

Sandhi *h* after third-person pronouns in Middle Welsh



Patrick Sims-Williams

Celtica 34 (2022), 60–86

DOI: 10.58480/SCS-jjyku-qcf9x

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/>

SANDHI *h* AFTER THIRD-PERSON PRONOUNS IN MIDDLE WELSH

ABSTRACT

‘Sandhi *h*’ after 3 sg. feminine possessive pronouns in Welsh, Cornish, and Breton is agreed to be ancient. Although it has been supposed that sandhi *h* after other pronouns in Welsh is also of ancient origin, an earlier study (Sims-Williams 2010) argued that *h* did not appear after first-person possessive and infixed object pronouns with nasal auslaut (*’m*, *yn*, *’n*) until about the middle of the thirteenth century. At that point sandhi *h* was already frequent after infixed object and third-person plural possessive pronouns (*’y/’e*, *eu*), but it did still not appear consistently. Here it is argued that some of the examples without *h* were due to dissimilation (a form of Grassmann’s Law), but that when these exceptions are set aside enough evidence of significant absence remains to conclude that sandhi *h* after third-person pronouns was a recent development in the mid-thirteenth century. In the case of the infixed object pronouns, the main evidence comes from alliteration in poetry composed before *c.* 1258. In the case of 3 pl. possessive pronouns, the main evidence is provided by thirteenth-century manuscripts in which sandhi *h* is significantly less frequent than in the early fourteenth century. It is argued that sandhi *h* spread first from third-person infixed pronouns to 3 pl. possessive pronouns and then to first-person pronouns. An Appendix revisits the relevance of post-nasal hypercorrect *h* to the emergence of sandhi after first-person pronouns with nasal auslaut, and comments on the relevance of ‘post-sonorant aspiration’ in Basque.

INTRODUCTION

IT IS AGREED on all sides that Welsh ‘sandhi *h*’ after the feminine prefixed and infixed possessive pronouns MW *y*, *-e/y*, ModW *ei*, *-i*, as in *ei hafal* ‘her apple’, *a’i hafal* ‘and her apple’, is a reflex of the final **s* of **esjās* ‘her’. This initial mutation is common to Welsh, Cornish, and Breton, and is clearly ancient. In Welsh it spread by analogy to other pronouns, according to Pedersen (1909: 406; Lewis and Pedersen 1961: 121). This is plausible, though Pedersen did not provide much detail, leaving later scholars to suggest a number of competing analogies or even to look for non-analogical explanations.

Some other Welsh pronouns followed by sandhi *h* include the 1 sg. infixed and 3 pl. prefixed possessive pronouns (*i’m hafal* ‘to my apple’, *eu hafal* ‘their

apple') and their explanation is less obvious, since they are normally reconstructed with final **n*: **dummen* 'to my', **e(s)on* 'their' (or the like). One might have expected the nasal mutation to follow, but it does not, neither when the following word begins with a vowel, as in *i'm hafal*, *eu hafal*, nor when it begins with a consonant, e.g. *i'm bys/pen* 'to my finger/head', *eu bys/pen* 'their finger/head'. Thomas (1990: 34–5 and 37–9) convincingly explained the non-mutation in *eu bys/pen* etc. by the theory that in the ancestor of Welsh (West British), unlike Cornish and Breton (South-West British), polysyllables such as **eon* lost their final /n/ after the periods when final vowels voiced or spirantised following consonants. Hence West British **eo* (< **eon*) would not mutate a following consonant, and neither would **dumme* (< **dummen*), hence Welsh *eu bys/pen* 'their finger/head' and *i'm bys/pen* 'to my finger/head'.¹ So far so good; but we would also expect *eu **afal* 'their apple', *i'm **afal* 'to my apple', leaving *eu hafal* and *i'm hafal* to be attributed to some sort of analogy. (A similar pattern can be seen with the 1 pl. possessive forms — *ein hafal* 'our apple', *ein bys/pen* 'our finger/head', *i'n hafal* 'to our apple', *i'n bys/pen* 'to our finger/head' — but they can be left aside for now as their etymology is unclear;² a non-etymological explanation of their sandhi *h* (Sims-Williams 2010) will be summarised below.)

Without referring to the contrary view of Thomas (1990), Schrijver (1999) proposed that *throughout* the Brittonic languages final /n/ in polysyllabic forms such as **eon* was lost *before* the spirantisation of voiceless consonants and that, because they therefore caused the spirant mutation of following consonants (e.g. Breton *o phenn* 'their head'), as did the reflex of **esjās* 'her' (e.g. Breton *he phenn* 'her head'), they followed the analogy of the latter pronoun before vowels (e.g. Breton *he h-alc'hoez* 'her key') and added sandhi *h* to following vowels. Subsequently, however, Welsh backtracked, as it were, dropping the spirantisation but retaining the analogical *h* (Schrijver 1999: 8–10 and 13).

Isaac (2004: 81; 2008: 19), on the other hand, suggested that **-n* in Brittonic clitic polysyllables lost its nasality and developed into /h/, a possibility already rejected 'on general phonetic grounds' by Schrijver (1999: 9).³ Thus, for Isaac, Welsh *eu hafal*, *i'm hafal*, etc. were regular, with *h* < **n*, not analogical.

Although Schrijver's and Isaac's theories were very different, they both supposed that Welsh sandhi *h* in *eu hafal*, *i'm hafal*, etc. arose at an early date. In mid-thirteenth-century Welsh manuscripts, however, written *h* is still spreading after first-person pronouns and may therefore be recent, both there

¹In South-West British polysyllables (Thomas 1990: 34–5 and 38–9), final /n/ was already lost *before* the period when final vowels spirantised following voiceless consonants; consequently **eo* (< **eon*) caused the spirant mutation, as in Breton *o phenn* 'their head' (Hemon 1975: 8). On sporadic Breton *h-* after *o* 'their' see Jackson (1967: 322) and Schrijver (1999: 6).

²Schrijver (1999: 7–8) suggested that the sandhi *h* arose from the infixed object pronoun **nes* or **nos*.

³Cf. Hualde (2018: 3 and 17), who quotes the view that in Basque 'in some instances, aspiration appears to have developed as a regular evolution of intervocalic /n/, which is a typologically uncommon sound change' (my italics) and 'appears to lack parallels in the history of other languages' (an exaggeration: see Blevins and Garrett 1993: 223–4; Ó Maolalaigh 2003a: 317–18 and 2003b). On Basque *n* > *h* see Igartua (2015) and cf. Appendix below.

(Sims-Williams 2007: 53 n. 12)⁴ and possibly, by implication, after various other pronouns such as *eu*, excluding, of course, *y* ‘her’ < **esjās*, after which sandhi *h* is the regular reflex of *-*s*. Isaac disagreed with my 2007 footnote on this point, partly because I did not include a satisfactory explanation of the analogies involved, and partly because

the basis for the assumption of late analogy for prefix *h*, that is the inconsistent writing of the *h* in Middle Welsh texts, is a vacuous premiss. If we were to allow ourselves to be guided positivistically by the *writing* of the mutations in medieval texts, then we would not posit any mutations at all earlier than Middle Welsh, and then only as a haphazard whim (Isaac 2008: 27 n. 9).

It is certainly true that an occasional missing mutation in Middle Welsh cannot be accepted at face value. In the case of the first-person possessive pronouns, however, the rarity of following *h* in the vast majority of thirteenth-century manuscripts, contrasting with their very regular inclusion of *h* after the 3 sg.f., is statistically significant. Apart from one example of *a’m hadaw* ‘and my abandoning’ in NLW MS 5266B, p. 155 and one of *yn harglwyd ni* ‘our lord’ in NLW Peniarth 14, p. 81 (both manuscripts from the second half of the century), the only examples of first-person sandhi *h* occur in conjunction with *erbyn* (*en en herbyn* ‘against us’, *y’m herbyn* ‘against me’, etc.), starting with *en en herbyn* ‘against us’ beside *en en erbyn* in NLW Llanstephan 1, pp. 105 and 111 in the mid-thirteenth century, when extant manuscripts in Middle Welsh begin.⁵ This distribution is probably a key to how sandhi *h* after first-person pronouns originated:

- (1) by dissimilation of *en en erbyn* to *en en herbyn*;
- (2) more generally, by hypercorrection of /nV/ and /mV/ to /nhV/ and /mhV/ in reaction to the already ongoing loss of post-nasal /h/ in Middle Welsh words such as *brenin* < *brenhin* ‘king’ and *kymell* < *kymhell* ‘compel’;
- (3) possibly, in the case of 1 sg. *a’m hadaw*, *y’m herbyn*, etc. (despite Isaac 2008: 19), under the influence the /h/ heard after the prefixed form of the 1 sg. possessive pronoun (ModW *fy mhen* ‘my head’, etc.).

For detailed discussion see Sims-Williams (2010). As the argument that sandhi *h* after first-person pronouns is a late innovation has not been disputed since 2010, it will not be elaborated further here (except in the Appendix below). Instead, the present contribution concentrates on sandhi *h* after the relevant *third-person* pronouns.⁶ These may well have influenced its development after first-person pronouns.

⁴Despite its date, Sims-Williams (2007) contains a slightly later version of Sims-Williams (2008).

⁵The pronouns before (*h*)*erbyn* (: Old Irish *ar chiunn*) are possessives, despite the English translations.

⁶Unless otherwise noted, all citations of prose below are from the following databases: G. R. Isaac, Simon Rodway, Silva Nurmio, Kit Kapphahn, and Patrick Sims-Williams (eds),

I. SANDHI *h* AFTER THIRD-PERSON INFIXED OBJECT PRONOUNS

In Middle Welsh the third-person infixed object pronouns all share the same two forms irrespective of gender and number: *-s*, which is never followed by sandhi *h*,⁷ alternating, according to grammatical context (*GMW* 55), with *-e/y*, which is usually followed by sandhi *h* (e.g. Peniarth 44 (s. xiii^{med.}), p. 34 *a | h6nn6 ae herbynnys ef* ‘and that man received him’).

Evidently the third-person infixed object pronouns were homogenised via various mergers. For the third-person plural, *-s* is etymologically regular (cf. Old Irish and Middle Cornish *-s*) < **sos* (Schrijver 1997a: 22 and 39), whereas 3 pl. *-e/y* seems to be borrowed from the 3 sg.m. *-e/y* (cf. Middle Breton *en*, Middle Cornish *-n*), where *-e/y* derives regularly from **en* < **em* (*GOI* 283–4; Schrijver 1997a: 55; 1999: 7 and 12). Similarly, the 3 sg.f. infixed object pronoun *-e/y* seems to be borrowed from the 3 sg.m. *-e/y*, whereas its *-s* form (cf. Old Irish, Old Breton, and Middle Cornish *-s*) is regular from **sVn* (Le Bihan 2020). The 3 sg.m. variant *-s* is presumably borrowed from the 3 pl. and/or 3 sg.f. *-s*.

