



Authorship

Dafydd Johnston

This edition recognises three categories of poems: the canon of 147 poems which are accepted as the work of Dafydd ap Gwilym (and the four by Gruffudd Gryg in the bardic debate), 20 poems of uncertain authorship, and the numerous poems which are attributed to Dafydd ap Gwilym in some manuscripts but which are judged not to be his work (see list of 203 under the heading 'Apocrypha'). It must be emphasized from the start that the boundaries between these categories are not absolute by any means. As will be seen, there are reasons to doubt the authenticity of one or two of the poems included in the canon, and on the other hand a case can be made for the authenticity of all the poems of uncertain authorship and a few of the apocrypha as well. But in doing so it is essential to follow guidelines which are as objective as possible, whilst also recognising the theoretical problems associated with the concepts of authorship and authenticity.

There was some discussion of the content of the canon following the publication of GDG, and a few further poems were proposed for inclusion as will be seen. But the most far-reaching criticism of the principles of the canon of authentic poems was that made recently by Helen Fulton, both in terms of theory of authorship and authority and in terms of methodology. Fulton's fundamental argument is that the canon of an author's works which is considered to be a consistent expression of a unique personality is a modern concept promoted by the publishing industry.¹ She suggests that the ascriptions of poems to named poets in the manuscripts should be regarded primarily as generic markers, and that the name 'Dafydd ap Gwilym' was used by copyists in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance period to denote a particular type of love poem. But that does not necessarily mean that individual authorship was not a meaningful concept in the Middle Ages.

In fact there is plenty of evidence that copyists in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did seek to distinguish, rightly or wrongly, between authors of *cywyddau* in this field, despite the great renown attached to the name of DG himself. For example, in the middle of a group of poems ascribed to DG in Pen 54 the copyist attributed one poem to Madog Benfras (although the poem is attributed to DG in other manuscripts). And in the first part of Pen 57 'Y ferch lygad ruddell fain' is attributed to Llywelyn Goch ap Meurig Hen, following four poems ascribed to DG. Numerous other instances of distinguishing between

¹ Helen Fulton, 'Awdurdod ac Awduriaeth: Golygu'r Cywyddwyr', in Iestyn Daniel *et al.* (eds), *Cyfoeth y Testun* (Caerdydd, 2003), 50–76.

authors could be quoted, and also of notes in which copyists cast doubt on the authenticity of a poem which they found ascribed to DG.² Nor was this sort of care in attributing poems to authors a new phenomenon. Authorship was essential to the careful arrangement of the collection of poems by the Poets of the Princes which was made in the Hendregadredd Manuscript around the beginning of the fourteenth century.³ Reconciliation poems from the time of Taliesin onwards clearly demonstrate that poets and their audiences considered the author to be responsible for his words, and the accusations of plagiarism in the debate between Dafydd ap Gwilym and Gruffudd Gryg presuppose the idea of an author's ownership of a poem, as Morgan Davies has recently argued.⁴

Wales was quite similar to most other countries of medieval Europe in terms of awareness of a sense of authorship, and it seems that England was different to others in this respect, as Nicolas Jacobs suggested:

It has been argued that the anonymity of the great bulk of compositions in Middle English is evidence of the lack of a sense of authorship in the period. The situation is, however, anomalous in Western Europe and cannot be explained in terms of general cultural development. The greater portion of *trobador* lyric is attributed to named authors, and the fact that many of these were provided with biographies, however fictitious those may be, suggests that authorship was a matter of some interest among their audience; attributions occur also in the case of their French, Italian, Catalan, and, especially, German and Portuguese followers. The same is of course true of the authors of French and German romances; one of the former, Hue de Rotelande, was actually resident in England, while one of the most eminent of the latter, Gottfried von Strassburg, provides in his celebrated critical digression further evidence that the attachment of names to vernacular texts was no mere formality, at least by the beginning of the thirteenth century. The compositions of the poets of the Welsh princes and their successors, active from the beginning of the twelfth century on, are assiduously attributed to their authors in the manuscripts in which they are preserved; the earlier poetry preserved in manuscripts of roughly the same date is similarly attributed, though less reliably and in some cases certainly wrongly. Such attributions, true or false, demonstrate plainly that the concept of vernacular authorship was taken for granted in medieval Wales as it was on the continent of Europe.⁵

It can be concluded, therefore, that ownership of a poem by an author was a meaningful concept in medieval Wales. However, deciding on the authorship of individual poems is another matter altogether, and consideration must be given to Helen Fulton's important critique of Thomas Parry's methods of canon formation in GDG. Fulton emphasizes in her introduction to her selection of the apocrypha that none of the criteria used by Parry to decide authenticity are entirely objective, and that every attempt to define the canon is

² See further A. Cynfael Lake, 'Awduraeth Cerddi'r Oesoedd Canol: Rhai Sylwadau', *Dwned* 3 (1997), 63–71.

³ See the analysis by Daniel Huws in MWM 193–226.

⁴ Morgan Thomas Davies, 'The Death of Dafydd ap Gwilym', in Joseph Falaky Nagy and Leslie Ellen Jones (eds), *Heroic Poets and Poetic Heroes in Celtic Tradition* (Dublin, 2005), 55–73.

⁵ 'Kindly Light or Foxfire? The Authorial Text Reconsidered', in Vincent P. McCarren and Douglas Moffat (eds), *A Guide to Editing Middle English* (Michigan, 1998), 3–14 (7–8).

subjective (as Parry himself recognized), and she therefore argues that it is not possible to do more than talk of a 'school' of poets of which DG was a prominent member.⁶

Many of the arguments about authenticity of poems depend on distinguishing between poetry of the fourteenth century and that of the fifteenth (or sometimes even the sixteenth). If it can be proved that a poem is characteristic of the fifteenth century then it is unlikely to be the work of DG. But according to Fulton we do not have dependable criteria to distinguish with confidence between products of the two centuries. Some of Parry's criteria on this point are indeed excessively rigid, particularly those concerning *cynganedd*, and need to be refined and applied with greater circumspection. And since considerably more poetry from the two centuries has by now been edited it is quite possible to do so.

It is important to bear in mind the generation of poets who flourished around the turn of the century, Gruffudd Llwyd, Llywelyn ab y Moel and others, whose work shows some characteristics of the early *cywyddau* as well as some of the later style. It must also be recognised that some stylistic differences may be due to genre rather than period. For instance, it is possible that a fourteenth-century poet would choose a simpler style for a *cywydd* which had an educational purpose, such as the short one on the Trinity (no. 3). That argument is relevant to the *cywydd* 'Credo' (no. 153) and perhaps also to some of the comic love poems. It must be accepted, therefore, that the distinction between poems of the two centuries is not always clear-cut, but nevertheless the attempt to distinguish between them can be a useful means of judging authenticity, particularly when a poem is attributed both to DG and to a known poet of the fifteenth century.

