

The grammatical sources of the *Dwned*



Michaela Jacques

Celtica 31 (2019), 163–190

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-t9ecd-64c4e

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 GRAMMATICAL SOURCES OF THE *DWNED*

ABSTRACT

The fifteenth-century Welsh grammatical tract in NLW Llanstephan 28, known as the *Dwned*, has long been recognised as a realignment of the earlier bardic grammars with Donatus' *Ars Minor*. However, the use of the *Ars Minor* alone does not account for all of the revisions that occur in the *Dwned*, nor does it explain the impetus behind the rewrite. By examining some of the terminological adaptations in the *Dwned* in greater detail, and by situating its creation in both a local and a more international context, this paper identifies a Middle English grammatical tract as a probable source for the Welsh text. A deeper consideration of this Middle English tract, the *Accedence*, in conjunction with the *Dwned*, both illuminates the possible purpose of the *Dwned* revision, and points towards a multilingual, cosmopolitan culture of scholarship in fifteenth-century north-east Wales.

INTRODUCTION

THE Welsh grammatical tract on pp. 33–69 of NLW Llanstephan 28 (1455–6)¹ begins with the following title (in red ink):

Llyma Gyfrinach Beirdd Ynys Brydain yr hwnn a elwir y Dwned ynghymraec.²

'Here is the secret of the bards of the island of Britain, that which is called the *Dwned* in Welsh.'³

It is the first time that the word *Dwned* is attached to a text of the bardic grammars,⁴ although similar forms regularly occur as terms for grammatical

¹Except where noted otherwise, dates in this article are taken from Daniel Huws, *A Repertory of Welsh Manuscripts and Scribes*, forthcoming. I am grateful to Daniel Huws for granting me access to a draft version of the *Repertory* prior to publication. The dating of Llanstephan 28 is discussed below.

²G. J. Williams and E. J. Jones (eds), *Gramadegau'r Penceirddiaid* (Cardiff, 1934) (hereafter *GP*), 67. *GP* gives 'yng [Ng]hymraec' in this line; the manuscript reading is restored here.

³Translations of Welsh and Latin in this paper are my own.

⁴It should be noted that there are earlier attestations of the term in Welsh, though they are not necessarily connected to the tract under discussion here. The word occurs in the fourteenth century in the Dafydd ap Gwilym poem 'Moliant Llywelyn ap Gwilym' (www.dafyddapgwilym.net, poem 5, line 1; accessed 16 July 2019); however, scholarly opinion has not reached a consensus on what exactly the phrase *Llyfr dwned Dyfed* means in context. For discussion, see Paul Russell, *Reading Ovid in Medieval Wales* (Columbus, Ohio, 2017), 227–9; also Rachel Bromwich, 'Gwaith

tracts in other vernaculars.⁵ As a result of the widespread popularity of Aelius Donatus' elementary Latin primer, the *Ars Minor*, across medieval Western Europe, various forms of the name *Donatus* underwent semantic broadening, coming to mean elementary grammar books in general.⁶ The word comes into Welsh not directly from Latin, but via Middle English *Donet*.⁷ This titular reference to a Latin grammarian, borrowed into Welsh from English, and situated firmly within a wider European terminological trend, grants us a microcosmic insight into the *Dwned* as a whole. As this borrowing pattern suggests, we can begin to understand the compilation of the *Dwned* only in the context of its multilingual source texts. A closer examination of some of these sources will serve to illuminate not only the possible purpose of the *Dwned* text itself, but also some of the main concerns and preoccupations of linguistic scholarship and intellectual life in fifteenth-century Wales more broadly.

The *Dwned* is generally characterised as essentially a major fifteenth-century reworking of the medieval Welsh bardic grammars, which had been in circulation for well over a century by the time this edit was made. These tractates, which collect and organise information about the Welsh language as used in bardic poetry, as well as the appropriate forms and subjects of poetic composition, are thought to have been compiled initially sometime in the thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Ann Matonis has argued that the compilation of the bardic grammars represented a reaction to the Edwardian Conquest of 1282, which spurred on the preservation and codification of traditional material,⁸ and perhaps, as suggested by R. Geraint Gruffydd, demanded a re-definition of Welsh panegyric poetry as a whole.⁹ More recently, Thomas Charles-Edwards has suggested that at least one section of

Einion Offeiriad a barddoniaeth Dafydd ap Gwilym', *Ysgrifau Beirniadol* 10 (1977), 157–80. It is also possible that a reference to the book of Donatus occurs in a twelfth-century poem by Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr, though this is not settled (see Nerys Ann Jones and Ann Parry Owen (eds), *Gwaith Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr* II (Cardiff, 1995), 292, note to poem 16, line 143 *llyuyr doneit*). In any case, it seems implausible that either early example is referring to the vernacular bardic grammars, as opposed to the Latin *Donatus*. However, *dwned* does eventually come to refer to the bardic grammars specifically: in later manuscript copies, the term regularly serves as a title for the bardic grammars — often, but not always, attached to copies of the version discussed in this article. It also occurs frequently in later poetry, apparently as a reference to knowledge of the bardic grammars. Russell gives fifteenth-century examples in the work of Lewys Glyn Cothi and Tudur Aled (*Reading Ovid*, 227–8); by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the word *dwned* is a standard praise metaphor in elegies for dead poets. It is possible that familiarity with the later material has coloured interpretation of the earlier references.

⁵For example, Breton *Donoet*, Provençal *Donatz*, French *Donait*, English *Donet*; see also discussion on p. 173–4 below.

⁶See discussion in Russell, *Reading Ovid*, 227.

⁷*GPC* s.v. *dwned*; Russell, *Reading Ovid*, 226.

⁸Ann Matonis, 'Gutun Owain and his orbit: the Welsh bardic grammar and its cultural context in northeast Wales', *ZCP* 54 (2004), 154–69, at 155–6; Ann Matonis, 'Problems relating to the composition of the early bardic grammars', in Ann Matonis and Daniel Melia (eds), *Celtic Language, Celtic Culture: A Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp* (Van Nays, California, 1990), 273–91, at 287–8.

⁹R. Geraint Gruffydd, 'Wales' second grammarian: Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug', Sir John Rhŷs Memorial Lecture, *PBA* 90 (1995), 1–28, at 20.

the grammars, on letters, must have been written down earlier in the thirteenth century.¹⁰

The earlier bardic grammars are usually classed into two ‘recensions’, the first associated with a compiler called Einion Offeiriad, versions of which are found in Jesus College 111 (The Red Book of Hergest, 1382 × 1405), NLW Llanstephan 3 (early fifteenth century) and Balliol College 353 (c. 1539–49), and a second, expanded recension associated with a later compiler called Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug, found in NLW Peniarth 20 (c. 1330).¹¹ The associations with specific characters are made on the basis of their supposed innovation of metrical forms in each tract; they do not appear to be granted full authorship of the tracts until a much later period.¹² In general, the earliest tracts resemble one another quite closely in terms of structure and organisation; however, the ‘Dafydd Ddu’ expansion includes a great deal more detail than the ‘Einion Offeiriad’ version, and changes many of the lexical and metrical examples. Its substitutions and additions are often religious in content.

Both the ‘Einion Offeiriad’ and the ‘Dafydd Ddu’ versions can be divided into five main sections: an *ars grammatica* portion, which includes treatments of the letters, syllables and diphthongs, parts of speech, and syntax; a section on metrical rules; metrical faults in poetry; a section which details how to praise different classes of people in poetry; and finally a set of triads, which organise the preceding information as well as some new content into groups of three.

Approximately 78 versions of the texts known as the bardic grammars are extant, preserved in manuscripts dating from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century.¹³ The grammars were regularly re-edited, but the *Dwned* represents

¹⁰Thomas Charles-Edwards, ‘The Welsh bardic grammars on *litterae*’, in Deborah Hayden and Paul Russell (eds), *Grammatica, Gramadach, and Gramadeg: Vernacular Grammar and Gramarians in Medieval Ireland and Wales* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 2016), 149–60, at 159–60. In this vein, a thirteenth-century author (Cnepyn Gwerthrynion) has been proposed for an earlier version of the grammars, primarily by Iestyn Daniel; for discussion see Iestyn Daniel, ‘Awduriaeth y gramadeg a briodolir i Einion Offeiriad a Dafydd Ddu Hiraddug’, *Ysgrifau Beirniadol* 13 (1985), 178–209. Despite the occurrence of the name in a number of contexts relating to the bardic grammars, including the recently-unearthed *Gramadegau'r Gwysanau*, written in the second half of the fourteenth century and associated with north-east Wales (see Ann Parry Owen, ‘Gramadeg Gwysanau (Archifdy Sir y Fflint, D/GW 2082)’, *Llên Cymru* 33 (2010), 1–31, at 9–10, and Ann Parry Owen, ‘Gramadeg Gwysanau: a fragment of a fourteenth-century Welsh bardic grammar’, in Hayden and Russell, *Grammatica, Gramadach, and Gramadeg*, 181–200, at 186–7), the suggestion has not garnered quite as much attention or tacit acceptance in modern scholarship as the Einion Offeiriad/Dafydd Ddu authorial tagteam, discussed below. Nonetheless, it potentially adds to our picture of a thirteenth-century grammatical tradition in Wales, which may be connected to the prehistory of the extant bardic grammars.

¹¹The Peniarth 20 version has long been recognised as significantly different to the Einion Offeiriad text; however, Gruffydd (‘Wales’ second grammarian’, 5) is the first to refer to it as a second recension. On the authorship of the tracts, see also Daniel, ‘Awduriaeth’, *GP* xvii–xxix on ‘Y gwŷr a gysylltir â’r Gramadeg’, and J. Beverley Smith, ‘Einion Offeiriad’, *BBCS* 20 (1962–3), 339–47.

¹²*GP* xvii–xxix; for problems with this approach, see Matonis, ‘Problems’, 283.

¹³Ann Matonis, ‘The Welsh bardic grammars and the western grammatical tradition’, *Modern Philology* 79 (1981), 121–45, at 123. For a selection (incomplete) of these manuscripts, see *GP* xiii–xvi; xlvii–lviii.

the first complete structural overhaul of the base text. The primary witness for this text is Llanstephan 28, dated by Daniel Huws to 1455–6, but an early copy is also preserved in NLW Peniarth 51 (c. 1460–80), recorded by Gwilym Tew (for discussion of the relationship between these copies, see below).

