

The quotatives Old Irish *ol / olsé* and Middle Welsh *heb / hebyr*



Patrick Sims-Williams

Celtica 31 (2019), 90–123

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-6nzp9-3betj

DIAS

Institiúid Ard-Léinn | Dublin Institute for
Bhaile Átha Cliath | Advanced Studies



© School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
This work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0. To view a copy of this
license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

THE QUOTATIVES OLD IRISH *OL* / *OLSÉ* AND MIDDLE WELSH *HEB* / *HEBYR*

ABSTRACT

The etymologies of Irish *ol(sé)* and Welsh *heb(yr)* and the relationship between their short and long forms remain controversial. While *ol* is clearly of non-verbal origin, *heb* and *hebyr* may be forms of a verb or verbs meaning ‘say’ or ‘follow’, or may have fallen together with such verb(s). But *hebyr* may also be compared to the syntactically and prosodically similar *olsé* and be analysed as preposition *heb* ‘past’ + demonstrative *-yr* < **sin*. If so, *hebyr* may be a deictic quotative ‘beyond that’ equivalent to *olsé* ‘beyond this, moreover’. *Heb*, if not a verb, may have been extracted from *hebyr*, just as *ol*, according to Quin, was extracted from *olsé*. Alternatively, *heb* may be a conjunction ‘and this, moreover, namely’, cognate with the Irish conjunction(s) *sech*. In an Appendix it is shown that the definite article was very rare before personal names in early Welsh (unlike Middle Irish), casting further doubt on the theory of Pedersen and Thurneysen that *y(r)* in ‘heb y Peredur’ etc. is the article.

ONE of the Modern Welsh words for ‘says, said’ — *eb* (also *ebe*, *ebr*, and *ebra*), used (like *medd* ‘says’) to quote direct speech — is attested in just one Old Welsh manuscript: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 153 (c. 900).¹ This has seven examples of *hepp* and one of *hep* in its glosses on Martianus Capella, such as *hepp Philologia* and *hep Geometria* (Falileyev 2000: 83). The Old Breton cognate *hep* is similarly rare, occurring only in Angers, Médiathèque Toussaint, MS 477 (dated 897), in two glosses on Bede: *hep Augustus* and *hep Teopil in suo libro* (Fleuriot 1964: 9 and 209).

The nineteenth-century Celtic philologists derived *hep(p)*, Middle Welsh *heb*, from IE **sek*^w - ‘say, speak’ (as in Old Irish *seichid* ‘declares’ and Welsh *ateb* ‘answer’, *gohebu* ‘communicate’, and *gwrtheb* ‘reply, refuse’) and this ‘obvious’ derivation remains the standard one (Schumacher 2004: 565–8).

A different approach to *heb* — a comparison with Old Irish *ol* — was suggested by Strachan (1909: 97) in his posthumous *Introduction to Early Welsh*, §151, s.v. *heb* ‘says’:

This word, of adverbial origin and uninflected, is used like Ir. *ol* to give the very words of the speaker, **heb ef** *says he*, **heb wynt** *they say*, etc.

¹On its date see O’Sullivan (2011: 36).

Before a proper name **heb** is followed by **y**, **yr**, e.g. **heb y Goewin**, **heb y Gwenhwyfar**, **heb yr Arthur**. The same is not infrequently found before a pronoun, e.g. **heb y mi** R[ed] B[ook] 32, 7, **heb yr ynteu** RB. 245, 181 = **heb ynteu** W[hite] B[ook] 386, p. 217, **heb yr ef** WB. 386 = **heb ef** RB. 245, **heb yr wynt** WB. 185 = **eb wynt** WB. p. 93^a; cf. Mod. W. **ebr**. No satisfactory explanation of this has yet been given.

The two novel aspects here are (i) that *heb* is regarded as ‘of adverbial origin’ (a ‘perverse’ statement according to Morris-Jones (1913: 377)) and (ii) that Strachan does not endorse the ‘obvious’ explanation of *y/yr* as the definite article, an explanation which to some extent remains current (e.g. Thurneysen 1918; Schumacher 2004: 568). I shall discuss (ii) later. In respect of (i), Strachan possibly had in mind an adverb not from IE **sek^w*- ‘say, speak’ but from its homonym IE **sek^w*- ‘join, follow’ (as in Irish *seichithir* ‘follows’ (: Latin *sequor*) and possibly in Middle Welsh *gohebu* ‘pass by, refuse’). The latter root may in fact be ultimately identical with **sek^w*- ‘say, speak’.² From **sek^w*- ‘join, follow’ come the Irish and Welsh prepositions *sech* and *heb* ‘without; past’, and the Middle Welsh and Middle Breton adverbs *heibyaw* and *hebiou* ‘past’ (cf. Hamp 1958–9). Some such form might come to be used to indicate quoted speech — compare the semantics of the Welsh quotative *yn ôl X* ‘according to X’, literally ‘in the track of/following X’ — and this idea may have passed through Strachan’s mind.³

Pedersen, who was already able to use Strachan’s 1909 book, silently rejected his ‘adverbial origin’ for *heb* and derived it from **sek^w*- ‘say’ in the traditional way (VKG i viii and 129; VKG ii 620–1). Apparently following but reversing Strachan’s line of thought, he suggested that Irish had used the cognate verb *sech*- ‘say’ in the same way as the Welsh verb *heb*, and that *sech*- ‘say’ got misinterpreted as the homophonous preposition *sech* ‘(past, beyond)’ and was then superseded by the synonymous preposition *ol*, giving rise to a verb *ol* ‘says’, with *olse/olsé* owing its *s* to a hypothetical *s*-preterite **sech-s* (presumably from **sek^w Vst-?*).⁴ This clever hypothesis has won no support (cf. García Castillero 2017: 71).

Thurneysen (1918), on the other hand, in a generally overlooked note, maintained that Welsh *heb* ‘inquit’ is not a verb, despite appearances, but ‘die Präposition oder Konjunktion *heb* = ir. *sech*’, so that Middle Welsh *heb y Peredur* ‘says/said Peredur’ is really ‘nämlich der (erwähnte) Peredur’.⁵ This statement is confusing: Welsh *heb* is attested as a preposition (one which

²Rix (2001: 526 n. 1). The two meanings of Welsh *gohebu* (‘communicate’ and ‘pass by, refuse’) may reflect the two roots: Lewis (1931: 173), and GPC s.v. *gohebaf*. *Gohebu* should possibly be added alongside Irish *seichithir* in LEIA S-62 and Schumacher (2004: 564).

³In mentioning Welsh *ôl* I do not mean to imply that it is related to any of the Irish words *ol*, although that has been suggested; see Thurneysen (GOI 301–2 and 559); LEIA O-18; and references in García Castillero (2017: 68 n. 5).

⁴VKG ii 141. Cf. Meid (1970: 109) = (2015: 130). One problem here, as noted by García Castillero (2017: 71, n. 6), is that *seichid* forms a long-*i* preterite (see n. 15 below).

⁵Here Thurneysen seems to equate the preposition *sech* with *sech* ‘namely’ (eDIL s.v. 3 *sech*), but see GOI 550 and LEIA S-62. He compares the *y* in *heb y Peredur* with OIr *intí* ‘the aforesaid’ +

lenites — unlike *heb* ‘says’), but not as a conjunction, unlike Irish which has one or possibly two distinct conjunctions: *sech* ‘namely’⁶ and *sech* ‘besides, moreover’.⁷ A further problem with Thurneysen’s suggestion is his mistaken assumption that the article could be used before personal names in Middle Welsh, as in German *der Peredur* (see Appendix below).

In classifying Irish *ol* ‘says, said’ as ‘adverbial’ Strachan agreed with received wisdom at the time, subsequently rejected by Quin as ‘patently impossible, *ol* being unstressed and adverbs in Irish being stressed’ (Quin 1960: 98). Quin preferred to identify *ol* with the preposition *ol* ‘beyond’, and suggested that *ol se/ol sé*, originally meant ‘beyond this, furthermore’, with *ol* + stressed neuter accusative pronoun *se/sé* < **sio(d)* (GOI 304), as in *co se/sé* ‘so far’ and *la se/sé* ‘while’. This then developed the meaning ‘says, said’ in (later attested) phrases such as *olsi Cuchulaind* ‘furthermore/says Cú Chulainn’ (TCD MS H 2.16 (1318; Yellow Book of Lecan), col. 586.1). Finally a defective verb *ol*, as already in Old Irish *ol Dia* ‘says God’, was extracted from *ol se/ol sé*, after the second element was mistaken for a personal pronoun.⁸ Quin was unsure that the *e* was lengthened ‘before, say, the eleventh century’ (Quin 1960: 101). Breatnach (2003), however, has shown that it was already long in Old Irish, which helps Quin’s case.

There have been two main objections to Quin, neither of them insuperable.

(i) Meid (1970: 108–9) = (2015: 130) has questioned the proposed semantic development from ‘beyond that’ to ‘he said’.⁹ Here recent work on ‘new quotatives’ and their semantic sources can usefully be compared, as seen by García Castillero (2017: 72–3), who links *ol* ‘says’ with *ol* ‘than’ and the English quotative *like*, as in ‘He was *like*, “You must be joking”’ (cf. French *Il est genre* [...], etc.). A rather similar proposal was made by Brian D. Joseph

personal name, sometimes preceded by the article alone ‘in later MSS.’ (GOI 299). A major difference, however, is that MW *y(r)* + PN only occurs after *heb* (and no other *verba dicendi*) whereas OIr *intí* + PN occurs in many contexts.

⁶*eDIL* s.v. 3 *sech*, used with the copula in *sech is*, etc. This conjunction is differentiated from the preposition *sech* by Thurneysen (GOI 550, §883). The meaning ‘namely’ was questioned by Binchy (1960, 86–7), but see below, n. 55.

⁷*eDIL* s.v. 2 *sech*, equated with the preposition by Thurneysen (GOI 550, §882). Semantically ‘moreover Peredur’ would be as plausible a quotative as ‘namely Peredur’.

⁸Quin (1960), *passim*, accepted by Griffith (2013: 57): ‘While the syntax of *ol* is clearly verbal in Old Irish, its origin is equally clearly prepositional/adverbial *ol* (Quin 1960).’ If taken as an originally present tense verb, *ol* would be peculiar in form, since it could only be conjunct (the same applies to W. *heb*, and on this account Thurneysen (1918) objected to taking *heb* as a verb). Arguably, however, a conjunct would be appropriate since ‘says he’ in Indo-European may have been sentence-initial (Dressler 1969) — unlike Welsh and Irish *heb/ol* — and the conjunct may have been used for inherited sentence-initial verbs in Celtic, as reflected in the Old Irish responsive (Sims-Williams 1984: 170–1). On the syntax of *heb/ol* see below. If taken as an originally past tense verb, *ol* could perhaps be a suffixless preterite (cf. *sích* ‘said’), a category which had no absolute/conjunct distinction. (The non-palatal /l/ of 3 sg. *ol*, if proclitic (see below), might be attributed to ‘depalatalization, common in clitics’, to quote Schrijver (1997: 24), in another context). For *se* see GOI 303–4 and *eDIL* s.v. 1 *so* and for the vowel *é* (lengthened under the stress) see Breatnach (2003: 138 and 140). The latter agrees with Quin that ‘the *sé* most likely was historically the demonstrative’ (Breatnach forthcoming). On the etymology of *se* see Schrijver (1997: 22–7) and Katz (2001: 3).

⁹Quin (1960: 98), does indeed write ‘beyond that’, but means ‘beyond this’.

for the Hittite quotative particle *-wa(r)*, which he would connect not with the verb *weriya-* ‘say, speak’ (Rix 2001: 689), but with adverbial *iwar* ‘like’ (Joseph 1981; Joseph and Schourup 1982/3; Joseph 2003a; Joseph 2003b; cf. Hock (1982: 63 and 70); Hoffner 1993). In fact new quotatives offer a smorgasbord of semantic possibilities. The main four types are illustrated by the following three, collected in Hackney, London in 2005/6 — ‘and **this is me** “what. what’s your. what’s your problem?”’, and **he goes** “I don’t like you”, and **I was like** “I don’t like you” yeh’ (Fox 2012), supplemented from California by ‘And **she was all** “Were you in the church?” and **I was all** “yeah”’ (Rickford *et al.* 2007: 4).¹⁰ The ‘beyond this, furthermore’ explanation of *olsé* belongs in the first, ‘demonstrative deictic’, category of quotatives, also exemplified by Parisian French *T’es là* ‘*ah euh euh*’ as well as London English *This is me* ‘*let’s go now*’ (Cheshire *et al.* 2013; Cheshire and Secova 2018). The inclusion of the verb *be/être* again makes these examples slightly different from *olsé*, but compare various ‘demonstrative deictic’ quotatives translatable as ‘on that’, ‘to that’, etc., for example Finnish *Mä vaan siihen että ‘buhuu’*, lit. ‘I just **to-that** “boohoo”’ (Buchstaller and Van Alphen 2012: xiv; Buchstaller 2014: 20–2). ‘Bare deictics’ have also been noted in West African languages, for example *Mel ninε* ‘Mel said’ (lit. ‘Mel **this**’) in Adioukrou (Güldemann 2008: 351). Sanskrit *īti* ‘so, thus’ — which Quin himself compared as being ‘used at the end of a word, phrase or sentence to indicate direct speech, though an ordinary verb of saying is frequently added’ (Quin 1960: 98) — has been categorized as a ‘deictic quotative’ by Hock (1982: 46), quoting examples with ‘say’ omitted such as Vedic *‘prá vaya ápa vaya’ íti āsata taté* ‘they sit at the spread-out (sacrifice) (saying/thinking) “weave hither, weave thither”’ (cf. Buchstaller and Van Alphen 2012: xviii). The construction is in fact an obvious one; compare Milton’s verbless quotative *Thus Satan* (*Paradise Lost*, II.988). Typologically and semantically, therefore, the ‘beyond this, furthermore’ proposal is viable, and is particularly supported by parallels involving prepositions, such as the Finnish example above.

