



The Principles of the Edited Texts

Dafydd Johnston

The edited texts are composite ones which draw on the evidence of all the manuscripts in order to recreate as closely as possible the poems as composed by the poet. They are presented in modern orthography, with punctuation and paragraphing reflecting editorial interpretation, and titles have also been provided by the editors. This essay will discuss the theoretical questions and practical problems which this methodology raises.

Composite texts were deemed to be the most appropriate editorial method for the poems of Dafydd ap Gwilym because of the nature of their transmission. In cases where a poem has been preserved in a single version the text is based on the earliest surviving manuscript, adapted only where necessary, as explained below. But most of the poems survive in more than one version, with substantial differences between them. Some of these differences can be explained as changes made by scribes during the copying process, but there is reason to believe that much of the variance derives from oral transmission (that is learning a poem by heart and transmitting it by word of mouth). Although the oral performances were essentially ephemeral, we can be quite certain that that was how most of the *cywyddau*, and also apparently some of the *awdlau* and *englynion*, were transmitted by the poet to the first reciters, and by them in turn to their successors for some period before being preserved in writing. The evidence for oral tradition is set out in the section on the manuscripts.

Some at least of the different manuscript versions of the poems are the product of oral transmission, as shown by variations in number and order of lines as well as in readings. After being committed to writing a version would retain its main characteristics in terms of line-order during subsequent written transmission, but it could develop further in terms of readings as copyists adapted their exemplars. For that reason a number of independent texts can be regarded as a single version even though their readings may differ.

Traces of oral transmission are more obvious in some manuscript texts than others, e.g. Pen 54 (see further the section on the manuscripts), but it cannot be assumed that any manuscript is completely free of it. And inconsistency is typical of texts which have been transmitted orally. Although a transmitter may have succeeded in preserving the text which he had received quite faithfully on the whole, he would

usually make unintentional and random changes at some points in the text, by simplifying complicated passages, by exchanging synonyms, and particularly by reciting lines in a different order or omitting some lines altogether. On the other hand a text which contains a number of mistakes due to lapse of memory can also preserve the occasional good reading which has been lost in other versions. The kind of changes which are typical of oral and written traditions are discussed below, but the important point at this stage is that these changes are common throughout all the manuscript texts, including those of the fifteenth century, so that it is generally not possible to establish a satisfactory edited text on the basis of one manuscript version alone. Following the earliest manuscript alone (as Fulton mainly did in DGA) would mean excluding lines and readings in other manuscripts which appear to be authentic according to all available criteria.

Having adopted the composite text as a means of dealing with the extensive variance in the manuscripts, the question must be asked what exactly is the status of such texts and what authority do they possess, bearing in mind that they are the product of a modern editor's judgement. It is claimed that we are seeking to restore the original compositions, and indeed all the editorial guidelines listed below presume the existence of an original text and of knowledge about it, but how meaningful and how practical is that aim?

The most fundamental criticism of the principle of the edited text is the argument that the concept of a fixed text was foreign to an oral culture, and that no original fixed text ever existed because it varied every time the poem was performed anew by the poet himself.¹ According to this argument, the composition of the poem was not one definitive act, but rather an open-ended process, and it is not possible to refer to any 'publication' which would finally fix the text. (But the debate poems between Dafydd ap Gwilym and Gruffudd Gryg raise interesting questions about publication; note in particular 28.15–18.) This helps to explain the variation of synonyms often found in the manuscript texts. If such variation derives from different performances by the poet himself, then the two (or more) readings are equally valid. Fluidity was, therefore, an essential feature of the text from the very beginning.

It is reasonable to assume that the poet would not recite his text in precisely the same form word-for-word on two separate occasions. But the question is what the extent of the variation might be. There is no direct evidence for fourteenth-century poetry, but there is evidence from the fifteenth century in the autograph copies of Lewys Glyn Cothi's poems. Where more than one text of a poem exists in different manuscripts there are enough differences between them to suggest that the poet was not copying from a common written exemplar, but rather depending on his memory and to some extent recomposing as he wrote. But the variants occur within the same *cynganedd* framework and retain the same basic sense. They are confined to synonyms, tenses of verbs, prepositions and other minor particles.² The variation is thus considerably less than that which occurs in later texts of the poet's work. It could be argued that the texts of Lewys Glyn Cothi's poems were more fixed because the poet was more familiar with the written text, and that more

¹ See Jerry Hunter, 'Testun Dadl', *Tu Chwith* 3 (1995), 81–5; Helen Fulton, 'Awdurdod ac Awduriaeth: Golygu'r Cywyddwyr', in Iestyn Daniel et al. (ed.), *Cyfoeth y Testun* (Caerdydd, 2003), 50–76 (65–8).

² For an example see Dafydd Johnston, 'Dafydd ap Gwilym and Oral Tradition', *SC* xxxvii (2003), 143–61 (150), and see further the textual notes to GLGC.

extensive variation might be expected in poems from the previous century. But it would be a mistake to regard Dafydd ap Gwilym's poetic culture as entirely oral. The two contemporary texts of his work in the Hendregadredd Manuscript (one possibly in his own hand), and references in his poems such as that to 'cwrrach memrwn' (24.21) indicate that he was familiar enough with written texts. In fact the bardic culture of Wales combined oral and written elements throughout the later Middle Ages. Lewys Glyn Cothi's texts can therefore appropriately be used to give some idea of the extent of variation which might be expected in the poems of Dafydd ap Gwilym before they were further disseminated by reciters and copyists.

Metre and *cynghanedd* would ensure a fixed textual form to a large extent, and in so far as they did so the concept of a correct and authoritative text must have existed. All the learning of the poets presupposes an ideal of correctness, as many claims in their poems demonstrate, e.g. Iolo Goch's praise of Llywelyn Goch's work, 'Not a single word is wrongly positioned in the song' (GIG XXII.33–4). Correctness and authority are essential ideals in the Bardic Grammars, and the warning about the shortcomings of reciters is particularly revealing. This is contemporary evidence that textual changes occurred which were not acceptable to the author of the poem. One of the three things which a performer should not believe is:

kanu kam gerd o brydyd kanmoledic ac awdurdawt idaw, kanys damwein yw kaffael datkeinyat a datkano kerd yn gwbyl megys y kano y prydyd. (GP 17)
(*that a faulty poem was composed by a respected poet of authority, since it is rare to find a reciter who recites a poem exactly as the poet composes it.*)

Nevertheless, *cynghanedd* is an essentially flexible system, and there is usually room to vary some words within its framework, particularly in *traws* and *llusg*. The gaps in a line of *cynghanedd* are those words which are free to vary without affecting the *cynghanedd*, and at those points variants can be expected, as seen in Lewys Glyn Cothi's texts. It must be accepted, therefore, that the nature of the bardic text contained an element of paradox. Although it was basically fixed, a limited degree of flexibility was acknowledged within the fixed confines. This kind of flexible fixity was characteristic of other learned bardic traditions in the Middle Ages.³