When a Brittonic element such as a particle or preverb — or at least one ending in an elision-impeding consonant — was followed by infixed **-en*, the result would be a polysyllable in which the /n/ of **-en* should be lost (cf. Schrijver 1999: 12). According to the chronology outlined above, the resulting final /e/ should be followed by no consonantal mutation in Welsh, and this is indeed the case, e.g. Peniarth 44 (s. xiii^{med.}), p. 23 *ae karey ef* ‘who loved him’, p. 31 *ty ae gyrryst* ‘you drove him’ (both with *ae* < relative *a* + *-e* < **-en*). As illustrated by these examples, elision to a monosyllable did not happen early enough in West British to allow **-en* to nasalise.⁸

From an etymological point of view, none of the third-person singular and plural *-e/y* infixed object pronouns should be followed by sandhi *h*, but they all are. A probable source is the 3 sg.f. infixed possessive pronoun MW *-e/y* < **esjās*, after which sandhi *h* is etymologically regular. Thus sandhi *h* may have spread as follows:

2013: *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg o Lawysgrifau'r 13eg Ganrif: Fersiwn 2.0.*, <https://doi.org/10.20391/3abf4ef1-e364-4cce-859d-92bf4035b303>; Diana Luft, Peter Wynn Thomas, and D. Mark Smith (eds), 2013: *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg 1300–1425*, <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk>; Katherine Himsworth, Silva Nurmio, Richard Glyn Roberts, Sara Elin Roberts, Sarah Rowles, Paul Russell, and Patrick Sims-Williams (eds), 2019: *Rhyddiaith y 15fed Ganrif: Fersiwn 2.0.*, <https://doi.org/10.20391/148879e0-6ce3-49d6-bf77-5d7597ba4422>.

⁷Cf. *nis ofnir* ‘one does not fear them’ (Morris-Jones 1913: 278). According to Schrijver (1997a: 21, 39, and 57; 1999: 7 n. 5), the infixed object pronoun *-s* comes from **san* < **sām*, cognate with *-s^N* in Old Irish *du-s-ngí* ‘he makes it (f.)’, etc. (*GOI* 261 and 284; cf. Watkins 1965: 287 who favours **siyan*). Since infixed **sVn* by definition only occurred in polysyllables, its /n/ should be lost in Welsh and the resulting final vowel should be followed by no mutation, and no sandhi *h*, and that is the case. The non-development of **-s* > ***-h* requires an explanation, such as combination with the **-s* of **nis* ‘not’; compare the survival of *-s* in Old Irish (Sims-Williams 1984: 144 and 186–7; McCone 2006: 92–5). The *-s* form of the object pronoun is regularly used after the negative *ny* (*GMW* 55).

⁸Possibly only the *(C)VC-*e(n)* type was productive in West British. Schrijver (1999: 12) argues that what he exemplifies as the **ron* < **ro-en* type was generalised in South-West British, whence Middle Cornish *-n* and Middle Breton *en*.

3 sg.f. infixed possessive $-e/y^H \rightarrow$ 3 sg.f. infixed object $-e/y^H \rightarrow$
 3 sg.m. and 3 pl. infixed object $-e/y^H$.

A suggestion that sandhi *h* after infixed object pronouns is late and analogical is provided by some texts where it is missing. These are fairly rare (*TC* 154–5). The only example cited in *GMW* 23 is *ninheu a'y arhown* ‘we shall await him’ in the mid-fourteenth-century White Book *Manawydan* (versus the Red Book’s *a’e harhown*, half a century later). This may be a special case, since there is evidence at various periods of Welsh (*TC* 154–5) that sandhi *h* could be omitted before words containing an internal /h/, by a dissimilation comparable to Grassmann’s Law in Greek and Indic (Collinge 1985: 47–61) and to similar phenomena elsewhere (e.g. de Reuse 1981). A slightly earlier example with the same verb occurs in *Lludd a Lleuelys* in BL Cotton Cleopatra B.v, part i (s. xiv¹), fol. 34r *Ac yntev a|y arhoes ef* ‘and he awaited him’, which agrees with the Red Book of Hergest, Oxford, Jesus College, 111 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 175r, col. 709, *a|e arhoes ef*,⁹ against the later NLW 7006D (s. xv¹), p. 93a *Ac yntav yma ai harhoes*.

Caution is needed in assessing examples of preverbal *ae* without following *h* for two reasons:

- (a) *a’e* (with *-e* = possessive pronoun) before verbal nouns and *a’e* (with *-e* = object pronoun) before finite verbs have to be distinguished. In the earliest text of *Lludd a Lleuelys*, in NLW Llanstephan 1 (s. xiii^{med.}), a verbal noun is used in the above passage: *Ac ... ente6 ... ae arhos ef* (p. 63), literally ‘... and his awaiting him’ (cf. Cardiff 1.363 (s. xiv¹), fol. 50v *a|e arhos ef* and Peniarth 23 (s. xv²), fol. 30v *ac aros*). In this construction sandhi *h* is not expected. Conceivably *ay arhoes* in the copies of *Lludd a Lleuelys* cited above originated in a miscopying of *ae arhos*.
- (b) Middle Welsh *ae* can sometimes be a survival of the Old Welsh relative pronoun (*h*)*ai*, as noted in *GMW* 63. This pronoun has been derived from **sosin* (Schrijver 1997a: 45, 56, 161, and 172; cf. Falileyev 2000: 80, and Hemon 1975: 204, 206, and 232 on Breton *a y-* as in *me a y-a* ‘I go’). Assuming that **sosin* lost its /n/ at the same stage as **dummen* and **eon* (see above), the non-mutation of following consonants, as in MW *ae gulich y glav* ‘which the rain wets’ and *ae tut mor* ‘which the sea covers’ (cited in *GMW* 63 and *TC* 172–3), is predictable, as is the absence of sandhi *h*.¹⁰ Sometimes it can be uncertain whether *ae* represents relative *ae* or one of the various forms that modern editors punctuate as *a’e*.

Turning now to the data with the above caveats in mind, we may begin with the poetry. In the poems in the Black Book of Carmarthen (c. 1250) sandhi *h*

⁹Cf. Roberts (1975: line 157) (the White Book has a lacuna here).

¹⁰Unless the non-lenition in *ae gulich* and *ae tut* is purely scribal (which is quite possible), the relative pronoun OW (*h*)*a*, MW *a*, which is followed by lenition, e.g. *LL* 121 *a | uo* ‘which may be’, would seem to be of different origin from *ae*. But Schrijver (1994: 178) explains the lenition as secondary. In BL Add. 14931, p. 29 *a eill* and *ay eill* alternate, both with lenition of the following *g-*. However, *ay* may well be a scribal error for *a* there.

is always included after infixed object pronouns: 2.22 *a'e hamhevo*; 5.44 *ac y* [= ModW *y'i*] *haruetud*; 15.22 *a'e harhowe*; 16.36 *a'e hargel*; 17.144 *a'e harovy*; 18.214 *a'y haelew*; 20.13, 17, 21, 25 *y* [= ModW *y'i*] *harchaw*; 31.31 *a'e heirirolei*; and 39.5 *a'e hellygaut* (numbering as in Jarman 1982, and supplying apostrophes). The same is true of *hengerdd* in later manuscripts such as Peniarth 3, part ii (s. xiii/xiv) (Williams 1928: 114 and 116 *ae hamouyn*, 121 *ay hys*, 124 *ay hargel*, 128 *ay harrowy*), and, in the fourteenth century, the Book of Taliesin (Haycock 1994: poem 20.42 *a'e harhöes* and 61 *a'e hen[n]yn*, and Haycock 2015: poem 21.24 *a'e harobryn*) and Red Book of Hergest (*R* 578.16 *y* [= *y'i*] *hetmycca6r*; 579.32 and 580.35 *ae hamouyn*;¹¹ 1030.36 *ae heirch*; 1039.25 *ae hys*; 1052.33 *ban y* [= *y'i*] *hatrodi*). An exception in the Book of Taliesin is *Ar meint a gollwyf y argollawr* ('and the number I may lose shall be lost?'), if *y* corresponds to ModW *y'i* or *y'u* (Williams 1968: poem VII.48 and pp. 91–2).¹² This may have dissimilation before the future ending *-hawr*, even though the latter's /h/ is not expressed in writing here. Another possibility is that the *y* after *gollwyf* is the 1 sg. affixed pronoun (cf. line 54 of the same poem: *yny vallywyf y*). All these undated poems may well have been edited during transmission.

With one exception, sandhi *h* is always shown in the dateable Poetry of the Princes copied into the Hendregadredd Manuscript (NLW 6680B, s. xiii/xiv and later) —

CBT I, 14.75 *pan y* [= *y'i*] *herlyn*; II, 16.6 *a'e harwed* and 49 *yssef a'e herly*; 26.172 *a'e haroy* [*ae haroei* *R* 1189]; III, 10.76 *Kyndel6 a'e hanrec*; V, 1.130 *a'e hymduc*; VII, 50.18 *y* [= *y'i*] *henwaf*

— and the Red Book of Hergest (c. 1400):

CBT VI, 35.26 *a'e hyssiga* and 58 *a'e harueida*; VII, 33.34 *Dy uoned a'r wed y* [= *y'i*] *harwedych*; 42.3 *vegys y* [= *y'i*] *harchei*.

¹¹Cf. *ae hamouyn* in Peniarth 3ii (s. xiii/xiv): Williams (1928: 114 and 116).

¹²Cf. Williams (1960: 70): 'a'r nifer a gollwyf fe'i collir'. MW *y* is the normal form of the preverbal particle *y* + third-person infixed object pronoun *-y* (*GMW* 55; on its syntax see Mac Cana 1995: 54–5). The ModW forms *y'i*, pl. *y'u* have 'no authority' according to Morris-Jones (1913: 278). In the following examples *eu* is written instead of particle *a* + 3 pl. object pronoun, perhaps on the analogy of the use of possessive *eu* after *nac* and *ac* (for which see in Evans 1950): (1) Peniarth 29, p. 81a *kany's ef ac eu hamdyfyn* 'for it defends them'; (2) Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 57r, col. b *cany's y tauaut ac eu hamdyfyn* 'for the tongue defends them'; (3) Peniarth 14 (45–78) (s. xiii²), p. 54 *ac ny byd a brthuynepo udunt nac eu hamdiffynho* 'And there will not be anyone who may oppose them nor defend them'; (4) NLW 5266B (s. xiii²), p. 107 *cany's y uelly y tebygynt cael hed6ch o[s]* [*o* with *s* added above; the reading of the other manuscripts (*ac*) gives better sense] *ruueina6l amherodraeth ac eu hamdiffynnei* 'For thus they thought to get peace, and the Roman empire would defend them'; (5) NLW 3036B (s. xiv¹), p. 99 *kany's velly y tebygynt kaffel hed6ch. A rufeinha6l amherodraeth ac eu hamdiffynnei*. Cf. Oxford, Jesus College 111, fol. 26r, col. 101 ... *a rufeina6l amherodraeth a[e] hamdiffynnei*. Other manuscripts substitute verbal-noun constructions: Cardiff 1.362, fol. 38v–39r *Kans velly y tebygynt kaffael hed6ch a rufeina6l amherodraeth y emdiffyn*; Peniarth 45, p. 105 *Cany's y uelly y tebygynt cael hed6ch yn tragywyda6l tr6y amdiffyn* gwyr ruuein; Peniarth 46, p. 145 *a[l]lyma argl6yd heb ef y tebygant kaffel hed6ch yn tragy6yda6l tr6y amdiffyn* g6yr ruuein.

The exception is *a'e adawo* 'who may leave him' in the Hendregadredd copy of a poem addressed by Llygad Gŵr to Gruffudd ap Madog between the late 1250s and 1269 (*CBT* VII, 25.68). Is this due to the scribe, Hand J (s. xivⁱⁿ), or is it an original scribal feature of a manuscript of c. 1260 that escaped updating? The latter possibility is at least suggested by the absence of *h* in some of the mid-thirteenth-century legal manuscripts examined below, in which *h-* is similarly omitted (presumably owing to dissimilation) before subjunctives in *-(h)o*.