(ii) The lack of lenition after *ol*, a problem noted by Quin (1960: 98–9) himself, has been raised as an objection by Rasmussen (1999: 109–12), who would reconstruct an ablative **ól-o-ts* ‘beyond that, furthermore’, and by Kortlandt (2007: 113–15), who proposes **ol-est-*, that is, **ol* plus the particle by which he would explain the non-lenition in deuterotonic verbs (cf. Sims-Williams 2017c: 371). Perhaps the simplest way to explain the unlenited *s* of *olsé* is to suppose that as *ol-sé* came to be regarded as a verb ‘says/said’ (which must have occurred before its plural *ol-seat* was created in the Old Irish period), the *s* was generalized following the rule that non-relative deuterotonic verbs retain the radical (for whatever reason). Alternatively, if we suppose that the *s* of *olsé*

¹⁰Starting from the last, ‘all, totally’ type (Buchstaller 2014: 20 and 22) might lead one to connect *ol* with OIr *uile* ‘all’ from **ol-yo-*, although of course *she was all* and *olsé* are differentiated by the presence/absence of the verb *to be*, inter alia. (It is syntactically difficult to see the copula *is* in *olsé*, although see Kortlandt (2007: 114), rejected by García Castillero (2017: 71–2).) On *uile* see Katz (2001: 5) and De Bernardo Stempel (2003), and cf. *GOI* 500. Joseph and Schourup (1982/83) note that Tok Pisin *olsem* ‘like’ < English *all [the] same* introduces indirect speech and that *qhe* ‘like’ in the Tibeto-Burman language Lahu is a quotative following direct speech.

was originally lenited, it is conceivable that **olsé* ‘beyond that, furthermore’ became understood as **ol^h-é* ‘furthermore he/they’, with *é* taken as the Old Irish ‘he/they’ pronoun, that **ol^h-é* spawned an analogical feminine **ol^h(^h)-sí* ‘furthermore/says she’ (with /h/ unrealizable before /s/), and that in due course the analogy of this *ol-sí*, coupled with the ambiguous patterns heard in *os é* ‘and he’¹¹ and *is é* ‘it is he’, led to *ol-sé* ‘says he’ replacing **ol^h-é*,¹² eventually giving rise to *ol* + non-pronominal subjects, as in *ol Día*. Given the frequency of *he said* ~ *she said* ~ *they said* patterns in reported speech, it is likely enough that *she said* influenced *he said*. Compare Hausa, where the feminine deictic quotative *cêe* seems to have been generalized at the expense of the masculine (Güldemann 2008: 368–9).

In a discussion of previous explanations of *heb* and *ol* (other than Thurneysen’s), Dottin (1927) remarked that the use of adverbs and prepositions, rather than verbs, when citing direct speech was natural enough, comparing French *selon, suivant, d’après*. Yet he noted various objections, and argued that Breton *e-mez-an* ‘dit-il’ might be a stronger example of the use of a preposition in this function, if *mez* could be connected with prepositions such as Gothic *miþ* and Greek *meta* (despite the non-cognate dentals) rather than with Welsh *medd* ‘says’ and Irish *midithir* ‘judges’, as is surely more likely (cf. Hamp 1976: 72–3).¹³ Dottin’s ideas did not win acceptance.¹⁴ Nevertheless, there is a general similarity in the way in which *ol* and *heb* are used, as seen by Strachan, Pedersen, and Dottin. The similarity lies in both (a) syntax and (b) prosody.

(a) *eDIL* s.v. 6 *ol*, describes its usage as follows:

Used like Lat. *inquit* in direct oration and always parenthetical, generally after the opening words of the speech reported, in 3d pers. sing. or pl. (exceptionally with 1 s. pron.) and with force of present or past. In Glosses often used to refer to the speaker of words reported in the Lat. text. Often tautological, preceded by a vb. of saying introducing the quotation [...]

Since this entry was originally published in 1940, some excellent further examples have come to light in the Old Irish *Gospel of Thomas*, where sentence-initial verbs introducing direct speech (*Sích* ‘said’, *As-bert* ‘said’, and *Fris-gart* ‘answered’) contrast with examples of *ol* following the opening

¹¹Probably *os é* also meant ‘and they’ originally (Binchy 1960: 79 n. 2).

¹²Cf. Quin (1960: 97 n. 8 and 101–2). A role for *ol-sí* had earlier been suggested by Havers (1911: 33) and Thurneysen (1917: 57). See also Kortlandt (2007: 114) and García Castillero (2017: 58 and 70–2). The replacement of *é* with *sé* in *olsé* was part of a wider trend, not discussed here (McCone 1997: 177). In this process an important role was assigned to *olsé* by Greene (1958: 111), quoted and commented on by Breatnach (forthcoming).

¹³Among Welsh parallels, note ‘*Pwy bynnac*, *med seint awstin*, ‘*a garo y nep nys karo yntev [...]*’ (NLW Peniarth 3ii (s. xiii/xiv), p. 32.4–5); ‘*A gŷbythed paðb*, *med Crist [...]*’ (BL Cotton Titus D.xxii (s. xv¹), fol. 5r3–4) (my punctuation). According to Morris-Jones (1913: 378), Middle Welsh *heb* was used ‘in reporting a conversation’ and *med* ‘in citing authors [...] or in quoting an expression of opinion [...] or an answer not necessarily true’. Cf. *met paðb* in *CBT* I 9.121.

¹⁴Vendryes (1928: 106); cf. Hemon (1975: 243–4), citing Ernault (1890: 476), and Schumacher (2004: 482–3).

words of a speech, for example, *Sích in suí Sacharias*: / ‘Berith in mac uaim’, ‘Said the sage Zacharias: “Take the boy away from me”’ versus ‘*Anaid-si frium-sa*’, *ol Ísu*, / ‘*céin conid rís*’, ““Wait for me a while”, said Jesus, “until I reach him”’.¹⁵ In Middle Welsh compare the contrast between *dywedut* and *heb(yr)* in the following typical passage:

Sef a oruc Scuthyn, kyfuodi y vynydd a *dywedut*: ‘Tidi,’ *heb* ef, ‘ny wassanaethy di hediw. Miui’, *heb yr* Scuthyn, ‘a uyd gwassanaethwr hediw.’¹⁶

‘Scuthyn arose and *said*: “You”, *said* he, “shall not wait today. I”, *said* Scuthyn, “shall be waiter today.”’

Admittedly, there are examples of initial *Ol* and *Heb* but they are comparatively rare.¹⁷

(b) Quin (1960: 96 and 100) noted evidence that ‘*Ol* and its successors [i.e. *al*, *ar*, *or*, etc.] are unstressed (proclitic) at all stages of the language’ and that *olsefolsé* (> Modern *arsa* etc.) suffered a ‘loss of stress at some period which cannot be fixed’. There are several indications that *heb* was similarly proclitic. Old Welsh *hepp* appears with *-pp* in seven out of the relevant eight glosses on Martianus Capella. The scribe of this manuscript doubles consonants to indicate that a preceding vowel is short (Schrijver 1998–2000). In the normal course of events one would expect stressed OW *hep* to be pronounced [he:b], following the rules of the New Quantity System. The spelling *hepp* indicates a pronunciation [heb], presumably due to proclitic shortening. Furthermore since there is evidence that words in *h-* could lose the *h-* if unstressed (Haycock and Sims-Williams 2017: 30) it is significant that *heb* ‘says/said’ is sometimes written without *h-* in Middle Welsh. In fact the two MSS which head Huws’s chronological list of the earliest Middle Welsh prose MSS (Huws 2000: 58), namely NLW Peniarth 44 and Llanstephan 1 (s. xiii med., by the same scribe), have 66 examples of *ep* and 2 of *eb* ‘says’, versus none of *hep* or *heb*. By contrast *hep/heb* occurs regularly in these MSS for the preposition ‘past, without’, presumably because this bore more stress.¹⁸ Admittedly, other 13th-century prose MSS usually retain the *h-* in *heb/hep* ‘says’ (sometimes through orthographical conservatism?), but there are occasional examples without it: NLW Peniarth 30, col. 319 *ep* (versus 8 examples of *hep/heb*); NLW 5266B, p. 190 *eb* (versus 70 *hep/heb*);¹⁹ NLW Peniarth 16iii, fol. 44r *eb* (versus 20 *hep/heb*).²⁰

¹⁵Carney (1964: 90–105, §§29 and 42). On *sích* see *ibid.*, 157, and Breatnach (1986: 191–2), also Schumacher (2004: 567–8). Very oddly, Hamp (1975: 173), says that ‘The syntax in which [*sích*] is found is that of Welsh *heb(yr)*’ — the reverse of the truth.

¹⁶Evans (1988: 7).

¹⁷See Quin (1960: 95) and García Castillero (2017: 62 n. 3) on *Ol Patraéc*. Welsh examples are *Heb er amdyffynnur* in *Llyfr Iorwerth* (William 1960: 47), and *Heb y Brawd wrthyf yna* in Dafydd ap Gwilym (see below). Cf. Davies (1995: 199–229).

¹⁸There are occasional MW examples elsewhere of the preposition written without *h-*, e.g. *eb herlit* in BL Add. 14931, p. 16, beside *heb erlit* p. 10, and *ep echueith* in the poem in NLW Peniarth 29 (CBT VI 27.26 (p. 431)).

¹⁹*eb* is in a later hand according to Lewis (1942: 123 n. 7).

²⁰There is no phonetic distinction between *-p* and *-b* for /b/. On the whole *-p* is typical of the earlier MSS. A turning point seems to come with BL Add. 14931, which has 7 *heb* versus 1

Such spellings again suggest that (*h*)*eb* was unstressed, even though it is not normally joined onto the next word, unlike very short proclitics like the definite article *y* and relative *a*.

Thus Strachan's comparison of *ol* and *heb* is supported by their similar syntax and prosody. Pedersen, however, was probably over-ingenious in his attempt to establish a close connection between them. It is easier to consider them simply as typologically comparable speech-tags. After all, clitic-shortening of quotatives is found in other languages, e.g. Czech *pravy* 'said' > *prý* 'they say'.²¹

Despite the convergence between *heb* and *ol*, one point in favour of regarding *heb* as a verb, which seems to have passed unnoticed, is the isolated survival of a clear 3 sg. form *ny heb* 'he does not speak' in a poem by Madog ap Gwallter (second half of the 13c).²² Moreover, there are a few examples where *heb* '[he] says' occurs as a speech-tag without any following pronoun.²³ If *heb* really is a preposition, forms such as *ny heb* and the examples of bare *heb* might be explained as verbs created out of a non-verbal quotative. This is not impossible: Quin's explanations of Irish *ol*, and in particular *olseat* 'they say', with added 3 pl. ending *-at* (Quin 1960: 102; García Castillero 2017: 61), provide a parallel.

If the quotative *heb* did originate as a preposition, it must have evolved into a distinct word. This is shown by the phonetic divergence between *ep/eb* 'says' and *hep/heb* 'past, without' in the thirteenth-century manuscripts cited above, and also by the formal distinction between (*h*)*eb ef* 'says he' and the conjugated preposition *hebdau* 'without him' (Sims-Williams 2013: 45).

A possible further approach is to suppose that *heb* 'says/said' is the result of a merger between the verb *heb* < IE **sek^w*- 'say, speak' (as in *ny heb*) and the preposition *heb* 'past' < IE **sek^w*- 'join, follow' (see below).

THE -y(r) OF *hebyr*(r)

Where Strachan was agnostic about the y(r) in *heb y Gwenhwyfar* and *heb yr Arthur*, Pedersen (VKG ii 179 and 621) argued that it is the definite article (in

hep, and NLW 5266B which has 70 *heb/eb* versus 1 *hep* (p. 56). However, *hep* is preferred in NLW Peniarth 16iii, NLW Peniarth 14ii, and NLW Peniarth 14iii. There seems to be an effort to distinguish *heb* 'says' and *hep* 'without, past': BL 14931 has 20 examples of the latter, and NLW 5266B has 9. Compare NLW Peniarth 8i (s. xiii/xiv), p. 43.27–29, where *eb* 'says' and *hep* 'without' contrast: "‘hynn yssyd ryved gennyf i”, **eb** ylkawr, “pa delw ygenit ef ual ylkedernhey di **hep** gyt dynyawl o vrv ylwry”. “Duw”, **eb** yrlolant, “ay gorvc” (my punctuation). There are similar passages on pp. 44, 66, and 84. In NLW MSS Peniarth 8i–ii, 7, and 21 (all four s. xiii/xiv), *eb*, occasionally *ep*, is common.

²¹Hock 1982: 63; Martinková and Janebová 2017.

²²CBT VII 33.62. Cf. Lewis (1931: 173 and 251). For the verbal noun *hebu* see CBT II 28.32 and IV 9.173, Daniel (1999, no. 4.26 (Casnodyn)), and Roberts and Lewis (1927: 2 (Rhys Fardd, 15th c.)); for 1 sg. pres. *hebaſ* see CBT II 3.71, III 13.58, and IV 9.174; and for 1 sg. impf. *hebnw* see CBT V 26.144. The idea that some of these contain a verb *hebu* 'sleep' (Lloyd-Jones 1931–63: 771) has not been accepted. Schumacher (2004: 568) argued that *hebu* and *hebaſ* were artificial poetic creations, based on 3 sg. *heb*; he underestimated the extent of such verbal forms.

²³See below, n. 35. It is debatable whether these are all scribal errors.

passages omitted by Lewis and Pedersen (1961: 219 and 394)), comparing the use of the article in such proper names as *yr Ysbaen* ‘Spain’. Place-names are not the same as personal names, however, and Pedersen provided no Welsh examples of definite articles with personal names, apparently assuming that *yr Arthur* would be as natural expression as *der Arthur* in German. The same assumption was made by Thurneysen (1918), discussing *heb y Peredur* ‘nämlich der (erwähnte) Peredur’, in the context of his argument that *heb* is a preposition or conjunction.

It is a problem for Pedersen that there are no parallels for the use of the article after other *verba dicendi*, e.g. ***Dywawt yr Arthur* or ***Atebawd y Peredur*. In fact it is extremely difficult to find Middle Welsh examples of definite article + personal name, despite the rather vague entry in the *Grammar of Middle Welsh* (GMW 26 (§29); cf. the Appendix below). The commonest exception is in the definite article + substantive + demonstrative construction, e.g. NLW Peniarth 44 (s. xiii med.), p. 23 *yr lleyr hōnnō* ‘to that Llyr’, NLW Llanstephan 1 (s. xiii med.), p. 33 *Ar llyr hōnnō* ‘and that Llyr’, NLW Peniarth 16iii (s. xiii²), fol. 35v *er arthur hōnnō* ‘that Arthur’. Here the article is required by the demonstrative; we do not find ***y Llyr* and ***er Arthur* without *hwnnw* (nor ***Arthur hwnnw* etc. without the article). Note, too, that while Welsh and Irish avoid the article before *Duw/Día* (as noted by Pedersen), *heb y Duw* ‘said God’ is common in Middle Welsh,²⁴ corresponding to Old Irish *ol Dia* ‘says God’; this again suggests that *y* is not the article. Another such anomaly is *heb y paōb* ‘says everyone’ (Oxford, Jesus College 111 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 179r, col. 725:38 and fol. 179v, col. 726:18), for Welsh *pawb* never occurs with the article (unlike Irish *cách*). Compare *met paōb* ‘says everyone’ (CBT I 9.121).

Such considerations, coupled with the occurrence of *heb y(r)* with following pronouns, make it attractive to explain *heby(r)* as a verb (e.g. Morris-Jones 1913: 377; Lewis and Pedersen 1961: 394; GMW 154), even though Middle Welsh scribes usually leave a space after *heb*, typical spacings being *heb yr arthur* and *heb yduw*, with *y(r)* treated in the same way as the proclitic definite article, which is sometimes joined to the following word. This may well be because some scribes associated the *y(r)* with the article, consciously or unconsciously. Or possibly the spacing originated as a way of showing that *heb* was unstressed, for the natural way of (mis)pronouncing ***hebyr arthur* and ***heby duw* would have been to stress the penultimate *e*.