There are two grammars in Llanstephan 28, and neither is a complete copy of the earlier versions. The first is found on pp. 10–16, and consists of a fragment of the section on letters, as well as the classification of the metres.¹⁴ This section contains a number of innovations, and as a result has attracted a small amount of scholarly interest.¹⁵ The updates to the metrical system include the replacement of older, out-of-date metrical forms like the *englyn o'r hen ganiad* and the *englyn milwr* with intricate inventions, the *gorchest y beirdd* and *cadwynfyr*, as well as the first mentions of the *cynganedd* system. The changes are attributed to the bardic master Dafydd ab Edmwnd, and (according to later tradition) were introduced at the Carmarthen Eisteddfod of c. 1451.

Somewhat less attention has been paid to the second grammatical text, the *Dwned*, although it likewise demonstrates significant innovation. This section consists only of a treatment of the parts of speech and syntax, omitting the sections on letters, syllables and diphthongs, metres, metrical faults, praise adjectives, and the triads — meaning that it loses almost all of the portions of the earlier bardic grammars that are purely ‘bardic’ in orientation.

THE *Ars Minor*

One of the most significant changes in the *Dwned* text is in the reformulation of the parts of speech. The earlier copies of the grammar (Jesus College 111, Llanstephan 3, Peniarth 20, Balliol College 353, Bangor 1, etc.) divide the parts of speech into two main categories: *berfau* (verbs), and *enwau* (nouns), a division which reflects earlier Latin tradition, particularly the work of Priscian.¹⁶ The *Dwned* expands these categories to eight, mirroring the system in the Latin grammatical text known as the *Ars Minor* (see table). The terms already in existence in the earlier grammars (*henw*, *beryf*, *raghenw*) are preserved in the *Dwned*. New additions all correspond to the Latin terms found in the *Ars Minor* (*racveryf*, *cyfranniad*, *cysylldiad*, *arddodiad*, *taflodiad*). These terms, all calques on their Latin counterparts, are apparently introduced for the first time into the linguistic discussion of Welsh, and the bardic-grammatical tradition, via the *Ars Minor*.

The *Ars Minor*, written by Aelius Donatus in the fourth century CE, has long been recognised as a significant source for the bardic grammars in general, and the *Dwned* in particular. The editors of the tract wrote that while no specific

¹⁴GP xlviii; the text is printed in G. J. Williams, ‘Gramadeg Gutun Owain’, *BBCS* 4 (1927–9), 207–21.

¹⁵See D. J. Bowen, ‘Dafydd ab Edmwnd ac Eisteddfod Caerfyrddin’, *Barn* 142 (August 1974), 441–8, at 446–7; J. E. Caerwyn Williams, ‘Gutun Owain’, in A. O. H. Jarman and G. R. Hughes (eds), *A Guide to Welsh Literature*, vol 2: 1282–ca. 1550, revised by D. Johnston (Cardiff, 1997), 240–55, at 240–1; G. J. Williams, ‘Eisteddfod Caerfyrddin’, *Y Llenor* 5 (1926), 94–102; GP xlv–xlv.

¹⁶Matonis, ‘Western grammatical tradition’, 137–8.

Earlier bardic grammars	<i>Dwned</i>	<i>Ars Minor</i> ¹⁷
enw	henw	nomen
	raghenw	pronomen
	beryf	uerbum
	racveryf	aduerbium
berf	cyfranniad	participium
	cysyllldiad	coniunctio
	arddodiad	praepositio
	taflodiad	interiectio

Table 1: *Parts of speech*

copy of the Latin exemplar used to create the *Dwned* could be identified, the section on the parts of speech was undoubtedly based on Donatus.¹⁸ This is no great surprise. As mentioned above, the *Ars Minor* was used in Wales, as in most of the medieval West, as the standard primer for elementary Latin education. Nicholas Orme has written that ‘most boys in medieval Wales would have begun learning grammar from Donatus or a derivative of him.’¹⁹ The *Ars Minor* deals only with the parts of speech, and is written in a characteristic, pedagogical question-and-answer style.

The imposition of the eight-fold *Ars Minor* division of the parts of speech onto the original bipartite division of the earlier medieval grammars necessitated considerable addition to, and reworking of, the text of the bardic grammars. As a rule of thumb, where it is possible to follow the Welsh exemplars, the *Dwned* in Llanstephan 28 more or less does so; however, where the introduction of new parts of speech means that it cannot, the relevant sections of the *Ars Minor* are imported into the text. Take, for instance, the following paragraph describing the division between strong and weak nouns. First, here is the version of the earlier grammars (taken here from Peniarth 20):

Deu ryw henw ysyd, henw kadarn a henw gwann. Henw kadarn yw hwnn a sauo drwydaw e hun yn ymadrawd, val y mae *dyn*, ac *eniueil*. Henw gwann yw hwnn ar ny sauo drwydaw e hun yn ymadrawd heb gadarn yn y gynnal, val y mae *gwann*, *kryf*, *dewr*.²⁰

¹⁷ All text and terminology of the *Ars Minor* is taken from Louis Holtz (ed.), *Donat et la tradition d'enseignement grammatical. Étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe-IXe siècle) et édition critique* (Paris, 1981), 585–602.

¹⁸ *GP* lxxix–lxx. See also Ifor Williams, ‘Awdl i Rys ap Gruffudd gan Einion Offeiriad: dos-barth Einion ar ramadeg a’i ddyled i Ddonatus’, *Y Cymmrodor* 26 (1916), 115–46, and Matonis, ‘Western grammatical tradition’, 121–45.

¹⁹ Nicholas Orme, ‘Education in medieval Wales’, *Welsh History Review* 27.4 (2015), 607–44, at 635.

²⁰ *GP* 42. The text of the bardic grammars throughout this paper is reprinted from the edition of Peniarth 20 in *GP*. The reasoning behind selecting this version is discussed below.

‘There are two kinds of noun, a strong noun and a weak noun. A strong noun is one that stands on its own in speech, like *man*, and *animal*. A weak noun is one that does not stand on its own in speech without a noun supporting it, like *weak*, *strong*, *brave*.’

The *Dwned*’s definition is not exactly identical, but the broad strokes are the same:

Pob henw sydd, nid amgen, henw gwann a henw kadarn. Henw kadarn a saif wrtho e hyn heb nerth gan arall, val y mae *gwr*, *mab*. Henw gwann ni saif wrtho e hun heb nerth gair arall, val y mae *gwynn*, *dv*, *doeth*, *tec*.²¹

‘Every noun is either a weak noun or a strong noun. A strong noun stands on its own without support from another, like *man*, *boy*. A weak noun does not stand on its own without support from another word, like *white*, *black*, *wise*, *fair*.’

The paragraph is not found in the *Ars Minor*. It is clear then that here, as was the case for the parts of speech terminology, the aim is to preserve and build upon what already exists in the earlier bardic grammars, even if it is absent in the Latin text. The text of the earlier grammars is by no means inviolable — it can be rewritten, and the meaning altered slightly — but it provides the basic outline for the rewrite.

Material from the *Ars Minor* is only brought in where the earlier grammars are lacking. Often entire paragraphs, consisting of whole sections of the *Dwned*, are imported from the Latin. One such importation occurs in the section on adverbs. The *Dwned* reads: *Beth yw rragveryf? Rran araith a osoter wedy beryf, ac yn gyflawn synnwyr yn ol beryf*. ‘What is an adverb? A part of speech which is put after a verb, and the completion of meaning following a verb’.²² This sentence appears to be taken almost word-for-word from the *Ars Minor*: *Aduerbiūm quid est? Pars orationis, quae adiecta uerbo significationem eius explanat atque inplet*.²³ ‘What is an adverb? A part of speech which, added to the verb, explains and completes its meaning’. Similar examples abound, wherever the new parts of speech are introduced into the *Dwned*. In some instances, untranslated Latin examples are lifted directly from the *Ars Minor*.²⁴

Of course, the importation of new content from the *Ars Minor* demands the introduction of new sets of terminology into the *Dwned* text, and in these instances there is no need to negotiate between the earlier bardic grammars (which do not contain these terms) and what occurs in the Latin source material. Again, the Welsh terms in the table below correspond to those found in the *Ars Minor*. Here, however, no forms from the earlier bardic grammars

²¹GP 67.

²²GP 72.

²³Holtz, *Donat*, 595.

²⁴See for instance the section on prepositions in the *Dwned*, printed on p. 172 below.

are preserved in the case system terminology (none exist). It is worth noting that the Welsh terms are all intensely Latinate in form — perhaps reflecting an earlier application to Latin rather than Welsh,²⁵ and their restriction to a grammatical context. In any case, as above, they appear to be brought into the *Dwned* via the *Ars Minor*.

<i>Dwned</i>	<i>Ars Minor</i>
nomnadio	nominatiuus
genedio	genetiuus
dadio	datiuus
achwysiad	accusatiuus
bogaid	uocatiuus
aplliaid	ablatiuus

Table 2: Case System Terminology

It is clear that the *Ars Minor*, as has long been acknowledged, did play a significant role in the *Dwned* revision. In spite of its immense importance as a source, however, the content of the *Ars Minor* never completely overwhelms that of the earlier bardic grammars: wherever possible, the terms and definitions set forth in the bardic grammars are preserved, with additions only made as necessary. New material is only introduced from the *Ars Minor* when no corresponding section exists in the earlier grammars.

PENIARTH 20

The regular negotiation between the *Ars Minor* and the earlier versions of the Welsh bardic grammars has some implications for the Welsh source of the *Dwned*. The following paragraph, on interjections, is from the *Dwned*:

Beth yw taflodiad? Rrann araith a arweddoka dehevwyd meddwl dan lef gyhvdedi. Vn peth a ddamwynia iddi, nid amgen, synnwyr e hun. Pedwar rryw synwyr ysydd i daflodiad, kanis rrai o'r taflodiadav a arweddoka lywenydd, val y mae *vah*, *evax*. Rai a arweddoka dolvr, val y mae *heu*. Rai a arweddoka ryveddwch, val y mae *pape*. Rai a arweddokant ofn, val y mae *atat*. Rai a arweddokant []²⁶ val y mae *hoe*,²⁷ ac od oes eraill kyffelip vddvnt.²⁸

‘What is an interjection? A part of speech which signifies zeal of mind by a cry of complaint. One thing affects it, namely, its own

²⁵I am grateful to Barry Lewis for this suggestion.