If flexible fixity is accepted as a fundamental textual principle, then it follows that the attempt to recreate such a text is not as pointless as some have argued recently. But it also follows that a definitively correct text cannot be achieved, and that the necessity to select one reading and reject all others can sometimes be misleading. Ambiguity and duality are prominent characteristics of all Dafydd ap Gwilym's work, and it is possible that he took advantage of the flexibility of the text to enhance those aspects by reciting different versions of a line on separate occasions, or even within the same performance. For example, the two versions of

³ See Johnston, 'Dafydd ap Gwilym and Oral Tradition', 150–1 on the Skaldic poetry of Iceland, and Amelia Van Vleck, *Memory and Recreation in Troubadour Lyric* (Berkeley, 1991). The Irish practice of composition in the dark has been taken to be a sign of a largely oral tradition, but the bardic pupils were then expected to commit the completed poem to writing, and Damian McManus has recently argued that writing was the primary means of preservation of Irish bardic poetry, see 'The Bardic Poet as Teacher, Student and Critic', in Cathal G. Ó Háinle and Donald E. Meek (eds), *Unity in Diversity: Studies in Irish and Scottish Gaelic Language, Literature and History* (Dublin, 2004), 97–123 (102–3).

the second line of this couplet from ‘Sarhau ei Was’ offer very different images of the poet, and it cannot be proved that one is correct and the other incorrect:

Minnau o'm clwyf a'm anhun
Yn wylo byth yn ôl bun. (74.15–16)
(*Me sick and sleepless*
for ever weeping after the girl.)

Yn gwyllo byth am gael bun. (GDG 128.16)
(*for ever watching to get the girl.*)

It is perfectly possible that both versions are the work of Dafydd ap Gwilym himself, and that he varied them in order to create an ambiguous image of himself, either as a wily ladies man or a pathetic failure, as he did in other poems such as ‘Merched Llanbadarn’ (137) and ‘Trafferth mewn Tafarn’ (73). Another example of variation which could be significant is the two versions of the key line in ‘Chwarae Cnau i'm Llaw’ (95.30) in which the number of nuts is revealed, either *amnifer* (‘odd’) or *cyfnifer* (‘even’). In other cases it is very difficult to distinguish between variants which derive from alternative performances by the poet himself and ones which derive from adaptation by reciters (e.g. *anfawr / ynfawr* in 137.40).⁴ It is usually possible to distinguish between synonymous variants on the basis of the strength of manuscript evidence or by using the principle of the *lectio difficilior* (see point 40 below), but sometimes it is impossible to prove that two or even three alternative readings are not all authentic. And similarly, although variation in line order is taken to be a clear sign of oral transmission, it is not impossible that some of it derives from different versions of the poem by the poet himself, particularly where the order of the lines does not make any substantial difference to the effect of the poem, such as in passages of *dyfalu*.

Even if it is accepted that recreating the poet’s original text is a meaningful aim, it must be admitted that it is a very ambitious one. And this brings us to the second fundamental criticism of the edited text, namely the argument that it is not possible to bridge the gap of at least one hundred years, and often as much as two hundred, between the earliest manuscripts and the original texts. There is a theoretical aspect to this argument as well as the obvious practical one. The theoretical basis is that of cultural materialism, a theory which denies that the literary work has any ideal abstract existence beyond time and space, focusing rather on its objective existence in manuscript or book and investigating the conditions and purpose of its production. Dafydd ap Gwilym is a very appropriate case for this theoretical standpoint, both because of the gap between the supposed period of the original work and its manifestation in manuscripts, and also because of the enormous differences between the texts created by Thomas Parry and those preserved in the manuscripts. Cultural materialism has been most forcefully expressed in the Welsh field by Helen Fulton. The following two statements are representative of her position:

Virtually none of the poems in Parry’s text occurs exactly in that form in any medieval or renaissance manuscript. They are the products of a twentieth-

⁴ See further Dafydd Johnston, ‘*Cyngan Oll?*’ *Cynghanedd y Cywyddwyr Cynnar* (Darlith Goffa J. E. Caerwyn Williams a Gwen Williams, Aberystwyth, 2007).

century editor, and not of a medieval scribe, let alone a fourteenth-century poet.⁵

[P]an awn ati i olygu'r cywyddau, nid oes modd dod o hyd i ryw destun 'gwreiddiol' a awdurdodwyd gan ei awdur. Yn hytrach, talu teyrnged a wnawn i gopiwyr a chasglwyr llawysgrifau'r Dadeni. Fersiynau'r oes honno a geir yn y llawysgrifau, ffrwyth trosglwyddo'r cywyddau drwy estheteg a theorïau ystyr y Dadeni.⁶

(When we seek to edit the cywyddau it is not possible to find any 'original' text authorised by its author. Instead, we pay homage to the copyists and manuscript collectors of the Renaissance. The manuscript versions are those of that age, the product of transmitting the cywyddau through the medium of Renaissance aesthetics and theories of meaning.)

Fulton does not accept that manuscript texts can be treated as evidence for linguistic or bardic practices earlier than the period of the manuscript itself (see her introduction to DGA). This position is logical enough if each manuscript text is considered in isolation. However, it is possible to come to some conclusions about their predecessors by comparing texts. An important step back beyond the Renaissance collections can be taken in the case of those texts which derive from identifiable lost exemplars. Where we have two or more copies of poems deriving from the White Book of Hergest, the Vetustus and the Book of Wiliam Mathew, most of the lost texts can be recreated fairly confidently, and indeed that step must be taken in order to explain the relationship between the surviving copies (see guidelines 31 and 32 below). Although the White Book no longer exists, we have detailed knowledge of its texts which extends the manuscript tradition back to the third quarter of the fifteenth century, that is before the period of the Renaissance in Wales. And by following the same principle it is possible to draw on all the manuscript evidence in order to seek to restore unknown lost exemplars, although much more tentatively. The question that remains is how close does this method allow us to come to the original poems. And that question introduces the practical aspect of cultural materialist criticism, namely that the surviving manuscript evidence is inadequate as a basis on which to reconstruct the original poems.

This practical criticism is apparent in Peredur Lynch's study of the *cynganedd* of Dafydd ap Gwilym's *cywyddau*.⁷ Citing Fulton's theoretical standpoint, Lynch argues that the composite texts of GDG are not a dependable basis for analysis, and he therefore uses the earliest objective evidence, four manuscripts from the fifteenth century (including the White Book of Hergest as represented by the transcriptions in Pen 49). The analysis demonstrates the difficulties caused by scribal interference with *cynganedd*, but it does not prove that restoration of the original text is an impossible aim, and indeed it provides valuable guidance in that endeavour by identifying ways in which irregular *cynganeddion* were likely to be standardised.