A more fruitful approach to these poetic texts is suggested by Morris-Jones's observation (1925: 204–6) that in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century *cywyddau* an accented /h/ tends to alliterate with another /h/ rather than with a vowel (for some earlier instances see Parry 1936: 148 [*CBT* I, 7.120] and Lynch 1996: 267 and 269 [*CBT* III, 16.103 and 7.33], and another, with sandhi *h* after 'e 'her', is *Llysseit y hirdwf o'e heurduted*, 'Courtly her tall form in her gold garment', *CBT* III, 5.43). Applying this doctrine to the line by Llygad Gŵr, *Ny chymer hyder a'e adawo!*, 'He who may leave him will not take courage!', suggests that *a'e adawo* — however it may have been written down — was pronounced *a'e *hadawo* for the sake of alliteration; many of the nearby lines have alliterating cadences: for example, *nef a'e nerthao*; *kyrt a'e kyrcho*; *kenetyl a'e canlyno*; *am dud a deruyno*. If so, absence of written *h* does not necessarily mean absence of /h/, a warning that will need to be taken into account. Perhaps *Ny chymer hyder a'e *hadawho!* was acceptable c. 1260¹³ but the initial /h/ was subsequently lost through dissimilation before the subjunctive *-ho*, leading to the spelling *adawo* in the Hendregadredd Manuscript.

Among the above citations from undated *hengerdd*, the sandhi *h* is supported by alliteration in the Black Book, poem 16.36 *y hangerd a'e hargel rac riev Ryderch* 'her virtue hides her from Rhydderch's lords' (in the *Afallennau*),¹⁴ in Peniarth 3, part ii, *yr ay hys melis y haualeu* 'for those who consume them, sweet are her apples' (also in the *Afallennau*), and in the Red Book, *R* 578.16 *a hyt byt y hetmycca6r* 'and the length of the world it will be praised' (in the *Cyfoesi*) and *R* 1030.36 *bit hoffder llawer ae heirch*, a rather obscure gnome, '? what many ask for is a favoured thing' (Jacobs 2012: poem III.18 and n.). None of these four poems is likely to be early. Conversely, in the Book of Taliesin line, *gwyn y vyt yr eneit a'e harobryn* 'blessed the soul who shall secure it (f.)' (in *Marwnat Corroi m. Dayry*), omission of the *h*-would improve the alliteration. The same applies to: two lines by Llywarch Llaety (c. 1160?) copied into the Hendregadredd Manuscript by Hand F (s. xivⁱⁿ), *CBT* II, 16.6 *Nyt arall a'e harwed* 'it is not another who wears it (f.)' and 49 *Yssef a'e herly, arlwy garthan—dyn* 'this one guards(?) them, a man preparing a fort'; a line by Gwynfardd Brycheiniog (c. 1170s?), *CBT* II, 26.172 *A'r adar [anwar]*¹⁵ *a'e haroy* 'and the wild birds that awaited him'; one by Dafydd Benfras (1240) extant in late manuscripts, *CBT* VI, 27.97 *I'm Rhec y [= y'i] harchaf arch* (var. *ir archaf arch*) *o'm plegyd* 'to my Patron I

¹³Verbs ending *-w-ho* are common in the legal manuscripts of this period.

¹⁴But Peniarth 3ii has *anger ay hargel rac rieu ryderch* (Williams 1928: 124).

¹⁵Hendregadredd (Hand alpha) and *R* 1189.40 share the lacuna.

request it, a request for my sake'; another line by Dafydd Benfras (c. 1258), *CBT* VI, 35.58 *Aróreid a vleid a'e harueida* 'an heroic wolf attempts it'; and a line by Madog ap Gwallter (mid-thirteenth century?), *CBT* VII, 33.34 *Dy uoned a'r wed y [= y'i] harwedych* 'your nobility and the way that you may bear it'. By contrast, alliteration may support sandhi *h* in the following line by Bleddyn Fardd (1282), copied into the Hendregadredd Manuscript by Hand A (s. xivⁱⁿ): *CBT* VII, 50.18 *G6r oet dros Gymry, hy y [= y'i] henwaf* 'he was a warrior for Wales, boldly I name him'. Caution is needed here, however, because a peculiarity of the noun (*h*)*enw* and verb (*h*)*enwi* is that they are sometimes spelt with *h*- regardless of context (Lloyd-Jones 1913–31: 481; Sims-Williams 2010: 42). Nevertheless, parallels suggest that *henwaf* probably does have /h/ (thus Andrews 1994: 134; cf. 145–6).

To sum up, alliteration in poetry suggests a mid-thirteenth-century date for the advent of sandhi *h* after third-person infixed pronouns. The *h* is always written in the poems in the Black Book of Carmarthen c. 1250, but we do not know how typical that manuscript was.

Sampling the thirteenth-century prose corpus for [space **ae** space **ha**] turns up 26 examples of infixed object pronouns + *h*, starting with *6n ae hatwaenat* 'one who knew him' in Peniarth 44 (s. xiii^{med}), p. 6. BL Cotton Titus D.ii (s. xiii²), however, has 2 examples without *h*:

1. fol. 28r *osyt ae amheuo*, 'if there is anyone who doubts it'.¹⁶ Compare *osyt ay hamheuo* in the roughly contemporary BL Add. 14931 (s. xiii²), p. 46.
2. fol. 72r *o | byd ae amheuo*, 'if there is anyone who doubts it'.¹⁷ Compare *o | byd ay hamheuo* in BL Add. 14931, p. 46.

Searching for [space **ay** space **a**] produces 5 more examples, three of them in a similar phrase in Peniarth 30 (s. xiii^{med}):

3. col. 115 *o | byt ay amheuo*.
4. col. 273 *o | byd ay amheuo*, 'if there is anyone who doubts it'. Compare *ac o|r byd a|e hamheuo* in a later copy of the text in question in Peniarth 32 (s. xiv/xv), p. 203.
5. col. 302 *o bey ay amheuey*, 'if there be anyone who doubts it'.¹⁸ Compare *ac o bei a|e hamheuei* in the later copies in Peniarth 32, p. 212 and NLW Wynnstay 36 (s. xv¹), fol. 117rb.

It may be suspected that in these five examples sandhi *h* was omitted because of the internal /h/ in the verb, by the sort of dissimilation discussed above in connection with *ninheu a'y arhown* and *yntev ay arhoes*. This consideration may

¹⁶Wiliam (1960: 46 §75); Jenkins (1986: 86).

¹⁷Where, to aid searching, the thirteenth-century corpus inserts a highlighted space between words joined in the manuscripts I replace the highlighted space with | plus a space on either side. Note that the fourteenth-century corpus uses | (without a space on either side) more widely, e.g. where Modern Welsh inserts an apostrophe.

¹⁸Jenkins (1973: 51 §458). I follow the conventions of the corpus being cited.

also apply to three final examples, which all involve verbs with the underlying subjunctive ending *-ho*:¹⁹

6. Peniarth 30, col. 320 *Nyt oes achuysson ereyll ay annoto onyt try*, ‘there are no other occasions that may delay it except three’.²⁰ Compare Oxford, Jesus College 57 (s. xiv/xv), p. 292, *Nyt oes ach6ysson ereill a|e hannotto onyt tri*.²¹
- 7 and 8. Peniarth 29 (s. xiii^{med.}), p. 82 *e | nep ay | arholleho ... e | nep ay | archollo*, ‘whoever may wound him’. Other copies of this text include the sandhi *h*: BL Cotton Caligula A.iii (s. xiii^{med.}), fol. 193r, col. 1 *e nep ay harchollo*; BL Add. 14931, p. 88 *y nep ay harchollo*; Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 57v *e nep ae harchollo*; Peniarth 32, p. 150 *y neb a|e harchollo*.

Searching for examples of [*ae/ay*²² + any vowel] in the prose of the s. xiii/xiv and s. xiv¹ periods suggests that sandhi *h* after object pronouns was almost universal then.

First, cases of relative *ae/ay* must be eliminated:

- (a) Peniarth 7 (s. xiii/xiv), fol. 36v, col. 131 *March balch advwyn ay | esgyn-nawd* ‘a proud fine horse he mounted’ (probably not ‘he mounted it’ with anaphoric pronoun).²³
- (b) BL Cotton Cleopatra B.v i (s. xiv¹), fol. 110v *a|y gwr ae achwanegws y rod o seith kyvanned*, is translated by Thomas Jones as ‘and her husband augmented her gift with seven dwellings’. He punctuates *a’y gwr a’e achwanegws y rod o seith kyvanned*,²⁴ but again it may be simpler to regard *ae* as an old alternative to relative *a* rather than as *a* + proleptic *e*.
- (c) Cardiff 1.363 (s. xiv¹), fol. 110v *ac eissoes degwm normandi a|e argyweda* (cf. Peniarth 23 (s. xv²), fol. 62v *Ac eisioes. degwm normandi ae hargyweda*), corresponds to *sed decimatio Neustriae nocebit* (HRB VII.3 §113), translated by Wright as ‘but Normandy’s tithe will injure it’ (‘it’ being the ‘German dragon’). There is no object pronoun in the Latin, however, and perhaps the 1.363 translation has followed its syntax closely. Compare the syntax of the independent translation in NLW 5266B (s. xiii²), p. 161 *degwm flandrys hagen a argyweda*.
- (d) Cardiff 1.363, fol. 74r (translating HRB V.5 §77) presents similar problems:

¹⁹The *h* only appears in spelling here in the peculiar form *arholleho*. Nevertheless, comparable subjunctive verbs in the mid-thirteenth-century legal manuscripts can easily be found by searching for the string [llho].

²⁰Jenkins (1973: 58 §486). Cf. Peniarth 30, col. 31: *canyt oes dym ay hannoto namryn try peth*.

²¹Richards (1957: 141).

²²The modern spelling *ai* is not used.

²³Cf. Rejhon (1984: 134 §XXIII); Williams (1968: 121).

²⁴Jones (1971: 6–7). The later text in NLW 7006D (s. xv²), p. 201, col. a simplifies: *ar brenin a roes saith gyvannedd*.

A seynt alban ... a kymyrth amphybal y kyffessvr ef o lav er rey a[e merthrey ac en kyntaf a[e kvdyws enly ty e hvnan. ac odyna a sym6dvs e dyllat. ac[a]e **ellynaws** y emdeyth. ac ed emrodes entev e hvnan y verthyryolaeth. Ar rey ereyll trwy amravalyon poynev ar ev corfforoed **a[e ehedassant** ar orwchelder llewenyd gwlat nef.

‘And St Alban ... took Amphybal his confessor from those who would martyr him and at first hid him in his own house, and then changed his clothes and **let him go** away, and gave up himself to martyrdom. And the others, owing to various tortures on their bodies, **flew** to the height of joy of the land of heaven.’

Here *ae ellynaws*²⁵ clearly has an infixed pronoun, but *ae ehedassant* seems to have the relative alone, and this is confirmed by the earlier text in Llanstephan 1 (s. xiii^{med.}), pp. 93–4, which has *ae hellygh6s* and *a ehedassant*. It is generally agreed that these two manuscripts go back to a common exemplar (Roberts 2015). Presumably this mid-thirteenth-century or earlier exemplar lacked sandhi *h* after the infixed pronoun (dissimilation before the /h/ in /nh/ in *ellynaws* is a possible explanation)²⁶ and still used *ae* as a relative pronoun.

