies in Celtic Languages Before the Year 1000* (Aberystwyth, 2007), 43–58 (also the shorter version printed as Patrick Sims-Williams, 'The problem of spirantization and nasalization in Brittonic Celtic', in Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaecken and Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds), *Evidence and Counter-Evidence: Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt*, 2 vols (2008), i, 509–25); G. R. Isaac, 'Brittonic voiceless spirants again', *JCL* 12 (2008), 17–37. I use the symbol /f/ here, though during the Old and Middle Welsh periods the sound was probably realised as [ɸ]: Willis, 'Old and Middle Welsh', 126.

⁴² *LHEB* 572–3; cf. Sims-Williams, 'Emergence', 27 n. 2.

⁴³ The origins of the *h*-spellings are considered in Anthony Harvey, 'Some significant points of early Insular Celtic orthography', in Donnchadh Ó Corráin, Liam Breatnach and Kim McCone (eds), *Sages, Saints and Storytellers: Celtic Studies in Honour of Professor James Carney* (Maynooth, 1989), 56–66. Harvey considers some factors that point towards a Brittonic origin for the spellings and others that point towards an Irish origin, but seems marginally more inclined to favour the latter.

⁴⁴ For example, see the range of spellings found in the Old Welsh memoranda in the Lichfield Gospels: Jenkins and Owen, 'Welsh marginalia', ii, 117–20.

was not restricted to the ‘Old Welsh period’ up to *c.* 1200, but in fact continued, at least in north-west Wales, into the thirteenth century.⁴⁵

In the Jesus College 20 genealogies, a high proportion of identifiable orthographical mistakes or confusions involves the spelling of dentals. The greatest challenge for copyists seems to have been presented by Old Welsh spellings with medial or final *t*, which could represent either /d/ or /θ/. In Middle Welsh orthography after *c.* 1250, medial or final /d/ could be spelled as *t* or *d* and medial or final /θ/ was usually spelled as *th*.⁴⁶ A scribe copying an early exemplar with medial or final *t* potentially for either /d/ or /θ/ would therefore need to decide whether each letter represented /d/ (in which case it would be left as *t* or changed to *d*) or /θ/ (in which case it would probably be changed to *th*). For names that were obscure or unfamiliar, incorrect decisions could sometimes be made. These are revealed especially by the examples discussed below where /d/ is spelled *th*, which was not an accepted practice in any period. Similarly, though to a lesser extent, scribes sometimes struggled to decide whether medial or final *c* represented /g/ or /χ/. In these cases, misunderstandings are revealed when *ch* is found medially or finally for letters that one would expect to represent /g/.

th for /d/

JC 3.4 Tutlith

DSB 12.9 Tutglid

CB 15.9 Tuglit

⁴⁵ Russell, ‘Scribal (in)competence’, 141–4.

⁴⁶ *GMW* 7–8.

JC 19 Tutwal Tuclith
cf. LIIG 9.2 Tudwal Tutklut
cf. *BGG* 8 Tutwal Tutclyt⁴⁷

The first of these examples is a name in the Brychan tract belonging to one of Brychan's daughters, though not straightforwardly: in *DSB* 12.9 and *CB* 15.9, Tudglyd is the wife of Cyngen Glodrydd, whereas in *JC* 3.4 *Tutlith* is, uniquely, associated with *Llys Ronwy* in Glamorgan.⁴⁸ Elsewhere in the Jesus College 20 genealogies, Cyngen's wife is called *Gutuyl* (*JC* 3.10), mirroring *Tudwyl* in *LIIG* 1.3.3. Given the rarity of the name, it is likely that *JC* 3.4's *Tutlith* was recycled from an item about Cyngen's wife Tudglyd. The second example seems to show the same form as an epithet. Tudwal Tudglyd was the father of Rhydderch Hen (later called Rhydderch Hael), a sixth-century king of Alclud first mentioned in Adomnán's *Life of St Columba*.⁴⁹ However, the Tudwal in *JC* 19 belongs to the line of the kings of Man, and bears no relation to Tudwal Tudglyd or Alclud. The epithet was added here in error because of the identity of the names.

The personal name is probably formed from *tud* 'people' + *clyd*, possibly 'shelter, refuge' or 'praise, fame'.⁵⁰ The common exemplar of the first example may have read *-glit*, as in *CB* 15.9, leading a later copyist of *JC* 3.4 to think that the final *-t* represented /θ/ rather than /d/, which was duly spelled as *th*. The same copyist may also have assumed that *-glit* did not show initial lenition, leading him to omit the *g*; alternatively, it is possible that the

⁴⁷ *BGG* = *Bonedd Gwŷr y Gogledd*, edited in *MWG* 427–8.

⁴⁸ *Llys Ronwy* is a bardic name for Llyswyrny (Llysworney): see G. J. Williams, *Traddodiad Llenyddol Morgannwg* (Cardiff, 1948), 149 n. 19; Melville Richards, 'Gwrynydd, Gorfynydd and Llyswyrny', *BBCS* 18 (1958–60), 383–8, at 385.

⁴⁹ Called (in the ablative case) *Roderco filio Tothail qui in petra Cloithe regnauit*: Alan Orr Anderson and Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson (ed. and trans.), *Adomnán's Life of Columba*, rev. Marjorie Ogilvie Anderson (Oxford, 1991), 38 (i.15).

⁵⁰ Stefan Zimmer, 'Die altkymrischen Frauennamen. Ein erster Einblock', in Joseph F. Eska, R. Geraint Gruffydd and Nicolas Jacobs (eds), *Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica: Essays in Honour of Professor D. Ellis Evans on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Cardiff, 1995), 319–35, at 325–6.

sequence *-tc-* (with a flat-topped *t*) was misinterpreted and copied as a single letter (which may account for the similar omissions of the *ts* in *CB* 15.9's *Tuglit* and *JC* 19's *Tuclith*). The epithet of Tudwal Tudglyd could bear the same meaning as the personal name, but another option, given the connection with Alclud, is that the epithet is comprised of *tud* 'people, tribe' + *clud* '(river) Clyde'.⁵¹ This is supported by the vowel spelling in *LIIG* 9.2's *-klut*.⁵² As in the first example, a final *-t* in an exemplar of *JC* 19 was interpreted as /θ/, and spelled accordingly as *th*.

JC 6/17 Tegyth

HG 1 Tacit

LIIG 11.1(4) Tagit

HGK 1 Tagit⁵³

etc.

Tegid < Lat. *Tacitus*. The name was probably inserted into Rhodri Mawr's patriline (as in *JC* 17) on the model of Cunedda's pedigree (as in *JC* 6).⁵⁴ *HG* 1, followed by the later witnesses, does not show vowel affection, probably due to the influence of the Latin spelling of *Tacitus*.⁵⁵ Koch attributes this spelling to 'a written pedigree from the north', but the evidence

⁵¹ Rachel Bromwich, followed by Peter Bartrum, interpreted the epithet *tudglyd* as 'defender of the people', though this has been rightly criticised by Stefan Zimmer: Rachel Bromwich (ed. and trans.), *Trioedd Ynys Prydein: The Triads of the Island of Britain*, 4th ed. (Cardiff, 2014), 508; *EWGT* 228; Zimmer, 'Die altkymrischen Frauennamen', 326. Zimmer, however, did not distinguish the epithet from the female personal name. For *Clut* = Clyde in Old Welsh, see David N. Dumville (ed. and trans.), *Annales Cambriae, A.D. 682–954: Texts A–C in Parallel* (Cambridge, 2002), s.a. 871 (*arx Alt Clut*) and 945 (*Strat Clut*).

⁵² Most of the earliest and best manuscripts of *LIIG* spell the epithet with a *u* in the second syllable. *Tutklut* is the reading of Cardiff 3.77 (John Jones, 1640, copying a medieval exemplar); others include *Tutklud* in *NLW Peniarth* 131, part iii (Gutun Owain, 1483 × 1489), *Tudclud* in *NLW Peniarth* 182 (Huw Pennant, 1509 × 1513), and *Tudclut* in *NLW Peniarth* 127, part i (Thomas ab Ieuan ap Deicws, 1510).

⁵³ D. Simon Evans (ed.), *Historia Gruffud vab Kenan* (Cardiff, 1977) [hereafter *HGK*].

⁵⁴ *MWG* 116–18.

⁵⁵ *LHEB* 607.

for this is lacking.⁵⁶ The form *Tacit(us)* probably derives from the same early Latin source as the form *Cunedag(us)*, as discussed above. This source could plausibly have been written in Gwynedd, the north, or anywhere else.

JC 12	Eleothen
HG 2	Cloten
<i>Déisi</i> (R)	Clotenn (gen. sg.) ⁵⁷
<i>Déisi</i> (L)	Clothienn (gen. sg.)
LIIG 38.1	Gwlyddien
<i>GM</i> 3	Klodden ⁵⁸

This obscure name in the pedigree of the early medieval kings of Dyfed probably contains *clod* ‘praise, fame’ (like *Clotri* in the same pedigree) plus the suffix *-en* that is also found in *Cathen*, the name of *Cloten*’s son.⁵⁹ The form *Eleothen* in JC 12 probably reflects the mistaken assumption that the medial *t* in a form like HG 2’s *Cloten* represented /θ/. The name was reinterpreted in the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies as Gwlyddien (‘tender-born’), a name otherwise encountered in the Lleision pedigree (e.g. LIIG 32.1 and A3.6).

⁵⁶ Koch, *Cunedda*, 74.

⁵⁷ The early medieval pedigree of the kings of Dyfed was incorporated into the Old Irish tale *Indarba na nDéisi* in the middle of the eighth century: see Ben Guy, ‘The earliest Welsh genealogies: textual layering and the phenomenon of “pedigree growth”’, *Early Medieval Europe* 26 (2018), 462–85, at 476–85. The ‘early version’ of the tale, which includes the pedigree, is best represented in two manuscripts: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B. 502, edited in Kuno Meyer, ‘The expulsion of the Dessi’, *Y Cymmrodor* 14 (1901), 101–35 (pedigree at 112, §11) [hereafter *Déisi* (R)] and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud 610, edited in Kuno Meyer, ‘The expulsion of the Dessi’, *Ériu* 3 (1907), 135–42 (pedigree at 136, ll. 34–41) [hereafter *Déisi* (L)]. The pedigrees are also edited individually in *EWGT* 4.

⁵⁸ *GM* = *Gwehelyth Morgannwg*, edited in *MWG* 345–8.

⁵⁹ For *Clotri*, see below, [???](#). Note that the *-en* suffix in *Cloden* and *Cathen* cannot be *gen* < *genos*, as seen, for instance, in MW *Arthen* < OW *Arthgen*, because the Harleian genealogies never mark the lenition of /g/ by omitting the *g*: compare [U]rbgen in HG 8, *Guidgen* in HG 16, *Popgen* in HG 17, *Guitgen* in HG 24, *Morgen* × 2 in HG 25, and *Arthgen* in HG 26.