²⁶*GP* inserts square brackets to indicate that a word has been left out of the text. This must be true on the basis of sense, but there is no blank space in the manuscript. The corresponding sentence does not occur in Peniarth 51.

²⁷*GP* has emended this to *o*; the manuscript reading is restored here.

²⁸*GP* 75.

sense. There are four kinds of sense to an interjection, since some interjections signify joy, like *vah*, *evax*. Some signify pain, like *heu*. Some signify wonder, like *pape*. Some signify fear, like *atat*. Some signify [] like *hoe*, and if there are others, they are similar to them.'

This is a translation of the corresponding paragraph in the *Ars Minor*, and even includes some identical, untranslated Latin examples. The *Ars Minor* reads:

Interiectio quid est? Pars orationis significans mentis affectum uoce incondita. Interiectioni quid accidit? Tantum significatio. Significatio interiectionis in quo est? Quia aut laetitiam significamus, ut *euax*, aut dolorem, ut *heu*, aut admirationem, ut *pape*, aut metum, ut *attat*, et si qua sunt similia.²⁹

'What is an interjection? A part of speech signifying emotion of the mind through an undisciplined utterance. What affects an interjection? Only meaning. In what is the meaning of an interjection? That we signify joy, as *evax*, or pain, as *heu*, or wonder, as *pape*, or fear, as *attat*, and any other similar ones there might be.'

Normally, as discussed above, this kind of direct importation and translation would be expected only if it were a result of the expansion of the parts of speech, and the section were absent in the earlier bardic grammars. However, a section on interjections does appear in all of the earliest copies of the 'Einion Offeiriad' recension, as follows (text from Jesus College 111):

Geireu ereill ar ny hanffont o'r dwy rann ymadrawd racko, henw, neu rachenw, a beryf, a arwydockaant tristyt, val y mae *och*, neu lewenyd, val y mae *oi*; nyt ynt ranneu ymadrawd kwbwl, ac ny wnant namyn aghwaneckau ymadrawd.³⁰

'Other words which do not derive from the two preceding parts of speech, noun (or pronoun) and verb, signify sadness, as in *och*, or joy, as in *oi*; they are not complete parts of speech, and they do not do anything but augment a statement.'

This paragraph, which is present in all the early copies of the 'Einion Offeiriad' version, is absent in Peniarth 20, the 'Dafydd Ddu' version. It may be inferred on the basis of his regular alternation elsewhere that the redactor of Llanstephan 28 did not have access to a version of the grammar which contained the section on interjections, and therefore resorted to a translation of the *Ars Minor*. He must therefore have been using Peniarth 20 or a close relative: in other words, the 'Dafydd Ddu' recension. It is possible that the

²⁹Holtz, *Donat*, 602.

³⁰GP 5.

compiler of the *Dwned* was indeed using Peniarth 20 itself. A colophon on p. 69 of Llanstephan 28 notes that the book was written in the year 1455 by Gutun Owain, and that it belonged to Phylip ap Madoc ap Ieuaf ap Ierwerth. Gutun Owain was closely associated with Valle Crucis abbey, where he spent forty years of his life and to whose abbots he composed praise poetry,³¹ and coincidentally, the place where Peniarth 20 was likely produced over a century earlier, c. 1330.³² In fact, it is likely that he had access to and made use of Peniarth 20 in other works. Gutun is well known to us not only as a poet himself, and as a genealogist, but as a prolific copyist and editor. Among his many works was the copy of *Brenhinedd y Saesson* found in NLW 7006D (The Black Book of Basingwerk), which was written using Peniarth 20 as a source, according to Thomas Jones.³³ If we take Gutun Owain to be the editor of the grammar rather than merely a copyist (the argument for doing so is discussed further below), it is therefore reasonable to assume that the bardic grammar contained in Peniarth 20 itself was his main Welsh source for the *Dwned*.

CONFRONTING LINGUISTIC REALITIES IN THE *Dwned*

Thus, it is more or less possible to describe a regular system by which the earlier bardic grammars and the *Ars Minor* are synthesised. The earlier bardic grammars took primacy over the *Ars Minor* where possible, with the *Ars Minor* providing supplementary additional material where the bardic grammars were lacking. It is more difficult to satisfactorily explain such a system. Taking the case terminology in Table 2 above, for instance, one is met with an immediate, obvious problem, which is that by this period, the Welsh language (unlike Latin) was not a case language. Introducing terminology for case in order to describe a language that lacked cases would seem to be a rather pointless exercise. To some extent, the *Dwned* attempts to account for this disconnect: it is in the section on case that one encounters some of the most innovative material in the *Dwned* revision — material which belongs neither to the earlier grammars nor to the *Ars Minor*, but appears to be an original composition. Where the *Ars Minor* naturally focuses on inflection as the defining feature of case, the Welsh grammar uses syntactic and semantic criteria. This is evident in the description of the genitive case, given below.

Genedio a arweddoka ganedigaeth, ac a vydd pan vo dav henw gadarn yn dyvod i gyd, ac vn yn perchennogi ar y llall. Yr vn a vo perchennoc a vydd genedic, val y mae *penn Rys*: *Rys* yw'r genedio iddo. Nev pann vo yn dyvod yn ol svperlliaid radd, val y mae y *dekaf o'r dynion*: y *dynion* yw'r genedio.³⁴

³¹Matonis, 'Gutun Owain', 160, 163.

³²Huws, *Repertory*; Matonis, 'Gutun Owain', 160.

³³Thomas Jones (ed. and trans.), *Brut y Tywysogion, or The Chronicle of the Princes: Peniarth MS 20 Version* (Cardiff, 1952), li.

³⁴*GP* 70.

‘Genitive signifies possession, and it exists when two strong nouns come together, and one belongs to the other. The one that is the owner is genitive, as in *the head of Rhys*: *Rhys* is the genitive to it. Or when it comes after a superlative degree, as in *the fairest of the men*: *the men* is the genitive.’

Of course, as we have seen, no cases are described in the earlier bardic grammars. In the *Ars Minor*, the cases are not defined in this way, but simply given as examples: so for instance *genetiuo huius magistri* (genitive ‘of this teacher’).³⁵ These case forms do not exist in Welsh, and so could not be translated into the *Dwned* text. Instead, the explanation of the imported case system is supplemented with an innovative description of a syntactic feature which occurs in Welsh, but not in Latin. The result is that the idea of the genitive becomes intelligible in Welsh from the perspective of function rather than form.

Elsewhere, the solution in the *Dwned* is neither to translate nor to innovate, but simply to replicate the Latin forms exactly as they appear in the *Ars Minor*. Latin examples are scattered throughout the *Dwned*, but they are concentrated most heavily in the sections describing conjunctions and prepositions. The following example is illustrative.

Pedwar arddodiad a wysnaetha weithiav i achwyssiaid, weithiav i applaid, nid amgen *in, super, sub, subter*. Pan gyffroo o le i le arall, yna y gwyssnaetha i achvsiaid, val y mae *itur in antiquam silvam*. Pryd na bo kyffro o le i le arall, [yna y gwassanaetha i ableit]³⁶ val y mae *stans celsa in puppi*.³⁷

‘Four prepositions are sometimes subject to the accusative, sometimes to the ablative, namely *in, super, sub, subter*. When it goes from place to place, then it is subject to the accusative, as in “goes into an ancient forest”. When it does not go from place to place, then it is subject to the ablative, as in “standing on the elevated stern”.’

In this paragraph, the *Dwned* copies lists and phrases wholesale from the text of the *Ars Minor*.³⁸ Again, the immediate reason is obvious: the linguistic phenomenon under consideration did not exist in Welsh, and so cannot possibly

³⁵Holtz, *Donat*, 586.

³⁶This insertion is made in *GP* based on the reading in Peniarth 51. It probably represents a correction to the text of Llanstephan 28 by Gwilym Tew; see discussion of the relationship between these manuscripts below.

³⁷*GP* 75.

³⁸The corresponding section in the *Ars Minor* (Holtz, *Donat*, 600) reads:

Da utriusque casus praepositiones. In, sub, super, subter. In et sub quando accusatiuo casui seruiunt? Quando uel nos uel quoslibet in locum ire isse iturus esse significamus. Quando ablatiuo? Quando uel nos uel quoslibet in loco esse fuisse futuros esse significamus. In accusatiui casus, *itur in antiquam siluam*; in ablatiui casus, *stans celsa in puppi*.

be described with reference to any Middle Welsh word-forms. What is clear from both of these examples is that the compiler of the *Dwned* appears to have been fully cognisant of those instances in which the description of the Latin language in the *Ars Minor* and the realities of the Welsh language were in conflict with one another. The text presents two possible solutions to this dilemma: either the supplementation of innovative material, explaining the sense rather than the form of a Latin case, or the direct replication of Latin examples. What remains less clear is why, exactly, this exercise was felt to be necessary at all. What was the point of introducing technical terminology to describe forms that do not occur in the language being described? To answer this question, we must first raise another.

THE *Accedence*

To this point, the *Dwned* can essentially be considered a creative synthesis of the *Ars Minor* and the earlier bardic grammars (probably Peniarth 20) with some original insertions, a text which displays a sensitivity to both the bardic and Latin grammatical traditions, as well as the reality of the Welsh language. However, this characterisation does not explain the impetus behind its creation, nor why the text coalesced at this precise moment in time. Donatus and Priscian were both already source texts for the bardic grammars at the time of their compilation.³⁹ Donatus had been in circulation for some thousand years, and the grammars themselves for well over a century, by the time of the *Dwned* revision. Why, then, were the bardic grammars realigned with the *Ars Minor* in the fifteenth century?

It is worth taking the wider context of the Welsh project into consideration. The adaptation of the *Ars Minor* into a vernacular language was not the peculiar domain of the Welsh.⁴⁰ Rather, the production of the *Dwned* fits within a wider trend in the late middle ages. There are earlier examples of the phenomenon on the continent, such as the Provençale *Donatz proensals* by Uc Faidit in the second quarter of the thirteenth century and possibly the Breton *Donoet*, also in the thirteenth century.⁴¹ However, interest in Donatus

'Give the prepositions of both cases. *In, sub, super, subter*. When are *in* and *subter* subject to the accusative case? When we signify that either we or whoever go, went, will go into a place. When ablative? When we signify that either we or whoever are, were, will be in a place. In the accusative case, *goes into an ancient wood*; in the ablative case, *standing on an elevated stern*.'