After eliminating (a)–(d), we are left with only 11 passages in the prose of the xiii/xiv and xiv¹ periods where [*ae/ay* + any vowel] definitely includes an infixed pronoun (manuscripts are listed in the chronological order established by Huws 2000: 58–9):

1. Peniarth 8, part i (s. xiii/xiv), p. 31 *Ac a wahanassej y wrthaw oy garyat ef oc ev heuyrllit wy ef ay ymchwelws attaw o wir gyngweinnyeint*, ‘And whoever had separated from him, through his love and according to their merit he returned **them** to himself through true compunction’, translating *et quos ab amore suo iuste separaverat, Dei dilectione compunctus, ad amicitiam suam omnino convertit*.²⁷ Other manuscripts have *a*, without infixed pronoun,²⁸ so it is possible that *ae* is in fact comparable to *ae ehedassant* above.

- 2–4. The law manuscript, Peniarth 35, fol. 52–70 (s. xiv¹), which is notable for preserving old orthography (Sims-Williams 2021: 27, 32, and 34), has

²⁵ On *-aws* see Rodway (2013: 135).

²⁶ Compare TC 154 on Early Modern *ei anghyfannedd leoedd hi*, where *h-* is even omitted after the feminine possessive pronoun.

²⁷ Castets (1880: 16 §XI).

²⁸ Peniarth 9 (s. xiv¹), fol. 33r *Ac a wahanassei o gyfya6nder y 6rtha6 kygweinyeint caryat du6 a ymchoel6ys ar ylgetyndeithyas a chedyndeithyon*; Peniarth 10 (s. xiv^{med.}), fol. 21v *Ac a giliassei neu a wahanassei o[e] garyat ef. oc eu hefyrllit wy. ef a ymchwelawd y holl gareat a[e] gerennyd vdunt trwy wir gygweinieint*; Peniarth 5 (s. xiv^{med.}), fol. 70r, col. 47 *ac a[6]ahanassei o gyfya6nder y 6rtha6 kyg6eineit caryat du6. a ymhoela6d ar ylgetyndeithas. a chetymeithon*; Jesus College 111 (s. xiv/xv), fol. 93r, col. 390 *ac a[w]ahanyssai o gyfya6nder y wrtha6. o gyng6einyeint caryat du6 a ymchoeles ar y gedymdeithas* (cf. Williams 1968: 14 §XI).

three examples of *ossyd a|y amheuo* (fol. 52r), *ossyd a|y amhe6o*, and *ossyt a|y amhe6o* (fol. 53v) — the phrase discussed earlier, where dissimilation was mentioned as a possible factor.

5. Peniarth 20 (s. xiv¹), p. 21, col. 1 *ef aly anghanmoles duw*,²⁹ ‘God rebuked **him**’. Dissimilation before the /h/ in /ɣh/ is again a possible explanation.
6. Peniarth 20, p. 195, col. 1 *pawb o|y gynesseyfeyt aly ergrynnei*, ‘all of his neighbours dreaded **him**’. (The Red Book of Hergest version of *Brut y Tywysogyon* (Jones 1955: 170) has *a’e hergrynnynt* here, s.a. 1187.) Is it possible that subjunctive *-hei* underlies *ergrynnei*?
7. BL Cotton Cleopatra B.v, part i (s. xiv¹), fol. 26v *Ac yn oes gurgant y bu y seith wyr doetheon y rei a gauas y keluydodeu kyntaf o annean ac aly ysgriuennessant ac a|y dysgassant*, ‘And in the time of Gurgant lived the seven wise men, who discovered the first arts of nature ... and wrote **them** and taught them’. (The later text in NLW 7006D (s. xv²), pp. 80–1 agrees.)
8. BL Cotton Cleopatra B.v, part i, fol. 34r *Ac yntev aly arhoes ef*, ‘and he awaited **him**’ (on dissimilation in this passage see above).
9. Cardiff 1.363 (s. xiv¹), fol. 74r *ac|a|e ellynaws* (see (e) above on dissimilation before /ɣh/).
10. Cardiff 1.363, fol. 147v *Ac|wrth henny arth6r a chymyrth³⁰ e6 gol6t wynt ac e6 gwystlon ac a|e ellyngha6d y emdeyth*, ‘And at that Arthur took their wealth and their hostages and let **them** go away’. (Llanstephan 1, p. 149 has *Ac wrth henny arthvr a kymyrth ev golv t wynt ac ev gwystlon ac ae hellynghavd y emdeyth*.) Dissimilation before the /h/ in /ɣh/ is again a possibility.
11. Cardiff 1.363, fol. 199r *y gan er hyn rey aly etholynt*, ‘by the same ones who chose **them**’. (Llanstephan 1, p. 195 has *y gan er 6n | rey ay hetholynt*.) Might *-thol-* here be felt to contain /θ-hol-/ , leading to dissimilation?

In assessing these exceptions it must be borne in mind that the scribes of Peniarth 35 and Cardiff 1.363 were copying older texts, and that the scribes of Peniarth 20 and Cotton Cleopatra B.v, part i were colleagues at Valle Crucis where conservative orthographical ideas were prevalent (cf. Sims-Williams 2021: 34–5).

Conclusion

To sum up, much of the manuscript evidence for the absence of /h/ seems ambiguous, once the possibility of dissimilation is taken into account, but the alliterative patterns in poetry composed before c. 1250, which deserve more

²⁹*est reprobatus a Domino* in the Latin. See Jones (1940: 25 and 91) for the translator’s avoidance of the passive.

³⁰Probably the scribe absent-mindedly changed *k* in his exemplar to *ch*, as if the preceding *a* was the conjunction ‘and’.

study (cf. Lloyd 1968; Jones 1997; Parry Owen 2022: 271, 273), suggest that sandhi *h* after third-person infixed pronouns was an innovation of the mid-thirteenth century, about the time when the sequence of extant Middle Welsh manuscripts begins.

II. SANDHI *h* AFTER *eu* AND *-e/y* ‘THEIR’

In West British (the ancestor of Welsh), after the relevant periods of lenition and spirantization were over, 3 pl. **e(s)on* or similar underwent the apocope of **-n* that was limited to polysyllables (see above). The regular result was the non-mutation of following consonants, whence ModW *eu bod* ‘their being’ and *eu cymer* ‘their confluence’. This non-mutation is already seen in Old Welsh *ou bot* and *ou cimer* (LL 121 and 197).³¹ Old Welsh *ou* is unfortunately not attested before vowels, but in Middle Welsh a non-etymological sandhi *h* appears, e.g. *eu hargluyd* ‘their lord’ (Peniarth 17 (s. xiii²), p. 5). It also appears after the 3 pl. infixed possessive, which is etymologically identical, e.g. *o’y henill* ‘of their gain’ (GMW 23 and 53).³²

The sandhi *h* following 3 pl. infixed object pronouns is a likely source for sandhi *h* after 3 pl. possessive pronouns. For analogical influence between object and possessive pronouns, compare the comment by Jackson (1967: 322), cited by Schrijver (1999: 6), that the Breton

possessive *o* ‘their’, probably from Brit. **eson*, ... may prefix *h-*,
... an easy analogical extension ... from the infixed object pronoun
o ‘them’, probably from Brit. **sos*, which itself spirantises.

As Schrijver notes (1997a: 34), ‘there was a gradual tendency in B[reton] to give up the distinction between the object and possessive pronouns’. Assuming that sandhi *h* after 3 pl. possessive *eu* and *-e/y* in Middle Welsh is due to analogy, when did it arise?

Sandhi *h-* after *eu* is not consistently written in early Middle Welsh. The following examples, again listing manuscripts in the chronological order established by Huws (2000: 58–9), were assembled by searching the prose databases for [*space eu space a*]. The sample could of course be enlarged by looking for examples before vowels other than *a* and including the spelling variants *ev* and

³¹ Although initial mutations are not shown regularly in Old Welsh, /v/ as a result of lenition is regularly written *u* in *ouinyd garthon* ‘from Garthon mountain’ and *diuinid* ‘upwards’ (LL 126 and 226), and *ch* as a result of the spirant mutation is written in *ichimer* ‘its confluence’, *ichoretou* ‘its weirs’ (LL 42 and 166), and *hichet* ‘its tribute’ (‘Chad 4’, LL xlv), so it is unlikely that a consonantal mutation (for which there is no evidence in Middle Welsh) is concealed in *ou bot* or *ou cimer*. It may also be worth noting that although silent *h-*, as in Old Irish (GOI 19–20; cf. Schrijver 1997b), appears in Old Welsh proclitics such as *hi* in *hichet*, it is very rare in other words (see Falileyev 2000: 78–88). Omission of *h* for initial /h/ is also very rare (Haycock and Sims-Williams 2017: 30).

³² A referee asked whether scribes sometimes inserted ungrammatical sandhi *hs*, e.g. after inappropriate possessive pronouns. I can find no examples of *h-* after 1 sg. *uy/by* or 2 sg. *dy* in the thirteenth-century prose. 2 sg. *’th* and 2 pl. *ach*, *’ch* etc., are a special case in that they already include *h*. In pre-twentieth-century printed texts forms such as *eich harghyoeddi* sometimes appear (TC 154), but a search for [*h space h*] in thirteenth-century prose leads nowhere.

e6 (for these see below) and even the later monophthongised **y** < *eu* (which is not attempted in this article). In the following collection note that **eu a** sometimes contrasts with *eu h* in the same passage (e.g. at Peniarth 17, p. 5).

s. *xiii*^{med}.

Peniarth 29, p. 11 *kan eu ardercauael*; p. 61 *ac o | achaus henne et hys en deuody eu hargluydh | y*³³ *dyheuraeu eu | allduyon*;³⁴ Peniarth 30, col. 78 *gan eu arderchauel ... gan eu arderchauel*; col. 99 *eu alldudon*;³⁵ col. 159 *eu | alldudyon*; col. 160 *eu argluyd*; col. 170 *ac eu amdyffyn*; col. 237 *oc eu achaus huy*; col. 274 *en eu absen*.

s. *xiii*²

Peniarth 17, p. 5 *eu hargluyd priodaur ... eu ampriodoryon argluydi*; Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 38v *eu agkeureythyau ac eu dyrue ac eu kamluru ac eu hebedyu ... eu amdyffyn*; NLW 5266B, p. 89 *ac eu anreitha6 ac eu llogsi*; p. 248 *yn herwyd eu anryded*; p. 273 *eu hargl6ydiaeth ... eu anryded*; Peniarth 16, part iii, fol. 37r *eu achwydawl dyfred wy a | 6agant angheu*.³⁶

After the turn of the century, there are many more prose manuscripts, yet far fewer examples without *h*-, most or all of them in copies of older texts:³⁷

s. *xiii/xiv*

Nil.

s. *xiv*¹

NLW 3036B (Mostyn 117), p. 232 *eu heur ac eu aryant* ‘their gold and their silver’; Peniarth 45, p. 173 *herwyd eu anryded* ‘according to their status’; Peniarth 9, fol. 52r *eu angreiffya6 gan eu hannoc* ‘chiding them by inciting them’;³⁸ Cardiff 1.363, fol. 113v *ac eu achwydawl dyfred wynt a 6agant ageu* ‘and their health-giving waters will foster death’.

The reading **eu aryant** in *Brut y Brenhinedd* in NLW 3036B probably goes back to an early version of the *Brut* (‘*Brut X*’), since **ev aryant** is also the reading of Peniarth 23 (s. xv²), fol. 90r (cf. Sims-Williams 2017: I 124 and II 35). Peniarth 45’s *herwyd eu anryded* (also in the *Brut*) must come from an older exemplar because its later sister manuscript Peniarth 46 (p. 241) similarly

³³Read *hargluydhy*. Despite the editorial |, the -y must be the plural ending of *hargluydhy*. Cf. Caligula A.iii’s *ed edes en de6ody yr arglwydy dyhe6ra6 e6 gweyssyon allt6dyon* (quoted below). Where the latter has ‘it is customary for the lords to exonerate their alien servants’, Peniarth 29 here has ‘for their (*eu* = ModW *i*’w) lords ...’ (not an example of prefixed *eu*).