Helen Fulton's most fundamental criticism of the methodology underpinning the GDG canon is that concerning the circular argument. The essential point is that the poems of the canon were used to establish the criteria which are supposed to decide the contents of the canon. Thomas Parry appears to have been aware of this danger to some extent, since he took care to avoid it in forming his criterion on language by drawing his evidence from the work of DG's contemporaries (GDG¹ lxxx–xc). As a result, of course, this criterion relates to period rather than to individual author. And in relation to other criteria the circular argument is quite obvious. For instance, one of the reasons given by Parry for rejecting two of the apocryphal *cywyddau*, 'Dydd da i'r gog serchogfwyn' (no. 164 in this edition) and 'Yr alarch ar ei wiwlyn' (A194) is that the girl's name is spelt out in the poem, which he claims does not occur in any of DG's authentic poems (GDG¹ clxxvi; see also cxc). But if one of these two were to be accepted then there would be no reason to reject the other on that account. It is clear, therefore, that the canon had been established before deciding on the authenticity of these two poems.

Ultimately it is not possible to avoid the circular argument altogether, since there has to be some sort of core of authentic poems against which to measure others. The only thing that can be done to counteract this is to seek to ensure that several criteria coincide, and that one alone is not relied upon. Although the circular argument is a danger in relation to each criterion in isolation, a cluster of criteria taken together is likely to provide firm enough

⁶ Helen Fulton (ed.), *Selections from the Dafydd ap Gwilym Apocrypha* (Llandysul, 1996), xxi–xxviii.

evidence to break out of the vicious circle. and that is generally found to be the case, as Thomas Parry himself emphasized (GDG¹ cv).

Accepting, then, that the precise contents of the canon can never be definitively established, it must be asked what degree of certainty pertains to the poems in the canon of this edition. There are specific reasons for questioning the authenticity of poems in the canon, nos 64 and 142 (see the introductory notes to the two poems), and some other poems are noted below for which a case could be made for moving them to the uncertain authorship section. But a more crucial question for the purpose of establishing criteria to judge authorship is whether there are poems which can be accepted as the work of DG beyond any doubt, poems which would form the core of the canon.

Three poems must first be noted which form a special class because they survive in manuscript copies which are more or less contemporary with the poet's own lifetime, namely nos 1, 9 and 84. To be precise this evidence is not so definite in the case of no. 9 since the early text lacks an attribution as it stands, but since the parts of the page where an attribution might be expected are illegible no great weight need be attached to that consideration. And in that case the evidence of sixteenth-century copies is very strong in favour of DG's authorship.

Although the evidence of fifteenth-century manuscripts is nothing like as dependable as those of the fourteenth, twelve poems should be noted which are (or were) preserved in two or more manuscripts from the fifteenth century, nos 4 (Pen 48, Pen 57), 14 (Pen 54 x2), 42 (LIGH, LI 27), 91 (Pen 54, Pen 57), 94 (LIGH, Pen 54), 101 (LIGH, Pen 57), 109 (LIGH, Pen 57, Pen 67), 112 (LIGH, Pen 54), 116 (Pen 57, Pen 54), 122 (Pen 57, Pen 54), 124 (LIGH, Pen 54), 141 (LIGH, Pen 57, LI 27). In the case of most of these poems other considerations support the manuscript evidence, as will be shown below, but in the case of nos 4, 42, 124 and 141 the strong evidence of the manuscripts is crucial since they are somewhat different to other poems attributed to DG.

In the case of all the other poems, where the evidence of the manuscripts is not strong enough in itself to decide the issue, a judgement has to be made on the basis of content and style. Although there is a good deal of similarity between the poems of the early Cywyddwyr in terms of style and techniques such as *dyfalu*, and although imagination and creativity comparable to that of DG himself are to be seen in some poems by his contemporaries, some subjects and ways of treating them are apparently distinctive of his work. The following are the most unique poems amongst those attributed to DG, and therefore the ones which can be most confidently accepted as his genuine work.

The love-messenger poems (nos 44–48). There are love-messenger poems by DG's contemporaries and amongst the apocrypha, but what is distinctive about those by DG is the detailed attention given to the messenger rather than the message, and in particular the way in which the description conveys the symbolic significance of the creature. The wind is a symbol of the freedom for which the poet longs, the seagull is a symbol of the girl's beauty, the roebuck is a symbol of Dyddgu's nobility, Dwynwen was the patron saint of lovers, and the skylark sings God's praises. These may be contrasted with 'Y Penlöyn' (A39) and 'Y Brithyll' (160), poems which are very similar to DG's work in terms of language and style but without the wider significance attached to the messenger.

Poems which present a critical view of the poet himself through the medium of a kind of 'alter ego', that is 'Cyngor y Bioden', 'Ei Gysgod', 'Y Gal', 'Merched Llanbadarn', 'Y Bardd a'r Brawd Llwyd' (nos 36, 63, 85, 137, 148).

Poems which develop one extended image or comparison, which is very often multi-faceted and ambiguous in impact, that is 'Offeren y Llwyn', 'Y Mwdwl Gwair', 'Serch fel Ysgyfarnog', 'Y Mab Maeth', 'Hwsmonaeth Cariad', 'Morfudd fel yr Haul', 'Caer rhag Cenfigen', 'Yr Adarwr', 'Telynores Twyll' (nos 39, 66, 75, 77, 109, 111, 122, 131, 135). A variant on that technique is seen in those poems which contain three parallel comparisons with the same point, namely 'Anwadalrwydd' and 'Caru Merch Fonheddig' (nos 76 and 87).

The poems about Dyddgu (nos 86–92 and 120). These are very consistent in their attitude towards Dyddgu, a combination of praise and frustration, and they display all the features of DG's most elaborate style. And Dyddgu is named by Gruffudd Gryg as DG's sweetheart in the bardic debate (27.47–52).

Most of the poems about Morfudd, that is those which convey the emotional complexity of their relationship and respond bitterly, yet also ultimately triumphantly, to her marriage to y Bwa Bach (nos 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120). But Morfudd's name is not in itself proof of the authenticity of a poem (e.g. no. 157, and A3, A26, A105, A107, A115, A160, A189). It is possible that other poets sang about girls of the same name, or if a poet wished to pass off a poem as the work of DG then an obvious thing to do would be to put Morfudd's name in it.

Poems about the seasons, and others which express anxiety about the passage of time, that is 'Mis Mai', 'Mis Mai a Mis Tachwedd', 'Yr Haf', 'Mawl i'r Haf', 'Cyngor y Bioden', 'Lladrata Haf', 'Morfudd yn Hen', 'Yr Adfail' (nos 32–36, 41, 150, 151).