³⁹Matonis, 'Western grammatical tradition', 121; *GP* xxxv.

⁴⁰I am not the first to make this observation. In her treatment of the English grammar in NLW 423D, discussed immediately below, Llinos Beverley Smith remarked that 'the medieval Donet was also available in Welsh' ('The grammar and commonplace books of John Edwards of Chirk', *BBCS* 34 (1987), 174–84, at 181), however the exact nature and implications of this apparent connection are not explored, and following the editors of *GP*, the *Dwned* is taken to be a tool for the instruction of aspirant bards.

⁴¹J. H. Marshall (ed.), *The Donatz Proensals of Uc Faidit* (London and New York, 1969); Gwenaël Le Duc, 'Le Donoet, grammaire latine en moyen Breton', *EC* 14 (2) (1975), 525–65 and 16 (1979), 237–59.

reaches a crescendo in the fifteenth century, with the production of a number of commentaries on the *Ars Minor* and a flurry of translation activity.⁴² Two major translations are associated with England in the early fifteenth century: the *Donait françois* of John Barton, written sometime between 1400 and 1409 for the purpose of French instruction,⁴³ and the *Accedence*, either written or revised by John Leylond in the first quarter of the fifteenth century.⁴⁴

The *Accedence* is of particular importance in the Welsh context. Written in Middle English, it is, like the Welsh text in many places, more or less a translation of Donatus' *Ars Minor*, but unlike the bardic grammars, it is intended to teach Latin, and not the vernacular language in which it is written. It was composed or revised before 1428 by John Leylond, who served as a schoolmaster at Peckwater Inn, now a part of Christ Church in Oxford. Leylond's treatise is not a great *summa grammatica*, but an intensely pragmatic and focused work, likely representative of his own experience as a teacher and written to suit his own needs as a schoolmaster. It is reflective of the shift at the end of the fourteenth century and beginning of the fifteenth in England towards teaching grammar through the medium of English, rather than French or Latin. The tract enjoyed immense popularity throughout the fifteenth century, and was widely recopied.⁴⁵

In fact, two surviving copies of the *Accedence* come from north-east Wales, both preserved in NLW Peniarth 356 (c. 1460–80), which was written by Thomas Pennant, probably at Basingwerk Abbey.⁴⁶ In addition, this manuscript contains a number of other Middle English grammatical texts connected with the name of John Leylond, including two different versions of both the *Comparacio* and the *Informacio*.⁴⁷ The manuscript seems to have been used as a teaching text: Daniel Huws suggests that it was created during Pennant's youth but later used while he was working as a teacher, probably at Valle Crucis abbey.⁴⁸

This would place Peniarth 356 within a wider tradition of English grammatical teaching in fifteenth-century north-east Wales. A second manuscript, NLW 423D, mostly in the hand of John Edwards of Chirk and probably compiled at Valle Crucis abbey in the 1480s, also contains a copy of the *Informacio*, and also seems to have been used as a teaching text (in this case, for Edwards's son, John Wyn).⁴⁹ Glossing in English in this manuscript indicates this was

⁴²G. L. Bursill-Hall, 'Medieval Donatus commentaries', *Historia Linguistica* 8.1 (1987), 69–97, at 72–3.

⁴³Bernard Colombat (ed.), *Donait françois* (Paris, 2014).

⁴⁴David Thomson (ed.), *An Edition of the Middle English Grammatical Texts* (New York, 1984), xii; David Thomson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Middle English Grammatical Texts* (New York, 1979), 11.

⁴⁵Many of these copies are edited in Thomson, *An Edition*.

⁴⁶David Thomson, 'Cistercians and schools in late medieval Wales', *CMCS* 3 (1982), 76–80, at 76–7; Thomson, *Catalogue*, 105–31.

⁴⁷For a complete list, see Thomson, *Catalogue*, 1–2.

⁴⁸Huws, *Repertory*, s.n. Peniarth 356.

⁴⁹Huws, *Repertory*, s.n. NLW 423D. The John Edwards manuscript is also treated in Smith, 'John Edwards', 179–84.

the primary language of instruction.⁵⁰ On the basis of these two manuscripts, as well as the sixteenth-century account of the English-language education of Maredudd ab Ieuan ap Robert in Caernarfon,⁵¹ Orme has noted that ‘the use of English for teaching Latin was spreading into grammar schools in Wales, at least in the north of the country’.⁵²

Ann Matonis has shown that Gutun Owain was connected not only with both of these places, but with both Thomas Pennant and John Edwards. She writes that Gutun ‘copied manuscripts at Basingwerk, and is often referred to as the historian of Basingwerk, but is most closely associated with Valle Crucis where Peniarth 20 is likely to have been produced and where his uncle, Siôn ap Rhisiart, served as abbot from c. 1448–1455’.⁵³ Praise poems and elegies by Gutun for both John Edwards and Thomas Pennant survive. Matonis sees them both as existing in the same social and cultural orbit, which she defines as ‘a horizontally and spatially defined group connected by ties of kinship and cultural interests’.⁵⁴ The presence of the various Middle English grammatical treatises in Welsh manuscripts of the period suggests that the group Matonis defines, and perhaps one might say more broadly the learned culture of fifteenth-century north-east Wales, operated at least partially in English.

Aspersions have occasionally been cast on the *Dwned* editor’s grasp of Latin on the basis of the rampant copying errors in its Latin examples.⁵⁵ It seems likely he had at least a grasp of basic vocabulary: after all, he could follow along with the *Ars Minor* competently enough — admittedly a syntactically simple text — and plug the right examples into the right sections.

If we take Gutun Owain to be the original editor of the *Dwned*, it is clear from his work in other areas that he did know English: for instance, Huw Pryce has recently found that he used the printed version of William Caxton’s 1480 Middle English translation of the Anglo-Norman prose *Brut* in some of his additions to *Brenhinedd y Saeson*.⁵⁶ It can therefore be assumed that he would have been perfectly comfortable working with Middle English grammatical texts. In fact, if the editor (whatever his identity) were slightly ill at ease in Latin, as G. J. Williams believed, the *Accedence* might have proven to be an attractively intelligible source text, as a complement to the *Ars Minor*.

The discussion in this section of Gutun Owain’s professional network, language skills, and probable access to the relevant source material has so far naturally assumed that he was chiefly responsible for the changes made to

⁵⁰Smith, ‘John Edwards’, 181.

⁵¹Orme, ‘Education’, 632. The account is found in Sir John Wynn’s *History of the Gwydir Family*. For more on these manuscripts as teaching texts see Thomson, ‘Cistercians and schools’, 76–80.

⁵²Orme, ‘Education’, 636–7.

⁵³Matonis, ‘Gutun Owain’, 160.

⁵⁴Matonis, ‘Gutun Owain’, 168.

⁵⁵*GP* xlvii.

⁵⁶Huw Pryce, ‘Chronicling and its contexts in medieval Wales’, in Ben Guy, Owain Wyn Jones, Georgia Henley, and Rebecca Thomas (eds), *The Chronicles of Medieval Wales and the March: New Contexts, Studies and Texts* (Turnhout, forthcoming). I am grateful to Huw Pryce for granting me access to this chapter prior to publication.

the re-edit of the grammars found in Llanstephan 28. This is not necessarily correct, or at least, it may not be the full picture. It is possible that Gutun was copying from another, earlier source (see further the discussions of the colophon below on p. 185, and of the relationship between Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 51 below on pp. 181–4), and if so, it is impossible to know how much (if any) of the editorial work represents his original input. Nonetheless, the arguments for Gutun's involvement in the edition could be generalised and applied to other scholars working in the same milieu, if necessary. There are a number of suitable candidates.⁵⁷ In the most cautious possible terms, it can be stated that the *Dwned* revision was likely made in north-east Wales, in the mid-fifteenth century, against the backdrop of scholarship taking place in Welsh, Latin, and English. Given the circumstantial evidence for access and linguistic skill, and the copy surviving in his hand in Llanstephan 28, Gutun Owain is at the very least a likely candidate — and if not him, then certainly someone in what Matonis calls his 'orbit'.

In any case, there is no need to rely on the positive identification of the *Dwned* editor to make a case for the use of the *Accedence* in the preparation of his edition. Our evidence for this extends beyond the purely circumstantial. Convergences between the text of the *Dwned* and the text of the *Accedence* are occasionally striking. The *Dwned* introduces a new means by which nouns might be classified, which is not found in either the earlier grammars or in the *Ars Minor*. The following paragraph appears at the start of the *Dwned* text:

Pa ssawl rrann ymadrodd ysydd? Wyth, nid amgen, henw a rraghenw, a beryf, a racveryf, a chyrranniad, a chysyllldiad, ac arddodiad, a thaflodiad. Pedwar o'r rrain a dreiglr, a ffedwar ni threiglr. Y pedwar a dreiglr yw henw, a rrachenw, a beryf, a chyfranniad. Y pedwar ni threiglr yw racveryf, a chyssyllldiad, ac arddodiad, a thaflodiad. Tair rrann a dreiglr ac achos, ac vn heb achos, henw a rraghenw, a chyfranniad ac achos, beryf vnac heb achos.⁵⁸

'How many parts of speech are there? Eight, namely noun and pronoun, and verb, and adverb, and participle, and conjunction, and preposition, and interjection. Four of these are inflected, and four are not inflected. The four that are inflected are noun, and pronoun, and verb, and participle. The four that are not inflected are adverb, and conjunction, and preposition, and interjection. Three parts are inflected with case, and one without case, noun and pronoun and participle with case, verb alone without case.'

⁵⁷I am grateful to the anonymous *Celtica* reader for drawing my attention to the Trefor family in particular, who seem to fit the bill in several respects: Edward ap Dafydd of Bryncunallt (fl. c. 1390–d.1445) and his sons Robert Trefor (fl. c. 1429–d. 1452) and Siôn Trefor (fl. c. 1440–d. 1493) were all active during or shortly before the 1455 date given in Llanstephan 28; they were closely related to the Edwards family; they were associated with Valle Crucis; and they were praised by Guto'r Glyn for their learning (see notes under 'Patrons and poets list' on www.gutorglyn.net, as well as poems 103, 104, 105 *ibid.* (accessed 16 July 2019)).

⁵⁸*GP* 67.