⁵ Helen Fulton, 'The Editor as Author: Re-producing the Text. A Case Study of Parry's *Gwaith Dafydd ap Gwilym*', *Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand Bulletin* 19, ii (1995), 67–78 (73).

⁶ Fulton, 'Awdurdod ac Awduraeth', 72–3.

⁷ Peredur Lynch, 'Cynganedd Cywyddau Dafydd ap Gwilym: Tystiolaeth y Llawysgrifau Cynnar', in Iestyn Daniel et al. (ed.), *Cyfoeth y Testun* (Caerdydd, 2003), 109–47.

The only one of all Dafydd ap Gwilym's poems which offers direct evidence of the textual variance which could occur over a period of two hundred years is 'Marwnad Angharad' (no. 9), an *awdl* which is preserved in a text more or less contemporary with the poet himself in the Hendregadredd Manuscript (not used in GDG), and also in a number of independent manuscript texts from the sixteenth century onwards. The significance of this case for the restoration of early texts is double-edged. In the first place it shows that the variance is largely a matter of deterioration. If we had to depend on one, or even two or three of the late texts, it would not be possible to come close to the text preserved in the fourteenth century. Nor can it seriously be argued that any of the late texts derive from alternative original performances, since the variants in readings and line-order are not particularly meaningful. They are all corrupt texts to differing degrees and at differing points. On the other hand, every line of the Hendregadredd text and most of its readings have been preserved in at least one of the later manuscripts, and none of them contain lines which are not in the Hendregadredd text. This case therefore provides an argument for the composite text. By drawing on the evidence of all the later manuscripts it would be possible to come close to the fourteenth-century text, although without the evidence of Hendregadredd it would be extremely difficult to choose correctly from amongst all the variants (as can be seen by comparing the GDG text with this edition).

The style of 'Marwnad Angharad' is of course extremely complex, and it is therefore not surprising that many of its lines are corrupt in the later manuscripts. It would be good to have a contemporary text of one of Dafydd's *cywyddau* so as to be able to measure the extent of the deterioration in later texts. The deterioration would most probably be a good deal less in the case of a simpler poem. But even in the case of the *cywyddau* it would clearly be presumptuous to claim that we can restore a whole poem in the very words of the poet. It is better to approach the problem in terms of the individual line (or even half-line), and from there perhaps proceed to the unit of the paragraph.

There are plenty of lines in which the form is determined by a combination of metre, *cynganedd* and sense, supported by consistent manuscript evidence, so that there is no reason whatsoever not to suppose that the line has survived as it was composed by the poet, such as these:

- Afrlladen o nen y nef (50.28)
- Rhwyd adar y ddaear ddu (57.18)
- Gwneuthur, ni bu segur serch,
Amod dyfod at hoywferch (73.21–2)
- Cyrch ystum caer a chastell (45.12)
- Drud byd heb droed heb adain (47.4)
- Drythyllfab ar draethellfor (47.42)
- Haws cerdded nos ar rosydd (57.47)

The degree of certainty depends to some extent on the type of *cynghanedd* involved. *Croes* (45.12) and *sain* (50.28, 57.18, 73.21–2) provide the fullest framework, but many lines with lighter *cynghanedd* are without variation in the manuscripts because of their clear sense, like the last example above. It is difficult to give a definite figure for the frequency of such secure lines, since their identification is to some extent a matter of subjective judgement, and their frequency of course varies from poem to poem, but as many as three quarters of Dafydd ap Gwilym's lines might fall into this category.

The remaining lines contain different types of uncertainty. One is the variation of synonyms or minor words which occurs without making any difference to the *cynghanedd* or the basic sense. This is of course most apparent in the case of poems which survive in several different versions, such as no. 36. Where only one version exists the potential for such variation needs to be considered. It is estimated that between 10% and 15% of DG's lines fall into this category. The words which vary most are those which do not form part of the *cynghanedd* at all, such as the first two words in this line of *cynghanedd lusg* (see manuscript readings):

A gosod gyngor gorau (36.63)

So also the preposition *drwy* in this line:

Yn myned drwy ludedd lwyr (36.13)

But the variation can also occur within the *cynghanedd* itself, as in the case of the adjectives *addwyned* and *faith* in these two lines:

Gan addwyned gweled gwŷdd (36.21)

Swydd faith a llafur sydd fwy (36.52)

By its nature such variation does not make a great deal of difference to the quality of the text, and as noted above some of it may derive from alternative versions by the poet himself. But sometimes the manuscripts offer a choice between two readings which are completely opposite in sense, such as that between *yn ael* ('before') and *yn ôl* ('after') in this line:

A nŷwl gwyn yn ael gwynt (33.23)

In this case the editorial choice can be made quite confidently, since wind scatters mist, but the correct reading is not always so obvious. In this line from the debate *waeldrefn wedd* is a variant reading for the final phrase, giving an opposite sense to that in the text:

Nid gwayw yng nghefn, wiwdrefn wedd (23.21)

The reading *waeldrefn* is perfectly possible, and gives good sense at first sight, but considering the passage as a whole the point is clearly that a spear in the back is a more honourable way to die than pining from the pangs of love. In cases such as

this the editor must depend on his or her own judgement, and of course that judgement is not infallible.

Another kind of uncertainty is the line which is confused in the manuscripts without any obvious sense. In most cases the confusion can be explained by a difficult reading in one version (e.g. *cwyn* in 73.3). But in some cases every one of the manuscript readings is unsatisfactory, and the editor attempts to restore the difficult reading which lies behind all of them by an emendation (see point 39 in the guidelines below).

Some emendations are more speculative than others; *dyungas* in 68.5 is offered quite confidently, but *llaw* in 6.112 and *cynnwgl* in 31.29 rather less so because they are further removed from the manuscript readings. But as far as the aim of reaching the original words of the poet is concerned, the essential point about all these difficult readings, whether they occur in the manuscripts or not, is that it would be illogical not to regard them as original. If they are supposed to explain corrupt manuscript readings it must be assumed that they existed prior to all the others, and it does not make sense to regard them as a development of something else since the general tendency in both oral and written tradition was to simplify.

Corrupt lines which offer no hope of restoring the original reading are quite scarce. There are a few instances in some of the *awdlau* (e.g. 17.23 and 31.39), and that may be a sign of written transmission. One of the characteristics of oral tradition is the necessity to ensure that the text always makes satisfactory sense for the purpose of performance, and textual difficulties would therefore be concealed by creative adaptation. (One of the skills expected of the reciter according to the Statute of Gruffudd ap Cynan was the ability to recognise when a poem was faulty and to be able to put it right.⁸) It is quite possible that there are cases of such adaptation in the poems which can no longer be identified, especially where only one version survives.