JC 14	Riagath
GM 4	Riagath
HB (Harl.) §49	Briacat ⁶⁰
HB (Vat.) §26	Briacat ⁶¹
Leb. Bret. §41	Briacat ⁶²

The Jesus College 20 genealogies and the tract *Gwehelyth Morgannwg* preserve the only versions of the pedigree of the early medieval kings of Buellt in the Welsh vernacular genealogical corpus. In both texts, the pedigree forms part of a collection of pedigrees concerning Morgan ab Owain, king of Morgannwg (d. 974); this collection may have been originally assembled during Morgan's lifetime in the tenth century. The Jesus College 20 genealogies and *Gwehelyth Morgannwg* are independent witnesses to this collection.⁶³ A version of the Buellt pedigree was also incorporated into the *Historia Brittonum* in 829/30, and is now preserved in three versions: in the Harleian and Vatican recensions of *Historia Brittonum* and in its Irish translation *Lebor Bretnach*. The *Historia Brittonum*'s version of the pedigree is probably textually related to the version incorporated into the collection focussed on Morgan ab Owain.⁶⁴ The name *Briacat* in the *Historia Brittonum* derives from **brīgo-katos*, with the composition vowel retained as *a* through assimilation with the vowel in the following syllable.⁶⁵ Although the form *Riagath* in JC 14 and GM 4 could represent the equally valid name **rīgo-katos*, the omission of the initial /b/- is more likely to have resulted

⁶⁰ HB (Harl.) = *Historia Brittonum* in BL Harley 3859, edited in Edmond Faral, *La légende arthurienne: études et documents*, 3 vols (Paris, 1929), iii, 5–62.

⁶¹ HB (Vat.) = *Historia Brittonum* (Vatican recension), edited in David N. Dumville, *Historia Brittonum 3: The 'Vatican' Recension* (Cambridge, 1985).

⁶² *Leb. Bret.* = *Lebor Bretnach*, edited in A. G. Van Hamel, *Lebor Bretnach: The Irish Version of the Historia Brittonum Ascribed to Nennius* (Dublin, 1932).

⁶³ MWG 142–56.

⁶⁴ MWG 154–6.

⁶⁵ Cf. Russell, 'Old Welsh *Dinacat*', pp. 449–50. Compare BRIAMAIL on an early inscription (*CIB* 127); *Briauail* in the Book of Llandaf (*LL* 143, 145, 148, 149, 151 and 217); *Briauayl* in GM 5; and, more corruptly, *Biuael* in JC 10 (MWG 148–9).

from confusion arising from the homophony of *mab Bri(a)gad* and *mab Ri(a)gad*. Either way, the final *-th* shared by JC 14 and GM 4 probably arose from an assumption that the final *-t* in an exemplar represented /θ/ rather than /d/.

d for /θ/

The use of *d* for /θ/ is more complex than *th* for /d/ because it could arise in two distinct ways. On the one hand, it could result from the same process of misunderstanding as *th* for /d/: a scribe during the Middle Welsh period could have seen medial or final *t* in an exemplar, assumed that it represented /d/ rather than /θ/, and changed it to *d*. On the other hand, *d* was itself one of many experimental spellings for /θ/ used during the Old Welsh period.⁶⁶ For example, ModW *wrth* is spelled *gurd* in the Juvencus nine, while ModW *peth* is spelled *ped* in the Old Welsh glosses on Martianus Capella.⁶⁷ The same practice is found occasionally as late as the mid-thirteenth-century Black Book of Chirk, where Hand A similarly writes *peth* as *ped*.⁶⁸ By the time of Jesus College 20 (c. 1400), however, *d* for /θ/ was entirely unorthodox. It is therefore most probable that the examples below arose either because a *t* for /θ/ was misunderstood as /d/ or because a legitimate Old Welsh *d* for /θ/ was overlooked and left to stand. In some cases, the former possibility is strengthened by the existence of an Old Welsh version of the same genealogy that spells the relevant name with *t* for /θ/.

JC 3.17 Talgard

DSB 12.18 Talgarth

CB 15.19 Talgarth

⁶⁶ Jenkins and Owen, 'Welsh Marginalia', ii, 119; Russell, 'Scribal (in)competence', 141.

⁶⁷ Falileyev, *Etymological Glossary*, 76 and 128.

⁶⁸ Russell, 'Scribal (in)competence', 137; cf. 154 (Hand H).

LIIG 1.3.17 Talgarth

tâl ‘end’ + *garth* ‘ridge’.⁶⁹ This item in the Brychan tract concerns Gwen ferch Brychan, patron saint of Talgarth in Brycheiniog. Jackson noted that the Old Welsh spelling *t* for /θ/ ‘is found almost exclusively after *r*, where it is not uncommon’; this is because the *t* in OW *-rt* unambiguously represented /θ/ rather than /d/.⁷⁰ It is quite possible, then, that an exemplar of JC 3.17 spelled Talgarth as *Talgart*. On the other hand, since Talgarth is a fairly well-known place, the spelling in *-d* may at some stage have been deliberate, following the Old Welsh convention that *d* could mean /θ/. There may indeed have existed a tradition of spelling Talgarth with a final *-d*, since other examples are extant.⁷¹ Either way, it is surprising that it was left to stand by the relevant scribe in Jesus College 20.

JC 6	Prydein
GM 2	Prydain
HG 1	Brithgwein
VS <i>Cadoci</i> §47	Brithgwein ⁷²
VS <i>Carantoci II</i> §1	Britgwenin
HGK 1	Brychwein
LIIG 11.1	Brychwein

⁶⁹ Hywel Wyn Owen and Richard Morgan, *Dictionary of the Place-Names of Wales* (Llandysul, 2007), 452.

⁷⁰ *LHEB* 572; Harvey, ‘Some significant points’, 63; Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 27 n. 2. T. Arwyn Watkins claims that the OW spellings *lc*, *rc*, *rt* for /lχ, rχ, rθ/ were adopted from Old Irish, but he overlooks the point that there was no standard way to spell these voiceless fricatives in Old Welsh (and thus that spellings like *rt* do not ‘deviate’ from an ‘expected’ *rth*): ‘Points of similarity between Old Welsh and Old Irish Orthography’, *BBCS* 21 (1965), 135–41, at 139–40. For spirantization in the cluster *-rt-*, see Paul Russell, ‘A footnote to spirantization’, *CMCS* 10 (1985), 53–6.

⁷¹ Wade-Evans, *Vitae*, 26 (*Vita sancti Cadoci*, prol.); William Henry Hart, *Historia et cartularium monasterii Sancti Petri Gloucestriae*, 3 vols (London, 1863–67), i, 315 (no. 284); cf. Joshua Byron Smith, *Walter Map and the Matter of Britain* (Philadelphia, 2017), 212 n. 168.

⁷² The Lives of Saints Cadog and Carannog incorporate genealogical matter extracted from a text very similar to the Harleian genealogies: see *MWG* 79–85. The texts are edited and translated in Wade-Evans, *Vitae*, 24–141 and 142–9 respectively.

The etymology is uncertain; possibly *brith* ‘coloured, speckled’ + *gwain* ‘slaughter’.⁷³ The name occurs in the legendary portion of the pedigree of the kings of Gwynedd, and was intended to form a rhyming pair with *Eugein* (the latter representing /euj̥ein/ < Lat. *Eugenius*).⁷⁴ In the common exemplar of JC 6 and GM 2, the name was reinterpreted as *Prydain* ‘Britain’, where the *d* clearly means /d/.⁷⁵ This reinterpretation may have been aided by an exemplar with *t* for /θ/, as in *Britguenin* in the Life of St Carannog.

JC 8	Caden
JC 12	Cathen
GM 3	Kathan
HG 2	Cathen
<i>Déisi</i> (R)	Caittienn (gen. sg.)
<i>Déisi</i> (L)	Catien (gen. sg.)
LIIG 38.1	Kathen
cf. HG 15	Caten
cf. JC 8	Cathen

Possibly *cath* ‘cat’ + *-en*, the suffix found in the name of Cathen’s father Cloden (see above).

The same name appears in Llangathen and the surrounding commote of Catheiniog.⁷⁶ By the time that Dafydd Epynt (fl. s. xv²) composed his poem for St Cathen of Llangathen, the saint

⁷³ *GPC Online* s.v. *gwain*².

⁷⁴ For OW *Eugein* < Lat. *Eugenius*, see *LHEB* 323–4 and 370, n. 1; cf. Kenneth Hurlstone Jackson, ‘The sources for the Life of St Kentigern’, in Nora K. Chadwick (ed.), *Studies in the Early British Church* (Cambridge, 1958), 273–357, at 284. For the rhyming pairs, see *MWG* 37–9.

⁷⁵ Compare *Prydain* in Beli Mawr’s pedigree: *HGK* 2; *LIIG* 11.1; etc.

⁷⁶ Melville Richards, ‘Early Welsh territorial suffixes’, *JRSAI* 95 (1965), 205–12, at 208; Melville Richards, *Welsh Administrative and Territorial Units: Medieval and Modern* (Cardiff, 1969), 126.

had been identified as the son of the legendary Cawrdaf ap Caradog Freichfras.⁷⁷ However, it is more likely that the eponym of Llangathen, located in Cantref Mawr in the heart of early medieval Dyfed, should be linked to the ruling dynasty of early medieval Dyfed, which favoured the name Cathen.⁷⁸ It is notable that JC 8 spells Cathen ap Cloden's name as *Caden* while spelling the name of his descendant Cathen ap Nowy more clearly as *Cathen*. In the Harleian genealogies, the names of the same two men are spelled *Cathen* (Cathen ap Cloden, HG 2) and *Caten* (Cathen ap Nowy, HG 15). Such orthographical variation in an exemplar (albeit the other way around) may account for the two variant spellings in JC 8, the form *Caden* having arisen from misunderstanding of an earlier *Caten*.

JC 9	Adroes
GM 1	Adroes
HG 28	Atroys
LIIG 35.1	Athrwys

The etymology of Athrwys is uncertain.⁷⁹ The appearance of these four forms nicely illustrates the relationships between these texts: HG 28 spells the name *Atroys*, with t for /θ/, and the name was correctly interpreted in the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies and updated to *Athrwys*; the Jesus 20 genealogies and *Gwehelyth Morgannwg*, on the other hand, draw on

⁷⁷ Barry J. Lewis (ed.), *Medieval Welsh Poems to Saints and Shrines* (Dublin, 2015), 121–3 and 306–12. St Cathen is also called son of Cawrdaf ap Caradog Freichras in versions of *Bonedd y Saint* dating to the sixteenth century and later: Barry J. Lewis (ed.), *Bonedd y Saint* (Dublin, [forthcoming](#)), no. E6. Note that a Cathen ap Cawrdaf ap Serwan is also found in HG 16.

⁷⁸ As seen in this instance and in HG 15 (an early ninth-century member of the same dynasty). The possible connections between Cathen ap Cloden, Llangathen and Catheiniog are discussed by Egerton Phillimore *apud* Henry Owen (ed.), *The Description of Penbrokshire [sic] by George Owen of Henllys, Lord of Kemes*, 4 vols paginated as 2 (London, 1892–1936), iii, 224–5 n. 1. For early medieval Dyfed, see Ben Guy, ‘Rheinwg: the lost kingdom of South Wales’, *Peritia* 30 (2019), 97–121.

⁷⁹ Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 52.

a common exemplar that spelled the name with *-d-*, perhaps because a *t* for /θ/ (as in *Atroys*) had been misinterpreted as /d/. For the diphthong in *Adroes*, see below.