In contrast, both the earlier Welsh grammars and the *Ars Minor* only list the parts of speech, before immediately launching into a definition of the noun. The discussion of inflection is wholly omitted. However, the *Accedence* begins with the paragraph below:

How many partys of spech byn þer? VIII. Qwech viij? Nown, pronowne, verbe, aduerbe, participul, coniunccion, preposicion, interieccion. How mony byn declynet and how mony byn vndeclynet? IIII byn declynet and iiij byn vndeclynet. Wech iiij byn declynet? Nowne, pronwne, verbe and partycipull. Wych iiij byn vndeclynet? Aduerbe, coniunccion, preposicion and interieccion. How mony byn declynt w^t case and how mony w^tout case? III wyth case and on w^tout case. Wech iij wyth case? Nowne, pronwne and partycipull. Wyn on w^tout case? Verbe allon.⁵⁹

This classification of parts of speech by what I have translated as ‘inflection’, and what Leylond calls ‘declension’,⁶⁰ does occur in other medieval vernacular versions of Donatus, such as the *Donat français*, and it is originally derived from Priscian.⁶¹ However, it is not always presented in this precise order, with a list of eight parts of speech (noun, pronoun, verb, adverb, participle, conjunction, preposition, interjection) that is then broken down into groups of four (noun, pronoun, verb, participle; adverb, conjunction, preposition, interjection). The order and breakdown of the Welsh and English lists are identical. It is of course possible that both of these works might have separately gone back into Priscian for only this part of their classification system, turning to Donatus for the rest, or that they might have both been influenced by a third, unknown text. But in conjunction with the fact that the *Accedence* was well-circulated in north-east Wales, and very likely known to the redactor, it seems likely that the section on declinability was imported into the Welsh *Dwned* from a text of the *Accedence*. It is also worth noting that the system as outlined does not actually describe the Welsh language: prepositions can be inflected in Welsh, but here they are classified amongst the four parts of speech that cannot be inflected, following the English text.⁶² Like the problem of the case system, discussed above, there appears in this section also to be a mismatch between linguistic reality and what is set out in the grammar.

⁵⁹Thomson, *An Edition*, 1. Throughout this article, the *Accedence* text has been taken from the first version in Peniarth 356 (fol. 54v–57v, 48r), as printed in Thomson, *An Edition*, 1–8 (Text A). This version more closely resembles the *Dwned* than the second text, in Peniarth 356 (Text B) (see pp. 185–7 below).

⁶⁰The base meaning of the Welsh term, *treiglo*, is essentially to turn or change in some way. It is used to describe both verbal conjugation and nominal declension in this text, and later comes to be used to designate the system of initial mutations in Welsh. I have therefore opted for the broader translation, although the *Accedence* uses ‘declines’. See GPC s.v. *treiglaf*.

⁶¹Thomson, *Edition*, 228, note to line 2.

⁶²I am grateful to the anonymous *Celtica* reader for drawing my attention to this point.

<i>Dwned</i> Llanstephan 28	<i>Dwned</i> Peniarth 51 ⁶³	<i>Accedence</i>	Earlier bardic grammars	<i>Ars Minor</i>
Pronouns				
masgl	massglin	masculyn	-	masculinum
ffemal	ffemin	femyn	-	femininum
neodr	nevtvr	neuter	-	neutrum
-	-	comyn	-	commune
Nouns				
gwrw	gwryw	masculyn	gwryw	masculinum
banw	baniw	femyn	benw	femininum
neodr	[illegible] ⁶⁴	neuter	-	neutrum
cyffredin	ky[-----]	comyn	cyffredin	-
anwybod	tybius/anwybot	dubyn	-	-
-	-	epycyn	-	epicoenon

Table 3: Terminology for grammatical gender

A CASE-STUDY: TERMINOLOGY FOR GRAMMATICAL GENDER IN THE *Dwned*

We can take this notion a little further by examining an additional selection of the terminology used in the *Dwned*, now with the *Accedence* in mind as well as the *Ars Minor* and the earlier bardic grammars. I have given above the full paradigm of terminology used to denote grammatical gender, as found in two different copies of the *Dwned* and some of its probable source texts.

To this point, I have generally been discussing the *Dwned* as it appears in Llanstephan 28. At this juncture I believe it is important to take the copy of the grammar in Peniarth 51,⁶⁵ Gwilym Tew’s miscellany (column 2), into consideration as a point of comparison, as the terminology for grammatical gender in the section on pronouns differs slightly in both copies. In addition to its terminological variance, the Peniarth 51 copy contrasts in certain important respects with Llanstephan 28. Most notably, the Gwilym Tew manuscript contains two

⁶³Taken from the transcription in Anne Jones, ‘Gwilym Tew: astudiaeth destunol o’i lawysgrif, Peniarth 51, ynghyd ag ymdriniaeth â’i farddoniaeth’, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales, Bangor (1980), 180–222.

⁶⁴Unfortunately, this section, which begins at the bottom of p. 71 and continues through to p. 72, is partially illegible (the tops of pages in Peniarth 51 are damaged). However, we know that there would have been five listed, as in Llanstephan 28, and that the first was *gwryw* (Peniarth 51, p. 71: *Pump kenetl henw y ssydd. nit amgen gwryw yw yr hwnn a berthyno. ar wr. val y mae gwynn*), and a later reference is made to *baniw* in the definition of *neodr* (Peniarth 51, p. 72: [...] *beth yw ai gwryw ai baniw* [...]). The definition of *kyffredin* is partially intact, and *tybius/anwybot* completely intact. Given the correspondence with the Llanstephan 28 version in this section, it can be assumed that we would have something like *neodr/nevtvr* here.

⁶⁵Images of the microfilm for this copy are available on the National Library of Wales website, at <https://viewer.library.wales/4396882> (accessed 16 July 2019); it has also been edited in Jones, ‘Gwilym Tew’, 180–222.

of the early sections missing from Llanstephan 28 which are more bardic in orientation: the letters, and the syllables and diphthongs.

The first point to note is that in the *Dwned* treatment of nominal gender, priority is given to the earlier bardic grammars: where a set of terminology already exists in the earlier texts (i.e. *gwryw*, *benw*, and *cyffredin*), these terms are preserved in the *Dwned* (*gwrw*, *banw*, *cyffredin*). *Neodr/nevtr*, for which no antecedent exists in the earlier grammars, is translated from the *Accedence*. This situation is similar to the negotiation described above in the *Dwned*'s formulation of a system of terminology for the parts of speech, where the established Welsh terms in the earlier bardic grammars are preserved, with new terms brought in to fill in the gaps created by the importation of additional content.

The section on pronouns is one such addition in *Dwned* text, and as such, it does not need to preserve the terminology of the earlier bardic grammars: thus, *gwrw* and *banw* are rejected in favour of *masgl* and *ffemal* in Llanstephan 28, and *massglin* and *ffemin* in Peniarth 51. As was the case above, it is possible that the terms *masgl/massglin*, *ffemin*, and *neodr/nevtr* were already in use in Welsh.⁶⁶ They are probably derived from Latin *masculinum*, *femininum*, *neutrum* or perhaps *masculus*, *femina*,⁶⁷ and indeed, the *GPC* describes all of these terms as learned borrowings from Latin.⁶⁸ It is notable, however, that the terms which are more Latinate in form are used only where more 'native' terms are not already in place.

Ffemal in Llanstephan 28 requires a little more elaboration. This appears to be a newer form than the rest, and I suggest that it was probably coined in Welsh in this translation of the *Accedence*. Unlike the other forms, it unquestionably comes into Welsh via English rather than Latin;⁶⁹ however, as Table 3 shows, the equivalent English term was not used in the *Accedence* as a label for grammatical gender. In general, in Middle English *female* was exclusively a term for biological sex.⁷⁰ The word does, however, occur in the *Accedence* text, not as a grammatical label, but a little further into the discussion of gender. It occurs in the definition of the *epicene* gender, in the final sentence of the paragraph given below:

⁶⁶Similar forms are found in two religious poems in the Black Book of Carmarthen: *vascul a femen* (A. O. H. Jarman, *Llyfr Du Caerfyrddin* (Cardiff, 1982), poem 9; Henry Lewis, *Hen Gerddi Crefyddol* (Caerdydd, 1931), poem 1) and *a mascul a bun* (Jarman, *LIDC*, poem 10; Lewis, *Hen Gerddi*, poem 2). The occurrence of these terms in phrases employing, respectively, a Latinate (*femen*) and a native Welsh (*bun*, see *GPC* s.v.) term for 'female' is compelling given the discussion above. However, in context they appear to be denoting biological sex rather than grammatical gender. Additionally, as Henry Lewis notes, both *mascul* and *femen* come from Latin *masculus* and *femina* (Lewis, *Hen Gerddi*, 110).

⁶⁷See previous footnote, and cf. the forms *mascul*, *femen*, *neuter* given in the *Auraicept na nÉces*, discussed in Paul Russell, 'Sex, gender, and the early Irish grammarian', in David Cram, Andrew Linn, and Elke Nowak (eds.), *History of Linguistics 1996, Volume I: Traditions in Linguistics Worldwide* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1999), 203–13, at 204.

⁶⁸*GPC* s.v. *masgl*³, *ffemen*, *neodr*. The terms are listed as borrowings from *masculus*, *femina*, and *neutrum* respectively.

⁶⁹*GPC* s.v. *ffemal*.

⁷⁰*OED Online* s.v. *female*; cf. *feminine*.