³⁴Scribal error for *alldudyon*; see below on this passage.

³⁵*Sic* (MS *alldud/on*). See below on this passage.

³⁶I omit Peniarth 14 (45–78), p. 60 *gan eu arant* because the *a*- is written over a *c* — *carant* must be meant.

³⁷I limit the collection to manuscripts earlier than s. *xiv*^{med}.

³⁸The later Peniarth 10 (s. *xiv*^{med}), fol. 48v has *Ac eu hagreifftiaw a oruc oliuer ... gan eu hannoc*. Cf. Rejhon (1984: 200 §LXX).

lacks sandhi *h*. (The thirteenth-century copy in NLW 5266B has *hanryded* at this point (p. 198 = *BD* 129), but it has the phrase *yn herwyd eu anryded* elsewhere (p. 248 = *BD* 160), showing that sandhi *h* was still optional.) The final quotation, from Cardiff 1.363, is from a version of the *Brut* which is generally similar to that in the mid-thirteenth-century Llanstephan 1 (which has a lacuna at this point), and its *eu achwydawl dyfred* ‘their health-giving waters’ is confirmed by the reading of Peniarth 16, part iii, *eu achwydawl dyfred wy*, quoted above. (Most other versions have *a’e dyured achvydawl* without the inversion, e.g. *BD* 109; Sims-Williams 2017: I 83 and II 33.) — Possibly *eu achwydawl* is a questionable example of missing sandhi *h*, however, for sandhi *h* is not regular before initial /j/³⁹ and *achwydawl* is < *iachwydawl*.

The following counter-examples were found by searching the thirteenth-century prose for [space *eu* space *ha*]. Some examples, such as *ac eu h-*, occur in situations where later Middle Welsh scribes prefer infixed forms, such as *a’u h-* ‘and their’, instead of the uncontracted *ac eu h-* (Evans 1950; *GMW* 53–4).

s. *xiii*^{med}.

Peniarth 29, p. 37 *eu* | *cenedel ac eu hargluyt*; p. 57 *eu hardelu*; p. 81a *kans ef ac eu hamdyfyn*; p. 86 *nac eu* | *guestau nac eu* | *hadauaelha*; p. 90 *eu hacure*; p. 97 *eu hamadraut*; p. 103 *eu hemys ac eu hanulkun* (‘pet dogs’ cf. Add. 14931, p. 100, below) *ac eu eu* [sic] *hebocheu ac eu* | *harueu*; Peniarth 30, col. 34 *eu hamot*; col. 133 *eu hardelu*; col. 160 *oc eu hanuot*; col. 189 *eu hadau*.

s. *xiii*²

Peniarth 14 (1–44), p. 30 *eu hanfydlonder*; p. 44 *eu hangeu*; Peniarth 17, p. 5 *eu hargluyd*; p. 6 *oc eu hannoc wy*; p. 7 *eu hargluyd ... eu hargluyd*; p. 8 *eu hargluyd*; p. 13 *eu hangenreidyau*; p. 14 *eu hargluyd*; p. 16 *eu hanhedeu*; p. 19 *oc eu hanyanaul gyffro*; p. 21 *eu hannyan*; Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 3r *ef a dely ethol y rey a uenho. y* | *eu hanuon ac ny deleyr e omed*;⁴⁰ fol. 25r *eu hamuot*; fol. 28v *eu hardelu*; fol. 31r *eu hardelu*; fol. 31v *eu hardelu*; fol. 35v *eu halltudyon*; fol. 36r *eu hargluydy ... oc eu hanuod*; fol. 45r *eu harderchauael*; fol. 49r *eu hargluyd*; fol. 59r *Ny deleyr e ychen a uo eg kyuar nac eu guystlau nac eu hadauaelha*; fol. 60r *ac eu hachure*; fol. 61v *eu har*; BL Add. 14931, p. 8 *eu hardyrchauael*; p. 41 *eu hamuot*; p. 51 *eu hardel6*; p. 57 *eu halldudyon*; p. 58 *eu hargluydy ... oc eu hanuod*; p. 62 *eu haghyureythyau ... eu hamdyfyn*; p. 72 *eu hardychauael*; p. 77 *y* | *eu hargluydy dyheurau eu halldudyon*; p. 91 *nac eu guystlau nac eu hadauaylha*; p. 92 *ac eu hachwyre*; p. 100 *eu hemys ac eu hannuyl gun ac eu hebogeu ac eu harueu*; NLW 5266B, p. 7 *ac eu harueu*; p. 11 *eu harglwyd ... eu hagheu ... eu harueu ... eu* | *hargl6yd*; p. 16 *ac y managyssant hyny y eu hargl6yd*; p. 19 *eu harueu*; p. 47 *y eu hamdiffyn*; p. 59

³⁹ See below, n. 48.

⁴⁰ *e omed* may be a case of omitted *h-* (‘their refusal’); cf. *y* | *homet* in Peniarth 29, p. 7.

ac *eu hanryded*; p. 63 6rth *eu haberthu*; p. 67 *eu harueu*; p. 78 ac *eu hamylder*; p. 83 ac *eu haberthu*; p. 85 *eu hachuanegu*; p. 86 *eu hargl6ydiaeth*; p. 91 *eu hagheu*; p. 94 *eu hargl6ydiaeth*; p. 97 *eu halltuded*; p. 105 *eu heur ac eu haryant*; p. 111 Ac y *eu hamdiffyn*; p. 122 *eu hagheu*; p. 132 *eu hann6yt ... Ac eu hanrydedu*; p. 133 yn *eu harydedu* [sic] hwy ... ac *eu hada6 bynteu*; p. 147 ac *eu hanrydeu* [sic]; p. 148 *eu hannoc*; p. 157 oc *eu hanadyl*; p. 198 *eu hanryded*; p. 208 *eu harganuot ... eu harueu*; p. 210 yn *eu haruoll*; p. 218 *eu hagreiffya6*; p. 219 *eu harueu*; p. 223 *eu haghen*; p. 228 gan *eu hamdiffyn ... eu heur ac eu haryant*; p. 229 *eu hamot*; p. 230 *eu harueu*; p. 232 *eu hagheu*; p. 234 *eu harueu ... eu hadoli*; p. 241 *eu har6ydyon*; p. 242 *eu hattal*; p. 253 *eu hanryded*; p. 268 *eu hanryded*; p. 272 *eu harhos*; p. 273 *eu heur ac eu haryant ... eu hargl6ydiaeth*; p. 274 *eu harueu*; p. 275 yn *eu hannoc*; p. 277 *eu hangerd*; p. 279 *eu hardercha6c urenhin*; p. 281 *eu hanuon*; p. 283 *eu habit*; p. 293 *eu harchescob*; p. 294 *eu harueu*; p. 295 *eu hamser ... eu hanuon ... eu haruoll*; p. 297 *eu hanrydedu*; p. 298 *eu haruoll*; p. 299 *eu hanrethy6*; p. 315 *eu hargl6ydiaeth*; Peniarth 16, part iv, fol. 51v *eu harglwyd ... eu harglwyd ... eu harglwyd ... eu harglwyd*; Peniarth 16, part iii, fol. 28v *eu hamser*; fol. 43r *eu harglwyd*; Peniarth 14 (45–78), p. 75 *eu harglwyd*.

Looking beyond prose, note that *eu* in the mid-thirteenth-century Black Book of Carmarthen (Peniarth 1) attaches *h* to *a-* (y *amdiffin eu hadew* ‘to defend their dwelling’) in poem 40.18 (Jarman 1982); 40.18 has therefore been counted in the Table below.⁴¹ In fact all the Black Book’s examples of *eu* (and *ev*) before vowels are followed by *h*: poems 1.28, 5.68, 12.71 (*Toriw anwar enwir ev hinni* ‘a rough host, cruel their energy’), 16.32 (*Andau de adar clywir ev hymevtun* ‘listen to the birds, their desire is heard’), and 17.188 (*Andau de leis adar. myr. maur ev hinni* ‘listen to the sea birds, great their energy’). In the three quoted lines — all from undated anonymous poems — the *h* could be perhaps be omitted to improve the alliteration. In the poetry in the Book of Aneirin (Cardiff 2.81) there are 6 examples of *eu* (never *ev*) followed by *ha-*, plus 9 more with *h* before other vowels (Williams 1938: lines 69, 85, 91, 132, 356, 364–7, 670, 1004, and 1319); all 15 are in the A-text of the *Gododdin*, except for line 1319 which is in *Gwarchan Tudfwlch*. In three lines the sandhi *h* seems to be confirmed by alliteration with (here underlined> words with radical *h-*:

85 *trauodynt eu hed eu hovnawr* ‘their fears shifted their dwelling’;

365 *mor dru eu hadrawd wy. angawr hiraeth* ‘how sad telling of them, insatiable longing’;

⁴¹In line 12 *o’e adav ar lan awon* (with alliteration) is possibly ‘because of *their* being left on the bank of a river’; however, ‘*e* is taken as singular by Jarman (1982: 158: *o’i*) and Rowland (1990: 473 and 536). There are two examples of 3 pl. possessive ‘*e* in poem 27.2 and these are followed by sandhi: *ae hesgip ae higneid*. Alliteration is no help here.

367 *mor hir eu hetlit ac eu hetgyllaeth* ‘how long grieving them and mourning them’.

All three lines are in the ‘narrative stanzas’ which have long been suspected of being subject to interpolation (Sims-Williams 2016: 167 and 216). There are no relevant examples of *eu* (or *ev* or *e6*) before vowels in the poems in Peniarth 29 and Peniarth 3, part i (*CBT* VI, 431–2; Lloyd 1949), but *ev hatneu* occurs in Peniarth 3, part ii (Williams 1928: 122). In the Hendregadredd Manuscript, however, there is just one example (fol. 2v) where *h* is omitted after *eu/ev/e6* (Owen and Williams 1989). This occurs in the copy of Meilyr’s elegy for Gruffudd ap Cynan, who died in 1137 (*CBT* I, 3.121):

ar meint a defu ar eu edryt ‘and as many as came back to their home ...’

Here Hand alpha (*s. xiii/xiv*) at first wrote *defu*, with the old spelling of schwa by *e* (cf. Sims-Williams 2021), then corrected it to *dyfu* in the margin. It looks as if he also failed to modernise his exemplar’s *edryt* to *hedryt* (ModW *hedrydd*). Further on, however, at line 151 (fol. 3r), he writes *eu havenyt* ‘their poet’ with sandhi *h* in the modern fashion (here alliteration is no help on deciding on the correct reading). Possibly *c. 1137* the poets did not regard sandhi *h* as essential after *eu*. From the 1160s, however, sandhi *h* seems to alliterate with words with radical *h*- (underlined>, twice in the poems of Cynddelw:

Handoet eu hachoet kyn eu hechig (fol. 58v/59v [Hand alpha]; *CBT* III, 24.157; R 1432.2)

‘Their pedigrees derived, before their suppression ...’;

Gweleis eu hadaw hep eu hadein (fol. 33r [Hand alpha]; *CBT* IV, 1.43)

‘I saw them left without their wings’.

and once in one by Prydydd y Moch *c. 1174–5*:

Meith o’th rad, heb reid eu heiryabl (fol. 101r/103r [Hand alpha]; *CBT* V, 1.149)

‘Numerous, out of your bounty, without need to ask for them’.