JC 12	G\$rdēber
GM 3	Gyrdeber
HG 2	Guortepir
<i>Déisi</i> (R)	Gartbuir (gen. sg.?)
<i>Déisi</i> (L)	Goirtiben (gen. sg.?)
LIIG 38.1	Gwerthefyr

This name derives from Brittonic **wor-tepo-rix*; the same person is called *Vortipori* (voc. sg.) by Gildas.⁸⁰ As noted above, the Old Welsh spelling *t* for /θ/ is most commonly found immediately after *r*, as here in HG 2's *Guortepir*. Once again, the Jesus College 20 genealogies and *Gwehelyth Morgannwg* share a spelling in *-d-*, perhaps because the *t* in a form like *Guortepir* was misunderstood, whereas the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies have correctly updated it to *th*. On the other hand, the *f* for /β/ in LIIG 38.1 is an error resulting from an assumption that *b* in an exemplar represented /β/ rather than /b/.

JC 19	Neidaon
HG 4	Neithon
LIIG 20	Meythion

⁸⁰ Patrick Sims-Williams *apud* Nancy Edwards, *A Corpus of Early Medieval Inscribed Stones and Stone Sculpture in Wales. Volume II: South-West Wales* (Cardiff, 2007), 205–6.

Cognate with OIr *Nechtán*; the phonology is uncertain, though the form *Neithon* may be Pictish.⁸¹

JC 41 Gweidno
HG 18 Gueinoth
LIIG 42 Gwethyno
cf. *LL* 144 Gueithgno, Gueithgen

Probably *gwaith* ‘work, battle’ + *-gno*, possibly < **gnāwjos* ‘knowing’.⁸² In HG 18, the *th* has been misplaced to the end of the word, and the *g* of *-gno* may have been omitted (if the etymology is correct), possibly because the scribe was influenced by Anglo-Saxon names in *-noth*.⁸³ In the past, it has sometimes been assumed that these forms represent the name Gwyddno (MW *Gwydneu*, *Gwydno*), which is more common; however, given especially the occurrence of *Gueithgno* in the Book of Llandaf, it is likely that the *gwaith* names are separate from Gwyddno.⁸⁴

JC 42 Arden
JC 21 Arthen
HG 26 Arthgen

⁸¹ See discussion and references in *CIB* 179; cf. T. M. Charles-Edwards, *Wales and the Britons 350–1064* (Oxford, 2013), 148.

⁸² For the latter element, see *LHEB* 382–3; E. P. Hamp, ‘Early Welsh names, suffixes, and phonology’, *Onoma* 14 (1969), 7–13, at 12; Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 51; Peter Schrijver, *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam, 1995), 299–300.

⁸³ Cf. Ben Guy, ‘A second witness to the Welsh material in Harley 3859’, *Quaestio Insularis: Selected Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic* 15 (2014), 72–91, at 89, and below, **?? n. ??**.

⁸⁴ For example, this was assumed in *EWGT* 195, Russell, ‘Scribal (in)competence’, 141 and Guy, ‘Second witness’, 88–90. The name Gwyddno may appear in the Harleian genealogies in HG 5, if the *p* in *Guipno* is understood to have been miscopied from a thorn (*þ*) representing /ð/. For the *-neu* of *Gwydneu*, see Schrijver, *Studies*, 300 n. 1.

LIIG 18 Arthen

arth ‘bear’ + OW *-gen* < **genos* ‘born’. It is striking that the name is spelled differently in JC 21 and JC 42, despite these two items otherwise reproducing the same version of the pedigree of the early medieval kings of Ceredigion with the same errors.⁸⁵ The common exemplar of JC 21 and JC 42 could conceivably have read either *Arten* or *Arden*, though perhaps the former is more likely.

JC 50 Elaed

LIIG 46.1 Elaeth

Probably *el* ‘much’ + *aeth* ‘pain, grief’.⁸⁶ These examples are taken from the pedigree associated from Dogfeiling, which is not attested in any Old Welsh source.

ch for /g/

JC 7 Afloch

HG 32 Abloyc

This is the eponym of the commote in Llŷn called *Aphlocya\$n* in JC 7, which later became Gaflogion or Cafflogion by popular etymology.⁸⁷ Despite the retention of *c* for /g/ in *Aphlocya\$n*, in *Afloch* the final *-c* for /g/ has been interpreted as *c* for /χ/ and copied as *ch*.

⁸⁵ For example, *Argloes* for *Arthloes*; see below, ???.

⁸⁶ Meredith Cane, ‘Personal names of men in Wales, Cornwall and Brittany 400–1400 AD’, 2 vols, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 2003, i, 19.

⁸⁷ Richards, ‘Early Welsh territorial suffixes’, 209.

JC 13 Pr\$tech
HG 2 Protec
cf. *LL* 150 Protec

This name in the pedigree of the early medieval kings of Dyfed forms an alliterating pair with *Protector*. Both names seem to have been inserted into the legendary portion of the pedigree in order to lend it a more ‘Roman’, and less Irish, appearance.⁸⁸ However, the presence of one *Protec* in the witness list of a putatively late seventh- or early eighth-century charter in the Book of Llandaf may suggest that the name *Protec* was not simply invented after all.⁸⁹ Either way, it is likely that the *-ch* spelling in JC 13 is a misunderstanding of the earlier spelling in *-c*.

JC 18 Deyrllloch
HG 22 Dunlurc
LIIG 19 Dehyrlllug
LIIG 40.1 Dyrnllug
cf. *HB* (Harl.) §35 Durnluc
cf. JC 16 Deernlluc

This is the epithet of Cadell, eponym of the Cadelling dynasties of Powys. The spelling in HG 22 is probably an error for *Durnluc*, as in the *Historia Brittonum*.⁹⁰ The first element is *dwrn* ‘fist’ or ‘hilt’. This was later spelled *Dyrn-*, showing the reduced vowel (as in LIIG 40.1); in turn, this prompted the element to be reinterpreted as the lenited form of *teyrn*

⁸⁸ Guy, ‘Earliest Welsh genealogies’, 483–4.

⁸⁹ Charter 150b: Davies, *Llandaff Charters*, 99; Sims-Williams, *Book of Llandaf*, 150.

⁹⁰ Egerton Phillimore, ‘The *Annales Cambriae* and the Old-Welsh genealogies from *Harleian MS. 3859*’, *Y Cymmrodor* 9 (1888), 141–83, at 179 n. 6.

‘prince’. The second element, however, is ambiguous: the OW spelling *-luc* could indicate either *llug* ‘light, radiance; ?shining, brilliant’ or *llwch* ‘dust’ or ‘lake; bog; mud, dung’. Most later spellings would seem to favour *llug*, resulting in the epithet ‘shining-fist’ or ‘shining-hilt’. If so, final *-c* for /g/ has been misunderstood as *c* for /χ/ by a copyist of JC 18.

Alternatively, the original epithet might have included (or been interpreted as including) *llwch*, which is perhaps what prompted the author of the *Historia Brittonum*, in a story about Cadell’s elevation to the kingship of Powys, to cite I Samuel 2.8: ‘He raiseth up the needy from the dust, and lifteth up the poor from the dunghill...’.⁹¹ If so, JC 18’s *-lloch* may be a perfectly legitimate rendering of the final consonant.

SPELLINGS RESULTING FROM LENITION

Certain consonantal spellings in an Old Welsh system of orthography were particularly liable to be misunderstood by later scribes. Three of these cases are addressed below. Each of these spellings arose due to the effects of lenition on the spelling system. By the Old Welsh period, in leniting positions /b/ had become the bilabial fricative /β/; /m/ had become the nasalised bilabial fricative /μ/; and /g/ had become the voiced velar fricative /γ/. Since in most cases lenition was not recognised overtly in spelling during the Old Welsh period, these three fricatives /β, μ, γ/ were usually spelled *b, m, g*, just like their non-lenited counterparts. By the twelfth century, the bilabial fricatives /β, μ/ had fallen together as /β/ following the loss of the nasal element of /μ/, leading to confusion between *b* and *m* as spellings for /β/.⁹² By the thirteenth century, the *b/m* spellings were abandoned and /β/ was spelled as *v, u* or *f*, thereby

⁹¹ Quoted from the Douay-Rheims translation. *HB* (Harl.) §35; cf. A. W. Wade-Evans, *Welsh Christian Origins* (Oxford, 1934), 89; Nikolai Tolstoy, ‘Cadell and the Cadelling of Powys’, *SC* 46 (2012), 59–83, at 63.

⁹² Paul Russell, ‘*Rowynniauc, Rhufoniog*: the orthography and phonology of /μ/ in early Welsh’, in Paul Russell (ed.), *Yr Hen Iaith: Studies in Early Welsh* (Aberystwyth, 2003), 25–47.

overtly differentiating /b/ and /m/ from their lenited equivalent /β/.⁹³ The voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ was eventually lost completely. This happened at different times in different environments between approximately the sixth and ninth centuries, though in most environments the etymological spelling with *g* was usually maintained up to the twelfth century.⁹⁴ In compounds where the first element ended with /l, r, n/ and the second element began with /ɣ/, the latter was vocalised as /i̯/ (e.g. *Sulien* < OW *Sulgen*).⁹⁵ Similarly, in internal position /ɣ/ after /l, r/ became /i̯/ (e.g. *arian* ‘silver’ < OW *argant*).⁹⁶ In both cases, this /i̯/ was spelled as *g* in Old Welsh orthography, although later *i* or *y* would be preferred.

The examples discussed below concern instances when Old Welsh-style spellings involving *b*, *m* and *g* with the values described above were either overlooked or misunderstood in the Old Welsh genealogical tracts that were incorporated in the Jesus College 20 genealogies.

b for /β/ and m for /μ/

JC 2.9	Cyblider
DSB 11.9	Chybliuer
CB 14.9	Kyfliuer
LIIG 1.2.5	Kyfliver

The first element is the prefix *cyf-* < OW *com-*, but the second element is uncertain.⁹⁷ Judging by the spellings in both JC 2.9 and DSB 11.9, the archetype of the Brychan tract probably

⁹³ /β/ would later become /v/ in modern Welsh: Willis, ‘Old and Middle Welsh’, 126.

⁹⁴ LHEB 469–70.

⁹⁵ LHEB 439.

⁹⁶ LHEB 466–9.

⁹⁷ For discussion, see David N. Parsons, *Martyrs and Memorials: Merthyr Place-Names and the Church in Early Wales* (Aberystwyth, 2013), 64–5.

spelled the fricative in the prefix with *b* rather than etymological *m*, suggesting that the nasality of the original /*μ*/ had been lost by the time that the archetype was written.⁹⁸

JC 3.2 Hirblaut

LIIG 1.3.2 Hirvlawt

LIFB 3.12 Hirvlawdd

hir ‘long’ + *blawdd* ‘terror’. In the first two instances cited, final *-t* represents *-ð*, as in the Black Book of Carmarthen.⁹⁹ This is the epithet of Iorwerth Hirflawdd, eponym of the Iorwerthion dynasties of Arwystli, Maelienydd and Elfael, as found in versions of the Brychan tract. Although Iorwerth is also mentioned in *De situ Brecheniauc*, the epithet does not occur there. In JC 3.2, the spelling *b* for /*β*/, representing the lenited initial consonant of the second element of the compound, has been left to stand.

JC 3.3 Bramdrut

DSB 12.17 Barmbruch

LIIG 1.3.4 Varyfdrwch

cf. HG 18 Barmbruch

barf ‘beard’ < Lat. *barba* + *trwch* ‘cut’. This is the epithet of Gwrin Farfdrwch, an early member of the line associated with Meirionydd. The first three forms are quoted from versions of the Brychan tract, where it is said that Gwrin Farfdrwch married Brychan’s daughter Marchell (or Mechyll), and the last form is quoted from a version of the Meirionydd

⁹⁸ Cf. *Cimliuer* (LL 32) alongside *Cibliuer* (LL 44), noted in *LHEB* 485.