By approaching the text line by line, then, it is not necessarily presumptuous to claim that we have large portions of the poems in the poet's original words. And in the same way, the unit of the paragraph can be the basis for a moderate degree of confidence in the text (see further point 46 in the guidelines below). In many paragraphs the flow of the sense confirms the line-order and the form of the main sentence, if not all of the *sangiadau* (e.g. 107.25–32). And it may be that the structural symmetry of some poems (e.g. nos 7, 10 and 87) is proof that none of their lines have been lost. It is estimated that about 90% of the texts (and more in the case of some poems) represent the original words of the poet. How the poet would have recorded his work in writing, if at all, is of course another matter entirely. It must be borne in mind that the edited texts are an attempt to represent spoken words according to modern print conventions (see particularly points 44–47 below). And once the text has been established its meaning can still be unstable because more than one interpretation is possible (see point 43 below).

The editorial guidelines which follow are an attempt to lay down the most objective foundations possible for the task of establishing the text, and thus to minimise the

⁸ 'gwybod a fydd pennill o gowydd yni le a medry i rroi yni lle oni byddant' (BL 15038 (c. 1575), see Bethan Miles, 'Swyddogaeth a Chelfyddyd y Crythor' (MA, Prifysgol Cymru, 1983), II, 554.

role of instinct or inspiration or even whim on the part of the editor. But the editor's subjective judgement cannot be dispensed with entirely, particularly where textual choices are based on the supposed sense of the passage in question.

It is also important to avoid creating hyper-correct poetry, ideal texts which follow every rule faultlessly. The manuscript texts have not been forced into such a framework at all points. The guidelines derive from the manuscript evidence, and they should not be used to distort it. Thus, although the seven-syllable line of the *cywydd* is a definite principle, some lines have been left short or long if there was no obvious way of achieving the standard length (e.g. 75.14, 78.2, 139.18). It is possible that DG did compose the occasional irregular line, but that possibility does not justify rejecting the principle of standard line-length altogether. And some of these guidelines have to do with irregularity as an aid to establishing the text. The task of the editor in those cases is to restore an irregular text which is presented in an ideal form in the manuscripts.

The guidelines have been arranged according to type: metrical rules, linguistic and stylistic features, transmission practices, and methods of dealing with manuscript evidence. But they are all to a large extent interdependent, and rarely is one applied without reference to others.

Metrical Rules

The term 'rules' raises questions about the poets' learning and their concept of craft and correctness. Fulton has argued that the rules of *cynganedd* are the creation of John Morris-Jones (Fulton, 1996, xxvi–vii), but in fact Morris-Jones's manual *Cerdd Dafod* provides a description of *cynganedd* as practiced by the poets based on an analysis of their poems, and sources from the fourteenth century support his analysis.⁹ The rules set out below are based on the texts of the poems as found in the best manuscripts, and they recognise a number of features which were considered irregular in later periods. Most of these rules are absolutely elementary, but they are essential guidelines. Without these, and particularly line-length, it would not be possible to establish a secure text.

Metre

- 1) Seven syllables in a *cywydd* line, and the standard line-length for the other metres, that is 10/9 in a *toddaid* stanza, 9 in *cyhydedd nawban* (which is combined with *toddaid* in *gwawdodyn* stanzas), 7/7/7/7 in an *englyn proest*, and 10/6/7/7 in an *englyn unodl union*. The line-length of the *awdl* and *englyn* metres was established long before DG's lifetime, and hundreds of lines by DG and his contemporaries demonstrate that the *cywydd* line contained seven syllables. Seven syllables was also the usual line-length of the *traethodl* metre, but there is reason to believe that *traethodl* lines could vary in length, see notes to no. 148. On words like *bwrw*, *eiry* etc., see linguistic features below.
- 2) One end-rhyme accented and the other unaccented in a *cywydd* couplet, and also in the final couplet of an *englyn unodl union*. A new end-rhyme in every *cywydd* couplet (except in monorhyme *cywyddau*). This principle is helpful in

⁹ See Lynch, 'Cynganedd Cywyddau Dafydd ap Gwilym', 113–14.

deciding between the line-order of two versions of no. 117 (contrast GDG 77.17–20). But an exception is found in 78.23–6 where the same end-rhyme is continued over two consecutive couplets (for emphasis?). Another exception occurs in 68.59–62 as a result of combining two versions, but there is reason to doubt the position of the first of the two couplets.

- 3) The second rhyme of *cyghanedd sain* on the fifth syllable in the first line of a *toddaid* or an *englyn unodl union* (see 6.113n. where this principle is a means of establishing the text; see also 7.31n.).
- 4) Although *cymeriad* (sound correspondence between the beginning of two or more lines), both *llythrennol* and *cynganeddol*, is a prominent feature of DG's poems, it is not consistent enough to be a valuable principle in establishing texts. *Cymeriad* is usually maintained within a *cywydd* couplet, but licences such as the correspondence of vowels and consonants and the running on of sense from one line to the next make it difficult to choose between readings on the basis of *cymeriad* (see for instance 34.26n., 144.53n.). In extended sequences of verbal *cymeriad* it is common enough for one line to vary the pattern (e.g. 88.10). It is doubtful whether line-order can be rearranged on the basis of *cymeriad*, as Thomas Parry did in some cases, but *cymeriad* can be a useful criterion for choosing between variant line-orders, for instance in passages of *dyfalu* where sense allows for considerable variation (e.g. 57.15–46). *Englynion* are often linked by *cyrch-gymeriad* (e.g. 9.1–36), but this is not a firm enough rule to justify rearranging the stanzas of 'Marwnad Llywelyn ap Gwilym' (6) contrary to the manuscript evidence as in GDG 13.

Cynghanedd

- 5) *Cynghanedd* can be omitted in the first line of the *cywydd* couplet. Some manuscript copies are likely to adapt such lines to include *cyghanedd* (e.g. 34.13, 47.63). And the whole couplet lacks *cyghanedd* in the dialogue between the two girls in 137.27–34 (compare 67.6, again a girl's voice).
- 6) The consonants *n*, *m*, and *r* can be left unanswered, both at the beginning of the line (*gwreiddgoll*) and within a sequence of correspondence (*perfeddgoll*), see Parry, 1939, and also *f* because it could be a semi-vowel. This can assist in choosing between two readings where one has sought to correct the *cyghanedd* by inserting a corresponding consonant or by deleting the unanswered one, and it can even provide a basis for emending to a reading which contains an unanswered consonant (e.g. 75.36, 115.4). But consonants unanswered in the middle of the line are not important in establishing the text of a fourteenth-century *cywydd*, although they might be significant for the analysis of *cyghanedd* types (allowing *traws* to be counted as *croes*). The letter *h* is usually answered in *cyghanedd* (e.g. no. 103 where it forms *cymeriad* throughout the poem, and the second line of every couplet in no. 34), but there are occasional instances where it is left unanswered (e.g. 5.12; see further Crawford, 1985, 258). In 92.2 the edited text follows the earliest manuscript reading, *eb oir*; contrast GDG 79.2, *Heb ohir*, which leaves *h* unanswered twice.
- 7) Incomplete *cynganeddion* are acceptable, with a missing section at the beginning of the line (*gwreiddgoll*), at the end of the line (*pengoll*), or at both

ends (*braidd gyffwrdd*). Once again, manuscript copies will tend to correct these (e.g. GDG 72.31).