Whether the *h*- alliteration apparent in these three lines is coincidental is unclear (cf. below, n. 52). In other lines by Cynddelw that begin with forms of the verb *hanfod*, it may participate in alliteration in two lines (*CBT* IV, 2.57–8) but not in four others (*CBT* III, 3.226, 5.123, 21.157, 26.120). Similarly *heb* seems not to alliterate with words containing /h/ (other than itself) in twenty-five of Cynddelw’s lines (for references see *CBT* IV, glossary), while alliteration may be deliberate in seven lines (*CBT* III, 3.75; 20.9; 21.42; *CBT* IV, 2.45; 6.19; 16.48; 17.66). For Prydydd y Moch the figures for *heb* are 20 (see *CBT* V, glossary) versus 2 (*CBT* V, 1.17; 1.85). In other words, little reliance can be

placed on the alliteration in the three lines quoted above. They may be contrasted with the following line, very possibly by Cynddelw (Williams 1996), from *Hirlas Owain* (cited by Parry 1936: 157) in which the sandhi *h* after *eu*, as transmitted in the Red Book, is inessential for the alliteration:

Kywir eu haruaeth, arueu lliweit (CBT II, 14.124 [cf. 14.38];
R 1435.5–6 [cf. 1433.8–9])

‘Proper their plan, (with) whetted weapons’.

At the foot of the Table, figures for the four early-fourteenth-century prose manuscripts that sometimes omit sandhi *h* after *eu* before *a-* are included.⁴² For statistical purposes Cardiff 1.363 is treated differently from the other three: because its usual spelling of *eu* is *ev* or *e6*, it has only one example of *eu h-* (fol. 114r: *eu hanudoneu*). It has no examples of *ev a-* or *e6 a-*, but 15 examples of *ev ha-* and 33 of *e6 ha-*; these have been included in the total.

Clearly omission of sandhi *h* after *eu* before *a-* is extremely rare by the fourteenth century; the 4 examples of its omission in only four fourteenth-century MSS (2.4%) in the Table contrast with 165 examples (97.6%) of its inclusion in the same four MSS.

In the Table there are 17 examples of *eu a-* (15%) in six thirteenth-century manuscripts, as opposed to 100 *eu ha-* (85%) in the same six manuscripts. Is the 15% a faint signal of a stage before *eu* acquired its sandhi *h* or can it be explained away? Possibly it can, but it seems significant that in the relevant six thirteenth-century manuscripts, there seem to be only *three* clear cases⁴³ where regular *h-* after *y* ‘her’ is omitted before *a-*:

Peniarth 29, p. 40 *canys e | bot en voruyn eu y | ardelu*. (One would have expected *h-* as in *canes e bot en uoruen yu e hardelu* (‘for it is *her* plea that she is a virgin’, Charles-Edwards 1980: 177) in Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 18v.)

Peniarth 30, col. 9 *am y | chwylyt y | aguedy* ‘for her shame, her maiden fee’ (cf. Jenkins 1963: 3, 43–4, and 54).

NLW 5266B, p. 301 *na ell6ch chuitheu y amdifyn hi* ‘that you cannot defend her’.

In the third passage (HRB XII.5 §194) one other manuscript also lacks the *h*. This is Cardiff 1.362 (s. xiv^{med.}), fol. 101v, which also omits the prefixed

⁴²Their examples of *ha-* are on the following pages: NLW 3036B, pp. 11, 12, 20, 22, 50, 64, 67, 81, 83, 85, 87, 90, 92, 99, 102, 104, 111, 118, 119, 130, 131, 139, 178, 179, 186, 190, 194, 195, 199, 205, 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 250, 251, 253, 255, and 256; Peniarth 45, pp. 11, 12, 67, 94, 96, 98, 117, 124, 136, 162, 182, 184, 192, 200, 205, 206, 214, 240, 244, 245, 246, 263, 264, 265, 266, 268, 283, 297, and 298; Peniarth 9, fol. 5r, 5r, 6r, 7r, 11r, 12v, 16v, 24r, 26r, 26v, 29r, 30v, 31r, 33v, 38r, 43v, 44v, 49r, 49v, 51v, 52r, 52v, 53r, 53v, 54r, 56r, and 62r; Cardiff 1.363, *ev* = fol. 43r, 75v, 82r, 84v, 87v, 95r, 122v, 123r, 179v, 183r, 186r, 187v, 188r, 193r, and 207r; *e6* = fol. 5v, 34r, 37r, 37r, 43r, 48r, 56r, 57r, 59v, 81r, 87v, 95v, 103r, 124r, 134v, 140r, 140v, 141v, 142r, 144r, 147v, 153r, 154v, 156v, 172v, 175r, 175v, 177r, 178v, and 195v.

⁴³Leaving aside the problematic examples of *kan y | arderh[a]uel* etc. mentioned below and in n. 47.

	eu a-	eu ha-
s. xiii^{med.}		
Peniarth 1	0	1
Peniarth 44	0	0
Llanstephan 1	0	0
Cotton Caligula A.iii	0	0
Peniarth 29	2	8
Peniarth 30	8	3
 s. xiii²		
Cardiff 2.81	0	6
Peniarth 14 (1–44)	0	2
Peniarth 17	1	10
Cotton Titus D.ii	2	13
BL Add. 14931	0	15
NLW 5266B	3	64
Peniarth 16, part iv	0	4
Peniarth 3, part i	0	0
Peniarth 16 part iii	1	2
Peniarth 14 (45–78)	0	1
Peniarth 14 (79–90)	0	0
 s. xiv¹		
NLW 3036B	1	54
Peniarth 45	1	34
Peniarth 9	1	28
Cardiff 1.363	1	49

Table: *eu a-* versus *eu ha-* in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries⁴⁴

pronoun (perhaps because of the line break?): *na ell6ch ch6itheu / amdiffyn hi*. Conceivably the *h-* was missing in their shared source (see the stemma in Sims-Williams 2017: II 12).

As the omission of *h* in *y | ardelu* ‘her plea’, etc., cannot reflect phonetic reality, arguably the same may be true of some of the above-cited examples of *eu* without *h-*. In Peniarth 29 (p. 61) the phrase *ac o | achau henne et hys en deuody eu hargluydhy dyheurau eu | allduyon* contains at least one scribal error (*allduyon* for *alldudyon*) and another scribal error may be its omission of the mutation-blocking word *gweysson* seen in the parallel passages on theft in BL Cotton Caligula A.iii, fol. 185r, col. 1 and Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 49r:

*Ac o achau6s henny ed edes en debody yr arglwydy dyhebra6 e6
gweysson allt6dyon.*

⁴⁴Peniarth 6, part iii (s. xiii¹) is omitted as Huws now dates it s. xiv¹. In any case, it has nothing relevant.

ac o achau henne yd yd (sic) en deuody gadu er argluydy dyheurau eu gweyssyon alltudyon.

‘And because of that it is customary for the lords to exonerate *their* alien servants’ (cf. Jenkins 1986: 167).

Possibly the Peniarth 29 scribe skipped over *gweyssyon* and this explains the absence of *h*–? A similar scribal omission of *gweyssyon* could explain both *eu alldudon* in Peniarth 30 col. 99 —

Ny deleyr dyeneydau caeth os pryn y | argluyd yr y | guerth. k{eureyth}. ac ony keffyr dym yn | y lau y | argluyd a | eyll y | dyheurau ac urth henny e | deuotta er uchelur (sic [cf. below]) dyheurau eu alldudon

‘One should not execute a slave if his lord redeems him for his legal worth and, if nothing is found in his hand, his lord can exonerate him, and because of that it is customary for the lord (*sic*) to exonerate *their* (*sic*? [cf. below]) aliens.’

— and also, conceivably, *eu | alldudyon* at col. 159:

Meybyon a | dalaant cadu yaun ac eu | alldudyon megys y | dely argluyd cadu argluydyaeth yaun ac eu alldudyon enteu.

‘Sons (of nobles) are entitled to maintain law over *their* aliens just as a lord is entitled to maintain lordship over his aliens.’

In the latter passage, however, *eu | alldudyon* is probably a sound example of *eu* without sandhi *h*, because the parallel passage in Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 35v reads:

e dele meybyon uchelwyr cadu argluydyaeth ar eu halltudyon ual e dele e brenhyn kadu argluydyaeth ar y alltudyon enteu (cf. Wiliam 1960: 58; Jenkins 1986: 114).

The last three words in the passage just quoted (*eu alldudyon enteu/y alltudyon enteu*) are particularly revealing because *eu* in Peniarth 30’s *eu alldudyon enteu* cannot possibly be 3 pl. in view of the 3 sg. affixed pronoun *enteu*, which refers back to *argluyd*. The only possible explanation is that *eu* here is a hypercorrect spelling of *y* ‘his’, no doubt owing to the Middle Welsh monophthongisation of *eu* (as in *eu* ‘their’ > *y* ‘their’) already being underway.⁴⁵ This suggests another explanation of *eu alldudon* in col. 99. Although Jenkins (1963: 24) emends MS *uchelur* to pl. *ucheluyr*, as it stands it is singular and that would fit with the lack of *h* in *eu alldudon*, if it means ‘his (the *uchelwr*’s) aliens’.

Eu ‘his’ is not a panacea that can explain all absences of *h* after *eu*; it cannot explain Peniarth 30, col. 237 *oc eu achau huy*, for instance, where the 3 pl. *huy*

⁴⁵Morris Jones (1913: 275) described ModW *eu* as a medieval form ‘preserved artificially in lit[erary] W[elsh]’. Examples of *y* ‘their’ are already found in the Black Book of Carmarthen (Jarman 1982: 151 s.v. *i*³).

confirms that *eu* must be plural. But it does provide a possible explanation for the three examples of *eu a-* in the phrase *kan eu ardercauael* ‘with their(?) augmentation’ or similar in Peniarth 29 and 30:

Peniarth 29, p. 11 *y | saraet eu .vi. byu a .vi. ugeyn aryant. kan y | arderh{a}uael. y | guerth eu .vi. byu. a .vi | ugey{n} | myu kan eu ardercauael.*

‘His honour-price is six cattle and six score pence with its(?) augmentation. His worth is six cattle and six score cattle with their(?) augmentation.’

Peniarth 30, col. 78 *Galanas mab uchelur o | byt penkenedyl. nau myv a nau ugeyn | myv gan eu arderchauel teyr | gueyth E | sarhaet nau myv a | nau ugeynt aryant gan arderchauel un gueyth. Galanas y | alldut y⁴⁶ | aylaut .i. y | kar. vi. byv. a cxx. myv gan eu arderchauel teyr gueyth.*

‘The compensation for a noble’s son, if he be a chief of kindred, nine cattle and nine score with their(?) augmentation three times. His honour-price nine cattle and nine score pence with augmentation one time. The honour-price of his alien [and] his member, i.e. his kinsman, six cattle and a hundred and twenty cattle with their(?) augmentation three times.’

In Peniarth 29, p. 11 the antecedent of *eu* in *kan eu ardercauael* is probably not the plurality of animals listed but *guerth* (m.), with *eu* as a spelling of *y* ‘its’. (But in the preceding clause *kan y | arderh{a}uael* lacks the *h* that is expected if the antecedent is *saraet* (f.) or the animals plus the money (pl.); is its antecedent *aryant* (m.) alone?)⁴⁷ In Peniarth 30, col. 78 both cases of *eu* may be for 3 sg.m. *y*, referring back to *galanas* which is m.f.