Comic narratives in which the poet makes fun of his own failure as a lover, that is 'Y Cwt Gwyddau', 'Tri Phorthor Eiddig', 'Trafferth mewn Tafarn', 'Sarhau ei Was' (nos 67, 68, 73, 74). Although there are poems about love escapades by DG's contemporaries, other poets were not so willing to present a negative image of themselves. Note the prominent element of boasting in 'Yr Halaenwr' by Madog Benfras (OBWV 48), and 'Chwarae Cnau i'm Llaw' by Iolo Goch (GIG XXVI). The only poem by one of the early Cywyddwyr which is similar in spirit to DG's work in this respect is 'Y Celffaint' by Ithel Ddu (GGrG 9), and since that is Ithel Ddu's only surviving poem it is a good indication of the dangers inherent in comparing the large corpus of poems attributed to DG with the few attributed to his contemporaries. Might some of Ithel Ddu's poems perhaps have been misattributed to DG?

Poems about hindrances, with negative *dyfalu* expressing the poet's frustration, that is 'Y Rhew', 'Y Fiaren', 'Y Niwl', 'Y Lleuad', 'Y Pwll Mawn', 'Y Rhugl Groen', 'Y Ffenestr' (nos 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 65). But DG was not the only poet to compose poems of this kind; cf. 'Y Garreg Ateb' (158) and 'Y Daran' (A102). It might be argued that the *dyfalu* in DG's poems is of a particular quality, in terms of thematic imagery, e.g. the theme of captivity about the mist, and the otherworld theme in the same poem and in the one about the peat bog, and

in terms of ambivalent imagery conveying a dual response, a combination of disgust and wonder (together with sexual ambiguity about the rattlebag).

Poems containing the theme that God's creation assists the lovers and is superior to human devices, as seen in the love-messenger poems and in 'Offeren y Llwyn' (39). In this respect 'Y Deildy' (37) is characteristic, and also 'Y Seren' (50) with its thematic religious imagery. The nuts in 'Chwarae Cnau i'm Llaw' (95) are also a reflection of God's grace, and it is typical of DG that he proceeds to celebrate the nuts by means of lyrical description (in contrast to Iolo Goch's poem on the same theme, GIG XXVI). But the duality of the natural world is a recurrent theme in DG's work, and that awareness is central to 'Y Don ar Afon Dyfi' (51), a poem which also demonstrates DG's predilection for references to his own poetry.

The seven poems to Ifor Hael (11–17). Of these 'Basaleg' (14) has the strongest manuscript evidence, as noted above, and the subtle references to his own love poetry are a clear indication of DG's authorship. That poem does not necessarily guarantee the authenticity of all the others, but nevertheless there is no particular reason to doubt any of them, and numerous references by fifteenth-century poets show that DG was renowned as Ifor's bard. Apart from 'Marwnad Angharad' (9) which is supported by strong manuscript evidence, the only one of the praise poems which can be confidently accepted as genuine is the elegy to Llywelyn ap Gwilym (6) on account of the personal references in it, and the eulogy to him (5) can probably be accepted on the same basis although it does not contain any reference to personal relationship.

The four poems in the bardic debate with Gruffudd Gryg, nos 24, 26, 28 and 30 (and of course the corresponding poems by GG, nos 23, 25, 27 and 29, although they do not belong to the DG canon as such).

That gives a total of 84 poems which can be confidently accepted as genuine on the basis of content and style. Although there is clearly a danger of circular argument in the way in which some poems act as surety for others and vice versa, the key point is that these are definitely different to the work of other fourteenth-century poets (with the very few exceptions noted). And this list certainly contains DG's most popular poems and the ones which encapsulate the essence of his genius according to critical consensus. Allowing for the addition of the seven other poems which can be accepted on the basis of early manuscript evidence alone, as noted above, the total rises to 91, that is about 60% of the poems in the canon. Before moving on to the remainder of the canon, it is important to note that the manuscript evidence does not correspond neatly to the core which is based on content and style. Those poems can be reclassified according to the strength of the manuscript evidence as follows:

i) Strong evidence, that is poems which occur in at least one manuscript before 1500, or two independent sources from the first half of the 16th century:

1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 24, 26, 28, 30, 34, 36, 41, 42, 47, 48, 50, 51, 54, 57, 58, 59, 62, 65, 66, 67, 68, 74, 75, 77, 84, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 116, 117, 118, 122, 124, 131, 135, 137, 141, 151.

ii) Moderate evidence, that is poems which occur for the first time in only one source from the first half of the 16th century (counting the various representatives of the Vetustus tradition as one source, and likewise those deriving from the Book of Wiliam Mathew):

12, 13, 33, 37, 39, 45, 46, 56, 63, 76, 85, 86, 87, 90, 96, 115, 120, 148.

iii) Comparatively weak evidence, that is poems which occur for the first time in manuscripts of the second half of the 16th century:

17, 32, 35, 44, 73, 150.

The first group is the most numerous, comprising 67 poems (about 45% of the canon), and these can be considered to form the most secure core where manuscript evidence supports judgement on the basis of content and style so that there are no grounds for doubting their authenticity.

In the case of the 18 poems in the second group the manuscript evidence is neutral, that is to say it affords no reason for doubting their authenticity, but neither can it be said to confirm it. It should be borne in mind that the Vetustus and the Book of Wiliam Mathew did contain a few poems which are considered to be apocryphal.

The third group demands particular attention since it contains some of DG's best-known poems, namely 'Mis Mai', 'Mawl i'r Haf', 'Yr Ehedydd', 'Trafferth mewn Tafarn' and 'Morfudd yn Hen'. It is surprising that these first occur in manuscripts over two hundred years after the poet's own period. In the case of 'Trafferth mewn Tafarn' it is clear that there was a flourishing oral tradition by the second half of the 16th century, but in the other cases it seems that only one exemplar survived. There are admittedly several poems amongst the apocrypha which have stronger manuscript evidence. These six poems are accepted as the work of DG on the basis of thematic similarity to other poems in the canon. But it should be noted that 'Mawl i'r Haf' is different to 'Yr Haf' (34) in terms of its temporal vision since it emphasizes the cycle of the seasons more optimistically but without any mention of sexual relations. That difference could be used as the basis for rejection of 'Mawl i'r Haf', but uniformity of vision is hardly a dependable principle on which to base the canon of such a multifaceted poet as Dafydd ap Gwilym.