- 8) *Cynghanedd sain gadwynog* and *sain dros-gl* are common enough in DG's poems. The accentuation of *sain dros-gl* is often standardised in manuscripts.
- 9) Apart from the licences noted above, one of the four types of *cynghanedd* is expected in every line, with standard accentuation. The accentuation of GDG 124.13 (= 73.15) has been corrected by adopting the reading of the best manuscripts, *gwaraeau*. In 36.50 it was necessary to emend in order to restore standard accentuation (contrast GDG 63.48), but note that the line occurs in only one version. If a consonant other than *n*, *m*, *r*, *f* or *h* interrupts a sequence of consonants, or if incomplete correspondence occurs such as lenited and unlenited consonants, then there is reason to suspect that the reading is corrupt.
- 10) DG's *cynghanedd* reflects linguistic norms in terms of the delentition of consonants, that is *h* delentites a preceding lenited consonant, and two adjacent lenited consonants delentite ($d + d = t$, $g + g = c$, $b + b = p$). Exceptions to this rule are to be found in 76.9 (unless the *g* at the end of line 8 causes delentition of the *g* at the beginning of line 9) and 146.16 (but there is reason to doubt the authorship of the second poem).

Linguistic Features

Many of the archaic forms in DG's language were incomprehensible by the period of the manuscripts in the second half of the fifteenth century, and were likely to be replaced, as seen below under transmission practices. In this section features are noted which are of assistance in choosing between manuscript readings.

- 11) Forms with final consonantal *-w* or *-y* such as *bwrw*, *carw*, *eiry*, *daly* etc., are monosyllabic (although the practice of elision of vowels in subsequent words suggests that they were actually bisyllabic in the contemporary spoken language). But such forms were clearly bisyllabic to sixteenth-century copyists, and so a syllable is very often omitted elsewhere in the line. It is sometimes difficult to see where the missing syllable should be restored, and such lines have therefore been left short, but there is no definite example in any of the canonical poems of one of these forms counting as a bisyllable.
- 12) Some forms can be both bisyllabic and monosyllabic (e.g. *tröes* 96.54, but *troes* 77.4, 103.25; *niwl* 33.23, 57.52, but *niwl* 57.14).
- 13) It is difficult to generalise about mutations since they are inconsistent in the manuscripts (and also by the poet himself to some extent, e.g. the first word of *sangiadau*, which can be both lenited and unlenited), but it can be said that DG's mutations mostly reflect Middle Welsh practices which are often different to those of Modern Welsh. Thus the object of some verbal forms in the present / future and past tenses is not lenited, but on the other hand both the object and subject of a verb in the imperfect / conditional tense are lenited.

But a noun following an adjective or another noun in an adjectival function ('hydref ddail') is consistently lenited unless phonetic conditions prevent the lenition, and similarly an adjective following a feminine noun. The caesura in the middle of the line and the beginning of a new line can prevent lenition which would be expected otherwise (e.g. 56.26 and 28, but contrast 56.46). On the whole mutations are more important for the interpretation of the text than for its establishment (see for instance the note on *cyweirglod bun* in 45.11).

- 14) The gender of some words is different to that which is usual in Modern Welsh, e.g. *haul* (f.) and *dinas* (m.). Where *dyn* refers to a girl (as it most often does in DG's work) its gender varies.

Stylistic Features

- 15) The collocation of similar sounding words is a prominent feature of the poems' *cynghanedd*, including the *cymeriadau* at the beginning of lines. This caused some confusion in the manuscripts (e.g. *lleas / lles* 6.47), and two words are often transposed (e.g. *Gweirfyl / gwirfawl* 144.44). Repetition of the same word or element of a word within a line is usually doubtful (e.g. *hoen / goroen* in versions of 9.47, and 149.24 which has been emended in order to avoid repeating *gwallt* in the rhymes of the *cynghanedd sain*).
- 16) A substantial proportion of DG's language derives from the works of the Gogynfeirdd, and correspondence with one of the poems of his predecessors can be a means of confirming a reading which has been lost in some copies (e.g. *llydw* 9.60).
- 17) DG's sentences often extend over two or three couplets, but there is a tendency in some manuscripts to rework the syntax in order to shorten them and keep them within the bounds of the couplet (e.g. 73.35–8).
- 18) The sense of extended sentences and the logic of the paragraph are important guides in choosing between readings (e.g. in 31.85–8). Empty or irrelevant phrases are questionable, and also pointless repetition. But dependence on sense does involve some difficulties (see the next two points).
- 19) It can be difficult to choose between the expected word and the bold metaphor (e.g. *cŵn / clêr* 31.3).
- 20) It can be difficult to determine the scope of a word's meaning, and it should not be assumed that it is the same as in the modern language. Manuscript readings have sometimes been retained by interpreting a word differently to its usual sense (e.g. *twrn* in 32.33, which was emended to *bwrn* in GDG).
- 21) DG often used adjectives with substantival sense, for instance in expressions such as *drud byd* ('bold one of the world') of the wind in 47.4. Some of these usages have been misinterpreted by Thomas Parry or by translators (e.g. *gloyw wybr* of the star = 'dewdrop of the sky', 50.38). This feature is usually of significance in interpreting the text after it has been established, but see

134.28 where the reading of the line depends on taking *trilliw* as a noun (see also the next point).

- 22) DG's poems have a strong concrete and visual element, and this can be helpful in deciding between readings, e.g. *trilliw* in 134.28 (see 21 above), and *lle'th ariannwyd* in 45.9 (contrast *llathr ei annwyd* GDG 118.9).

Transmission Practices

In order to interpret the evidence of the manuscripts it is necessary to consider the kinds of changes which reciters and copyists tended to make to the texts which they received. These changes can be classified as follows, some being specific to the medium of transmission and others more generally applicable:

23) **Misreading**

Failure to recognise a letter, e.g. confusion between *c* and *t* (5.12?), or misinterpretation of orthography in the exemplar, e.g. *d* for *dd*. Such cases arise in the copies of the White Book of Hergest (see for example 126.13n.).