While a few of the 17 examples of *eu a-* can thus be explained away, that is by no means true of them all. It is difficult to explain the remainder away as mere scribal errors when 3 sg.f. *y a-* for *y ha-* is so very rare a scribal error by comparison (see above). Is the disparity because *eu* was distinctively plural and did not need a following *h-* to be written to be intelligible, whereas *y* before a vowel was ambiguously ‘his’ or ‘her’, unless *h-* was written consistently after the feminine? The use of *eu* for sg. *y* is a slight objection to such a pragmatic explanation; when *eu alldudyon* could mean ‘his aliens’ as well as ‘their aliens’, writing the *h* would disambiguate the latter.

On balance, it seems that the thirteenth-century manuscripts do indicate, faintly, that sandhi *h-* after *eu* ‘their’ was still establishing itself in the thirteenth century, unlike the long-standing and etymologically justified *h-* after *y* ‘her’.

⁴⁶Jenkins (1963: 19, cf. 101) emends to *a’y*. Cf. Jenkins (1986: 155).

⁴⁷Compare Peniarth 29, p. 17 ‘*y | sarhaet eu vi byu a .vi. xx{ti}. aryant kan y | arderhauael ungueyth. y | guerth eu .vi. byu a | .vi.xx{ti} | myu kan y | arderhauael ungueyt*’ and ‘*y | saraet eu .vi | byu a .vi. xx{ti}. aryant kan y | arderchauael ungueyt. y | guerth eu .vi. byu a vixx{ti}. | myu. kan y | ardercheauae [sic]*’ and p. 18 ‘*y | sarhaet eu vi | byu a | vixx{ti}. aryarnt (sic) ka{n} y | arderchauael*’.

This conclusion can be strengthened by noting the further examples that can be found by searching thirteenth-century prose for combinations of [eu ~ ev ~ e6] + [a ~ e ~ i ~ o ~ u ~ v ~ 6 ~ y]:⁴⁸

s. *xiii*^{med}.

Peniarth 44, p. 49 *megys llew dywal en e6 plyth en e6 anreithyaw* ‘like a fierce lion in their midst plundering them’.

Peniarth 30, col. 22 [O] *d{eruyd} bot mach ar xii. d’ a | pan er doeth eu oet na* (sic) *oet ar helu y | kynnog{yn}*. (This seems to mean ‘their due date’, referring to the twelve pennies’ due date, but it must be admitted that the text seems corrupt at this point.)⁴⁹

Peniarth 30, col. 75 *y tat ay uam ay urodyr ay chyoryt ac eu etyuet* ‘... and their progeny’.

Peniarth 30, col. 230 *O | d{eruyd}. dody ar dyn un or petheu hyn emay ay llosc ay anreith ay kyrch godeuac* (sic). *sef eyryf a | dyly bot e | kyrch godeuac nau dyn ac eu espeyl ac eu kydluyn*⁵⁰ *ay llat dyn y | meun bruydyr ...* (Here *ac eu* is a false expansion of *ay* ‘or’, as if it were *a’y* ‘and their’, but the non-writing of *h-* after *eu* may still be significant. The scribe was obviously confused by the parenthetical definition of *kyrch godeuac*. Cf. Peniarth 32 (s. xiv/xv), p. 187: *O|deruyd. ellibya6 ar dyn ae llosc ae anreith. ae kyrch kyhoeda6c. Sef eiryf a|dyly bot my6n kyrch kyhoeda6c; na6 nyn. ae yspeil. ae llad dyn ym|br6ydyr. ae kynll6yn ...*, translated as follows by Owen (1841: 55): ‘If a person be charged with burning; or pillaging; or public attack, the number to constitute which is nine persons; or spoiling; or killing a person in battle; or waylaying ...’)

Peniarth 30, col. 310 *try eydyon cehet eu co{r}n ac eu esceuar* ‘three bullocks whose horns are as long as their ears’.⁵¹

s. *xiii*²

Peniarth 17, p. 23 *duw ... a | wyr rify syr ac eu enw* ‘God ... who knows the number of the stars and their name(s)’.

⁴⁸But absence of *h* before /j/ (as at Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 67r *eu yachau* and NLW 5266B, p. 245 *eu ya6n*) can be ignored; cf. Sims-Williams (2010: 45).

⁴⁹Cotton Caligula A.iii, fol. 158r, col. 2 has ‘O der6yd bot mach ar de6dec keynnya6c. a dy6ot oet e de6 dec keynnya6c. ac nat oes ar helw e kynnogyn namyn march a talho dec p6nt’ (translated ‘If it happens that there is a surety for twelve pence, and the time-limit for the twelve pence is up, and there is nothing in the possession of the debtor except a horse worth ten pounds’ by Charles-Edwards (1986: 147)), and Peniarth 29, p. 46 has ‘O | d{er}uit bot mach ar | deudec keniauc a | deuot oet e | deudec keniauc ac nad | oes ar e | helu e | kenogon namuin march decpunt’. But Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 22r has ‘O d{er}uyd bot mach ar deudec | keynnyauc ac nat oes ar helu e kennogyn namen march a | talho dec | punt’, which Jenkins (1986: 69) translates ‘If it happens that there is a surety for twelve pence, and the principal debtor has to his name nothing save a horse worth ten pounds’, while noting (p. 249) that Wiliam (1960: 37) restores the following italicised clause (‘and the due date for the twelve pence comes’) from BL Add. 14931, p. 37: ‘O deruyd bot mach ar | deudec keynnyauc a dyuot oet y deudec ceynnyauc ac nat oes ar helw y kynogyn namyn march dec punt’.

⁵⁰*d* partially deleted.

⁵¹Cf. ‘ac eu hesgyuarn’ in *Llyfr Iorwerth*, cited in GPC s.v. *ysgyfarn*. Cf. Sheringham (1982).

Cotton Titus D.ii, fol. 13r *Efa dele gedueu er eskrebyl a | ladher en | e llys sef achabŷ e dele vrth eu eskernegu ae wyall ef* ‘He is entitled to the necks of the livestock slaughtered in the court; the reason he is so entitled is that they are cut up with his axe’ (Jenkins 1986: 37). As *ysgrybl* is masculine singular as well as collective, perhaps *eu* is ‘its’ rather than ‘their’.

BL Add. 14931, p. 71 *y uam ay dat ay urodyr ay chwyoryd. ac eu etyuet* ‘... and their progeny’. (This comes from the same text as Peniarth 30, col. 75 above.)

These 8 thirteenth-century instances of *e6/leu* without sandhi *h* can be counted alongside the 17 thirteenth-century examples of *eu a-* discussed above.

Conclusion

Sandhi *h* after 3 pl. possessive pronouns (prefixed and infixed) was a mid-thirteenth-century innovation,⁵² still in progress, probably more or less contemporary with sandhi *h* after third-person infixed pronouns, from which it may have spread. It has been shown elsewhere that absence of sandhi *h* after first-person pronouns (e.g. *i'm eneid* ‘for my soul’, *a'm etev* ‘who promises me’, *Duw a'n amuc* ‘God defended us’, *an arueu* ‘our arms’, etc.) is still common in the thirteenth-century manuscripts (Sims-Williams 2010). That strongly suggests that sandhi *h* after first-person pronouns was the last type of sandhi *h* to develop. The analogy of the third-person pronouns may have been a factor in its development.

APPENDIX: A FURTHER COMMENT ON SANDHI *h* AFTER FIRST-PERSON PRONOUNS, WITH A NOTE ON ‘POST-SONORANT ASPIRATION’ IN BASQUE

In my earlier discussion, linking sandhi *h* after 1 sg. *'m* and 1 pl. *yn* and *'n* to hypercorrect *h* after nasals (Sims-Williams 2010), I alluded to a shortage of examples of that hypercorrection, and noted that the etymology of some that had been proposed, such as MW *bonhed* ‘nobility’ beside *boned* (ModW *bonedd*), was disputed — although here derivatives such as *bonhedyc* (ModW *bonheddig*) certainly tend to support the idea that the /h/ of *bonhed* is etymological.⁵³ Perhaps the earliest example of the hypercorrection (tenth century) is *a | ceroenhou* ‘and vats’ in the Cambridge Juvenius (Schrijver 2011: 34). Now that searchable databases for prose up to the fifteenth century are available, it is much easier to find good examples of unetymological *h*, for example *gynhedyfeu* in Shrewsbury School 11 (s. xiv/xv) p. 70, *kenhetloed* in

⁵²Regarding the alliteration in the three earlier lines by Cynddelw and Prydydd y Moch as coincidental.

⁵³Morris Jones (1913: 187) has explanations other than hypercorrection for ‘medial **h** before an accented vowel’. In Basque, according to Hualde (2018: 10), ‘aspiration ex nihilo, Ø > /h/, immediately before a stressed vowel and after a [+cons, +son, –lab], e.g. *onest* > *onhest* “honest”, [which] does not appear to have a phonetic justification’, may be due to an assumption such as ‘stressed syllables should have an aspirated onset’.

NLW Peniarth 23 (s. xv²), fol. 105r and *genhedyla6c* in NLW Wynnstey 36 (s. xv¹), fol. 125ra. A likely example in Early Modern manuscripts, noted by Ifor Williams, is *Pen hardd* / *Penhardd* for the place-name *Pennardd* in *Canu Llywarch Hen* XII.7–8;⁵⁴ a possible parallel is *Penharth* in Glamorgan in 1266, discussed by Padel (2021: 118 and 123–5). Further examples, in late manuscripts of *Bonedd y Saint*, are *yn hEnlli*, §§18–19 (MS D = Cardiff 3.242, part ii, s. xiv/xv), and *Kynhan* and *ynn hArllechwedd*, §§20 and 25 (MS N = NLW Peniarth 132, part iii (1554–64)).⁵⁵ The occurrence of sandhi *h* after the preposition *yn* here is striking and provides a parallel to its occurrence across the morpheme boundary after pronouns, e.g. *yn harglwyd* ‘our lord’. And note also *en herbyn* ‘against’ in Peniarth 14 (s. xiii²), p. 89 (twice) and *yn hachwanec* ‘additionally’ in Peniarth 7 (s. xiii/xiv), fol. 8v, col. 19 (Sims-Williams 2010: 49 and n. 3). In names compare *henheglus* in 1254 for Heneglwyys in Anglesey (Lunt 1926: 193), and *Einyawn hyrth* for Einion Yrth (Bartrum 1966: 45; Guy 2021: 81–2).

The spread of /nh/ in Welsh is curiously reminiscent of what has been labelled ‘post-sonorant aspiration’ in Basque and illustrated with *onhest* ‘honest’ < Romance **onest* (Salaberri Zaratiegi and Salaberri Izko 2016: 373–4; Hualde 2018: 8–10). This is not a close parallel, however, because inorganic /h/ is very restricted in Welsh whereas it occurs in a wide variety of environments in Basque and not principally following sonorants (see Igartua 2015).⁵⁶

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BD</i>	Lewis, Henry (ed.), 1942: <i>Brut Dingestow</i> (Cardiff).
<i>CBT</i>	Gruffydd, R. Geraint (general ed.), 1991–96: <i>Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion</i> , 7 vols (Cardiff).
<i>HRB</i>	Reeve, Michael D., and Wright, Neil (ed. and transl.), 2009: <i>Geoffrey of Monmouth: The History of the Kings of Britain</i> (Woodbridge).
<i>LL</i>	Evans, J. Gwenogvryn, and Rhys, John (eds), 1979: <i>The Text of the Book of Llan Dâv Reproduced from the Gwysaney Manuscript</i> (repr. Aberystwyth).
<i>R</i>	Evans, J. Gwenogvryn (ed.), 1911: <i>The Poetry in the Red Book of Hergest</i> (Llanbedrog).
<i>TC</i>	Morgan, T. J. 1952: <i>Y Treigladau a’u Cysrawen</i> (Cardiff).