Turning to the 56 poems which form the remainder of the canon, it should be emphasized that there is no specific reason to doubt their authenticity, with the exception of the two poems noted above (nos 64 and 142). This is a matter of degrees of certainty, the authenticity of these 56 poems being less certain than that of the 91 discussed above. But if one 15th-century manuscript were to be accepted as sufficient evidence for the authenticity of a poem, rather than two as proposed above, then a further 25 poems could be added to the core of the canon, namely nos 8, 19, 22, 38, 49, 52, 60, 71, 80, 81, 82, 83, 104, 121, 123, 126, 128, 132, 133, 136, 140, 143, 144, 145, 147. It should be borne in mind on the one hand that there are several instances of misattribution in 15th-century manuscripts (e.g. 'Yr haul deg ar fy neges', A198, in Pen 54, and perhaps 'Y Brithyll', no. 160, in the White Book of Hergest). But on the other hand in the case of most of these 25 poems the evidence of the single 15th-century manuscript is supported by others from the following century. The *awdl* to Ieuan Llwyd (7) can be added to this list since it survives in a number of good texts from the 16th century which clearly derive from an early written

exemplar. If all these are included then the core increases to 117, that is about 80% of the canon.

Of the 30 remaining poems, there is fairly strong manuscript evidence for 22 of them, that is nos 3, 18, 20, 21, 31, 40, 53, 64, 70, 72, 78, 113, 119, 127, 129, 130, 139 and 142 because they were preserved in the *Vetustus* or LIWM and other sixteenth-century manuscripts, no. 69 which was in both the *Vetustus* and LIWM, and nos 10, 61 and 79 which occur in independent texts from the sixteenth century. Internal or circumstantial evidence supports the authenticity of two of the elegies to fellow poets (nos 20 and 21), like that to Gruffudd Gryg (22) which is better attested in the manuscripts, and the same is true of the satire on Rhys Meigen (31) since DG and GG refer in their bardic debate to the tradition about the death of Rhys Meigen. The supposed connection with the debate probably guarantees the authenticity of no. 127 as well. The pseudo-elegy to Rhydderch ab Ieuan Llwyd (no. 10) can be accepted on account of DG's known connection with the Glyn Aeron family, but it should be noted that it is attributed to Iolo Goch in the earliest manuscript copy (perhaps because of some echoes in one of IG's elegies). The reference to 'Morfudd Llwyd' in the final line of no. 113 can be taken as adequate proof of its authenticity (cf. the final lines of nos 105 and 114), and also to a lesser extent Morfudd's name in no. 119 (but note that four lines of that poem also occur in no. 147). On the other hand, there is reason to doubt the authenticity of some of these poems. The short *cywydd* to the Trinity (3) is questionable on the grounds of its simple style, but that may be because it was intended for educational purposes. The style of no. 79 is also quite simple, without any apparent reason in terms of genre, and it might well be the work of another poet. Thomas Parry drew attention to doubtful linguistic forms in no. 139, and it must be admitted in any case that there is nothing in the poem which is particularly distinctive of DG's work.

No. 142 is a special case because the reason for questioning its authenticity is rather indirect. It is true that this is different to most of DG's other poems in terms of the arrogant attitude towards the girl, but that in itself is hardly sufficient reason to reject it (no. 141 might be cited in its defence). Of greater significance is its position in LIWM (on the evidence of Pen 49) next to a poem very similar in spirit ('Y ferch lygad ruddell fain') which is the work of Llywelyn Goch according to Pen 57. And the two poems are preceded in Pen 49 by no. 156, a poem which has been allocated to the uncertain authorship section partly because the Pen 54 text contains a couplet from Llywelyn Goch's elegy to Lleucu Llwyd. There is reason to suspect, therefore, that a block of three poems by Llywelyn Goch has been misattributed to DG in LIWM.

'Y Cloc' (no. 64) is another special case because the argument against its authenticity is based almost entirely on historical background. The problem (as set out more fully in the introductory notes to the poem) is that clocks of the kind described in the poem are not known to have existed in Britain or France until the 1370s, that is about twenty years after DG's supposed lifetime. It has to be admitted that circular argument is a danger here again. The evidence for DG's dates is scarce enough as it is, and it could be argued that this poem should be treated as part of that evidence rather than something outside it. But all the dateable references in other poems belong to the 1340s, so if this poem is genuine then it is quite exceptional. Although it is not impossible that DG lived until the 1370s, one would expect some reference in his poems which could be dated to the period 1350–70. It is simpler to assume that the poem is the work of a later poet, despite the evidence of a

number of good sixteenth-century manuscripts in favour of DG's authorship. And although the style of this poem is in general not dissimilar to that of DG's work, one particular aspect does corroborate the doubts raised on historical grounds, that is the figures for the various types of *cynghanedd*, which include an unusually low percentage of *sain* (18%) and an unusually high percentage of *croes* (54%). But since it is not impossible that new discoveries about the history of clocks might transform the judgement on the dating of the poem, it was thought best to respect the manuscript evidence and leave the poem in the canon.

The *Vetustus* is the only evidence for nos 43, 134, 138 and 146, and *LIWM* is the only evidence for no. 125. *Morfudd* is named in no. 43, and 'fab Gwilym' in no. 125. But there are reasons for doubting no. 146 on the grounds of metrical features.

The manuscript evidence for nos 2, 55 and 149 is comparatively weak. The name *Dafydd* occurs in the final couplet of 149, but such evidence is double-edged since the name might have been a reason for misattributing the poem to DG in the first place. Thomas Parry raised doubts about no. 55 because of the weakness of the manuscript evidence, and it is true that the nocturnal visit to the beloved's house is a common theme in the apocryphal poems, but on the other hand the sudden awareness of transience at the end of the poem is a good reason to accept the manuscript attribution.

To summarise the discussion about the authenticity of the canon, the poems can be classified according to degree of certainty as follows:

a firm core of 67 poems which are accepted on the basis of both very strong manuscript evidence and also style and content

24 poems which are confidently accepted as genuine on the basis of style and content even though they are not so strongly attested in the manuscripts

26 poems which are supported by the evidence of early manuscripts

30 poems which are not strongly attested in the manuscripts and which cannot be definitely accepted as genuine on the basis of style and content either. Of these, there are specific reasons to doubt the authorship of two (64 and 142), and there are no compelling arguments in favour of nos 2, 3, 79, 139 and 146. The boundary between these 30 and the 20 poems in the uncertain authorship section is by no means definitive.

This canon is much larger than that of any other fourteenth-century poet. In terms of number of poems *Iolo Goch* comes closest with 39 in the most recent edition (*GIG*), that is about a quarter of the number accepted as the work of *Dafydd ap Gwilym*. It is not difficult to suggest valid reasons for the difference, namely that poems of love and nature had a much wider appeal than praise poetry, and that reciters and copyists responded to the special quality of DG's work. Because of the popularity of his poems they would have attempted to record everything of his that they could find. But on the other hand that very popularity would have been a reason for misattributing love and nature poems to DG, particularly ones which originally circulated anonymously in oral tradition. That tendency

increased during the sixteenth century, as is clearly shown by the large number of poems attributed to DG by 1600.