24) **Mishearing**

Confusion between words of similar sound (e.g. *gynhinen* / *genhinen* 118.2; *fardd* / *farf* 116.59); losing a consonant through fusion with a preceding consonant (e.g. *iaith Ofydd am iaith Ddofydd* in 147.16); losing a word through compression of vowels (e.g. 114.1; 141.16; 150.21).

25) **Misremembering**

Putting a synonym in a gap in the *cynghanedd* (e.g. 36.63); repeating a word, or anticipating it (e.g. *eiddil* 29.1/9); rephrasing of sense (e.g. 24.5–6); changing line-order; losing lines; adding stray lines (e.g. the text of no. 45 in M 146 where a line from no. 39 was written because of the rhyme with *annwyd*).

26) **Misunderstanding**

Replacement of unfamiliar words resulting in loss of sense (e.g. *neud* to *nid* on numerous occasions; *crafangog* for *cyfragod* 109.3; *dyun* > *dyn* 68.5); simplification of extended sentences. Certain Middle Welsh constructions were likely to be misunderstood and reinterpreted, for instance *mawr a beth* ('a big thing') which is sometimes changed to *mawr beth* or *a mawr beth* (e.g. 33.9, 114.1). Misinterpretation of homophones (e.g. *hun* 98.4 in Pen 54).

27) **Modernization**

Replacing a Middle Welsh form with a modern one (*o* for *a*; *i'w* for *i* = *i'i* or for *oe*); replacing an archaic word with a synonym (e.g. *mi* for *neur* in 10.1); addition of a preposition where destination is conveyed by lenition only (e.g. 16.4).

28) **Standardization**

Correction of line considered faulty, either in length (often as a result of another change) or in *cynghanedd*.

29) **Random Change**

It is difficult to distinguish between this and other types of change, but it does seem sometimes that changes are made for the simple reason that they are possible, as a sort of self-expression on the part of the reciter (e.g. 9.15). There is reason to believe that the *cynghanedd* itself encouraged such variation (e.g. *llyw / llew / llaw* in 6.26). It is likely that poets would be particularly prone to creative adaptation of texts (for instance Gwilym Tew's copies in Pen 54). And some of the additional lines found in certain manuscripts are probably deliberate creations (e.g. additional lines about birds in the first part of no. 36, and lengthy passages in many of the texts in Wy 2).

Manuscripts

- 30) The manuscript texts can usually be divided into fundamental versions, as shown in the stemmas. This is mostly done on the basis of number and order of lines. Some if not all of these versions are the product of oral transmission, as explained above, and there may be variations in readings between the texts belonging to a single version as a result of changes made during the copying process. Most of the poems have survived in at least two versions. In cases where only one version has survived emendation of manuscript readings can be more easily justified. Focusing on fundamental versions helps to avoid the mistake of weighing the manuscript evidence by numbers. In terms of number of texts the evidence of the *Vetustus* version would weigh more heavily in the scales almost every time because it was so extensively copied.
- 31) The texts of the three known lost collections, the White Book of Hergest, the *Vetustus* codex, and the Book of William Mathew, can be largely recreated on the basis of the surviving copies (see further the section on the manuscripts). This is the first logical step beyond the existing manuscript texts.
- 32) Where it is known that a text is a direct copy of another surviving text, and yet differs from it at certain points, those different readings possess no independent authority, however attractive they may appear, unless there is definite reason to believe that the copyist was drawing on more than one source (e.g. some of Jaspar Gruffyth's texts in G 3 and LI 120). It is theoretically possible that different readings derived from the copyist's memory of an oral performance, but interference from oral tradition is unlikely by the end of the sixteenth century. The reading *gwenieithfin* which was adopted in GDG 118.23 must therefore be rejected (see 45.23n.), and similarly *ddigerydd* which was adopted in GDG 74.33 (see 133.33n.). Similarly, where several texts derive from a lost common exemplar and one gives a different reading to the others, that is most likely to be an attempt by the copyist to improve on the reading of the exemplar. Thus, for instance, the reading of H 26 in 83.15, *cusan y fun*, must be rejected. This principle is one means of avoiding random and subjective selection of readings. And if there is reason to believe that every copy derives from the same exemplar, then it is easier to justify emendation when the text appears to be corrupt (e.g. 17.23, 83.15 and several lines in no. 70).

- 33) Where a poem survives in more than two independent versions, agreement between two or more against one can be useful in deciding between readings (e.g. 6 .4, 20; 115.21). But the possibility must be considered that the same change has happened independently in more than one version because it was attractive or natural (e.g. changing *gwraig* > *merch* in 42.2 for respectability's sake, simplifying *ni ddawr* in 34.32, and *ys* > *os* in 118.43).
- 34) The earliest manuscript text provides a starting point in establishing the edited text, and its reading is generally accepted unless there is reason to doubt it on the grounds of any of the other editorial principles. But it does not possess any absolute authority on the grounds of date alone (except the two fourteenth-century manuscripts; no. 9 is the only poem in which an early copy has priority over all others on the grounds of date). Because of oral tradition, a version which was committed to writing in the sixteenth century (e.g. in the Book of Wiliam Mathew) can be just as valuable as one recorded in the fifteenth century.
- 35) The fact that lines occur in only one version is not in itself sufficient reason to reject them. A decision about their authenticity must be made on the basis of internal evidence. Fifteenth-century manuscripts have preserved numerous lines which are missing in later texts. And in the case of lines which survive only in a late manuscript, the possibility must be considered that they derive from an early text which is now lost (e.g. 24.1–2, 73.15–16 and 19–20).
- 36) If the same lines occur in two of DG's poems, and are in every version of one, but only one version of the other, then the likelihood is that they belong in the first poem only (e.g. GDG 63.65–6 = 41.9–10).
- 37) Line-order is usually based on the best manuscript text (not necessarily the earliest). Lines are not rearranged contrary to manuscript evidence without very strong reason. (Thomas Parry's reason for rearranging the stanzas of no. 6 is not sufficient, see notes to the poem.) Passages of *dyfalu* tend to be very confused in the manuscripts, and it must be accepted that in some cases it is impossible to be certain about the correct order. Uncertainty is inevitable when lines occur in only one version, and the line-order of that version is different to all the others (e.g. 6.65–8).
- 38) The reading of a single version can usually be followed for a whole line. But it is not essential to stick to one version for a line, any more than for a whole poem. There is reason to believe that lines were remembered in sections (either halves or thirds depending on syntax and *cynghanedd*), and more than one version can therefore be combined to achieve a satisfactory reading (e.g. 6.25, 6.63, 137.29). On the other hand, all versions might be rejected, and a reading restored which is a means of explaining the textual corruption (see next point).
- 39) In the case of a passage which has clearly caused the copyists difficulty, the evidence of every version must be considered in order to get to the root of the problem, seeking to reach a reading which explains all of them, rather than choosing one satisfactory reading and ignoring the rest (e.g. *dogn* in 115.42,

ceuoedd in 56.28, and *cydlwynach* in 133.25). This will sometimes involve emendation to restore a lost reading which lies behind all the manuscript variants (e.g. 6.112 and 130.18).