In *heb y(r)* the schwa *y* has generally been assumed to be epenthetic (e.g. Sims-Williams 2018a: 104 n. 244 and 162), as is implied by the modern spelling *ebr*, as well as being required by the etymologies such as **sek^w-re* proposed by those who regard *heb y(r)*, *ebr*, as a verb.²⁵ Compare the epenthesis in Middle Welsh words such as *gobyr*, *llwybyr*, and *wybyr* (Modern *g(w)obr*,

²⁴VKG ii 179; Lewis and Pedersen 1961: 219. See e.g. NLW Llanstephan 27 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 83v11–12, NLW Peniarth 32 (s. xiv/xv), p. 248.4, NLW Llanstephan 3 (s. xv¹), p. 419.

²⁵This precise reconstruction was first given by Morris Jones (1913: 377). After the loss of **-e* at the apocope, an epenthetic vowel would break up the awkward **-br* cluster. Lloyd-Jones (1912: 201) admitted the possibility of a reconstruction with a vowel between **b* and **r*. Such

llwybr, wybr). In strict verse epenthetic vowels did not count as syllables, so it is a possible objection that *heb y(r)* scans as a disyllable in its three rare occurrences in fourteenth-century poetry: ‘*Oes, heb yr un, ‘syberw wyd’* “‘Yes”, said one, “you are noble”’ (Iolo Goch (Johnston 1988: no. II.31)), ‘*Wt! eb y gwen, ateb gwyh*’ “‘Get away with you!” said Gwen, a good reply’ (Llywelyn ab y Moel (Daniel (1998, no. 13.25)),²⁶ and *Heb y Gwen, dan len loywlwys* ‘Said Gwen, under a shining fair mantle’ (Gruffudd Llwyd (Ifans 2000: 101, no. 6.45)). A possible way of explaining away the disyllabic scansion might be that *heby(r)* had no traditional syllable count, having apparently been avoided by the pre-fourteenth-century professional poets, along with 3 sg. *heb*, which is only attested in a poem by the thirteenth-century friar Madog ap Gwallter, as noted above.²⁷ With words like *gobyrr*, *llwybyrr*, and *wybyrr* it was easy for poets to know that the *y* was epenthetic, even without their craft tradition, because derivatives like *gobreu*, *llwybreu*, and *wybren* proved it (in isolation *gobyrr* etc. were aurally ambiguous and it would not be obvious whether they should be counted as poetic monosyllables or disyllables). *Hebyr*, on the other hand, had no such derivatives, and its *-yr* was temptingly similar to the (syllabic) definite article.

That *hebyr* might be a verb does not seem to have occurred to the nineteenth-century pioneers; it is not mentioned, for instance, in Dottin’s comprehensive monograph *Les désinences verbales en R en sanskrit, en italique, et en celtique* (1896). The idea is probably due to Lloyd-Jones (1912: 201–2), who makes the case fully, without reference to any earlier scholar. Admittedly it had already been briefly mentioned by his friend Ifor Williams (1908: 40; 1910: 33), but that was in student textbooks where any acknowledgement to Lloyd-Jones would have been inappropriate. It appears again in the *Welsh Grammar* of their teacher Morris Jones (1913: 377), whose lack of acknowledgment cannot be taken as implying that it was his own idea, since he rarely cited authorities, partly for the sake of concision (cf. Sims-Williams 2016: 134 and 136).

Lloyd-Jones’s cogent objections (1912: 201) to the ‘definite article’ explanation of *heb y(r)* were as follows:

a vowel would be lost and replaced by a non-syllabic epenthetic vowel (cf. Latin *imperator* > *ymherawd(y)r*); see Rodway (2013: 91).

²⁶Variants *heb gwen*, *ebe gwen*, *hebyr gwenn*, and see p. 162 where Daniel notes that *eb y* does not include the article. *Gwen* is capitalised, as a proper name, by Lewis *et al.* (1937: no. LXIX.25), and I have adopted this in translating since ‘said a girl’ does not make good sense in context. In either case, if *y* were the article we would expect *Gwen* or *gwen* to be lenited (as in Daniel (1998: 35, Atodiad i.9) *Heb y wen o ben bonedd*). *Ebr* in *Ebr y Brawd wrthyf yna* (‘The Friar said to me then’), in the edition of Dafydd ap Gwilym by Parry (1963: no. 137.19), is monosyllabic, but this reading lacks MS support and must be rejected in favour of *Heb y Brawd wrthyf yna* (DafyddapGwilym.net no. 148.19) because *ebr / hebyr* is not found before a definite article until Modern Welsh, e.g. *ebr un [...] meddei’r llall [...] ebr y trydydd* (Wynne (1703: 8); versus *eb y truan*, *ibid.*: 34); see David Willis, *Corpws Hanesyddol yr Iaith Gymraeg 1500–1850*, s.v. *ebr* <<http://people.ds.cam.ac.uk/dwew2/hcwl/hafan.htm>>.

²⁷Lloyd-Jones 1931–63: 770. Apart from the pre-fifteenth-century poetic examples already quoted, note only ‘*O bwy?’ heb ef, ‘O ba beth?’* (Dafydd ap Gwilym (Parry 1963: no. 50.22; DafyddapGwilym.net no. 95.22)), and *Ab Ieuan deg, eb un dyn* (Dafydd y Coed (Daniel 2002: no. 7.28)).

a) that *-yr* is found only in conjunction with *heb*, not, for example, with *dywed* ‘he says’; b) that, if *-yr* is the definite article we should expect mutation of the initial consonant of a feminine name, whereas we find *y Gwenhwyfar*; c) that the article would hardly be prefixed to personal pronouns, and *yr* is found followed by *ynteu*, *hitheu*, *wynt*; d) that *yr* occurs before the indefinite *un* without reference to any foregoing person.

With regard to the last point, note Iolo Goch’s ‘*Oes, heb yr un, ‘syberw wyd’*’ above and the following examples in prose:

National Library of Wales, Peniarth 11 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 19r23 *Paham heb yr vn o|r mynych*, fol. 124v20 *heb yr vn o|r lleill*, fol. 140v24 *heb yr vn o|r marchogyon*, fol. 146r25 *heb yr vn ohonunt*, fol. 164r7 *heb yr vn o|r morynyon*, fol. 165r7 *heb yr vn o vorynyon yr arglŷdes*, fol. 171r22 *heb yr un o|r morynyon*, fol. 202v10 *heb yr vn o|r marchogyon*, fol. 223v12 *heb yr vn o|r morynyon*, fol. 226v26 *heb yr vn o|r marchogyon urdolyon*, fol. 238r14 *arglŷd heb yr vn o|r meudwyeit*, fol. 267r5 *Myn vym|penn i heb yr vn*; Oxford, Jesus College 111 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 167v, col. 680:12 *arglŷd heb yr vn o|r morynyon*, fol. 178r, col. 722:38 *Och heb yr un o|r gŵraged*, fol. 180r, col. 729:1 *Je arglŷd heb yr vn*, fol. 187r, col. 757:7 *Arglŷd heb yr vn mi a|e hedrycheis*, fol. 207r, col. 837:16 *Y mae heb yr un*.²⁸

Note also that *rei* ‘some’ serves as the plural of *un*, and in that usage is used without the article (GMW 93). It is therefore difficult to see the article in *heb y rei* ‘said some’ in *Bown de Hamtwn* in NLW Peniarth 5 (s. xiv med.) 141r, col. 327:12–13 and Jesus College 111 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 223v, col. 898:4.

In Middle Welsh *hebyr* mainly occurs before vowels (and *h-*) and *heby* before other consonants.²⁹ Such preconsonantal loss of *-r* does not occur in

²⁸ Contrast: “‘Meir’ *hep* *ŋn* onadunt wynteu’ in NLW Peniarth 14i (s. xiii²), p. 30.

²⁹ *Heb yr* can also appear before an implied prosthetic **y-* (Oxford, Jesus College 119, fol. 98r14 *heb yr scuthyn*) and before *r-* (NLW Peniarth 7, fol. 33r, col. 117:20 *heb yr rolant*; NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 75r, col. 68:32, fol. 80r, col. 87:29, fol. 108v, col. 197:24 *heb yr rolond*). *Heb yr* is also frequent before *y/i|j-*, especially in the name *Yessu/Iessu*, but note also NLW Peniarth 14i, p. 21 *hep er yago* and NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 39v5 *Heb yr Ieuan*. However, *heb y* also occurs in this environment: NLW Peniarth 14ii, pp. 66, 68, 72, 78 *hep e ioseph* (versus *hep yr Yessu* pp. 68, 71, 73, 76, 78); NLW Peniarth 14iii, p. 87 *hep e iudas*; NLW Peniarth 7, fol. 57r, col. 209:1 *heb y|ludas*, fol. 60v, col. 224:1 *eb y|ludas*, fol. 60v, col. 224:8 *eb y|ludas*, fol. 60v, col. 224:21 *eb y Judas*, fol. 60v, col. 224:32 *eb y Judas*; NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 9r14 *heb y iudas*, fol. 9r17 *heb y iudas*, fol. 9r21 *heb y iudas*, fol. 16v42 *heb y / Iosep*, fol. 146v, col. 350:8 *heb y / Juor*, fol. 146v, col. 350:24 *heb / y iuor*; Oxford, Jesus College 20, fol. 42v7 *heb y Jesse*; NLW Peniarth 15, p. 2:11 *heb y Jevan*; NLW Llanstephan 27, fol. 108v4 *heb y iessu*, fol. 109v3 *heb y iessu* (cf. 109v7 *heb y iessu*), fol. 113r20 *heb y Joseph*, fol. 116r1 *heb y Joseph*; Oxford, Jesus College 111, fol. 128r, col. 528:22 *heb y iesse*, fol. 217r, col. 873:14 *heb y Josian*, fol. 217v, col. 874:26 *heb y iosian*, fol. 221r, col. 888:6 *heb y iosian*, fol. 224v, col. 902:2 *heb y iosian*. The *heby* forms suggest a consonantal pronunciation of the following *y/i|j-*. In the later Middle Ages consonantal forms such as *Siesu(s)* and *Sioseb* appear, *Sywdas* already occurring in the Red Book of Hergest (c. 1400); see Parry (1963: 433) and below, p. 115 and n. 83.

the case of other verbs such as *gŵyr* ‘knows’ and *gwelir* ‘is seen, one sees’. According to Williams (1910: 33), ‘the *analogy* of the article would suffice to change *hebyr* to *heby* before consonants’ (my emphasis; this passage is omitted in Williams (1922: 31)). According to Lloyd-Jones (1912: 202), however, ‘the loss of *r* before consonants is due to the same cause as the disappearance of the *r* of the definite article’ (my emphasis). This seems a better explanation of *heby*. In the case of the definite article, the *-r* was presumably lost because *yr* was proclitic; the same was probably true of *hebyr*.³⁰

The relationship between *heb* and *heby(r)* remains obscure. Lloyd-Jones (1912: 202) derived *heb* from *hebyr* (as did Morris-Jones (1913: 377)). Instead of invoking the loss of deponent inflection, he suggested confusion with the article by way of explanation:

when *-yr* became mistaken for the article, it was deemed unnecessary for pronouns to be preceded by it, and hence arose *heb arall*, *heb ef*, *heb hi*, &c.

An obvious objection is that only forms without *-yr* occur in Old Breton (e.g. *hep Augustus*) and Old Welsh (e.g. *hepp Philologia*), making it difficult to regard *heb* as a development from *hebyr* within Welsh (see Schumacher 2004: 568). It is conceivable, however, that Breton once had a form corresponding to *hebyr* and that its lack of attestation in Old Breton is only due to the paucity of Old Breton texts: for example only the innovative form *guid* ‘knows’ happens to occur in Old Breton, and the more archaic *goar* (: Welsh *gŵyr*, Cornish *gor*) is not attested before Middle Breton (Schumacher 2004: 701). Despite the lack of surviving cognates in Breton and Cornish, Welsh *hebyr* could thus be a Brittonic relic, and could have existed side by side with *heb*; after all, OW *hep(p)* and OBr *hep* are only attested in one MS each. The vagaries of manuscript attestation are underlined by the fact that while the [*hep/hepp* + personal name] construction occurs in Old Welsh, it is superseded by [*heby(r)* + personal name] in the extant thirteenth-century Middle Welsh manuscripts, and only starts to reappear at the turn of that century (see below): presumably [*hep/heb* + personal name] occurred in speech all along, but did not find its way into the extant manuscripts.

Hebyr has also been explained as due to misinterpreting [*heb* ‘says/said’ + *yr* ‘the’ + noun] as [*hebyr* + noun], with the supposed verb *hebyr* being generalised to other positions, for example before pronouns, as in *heb yr ef* ‘says he’ (Schumacher 2004: 568). An objection here is the lack of models for creating a verb of the shape *hebyr* (apart from *gŵyr* ‘knows’ which is hardly similar — its *y* is [i] and its diphthong is certainly not analysable as *gŵ-yr*). Also, if, for example, *heb yr arglwyd* ‘said the lord’ were misinterpreted as *hebyr arglwyd*, the latter would then mean ‘said lord’, owing to the apparent lack of a definite article, presenting a further problem. Such misinterpretation would only be possible when a double article was used: only then could **heb yr arglwyd y wlat* ‘said the lord of the land’ be reinterpreted as **hebyr arglwyd y wlat* ‘said

³⁰For a possible reflection of *hebyr* + consonant (*eb yr maccwy*) see below, n. 38.

the lord of the land'. But the double article is *extremely* rare in Middle Welsh (GMW 25; Ó Gealbháin 1991; Mac Mathúna 2013: 166 n. 34).

It may be preferable to regard both *heb* and *hebyr* as old forms which came to be treated as alternatives, distributed according to context. The usage in thirteenth-century manuscripts is as follows — always in prose, for 3 sg. (*h*)*eb*(*yr*) does not occur in poetry before the mid-fourteenth century, apart from the one example of *ny heb* in the second half of the thirteenth century.³¹

S. xiii med.

In the translations of Geoffrey of Monmouth in NLW Peniarth 44 and NLW Llanstephan 1, only *ep/eb* occurs, and then only before the 3 sg. pronouns *ef* and *hy*, never before nouns or personal names.³² The speaker in these texts may be identified in the following manner:

Ac ena *e dywaŷt Meŷryc*, 'Nyt oes le, arglwyd', *ep ef*, 'y emlad ar gwyr raccŷ'.³³

'And then *Meurig* said, "There is no reason, lord", *said he*, "to fight with those men."

The usage of *hep/heb/ep* in the legal manuscripts BL Cotton Caligula A.iii and NLW Peniarth 29 and 30 is similar, except that these also have examples where *hep/heb* is followed by the definite article + noun, e.g. *hep er haŷlŷr* 'says the plaintiff', also *hep e llall* 'says the other'. Personal names are hardly to be expected in legal texts, of course. (The slightly later legal manuscripts BL Cotton Titus D.ii and BL Add. 14931 (s. xiii²) are similar.)