How many gendyr of nownus byn per? VII. Qwech vij? Þe masculyn, þe femyn, þe neuter, þe comyn of ij, þe comyn of iij, þe dubyn and þe epycyn. How knos þu þe masculyn gendyr? For hyt ys declynynt w^l *hyc* as *hyc maijster*. How knos þu þe femyn gendyr? For hyt ys declynet w^l *hec* as *hec musa*. How knos þe neuter gendyr? For hyt declynynt w^l *hoc* as *hoc scamnum*. How knos þu þe comyn of ij gendyr? For hyt declynynt w^l *hic* and *hec* as nominatiuo *hic et hec sacerdos*. How knos þe comyn of iij gendyr? For hyt declynynt w^l *hic* and *hec* | and *hoc* as nominatiuo *hic et hec et hoc felix*. How knos þu dubyn gendyr? For hyt ys declynynt w^l *hic* and *hec* and a *vel* coniunccon comyng bytwene as *hic vel hec dies*, for ‘a day’. How knos þu þe epycyn gendyr? For vndyr on voyse and vndyr on articull he comprehendys boþe þe male and þe female as *hic passer* for ‘a sparo’ both þe he and þe hoo.⁷¹

The word *female* is used as expected above: as a marker of biological sex, serving to elucidate the relationship between biological sex and grammatical gender. It is not itself a part of the system of grammatical terminology set forth in the *Accedence*. This appears to change when the term *female* is introduced into the Welsh system. In the section on pronouns in the Llanstephan 28 *Dwned*, *ffemal* seems to function as a part of a formalised grammatical system of gender terminology (as indicated in Table 3). Its first appearance in the *Dwned* text, however, is not in the section on pronouns, but in the following explanation of nominal grammatical gender:

Masgl yw’r peth gwrw, ac a dreiglir a hwnn, ffemal yw’r peth banw, ac a dreiglir a honn [...].⁷²

‘Masculine (*masgl*) is the masculine (*gwrw*) thing, and is inflected with *hwnn*, feminine (*ffemal*) is the feminine (*banw*) thing, and is inflected with *honn* [...].’

Here, the new terms *ffemal*, *masgl* are defined with reference to the more standard Welsh terms *gwrw*, *banw*. However, it is unclear exactly what is being explained. As in the definition of *epicene* in the *Accedence* (above), this paragraph might be attempting to negotiate the relationship between biological sex and grammatical gender. But it is not obvious whether *ffemal* is acting primarily as a biological or a grammatical referent in the Welsh text. In spite of the term’s meaning in English, in the later *Dwned* section on pronouns it is unquestionably grammatical. It might therefore be the case that the glossing here is a negotiation between two overlapping systems of terminology, with this paragraph serving as a kind of bridge between the terminological system employed in the description of nominal gender (i.e. *gwrw*, *banw*) and the one

⁷¹Thomson, *An Edition*, 1–2.

⁷²GP 69.

used in the description of pronominal gender (i.e. *masgl*, *ffemal*, etc). It is possible that the Anglicised terms were novel (in the case of *ffemal*) or at least unfamiliar (in the case of *masgl*), and had to be explained with reference to the terms used in the earlier bardic grammars. I do not think this confusion needs to be resolved; in fact, some slight confusion over the English terminology for biological sex and grammatical gender might help to explain how a biological English term is borrowed as a Welsh grammatical term.

The ‘correction’ of *ffemal* to *ffemin* in Peniarth 51, if that characterisation is accurate, is illuminating. It suggests a grammaticalisation or formalisation of gender terminology, and perhaps a deliberate movement away from the more common associations of the English word.⁷³ It also gestures towards a further complexity, which is the precise way in which the grammars in Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 51 are related. There is a great deal of overlap between the two texts, but they are not identical. There are points at which the Peniarth 51 grammar departs from the Llanstephan 28 *Dwned*, following instead the earlier bardic grammars. The most obvious example is the reattachment of the section on syllables and diphthongs to the beginning of the grammar in Peniarth 51, but examples are littered throughout the text. For instance, at the very beginning of the text, Llanstephan 28 defines the noun as follows: *Rrann araith a dreiglr, a welir, nev a glywir, nev a deimlr, nev a ddyko henw ar beth, val y mae angel, dyn, meddwl, prenn* (‘a part of speech which is inflected, which is seen, or heard, or felt, or which presents a name of a thing, as in *angel*, *man*, *wood*’).⁷⁴ It should by now be unsurprising to learn that this definition comes directly from the *Accedence*: *For all þat I may fele, here or se þat berys þe name of a thyng, þe name þerof ys a nowne*.⁷⁵ However, Peniarth 51 gives instead:

Henw yw pob peth a arwyddokao keternyt nev anssawdd damweiniol i'r keternyt. Keternyt yw pob peth o'r a aller i welet, nev glybot, nev gywrdd ac ef; i welet val y mae *dyn, prenn, maen*; a'r gyvryw bethav hynn heb ev kyvansoddi: i glybot, val y mae *gwynt* nav *drwsst* nav *lef* a rryw bethav hynn heb ev kyvansoddi; hevyt kywrdd ac ef val y mae *awyr* nev *liw*.⁷⁶

‘A noun is everything that signifies substance — or a quality accidental to the substance. Substance is everything that can be seen or heard or touched: seen as in *man*, *wood*, *stone*; and similar things that are not composed: heard as in *wind* or *clamour* or *cry* and these kinds of things which are not composed; also touched as in *air* or *colour*.’

Note that the examples are identical to those found in the earlier bardic grammars (but not Peniarth 20), here from Jesus College 111:

⁷³Cf. the coinage of *ferindsne*, *banindsne* in the *Auraicept na nÉces*, discussed in Russell, ‘Sex, gender’, 211.

⁷⁴*GP* 67.

⁷⁵Thomson, *An Edition*, 1.

⁷⁶*GP* 67; Jones, ‘Gwilym Tew’, 185–6. I have altered the punctuation given in *GP* to better reflect the meaning.

Henw yw pob peth o'r a arwydockao kedernit, neu ansawd damweinyaw[!] y'r kedernyt. Kedernyt a arwydoka pob peth o'r a aller y welet, neu y glybot, neu gyhwrdd ac ef; y welet, ual y mae dyn, *prenn*, *maen*, a'r kyfryw betheu corfforawl, kyfanswddedic hynny; y glybot, ual y mae *gwynt*, neu *drwst*, neu *lef*, neu y kyfryw betheu; kyhwrdd ac ef, val y mae *awyr*, neu *liw*.⁷⁷

'A noun is everything that signifies substance, or a quality accidental to the substance. Substance signifies everything that can be seen or heard or met with: seen as in *man*, *wood*, *stone*, and similar physical, composed things; heard, as in *wind* or *clamour* or *cry*, or similar things; touched as in *air* or *colour*.'

Peniarth 20 gives a similar definition, but gives *taran* 'thunder' rather than *trwst* 'clamour' as an example of something that can be seen, and omits *awyr* 'air' from the examples of things that can be touched.⁷⁸ In Peniarth 51, therefore, this section appears to derive from an Einion Offeiriad-type grammar, and not the Dafydd Ddu-type.⁷⁹ This is true of the rest of the text as well, including, significantly, the additional section on the letters and syllables and diphthongs.

The editors of *GP* note that it is 'not impossible' that the copies of the *Dwned* in both Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 51 derive from the same source, with each of the copyists separately making a number of changes and additions to the original text.⁸⁰ If this is correct, then perhaps Gutun Owain was copying an earlier document, and was not the initial editor after all. However, I am not sure this is the simplest explanation. The notion of a shared source gives rise to a number of complexities. For one, the grammar in Peniarth 51 follows the Llanstephan 28 *Dwned* even where, as we have seen, the Llanstephan 28 importation pattern appears to reflect the use of Peniarth 20 as a source document. So in the section on interjections, Peniarth 51 gives an almost identical reading to the one in Llanstephan 28: *beth. yw tabliat. Rann. ar jaith ni threiglr. a arwyddokao diheuyd meddwl. dan lef gyhuddedic*.⁸¹ 'What is an interjection? A part of speech which signifies zeal of mind by a cry of complaint.' As discussed on pp. 169–71, this is a translation from the *Accedence* reflecting a deficiency that occurs in Peniarth 20, but not the 'Einion Offeiriad' grammars. If we hypothesise that both Peniarth 51 and Llanstephan 28 are copies of an earlier synthesis of the bardic grammars and the *Accedence*, and that on the basis of the noun examples in Peniarth 51 given above (and other correspondences throughout the text), this earlier source used an 'Einion Offeiriad' grammar, then why does the original compiler import the section on interjections from the *Accedence* rather than using the vernacular Welsh version of this

⁷⁷*GP* 3.

⁷⁸*GP* 42.

⁷⁹As noted above, the Einion Offeiriad-type grammar occurs in Jesus College 111, Llanstephan 3, Balliol College 353, etc. The Dafydd Ddu-type occurs in Peniarth 20 only.

⁸⁰*GP* xlv.

⁸¹Jones, 'Gwilym Tew', 201–2.

paragraph already in his possession? Further, a shared source assumes continuous re-translation of different parts the *Accedence*, in an apparently haphazard manner, with Gutun Owain drawing in, for instance, the *Accedence* definition of the noun above, sometime *after* the initial act of translation.

It seems more likely that during the preparation of Peniarth 51, Gwilym Tew was using Llanstephan 28 or a copy as his main source or base text, making corrections and additions with reference to the earlier bardic grammars,⁸² and bringing to the task either a Latin text or a general knowledge of Latin. The correction of *ffemal* to *ffemin*, and even *masgl* to *massglin*, may simply reflect a preoccupation on the part of Gwilym Tew with forms that were considered to be more formal and Latinate, whether or not he was aware of the *Accedence* or the *Ars Minor*. We do not have evidence that the *Accedence* had made its way from north-east Wales into Morgannwg by c. 1460–80, and it is probably easier to imagine that the translation of the *Accedence* into Welsh took place once initially, rather than continuously and randomly over the course of the fifteenth century. The Peniarth 51 corrections to the terminology for grammatical gender reaffirm the notion that the more Latinate terms brought into the section on the pronouns were not in regular use in linguistic discussions of Welsh, and so easily changed; this is in contrast to the terms already in place in the earlier grammars (*gwrw*, *banw*).

There may be a further point of interest in the system of grammatical gender terms employed by both Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 51. The grammatical usage of the Welsh term *anwybod* can almost certainly be traced back to the *Accedence*. *Dubyn* is an innovation in the *Accedence*; it has no antecedent in the *Ars Minor*.⁸³ Similarly, the earlier bardic grammars do not contain an equivalent term. I suggest that Welsh *anwybod* is brought into the grammatical context in the *Dwned* as a translation for Middle English *dubyn* (meaning ‘of uncertain gender’, from Lat. *dubius*),⁸⁴ in order to name a category of grammatical gender first introduced into Welsh linguistic discourse by the *Accedence*. However, the word occurs in Peniarth 51 as *tybius* ‘conjunctural’:

Tybius yw yr hynn ni wyp[-ly[.] [.]yssby[.] beth yw ai gwryw ai baniw, val y mae [w] gwydd naŵ jar ni wyr. neb beth yw [w]ryw ai baniw onit i dyb Anwybot val y mae colomen kans ni wyr neb bet[] yw kolomen ai gwryw a[] baniw.⁸⁵

‘Conjunctural is that which it is not known what it is, whether masculine or feminine, as in gosling or chicken. No one knows what

⁸²If the fragmentary grammar on pp. 10–16 of Llanstephan 28 were complete and intact at the time (i.e. including the sections on letters, syllables and diphthongs, and parts of speech), it is possible that Llanstephan 28 could have provided Gwilym Tew with a copy of both source texts — but it is impossible to say for certain.