- 40) As already seen, there is a tendency in the manuscripts to modernize and simplify the language of the poems, and to replace an unexpected reading with a cliché, but rarely are changes made in the opposite direction, that is making a simple reading more difficult. It is thus possible to implement the principle of the more difficult reading, or *lectio difficilior*, that is the most uncommon of two or more readings (e.g. *caenfedw* in 14.2, *arail* in 34.42 and 38.8, *marth* in 56.49, *ni thechwn* in 98.30, and *rhuddfoawg* in 108.8). The original reading does not necessarily have to be a difficult word in itself, if it is unexpected in its context (e.g. *wanllun* in 9.30 and *bath* in 32.18), or stronger than the more common word (e.g. *delff* instead of *gwas* in 73.55). This is an extremely useful principle in establishing the text, not only as a means of deciding between readings, but also to restore lost readings which explain the corruption (e.g. *cynnwgl* in 31.29). But some caution is required, since it is not always easy to tell how common or comprehensible a word would have been in the period of a poem's transmission. In the case of *cynnwgl* in 31.29 it is significant that no example of the word is recorded other than those in medieval legal texts.
- 41) Variant readings in the manuscripts are often synonyms (e.g. *addwyned* and *digrifed* 36.21), and it can sometimes be very difficult to choose between them. It is likely that reciters were responsible for such variation, but as suggested above it is not impossible that some variants derive from separate performances by the poet himself.
- 42) Manuscript readings in one poem can be helpful in solving a problem in another poem. See 83.15n., where the emendation of *cusan fun* to *cusan fu ym* is justified by reference to *dirdrais fu ym* in 150.21 which occurs as *dirdrais fun* in one copy.
- 43) From a logical point of view interpretation must be an essential part of the process of establishing the text, since a meaningless text would be unacceptable. In practice, however, although the form of the text may be absolutely certain, interpretation can be a matter of judgement, e.g. 50.38 where there can be no question about the verbal form of the line, but the relationship between the words is open to interpretation. Linguistic and stylistic patterns can be a basis for interpretation in such cases (see points 21 and 22 above). Punctuation usually indicates the editor's judgement, but in some cases it is necessary to turn to the translation to see how the edited text is interpreted (e.g. 'balch o febyd fûm' in 73.4, where it is not possible to indicate the interpretation by punctuation). This is not to be confused with deliberate ambiguity (which may well exist in the use of the word *balch* in that instance).
- 44) **Orthography**
Although the edited texts are in standard modern orthography, where an early manuscript copy gives a word in a form which is considered non-standard today but is attested in fourteenth-century texts, that form is retained in the

text. Fourteenth-century orthography is to be seen in the manuscript texts of nos 1 and 9 in the Hendregadredd Manuscript, and that of no. 84 in the White Book of Rhydderch. Conservative fifteenth-century orthography is most clearly seen in the texts of Pen 57 and Pen 52, and with some modern elements in those of Pen 48, Pen 52, Pen 54, Pen 55 and Pen 67.

Some Middle Welsh forms are retained as follows:

no(g) for *na(g)*; this form is common in fourteenth-century texts (see GPC 2587), and it is proved by rhyme in 124.56.

fal for *fel*; on the basis of the earliest manuscripts and other fourteenth-century texts (see GPC 1267–8).

-ig in final syllables instead of modern *-yg*; this is the spelling in the best manuscripts, and the form is proved by consistent rhymes with words such as *dig* (see further CD 247–8).

ydiw, as proved consistently by rhyme (e.g. 151.22); see GMW 4.

mywn for *mewn* in 1.157 where the orthography of the Hendregadredd text is followed.

wyd for *wyt*, and *-ud* for *-ut* in the second person singular imperfect / conditional of the verb; the older form is proved by rhyme and *cynghanedd* in numerous instances (but contrast 63.12 and see notes on *gwyddut* in 31.88 and *wnaut* in 121.25).

ymy and *yty* (= *imi*, *iti*) where required by rhyme, or where attested in an early manuscript text.

gwedy; the form is proved by rhyme in 6.97. Contrast the example in a poem of uncertain authorship, 153.37, where *gwedi* is proved by rhyme.

-aw and *-aw-* are modernized > *o* unless rhyme requires the diphthong. (But *rhuddfoawg* has been retained in 108.8 since that is the form in the only manuscript which has preserved the reading.)

45) Punctuation

Punctuation marks in the earliest manuscripts are scarce and very inconsistent, and generally seem to denote metrical divisions rather than syntactical ones. All the punctuation in the edited texts is therefore editorial, and reflects the editor's interpretation of the sense. The main punctuation marks used are the comma, which denotes either a *sangiad* interrupting the flow of the main sentence or an expression in parallel with another, a fullstop indicating the end of the syntactical unit, and the exclamation mark and question mark as appropriate. All of Dafydd ap Gwilym's poetry could be punctuated with these four marks alone, but selective use is also made of the semi-colon where there is a definite relationship in terms of sense but not in terms of syntax (e.g. 10.15–20, 65.12), and occasional use of the colon to

introduce what follows (e.g. 117.56), and two dashes to separate a sentence or exclamation within another sentence (e.g. 33.16–18, 137.13–14, 52.53).

Even with all these resources it is doubtful whether some passages can be satisfactorily punctuated because of their style. The most troublesome ones are not the extended parenthetical sentences, since their syntax can be adequately indicated by extensive use of the comma (e.g. 57.1–6), but rather descriptive passages with loose syntax and few verbs, e.g. 117.33–48, where everything depends on the verb *wyd* in line 33. All the passages of *dyfalu* fall into this category, since there is no syntactical connection between the images (e.g. 57.15–46). In GDG these are mainly punctuated in couplets, with a fullstop at the end of most couplets, despite Thomas Parry's opinion that the couplet-based style is not characteristic of Dafydd's work. In this edition greater use has been made of the comma in order to preserve the flow of such passages. Passages with mixed syntax could be punctuated in more than one way. A common problem is seen in 44.21–2, for instance, namely how verbless lines relate to their context; are these to be taken with the preceding lines, or the following ones, or should they remain independent? There is probably no final answer to these questions because of the oral nature of the poetry. Loose syntax could be maintained much more easily in live performance than in a written text. It must be admitted, therefore, that in punctuating DG's poetry we are to some extent forcing it into an inappropriate framework, and that our punctuation marks are inadequate to convey the flexibility of the poems' rhetorical flow. The comments on paragraphing below are also relevant to this issue. On punctuation strategies and their effect on the meaning of the text see Helen Fulton, 'Punctuation as a Semiotic Code: the Case of the Medieval Welsh *cywydd*', *Parergon* 13: 2 (1996), 21–35.