Thomas Parry devised a set of seven criteria (*meini praw*, see GDG¹ lxxii–cv) as a basis for deciding the authenticity of poems attributed to DG in manuscripts, as follows:

- i) *Manuscript evidence*
- ii) *Attribution to more than one author*
- iii) *Style and language*
- iv) *Metrics of the cywydd*
- v) *Common themes*
- vi) *Two poems on the same subject*
- vii) *Internal evidence*

These are discussed below, with some rearrangement to give a set of eight criteria. As already noted, the danger of circular argument is ever-present, and to some extent inevitable in any attempt to distinguish between canon and apocrypha, but we have sought to avoid it by basing the criteria on the works of all the early Cywyddwyr as well as on the canon of DG's poems defined above, and also by applying as many criteria as possible to each case.

i) *Manuscript evidence*

This is the most fundamental kind of evidence, and must be the starting point for any discussion on authorship. Poems which have no manuscript attributions to DG are not considered,⁷ whilst every poem attributed to DG even in only one manuscript must be considered. In one sense manuscript attributions are more objective than other kinds of evidence, in that they exist outside the text of the poem and can be counted and usually quite accurately dated. But the authority of the manuscripts is never beyond question. Even in the case of the three poems attributed to DG in manuscripts of the fourteenth century (nos 1, 9 and 84) style and content must be considered before accepting them as genuine. Apart from those three poems, there was a gap of at least a century between the time of composition and the earliest manuscripts, and some poems undoubtedly circulated anonymously during that period and subsequently. Manuscript attributions therefore represent the opinions of reciters and copyists.

On the whole the authority of a manuscript depends on its date, and the evidence of fifteenth-century manuscripts weighs particularly heavily. For instance, on the basis of the evidence of Pen 54 the satire to a Black Friar, 'Cosbwr y marwol bechawd' (A36), is accepted as the work of Madog Benfras, although later copies attribute it to DG. But in some cases where texts of a poem are preserved in more than one fifteenth-century manuscript their evidence is contradictory, and at least one must be rejected. For instance,

⁷ The only exception to this is no. 171 amongst the poems of uncertain authorship, on account of its connection with the Hendregadredd Manuscript, even though there is no attribution in the only manuscript copy. Consideration might also be given to the anonymous fragment of a love poem written in a fourteenth-century hand in Pen 10, see Dafydd Johnston and Ann Parry Owen, 'Tri Darn o Farddoniaeth yn Llawysgrif Peniarth 10', *Dwned* 5 (1999), 35–45, but it is suggested there that the poem is the work of Llywelyn Goch ap Meurig Hen.

the poem sending the sun to Glamorgan, 'Yr haul deg ar fy neges' (A198), is attributed to DG in Pen 54, but to Ieuan ap Gruffudd Gwent in Pen 57. It is clear, therefore, that one hundred years was plenty of time for the authorship of a poem to become uncertain. The only fifteenth-century manuscript whose authority was not found to be questionable at all in relation to the authorship of DG's poems is the first part of Pen 57 (c. 1440), but that only contains five of his poems. In the case of Pen 48, a manuscript from the second half of the fifteenth century, almost all of the eight poems attributed to DG can be accepted, but the authorship of the religious *cywydd*, no. 153, is uncertain on account of attributions to other poets and its simple style.

The tendency to misattribute poems to DG became very common in the sixteenth century as a result of the desire to produce large collections of his work. Poems of uncertain or doubtful authorship were to be found in the *Vetustus* and in the *Book of William Mathew*, two substantial collections from the first third of the sixteenth century. Some of these were poems by contemporaries of DG (e.g. 'Rho Duw hael rhadau helynt', GIG XXXII, and 'Y ferch lygad ruddell fain', GLIGMH 11), and it is likely that the two collections drew on a stock of fourteenth-century poems, and that those responsible for their transmission were able to distinguish between fourteenth- and fifteenth-century poems, but not between the work of DG and that of his contemporaries. Later in the sixteenth century a number of fifteenth-century poems begin to occur in the collections of DG's work, e.g. C 7, H 26, BI e 1 and the manuscripts of *Llywelyn Siôn*, and that suggests that the collectors were no longer able to distinguish between the products of the two centuries.

Although the evidence for a poem may appear strong because a large number of manuscripts attribute it to DG, this can be misleading. The number of copies is proof of a poem's popularity, but it does not necessarily prove anything about its authorship. The crucial question is how many independent exemplars lie behind the copies, and it is very often found that they can all be traced back to one common exemplar. Copyists would not generally be likely to question the attribution to DG (although there are occasional examples of critical comments in the manuscripts), and the manuscript evidence is therefore often less strong than it appears at first sight.

ii) *Attribution to more than one author*

This is a specific aspect of manuscript evidence. Bearing in mind the status of DG's name in the field of love poetry, the fact that a poem is attributed to any other author is very significant, even if the evidence is much weaker than that in favour of DG. When a poem is attributed to more than one poet other than DG the uncertainty suggests that the poem circulated anonymously at some time, and if so then the attribution to DG is all the more doubtful. This criterion is not conclusive in itself (for instance, 'Tri Phorthor Eiddig' (68) is judged to be the work of DG on the basis of style as well as preponderance of manuscript evidence, even though it is attributed to Bedo Brwynllys in LI 6 and *Llywelyn Siôn's* manuscripts), but it is a telling sign of uncertain authorship. Although no. 166 is attributed to DG in manuscripts deriving from the *White Book of Hergest*, and no other author is mentioned until the last quarter of the 18th century, the suggestion that it is the work of Gruffudd Llwyd endorses doubts arising from the content of the poem.

Textual interference in a manuscript copy can suggest a connection with another poet even if there is no specific attribution to that effect. This is seen in the case of the copy of 'Penwisg Merch' (156) in Pen 54 which contains a stray couplet from Llywelyn Goch's elegy to Lleucu Llwyd. And the position of that poem next to another by Llywelyn Goch in the Book of Wiliam Mathew is noteworthy (an argument which is also relevant to 'Bargeinio', no. 142, as seen above).