⁹⁹ Cf. Russell, ‘Scribal (in)consistency’, 149–51.

pedigree. It is striking that *De situ Brecheniauc* spells the epithet in the same unusual way as the Harleian genealogies, implying that there may be some textual connection between the two. In both instances, the fricative in *barf* is apparently spelled *mb* where one would expect *b*, presumably due to scribal hesitation about whether *m* or *b* was the appropriate graph to use.¹⁰⁰ JC 3.3's *Bramdrut* may represent an attempt to rationalise a spelling like *Barmbtruch* (albeit with a less dignified outcome for Gwrin).

JC 3.15 Beper

CB 15.3 Pefir

LIIG 1.3.10 Pefyr

pefr 'bright, shining', here used as the epithet of Tudwal Befr in the Brychan tract. In *DSB* 12.4, his epithet is rendered in Latin as *flauī* 'golden yellow' (gen. sg.). The etymology of *pefr* is uncertain. A possible explanation for the unusual form *Beper* in JC 3.15 is that an exemplar had spelled the fricative in *pefr* with *b*, encouraging a copyist to suppose that the epithet was *pybyr* 'lively; vigorous; fine, bright'.¹⁰¹ The medial *-b/-* in this word was then spelled with *p*.

JC 6 Eimet

GM 2 Ennot

HG 1 Oumun

VS *Cadoci* §47 Oumiud

¹⁰⁰ Compare this 'double' spelling of the fricative with *trefbret* in Ifor Williams (ed.), *Canu Taliesin* (Cardiff, 1960), I.2. My thanks to Patrick Sims-Williams for suggesting this comparison.

¹⁰¹ *GPC Online* s.v. *pybyr*². I owe this suggestion to Patrick Sims-Williams. There is similar confusion in spellings of Gronw's epithet in the Fourth Branch of the *Mabinogi*, which the White Book spells as *pebyr* (for *pybyr*) and the Red Book spells as *peuyr* (understanding *pefr*): Ifor Williams (ed.), *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi* (Cardiff, 1930), 286 (84.19n).

<i>VS Carantoci II</i> §1	Omnid
<i>VS Daidid</i> §68	Omid ¹⁰²
<i>HGK 1</i>	Onnet
<i>LIIG 11.1</i>	Onwed

This is a name found among the early ancestors of the kings of Gwynedd. The only witness that seems to preserve the proper Old Welsh form is the Life of St Cadog, which has *Oumiud*. This is probably the name attested in Middle Welsh as *Euuyd* (Eufydd), which appears several times in the Book of Taliesin in association with characters from the Fourth Branch of the Mabinogi.¹⁰³ Discussion of *Euuyd* seem to have overlooked the fact that the name occurs in its Old Welsh form in the pedigree of the kings of Gwynedd. Most of the other forms quoted above are more or less corrupt interpretations of *Oumiud*, with the exception of *Oumun* in HG 1.¹⁰⁴ This appears in the manuscript as *Oumú*, with what appears to be a nasal suspension mark over the *u*. HG 1's form may result from a deliberate alteration of *Oumiud* to *Oumú*, allowing the name to rhyme with *Dubun*, with which *Oumun* is paired in the pedigree.¹⁰⁵

JC 10	Arbeth
<i>GM 5</i>	Ayrddyl
cf. <i>LL 78</i>	Ebrdil

¹⁰² Richard Sharpe and John Reuben Davies (ed. and trans.), 'Rhygyfarch's Life of St David', in J. Wyn Evans and Jonathan M. Wooding (eds), *St David of Wales: Cult, Church and Nation* (Woodbridge, 2007), 107–55.

¹⁰³ Marged Haycock (ed. and trans.), *Legendary Poems from the Book of Taliesin*, 2nd ed. (Aberystwyth, 2015), 72, note to poem 1.81.

¹⁰⁴ Note that the Old Welsh-style spellings in the saints' Lives use final *-d* for *-ð*/, as one would expect, whereas texts probably originating in the late twelfth or thirteenth centuries (*HGK* and the common exemplar of *JC* and *GM*) have shifted to final *-t* for *-ð*/, as in the Black Book of Carmarthen. See above, **??? n. ???**.

¹⁰⁵ *MWG* 37 n. 175. See too the discussion of *Brithgwein* above.

Jon Coe has connected this name with the adjective *afreddwl* ‘sad, wretched; unfortunate’.¹⁰⁶

This seems plausible given that all these attestations refer to St Efrddyl, daughter of Peibio Glafrog, who receives rather ‘wretched’ treatment at the hands of her father in the Life of St Dyfrig.¹⁰⁷ Once again, the Jesus College 20 genealogies here share a common source with *Gwehelyth Morgannwg*, and in this case the latter can be used to explain the corruption of the former.¹⁰⁸ It is clear that JC 10’s form *Arbeth* is a corruption of Efrddyl’s name, probably encouraged by a failure to understand that *b* in the exemplar indicated /β/.

g for /γ, ĵ/

JC 3.2	Urgnngen
DSB 12.10	Aranwen
CB 15.10	Arganwen
LIIG 1.3.2	Arianwen
LIFB 3.12	Rianwen

arian (OW *argant*)¹⁰⁹ ‘silver’ + *gwen* ‘white’. *CB* 15.10 clearly preserves Old Welsh *g* for /ĵ/ in *Argan-*. The corrupt *Urgn-* of *JC* 3.2 probably preserves remnants of the same thing. The final *-gen* of *JC* 3.2’s *Urgnngen* is likely to derive from an exemplar where initial /w/ of

¹⁰⁶ Jonathan Baron Coe, ‘The place-names of the Book of Llandaf’, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 2001, 909–10. Zimmer instead interprets the first element of Efrddyl as *ef(w)r* ‘cow-parsnip, hogweed’ < Celt. *eburo* ‘yew tree’, though the ‘yew’ meaning of Celtic *eburo* (based on the meaning of the derivative OIr *ibar* ‘yew’) has now been rejected by Peter Schrijver in favour of ‘rowan’: Zimmer, ‘Die altkymrischen Frauennamen’, 326–7; Peter Schrijver, ‘The meaning of Celtic **eburos*’, in Guillaume Oudaer, Gaël Hily and Herve Le Bihan (eds), *Mélanges en l’honneur de Pierre-Yves Lambert* (Rennes, 2015), 65–76.

¹⁰⁷ See Ben Guy (ed. and trans.), *Vita Sancti Dubricii* (2020), §14, published online at <http://www.welshsaints.ac.uk/theedition>.

¹⁰⁸ *MWG* 148–9.

¹⁰⁹ Falileyev, *Etymological Glossary*, 11.

lenited *gwen* was spelled *gu* or *gw*. This feature was updated by spelling /w/ as *w* in all other witnesses, including *De situ Brecheniauc*.

JC 3.3 G\$rhynnt

DSB 12.17 Gurind

CB 15.16 Gurgeynt

LIIG 1.3.4 Wynnir

LIFB 3.20 Wrgant

cf. HG 18 Guurgint

JC 7 Hyrth

HG 32 Girt

LIIG 47.11 Yrth

The first of these examples is *gŵr* ‘man’ + *gynt* ‘tribe people’ < Lat. *gens*, *gent-* (cf. *Bleddyn*: *blaidd* ‘wolf’ + *gynt*).¹¹⁰ That the first element is *gŵr* rather than the intensive prefix *gwor* is suggested both by the comparison with ‘*Bleddyn*’ and by the spelling *Guurgint* in the Harleian genealogies, since the latter text usually spells the intensive prefix as *guor* (e.g. *Guorcein*, *Guortepir*, etc.).¹¹¹ The name ‘*Gwrin*’ is known in only four contexts: *Gwrin Farfdrwch* was a member of the dynasty associated with early medieval Meirionydd; a certain *Gwrin* was a witness to the Surexit Memorandum;¹¹² the cantref of *Gwrinydd* (later *Gronydd*,

¹¹⁰ Cf. *CIB* 181–2. Jenkins and Owen point out that the name should be spelled ‘*Gwryn*’ in modern Welsh (cf. ‘*Bleddyn*’), but since ‘*Gwrin*’ has become the standard spelling in references to *Gwrin Farfdrwch* and the modern place-name *Llanwrin*, the latter form is retained here: Jenkins and Owen, ‘Welsh marginalia’, ii, 107–8.

¹¹¹ Similarly, the name is spelled *Gurgint* in *Chad* 2 (the Surexit Memorandum), in contrast to *Guortigirnn* (with intensive *gwor*) in *Chad* 5: *LL* xliii and xlvi; Jenkins and Owen, ‘Welsh marginalia’, i, 51 and ii, 91 and 107–8 (for *Chad* 2). For a translation and discussion of *Chad* 5, see Charles-Edwards, *Wales and the Britons*, 247.

¹¹² See the previous footnote.

Gorfynydd) in Glamorgan derives from the name Gwrin;¹¹³ and the place-name Llanwrin is found on the north bank of the river Dyfi, north-east of Machynlleth.¹¹⁴ Due to its relative obscurity, the name caused endless trouble for later scribes, as shown by some of the forms above. The same issue was encountered by those engaging with the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth, whose character *Gurgint Barbruc* had been borrowed from the Meirionydd pedigree; he became Gwrgan Farfdrwch in *Brut y Brenhinedd*, while JC 51's list of Galfridian kings rendered him as *G\$rnet Vrichhir*.¹¹⁵ That said, the *h* in JC 3.3's *G\$rhynnt* may reflect a genuine attempt to spell the weakened remains of /ɣ/ at the beginning of the second element of the compound, and thus show comprehension of the OW spelling with -g-. Jackson estimated that /ɣ/ in this position did not fully disappear until the eleventh or twelfth century, like initial /ɣ/ in leniting position.¹¹⁶

There may be at least one other example of *h* used for weakened /ɣ/ elsewhere, but this is uncertain.¹¹⁷ In the context of the Jesus College 20 genealogies, however, the interpretation may be supported by the second cited example. This is *gyrth* 'rough, hard; fierce; strong', the epithet of Cunedda's son Einion Yrth. The initial /g/ of the epithet was lenited, and it is possible that JC 7's *Hyrth* spells the resulting /ɣ/ with *h*, as in *G\$rhynnt*. Alternatively, the perception of an initial /h/- in *Hyrth* could have been prompted by the final nasal of the preceding name *Einya\$n*, in the same way as has been argued for prefixed *h*- following first-person plural possessive pronouns.¹¹⁸

¹¹³ Richards, 'Gwrinydd'; Philip Jenkins, 'Regions and cantrefs in early medieval Glamorgan', *CMCS* 15 (1988), 31–50, at 45.

¹¹⁴ Richards, *Early Welsh Territorial and Administrative Units*, 142. Given the presence of Gwrin Farfdrwch in the Meirionydd pedigree, it seems unlikely to be a coincidence that Llanwrin is just to the south-east of the border of Meirionydd, in Cyfeiliog; compare Llangathen, discussed above.

¹¹⁵ *MWG* 283.

¹¹⁶ *LHEB* 438.