⁸³Thomson, *Catalogue*, 51.

⁸⁴<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/middle-english-dictionary/dictionary> s.v. *dubie* (accessed 16 July 2019). Cf. *moth*, *toth* in Russell, ‘Sex, gender’, 211t.

⁸⁵Jones ‘Gwilym Tew’, 188; the translation has been made with reference to GP 69, which gives a more complete version of the text found in NLW Peniarth 169.

it is, whether masculine or feminine, unless it is conjecture. Unknown as in dove, since no one knows what a dove is, whether masculine or feminine.'

Although it is attested in other contexts,⁸⁶ 'tybius' did not achieve popularity as a grammatical term in Welsh; in a sixteenth-century copy of the Peniarth 51 grammar it is glossed by a later hand as *anwybod*.⁸⁷ Is it too much of a reach to propose that in Peniarth 51, the term represents another 'correction' towards a more Latinate form, here *dubius* (an artificially unmutated radical form given in the Welsh) — in the same vein as the *ffemal-ffemin masgl-massglin* corrections — with the additional pleasure of the pun on Welsh *tybus*, *tybius* highlighted by the repetition of *tyb* 'conjecture' in the next sentence? If it is not, then the fact that the form is closer to *dubius* than to *dubyn*, and that *dubius* does not occur as a grammatical category in the *Ars Minor*, suggests strongly that the corrections to Peniarth 51 were being made without reference to the Latin or English texts discussed in this article.

Regardless, whatever we make of *tybius*, it is the term *anwybod* that is used in the following sentence, along with the same example, *colomen*, that is given in Llanstephan 28: *Anwybod yw y peth ni wypo neb beth yw, ai gwrw, ai banw, val y mae kolomen, kanis pan welo gwr golomenn, anwybod iddo ef beth yw, ai gwrw, ai banw*.⁸⁸ 'Unknown is the thing which no one knows what it is, whether masculine or feminine, as in *dove*, since when a man sees a dove, it is unknown to him what it is, whether masculine or feminine.' Perhaps the doubling up of terminology was deliberate, intended as a kind of gloss for a term that was not well known in a grammatical context. In any case, it is clear that Gwilym Tew had access to a text which used *anwybod* in a grammatical context (as suggested above, likely Llanstephan 28 or a copy). His fairly free and innovative editing practices mean that the grammar in Peniarth 51 is far more than just a mechanical copy of a single document. Like Llanstephan 28 itself, it demonstrates a high level of textual fluidity and editorial input.⁸⁹ it is its own sophisticated end-product, which synthesises a number of grammatical sources. Thus, while the Peniarth 51 grammar is interesting as a point of comparison, it is essentially a separate text, with a separate purpose. We will move to the Llanstephan 28 *Dwned* for the remainder of the discussion, and turn from Gwilym Tew back to Gutun Owain.

⁸⁶*GPC* s.v. 'tybus, tybius'.

⁸⁷The gloss, in a later hand, occurs on p. 165 of the copy of the Peniarth 51 grammar made by Roger Morris, Coed y Talwrn in Peniarth 169 (c. 1580), viewable on the National Library of Wales website at <https://viewer.library.wales/4834734> (accessed 16 July 2019); see also *GP* 69.

⁸⁸*GP* 69.

⁸⁹Cf. Thomas Charles-Edwards' discussion of textual fluidity in *Peredur* in 'The textual tradition of medieval Welsh prose tales and the problem of dating', in Bernhard Maier and Stefan Zimmer (eds), *150 Jahre "Mabinogion"* (Tübingen, 2001), 23–39.

PENIARTH 356 AS SOURCE?

If Gutun Owain were using the Pennant copy of the *Accedence* itself, Peniarth 356 (c. 1460s–80s), as a source text, a reconsideration of the date of Llanstephan 28 would be in order. The dates given in the colophons to Llanstephan 28, 1455–6, have been subject to some doubt. In particular, Thomas Roberts has argued on a palaeographical basis that the manuscript was probably compiled c. 1475,⁹⁰ and the editors of the tract believed that the bardic grammar on pp. 10–16 could not have been completed before 1485.⁹¹ Both arguments rest on the assumption that Gutun copied the dates in the colophons from his exemplar. Either proposed re-dating would put Llanstephan MS 28 more firmly within the dates of Gutun's other manuscripts, which are otherwise all thought to date from c. 1461–1500.⁹²

However, there is reason to accept the date given in the colophons. Ben Guy's recent work confirms that the genealogies in this manuscript did represent 'a product of an early stage in Gutun's career'.⁹³ Guy also reports Daniel Huws' belief that, given the personalisation elsewhere in the manuscript, it is unlikely that Gutun would have copied the dates blindly.⁹⁴ The copy of the *Dwned* in Peniarth 51 is not hugely helpful in answering this question. It is believed to have been written over a long period between 1460 and 1480; but this dating is uncertain, and is based mainly on the *floruit* of its compiler Gwilym Tew.⁹⁵ The most that can be said, then, is that it is possible Gutun was working from Peniarth 356, if we are willing to revise the dates of Llanstephan 28, but unlikely.

However, it is also possible that Gutun was working from a now-lost manuscript that also served as an exemplar for both Peniarth 356 and NLW 423D (the John Edwards of Chirk manuscript). Peniarth 356 contains two copies of the Leylond texts, with one group appearing in an earlier part of the manuscript (*Informacio* at fol. 1r–9v; *Comparacio* at fol. 9v; *Accedence* at fol. 48r, 54v–57v) and one in the later (*Informacio* at fol. 167v–168r; *Comparacio* at fol. 163r–164v; *Accedence* at fol. 163r, 165r–167v).⁹⁶ The Middle English grammatical tracts associated with Leylond appear to have frequently (though not always) travelled together.⁹⁷ The occurrences of

⁹⁰Thomas Roberts, 'Llawysgrifau Gutun Owain, a thymor ei oes', *BBCS* 15.2 (May 1953), 99–109, at 103.

⁹¹*GP* xlvii.

⁹²Roberts, 'Llawysgrifau Gutun Owain', 101.

⁹³Ben Guy, 'Medieval Welsh genealogy: texts, contexts and transmission', unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge University (2016), 104.

⁹⁴See Ben Guy, 'Writing genealogy in Wales, c. 1475–c. 1640: sources and practitioners', in Jost Eickmeyer, Markus Friedrich and Volker Bauer (eds), *Genealogical Knowledge in the Making: Tools, Practices, and Evidence in Early Modern Europe*, Cultures and Practices of Knowledge in History 1 (Berlin/Boston, 2019), 99–105, at 109 n. 45.

⁹⁵Huws, *Repertory*.

⁹⁶See Thomson, *Catalogue*, 1–2.

⁹⁷See Thomson, *Catalogue*, 1–2. The *Informacio* occurs with the *Accedence* once in Oxford, Bodley Rawlinson D 328 and twice in Peniarth 356; it occurs independently in NLW 423D, Lincoln 88, and Hatton 58.

duplicate copies in Peniarth 356 suggests to me that transcriptions would have been made from two different manuscripts, each of which contained all three texts.

The earlier copy of the *Accedence* in Peniarth 356 (at fol. 48r, 54v–57v) more closely resembles the *Dwned* than the second (fol. 163r, 165r–167v). This conclusion has been arrived at by close textual comparison. For instance, take the definition of a noun in the *Dwned*: *Beth yw henw? Rrann araith a dreiglr, a welir, nev a glywir, nev a deimlr, nev a ddyko henw ar beth.*⁹⁸ ‘What is a noun? A part of speech which is inflected, which is seen, or heard, or felt, or met with or which puts a name on a thing.’ This seems quite clearly to be a synthesis of the material in Peniarth 20: *Henw yw pob peth o’r a arwydokao kedernyt, neu ansawd damweinnyawl y’r kedernyt. Kedernyt a arwydokaha pob peth o’r a aller y welet, neu y glybot, neu gyhwrd ac ef [...]*⁹⁹ ‘A noun is everything which signifies substance, or a quality accidental to substance. Substance signifies everything which can be seen, or heard, or met with [...],’ combined with the definition given in the first Peniarth 356 *Accedence*: *How knos þu a nowne? For all þat I may fele, here or se þat berys the name of a thyng [...]*.¹⁰⁰ In contrast, the second *Accedence* is considerably briefer: *How knowe ze a noun? For þe Laten of eny þyng ys a noun.*¹⁰¹ The *Dwned* revision appears to be more or less a translation of the first Peniarth 356 version, perhaps preserving the order of the first two list items in the definition (seeing/hearing) and the impersonal verbs from the Peniarth 20 grammar, but introducing the question and answer format, as well as the final clause of the first Peniarth 356 *Accedence* definition of the noun, *þat berys the name of a thing [...]*.¹⁰²

Thomson likewise notes that the first copy of the *Informacio* (fol. 1r–9v) in the Pennant manuscript and the version in the John Edwards manuscript ‘are textually close, and their manuscripts are also close both in contents and probably origin’.¹⁰³ On these bases, we can tentatively conclude the following: (1) it is likely that both Thomas Pennant and John Edwards of Chirk used the same manuscript to produce copies of the *Informacio*; (2) this same manuscript contained a version of the *Accedence*, copied by Pennant, which closely resembles the translation in the *Dwned*; (3) this manuscript was in circulation within the group of scholars located in north-east Wales in the fifteenth century, and is likely to have been readily available to Gutun Owain.

Whether or not it was Gutun who was chiefly responsible for the re-edit, and whatever the editor’s exact sources, the following is clear: all of these grammars, both Middle English and Welsh, were circulating and being reproduced in the same circles around the same period of time, and thus, their compilers probably had access to similar or identical source texts. The

⁹⁸GP 67.

⁹⁹GP 42.

¹⁰⁰Thomson, *An Edition*, 1.

¹⁰¹Thomson, *An Edition*, 9.

¹⁰²Thomson, *An Edition*, 1.