S. xiii².

In NLW Peniarth 14i we have the same constructions, but also *hep* + *ŷn* 'said one', *hep* + 3 pl. *wynt*, *hep* + the conjunctive pronouns *enteu*, *hitheu*, *wynteu*, and two examples of *hep* + *er* + personal name: *hep er yago ebostol* 'said James (the) Apostle' (p. 21)³⁴ and *hep er ystyphan* 'said Stephen' (p. 23). These are cases of *hep er* (*hebyr*) rather than *heb* + definite article. There are *no* examples of *hep* + personal name without *er*. NLW Peniarth 17 (*Historia Gruffudd ap Cynan*) is similar, with *hep ef*, *hep ente*, and 5 cases of *hep* + *y* (or *e*) + personal name, as are the *Mabinogi* fragments in NLW Peniarth 6i and 6ii with 5 cases of *hep* + *y* + personal name. In NLW 5266B (*Brut*

³¹CBT VII 33.62, noted above. The earliest MS examples of any part of the verb in poetry are in NLW Peniarth 3i (s. xiii²), p. 4, which has the verbal noun *hebu* and 1 sg. *hebaŷ* in the lines *Ty heboŷ nyt hebu oed tev. my hebot ny hebaŷ vynhev* (Lloyd 1950–51: 96–7, IIB14–15; cf. CBT IV 9.173–4).

³²Cardiff 1.363 (s. xiv¹), which is closely related to NLW Llanstephan 1, is similar.

³³NLW Llanstephan 1, p. 102 (punctuation added). In the absence of quotation marks, speech-tags were important in medieval texts. See Moore (2011: passim).

³⁴The article is not expected before *ebostol* 'apostle'. See GPC s.v. (also s.v. *efangelystor*) and Lewis and Pedersen (1961: 219); cf. Mac Mathúna (2013: 161); Uhlich (2013: 439). Contrast English where it is compulsory in *the apostle Paul* but not, e.g., in *Colonel Johnson* (Hewson 1972: 108–9).

Dingestow) there are numerous examples of *heb ef*,³⁵ but also *heb hi* and *heb wynt/eb* (*wynt*), and two examples with personal names: *heb yr olfin* (p. 213) and *heb y peanda* (p. 309). NLW Peniarth 14ii has *heb/hep* followed by *ef* (once *hef!*), *hi*, *hitheu*, and *wynt*, and 13 examples of *hep/heb* + *e(r)* + personal name.³⁶ The third manuscript in that codex, NLW Peniarth 14iii, has *heb/hep* followed by *ef*, *hi*, *hitheu*, *wynt*, and *wynteu*, one example of *heb* + definite article *e* + *lleyll* ('say the others'), and two examples of *hep/heb* + *y* or *e* + personal name.

S. xiii/xiv

In the MSS which Huws (2000: 58) assigns to this period, we continue to have (*h*)*eb* + definite article + noun (e.g. *eb y|wrach* 'said the crone' (NLW Peniarth 21), *eb y melinid* 'said the miller' (NLW Peniarth 7)), (*h*)*eb* + pronoun (*ef*, *wynt*, *yntev*, *hithev*, *wynteu*, etc.), and a few examples such as *heb cyerlmaen* and *heb Iudas* (NLW Peniarth 7, fol. 21v, col. 72:24 and fol. 60v, col. 223:31), *heb yessu* (NLW Peniarth 14, p. 134.12), and *heb iessu* (NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 31r20), where *heb* immediately precedes a personal name — something not seen in the previous period, but presumably old in view of the Old Welsh evidence. Alongside the latter, however, there are many more examples of the type *eb yr oliver*, *eb y|rolant*, and *eb y turpin*, and throughout the fourteenth century *heby(r)* remains the norm before personal names. We start to see examples of *heb y(r)* before pronouns: *eb yr hi*, *eb yr wynt*, *heb yr hitheu* (all NLW Peniarth 7); and note further in NLW Peniarth 6iii (which may rather be s. xiv¹)³⁷ *heb yr ynteu* once, beside six examples of *heb ynteu*.

In other words, by c. 1300, the thirteenth-century distribution — *hebyr* + personal name versus *heb* + pronoun (including *un* 'one') and *heb* + definite article + noun — has been superseded, with examples now appearing of *heb* + personal name and *hebyr* + pronoun.

A possible explanation is suggested by the optional occurrence in this s. xiii/xiv period (lacking in s. xiii) of *heb/hebyr* before demonstrative pronouns: *eb yr hwnnw* in NLW Peniarth 8i, pp. 12.21 [twice], 12.29, 13.16, 50.11, 57.28, and NLW Peniarth 7, fol. 6r, col. 9.16 and fol. 15r, col. 45.20. Contrast *eb hwnnw* in NLW Peniarth 8ii, pp. 10.28 and 11.8 and *eb honno* in NLW Peniarth 7, fol. 63r, col. 234.15. Middle Welsh demonstrative pronouns were regularly used without the article, e.g. *o kyghor hōnnō* 'on the advice of

³⁵At NLW 5266B, p. 141 *heb* is used without following pronoun or other subject, possibly in error; Lewis (1942: 94) supplies the pronoun (*heb* occurs with *ef* earlier and later on the same page — *Rhyddiaith y 13g* needs correction here). Compare pp. 193, 207, and 254 where *ef* has been inserted after *heb* (Lewis 1942: 125 n. 5, 134 n. 7, and 164 n. 5), also NLW Peniarth 7 (s. xiii/xiv), fol. 16r, col. 49:12, *heb ef*, where *ef* has again been inserted, and NLW Peniarth 5 (s. xiv med.), fol. 67r, col. 35:3 *heb*. On bare *heb* without *ef* in anaphora see Morris Jones (1913: 377), and Sims-Williams (2018a: 165).

³⁶NLW Peniarth 16iii, by the same hand, is similar but lacks examples with personal names.

³⁷Cf. Sims-Williams (2017b: 79 n. 1): 'In unpublished corrigenda to [Huws 2000] Huws moved NLW Peniarth 6iii (in *Rhyddiaith y 13g*) to the s. xiii/xiv period, but he now places it even later, in s. xiv¹. Readings of NLW Peniarth 6iii are from *Rhyddiaith y 13g* and those from the other s. xiii/xiv MSS are from *Rhyddiaith 1300–1425*, verified in the case of NLW Peniarth 21 from the corrected text in Sims-Williams (2017a).

that [man]' (NLW Peniarth 44, p. 56), *ar honno y dodet hauren [...]* *ar hōnnō y dodet madaōc* 'on that [girl] was placed [the name] Hafren [...] on that [boy] was placed [the name] Madog' (NLW 5266B, p. 25), *A dyfod ar hōnnō* 'and coming up to that [man]' (NLW Peniarth 6i, p. 1), but the article could be used before demonstratives in various constructions, e.g. *yr ystwyffwl hwnn, a'r hwnn draw* 'this pillar and **the one** yonder' (GMW 83). It is therefore possible that some ambiguity arose as to whether a phrase like *eb yr hwnnw* 'said that [man]' contained *heb* + definite article + *hwnnw* or *hebyr* + *hwnnw*. The ambiguity could lead to innovations like *heb yr ynteu* 'said he' on the one hand (following the pattern *eb yr hwnnw*) and, on the other, *heb Iudas* 'said Judas' (following the pattern *eb hwnnw* — unless of course *heb Iudas* is a throw-back to the Old Welsh construction). The use of the definite article before other pronominalia (GMW 85) could also be a factor; *Dyoer hep e llall* "'God knows", says the other' (BL Cotton Caligula A.iii, fol. 162r, col. 2, also NLW Peniarth 29, p. 49 and BL Add. 14931, p. 24) and *nac ew heb y llall* "'No", says the other' (BL Add. 14931, p. 40), for example, could have influenced the rise of *heb yr ynteu*, etc.

If we suppose that Middle Welsh speakers had a choice between two alternative forms of the quotative, *heb* (actually attested in Old Welsh as *hep(p)*) and *hebyr*, it possible to guess why the latter had been avoided in certain contexts in the earliest extant Middle Welsh:

- (1) Since *hebyr* could be confused with **heb yr* (i.e. *heb* + article), *heb effhi/wynt* might be preferred to **heb yr effhi/wynt*, since the article was not used before pronouns, as seen by Lloyd-Jones (1912: 202). Also *heb yr hawlwr* 'says the plaintiff' and *heb y maccwy* 'says the lad' would be likely to supersede **heb yr yr hawlwr* and **heb yr y(r) maccwy* either through elision/haplology and/or because **heb yr yr hawlwr* and **heb yr y(r) maccwy* would seem to include two articles.³⁸ Hence in s. xiii med. texts we only see *heb* + pronoun and *heb* + article + noun.
- (2) In s. xiii² texts we see, in addition, *hebyr* + personal name. *Hebyr* may have been allowable here precisely because definite articles were *not* used before personal names,³⁹ so that there was no ambiguity. Hence *heby(r)* could survive in this position before personal names which indeed remained the most common context for *heby(r)*.
- (3) In s. xiii/xiv texts, we occasionally get forms like *heb Iudas*, although *hebyr* remains the norm before personal names. In addition, possibly

³⁸For another case where phonetic repetition induced a change (dissimilation in **yn yn erbyn* 'against us' > *yn yn herbyn*) see Sims-Williams (2010: 49). In extant Middle Welsh, *yr* before consonants (except when *yr* = 'r after vowels) is rare (there are no examples in *Brut Dingestow* (Lewis 1942), a very long text), but note *eb yr maccwy* 'said the lad' in NLW Peniarth 7 (s. xiii/xiv), fol. 14r, col. 41:20 (versus *eb y maccwy* at ll. 24–25), and *yr brenhin* in NLW Peniarth 21, fol. 4r 1:25 (by the same scribe). The Old Welsh form before consonants was *ir*: Falileyev (2000: 94–6).

³⁹See Appendix. In a case like Oxford, Jesus College 119 (s. xiv med.), fol. 132r8 *heb yr arglōyd Iessu* 'said the lord Jesus', the definite article *yr* is of course part of the phrase 'the lord Jesus'. ***Hebyr yr arglōyd Iessu* with *yr* twice was not an option.

under the influence of ambiguous phrases like *heb yr hwnnw* where *yr* could be interpreted either as part of a verb *hebyr* or as an optional article accompanying the demonstrative, we start to get examples of *hebyr* before pronouns, e.g. *hebyr ynteu* ‘said he’. It is not possible to rule out the possibilities that these ‘new’ *c.* 1300 constructions — *heb Iudas* and *hebyr ynteu* — were a throwback to what either existed in Old Welsh (*hepp Philologia*) or may have existed (*hebyr* + pronoun), nor that the difference between the ‘s. xiii’ texts and the ‘s. xiii/xiv’ texts is due to dialect differences rather than chronology, but such hypotheses are not necessary.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *hebyr*: TWO POSSIBILITIES

1. *Hebyr as a verb*

Lloyd-Jones (1912: 201–2) derived *hebyr* from IE **sek^w*- ‘speak’, and explained the *-yr* as a deponent ending that had resulted from confusion with IE **sek^w*- ‘follow’, which is deponent in Latin *sequor* and Irish *seichithir*. (It is worth adding here that the latter root probably appears in Welsh *gohebu* ‘to pass by, refuse’).⁴⁰ Ifor Williams’s earlier note on *heb yr* (1908: 40) — ‘the full form of *heb* = *said*. Cognate with L. *sequor*. In dialects, *eb* and *ebra*’ — may imply a semantic development of ‘say’ from ‘follow’ or it may be a condensed version of Lloyd-Jones’s explanation. It excited the ire of Vendryes (1910a: 109):

dire que *heb* ‘dit-il’ est apparenté au latin *sequor* résulte, il faut l’espérer, d’une simple bévue.

When in 1910 Williams again compared *heb yr* with *sequor*, ‘where the final *r* of the deponent corresponds perhaps to the *r* in *hebyr*’ (Williams 1910: 33), Vendryes reacted similarly:

si *heb* a un correspondant en latin, ce ne peut être qu’*(in)seque*.⁴¹

Vendryes did not, however, connect the *-yr* of *hebyr* with the article, explaining it on the analogy of *gŵyr* ‘knows’, the 3 sg. of the stem *gwydd-*. According to Vendryes, just as an impersonal **widri* ‘one knows’ < **widr* ‘they know’ (Sanskrit *vidúr*), whence Irish *-fitir* ‘he knows’, gave Welsh *gŵyr* ‘*one knows’ (> ‘he knows’), so in the same way *heb(y)r* was the impersonal ‘*one says’ (> ‘he says’) of the root **sek^w*- ‘say’ (Vendryes 1913: 141; cf. Vendryes 1927: 94).⁴² So far as Irish *-fitir* is concerned, there is a problem in that one would not expect **d* to escape lenition before /r/ and result in OIr *t* /d/, as pointed

⁴⁰See above, n. 2.

⁴¹Vendryes (1910b: 388). Williams (1922: 31) omitted the offending passage. Vendryes (1928: 105) is more clearly in favour of comparing *heb* and *inseque*.

⁴²Comparable explanations of *gŵyr* (not mentioning *heb(y)r*) are given by Pedersen (1909: 112–13), Lewis and Pedersen (1961: 310), Thurneysen (*GOI* 74 and 436), and Meid (1972–3: 346–8). Following this path *heb(y)r* could theoretically be a plural form in origin.

out by McCone and Schrijver, despite Vendryes's dubious appeal to Old Irish *cretar* 'relic' < **kred-ro-*.⁴³ A possible way round this is to reconstruct his hypothetical 'they know' form as **wintri* with **nt* (> Old Irish *t* /*d*/) introduced from the regular 3 pl. ending. This would not produce Welsh *gŵyr*, however, which the deponent suffixless preterite **wid-r-e* reconstructed by McCone and Schrijver explains nicely.⁴⁴

If we start from a comparable 3 sg. suffixless preterite **sek^w-r-e* (or **sek^w-e-r*) we get *hebyr* regularly. This would originally have meant 'he said',⁴⁵ contrasting with 3 sg. present *heb* (OW *hep(p)*) 'says'. That tense distinction could have existed in Old Welsh and Old Breton. It would explain why the two Old Welsh and Old Breton manuscripts have only *hep(p)*; 'says' rather than 'said' is the meaning required in all their glosses. Whether any distinction of tense is maintained in Middle Welsh is hard to tell, since in most contexts 'says' (present and historic present) and 'said' are equally possible.⁴⁶ Among the poetic examples quoted earlier, Madog ap Gwallter's *ny heb* 'he does not speak' has to be present, and Llywelyn ab y Moel's '*Wt!*' *eb y Gwen* and Gruffudd Llwyd's *Heb y Gwen* have to be past in context. The context is little help with Iolo Goch's '*Oes,*' *heb yr un*⁴⁷ and Dafydd ap Gwilym's '*O bwy?*' *heb ef*, '*O ba beth?*', but Dafydd y Coed's *eb un dyn* is presumably present. In Dafydd ap Gwilym, however, we have *Heb y Brawd*, which must be past in context ('said the Friar'), so apparently the poets used *heb* and *heby(r)* more or less interchangeably so far as tense was concerned. For practical purposes, languages do not need to differentiate between present and past in speech tags (as shown by Irish *ol*, Breton *eme*,⁴⁸ and Latin *inquit*),⁴⁹ so if there was originally a tense distinction between *heb* and *hebyr*, it is not surprising that it broke down.