¹¹⁷ *CIB* 222–3 and 280.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Patrick Sims-Williams, 'The spread of "sandhi *h*-" in thirteenth-century Welsh', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108 (2010), 41–52, at 48–50.

JC 5	G\$rgust
JC 17	G\$rgust
JC 34	G\$rguest
HG 8	Gurgust
LIIG 7.4	Gwrwst

As with Gwrin above, the spelling *Gurgust* in the Harleian genealogies probably indicates that first element is *gŵr* ‘man’ rather than the intensive prefix *gwor*. This is confirmed by the Irish cognate *Fergus*. Cane translates the second element, *gwst*, as ‘valour’, though *GPC* suggests, among other meanings, ‘pain, torment; endurance, patience; effort, fighting; trouble, distress’.¹¹⁹ The name was later reduced to Grwst, as in Llanrwst. It is likely that one or more copyists of the Jesus College 20 genealogies overlooked the fact that the initial *g* of the second element of this name represents a lenited *g*, which, by Middle Welsh standards, should be omitted (as it usually is in the Jesus College 20 genealogies, e.g. in *Idwal*, *Kadwaladyr* and *Katwalla\$ŋ* in JC 22). The same oversight is found in *Culhwch ac Olwen*, where Grwst Ledlwm is called *Gwrgwst Letlwm*.¹²⁰

JC 12	G\$ga\$ŋ
<i>GM</i> 3	Gwgon
JC 8	Cad\$ga\$ŋ
HG 2	Catgocaun
<i>Déisi</i> (R)	Catacuind (gen. sg.)
LIIG 38.1	Cadwgawn

¹¹⁹ Cane, ‘Personal names’, i, 167; *GPC Online* s.v. gwst¹.

¹²⁰ Rachel Bromwich and D. Simon Evans (eds), *Culhwch ac Olwen*, 2nd ed. (Cardiff, 1997), 35 (l. 993). For Grwst Ledlwm, see below, ??? n. ???.

In the common exemplar of the Jesus College 20 genealogies and *Gwehelyth Morgannwg*, the second element of the name Cadwgon (*cad* ‘battle’ + *g(w)ogawn* ‘glory’) had been taken as the full name, since Gwgon was also a name in its own right (OW *Gu(o)caun* < **wo-kān-*).¹²¹ This probably occurred because the source, like HG 2, did not spell the lenited initial of the second element of the compound by omitting the *g*.

JC 21/42	Argloes
HG 26	Artgloys
LIIG 18	Arthloes
JC 40	Podgen
HG 17	Popgen
LIIG 43	Pobien

The first example is *arth* ‘bear’ + possibly either *gloes* ‘agony’ or *glwys* ‘beautiful, fair, comely’.¹²² The same form, including the omission of *t(h)* and the retention of *g*, is found in both JC 21 and JC 42, which repeat the same version of the pedigree of the early medieval kings of Ceredigion. The second example is apparently *pob* ‘every, all’ + OW *-gen* < **genos* ‘born’.¹²³ In both instances, the Jesus College 20 genealogies maintain the etymological spelling of the second element without spelling the lenition by either omitting the *g* or, as

¹²¹ [G]uocaun in HG 26, Gucaun in LL 237, 265, 268 and 276.

¹²² In the Harleian genealogies, the spelling *oy* can represent either /oi/ (*Coyl* × 4, *Coyt*, *Abloyc*) or /ui/ (*Tancoyslt*, *Nougoy* × 2, *Loyt*, *Atroys* × 2). Less certain are *Amguoloyt* (cf. *an guoloet* in Williams, *Canu Aneirin*, l. 1188), *Ytigoy* (cf. the equivalent names *Idwin* in JC 39 and *Idgwin* in LIIG 44) and *Cynloyp*. For Old Welsh spellings in *oy*, see below, **?? n. ??**.

¹²³ Cane, ‘Personal names’, i, 22. For the first element, compare Pobien’s son Pobddelw, spelled *Popdelgu* in HG 17.

seen in LIIG 43 in the second case, by altering the spelling to *i* or *y* for /i/ (cf. *Vryen* in JC 3.5 and *Vrien* in JC 34 < OW *Urbgen*).

SPELLING VOWELS

Another problematic area of early Welsh spelling was the front and central vowels. The underlying issue was that Welsh had more vowels than available Latin graphs to represent them: thus, in ninth-century Old Welsh, the six vowels /i, i, e, ə, u, u/ and the semi-vowel /j/ were represented by only three letters: *i*, *e* and *u/v* (and *u/v* could additionally sometimes represent /w/ and the fricatives /β/ and /μ/).¹²⁴ The pressure on the front and central vowels was eventually eased by the introduction of the letter *y*, probably borrowed from English; this appeared in restricted environments in the tenth century but was adopted more widely after c. 1100.¹²⁵ The use of *y* continued to fluctuate until the fourteenth century, when the ‘standard’ Middle Welsh pattern emerged.¹²⁶

Due to these ongoing fluctuations, it is not especially instructive to discuss the spellings of front and central vowels in isolated words and phrases in the Jesus College 20 genealogies, since they might have been altered in different directions during the

¹²⁴ See the tables in Russell, *Introduction*, 215; Falileyev, *Llawlyfr*, 7–9. In addition, /ə/ was sometimes spelled *a*. The orthography of the Llandaf charters suggests that *u* was used in some scribal milieus for /β/ and /μ/ in the seventh and eighth centuries: Russell, ‘*Rowynniauc, Rhufoniog*’, 32–8.

¹²⁵ For the introduction of *y* to Welsh orthography, see Peter Kitson, ‘Old English literacy and the provenance of Welsh *y*’, in Russell (ed.), *Yr Hen Iaith*, 49–65. The Harleian genealogies make use of *y*, though this is overlooked in *ibid.*, 51–2, perhaps because of a supposition (incorrect, in my view) that the spelling of the tenth-century Harleian genealogies was altered when they were copied in England around 1100. As in the Computus fragment (*ibid.*, 55–6; cf. T. M. Charles-Edwards, ‘The authenticity of the *Gododdin*: an historian’s view’, in Bromwich and Jones (eds), *Astudiaethau*, 44–71, at 50–1), the use of *y* in the Harleian genealogies is almost entirely restricted to the diphthong *oy* (see above, ??? n. ???), though it occasionally appears in *ey* (*Himeyt, Bleydiud*) and *ay* (*Brocmayl* × 2, *Mormayl, Iusay*). The only exception is *Typipaun* for *Tybion*, the apparent dittography in which may well have arisen due to a mechanical copying of an attempted spelling alteration of *ip* to *yp* or vice-versa.

¹²⁶ For fluctuations in the use of *y* in the thirteenth century, see especially Russell, ‘Scribal (in)competence’, 140–1, 164–5 and 169–70; T. M. Charles-Edwards and Paul Russell, ‘The Hendregadredd manuscript and the orthography and phonology of Welsh in the early fourteenth century’, *NLW Journal* 28 (1994), 419–62, at 421–2, 425 and 431–2; Paul Russell, ‘What did medieval Welsh scribes do? The scribe of the Dingestow Court MS’, *CMCS* 37 (1999), 79–96, at 88–90; Russell, ‘Scribal (in)consistency’, 157–60.

transmission of the texts. This can be appreciated by considering spellings of the name of Brychan's son Clydwyn in versions of the Brychan tract. The first element of Clydwyn is probably *clyd* 'praise, fame' < Celtic **klut-* (whence ModW *clod*).¹²⁷ The pretonic vowel in *clyd-* underwent the changes /u/ > /ö/ in the sixth century and /ö/ > /ə/ by the ninth century.¹²⁸ The last stage is represented in the Harleian genealogies by *i*, as in *Clitauc* (HG 26),¹²⁹ and the intermediate /ö/ stage might also be represented by three spellings in the pedigree of the kings of Dyfed (HG 2): *Cloten*, *Clotri* and *Gloitguin* (the latter probably representing Clydwyn).¹³⁰ Among versions of the Brychan tract, the /ə/ in Clydwyn is represented by *y* in *De situ Brecheniauc* and *Cognacio Brychan* (*Clytguin* DSB 11.3, *Clytwyn* CB 14.3), by *e* in the best witness to the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies (*Kletwyn* LIIG 1.2.2) and in the more corrupt *Llyma Frychan Brycheiniog a'i Blant* (*Glewyn* LlFB 2.2), and by *i* in the Jesus College 20 genealogies (*Clitwin* JC 2.3). The rubricator of Jesus College 20 subsequently expuncted the *i* in *Clitwin* and wrote *y* above it instead. It is difficult to say whether the form with *i* in the Jesus College 20 genealogies originated in the Brychan tract's archetype, or whether, for instance, an original *y* was changed to *i* during transmission, perhaps at the hands of an early thirteenth-century scribe employing a 'y-shy' orthography.¹³¹

The remainder of this section discusses Old Welsh spellings with *e* for the diphthongs /ei/, /ui/ and, possibly, /oi/, which were sometimes overlooked or misunderstood by copyists of the Jesus College 20 genealogies.¹³² These are more easily identified than the cases

¹²⁷ *LHEB* 677 (for OW *Clitauc* < Brit. **klutācos*); *CIB* 147 n. 872.

¹²⁸ For the spelling of these sounds in Old Welsh, see Sims-Williams, 'Emergence', 36–47.

¹²⁹ Other examples involve textual corruptions: thus, both [C]*linog* in HG 7 and *Glithoth* in HG 18 are probably corruptions of *Clit(g)no* (cf. *Clidno* in LL 279). The scribe of HG 18 may have produced the form *Glithoth* due to the influence of Anglo-Saxon names in *-noth*: compare *Gueinoth*, the preceding name in the same pedigree, discussed above, ???.

¹³⁰ Jackson (*LHEB* 607) thought that the *o* spelling of *Clotri* (found also in LL 176–8 and 184–5) represents /o/, making this name an exception to *i*-affection (perhaps influenced by *clod*), but Sims-Williams (*CIB* 147 n. 872) observes that it could simply represent /ö/ < /u/. If the latter, the name should be written in modern Welsh as 'Clydri' (contrary to usual practice).

¹³¹ Cf. Russell, 'Scribal '(in)competence', 169; Russell, 'What did medieval Welsh scribes do?', 92.

¹³² For the former, see Watkins, 'Points of similarity', 138–40; Jenkins and Owen, 'Welsh marginalia', ii, 118–19. For the latter two, see Sims-Williams, 'Emergence', 47–63.

discussed above, since the relevant spellings in *e* are very unlikely to have been created after the Old Welsh period.

JC 3.6 Kyngar
DSB 12.7 Kehingayr
CB 15.7 Keyngair
LIIG 1.3.11 Keyngar
LIFB 3.8 Riangar
cf. LL 207–8 Ceincair

The first element is *cain* ‘fine, fair, beautiful’, but the second element is uncertain.¹³³ In *De situ Brecheniauc*, a *h* has been used to indicate the diphthong, as is occasionally found elsewhere in Old Welsh orthography (e.g. *luhyn* for *llwyn* ‘bush; copse’ in *Braint Teilo*).¹³⁴ JC 3.6 confuses the name of Brychan’s daughter Ceingair with the masculine name Cyngar. This probably arose because an exemplar spelled the diphthong in the first syllable as *e*, which was misinterpreted as /ə/.