Even if a poem is not attributed to any other poet in the manuscripts, the fact that it is anonymous in some can cast doubt on the attribution to DG in others. For example, the *englyn* to Ifor Hael's mother (167) occurs without attribution in some genealogical manuscripts, and it is therefore likely that it was attributed to DG in some later manuscripts on account of his association with Ifor himself. And the fact that 'Y Garreg Ateb' (158) occurs without attribution in BM 24 undermines the value of the attribution to DG in LI 6 from the same period. If the poem were the work of DG one would expect the copyist of BM 24 to know that, since he ascribed numerous other love poems to DG in his collection.

iii) *Internal evidence*

Some poems contain specific references which constitute evidence against DG's authorship. These are mostly placenames, particularly ones which are presented as being in the poet's native region. For instance, one would not expect DG to talk of wooing a girl in Llandaf (A94) or in Is Conwy (A166). The references in 'Y Penlöyn' (A39) to a girl from Merioneth with a husband named Dafydd, and the poet himself being away from home in south Wales, constitute a strong argument for assuming the poem to be the work of Llywelyn Goch ap Meurig Hen sending the bird as a messenger to Lleucu Llwyd, wife of Dafydd Ddu. Because of the element of praise to the Eutun family of Maelor (Madog Benfras's native region) in 'Yr Eos a'r Frân' (154) the poem has been placed in the section of uncertain authorship despite the strong manuscript evidence in favour of DG, and also the similar poem about the nightingale in Coed Eutun (155), since its geography and dialogue are unclear. It may well be that the references to Dafydd ap Gwilym and Madog Benfras in the latter poem are misleading, and that the author was a third poet who remains anonymous.

Such references can be very difficult to interpret, and the prominence of invention and fiction in the work of all the Cywyddwyr must be borne in mind. Thomas Parry rejected the poem which sends the trout as a love-messenger (no. 160), arguing on the basis of the reference to 'groyw awdur o Fôn' that it is the work of Gruffudd Gryg. But it is not impossible that the reference is to the trout itself. He rejected 'Y Sêr' (161) on account of the reference to 'ffyrdd i Fôn a'r ffordd fau', assuming the author to be from Anglesey. But as D. J. Bowen argued (see notes to the poem), the line could be understood differently, and in any case DG's connections with Anglesey are well attested. 'Y Sêr' is still in the category of uncertain authorship, but for reasons of style rather than any specific references.

'Internal evidence' is one of Parry's weakest criteria, and it hardly ever constitutes adequate grounds in itself to reject a poem. But if applied as it were in reverse, it can be a useful means of explaining why certain poems might have been misattributed to DG. It is clear that the occurrence of the name Dafydd in the text was sufficient reason to claim a

poem as DG's work (e.g. 'Dafydd y sydd yn d'ofyn', A42). It may be that 'Penwisg Merch' (156) was attributed to DG because of the name Dafydd in the opening line, and that 'Y Penlöyn' (A39) was attributed to him because of the reference to 'wraig Ddafydd'. The same may also be true of the name Morfudd. A26 is an example of a poem containing the name Morfudd which was misattributed to DG, and it is possible that 'Y Fun o Eithinfynydd' (157) was misattributed to him because it contains two instances of the name (see above on the poems to Morfudd in the canon).

iv) Language

Various linguistic forms which are characteristic of Middle Welsh are to be found in the poetry of the first generation of the Cywyddwyr, and the presence of some of these in a poem is an indication that it belongs to DG's period:

a) the sound *y* in the second person present form of the verb (e.g. *cery* rather than *ceri*), in conjugated forms of prepositions such as *ymy*, *yty* (rather than *imi*, *iti*), and in the final syllable of *gwedy*. These forms are confirmed by rhyme in a number of examples (e.g. *gwedy* rhyming with *fry* in 6.97). If the sound *i* is confirmed by rhyme (e.g. *gwedi* rhyming with *cyfodi* in 153.37), there is reason to doubt the authenticity of the poem.

b) the verbal particles *ydd* (rather than *yr*), *rhy*, *neud*, and *neur*.

c) second person singular forms of the preposition ending in *-d*, e.g. *wrthyd*, *arnad*.

d) two consecutive vowels not compressed into a diphthong e.g. *tëyrn*, *gwëu*, *trahäus*. (But *deyrn* 35.49, if the reading is correct.)

e) words such as *bwrw*, *carw*, *chwerw*, etc, and *daly*, *eiry* etc, counting as monosyllables (although it is fairly certain that these were bisyllabic in the spoken language even in the fourteenth century, as the practice of elision in following words indicates). It can be difficult to judge the original reading since later copyists often counted these forms as bisyllabic and adjusted the line-length accordingly. But the early Cywyddwyr never treated the semi-vowel as a full syllable for the purpose of rhyme (e.g. *bwrw* rhyming with *carw*).

f) destination denoted by lenition alone, without any preposition (e.g. GIG V.1).

g) archaic words such as *llywy*, *dwy* / *dwywes* (= *duw* / *duwies*), *llerw*, *gwymp*, and verbal forms such as *gorug*, *deryw*, and *ciglef*. The presence of such words and forms is certainly an indication that a poem belongs to the fourteenth century, but their absence does not necessarily prove that it is later, since the genre or purpose of a poem may have influenced its vocabulary.

Thomas Parry noted some other features which are also characteristic of Middle Welsh, but which cannot be used as criteria for deciding authorship since both old and new forms are to be found in DG's authentic poems. The predominant form of the second person singular present of *bod* is *wyd*, as confirmed by rhyme in numerous cases, but *wyt* does occur in 63.12. Similarly in the case of the second person singular ending of the imperfect, *-ud* is usual, but *gwyddut* occurs in 31.88, *aut* in 35.26 and *wnaut* in 121.25. The old third

person feminine form of the preposition with *-ai* (e.g. *arnai*) is to be found occasionally in the poems of DG and his contemporaries, but the more recent form with *-i* also occurs. The two imperative forms *dywed* and *dywaid* are both used according to demands of rhyme.

There are very few colloquial forms in DG's authentic poems, and the presence of any such forms in a poem is a strong reason for doubting its authenticity. The following are most commonly found in the apocrypha:

h) simplification of a final diphthong, e.g. *-e* for *-au* and *-ai*. (The abstract ending *-aeth* which occurs as *-eth* in *llateieth* in 46.8 is a different matter, see the note on *lluniaeth* in IGE² 380.) The colloquial form *minne* which is confirmed by rhyme in 165.26 is one of the grounds for doubting the authorship of that poem.

i) unnecessary omission of syllables (e.g. omission of the pronoun *fy* and the preposition *yn* before a nasal mutation). On the other hand an equally dubious feature is the necessity to read a full syllable where elision would be expected, e.e. *mae yn*.

j) an epenthetic vowel counting as a full syllable, e.g. *eithyr*, *cefen*, *dadal*.

Of course, where the form is not confirmed by metrical requirements we are dependent on the whims of copyists, and in such cases linguistic forms cannot be used as evidence of authorship. For instance, in 10.1 the particle *neur* occurs in only one manuscript copy, all the others having *mi*. Without Gw 25 (which was not available to Parry) the archaic form could not be identified in the text at all.

v) *Style*

Two distinctive stylistic features of fourteenth-century *cywyddau* are compound words and sentences which extend over several lines. Compounds are discussed as an aspect of the poets' language in GDG¹ lxxxiii, but since most were occasional formations for a specific context rather than words which were already part of the language (such as *gwrda* or *deuddyn*) they are considered here as an aspect of style. It is difficult to generalize about the frequency of compounds in DG's poems since they are more common in descriptive passages than in narrative, but on the whole the average is around one in every four lines, and many lines contain two or even three compounds forming *cynganedd*, such as 'Gernfraith, gyflymdaith lamdwyn' (75.6). None of DG's poems is without any compounds at all, and scarcity of compounds is therefore a reason for doubting the authenticity of a poem. (It should be noted that this is true of the short poem to the Trinity, no. 3, which has only 'pymoes'.)