⁵⁴Williams (1953: 49–50 and 244). He used an inferior copy, but *Pen hardd* is also found in the better manuscripts listed in Sims-Williams (1978: 91 n. 1) and the new one noted by Guy (2016: 75 n. 32).

⁵⁵I noted these when I was privileged to read Barry Lewis’s forthcoming edition.

⁵⁶For advice here I am very grateful to Professor Joseba Andoni Lakarra. I also want to thank Professors Marged Haycock and Barry Lewis for their suggestions and to acknowledge the use of Professor Ann Parry Owen’s Modern Welsh concordance to *CBT*.

REFERENCES

- ANDREWS, RHIAN M. 1994: 'Cynganeddion Bleddyn Fardd', *SC* 28, 117–52.
- BARTRUM, P. C. (ed.) 1966: *Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts* (Cardiff).
- BLEVINS, JULIETTE and GARRETT, ANDREW 1993: 'The evolution of Ponapeic nasal substitution', *Oceanic Linguistics* 32:2, 199–236.
- CASTETS, FERDINAND (ed.) 1880: *Turpini Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi* (Paris).
- CHARLES-EDWARDS, T. M. 1980: 'The "Iorwerth" text', in Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen (eds), *The Welsh Law of Women* (Cardiff), 161–79.
- , 1986: 'The "Iorwerth" text', in T. M. Charles-Edwards, Morfydd E. Owen, and D. B. Walters (eds), *Lawyers and Laymen* (Cardiff), 137–78.
- COLLINGE, N. E. 1985: *The Laws of Indo-European* (Amsterdam).
- DE REUSE, WILLEM J. 1981: 'Grassmann's Law in Ofo', *International Journal of American Linguistics* 47:3, 243–4.
- EVANS, D. SIMON 1950: 'Y rhagenw mewnol genidol', *BBCS* 14:1, 24–9.
- FALILEYEV, ALEXANDER 2000: *Etymological Glossary of Old Welsh* (Tübingen).
- GUY, BEN 2016: 'A lost medieval manuscript from North Wales: Hengwrt 33, the *Hanesyn Hên*', *SC* 50, 69–105.
- , 2021: 'Misunderstanding Old Welsh orthography and Insular script in the Jesus College 20 genealogies', *Celtica* 33, 59–96.
- HAYCOCK, MARGED (ed.) 1994: *Blodeugerdd Barddas o Ganu Crefyddol Cynnar* (Llandybie).
- , (ed.) 2015: *Legendary Poems from the Book of Taliesin*, 2nd edition (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).
- HUALDE, JOSÉ IGNACIO 2018: 'Aspiration in Basque', *Papers in Historical Phonology* 3, 1–27.
- HUWS, DANIEL 2000: *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts* (Cardiff and Aberystwyth).
- IGARTUA, IVÁN 2015: 'Diachronic effects of rhinoglottophilia, symmetries in sound change, and the curious case of Basque', *Studies in Language* 39:3, 635–63.
- ISAAC, G. R. 2004: 'The chronology of the development of the Brittonic stops and the spirant mutation', *JCS* 8, 49–85.
- , 2008: 'Brittonic voiceless spirants again', *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 12, 17–37.
- JACKSON, KENNETH HURLSTONE 1967: *A Historical Phonology of Breton* (Dublin).
- JACOBS, NICOLAS (ed.) 2012: *Early Welsh Gnostic and Nature Poetry* (London).
- JARMAN, A. O. H. (ed.) 1982: *Llyfr Du Caerfyrddin* (Cardiff).
- JENKINS, DAFYDD (ed.) 1963: *Llyfr Colan* (Aberystwyth).
- , (ed.) 1973: *Damweiniau Colan* (Aberystwyth).
- , (ed.) 1986: *The Law of Hywel Dda* (Llandysul).

- JONES, R. M. 1997: 'Gogynghanedd y Gogynfeirdd', *Ysgrifau Beirniadol* 22, 41–79.
- JONES, THOMAS (ed.) 1940: *Y Bibyl Ynghymraec* (Cardiff).
- , (ed.) 1955: *Brut y Tywysogyon or The Chronicle of the Princes: Red Book of Hergest Version* (Cardiff).
- , (ed.) 1971: *Brenhinedd y Saesson* (Cardiff).
- LE BIHAN, HERVÉ 2020: 'Le pronom infixe -s en moyen breton', *EC* 46, 87–9.
- LEWIS, HENRY and PEDERSEN, HOLGER 1961: *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*, 2nd edition (Göttingen).
- LLOYD, D. MYRDDIN 1949: 'La poésie de Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr et le manuscrit Peniarth 3', *EC* 5:1, 87–104.
- , 1968: 'Some metrical features in Gogynfeirdd poetry', *SC* 3, 38–46.
- LLOYD-JONES, J. 1913–31: *Geirfa Barddoniaeth Gynnar Gymraeg* (Cardiff).
- LUNT, W. E. (ed.) 1926, *The Valuation of Norwich* (Oxford).
- LYNCH, PEREDUR 1996: 'Yr awdl a'i mesurau', in Morfydd E. Owen and Brynley F. Roberts (eds), *Beirdd a Thywysogion: Barddoniaeth Llys yng Nghymru, Iwerddon a'r Alban* (Cardiff), 258–87.
- MAC CANA, PROINSIAS 1995: 'Notes on the English edition of *Culhwch and Olwen*', *CMCS* 29, 53–7.
- McCONE, KIM 2006: *The Origins and Development of the Insular Celtic Verbal Complex* (Maynooth).
- MORRIS-JONES, J. 1913: *A Welsh Grammar, Historical and Comparative* (Oxford).
- , 1925. *Cerdd Dafod* (Oxford).
- Ó MAOLALAIGH, ROIBEARD 2003a: Review of *Scottish Gaelic Studies* 17, in *Celtica* 24, 306–30.
- , 2003b: 'Processes in nasalization and related issues', *Ériu* 53, 109–32.
- OWEN, ANEURIN (ed.) 1841: *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales*, vol. II (London).
- OWEN, MORFYDD E. and WILLIAMS, KEITH 1989: *Mynegair i Lawysgrif Hendregadredd* (Cardiff).
- PADEL, OLIVER 2021: 'The relations of Penarth (Glamorgan), especially in Cornwall', in Gareth A. Bevan, G. Angharad Fychan, Hywel Wyn Owen and Ann Parry Owen (eds), *Ar Drywydd Enwau Lleoedd* (Talybont), 116–31.
- PARRY, TOM 1936: 'Twf y gynghanedd', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 143–60.
- PARRY OWEN, ANN 2022: '"Canu" Beirdd y Tywysogion i'r saint', in David N. Parsons and Paul Russell (eds), *Seintiau Cymru, Sancti Cambrenses: Astudiaethau ar Seintiau Cymru/Studies in the Saints of Wales* (Aberystwyth), 269–86.
- PEDERSEN, HOLGER 1909: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, vol. I (Göttingen).
- REIHON, ANNALEE C. (ed.) 1984: *Cân Rolant: The Medieval Welsh Version of the Song of Roland* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).
- RICHARDS, MELVILLE (ed.) 1957: *Cyfreithiau Hywel Dda* (Cardiff).

- ROBERTS, BRYNLEY F. (ed.) 1975: *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys* (Dublin).
- , (ed.) 2015: ‘*Brut y Brenhinedd* ms. National Library of Wales, Llanstephan 1 version’, in Hélène Tétrel and Géraldine Veyseyre (eds), *L’Historia Regum Britannie et les ‘Bruts’ en Europe*, I (Paris), 71–80.
- RODWAY, SIMON 2013: *Dating Medieval Welsh Literature: Evidence from the Verbal System* (Aberystwyth).
- ROWLAND, JENNY 1990: *Early Welsh Saga Poetry* (Cambridge).
- SALABERRI ZARATIEGI, PATXI and SALABERRI IZKO, IKER 2016: ‘An introduction to Basque aspiration: the contribution of onomastics’, *Fontes Linguae Vasconum* 122, 365–92.
- SCHRIJVER, PETER 1994: ‘The Celtic adverbs for “against” and “with” and the early apocope of *-i’. *Ériu* 45, 151–89.
- , 1997a: *Studies in the History of Celtic Pronouns and Particles* (Maynooth).
- , 1997b: ‘On the nature and origin of word-initial *h-* in the Würzburg glosses’, *Ériu* 48, 205–27.
- , 1999: ‘Spirantization and nasalization in British’, *SC* 33, 1–19.
- , 2011: ‘Old British’, in Elmar Ternes (ed.), *Brythonic Celtic — Britannisches Keltisch: From Medieval British to Modern Breton* (Bremen), 1–84.
- SHERINGHAM, J. G. T. 1982: ‘Bullocks with horns as long as their ears’, *BBCS* 28.4, 691–708.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, PATRICK 1978: ‘*anfab*² “illegitimate child”: a ghost-word’, *BBCS* 28.1, 90–3.
- , 1984: ‘The double system of verbal inflexion in Old Irish’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 82.1, 138–201.
- , 2007: *Studies on Celtic Languages before the Year 1000* (Aberystwyth).
- , 2008: ‘The problem of spirantization and nasalization in Brittonic Celtic’, in Alexander Lubotsky, Jos Schaeken, and Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds), *Evidence and Counter-Evidence: Essays in honour of Frederik Kortlandt, I, Baltic and Indo-European Linguistics* (Amsterdam and New York), 509–25.
- , 2010: ‘The spread of “sandhi *h-*” in thirteenth-century Welsh’, *Transactions of the Philological Society* 108.1, 41–52.
- , 2016: ‘Dating the poems of Aneirin and Taliesin’, *ZCP* 63, 163–234.
- , (ed.) 2017: *Liber Coronacionis Britanorum: A Medieval Welsh Version of Geoffrey of Monmouth*, 2 vols (Aberystwyth).
- , 2021: ‘“Dark” and “clear” *y* in medieval Welsh orthography: Caligula versus Teilo’, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 119.1, 1–39.
- THOMAS, PETER WYNN 1990: ‘The Brythonic consonant shift and the development of consonant mutation’, *BBCS* 37, 1–42.
- WATKINS, CALVERT 1965: ‘OIr. *nache n-* “neque eam”’, *Lochlann* 3, 286–7.
- WILIAM, ALED RHYS (ed.) 1960: *Llyfr Iorwerth* (Cardiff).
- WILLIAMS, GRUFFYDD ALED 1996: ‘Owain Cyfeiliog: bardd-dywysog?’, in Morfydd E. Owen and Brynley F. Roberts (eds), *Beirdd a Thywysogion: Barddoniaeth Llys yng Nghymru, Iwerddon a’r Alban* (Cardiff), 180–201.

WILLIAMS, IFOR (ed.) 1928: ‘Y Cyfoesi a’r Afallennau yn Peniarth 3’, *BBCS* 4.2, 112–19.

——, (ed.) 1938: *Canu Aneirin* (Cardiff).

——, (ed.) 1953: *Canu Llywarch Hen*, 2nd edition (Cardiff).

——, (ed.) 1960: *Canu Taliesin* (Cardiff).

——, (ed.) 1968: *The Poems of Taliesin* (Dublin).

WILLIAMS, STEPHEN J. (ed.) 1968: *Ystorya de Carolo Magno*, 2nd edition (Cardiff).

PATRICK SIMS-WILLIAMS

Aberystwyth University