JC 5 Tep\$yll
GM 1 Taithpwyll
HG 10 Telpuill
VS *Cadoci* Teilpuill

¹³³ The spellings in JC 3.6, LIIG 1.3.11 and LIFB 3.8 suggest that the second element is *câr*, ‘kinsman, friend’, as in names like Cyngar: for this element, see Eric P. Hamp, ‘On some Gaulish names in *-ant-* and Celtic verbal nouns’, *Ériu* 27 (1976), 1–20, at 4–6; for relevant names, see Melville Richards, ‘Gwŷr, gwragedd a gwehelyth’, *THSC* (1965), 27–45, at 31. On the other hand, the earlier, and probably better, spelling in DSB 12.7 (supported by CB 15.6) suggests that the second element is something else, as in LL 207–8.

¹³⁴ Russell, ‘Scribal (in)competence’, 144–5. The same is probably seen in *Mahelgun* in DSB 12.9. In JC 16, a *h* is used to indicate the vowel hiatus in *Cedehern* (unless this is another example of *h* indicating weakened /ɣ/; see above, ???). Cf. CIB 222–3 and 280.

LIIG 11.1.4 Tydbwyll

tail ‘dung, excrement’ + *pwyll* ‘deliberation, care; prudence, wisdom; nature, disposition; meaning, significance’. This may seem like an unlikely name, but it need not have been real, since it occurs in the ‘prehistoric’ portion of the pedigree of Coel Hen, progenitor of the Men of the North. Derogatory names and epithets were often given to legendary Northerners, probably reflecting the extent to which the ‘Old North’ became a literary arena for comedy and farce as much as for heroism and valour: consider, even in the Harleian genealogies, *Letlum* ‘ragged one’ (HG 12) and epithets like *clop* ‘lame, limping’ (HG 9), *bulc* ‘gappy, defective’ and *moilmut* ‘bald-mute’ (both HG 10, like *Telpuil*).¹³⁵ Such epithets proliferate in later writing about the Men of the North. Thus, Urien’s grandfather emerges as Meirchion Gul ‘the Lean’ (LIIG 11.1.2), Clydno Eidyn’s brother is called Cynfelyn Drwsgl ‘the Awkward, Clumsy’ (BGG 3), and a charming line of Dyfnwal Hen’s descendants are listed as ‘Brwydr Ddiriaid ap Gwyddien Astrus ap Deigr ap Dyfnwal Hen’ (lit. ‘Evil Battle son of Gwyddien the Abstruse son of Tear-drop son of Dyfnwal the Old’, LIIG 9.3.1). The obscure and unique name ‘Teilbwyll’ was generally reinterpreted by later scribes, as seen in the Jesus College 20 genealogies, where the initial *Te-* of a form like HG 10’s *Telpuil* (with *e* for /ei/) was perhaps interpreted as hypocoristic *ty-* (as in Tysilio, Teilo, etc.).¹³⁶

JC 16 Noe

cf. HG 2, 15 Nougoy

cf. JC 8 Neuue

¹³⁵ Note that, in the Harleian genealogies, ‘Lledlwm’, the grandfather of Gwrgi and Peredur, is an independent character, whereas in later texts he is merged with Grwst, great-grandfather of Urien, to create ‘Grwst Ledlwm’. This is why, in later pedigrees, Lledlwm’s father Cenau is inserted into Urien’s pedigree as Grwst’s father (e.g. JC 5).

¹³⁶ For the hypocoristic construction, see the references in D. Ellis Evans, ‘A comparison of the formation of some Continental and early Insular Celtic personal names’, *BBCS* 24 (1972), 415–34, at 426.

cf. JC 12 Nennue
 cf. GM 3 Neyney
 cf. LIIG 38.1 Nowy

This name derives from Latin *Nōē* (Noah).¹³⁷ JC 16's *Noe* may well preserve *e* for /ui/, which was a common spelling until the late eighth century, when it was replaced by *ui*.¹³⁸ Both spellings of this name are found in the Book of Llandaf: the fabricated charter 77 spells the name of Nowy ab Arthur, a seventh-century king of Dyfed, as *Noe*, whereas tenth-century charters spell Nowy ap Gwriad's name as *Nogui* or *Nougui*.¹³⁹ Again, a fragment of an early charter apparently preserved in St Davids in the sixteenth century is said to have mentioned *Noe rex Demetiae*, the same seventh-century king, using the early spelling.¹⁴⁰ Alternative explanations could be offered for the spelling *Noe* in JC 16. For instance, there may have been influence from the biblical Noah, whose name continued to be spelled as *Noe* in Welsh genealogies of the thirteenth century and later.¹⁴¹ But the same name is spelled elsewhere in the Jesus College 20 genealogies as *Neuwe* (JC 8) and *Nennue* (JC 12, where the minims are uncertain), which seem to be attempts to update Old Welsh forms like *Nougoy* in the Harleian genealogies (*Neuwy* elsewhere in Middle Welsh).¹⁴² If JC 16 genuinely preserves *e* for /ui/, it

¹³⁷ Egerton Phillimore *apud* Owen, *Description*, iii, 201 n. 2 and 266–7 n. 1; J. Vendryes, 'Gallois Noé, Neuwy, Nouguy', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 43 (1946), 32–7.

¹³⁸ Sims-Williams, 'Emergence', 59.

¹³⁹ *LL* 77, 217–22 and 243–5.

¹⁴⁰ Egerton Phillimore *apud* Owen, *Description*, i, 246–7 n. 1 (cf. iv, 428–30); Robin Flower, 'William Salesbury, Richard Davies, and Archbishop Parker', *NLW Journal* 2 (1941–2), 7–16, at 11; Richard Davies *apud* William Salesbury, *Testament Newydd ein Arglwydd Jesu Christ* (London, 1567), b.iv verso; cf. Caroline Brett, 'John Leland, Wales, and early British history', *Welsh History Review* 15 (1990–1), 169–82, at 179–81; Sims-Williams, *Book of Llandaf*, 14–15.

¹⁴¹ *HGK* 2, *LIIG* 11.1, *MG* 1 (the Mostyn genealogies, edited in *MWG* 429–30), etc. The same is found in Thomas Jones (ed.), *Y Bibyl Ynghymraec: sef Cyfieithiad Cymraeg Canol o'r "Promptuarium Bibliae"* (Cardiff, 1940), 8 and Henry Lewis and Pol Diverres (eds), *Delw y Byd: Imago Mundi* (Cardiff, 1928), pp. 35 (A text, chap. 16, l. 12) and 36 (A text, chap. 19, l. 13); cf. Natalia I. Petrovskaia, 'La disparation du *quasi* dans les formules étymologiques des traductions galloises de l'*Imago Mundi*', in Elise Louvriot (ed.), *La Formule au Moyen Âge* (Turnhout, 2012), 123–41, at 136–7. My thanks to Natalia Petrovskaia for assistance with the reference to *Delw y Byd*.

¹⁴² Cf. *Nevuy* (A. O. H. Jarman (ed.), *Llyfr Du Caerfyrddin* (Cardiff, 1982), poem 22.22 = R. Geraint Gruffydd, 'Awdl fawl ddiennw i Hywel ap Goronwy', in J. E. Caerwyn Williams (ed.), with Peredur I. Lynch, *Gwaith*

would be a rare thing indeed in the medieval Welsh genealogical corpus, which almost never preserves orthographical features that necessarily antedate the ninth century. The only other example that can tentatively be produced is *Geneda\$*c: although absent from the earliest versions (e.g. in the Harleian genealogies), the names *Iago m. Geneda\$*c are found inserted into most later versions of Cunedda's pedigree, such as JC 6 (*Iago m. Geneda\$*c), LIIG 11.1 (*Iago ap Genedawg*) and HGK 1 (*Yago m. Guidauc*). The earliest appearance of these names, oddly, is in the genealogical preface of the early twelfth-century Life of St Gurthiern, preserved in the Cartulary of Quimperlé, where they are *Iacob filii Genethauc*; this preface was probably constructed with the aid of the *Historia Brittonum* and a text like the Harleian genealogies.¹⁴³ Given the association with Gwynedd, it is tempting to see *Geneda\$*c as containing *wēneð* < *wēnijā* 'Gwynedd' + nominal suffix *-og*, thus preserving *e* for /ui/ in the first syllable.¹⁴⁴ Perhaps he was a Venedotian hero recorded in some early written source, only later to be drawn into Cunedda's ancestry. If so, the name would have been originally spelled with an initial *u-* or *gu-*, rather than *g-*, but, if *Geneda\$*c really does represent a partially updated version of a name first written down between the sixth and eighth centuries, the initial *g-* could be explained as a mistaken attempt to update the spelling.¹⁴⁵

If *e* was used for /ui/ in an early version of JC 16, it is possible that the final *-oe* in *Kanhaethoe*, another name in JC 16, was wrongly modernised from an earlier spelling in *-e*, since the final diphthong in this name is probably *-ui/* rather than *-oi/*. That said, *oi* does

Meilyr Brydydd a'i Ddisgynyddion, Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion 1 (Cardiff, 1994), poem 1.22); *Nev\$y* (Nerys Ann Jones and Ann Parry Owen (eds), *Gwaith Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr II*, Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion 4 (Cardiff, 1995), poem 16.184); *Nefwy* (Marged Haycock (ed. and trans.), *Prophecies from the Book of Taliesin* (Aberystwyth, 2013), poem 1.1 and 1.8).

¹⁴³ MWG 86–90.

¹⁴⁴ For 'Gwynedd', see Schrijver, *Studies*, 250 and *CIB* 23; for further references, see *CIB* 191 n. 1170. Paul Russell points out to me that, if this interpretation of *Geneda\$*c is correct, the derivation must be secondary, in the sense that the nominal suffix was added to the base after /j/ > /ð/ around the fourth or early fifth centuries (*LHEB* 353–6 and 694).

¹⁴⁵ Compare *Gedianus* in the Book of Llandaf's version of the Life of St Samson (*LL* 19–20); this is *Guedianus* in manuscripts of the First Life of St Samson and *Widianus* in the Second Life of St Samson: Pierre Flobert, *La vie ancienne de Saint Samson de Dol* (Paris, 1997), 217 n. 48.4.

occur in Old Welsh as an alternative spelling of /ui/ (e.g. OW *loinou* for ModW *llwynau*), and in Middle Welsh *oe* can be seen to alternate with *wy* in certain spellings (e.g. *oeth*, *wyth* ‘eight’).¹⁴⁶ One of these factors may instead lie behind the final *-oe* of *Kanhaethoe*. The same possibilities could account for the diphthong spelling in *Adroes* for *Athrwys* (JC 9, also discussed above), a name which seems to be attested in an eighth-century Llancarfan charter as *Andres*, probably with *e* for /ui/.¹⁴⁷ A further twist is offered by another form in JC 16: *Bredoe*, seemingly for *Brydw*. This name occurs in Old Welsh contexts as *Brittu* (HG 23) and BRITU (Pillar of Eliseg).¹⁴⁸ In Old Breton, the same name is attested as both *Britou* and, with a final diphthong, as *Britoei*; the former may have developed from the latter in a manner comparable to Welsh *Gronw* < *Gronwy*.¹⁴⁹ If the same development accounts for the Old Welsh name *Brittu*, then JC 16’s *Bredoe* may preserve the earlier form with the final diphthong *-/ui/*, spelled *-oe*, just as, seemingly, in *Kanhaethoe*.