As seen by Lloyd-Jones, Ifor Williams, and Morris Jones, a possible reason why *hebu* 'to say' < IE **sek^w-* 'say' might form a deponent was its close similarity to (and perhaps ultimate identity with?) IE **sek^w-* 'follow', which, being deponent in Irish and Latin, had presumably also been deponent at an early stage in Brittonic. It is even conceivable that the original meaning of *hebu* 'say, speak' was 'follow' rather than 'say'; 'follow' would make sense as a quotative in reporting a conversation.

⁴³Vendryes 1927: 94 (cf. *GOI* 74). See McCone (1994: 171) = (2005: 230), whose explanation of *-fitir* is criticised by Schrijver (2017: 681 n. 10). According to Lloyd-Jones (1912: 202), quoting Windisch, *ro-fitir* 'knows' owes its *t* /*d*/ to the influence of *creitid* 'believes' (< **kredd-*).

⁴⁴McCone (1986: 238) (citing Schmidt (1964)), Cowgill (1983: 83), and Schrijver (2017: 679 and 680 n. 5) (who notes **wid-e-r* as a workable alternative).

⁴⁵The present meaning of *gŵyr* is a peculiarity of that deponent preterite 'which possesses the archaic feature of expressing present meaning ("has found out > knows")' (Schrijver 2017: 679).

⁴⁶A common state of affairs with *verba dicendi*, e.g. 'I says' (in reporting a conversation) and 'She said [...] and I'm like [...] I explained. And she's like [...]' (Moore 2011: 51–2).

⁴⁷Johnston (1993: 6) translates 'said one'.

⁴⁸Hemon (1975: 244).

⁴⁹For an etymological survey of *verba dicendi* see Buck (1915: 3 n. 1; 1949, 1255–8).

2. *Hebyr* as *preposition* + *demonstrative*

Before deciding in favour of the above etymology of *hebyr*, it is worth considering whether it cannot be aligned more closely with Irish *olsé* < preposition *ol* ‘beyond’ + *se* ‘this’ < **sio(d)*. Besides **sio-*, Celtic had a demonstrative, **sin* < **sīm*, which underlies the definite article *sindo-* > OIr (*s*)*in(d)*, Old Breton and Cornish *in*, Old Welsh *ir* (cf. De Bernardo Stempel 1986; Schrijver 1997: 46–8; Katz 2001: 4; De Vaan 2015: 48). This has secondary *-n* > *-r* in Welsh and to some extent in Breton (Lewis and Pedersen 1961: 218–19; Jackson 1967: 150 n. 4 and 798–801). A combination of the Welsh preposition *heb* ‘past, beyond’ (< **sepV-* < **sek^wV-*: Irish *sech*) and the demonstrative **sin* ‘that’ could give disyllabic *heb yr* ‘beyond that, furthermore’ quite regularly. This would be a near equivalent of *olsé*. Compare Pedersen’s theory, quoted at the beginning of this paper, and Thurneysen’s apparent equation of *heb* in *heb y Peredur* with the Irish preposition and conjunction(s) *sech*.

Why should the *y* of *hebyr* < **-sin* become schwa rather than /i/? Possibly this is comparable to the development of the speech-tag *olsé* to unstressed *arsa* in Irish (Quin 1960: 100, quoted above). Proclitic **sin* would develop to Middle Welsh *y(r)* with schwa and *-(r)* in the same way as the proclitic article **sindos* developed to Old Welsh *ir*, Middle Welsh *y(r)*, also with schwa. If (*h*)*eby(r)* is derived from **sek^w-* ‘past, beyond’ + **sin* ‘that’, the difficulty of explaining its disyllabic scansion in Middle Welsh is removed.

Both the above explanations of *hebyr* have their merits, but the second avoids the need for special pleading to explain away its disyllabic scansion.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF *heb*: FURTHER POSSIBILITIES IN THE LIGHT OF *ol*

On explanation 2 above, whereas *heb* ‘says’ might be in origin a verb like Irish *seichid*, *hebyr* would be a prepositional phrase like Irish *olsé*. This looks less economical than supposing that *heb* and *hebyr* are both verbs in origin. On the other hand, if it is true that IE **sek^w-* ‘say, speak’ (underlying *heb* ‘says’) and the homophonous IE **sek^w-* ‘join, follow’ (underlying the preposition *heb* ‘past, beyond, without’) are ultimately identical (Rix 2001: 526 n. 1), we should not be surprised if they sometimes fell together. The homophony of the Welsh verbs *gohebu* ‘communicate’ and *gohebu* ‘pass by, refuse’ provides a parallel.⁵⁰

Yet if *hebyr* like *olsé* indeed originated in a prepositional phrase, it may be worth hypothesising that OB *hep* and OW/MW *hep(p)*, *heb*, ‘says’ were extracted from a preform of *hebyr* ‘beyond that’ in the same way as *ol* ‘says’ was extracted, following Quin’s theory, from *olsé* ‘beyond this’. If so, Strachan’s comparison between *heb* and *ol* would be spot on; neither of these quotatives would have a verbal origin.

Since the quotative *hep* ‘says’ occurs in both Old Welsh and Old Breton, it may go back to these languages’ common ancestor. This may imply (on the present argument) that a preform of *hebyr* ‘beyond that, says’ existed at

⁵⁰See above, n. 2.

a much older period than the Middle Welsh texts in which it is first attested. Quin (1960: 102) noted exactly the same chronological disparity in Irish, and found it ‘disturbing’ but acceptable: the type *ol Día* ‘says God’ is attested much earlier than the type *olsi Cuchulaind* ‘furthermore/says Cú Chulainn’ from which it derives, on his theory.⁵¹

In the Brittonic case the extraction of a quotative *heb* ‘says’ from *hebyr* ‘beyond that’ (< IE **sek^w* - ‘follow’) is more straightforward than that of *ol* ‘says’ from *olsé* ‘beyond this’ because a verbal stem *heb-* ‘says’ (< IE **sek^w* - ‘say’) already existed in Brittonic,⁵² whereas there is no evidence for an ancient Irish verb *ol-*. Indeed the extraction is so straightforward as to make it thinkable that the quotative *hep* arose independently in Welsh and Breton, after the languages had diverged.

Alternatively, it is not impossible that two similar-looking but independent quotatives co-existed: MW *hebyr* ‘says’ from a prepositional phrase ‘furthermore’ < ‘beyond that’ and OW/MW/OBr *hep* ‘says’ from a conjunction meaning ‘besides, moreover’ (Irish 2 *sech*)⁵³ or ‘namely, and this’ (Irish 3 *sech*).⁵⁴ If Irish 3 *sech* is correctly derived from *se* ‘this’ (< **sio(d)*) + ‘*ch*’ and’ < **k^we*,⁵⁵ a corresponding OW/OBr conjunction *hep(p)* is a conceivable quotative: *hepp Philologia* ‘and this Philologia’ and *hep Augustus* ‘and this Augustus’ would be similar to ‘Mel this’ in Adiokrou and other ‘bare deictics’ quoted above.

APPENDIX

DEFINITE ARTICLE + PERSONAL NAME IN PRE-1400 WELSH

Since *y(r)* in *heb y Peredur* etc. has often been explained as the definite article (e.g. Thurneysen (1918)), the purpose of this Appendix is to examine the evidence for the use of the article before personal names in Middle Welsh.⁵⁶ In looking for examples of *y* + *personal name*, we must pass over special

⁵¹García Castillero (2017: 71) objects that the *olsi Cuchulaind* type is ‘something of a secondary development’. A variation on Quin’s proposal would be to suppose that the development was *ol + se* ‘furthermore’ → *olsé/olsí* (*ol* + pronoun) ‘says he/she’ → *ol* + noun or personal name (instead of the pronoun), as already in Old Irish, with the *olsi Cuchulaind* type arising in Middle Irish. In addition to the *olsi Cuchulaind* syntagm, note the Middle Irish formula *arsé ar Adam [...] arsí ar Eua* discussed by Mac Cana (1984), who translates ‘said he said Adam [...] said she said Eve’. I am grateful to Prof. Tomás Ó Cathasaigh for this reference.

⁵²Even if the 3 sg. simple verb in *ny heb* in *CBT* VII 33.62 (cited above, n. 22) is dismissed as deriving from the quotative, transparent compound verbs like *górthep* ‘answer’ (2 sg. impv., *CBT* II 3.66) would have made it easy to interpret *hebyr* as containing a verb *heb* ‘says’.

⁵³Above, n. 7.

⁵⁴Above, n. 6.

⁵⁵*GOI* 304 and 550. Binchy (1960: 92) objected that ‘*ch*’ would not be attached to a stressed element, but see Watkins (1963: 11) and Charles-Edwards and Kelly (1983: 153). As to whether **sio(d)* would give Welsh and Breton *he-* see Schrijver (1997: 24–5). The following suggestion assumes that *hep(p)* escaped the delabialization seen in *ac* ‘and’ etc. (Lewis and Pedersen 1961: 44).

⁵⁶The use of the article in general in Welsh is a larger subject, discussed by R. M. Jones (1975–6) and Bob Morris Jones (1991–2), and more remains to be said (compare the book-length treatment of *Article and Noun in English* by Hewson (1972)).

cases like *yr Yessu hōn* ‘this Jesus’ (NLW Peniarth 14ii (s. xiii²), p. 71) and *y Margarit hwnnw* ‘that Margarit’ (NLW Peniarth 8i (s. xiii/xiv), pp. 70.24 and 71.15), where the demonstrative requires the article at all periods of the language. So similarly, when epithets or titles come between the article and the name, for example *y Parchedig Isaac Jones* and *y brenin Arthur*, Welsh uses the article, like many other languages, e.g. English ‘the Reverend Isaac Jones’ and French *le roi Artu*.⁵⁷

The article is also not unexpected before a ‘diminutive or pet name’, as noted by Morris Jones, citing fifteenth-century examples of *y Gutto* (for Gruffudd) and *y Bedo* (for Maredudd),⁵⁸ and it often occurs before nicknames, e.g. *y Bwa Bach* ‘the little bow’, and names of horses, e.g. *y Du* ‘the Black’.⁵⁹ Since most attestations of nicknames with the article are late (fifteenth century onwards), an earlier nickname, *y Delffled*, may be mentioned here. In the thirteenth-century manuscripts of the Welsh translations of Geoffrey of Monmouth (the *Brutiau*), and in most later ones, Geoffrey’s Saxon kings *Edelbertus* of Kent and *Edelfridus* of Northumbria both appear as *Edelflet* or occasionally as *Elflet*. NLW Peniarth 21 (s. xiii/xiv) has generally *Edelflet*/*Edlflet*, but once apparently *Delflet* in the phrase *gadv ydelflet* ‘permit to Delflet’ (fol. 37r, col. 2.12) where the related text in NLW Peniarth 23 (s. xv/xvi) has *gadv y Edelffle<t>* (fol. 99r).⁶⁰ Similarly NLW Peniarth 45 (s. xiv¹) normally has *Edelflet*, but has *Gadu y delflet* (p. 265) in this phrase. After the verb *gadu* one expects the preposition *y* (or *e* in thirteenth-century orthography), so possibly the preposition and the initial vowel of the name have been run together in NLW Peniarth 21 and 45. Nevertheless, it is likely that some textual confusion ensued, giving rise to the form *Delflet* alongside *Edelflet*. In the *Brut* in BL Cotton Cleopatra B.v i (s. xiv¹), *Delflet* is already the regular form and *Edelflet* occurs only once (fol. 101r). *Edelbertus* is at first called *Delflet* (fol. 99v19: *Pan wybu delflet*), but subsequent mentions of *Delflet* (*Edelfridus*) include the article, for example *gwedy gwybod or delflet* (fol. 100r7) and *gadu yr delflet* (100v16).⁶¹ The most likely explanation for the article is that *y Delflet* was taken to be a nickname. In Middle Welsh *del* had negative connotations and *ffled* (fem.) meant ‘deceit’ (it is used of the

⁵⁷GMW 26; Morris Jones 1991–2: 195–6; Thomas 1996: 183–4. With article + adjective/title + personal name (*y gwir Iesu*, *y brenhin Arthur*) compare English where *the great Toscanini*, *the painter Turner* are normal, but not **the Toscanini*, **the Turner*. Languages vary greatly in the use of articles before personal names, e.g. German *die Anna*, Hungarian *az Anna*, Italian *la Maria*, *il Mario*, Portuguese *a Mariana*, Armenian *Anin* (‘the Ani’) (some of these are colloquial only, and they have different nuances of meaning). These examples are taken from <https://forum.wordreference.com/threads/definite-articles-with-proper-nouns.2834983/> and <https://www.quora.com/In-which-regions-do-people-in-different-languages-speak-about-acquaintances-as-the-and-then-their-name> (both accessed 17 June 2018). See also Hewson (1972: 22 and 108–9).

⁵⁸Morris Jones 1931: 12.

⁵⁹For discussion see Sims-Williams (2018b).

⁶⁰In Sims-Williams (2017a: 140), I should possibly have printed *ydelflet* as *y | delflet*.

⁶¹See *Rhyddiaith 1300–1425* and Parry (1937: 99v–100v). *Y Delfled* is also the form used later by Gutun Owain in the Black Book of Basingwerk (NLW 7006D, fol. 187v–189v), and in Oxford, Jesus College 141 (fol. 46v, etc). I have used unpublished transcripts by Dr Katherine Himsforth.

Saxons in *Armes Prydein*),⁶² so a nickname *Y Ddelffled* would mean ‘Dirty Trick’ or similar. If *Delflet* is a nickname, the use of the article does not require any special explanation.

Leaving such cases aside, only two relevant examples of *y* + personal name are cited in Simon Evans’s *Grammar of Middle Welsh* §29: *yr Iessu* (without reference) and *y Lleuelys* in *Cyfranc Lludd a Lleuelys*, two forms already noted by Ifor Williams (1922: 11 and 16). How typical are these? *Y Lleuelys* occurs just once in the *Cyfranc*, and then only in the ‘Mabinogion’ version in the White Book (c. 1350) and in the Red Book (c. 1400), which is very close to the White Book and may derive from it or, more likely, from its exemplar (Roberts 1975: xxiii n. 1; cf. Rodway (2004: 97)):

Mŷhaf oe vrodyr y karei lud ylleuelys
(White Book, NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 48v, col. 192:14–15)

Mŷaf oe brodyr y karei lud ylleuelys
(Red Book, Oxford, Jesus College 111, fol. 174r, col. 706:1).⁶³

‘Greatest of his brothers Lludd loved the Lleuelys.’