¹⁰³Thomson, *Catalogue*, 53; see also discussion at 19–20.

north-east of Wales was a key location for grammatical scholarship in the mid-fifteenth century; it is not surprising that significant influence can be detected across the scholarly products that emerged from this centre.

CONCLUSION: THE PURPOSE OF THE *Dwned*

Let us return for a moment to the title of the text in Llanstephan 28: *Llyma Gyfrinach Beirdd Ynys Brydain yr hwnn a elwir y Dwned ynghymraec* ‘Here is the secret of the bards of the island of Britain, that which is called the *Dwned* in Welsh.’ At this point it is possible to make slightly more of the strange Middle English borrowing introduced at the beginning of this paper. The word *Donet*, from which *Dwned* derives, does appear in the *Accedence* — though as a reference to the *Ars Minor*, and not to the *Accedence* itself:

All þat byn contenyt in þis leson of þe ‘Donet’: ‘Da preposiciones casus accusatiui, vt *ad*, *apud*, et cetera;. Wych by þe preposicions þat will serue to ablatiue case? All þat byn contenyt in þis lesson of þe ‘Donet’: ‘Da vtriusque casus preposiciones, et cetera.’¹⁰⁴

The co-occurrence of the word across both texts is interesting, given what we have seen of terminological borrowing above. It is also worth noting that this paragraph, which occurs at the end of the section on prepositions in the *Accedence*, directs the reader to consult the *Ars Minor* at exactly the point in the *Dwned* where we see the heaviest concentration of Latin examples (as discussed above on p. 172). This suggests that, along with the bardic grammar in Peniarth 20, the *Accedence* may have been the primary source document for the compilation of the *Dwned*, with the *Ars Minor* used as a supplement where necessary (or indeed, where the compiler was directed to do so by the text of the *Accedence*). The choice of a word taken from the *Accedence* for the title of the Welsh text is therefore significant: in fact, I believe that the use of the *Accedence* was absolutely central to the compiler’s programme.

If the *Accedence* is indeed as fundamental as I suppose to the Welsh compiler’s conception of his own work, the purpose of that document may shed some light on the impetus behind the compilation of the *Dwned*. We saw above that the *Accedence* was created as a pedagogical text, and that it circulated in manuscripts in north-east Wales which were themselves intended to serve as teaching tools. It is not a leap to infer therefore that the Welsh work also had a pedagogical orientation. Recall, however, that the English text was specifically intended to teach Latin to speakers of the vernacular. I would suggest, quite simply: so was the Welsh. The *Dwned*’s pointed affiliation with the *Accedence* makes a similarity of purpose likely, but even more compellingly, such a purpose would supply us with an answer to the question I raised above: what was the point of introducing technical terminology to describe forms that do not occur in the language being described?

¹⁰⁴Thomson, *An Edition*, 8. See footnote 38 above for the quoted section in the *Ars Minor*.

By analogy with the *Accedence*, the language being described was not Welsh, but Latin. Terminology for the case system was introduced not in order to define grammatical categories that did not exist in Welsh, but to give some sense of how these categories worked in Latin. As we have seen, this could be achieved either by explaining their semantic function (as in *penn Rys*), or simply by plugging Latin examples into the Welsh text. As a pedagogical tool, one can compare this against the continued production and use in the modern period of books like *English Grammar for Students of Latin*,¹⁰⁵ intended (as the title suggests) for English-speaking students of Latin to get a grasp on grammatical terminology in English, which then prepares them to discuss Latin in a linguistically sophisticated way. The name *Dwned* thus not only replicates the form of Middle English *Donet*, but also its meaning: elementary grammar book.

The *Dwned*'s concern with Latin rather than Welsh appears to be borne out by a final paragraph appended to a later copy of the text in NLW Peniarth 158 (1587):

Ag fal hyn y terfyna y rhwolav gramadeg in iaith Gymraeg, y rain a berthynant i benkerdd o brydydd i gwybod, ag yn anwedig gidag iaith Lading ag ieitho[e]dd diarth o achos bod yn anodd i siar[a]d yn gyfion ymadrodd heb wybod y rhwolau hyn ysydd yn dysgy i doyd[yd] yn gowir. Er hyny, nid mawr anghenRaid yw wrthynt mewn iaith Gymraeg o achos i bod yn ddilwgr ohoni i hvn ag anodd i neb i hadrodd yngham. Eto, er hyny, nid llai grym y radd o gylfyddydd rymadeg, achos peth godidog yw hi, ag ynddi y mae gwraidd pob dysg mewn [i]eithoedd eraill yn sefyll.¹⁰⁶

'And so end the rules of grammar in the Welsh language, those which it is appropriate for the chief bard to know, and especially with the Latin language and foreign languages, because it is difficult to utter a statement accurately without knowing these rules, which teach to speak correctly. Despite this, there is not a great need for them in the Welsh language, because it is unblemished on its own and it is difficult for anyone to speak it incorrectly. Still, despite this, a degree in the art of grammar has no less virtue, because it is an excellent thing, and in it lies the root of every kind of learning in other languages.'

Here, the copyist (Robert ab Ifan of Brynsiencyn) seems to indicate, as I have suggested, that the primary utility of the grammatical rules was in the

¹⁰⁵The book's statement of purpose is illustrative: '*English Grammar for Students of Latin* explains the grammatical terms that are in your Latin textbook and shows you how they relate to English grammar. Once you understand the terms and concepts as they apply to your own language, it will be easier for you to understand what is being introduced in your textbook and by your teacher'. Norma Goldman, *English Grammar for Students of Latin*, third ed. (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2004), 1.

¹⁰⁶GP 88. I am grateful to the anonymous *Celtica* reader for drawing my attention to this paragraph.

acquisition of other languages, particularly Latin. He acknowledges that the grammatical rules laid out in the *Dwned* are not actually particularly useful for Welsh, as we likewise have seen above. The additional paragraph does not appear in Llanstephan 28 and so does not provide any contemporary evidence, but it is interesting in its capacity as an early reading of the *Dwned* as a vernacular Latin primer.

The objection might be raised that Llanstephan 28, unlike the Pennant and Chirk manuscripts, is not an obvious working pedagogical document. Outside of the *Dwned* and the bardic grammar, its other contents, all Welsh (genealogical material, saints' Lives) do not seem to display any particular interest in Latin pedagogy. However, a text can be pedagogical in orientation without necessarily being contained in a document intended for the purposes of classroom instruction; compare, for instance, the earlier bardic grammars themselves, generally conceived of as pedagogical,¹⁰⁷ but often contained in massive anthology manuscripts like Jesus College 111 (The Red Book of Hergest). Rather than a practical 'teaching text', I think the *Dwned* in Llanstephan 28 must be considered as a chiefly scholastic endeavour with a pedagogical orientation.

In his discussion of the *Accedence* text in the context of education in late medieval Wales, Orme notes briefly, 'it does not appear that equivalent texts were produced in Welsh'.¹⁰⁸ This is not correct: as I have argued, the *Dwned* is precisely such an equivalent text. But perhaps this same deficiency was apparent to scholars of the early fifteenth century, and corrective measures sought. It is perhaps useful to think of the *Dwned* as an answer to the *Accedence* rather than purely a derivation of it: an attempt to bring Welsh scholarship into line with contemporary standards and practices.

The failure to understand the *Dwned* as primarily a work of grammatical scholarship, or to account for the *Accedence* as one of its main source texts, has further consequences for the way in which we understand both its contents and the context of its creation. The *Dwned* is usually read in terms of its role in the native bardic tradition. In past scholarship, it has been taken more or less as an incomplete reflex of the bardic grammars. It must be emphasised that in Llanstephan 28, the metrical and the grammatical tract are very clearly separate texts, which occur at different points in the manuscript. The *Dwned* is purely grammatical in orientation, lacking any reference to the more 'bardic' sections of the bardic grammars, i.e. the diphthongs, metres, faults, *prydlyfr*, or triads. It is nonetheless a complete text. I should like to make the following distinction: the *Dwned* in Llanstephan 28 makes use of the bardic grammars, and works within the tradition established by the bardic grammars, but is not itself a bardic grammar.

The miscategorisation (or perhaps more correctly, recategorisation, or reappropriation) of the text began with many of the earliest sixteenth-century copies, which re-attach the *Dwned* to the section on metre, and continued

¹⁰⁷GP xiii; Matonis, 'Western grammatical tradition', 124; Ceri Lewis, 'Einion Offeiriad and the bardic grammar', in Jarman and Hughes, *A Guide to Welsh Literature*, vol. 2, 58; Gruffydd, 'Wales' second grammarian', 20.

¹⁰⁸Orme, 'Education', 636.

through to the twentieth-century edition of the text, in which the *Dwned* is included under the title *Gramadegau'r Penceirddiaid* 'Grammars of the Chief Poets'. This title is reflective of a disconcerting tendency to read the bardic grammars in general (and as a result, the *Dwned*) as the exclusive domain of a class of men, the bardic order, who were concerned primarily with their own native tradition and its preservation. As a result, the grammars have been taken as conservative in function and insular in outlook, not to say parochial. Such a blinkered view of this text does a disservice to the richness and complexity of scholarship and intellectual life in fifteenth-century Wales.

In the fifteenth century, English was starting to become the language of grammatical scholarship and pedagogy — not only in England, but as the John Edwards and Thomas Pennant manuscripts show, in Wales as well. The preservation and promotion of Welsh culture in this period entailed the deliberate alignment of its vernacular scholarly texts with contemporary Latin and English material. The compilation of the *Dwned* suggests not an antiquarian or a backward-looking outlook on the part of its compiler, but rather a continued determination to elevate the Welsh material to the cutting-edge of scholarship. The resultant text successfully negotiates between the linguistic tradition already established by the bardic grammars and the new mode of grammatical scholarship emerging from England in the period. The *Dwned* is the product of a community that appears to have been aware and respectful of its own tradition of vernacular grammatical writing, and at the same time consciously multilingual, cosmopolitan, and intellectually engaged.¹⁰⁹

ABBREVIATION

GP G. J. Williams and E. J. Jones (eds), *Gramadegau'r Penceirddiaid* (Cardiff, 1934).

MICHAELA JACQUES

Harvard University

¹⁰⁹I am grateful to Paul Russell, Barry Lewis, and the anonymous *Celtica* reader for their insightful comments and suggestions. Remaining errors, omissions, and miscategorisations are my own.