JC 14	Gwedgad
GM 4	Gweddgat
HB (Harl.) §49	Gaidcant
HB (Vat.) §26	Guoidcant
Leb. Bret. §41	Guodicant

This is another name from the pedigree of the early kings of Buellt, an Old Welsh version of which is preserved in recensions of the *Historia Brittonum*. As ever, the Jesus College 20

¹⁴⁶ For the Old Welsh spellings, see Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 51; Paul Russell, *Reading Ovid in Medieval Wales* (Columbus, 2017), 156; for the Middle Welsh spellings, see *GMW* 4; *LHEB* 380.

¹⁴⁷ *VS Cadoci* §65. Some questions concerning this name are discussed in Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 52.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *CIB* 87 n. 436.

¹⁴⁹ *CIB* 194; cf. Rodway, *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature*, 130 and n. 369; for other Old Breton examples, see Léon Fleuriot, *Le vieux Breton. Éléments d’une grammaire* (Paris, 1964), 402. The Breton forms are found respectively in A. de Courson, *Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Redon en Bretagne* (Paris, 1863), nos 9 and 147.

genealogies and *Gwehelyth Morgannwg* share a common source, in which, in this case, OW *cant* had been misconstrued as OW *cat* ‘battle’, perhaps due to an overlooked nasal suspension mark.¹⁵⁰ The first element could be subject to various interpretations, as has been discussed by Sims-Williams in the context of the Book of Llandaf: for instance, it could be interpreted as *gwaedd* < **gwoedd* ‘clamour, host’, *gŵydd* ‘presence, face’ or ‘wild’, or even *gwýdd* ‘forest’.¹⁵¹ If all the forms above are taken into account, a case could be made for the first element of this name being **gwoedd*, with the *Gaid-* of Harley 3859 spelling the vowel change to *gwaedd*. If so, JC 14 and GM 4 may preserve an early spelling with *e* for /oi/. A very similar range of forms (*Guednerth*, *Guoidnerth*, *Gaidnerth*) has been preserved in the early charter evidence for what appears to be a single name, but, as Sims-Williams has cautioned, the etymology of this name (as with *Guoidcant* etc.), and thus the significance of the spellings, remains fundamentally uncertain.

MISREADING INSULAR SCRIPT

During the early medieval centuries, Wales was firmly part of an Insular script province that also included Ireland, England and Brittany.¹⁵² Perhaps the earliest extant manuscript of Welsh origin is the *Liber Commonei* (Oxford, Bodleian Library, F. 4. 32, part iii, fols 19–36), written sometime in the first half of the ninth century, which briefly (on fol. 22r) demonstrates the Insular hierarchy of scripts in action, with an Insular Half Uncial majuscule

¹⁵⁰ For problems with interpreting *cant*, see D. Ellis Evans, ‘Some Celtic forms in *cant*’, *BBCS* 27 (1977), 235–45.

¹⁵¹ Sims-Williams, ‘Emergence’, 52 and 60–1.

¹⁵² For introductions to Insular script, see Julian Brown, *A Palaeographer’s View*, ed. Janet Batley, Michelle P. Brown and Jane Roberts (London, 1993), esp. chap. 8 (with Dumville, *Palaeographer’s Review*, i, chap. 2) and Michelle P. Brown, ‘Writing in the Insular world’, in Richard Gameson (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Volume I: c.400–1100* (Cambridge, 2011), 121–66. For the most important early Welsh manuscripts written in Insular script, see W. M. Lindsay, *Early Welsh Script* (Oxford, 1912).

used alongside an Insular set minuscule.¹⁵³ Two Gospel books, the Hereford Gospels (s. viii/ix) and the Lichfield Gospels (s. viii), might represent earlier examples of Welsh book production, but this remains uncertain, especially in the latter case.¹⁵⁴ From c. 850, Welsh (and Cornish) scribes followed their Irish counterparts by adopting a series of new practices, relating mostly to abbreviations, that together constitute what has been called the ‘Late Celtic’ variety of Insular script.¹⁵⁵ Late Celtic Insular minuscule is the script used in all Welsh manuscripts from c. 850 to c. 1100, aside from a single column in the Corpus Martianus Capella manuscript (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 153, part i, fol. 17r, dated c. 850 × c. 930) written in a hybrid Insular/Caroline script.¹⁵⁶ Although there are no features of Welsh specimens of Late Celtic minuscule that can be regarded as decisively ‘Welsh’, there are several characteristic tendencies that can together suggest a Welsh origin for a particular scribe or manuscript.¹⁵⁷ Thus, it has been plausibly suggested, solely on palaeographical grounds, that the two leaves constituting the ‘Lambeth Passional’ (Lambeth Palace Library, 1230) were written in Wales, perhaps in the eleventh century.¹⁵⁸ Similarly, a Welsh origin has been suggested on palaeographical grounds for BL Harley 5228, fol. 140 (s.

¹⁵³ See the facsimile edition: R. W. Hunt, *Saint Dunstan’s Classbook from Glastonbury* (Amsterdam, 1961). The manuscript has also been digitised: see the catalogue entry at https://medieval.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/catalog/manuscript_675.

¹⁵⁴ Richard Gameson has argued that the Hereford Gospels were written in Wales: ‘The Insular Gospel book at Hereford cathedral’, *Scriptorium* 56 (2002), 48–79, at 72–4. The Lichfield Gospels were given to the church of Llandeilo Fawr early in the ninth century, but the book’s origin is unknown (see Chad 1: Jenkins and Owen, ‘Welsh marginalia’, i, 50). Michelle Brown has expressed doubt about the possibility that the Lichfield Gospels were written in Wales, but for the most part Brown’s argument is based on the highly dubious premise that the ‘Hiberno-Saxon cultural orbit is not known to have embraced Wales’ (p. 64): ‘The Lichfield / Llandeilo Gospels reinterpreted’, in Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones (eds), *Authority and Subjugation in Writing of Medieval Wales* (New York and Basingstoke, 2008), 57–70. For other problems with Brown’s argument, see Gifford Charles-Edwards and Helen McKee, ‘Lost voices from Anglo-Saxon Lichfield’, *Anglo-Saxon England* 37 (2008), 79–89, at 79 n. 1.

¹⁵⁵ Late Celtic features are summarised in Dumville, *Palaeographer’s Review*, i, 125; McKee, *Cambridge Juvenus Manuscript*, 3–4; and Elizabeth Duncan, ‘The Irish and their books’, in Roy Flechner and Sven Meeder (eds), *The Irish in Early Medieval Europe: Identity, Culture and Religion* (London, 2016), 214–30, at 223–4.

¹⁵⁶ T. A. M. Bishop, ‘The Corpus Martianus Capella’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 4 (1964–8), 257–75, at 263.

¹⁵⁷ McKee, *Cambridge Juvenus Manuscript*, 6.

¹⁵⁸ Dumville, ‘Palaeographical considerations’, 248 n. 4 and ‘Ystyriaethau palaeograffegol’, 21 n. 14, and at greater length Conway, ‘Towards a cultural context’, 12–13, both following the opinion of N. R. Ker *apud* E. G. W. Bill, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in Lambeth Palace Library: MSS. 1222–1860* (Oxford, 1972), 60–1.

xi, prov. Worcester) and Columbia, University of Missouri Library, Fragmenta manuscripta, F. M. 2 (s. ix, prov. Winchester by s. xⁱⁿ).¹⁵⁹ Generally, however, one has to rely on features like vernacular glossing in order to suggest a Welsh origin or provenance for an early medieval manuscript. For instance, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 516 was written probably in north-east Francia in the third quarter of the ninth century and was in England by the second half of the eleventh century (prov. Salisbury by s. xivⁱⁿ), but in the tenth century the Brittonic name *Guoroithon* was added in the top margin of fol. 9r in Insular script, probably by a Welsh or Cornish scribe (though not Breton, since Insular script was abandoned in Brittany in the middle of the ninth century).¹⁶⁰

The early twelfth century seems to have been the decisive point in Wales when Insular script was abandoned in favour of Caroline minuscule for writing Latin manuscripts.¹⁶¹ However, Daniel Huws has raised the interesting possibility that Insular script continued to be used for vernacular manuscripts in some parts of Wales for the following century and a half, perhaps accounting for why no vernacular manuscripts survive from before c. 1250; after this time, he posits, the increasingly unfamiliar Insular manuscripts would have been discarded in favour of newer Gothic ones.¹⁶² Some support for this notion is

¹⁵⁹ For Harley 5228 (and the related Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian 431, copied in Worcester early in the eleventh century from an Insular Celtic, and quite possibly Welsh, exemplar, and continued in the early twelfth century when it received the Welsh gloss *duglas*), see K. A. Lowe, 'Worcester and Wales: copies of the *Regula pastoralis* in the early Middle Ages', in E. Kwakkel (ed.), *Vernacular Manuscript Culture 1000–1500* (Leiden, 2018), 25–48; cf. David N. Dumville, *The Early Mediaeval Insular Churches and the Preservation of Roman Literature: Towards a Historical and Palaeographical Reëvaluation* (Cambridge, 2004), 11–12 (repr. and rev. in his *Palaeographer's Review*, ii, 131–70, at 142–3). For the Columbia fragment, see N. H. Webb, 'Early medieval Welsh book-production', unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London, 1988, 78–93. For further references to these two manuscripts, see Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Toronto, 2014), 361–2 (no. 439.6) and 580 (no. 809.9).

¹⁶⁰ F. A. Rella, 'Continental manuscripts acquired for English centers in the tenth and early eleventh centuries: a preliminary checklist', *Anglia* 98 (1980), 107–16, at 114; Thomas N. Hall and Michael Norris, 'The Chrysostom texts in Bodley 516', *The Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 62 (2011), 161–75, at 163; Gneuss and Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, 453–4 (no. 581). Hall and Norris compare *Guruthon filius Mabon* in *LL* charter 163b (= *Guordoi filius Mabon* in *LL* charter 164) and *Guruithon filius Elcon* in *LL* charter 174b.

¹⁶¹ The earliest examples are the Book of Llandaf (NLW 17110E), the Peniarth Bede (NLW Peniarth 540) and the Llanbadarn Macrobius (BL Cotton Faustina C. i, part ii): Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, chaps 7–8; Alison Peden, 'Science and philosophy in Wales at the time of the Norman conquest: a Macrobius manuscript from Llanbadarn', *CMCS* 2 (1981), 21–45.

¹⁶² Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, 37–9.

found in the Book of Llandaf (written c. 1132), where Insular letter forms are occasionally used for writing Welsh, but not Latin.¹⁶³ Should Huws's suggestion be correct, it would have important implications for understanding the transmission of Welsh vernacular literature.

Since there are certain letter forms that look very similar in Insular script but less similar in Caroline and Gothic scripts, it is possible to argue that a copy of a text that seems to confuse those letter forms derives from an exemplar written in Insular script. This argument is familiar to students of early Welsh, though it has sometimes been misapplied due to a lack of understanding of palaeographical developments.¹⁶⁴ Judging by the testimony of extant manuscripts, such confusions, especially when they recur, probably indicate that a text's exemplar was written before c. 1100. However, if there is truth to Huws's suggestion that Insular script continued to be the primary means of writing the vernacular in parts of Wales for some time after 1100, this *terminus ante quem* for the date of an exemplar written in Insular script is less firm than it may seem. With this in mind, three confusions that can arise through misreadings of Insular script are addressed below: confusion of Insular round *d* with *o*; confusion of Insular minuscule *r* with *n*; and confusion of Insular long *s* with *p*.