The ‘Mabinogion’ version of the *Cyfranc* was extracted from the Llanstephan version of *Brut y Brenhinedd* and adapted to make a separate tale.⁶⁴ The article does not occur in the earlier MSS of the *Cyfranc* — NLW Llanstephan 1 (s. xiii med.), p. 59 (‘Lleuelys hagen a karey ef en wuyhaf oy (vrodyr’), Cardiff 1.363 [Hafod 2] (s. xiv¹), fol. 46v12–13, and BL Cotton Cleopatra B.v i (s. xiv¹), fol. 32r5–6 — nor in the later NLW Peniarth 23 (s. xv/xvi), fol. 28r. It may have been introduced c. 1350 in the White Book itself, or a little earlier, if the Red Book was copied from an exemplar of the White Book rather than from the White Book itself. On the basis of the use of the article in other languages one might guess that *y Lleuelys* indicates affection (‘der Lleuelys’) or is a way of saying ‘the aforesaid Lleuelys’. Or *Lleuelys* may have been regarded as a pet form of the name *Lleu*.⁶⁵ Or there may be influence from *y lleu* ‘the fair one’, in the story about how Lleu got his name, in the same two manuscripts.⁶⁶ Since Lleuelys is nowhere else referred to with the article, however, there must be a suspicion that *yllueuelys* is a scribal error (a miscopying of *y|karey|lleuelys*?).

The same is true in the case of the apparent article before *Beli Mawr* in the first line of the *Cyfranc* in the Red Book, but not the White Book (which only has the preposition *y* ‘to’, not the Red Book’s *y* + ‘r’):

Y Beli ua(r vab manogan y bu tri meib. (White Book)

Yr beli ma(r uab manogan y bu tri meib. (Red Book)

⁶²Williams and Bromwich (1972: 31).

⁶³Cf. Roberts (1975: l. 15).

⁶⁴Roberts (1975: xxx–xxx1). For parallel texts of the passages discussed below see Randell (2009: 274–5).

⁶⁵For *-el-* as a diminutive compare perhaps *Cu(h)elyn* and *Llywelyn*.

⁶⁶Williams (1951: 80 and 275–6).

As Roberts points out, this may be influenced by the earlier Llanstephan version: *Ac yr bely hōnnō ebō try meyb* ‘And to that Beli were [born] three sons’ (NLW Llanstephan 1, cf. Cardiff 1.363 *Ac yr bely hōnnō e bō try meyb*, NLW Peniarth 23 *ac ir belī hwnnw y bv drimeib*).⁶⁷ Probably the author of the ‘Mabinogion’ version had started to copy something like **Yr Beli hwnnw* before remembering that *hwnnw* was inappropriate at the start of the free-standing tale and had to be omitted. The White Book then omitted the *r* (regarding it as ungrammatical without *hwnnw*?), though failing to lenite *Beli* after the preposition, while the Red Book scribe left the article in by mistake. Simon Evans included *Y’r Beli mawr* in his *Gramadeg Cymraeg Canol* (Evans 1951: 15), but, significantly, omitted it in the English revision (*GMW* 26).

I can find only three examples comparable to *y Lleuelys* and *Y’r belī maōr* in all the prose in thirteenth-century manuscripts, even though these manuscripts include texts such as saints’ Lives and *Brutiau* which are full of personal names.

(i) The first exception occurs in the version of *Mabinogi Iesu Grist* in NLW Peniarth 14ii (s. xiii²). Leaving aside the special cases of *yr Yessu hōn* ‘this Jesus’ (p. 71), where the article has to be used with *hwn*, and *hep yr Yessu* (passim), where *hep yr* is the quotative, *Yessu* occurs throughout without the article, with one exception on p. 78 (italicised below):

Ac odena y dissymythus ioseph
gyt a meir a **yessu** ac a doethant capharnaum
trwy arōordired rac digassogyon. A phan do
eth **yessu** eno yd oed eno gur kyuoethauc en
glaf wan ioseph y enw a niuerod eny gwyn
aō ac en drycyrerthu amdanau. Pahan
hep yr **yessu** urth ioseph na rody di waret
y hwn ac ef en ōn enw a thi. Pa allu e syd
ym mi y waret idau ef hep e ioseph. Kymer
y llein y syd yg kylch dy benn hep yr **yessu**
a dos yu dodi ar wynep y marw a dywet **yr**
yessu ath ellung ac ene lle ef a uyd yach ac a
gyuyt e marw oe wely. Ac ar e geir hōnnō
e kerdus ioseph hyt en ty e marw a dodi am
ben y marw y wisc a vuassei am y benn ehun
ac ar henne kyuodi y marw oe wely a gouyn
pa le yd oed **yessu**. Ac odena yd aethant hyt

⁶⁷Roberts (1975: 8). Cf. Williams (1922: 11). Roberts (1975: xxii) also quotes Cotton Cleopatra B.v i *Ac y bu pedwar meib idaw* and NLW 5281B (s. xvi ex.) *Ac y hwnnw y bū petwarmeip*, and cf. Elis Gruffudd (Roberts 1975: 17): [...] *na bu J Eli Mawr onid tri o veibion*. The wording is similar in the Dingestow version: *Ac y hwnnw y bu tri meib* (Lewis 1942: 44; Himsworth 2015: Appendix D, vol. iii, 133–4). Randell (2009: 275) quotes *Ac yr belī hwnnw i bu bedwar o veibion* from the Black Book of Basingwerk (NLW 7006D). Welsh does not have a definite article syntagm like *Alfred the Great* that might be invoked to explain yf’*Jr Beli mawr*. *Mawr* in the title *Gwawt Lud y mawr* is different; it refers to *gwawt*, not *Lud*: ‘The song of Lludd, the big one’ (on the syntax see Haycock (2013: 132)).

ym bethlem ac yd oed ioseph eny dy y gyt a
meir a **yessu**.⁶⁸

‘And thence Joseph departed together with Mary and Jesus and they came to Capernaum along the shorelines to escape their enemies. And when Jesus came there there was a rich man there who was very sick, Joseph by name, and crowds wailing and lamenting over him. “Why”, said Jesus to Joseph, “don’t you save this man, and he with the same name as you?”. “What power do I have to save him?”, said Joseph. “Take the cloth which is around your head”, said Jesus, “and go and put it on the face of the dead man and say ‘*the Jesus saves you*’,⁶⁹ and immediately he will be well, and the dead man will arise from his bed”. And at that word Joseph went to the dead man’s house and put the headdress that had been around his own head around the dead man’s head, and thereupon the dead man arose from his bed and asked where Jesus was. And thence they went to Bethlehem and Joseph was at home together with Mary and Jesus.’

The definite article is absent from the phrase ‘Yr Yessu a’th ellung’ in the later copies of *Mabinogi Iesu Grist* in NLW Peniarth 14iv (s. xiv¹), p. 134.13, the White Book of Rhydderch (NLW Peniarth 5 (s. xiv med.), fol. 20r36), and the Red Book of Talgarth (NLW Llanstephan 27 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 101r23). It could well be a scribal error in NLW Peniarth 14, with *dywet yr / yessu* influenced by *hep yr yessu* both in the previous line and in an earlier sentence; a line-break is a common environment for scribal errors. If *yr / yessu ath ellung* really is correct, the article may have some special nuance in Jesus’s speech, perhaps ‘the famous Jesus, the Jesus who is being talked about’, or, as in some much later examples of *yr Iesu*, *yr* may be hypocoristic, expressing a special familiarity, like *der/die* + personal name in some German dialects.⁷⁰ Or possibly Jesus is treating his own name as a nickname (cf. *y Bedo*, etc), as if *Iesu* were a short form of *Iesus*. Jesus is playing with the name of Joseph, and may therefore be playing with his own name as well. On the whole, a scribal error, influenced by the preceding *hep yr Yessu*, seems likely.

(ii) In *Historia Regum Britanniae* II.16 §33, Geoffrey of Monmouth mentions the two sons of Gorbodugo, *unus Ferreux*, *alter Porrex*, and their rivalry. *Brut Dingestow* (NLW 5266B (s. xiii²), pp. 37–8) translates as follows:

Ac y hōnnŏ y bu deu uab. Porrex. a Feruex. a guedy marŏ eu tat
y kyuodes teruysc y rygthunt am y urenhynyaeth. A cheissyaŏ **or**
porrex llad feruex o urat. A gŏybot hynny **or** Feruex <a> fo hyt

⁶⁸*Sic* MS. Cf. Williams (1912: 248).

⁶⁹The Latin is ‘Salvet te Christus’ in Tischendorf (1876, 109). However, Tischendorf quotes a version which has ‘Salvet te Iesus’ (cf. McNamara *et al.* (2001, II:879)), which agrees with Joseph’s words to the sick man later.

⁷⁰<https://www.quora.com/In-which-regions-do-people-in-different-languages-speak-about-acquaintances-as-the-and-then-their-name> (accessed 17 June 2018).

yn freinc. A dyuot a phorth y gan suardus (renhyin [*sic*] freinc ac ymlad a phorrex y uraŋt.

‘And to that (one) were [born] two sons, Porrex and Feruex. And after their father died, a struggle arose between them over the kingship. And **the** Porrex tried to kill Feruex by treachery. And **the** Feruex learnt that and fled to France and came with aid from Suardus king of France and fought with Porrex his brother.’

The definite articles are also found in two closely related manuscripts of the Dingestow Version, NLW Peniarth 45 (s. xiv¹) and 46 (s. xiv med.), but not in the other manuscripts of the Dingestow Version, nor in the Llanstephan Version and *Liber Coronacionis Britanorum*, which are both related to the Dingestow Version at this point.⁷¹ One other text which is particularly close to NLW 5266B and NLW Peniarth 45–6 is NLW Peniarth 263 (s. xv¹),⁷² and this also includes the article, although slightly differently:

Ac y hōnnŋ y bu deu vab. porrex. a fernex. A gŋedy marŋ eu tat y kyuodes teruysc yrygthunt am y vrenhinyaeth a cheissaŋ **or** porex llad y ffernex o vrat. A gŋedy gŋybot hynny o fernex fo hyt yn freinc. A dyuot a phorth y gan suardus vrenhin freinc. Ac ymlad a porex y vraŋt.

Presumably the article was introduced into the passage in the ancestor of the four manuscripts, no later than the second half of the thirteenth century. Perhaps the peculiar names *Porrex* and *Feruex* were imagined to be nicknames (like *y Delflet*, discussed above); compare Latin *sorex* ‘shrew-mouse’ and *vervex* ‘wether, mutton-head’. Or the purpose of the article may be to underline the contrast between *the one* brother and *the other* brother (if so it is a very rare usage).⁷³ Or it may have a sense like ‘the aforesaid’, comparable with the occasional use of the article ‘with anaphoric force’ in Middle Irish, mentioned in *eDIL* s.v. 1 in III B (a), as in *A n-Inis moccu Ché[i]n ro-baí in Gartnán* ‘The aforesaid Gartnán was in Inis moccu Chéin’ and *Is ferr in Cathal 7 Leth Moga do t[h]esarcaín oldás in cochall* ‘It is better to save the aforesaid Cathal and Leth Moga than the cloak’.⁷⁴

(iii) In XII.18 §206 an angel advises Cadualadrus to send his son Iuor and his nephew Yni to Britain. In XII.19 §207 they duly go there. According to *Brut Dingestow* (NLW 5266B, p. 316):

⁷¹See concordance in Himsforth (2015: Appendix D, Vol. iii, p. 100), and Sims-Williams (2017a: 31, and 2017b: 12 (stemma) and 30).

⁷²Cols. 144–5. Transcript by Richard Glyn Roberts in *Rhyddiaith y 15g*. On this text see Roberts (1977–8). The other Red Book versions do not have the article.

⁷³Even though a binary contrast occurs in both cases, the article in *y deu lu* ‘the(?) two hosts’ [...] *y deu uroder* ‘(the?) two brothers’ in *Branwen* — discussed by Mac Cana (1958: 81 n. 1), who thinks the article here is ‘used generically rather than to particularize’ — is hardly comparable.

⁷⁴Binchy 1963: lines 3–4; Jackson 1990: lines 525–7 (cf. his note on *in Cathal* on p. 57: ‘This construction, known elsewhere, with virtually meaningless article, is perhaps a stereotype of an archaic usage when it had a trace of its old demonstrative force — “this Cathal”’). Cf. Uhlich (2013: 439) and n. 5 above.

AC yna wedy kynnullaŵ **or** iuor uab catwaladyr ac ini y keuynderŵ
yr hyn a allasant o longeu ŷynt a doethant hyt yn enys prydein.

‘And after **the** Iuor son of Cadwaladyr and Ini his cousin
assembled as many ships as they could, they came to the island of
Britain.’

The article is not found in any other manuscript, not even in NLW Peniarth 45–6, which have *o* (NLW Peniarth 263 does not get as far as XII.19). It could mean something like ‘the aforesaid’, but equally well it could be a scribal error (with *or* anticipating the *-or* of *iuor*?). Since *Iuor uab* is followed by the dependent genitive *Catwaladyr*, the definite article seems grammatically odd.

Searching through the prose manuscripts which Daniel Huws dates s. xiii/xiv (i.e. c. 1275–c. 1325), I see no further examples of *y(r)* + personal name. Nor, after a more cursory search, have I noticed any in the fourteenth century to add to *ylleuelys* in the White and Red Books and *Yl’jr beli maŵr* in the Red Book, apart from the following articles, most of which precede *Iessu*.

(i) In the later version of *Mabinogi Iesu Grist* in NLW Peniarth 14 (s. xiv¹), pp. 101–90, after Joseph heals the man by reciting the words *Iessu ath iacha* (‘Jesus heals you’),

ynteu a gyfuodes y uynyd ac a ouynawd ‘pwy **yr** Iessu’. (p. 134)

‘He got up and asked “Who is **the** Jesus?”’

This could be a scribal error for **pwy yw Iessu*?⁷⁵ However, since the sick man may be ignorant as to the significance of *Iessu* (e.g. whether it is a title or a name or common noun), his use of the definite article seems appropriate.

(ii) A similar special case occurs in *Cronicl Turpin*. In the early copy in NLW Peniarth 8i (s. xiii/xiv), Roland tells a pagan that he believes in Christ. Then:

Pan gigleu y pagan enwi crist y gouynnws yntev pwy oed grist.

(t. 42)

‘When the pagan heard Christ being named, he asked who Christ was.’

Later manuscripts, starting with NLW Peniarth 9 (s. xiv¹), fol. 2r, have this in direct speech:

A phan gigleu y pagan enwi crist y gouynŵys ynteu pŵy y crist y
credy di idaŵ.⁷⁶

⁷⁵Compare *pŵy oed Iessu*? in the White Book of Rhydderch and Red Book of Talgarth texts (both cited above). The Latin is *quaerebat quis esset Iesus* (Tischendorf 1876: 109) or *quaerens quis esset* (McNamara et al. 2002: II.879).

⁷⁶Compare NLW Peniarth 10 (xiv med.), fol. 28v (where the article was later deleted) and Oxford, Jesus College 111 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 96r, col. 401.2; *GMW* 74–5; Williams (1969: 227–8). The Latin is ‘Quis est *ille* Christus, in quo credis?’ (or ‘*Ille* quis est Christus?’ in the verse version): Schmidt (1996: 84 and 87).