46) **Paragraphing**

The paragraphing of *cywyddau* is a modern editorial device without any basis in the manuscripts. In one sense any paragraphing imposes the editor's interpretation on the poem (see further Fulton, 'Punctuation as a Semiotic Code', on ways in which paragraphing can affect a poem's meaning). The poems could justifiably be printed without any paragraphing, as Ifor Williams did in DGG, leaving the reader to decide where the sense of the poem might call for any divisions. But there is reason to believe that the early *Cywyddwyr* composed most of their poems in units of some sort, and that the concept of the paragraph (whatever name they would have given to it) would have been meaningful to them. Blocks of lines form clear thematic units, for instance the passage in 'Y Don ar Afon Dyfi' (51.9–26) where the poet reminds the wave of all the praise to it in his poems. The passage contains four independent sentences, and it is true that the order of the last three could vary, as it does in the Pen 54 text, but all those three expand on the rhetorical question in the first sentence, and thus the eighteen lines clearly belong together as a unit of sense. Rhetorical structure often binds lines into a paragraph (cf. 10.31–40 and 22.9–18). Imagery or a comparison can create thematic unity within a paragraph as well, such as the coinage imagery in 32.9–18, and the reference to the story of Peredur which forms a long paragraph in 86.33–52. Groups of lines are also bound together by initial *cymeriad*, e.g. 47.19–32 and 111.1–14, blocks of fourteen lines which are units of both sound and sense (cf. also 22.1–8, 32.1–8, and nos 89 and 103 where *cymeriad* is maintained through

the whole poem). Repetition of a word or prefix was another means of binding lines together, like the repetition of *di-* in 20.35–42, and *neud* in 32.29–38. But sustained *cymeriad* generally occurs within passages which form longer units of sense, e.g. the long passage of *dyfalu* in ‘Y Niwl’ (57.15–46) which contains three sequences of *cymeriad* as well as lines in which *cymeriad* is confined to the couplet. Such passages must be paragraphed on the basis of sense rather than sound.

The number of paragraphs depends of course on the length of the poem. Some of the short *cywyddau* form a single paragraph (nos 3, 42, 103, 119), and a few divide naturally into two (e.g. no. 141). A tripartite structure is quite common (e.g. nos 16, 45, 57), with an introduction setting the scene, development in the body of the poem, and a concluding paragraph. But some of the longer poems divide into five or six paragraphs, either dealing with various aspects of the subject (e.g. no. 32), or developing an image and then applying it (e.g. nos 75 and 111).

As seen in the examples already noted, paragraphs vary considerably in length, with some as long as twenty lines, and concluding paragraphs often only four (e.g. 10.41–4, 90.41–4), but the typical length is eight or ten lines. In some poems the paragraphs are closely balanced (e.g. nos 32 and 87), and it is possible that symmetrical proportion was a deliberate decorative feature, as seen in the *awdl* to Ieuan Llwyd (no. 7), where the initial *cymeriad* divides the stanzas into three groups of four. The edited text of ‘Marwnad Rhydderch’ (no. 10) has been divided into four paragraphs of ten lines and a concluding paragraph of four, and the two cultured patrons would no doubt have appreciated such an intricate pattern. But the pattern is not absolutely certain, since it is possible to link lines 9–10 with the following paragraph (as Thomas Parry did), and it is doubtful whether symmetry can be used as a general principle in paragraphing poems.

Although most of the paragraphing is quite obvious and uncontroversial, subjective judgement does play a role sometimes, as can be seen by comparing the paragraphing in this edition with that of GDG. On the whole Thomas Parry tended to paragraph rather more than we have done, sometimes without apparent reason. For instance in ‘Y Seren’ (no. 50) he divided the lines which refer to God as creator of the stars into two paragraphs of four lines each (GDG 67.15–22). He no doubt did this for the reader’s convenience, so that the blessing stands out more clearly, but such decisions are not without implications for the tone and impact of the text. Parry gave ‘Dan y Bargod’ a striking conclusion by making the final couplet with its accusatory question into a separate paragraph (GDG 89.45–6), but since *cymeriad cynganeddol* links the couplet with the previous lines they have been kept together in this edition (98.37–46). And similarly in the previous paragraph the verbal *cymeriad* has been followed, rather than isolating the declaration of love in lines 29–36 as Parry did. In general the paragraphing in this edition has been based as far as possible on objective criteria in terms of sound and sense according to the essential structure of the poem, leaving lines together unless there is a good reason to separate them. But it must be admitted that in some cases different paragraphing could be justified.

47) **Titles of poems**

All titles have been devised by modern editors. The earliest collection to have included titles seems to have been the Book of Wiliam Mathew, as seen in the copies of it, that is simple titles referring to the object of the poem, such as 'kywydd y gwynt' (47). There were apparently no titles in the Vetustus collection. Titles were becoming more common by the second half of the sixteenth century, as seen in C 7, some referring to the object, such as 'kowydd y bi' (36), and others denoting little more than genre, such as 'kowydd merch' (38, 68, 69, 92 etc.) and 'kowydd kariad' (100). By the seventeenth century titles tended to be fuller and rather long-winded, e.g. 'Kow: ir nywl a rwystrodd i gariad gyfwrdd ar Bardd' (no. 57 in Wy 2), and that type of title found its way from late manuscripts into the BDG collection. Ifor Williams was the first to devise succinct and practical titles for the selection of poems in DGG, and Thomas Parry retained a number of those in GDG (e.g. 'Rhag Hyderu ar y Byd' GDG 76 = no. 108). Some of the titles in GDG are completely objective and inevitable, such as 'Yr Wylan', and others are so well-established that they cannot easily be changed (e.g. 'Trafferth mewn Tafarn', no. 73, although the word *tafarn* does not actually occur in the poem). But some of Parry's more abstract titles have been changed in this edition, in an attempt to provide titles which are as neutral as possible. For instance, instead of 'Blinder' GDG 96, no. 100 has been entitled 'Nodwyddau Serch' ('Love's Needles') on the basis of the title in LIWM, 'kywydd nydwyddau', referring to the main image of the poem. Another way of providing a title is to use a key expression from the text, such as 'Telynores Twyll' (135) instead of 'Hudoliaeth Merch' GDG 84. Titles are ultimately no more than convenient labels, and they do not form part of the text as modern poem titles do.