Insular round d

A distinctive feature of Insular script is its general use of the uncial round-backed *d* as a minuscule letter. In Wales, during the 'Late Celtic' period of Insular script (c. 850–1100), there was an increasing tendency to flatten the ascender of the round-backed *d*, to the extent that the ascender was sometimes reduced to a short horizontal stroke to the top-left of the letter's body. This tendency is already apparent in the late ninth or early tenth century, as

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 135 and 142.

¹⁶⁴ Dumville, 'Palaeographical considerations'; 'Ystyriaethau palaeograffegol'. A classic statement of the argument, with reference to poems in the Book of Taliesin, is Morris-Jones, 'Taliesin', 130 and 134–9.

seen in the Corpus Martianus Capella, and becomes more pronounced in the late eleventh-century manuscripts of the Llanbadarn school.¹⁶⁵ The reduction in the prominence of the ascender rendered the round *d* liable to be confused with the letter *o*. It was Egerton Phillimore who first noticed such confusions between *d* and *o* in Harley 3859's copy of the *Historia Brittonum*, no doubt due to that text having been copied from a tenth-century Welsh exemplar that used an especially flattened *d*.¹⁶⁶ There is at least one comparable example in the Jesus College 20 genealogies:

JC 14	Morvo
GM 4	Merini
HB (Harl.) §49	Moriud
HB (Vat.) §26	Moriud
Leb. Bret. §41	Morut

mor 'great' or 'sea' + *-udd* < OW *-iud* 'lord'. This is another example taken from the pedigree of the early kings of Buellt, which is first attested in the *Historia Brittonum*. It is likely that the final *-o* in JC 14 resulted from a misreading of a flattened Insular round *d*. GM 4 probably derives from an exemplar with the same misreading, though there the name has been reinterpreted as *Merini* (otherwise found as an epithet in the name Llŷr Merini).¹⁶⁷

Insular minuscule r

¹⁶⁵ See the examples in Lindsay, *Early Welsh Script*, pls 10 and 16–17.

¹⁶⁶ *Dinguardi* for *Dinguaroi* and *Eoguin* for *Edguin* (i.e. Edwin): Phillimore, 'Annales Cambriae', 146 n. 1.

¹⁶⁷ See *Llyma Dalm o Weheliaethau a Llwythau Cymru*, §T23.2, in MWG 417.

The hook of the Insular minuscule letter *r* was usually continued down towards the base-line, resulting in a form that could look very similar to the letter *n*. Sometimes, the shaft of the left-hand vertical stroke descended below the base-line, thereby differentiating *r* from *n* (though causing *r* to look rather similar to long *s*), but this descending stroke was more a matter of scribal preference than necessity.¹⁶⁸

JC 3.5	Drynwin
DSB 12.14	Nyuein
CB 15.14	Nyuen
LIIG 1.3.5	Nefyn
LIFB 3.13	Nevyn

Probably *nef* < **nem* ‘heaven’ + suffix *-ain* < **anĭā*.¹⁶⁹ If so, the spellings in *Ny-* in *DSB* 12.14 and *CB* 15.14 probably resulted from the assumption that *Ne-* in an exemplar represented a schwa (as in OW *emedou* for ModW *efyddau* ‘bronzes’).¹⁷⁰ *JC* 3.5’s strange form *Drynwin* should be compared with *Drein Dremrud* in *JC* 2.2, which is an error for *Rein Dremrud* (Rhain Dremrudd son of Brychan Brycheiniog). Possibly the *D-* in *Drein* was added to the name so that it alliterated better with *Dremrud*, but there may be some other reason why the same thing seems to have happened in *Drynwin*. It is much easier to explain how ‘*Rynwin*’ could have been produced from something like *Nyuen*, the form seen in *CB* 15.14: the initial *n* could have been misread as an Insular minuscule *r*, while the *e* for /ei/ could have been understood as *e* for /ui/.

¹⁶⁸ Errors of this kind are discussed productively in Morris-Jones, ‘*Taliesin*’, 134–8, though he was wrong to say that ‘confusion of *r* and *n* is less likely in copying from a late than from an earlier type of Insular script’ (p. 135): see Dumville, ‘*Palaeographical considerations*’, 247–8; ‘*Ystyriaethau palaeograffegol*’, 18–20.

¹⁶⁹ Zimmer, ‘*Die altkymrischen Frauennamen*’, 328; *CIB* 62 n. 256.

¹⁷⁰ Russell, *Reading Ovid*, 125, 154 and 167.

JC 3.10	Kynger
DSB 12.9	Kenken
CB 15.9	Kyngain
LIIG 1.3.3	Kyngen
LIFB 3.11	Gyngen

Cyngen < **kuno-kennos*. This seems to be a more straightforward instance of an *n* being understood as an Insular minuscule *r* in an exemplar where the latter letter was expected.

Insular long s

Throughout the Middle Ages, long *s* was commonly used as an alternative form to the round *s* that is still current today. The long *s* in Insular script was distinctive because the vertical shaft of the letter dropped below the base-line as a descender; by contrast, a long *s* in Caroline minuscule (and in later Gothic scripts) usually sat on the base-line. Insular long *s* was thereby liable to be confused with *p*, especially when the bow of the *p* was not closed.

Two instances of this confusion are found in the Jesus College 20 genealogies, both in the list of the sons of Glywys Glywysing (JC 5). The names of most of these ‘sons’ are eponyms or representatives of cantrefs and commotes in south-east Wales. This list of sons is textually related to the similar list found in the preface of Lifris’s Life of St Cadog, as preserved in Cotton Vespasian A. xiv.¹⁷¹ There, two sons are rightly named as *Poul* of Penychen and *Seru*, eponym of Serwynnydd.¹⁷² In JC 5, however, the same two sons are

¹⁷¹ *VS Cadoci*, pref. The two lists are compared in *MWG* 297–8.

¹⁷² Serwynnydd is possibly the same as Senghenydd: see Jenkins, ‘Regions and cantrefs’, 36; cf. Richards, ‘Early Welsh territorial suffixes’, 210.

called *Saul* and *Perun*. While there is certainly precedent for the interchangeability of ‘Paul’ and ‘Saul’, the same cannot be said for ‘Serw’ and ‘Perw(n)’.

CONCLUSION

The Jesus College 20 genealogies provide a good case study for investigating how aspects of Old Welsh orthography and Insular script could be misinterpreted by later scribes. The evidence provided by the Jesus College 20 genealogies is useful because most of the genealogies in which the relevant errors occur also survive in Old Welsh contexts: most especially in the Harleian genealogies, the *Historia Brittonum* and, from the end of the Old Welsh period, *De situ Brecheniauc*. Conversely, it should be noticed that none of the relevant errors has been identified in sections of the Jesus College 20 genealogies that concern later individuals: namely, the thirteenth-century sections focussed on Rhys Gryg and Llywelyn ab Iorwerth (JC 24–29) and, more surprisingly, the early twelfth-century sections focussed on Hywel ap Goronwy (d. 1106) and his cousin Seisyll ap Llywelyn (JC 30–33). This may be because those genealogies concern individuals who were more likely to be known to later copyists, but another explanation is that the features of Old Welsh orthography and Insular script under discussion became progressively less likely to prevail in twelfth- and thirteenth-century contexts.

Misinterpretations of Old Welsh orthographical features may be summarised as follows:

- Voiceless fricatives: Old Welsh spellings of dentals were a major headache for scribes during the Middle Welsh period, especially since medial and final *t* could represent

both /d/ and /θ/. Similarly, medial and final *c* was a problem because it could represent both /g/ and /χ/.

- Spellings with *b* or *m* for /β/ were occasionally overlooked or reinterpreted.
- Spellings showing an etymological *g* in lenition position were sometimes overlooked or misunderstood. There is also some evidence for experimentation with the use of *h* to represent a weakened /γ/.
- Spellings with *e*, which could represent the diphthongs /ei/, /ui/ and perhaps /oi/, could be subject to confusion.

It is not possible to provide a similar summary of misinterpretations of Insular script due to the paucity of relevant examples, but the cases discussed above do, at least, demonstrate that later scribes sometimes struggled to read Insular exemplars.

Finally, we may observe that some of the later texts which have been compared with the Jesus College 20 genealogies, and which similarly derive genealogical material from the Old Welsh period, were markedly more successful at interpreting Old Welsh orthography and Insular script. This is especially notable in *De situ Brecheniauc* and the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies. *De situ Brecheniauc* is usually the most reliable witness to the archetypal Brychan tract. This is not surprising, since it is likely that the archetype of the extant Brychan texts was compiled sometime in the period *c.* 1050–1150, not long before the manuscript of *De situ Brecheniauc* (Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, part i) was written.¹⁷³ Yet, it is clear that *De situ Brecheniauc* does not preserve the earliest spelling features in every respect by comparison with other witnesses to the Brychan tract. It seems that the orthography of *De situ Brecheniauc* was partially modernised at some point in transmission by someone conversant with Old Welsh orthography. In particular, some effort was made to spell lenition more

¹⁷³ MWG 133–6.

regularly, and especially the lenition of /g/ (e.g. *DSB* 12.21 *auil* beside *LIIG* 1.3.16 *gabael* for lenited *gafl*; *DSB* 12.17 *Gurind* beside *CB* 15.16 *Gurgeynt*). It is not clear when this updating would have happened. The text is preserved in a manuscript written in the late twelfth century in Monmouth priory, but there is evidence that the monks of Monmouth were not entirely comfortable with Welsh.¹⁷⁴ A consideration of Welsh orthography throughout this manuscript would throw interesting light on twelfth-century developments.

Similarly, the examples discussed above suggest that the compiler of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies was generally more successful at interpreting Old Welsh orthography than the compiler of the Jesus College 20 genealogies. I have argued elsewhere that the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies were compiled in Gwynedd (perhaps in Aberconwy abbey) between 1216 and c. 1223 by either the poet Einion ap Gwalchmai or someone closely associated with him.¹⁷⁵ This background could account for the difference in various ways. If the compiler was Einion or an associate, that person might have possessed a deeper understanding of Welsh history and literature than a compiler who was not a poet. Alternatively, this might be a matter of time and place. As discussed above, there is reason to suspect that aspects of both Old Welsh orthography and Insular script continued to be used in some parts of Wales, perhaps especially north-west Wales, during the first half of the thirteenth century. The compiler of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies may, therefore, have been able to understand earlier sources more easily than the compiler of the Jesus College 20 genealogies, who worked in South Wales perhaps in the mid- to late thirteenth century.¹⁷⁶ Further investigation of the orthography of the witnesses to the Brychan tract and the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies is likely to reveal more about the crucial transition between the Old Welsh and Middle Welsh styles of orthography in the twelfth and thirteenth

¹⁷⁴ In the saints' Lives and charters that are common to the Book of Llandaf and Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, Welsh spellings are almost invariably more corrupt in the latter: Guy, 'Life of St Dyfrig', 7–8.

¹⁷⁵ *MWG* 211–23.

¹⁷⁶ *MWG* 110–13 and 156.

centuries. With regard to early Welsh poetry, with which this article began, the evidence of these genealogical texts suggests that the when and where of the written transmission of poetry could have profoundly affected the extent to which orthographical archaisms were either recognised by scribes and correctly updated, or misunderstood and left for us to ponder.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁷ I am grateful to Paul Russell and Patrick Sims-Williams for kindly commenting on earlier drafts of this article.