‘When the pagan heard Christ being named, he asked “Who/What is **the** Christ you believe in?”’

Since *Crist* means nothing to the pagan, he may mean: ‘Who or what is this “christ”?’. Normally, *Crist* is *not* preceded by the article. The defining relative clause may be a factor.

(iii) NLW Peniarth 5 (s. xiv med.), fols 1–57, now part of the White Book of Rhydderch, is an originally independent manuscript ‘written presumably for use by a cleric’ (Huws 2000: 244–5). Six times the scribe (Scribe A) shows a tendency to introduce the article before *Iessu* where other copies of the same texts lack it: *y | iessu* occurs in his texts of *Ystoria Pilatus* (11r11, *peis y | iessu g[ri]st*),⁷⁷ *Mabinogi Iesu Grist* (fols 18v15, 18v30, 19v40, 20r11), and *Efengyl Nicodemus* (fol. 32v31; cf. NLW Llanstephan 27, fol. 114r3, which has plain *Jessu*). Much more often this scribe omits the article, but clearly he was familiar with its use before *Iessu*, as in later Welsh (see Sims-Williams (2018b)).

(iv) Scribe C of the White Book appears to have the article just once in his copy of *Bown de Hamtwn: ar yr iessu grist* (‘for the sake of the Jesus Christ’, NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 131r, col. 287.14), as does the Red Book of Hergest (Oxford, Jesus College 111, fol. 217v, col. 874.22). This shared reading was probably due to a miscopying by their archetype of **ac yr iessu grist* ‘and for the sake of Jesus Christ’, where *yr* is not the article but *yr* ‘for the sake of’, translating *pur Deu!* in the French.⁷⁸

(v) In *Amlyn ac Amic* in the Red Book (Oxford, Jesus College 111, fol. 271v, col. 1088.31–2), *o rat yr iessu grist* ‘by the grace of Jesus Christ’ is a clear example of the article.⁷⁹

Turning to poetry, there are no relevant examples of the article in the Hengerdd⁸⁰ nor in Beirdd y Tywysogion. Obviously *y Lusiffer* in Llywelyn Fardd II (*CBT* VI 10.26) and *a’r Sathan* in Madog ap Gwallter (*CBT* VII 33.10) do not count, since Lucifer and Satan are titles.⁸¹ In fact the only relevant examples of the article in *CBT*, both with *Iessu*, occur in the religious poems ascribed to Gruffudd ab yr Ynad Coch (fl. 1282). The date and authorship of this corpus is uncertain,⁸² but obviously the poems cannot be later than the Red Book of Hergest (c. 1400) where both poems appear. One of them (*CBT* VII 39) begins at follows in the manuscript (*R* 1160.17–20):

⁷⁷NLW Llanstephan 27 breaks off before this point, and the wording in NLW Peniarth 7, fol. 63v, col. 236.10–11 (*y beis a | vv am Jessu*) is different.

⁷⁸See Watkin (1958: 111, n. on l. 1581); Poppe and Reck (2009: 65–6, n. on l. 488). In *Rhyddiaith 1300–1425* at NLW Peniarth 5, fol. 131r 287.24, *Ac myn <y> iessu grist* is a slip for *MS ac my<n> iessu grist*.

⁷⁹Williams (1982: 32, n. on l. 97).

⁸⁰I.e. the corpus defined in Isaac (2001).

⁸¹In Prydydd y Moch *o Dir yr Helet* (*CBT* V 10.32) does not refer to the character Heledd; see note in the edition. I am grateful to Professor Ann Parry Owen for use of her concordance to *CBT*. For references in *CBT* to *Iesu* and *yr Iesu* see the list in Costigan (2002: 200–2).

⁸²McKenna (1981); McKenna (1991, 53–4 and 232–3) (the attributions in NLW Peniarth MS 10 are also dated s. xv/xvi by Johnston and Parry Owen (1999: 35)); *CBT* VII 410.

Naŵd ytat armab rof amgalon . naŵd
 y glan yspryt kywyd kofyon . naŵd y
iessu caru coron tangneued; cared disgybled
 ae disgyblon. Naŵd ygroc deheu donyeu dan
 uon [...]

This is modernized as follows in *CBT* VII 39.1–5:

Nawdd y Tad a'r Mab Rhad rhof a'm galon,
 Nawdd y Glân Ysbryd cywyd cofon,
 Nawdd y **Iesu** caru, coron – tangnefedd,
 Caredd ddisgybledd a'e ddisgyblon!
 Nawdd y grog ddeau, ddoniau ddanfon [...]

and is translated as follows by McKenna (1991: 213), cf. Costigan (2002: 59):

The protection of the Father and the Son of grace between me and
 my enemies,
 The protection of the Holy Spirit is the aim of my thoughts,
 The protection of beloved Jesus, the crown of peace,
 The chastisement of sin and its followers!
 The protection of the true gift-granting cross [...]

Although it is noted in the edition (*CBT* VII p. 445) that the third line is arguably a syllable too long, it is not emended. Lewis (1931: 97) and McKenna (1991: 212), however, silently omit *y* before *Iessu* in their earlier editions, perhaps correctly. The scribe may have mechanically included *y* after *naŵd*, as in the other lines. He was clearly careless, for in line 10, *Naŵd [y] myr a Meir a'e morynion* ('The protection of the seas and of Mary and her maidens'), he omits the article (*naŵd myr ameir ae morynyon*). It is significant that *naŵd Jeuan* ('the protection of John') occurs in line 17 without the article. The form *y* before *iessu* rather than *yr* is unusual but not suspiciously so; when the article or *heby(r)* precedes *Iesu*, forms with *-r* are nearly always used in Middle Welsh MSS, e.g. in NLW Peniarth 14, p. 71 *yr Yessu hŷn* and p. 78 *yr Yessu* (discussed above), both with the article, and *hep yr Yessu* at pp. 68, 71, 73, 76, and 78 (twice), but there are exceptions, such as *y iessu* in Scribe A's part of the White Book (see above) and *heb y iessu* 'says Jesus' twice in the Red Book of Talgarth, NLW Llanstephan 27 (s. xiv/xv), fols 108v4 and 109v3 (cf. fol. 109v7 *hebyr iessu*).⁸³ (This convention does not operate so rigidly with names like *Iesse*, *Ioseph*, and *Iudas*, before which the *-r* is frequently dropped.)

The other 'Gruffudd ab yr Ynad Coch' poem (*R* 1164.13 = *CBT* VII 42.15) includes the line *Bot yn dir talu ger bronn yr Iessu* 'That it is necessary before Jesus to pay the price'.⁸⁴ This is less problematic, but again we do not know how much older than c. 1400 the poem is.

⁸³See above, n. 29. In the later poets note Johnston (1995, no. 1.366) *Rhan miragl y Iesu* (Lewys Glyn Cothi); Thomas (2002, no. 8.32) *Ond, er y Iesu, yn ei drwsiad* (Dafydd Epynt); Lake (2004, no. 62.22) *Trwy y Iesu y troesont* (Lewys Morgannwg).

⁸⁴Cf. Lewis (1931: 79). Cf. translations by Conran (1967: 124) and Costigan (2002: 64).

The two other examples of *yr Iesu* in the Red Book and in manuscripts derived from it are definitely late fourteenth-century. Bleddyn Ddu (fl. 1331–c. 1385) has *Achladdur iessu ar issaf/waelawt a ch<l>udb<ll> tywyllawd arawd araf* (R 1249.31–2), that is,

A chladdu'r Iesu ar isaf – waelawd
Achluddbwll tywawd, arawd araf

‘And burying Jesus on the lowest bottom of a grave of sand, a sad tale’

and Madog Dwygraig (s. xiv²) has *Jaʼn y rodeſ yr iessu* (R 1270.36), that is, *Iawn y rhoddes yr Iesu* ‘Well did Jesus give [...]’.⁸⁵ There are two or three further examples of *yr Iesu* in the late fourteenth-century Cywyddwyr, but as the manuscripts are late they cannot be relied on so much as the Red Book.⁸⁶

What is striking is that the definite article does not occur with personal names other than *Iesu* in the extant fourteenth-century poetry.⁸⁷ In the fifteenth century, however, we start to see it before pet names, such as *y Bedo* and *y Guto*. *Yr Iesu* may have a similar nuance, capturing the personal affection for Jesus characteristic of late medieval vernacular religion (e.g. Woolf (1968: 159–79)).⁸⁸ The most probable explanation is that it started to be used before personal names in an affectionate or familiar way in the fourteenth century and that the reason why it is mostly attested with *Iesu* in the fourteenth century is the large amount of religious poetry extant, on the one hand, and, on the other, the poets’ avoidance of hypocoristic forms before the fifteenth century, except occasionally in satires (see Sims-Williams (2018b)).

It is clear, then, that Middle Welsh *hebyr* is unlikely to be based on a use of the definite article before personal names since that usage is hardly attested before the end of the Middle Ages.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>CBT</i>	Gruffydd, R. Geraint (general ed.), 1991–96: <i>Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion</i> , 7 vols (Cardiff).
<i>DafyddapGwilym.net</i>	http://www.dafyddapgwilym.net/index_cym.php .
<i>R</i>	Evans, J. Gwenogvryn (ed.) 1911. <i>The Poetry in the Red Book of Hergest</i> (Llanbedrog).
<i>Rhyddiaith y 13g</i>	Isaac, G. R., Rodway, Simon, Nurmio, Silva, Kapphahn, Kit, and Sims-Williams, Patrick 2013: <i>Rhyddiaith Gymraeg o Lawysgrifau'r Drydedd Ganrif ar Ddeg, Fersiwn 2.00</i> . https://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/11163

⁸⁵Daniel 1994, no. 1.35–36; Edwards 2006, no. 3.9.

⁸⁶With the fifteenth-century poets, *yr Iesu* becomes more common, although *Iesu* is more frequent. See Sims-Williams (2018b).

⁸⁷Statement based on searching Dr Ann Parry Owen's unpublished concordance to fourteenth-century poetry, s.vv. *y*, *yr*, and *'r* + capital letter.

⁸⁸But much earlier in Irish: note *Ísucán* (Quin 1981).

- Rhyddiaith 1300–1425* Luft, Diana, Thomas, Peter Wynn, and Smith, D. Mark 2013: *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg 1300–1425*. <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk>
- Rhyddiaith y 15g* Roberts, Richard Glyn, Rowles, Sarah, and Sims-Williams, Patrick 2015: *Rhyddiaith y 15fed Ganrif: Fersiwn 1.0*. <https://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/26752>

REFERENCES

- BINCHY, D. A. 1960: 'IE *q^ue in Irish', *Celtica* 5, 77–102.
- (ed.), 1963: *Scéla Cano meic Gartnáin* (Dublin).
- BREATNACH, LIAM 1986: 'Varia VI', *Ériu* 37, 191–3.
- , 2003: 'On words ending in a stressed vowel in early Irish', *Ériu* 53, 133–42.
- , forthcoming: 'Observations on the demonstrative pronouns'.
- BUCHSTALLER, ISABELLE 2014: *Quotatives: New Trends and Sociolinguistic Implications* (Oxford).
- , and VAN ALPHEN, INGRID 2012: 'Introductory remarks on new and old quotatives', in Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid Van Alphen (eds), *Quotatives: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (Amsterdam), xi–xxx.
- BUCK, CARL D. 1915: 'Words of speaking and saying in the Indo-European languages', *American Journal of Philology* 36, 1–18 and 125–54.
- , 1949: *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago).
- CARNEY, JAMES (ed.) 1964: *The Poems of Blathmac* (Dublin).
- CHARLES-EDWARDS, THOMAS and KELLY, FERGUS (eds) 1983: *Bechbretha* (Dublin).
- CHESHIRE, JENNY, FOX, SUSAN, KERSWILL, PAUL and TORGENSEN, EIVIND 2013: 'Language contact and language change in the multicultural metropolis', *Revue française de linguistique appliquée* 18:2, 63–76.
- CHESHIRE, JENNY and SECOVA, MARIA 2018: 'The origins of new quotative expressions: the case of Paris French', *Journal of French Language Studies* 28:2, 209–34.
- CONRAN, ANTHONY in association with J. E. CAERWYN WILLIAMS 1967: *The Penguin Book of Welsh Verse* (Harmondsworth).
- COSTIGAN, N. G. 2002: *Defining the Divinity: Medieval Perceptions in Welsh Court Poetry* (Cardiff).
- COWGILL, WARREN 1983: 'On the prehistory of Celtic passive and deponent inflection', *Ériu* 34, 73–111.
- DANIEL, R. IESTYN (ed.) 1994: *Gwaith Bleddyn Ddu* (Aberystwyth).
- (ed.), 1998: *Gwaith Dafydd Bach ap Madog Wladaidd 'Syppyn Cyfeiliog' a Llywelyn ab y Moel* (Aberystwyth).
- (ed.), 1999: *Gwaith Casnodyn* (Aberystwyth).

- (ed.), 2002: *Gwaith Dafydd y Coed a Beirdd Eraill o Lyfr Coch Hergest* (Aberystwyth).
- DAVIES, SIONED 1995: *Creffft y Cyfarwydd* (Cardiff).
- DE BERNARDO STEMPEL, PATRIZIA 1986: 'Indogermanische Demonstrativa und der altirische Artikel', *ZCP* 41, 259–71.
- , 2003: 'Continental Celtic *ollo*: Early Welsh (*h*)*ol(l)*, *Olwen*, and *Culhwch*', *CMCS* 46, 119–27.
- DE VAAN, MICHEL 2015: 'Reduplicated demonstratives in ancient Indo-European languages', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113:1, 38–52.
- DOTTIN, GEORGES 1896: *Les désinences verbales en R en sanskrit, en italique, et en celtique* (Rennes).
- , 1927: 'Le breton *emez-an* "dit-il"', in *Symbolae Grammaticae in Honorem Ioannis Rozwadowski*, vol. i (Cracow), 229–33.
- DRESSLER, WOLFGANG 1969: 'Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung (Zur Anfangsstellung des Prädikatverbums)', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83:1, 1–25.
- EDWARDS, HUW MEIRION (ed.) 2006: *Gwaith Madog Dwygraig* (Aberystwyth).
- ERNAULT, E. 1890: 'Études bretonnes VII. Sur l'analogie dans la conjugaison', *RC* 11, 458–87.
- EVANS, D. SIMON 1951: *Gramadeg Cymraeg Canol* (Cardiff).
- , 1988: *The Welsh Life of St David* (Cardiff).
- FALILEYEV, ALEXANDER 2000: *Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh* (Tübingen).
- FLEURIOT, LEON 1964: *Dictionnaire des gloses en vieux breton*. Paris. (Reprinted as *A Dictionary of Old Breton, with Supplement* by Claude Evans and Leon Fleuriot (Toronto), 1985.)
- FOX, SUE 2012: 'The pragmatic performed narrative: the pragmatic function of *this is* + *speaker* and other quotatives in London adolescent speech', in Isabelle Buchstaller and Ingrid Van Alphen (eds), *Quotatives: Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives* (Amsterdam), 231–57.
- GARCÍA CASTILLERO, CARLOS 2017: 'Descriptive and diachronic aspects of the Old Irish quotative marker *ol*', *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 18:1, 58–81.
- GREENE, DAVID 1958: 'The analytic forms of the verb in Irish', *Ériu* 18, 108–12.
- GRIFFITH, AARON 2013: 'Irish *suide* / *-side* "the aforementioned"', in Anders Ahlqvist and Pamela O'Neill (eds), *Celts and their Cultures at Home and Abroad: A Festschrift for Malcolm Broun* (Sydney), 55–73.
- GÜLDEMANN, TOM 2008: *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey* (Berlin).
- HAMP, ERIC P. 1958–9: 'Welsh *heb*, Irish *sech*', *EC* 8, 402–3.
- , 1975: 'Varia II', *Ériu* 26, 168–74.
- , 1976: '*Barnu brawd*', *Celtica* 11, 68–75.
- HAVERS, WILHELM 1911: 'Altirisch *ol* "inquit"', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 44:1/2, 26–34.
- HAYCOCK, MARGED 2013: *Prophecies from the Book of Taliesin* (Aberystwyth).