Parenthesis is a very common feature of the early *cywyddau* (discussed by Parry under the heading 'Crefft y cywydd' in GDG¹ xci–iii). The flow of the sentence is broken by parenthetical phrases known as *sangiadau*. The elements of a name are sometimes separated (e.g. 86.1–4), but most often the *sangiad* separates the elements of a sentence. A sentence commonly extends over two couplets, and there are plenty of examples of a sentence extending over three, and a few over as many as six couplets (e.g. 86.33–44; 151.7–16). This is not the same thing as loose sentences in the form of a number of parallel clauses, such as 156.1–10, nor the series of images in passages of *dyfalu*. Both

those styles are based on the unit of the line, without any parenthesis as such, and they continue to be common in fifteenth-century *cywyddau*. The distinguishing mark of fourteenth-century *cywyddau* is the way that the syntax ignores the boundaries of the couplet. By the fifteenth century the couplet was the normal unit of syntax, and any parenthesis occurred only within the couplet. It is true that there are passages of couplet-based style in fourteenth-century *cywyddau*, but they are only parts of a greater whole, alongside extended sentences and images filling single lines. A clear example of the stylistic variety which is characteristic of DG's *cywyddau* is to be seen in 'Y Niwl' (57), where two complex extended sentences set the scene, followed by a long series of *dyfalu* line-by-line, with a simpler, couplet-based passage concluding the poem (see further Bowen, 1964). If the movement of a *cywydd* is based entirely on the couplet from beginning to end there is good reason to believe that it is later than the fourteenth century, and cannot therefore be the work of DG. When a *cywydd* is attributed in the manuscripts to DG and also to Dafydd ab Edmwnd or Bedo Brwynllys or another fifteenth-century love poet, the couplet-based style is usually sufficient proof that it is the work of the later poet. This is the most important criterion for authorship after manuscript evidence, since it is relevant to every *cywydd*.

vi) *Cynghanedd*

This criterion was discussed by Parry under the heading 'Crefft y cywydd' (together with parenthesis which is discussed above as an aspect of style). The practice of *cynghanedd* clearly changed a great deal during the two centuries after DG's time. This can be shown statistically by counting the frequency of the different types of *cynghanedd*, and this might therefore be regarded as one of the most objective criteria for deciding authorship. But it must be applied with care, bearing in mind the limitations of statistics as evidence, particularly in the case of short poems where a few lines can make a substantial difference to the proportions.

The most obvious difference in *cynghanedd* between a fourteenth-century *cywydd* and one from the mid-fifteenth century or later is the frequency of *cynghanedd sain*, which is likely to be substantially higher in the early *cywydd*.⁸ Thomas Parry concentrated almost exclusively on this feature in applying *cynghanedd* as an authorship criterion. His statement on the matter seems rather inflexible: 'A siarad yn gyffredinol gellir dweud, os yw cyfartaledd y cynganeddion Sain mewn cywydd arbennig yn is na 25 y cant, yna nid i'r 14g. y mae'n perthyn.' (GDG¹ xcvi–viii) [Broadly speaking it can be said that if the proportion of *cynganeddion Sain* in a *cywydd* is less than 25%, then it does not belong to the 14th century.] Unfortunately, there are some *cywyddau* in the GDG canon which contradict this statement, as Saunders Lewis noted in his review of the edition (Lewis, 1953, 200). The statistics prepared by T. D. Crawford with computer assistance (Crawford, 1982) show that 17 *cywyddau* in GDG have a proportion of *cynghanedd sain* lower than 25%, that is in this edition nos 60, 63, 64 (18%), 69, 80, 89 (16%), 96, 97, 98, 134, 136, 139, 141, 145 (14%), 147 (15%), 156 and 157. But Parry replied to Crawford's criticism (Parry, 1985), emphasising that his statement was not intended to be an absolute rule, and that *cynghanedd* is just one criterion amongst several. Of the 17 *cywyddau* listed above the last two are in the uncertain authorship section, and there is another reason for doubting the

⁸ See Eurys Rolant, 'Arddull y Cywydd', YB ii (1966), 36–57.

authorship of no. 64 as already noted. Three others are too short to give significant statistics (141, 145, 147). The figure of 25% is probably too high anyway, and by lowering it to 20% eight other *cywyddau* can be retained. The only poem which remains problematic is 'Dagrau Serch' (89). There is no reason to doubt its authorship on grounds of content, style, or manuscript evidence, and 50 lines is enough to give significant statistics, but it should be noted that this poem is in a deliberately difficult style, each line beginning with the letter *D*-. As Parry suggested (1985, 121), it may be that the high proportion of consonantal *cynganedd* is an aspect of the feat.

The characteristic pattern found in most of DG's *cywyddau* is a proportion of *cynganedd sain* over 30%, with the two consonantal *cynganeddion* accounting for about 60%, and *llusg* less than 10% (see further the section on *cynganedd* in the Introduction). If a *cywydd* is over about 30 lines in length and displays a pattern of *cynganedd* substantially different to this, then it is unlikely to be the work of DG. The proportion of *cynganedd sain* is not often low enough to be a crucial factor in terms of authorship (and if it is then other factors are likely to be more obvious in any case), but nos A181, A186, A194 and A195 can be noted as examples of *cywyddau* in which the low proportion (about 14%) does suggest that they are not the work of DG.

Another feature of *cynganedd* which Parry used as a criterion to decide authorship in some cases is the presence of *cynganedd groes o gyswllt* (in which the last consonant before the caesura answers the first consonant in the line). This most complex type of *cynganedd* first became common about the middle of the fifteenth century, and was soon a feat to be admired. There are no incontrovertible instances from the fourteenth century. (GIG III.61 appears to be an exception, but there are other reasons for believing that that poem is in fact a later composition, and similarly in the case of DGG LXXVII which contains two instances of *croes o gyswllt*.) Saunders Lewis (1953, 199–200) drew attention to a number of possible examples in the GDG texts, but all of them can be explained as consonants left unanswered at the beginning of the line (*gwreiddgoll*). If, therefore, a poem contains an instance of *croes o gyswllt* which cannot be explained in any other way, it is unlikely to be the work of DG. *Croes o Gyswllt* is however a fairly uncommon feature in the apocryphal poems, and its diagnostic value is therefore limited. But there is a definite example in 'Y Ceiliog Du', 162.17, 'Dwbled yt, o blu y dôn', a line which also contains correspondence between lenited and unlenited consonants. Considering the low proportion of *cynganedd sain* in that poem (15%), and the generally simple style, the manuscript attribution must be regarded as doubtful.