- , and SIMS-WILLIAMS, PATRICK 2017: ‘Welsh *vch* “fox?” in the Book of Taliesin’, *CMCS* 73, 21–30.
- HEMON, ROPARZ 1975: *A Historical Morphology and Syntax of Breton* (Dublin).
- HEWSON, JOHN 1972: *Article and Noun in English* (The Hague).
- HIMSWORTH, KATHERINE 2015: ‘The Peniarth MS 22 *Brut y Brenhinedd* and continuation chronicle, and its 15th century Aberystwyth scribe, Dafydd ap Maredudd Glais’, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Aberystwyth University.
- HOCK, HANS HENRICH 1982: ‘The Sanskrit quotative: a historical and comparative study’, *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 12:2, 39–96.
- HOFFNER, HARRY 1993: ‘Hittite *iwar* and related modes of expressing comparison’, *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 43, 39–51.
- HUWS, DANIEL 2000: *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts* (Cardiff).
- IFANS, RHIANNON (ed.) 2000: *Gwaith Gruffudd Llwyd a’r Llygliwiaid Eraill* (Aberystwyth).
- ISAAC, GRAHAM R., 2001: *Yr Hengerdd: Mynegeiriau Cyflawn* [CD] (Aberystwyth).
- JACKSON, KENNETH HURLSTONE 1967: *A Historical Phonology of Breton* (Dublin).
- (ed.), 1990: *Aislinge Meic Con Glinne* (Dublin).
- JOHNSTON, DAFYDD R. (ed.) 1988: *Gwaith Iolo Goch* (Cardiff).
- (ed.), 1993: *Iolo Goch: Poems* (Llandysul).
- (ed.), 1995: *Gwaith Lewys Glyn Cothi* (Cardiff).
- , and PARRY OWEN, ANN 1999: ‘Tri darn o farddoniaeth yn llawysgrif Peniarth 10’, *Dwned* 5, 35–45.
- JONES, R. M. 1975–6: ‘The article in Welsh’, *SC* 10/11, 326–44.
- JOSEPH, BRIAN D. 1981: ‘Hittite *iwar*, *wa(r)* and Sanskrit *iva*’, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95:1, 93–8.
- , 2003a: ‘Evidentiality in Proto-Indo-European? Building a case’, in K. Jones-Bley, M. Huld, A. Della Volpe, and M. Robbins Dexter (eds), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference (Los Angeles, November 8–9, 2002)* (Washington, DC), 96–111.
- , 2003b: ‘Evidentials: summation, questions, prospects’, in A. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds), *Studies in Evidentiality* (Amsterdam), 307–27.
- , and SCHOURUP, LAWRENCE 1982/83: ‘More on *iwar*’, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96:1, 56–8.
- KATZ, JOSHUA T. 2001: Review of Peter Schrijver, *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles* (Maynooth, 1997), in *Kratylos* 46, 1–23.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK 2007: *Italo-Celtic Origins and Prehistoric Development of the Irish Language* (Amsterdam).
- LAKE, A. CYNFAEL (ed.) 2004: *Gwaith Lewys Morgannwg*, vol. ii (Aberystwyth).
- LEWIS, HENRY (ed.) 1931: *Hen Gerddi Crefyddol* (Cardiff).
- (ed.), 1942: *Brut Dingestow* (Cardiff).
- , et al. (eds), 1937: *Cywyddau Iolo Goch ac Eraill*, second ed. (Cardiff).

- , and PEDERSEN, HOLGER 1961: *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar* (Göttingen).
- LLOYD, D. MYRDDIN 1950–1: ‘La poésie de Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr et le manuscrit Peniarth 3’, *EC* 5, 87–104.
- LLOYD-JONES, J. 1912: ‘The development of the verbal *r*-forms’, in Osborn Bergin and Carl Marstrander (eds), *Miscellany Presented to Kuno Meyer* (Halle a. S.), 198–206.
- , 1931–63: *Geirfa Barddoniaeth Gynnar Gymraeg*, 2 vols (Cardiff).
- MAC CANA, PROINSIAS 1958: *Branwen Daughter of Llŷr* (Cardiff).
- , 1984: ‘A note on the use of direct speech in *Saltair na Rann*’, *Ériu* 35, 206–8.
- McCONE, KIM 1986: ‘From Indo-European to Old Irish: conservation and innovation in the verbal system’, in D. Ellis Evans *et al.* (eds), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Celtic Studies* (Oxford), 222–66.
- , 1994: ‘An tSean-Ghaeilge agus a réamhstair’, in Kim McCone *et al.* (eds), *Stair na Gaeilge in Ómós do P[h]ádraig Ó Fiannachta* (Maynooth), 61–219.
- , 1997: *The Early Irish Verb*, second ed. (Maynooth).
- , 2005: *L’irlandese antico e la sua preistoria* (transl. Elisa Roma) (Alessandria).
- McKENNA, CATHERINE A. 1981: ‘The religious poetry attributed to Gruffudd ab yr Ynad Coch’, *BBCS* 29:2, 274–84.
- , 1991: *The Medieval Welsh Religious Lyric* (Belmont, Mass.).
- McNAMARA, M., *et al.* 2001: *Apocrypha Hiberniae*, i: *Evangelia Infantiae*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum, 13–14 (Turnhout).
- MAC MATHÚNA, SÉAMUS 2013: ‘On the definite article and definite descriptions in Irish’, in Dónaill Ó Baoill, Donncha Ó hAodha and Nollaig Ó Muraíle (eds), *Saltair Saíochta, Sanasaíochta agus Seanchais: A Festschrift for Gearóid Mac Eoin* (Dublin), 153–80.
- MARTINKOVÁ, MICHAELA, and JANEBOVÁ, MARKÉTA 2017: ‘What English translation equivalents can reveal about the Czech “modal” particle *prý*: a cross-register study’, in Karin Aijmer and Diana Lewis (eds), *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse-Pragmatic Aspects of Linguistic Genres* (Cham), 63–90.
- MEID, WOLFGANG (ed.) 1970: *Die Romanze von Froech und Findabair* (Innsbruck).
- , 1972–3: ‘On two points of Celtic morphology’, *EC* 13, 346–51.
- (ed.), 2015: *The Romance of Froech and Findabair or the Driving of Froech’s Cattle*. Innsbruck.
- MOORE, COLETTE 2011: *Quoting Speech in Early English* (Cambridge).
- MORRIS JONES, BOB 1991–2: ‘The definite article and specific reference’, *SC* 26/27, 175–201.
- MORRIS JONES, J. 1913: *A Welsh Grammar* (Oxford).
- , 1931: *Welsh Syntax: An Unfinished Draft* (Cardiff).
- Ó GEALBHÁIN, SÉAMAS 1991: ‘The double article and related features of genitive syntax in Old Irish and Middle Welsh’, *Celtica* 22, 119–44.

- O'SULLIVAN, SINÉAD 2011: 'The Corpus Martianus Capella: Continental gloss traditions on *De Nuptiis* in Wales and Anglo-Saxon England', *CMCS* 62, 33–56.
- PARRY, JOHN JAY (ed.) 1937: *Brut y Brenhinedd: Cotton Cleopatra Version* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- PARRY, THOMAS (ed.) 1963: *Gwaith Dafydd ap Gwilym*, second ed. (Cardiff).
- POPPE, ERICH, and RECK, REGINE (eds) 2009: *Selections from Ystoria Bown o Hamtwn* (Cardiff).
- QUIN, E. G. 1960: 'Old-Irish *ol* "inquit"', *Celtica* 5, 95–102.
- , 1981: 'The early Irish poem *Ísucán*', *CMCS* 1, 39–52.
- RANDELL, KELLY 2009: "'And there was a fourth son": narrative variation in "Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys"', *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium* 29, 268–81.
- RASMUSSEN, JENS ELMEGÅRD, 1999: *Selected Papers on Indo-European Linguistics*, vol. ii (Copenhagen).
- RICKFORD, JOHN R., WASOW, THOMAS, ZWICKY, ARNOLD, and BUCHSTALLER, ISABELLE 2007: 'Intensive and quotative ALL: something old, something new', *American Speech* 82:1, 3–31.
- RIX, HELMUT 2001: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, second ed. (Wiesbaden).
- ROBERTS, BRYNLEY F. (ed.) 1975: *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys* (Dublin).
- , 1977–8: 'The Red Book of Hergest version of *Brut y Brenhinedd*', *Studia Celtica* 12/13, 147–86.
- ROBERTS, E. STANTON, and LEWIS, HENRY (eds) 1927: *Peniarth 53* (Cardiff).
- RODWAY, SIMON 2004: 'The Red Book text of "Culhwch ac Olwen": a modernising scribe at work', *Studia Celtica* 3, 93–161.
- , 2013: *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature: Evidence from the Verbal System* (Aberystwyth).
- SCHMIDT, KARL HORST 1964: 'Altirisch *ro·fitir* und das Deponens des sog. suffixlosen Präteritums', *Die Sprache* 10, 134–43.
- SCHMIDT, PAUL GERHARD 1996: *Karolellus atque Pseudo-Turpini Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi* (Stuttgart and Leipzig).
- SCHRIJVER, PETER 1997: *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles* (Maynooth).
- , 1998–2000: 'Geminate spellings in the Old Welsh glosses to Martianus Capella', *EC* 34, 147–60.
- , 2017: 'The first person singular of "to know" in British Celtic and a detail of *a*-affection', in Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard Hansen *et al.* (eds), *Usque ad radices: Indo-European studies in Honour of Birgit Anette Olsen* (Copenhagen), 679–86.
- SCHUMACHER, STEFAN 2004: *Die keltischen Primärverben* (Innsbruck).
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, PATRICK 1984: 'The double system of verbal inflexion in Old Irish', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 82:1, 138–201.
- , 2010: 'The spread of "sandhi *h*-" in thirteenth-century Welsh', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108:1, 41–52.

- , 2013: ‘Variation in Middle Welsh conjugated prepositions: chronology, register and dialect’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 111:1, 1–50.
- , 2016: ‘John Morris-Jones and his *Welsh Grammar*’, *THSC new series* 22, 134–53.
- (ed.), 2017a: *Liber Coronacionis Britanorum* (Aberystwyth).
- (ed.), 2017b: *Liber Coronacionis Britanorum: A Medieval Welsh Version of Geoffrey of Monmouth, II, Introduction & Commentary*. Aberystwyth.
- , 2017c: ‘The Celtic languages’, in Mate Kapović (ed.), *The Indo-European Languages* (Abingdon), 352–86.
- (ed.), 2018a: *Buchedd Beuno* (Dublin).
- , 2018b: ‘*Iesu, yr Iesu, a’r beirdd*’, *Dwned* 24, 21–41.
- STRACHAN, JOHN 1909: *An Introduction to Early Welsh* (Manchester).
- THOMAS, OWEN (ed.) 2002: *Gwaith Dafydd Epynt* (Aberystwyth).
- THOMAS, PETER WYNN 1996: *Gramadeg y Gymraeg* (Cardiff).
- THURNEISEN, RUDOLF 1917: ‘Irishes’, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 48:1/2, 48–75.
- , 1918: ‘*Kymr. heb*’, *ZCP* 12, 413–14.
- TISCHENDORF, CONSTANTINUS DE 1876: *Evangelia Apocrypha*, second ed. (Leipzig).
- UHLICH, JÜRGEN 2013: ‘Zum Artikelgebrauch beim Bezugswort eines Relativsatzes im frühen Irischen’, in Dónaill Ó Baoill, Donncha Ó hAodha and Nollaig Ó Muraíle (eds), *Saltair Saíochta, Sanasaíochta agus Seanchais: A Festschrift for Gearóid Mac Eoin* (Dublin), 429–62.
- VENDRYES, JOSEPH 1910a: Review of Ifor Williams, *Breuddwyd Maxen* (Bangor, 1908), *RC* 31, 109–111.
- , 1910b: Review of Ifor Williams, *Cyfranc Lludd a Llevelys* (Bangor, 1910), *RC* 31, 386–8.
- , 1913: ‘Les formes verbales en -R- du tokharien et de l’italo-celtique’, *RC* 34, 129–42.
- , 1927: ‘A propos du verbe “croire” et de la “croyance”’, *RC* 44, 90–6.
- , 1928: Review of *Symbolae Grammaticae in Honorem Ioannis Rozwadowski* (Cracow, 1927–28), *RC* 45, 104–7.
- WATKIN, MORGAN (ed.) 1958: *Ystorya Bown de Hamtwn* (Cardiff).
- WATKINS, CALVERT 1963: ‘Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb’, *Celtica* 6, 1–49.
- WILLIAM, ALED RHYS (ed.) 1960: *Llyfr Iorwerth* (Cardiff).
- WILLIAMS, IFOR (ed.) 1908: *Breuddwyd Maxen* (Bangor).
- (ed.), 1910: *Cyfranc Lludd a Llevelys*, first ed. (Bangor).
- (ed.), 1922: *Cyfranc Lludd a Llevelys*, second ed. (Bangor).
- (ed.), 1951: *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*, second ed. (Cardiff).
- , and BROMWICH, RACHEL (eds) 1972: *Armes Prydein* (Dublin).
- WILLIAMS, J. E. CAERWYN 1969: ‘difod, diw, pyddi’, *BBCS* 23:3, 217–33.
- WILLIAMS, MARY 1912: ‘*Llyma Vabinogi Iessu Grist*’, *RC* 33, 184–248.
- WILLIAMS, PATRICIA (ed.) 1982: *Kedymdeithyas Amlyn ac Amic* (Cardiff).

WOOLF, ROSEMARY 1968: *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages* (Oxford).

WYNNE, ELLIS 1703: *Gweledigaethau y Bardd Cwsc* (London).

WEBSITES

<https://forum.wordreference.com/threads/definite-articles-with-proper-nouns.2834983/>.

<https://www.quora.com/In-which-regions-do-people-in-different-languages-speak-about-acquaintances-as-the-and-then-their-name>.

PATRICK SIMS-WILLIAMS

Aberystwyth University