DG's own *cynganedd* is not sufficiently consistent or unique to provide a means of proving authorship. Many of his poems and those of his contemporaries contain instances of *cynganedd sain gadwynog* and *sain dros-gl*, and also tolerated exceptions such as *n*, *m* and *r* unanswered at the beginning of the line or within a sequence of consonants, as well as incomplete *cynganedd* and lines without any *cynganedd* at all. The presence of these features suggests that a poem belongs to the fourteenth century, but the absence of any of them cannot be significant in terms of authorship. The only irregular feature which might be significant is the high proportion of *cynganedd lusg bengoll* in no. 164. Although there are plenty of examples of *llusg bengoll* in DG's poems, 16% is a sufficiently high percentage to suggest that this *cywydd* is probably the work of another poet, and that suspicion is

strengthened by the fact that the poem is anonymous in the second part of Pen 57 from the end of the fifteenth century.

Different patterns of *cynganedd* are to be found in the *awdl*, patterns which are even more conservative and archaic than those of the *cywydd*. The *cynganedd* of DG's *awdlau* is quite consistent on the whole, but the detailed analysis by T. D. Crawford (1990) demonstrated that 'I lesu Grist' (152) stands out on account of the high proportion of *cynganedd draws* in the first lines of the *toddeidiau*. The difference is substantial enough to be statistically significant, and it therefore supports the evidence of those manuscripts which attribute the *awdl* to Gruffudd Llwyd.

vii) *Common themes*

Thomas Parry noted some themes which occur in the work of more than one of the early Cywyddwyr, such as the game 'nuts in my hand', the rough beard, and the mirror. This is connected to the next criterion, and it is particularly relevant to the love-messenger poems.

viii) *Two poems on the same subject*

This criterion assumes that DG would not compose two poems on the same subject. (Using the same object for different purposes, as in the two poems about the woodcock, nos 52 and 53, is another matter.) It would be natural enough for a poet who wished to imitate DG to take the subject-matter of one of his well-known poems, and such a poem could easily be mistaken for DG's own work in oral or written tradition. A clear example which shows the principle at work is the *cywydd* to the wind ('Tydi'r gwynt tad eiry ac od', A139) by the mid-fifteenth-century poet Maredudd ap Rhys. The manuscript evidence is strongly in favour of Maredudd, and the only possible reason for attributing it to DG at all is the fact that he has a very well-known *cywydd* on the same subject (no. 47). And as would be expected considering the differences between the two poets in terms of period and background, the style and treatment of the subject supports the manuscript evidence clearly enough, particularly the way in which the wind is presented as an essential part of God's creation in general, rather than as a blessing to the lovers only as in DG's *cywydd*.

Another case in which this principle is very relevant, even though the manuscript evidence is not so strong in favour of the other author, is the *cywydd* to the mist (A123) which is most probably the work of Siôn ap Hywel in imitation of no. 57. There are clear differences between the two poems in terms of language and style, as Parry showed (GDG¹ c–ci). And a case in which the principle is applied in complete opposition to the manuscript evidence is 'Y Sêr' (161), which is on the same subject as 'Y Seren' (50), although perhaps not a direct imitation of it. The dialogue with a magpie (A68) is clearly an imitation of 'Cyngor y Bиден' (36). But it is not always so easy to decide which is the original and which is the imitation. Of the two aubades attributed to DG no. 69 has been accepted as genuine since the manuscript evidence is somewhat stronger and the style rather more complex than in the case of A134, but the distinction between the two is by no means clear-cut. It should be borne in mind, however, that this was an international genre, and therefore one is not necessarily a direct imitation of the other.

Although Thomas Parry was well aware of the force of this criterion, he did not apply it in every case where it might be relevant. There are two poems about cockthrushes in GDG (nos 49 and 159 in this edition), and although the manuscript evidence is strong enough in favour of the second it was decided on the basis of style and treatment of the subject that it was more likely to be the work of another poet. The nocturnal visit to the beloved's house is another subject which continued to be popular for a century or more after DG's time, and some of the poems which are attributed to him can be seen as imitations of 'Tri Phorthor Eiddig' (68) in particular. It is easy enough to distinguish between the work of DG and that of his imitators on this topic in most cases, but it may be that 'Caru yn y Gaeaf' (55) should be considered in this category since it is not particularly well-attested in the manuscripts, although there is no reason to doubt the authorship on the basis of style or vision, as noted above.

Although Thomas Parry listed a set of seven criteria for deciding authorship, he does also mention another, rather vaguer criterion which he used in some cases.

Y mae'r meini praw y buwyd yn eu trafod, o'u cymhwyso'n weddol ofalus, yn torri'r ddadl fel rheol, ond weithiau rhaid defnyddio maen praw arall na ellir ei ddiffinio, a hwnnw yw math o chwaeth lenyddol. Er mor amhersonol yw crefft y beirdd, ac er bod cymaint ohoni wrth reol, gellir synhwyro rhyw naws arbennig pan fo gwir awenydd fel DG wrth ei waith. Bu raid dibynnu ar y synhwyro hwnnw ychydig weithiau, ac nid pawb efallai a gytuna â'r ddedfryd. (GDG¹ clxxi)

[The criteria which have been discussed, if applied carefully, are usually decisive, but in some cases another criterion must be used which cannot be defined, and that is a kind of literary taste. Although the poets' craft is so impersonal, and although so much of it is according to rules, some special quality can be sensed when a truly inspired poet like DG is at work. It was necessary to depend on that sense occasionally, and perhaps not everyone will agree with the judgement.]

The obvious danger with a criterion based on taste is that it is entirely subjective. But it is possible to make some attempt at defining what is meant, and in one sense that is the purpose of the above list of poems which form the core of the canon. And from a broader perspective, it can be said that complexity of style and vision is one of the hallmarks of DG's poetry, and that deliberate structure with a pointed (if often ambiguous) conclusion is another. Although neither feature can be easily measured, they are nevertheless useful guidelines in distinguishing between the work of DG and that of other poets. For example, of the two poems to the cockthrush the one of uncertain authorship is simpler in every way than the one retained in the canon, and its portrait of the bird stands in an impersonal vacuum. There is reason to believe that the *cywydd* to the crow (163) is the work of another of the early Cywyddwyr because of its weak *sangiadau* and its abrupt ending. And similar points can be made about some of the undistinguished love poems attributed to DG which wallow aimlessly in self-pity (e.g. A24 and A44).



©Dafydd Johnston 2007