A LOST MEDIEVAL MANUSCRIPT FROM NORTH WALES: HENGWRT 33, THE HANESYN HÊN

In 1658, William Maurice made a catalogue of the most important manuscripts in the library of Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt, in which 158 items were listed.¹ Many copies of Maurice’s catalogue exist, deriving from two variant versions, best represented respectively by the copies in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales [= NLW], Wynnstay 10, written by Maurice’s amanuenses in 1671 and annotated by Maurice himself, and in NLW Peniarth 119, written by Edward Llwyd and his collaborators around 1700.² In 1843, Aneirin Owen created a list of those manuscripts in Maurice’s catalogue which he was able to find still present in the Hengwrt (later Peniarth) collection.³ W. W. E. Wynne later responded by publishing a list, based on Maurice’s catalogue, of the manuscripts which Owen believed to be missing, some of which he was able to identify as extant.⁴ Among the manuscripts remaining unidentified was item 33, the manuscript which Edward Llwyd had called the ‘Hanesyn Hên’.⁵ The contents list provided by Maurice in his catalogue shows that this manuscript was of considerable interest.⁶ The entries for Hengwrt 33 in

---

² For a list of manuscripts containing the catalogue, see *Handlist of Manuscripts in the National Library of Wales* (Aberystwyth, 1940–), i, pp. xvi–xx.
³ Aneirin Owen, ‘Catalogue of Welsh Manuscript, etc. in North Wales, No. II’, *Transactions of the Cymmrodorion or the Metropolitan Cambrian Institution*, 2.4 (1843), 400–18 (403–16).
⁶ Maurice’s description of the contents of Hengwrt 33 has been printed twice before, once in the *Cambrian Register* for 1818, taken from an unknown source, and once by A. O. H. Jarman, taken from Wynnstay 10, as communicated to him by E. D. Jones: ‘A Catalogue of the Curious and Valuable MSS. in Hengwrt
both Wynnstay 10 and Peniarth 119 are identical in all significant respects. These lists are supplemented by a briefer list compiled by Lhwyd and included elsewhere in Peniarth 119 as part of a document entitled ‘A Catalogue of some MSS. in Hengwrt study A° 1696’.\(^7\) In table 1 below, the latter’s entry on Hengwrt 33 is printed in parallel with the text from Wynnstay 10. The contents list of Hengwrt 33 published in Lhwyd’s *Archaeologia Britannica* is evidently a conflation of Maurice’s list and the list in Lhwyd’s 1696 catalogue, a circumstance which led to the accidental inclusion of the vernacular chronicle *O Oes Gwrtheyrn* at two different points.\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wynnstay 10, ff. 246r–246v, item 33 (1671)</th>
<th>Peniarth 119, p. 103, item 63 (c. 1700)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llyfr hên Tra rhagorol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yn yr hwnn y mae yn gyntaf:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achau Seint Ynys Prydain;</td>
<td>Ancient Genealogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Plant Brychann, a llawer o bethau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achawl (neu Geneologiol)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong>: Chronologieth yn dechreu Oes Gwrtheur Gwrtheneu;(^9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong>: Llyfr Bonedd;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


7 Peniarth 119, pp. 101–3; the contents of Hengwrt 33 are listed on p. 103. Cf. *Handlist*, i. p. xxi.


9 The relevant positioning of *Chronologieth yn dechreu Oes Gwrtheurn Gwrtheneu* and *Henweu Brenhinoedd Ynys Prydain* is at variance in the two lists. As is discussed below (p. ??), Peniarth 119 is likely to preserve the order of Hengwrt 33.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item: Englynion Duad;</th>
<th>Audyl a gant Adaf Vrâs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item: Anrheg Vrrien o waith Taliesyn;</td>
<td>Auret Urien: Taliesyn ai cant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marwnad Iago mab Beli, [o waith Beli] o 'waith Taliesun;</td>
<td>Marunat Iago ap LLedi, o waith Taliesyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item. Ach Llewelyn ab Iorwerth Drwyndwnn;</td>
<td>Acheu Llewelyn ap Iorwerth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item: Duad;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item. Henweu Brenhinoedd Ynys Prydain;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item: Llyfr Theophrastus am Neithiorau;</td>
<td>Chronicon o oes Gorthyyn Gortheneu hyd y Nordmyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item: Chronicl byrr yn dechreu yn Oes Arthur, pan lâs Arthur;</td>
<td>O Gad Gamlan i Ed.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henweu y Brenhined o Eneas ysgwythwyn i Gadwaladyr vendigeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item: Gwaith Merddyn yw Barchell;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llyfr 'gwedy ei gaeadu yn odieth ymgeledus yn Llyndain y gan Rob: Va:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In octavo, i Fodf: o Dêw</td>
<td>membr. 4º</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The Contents of Hengwr 33
Hengwrt 33 was evidently a medieval manuscript written on vellum. The contents included genealogy (both sacred and secular), poetry (englynion and awdlau), chronicles and Theophrastus’s tract against marriage. Although the manuscript is occasionally mentioned in scholarship, it deserves a much fuller treatment than it has yet received, not least because copies of a number of the items that it once contained can be identified in various extant manuscripts of later date. The present examination attempts to determine exactly how many extant manuscripts derive from or are closely related to the lost Hengwrt 33. On the basis of the evidence of these derivatives and relatives, it is suggested that Hengwrt 33 was written in the first half of the fourteenth century, perhaps in Valle Crucis Abbey, and that much of its contents derives from Aberconwy Abbey. Following the article is an appendix, in which is edited a series of texts derived from the lost manuscript.

**Genealogy**

Surviving manuscripts that can be identified as relatives of Hengwrt 33 contain various combinations of genealogy, chronicle and poetry. Here I treat the genealogical manuscripts first, since they are the most numerous and informative, before continuing to consider the manuscripts containing poetry and chronicles.

Arguably the most important surviving transcript of a section of Hengwrt 33 is that of John Jones of Gellilyfdy.\(^\text{10}\) In 1640, while in the Fleet Street prison in London, John

---

Jones transcribed the genealogical sections of some of the earliest manuscripts in Robert Vaughan’s collection at Hengwrt. This set of transcripts is preserved as Cardiff Central Library 3.77.\(^{11}\) Peter Bartrum identified the manuscripts transcribed by John Jones into Cardiff 3.77: pages 23–31 contain a transcript of *Bonedd y Saint* from NLW Peniarth 16, part vi\(^{12}\) (s. xiii\(^2\); a fragment of the Dingestow manuscript); pages 101–10 were transcribed from NLW Peniarth 50, pp. 82–6 (s. xv\(^{med}\); ‘*Y Cwta Cyfarwydd*’); and pages 111–24 contain transcriptions of *Bonedd y Saint, Ach Arthur* and *Ach Owain Tudur* from NLW Peniarth 27, part ii (s. xv/xvi).\(^{13}\) Egerton Phillimore was the first to realise that other parts of Cardiff 3.77 had been copied from the lost Hengwrt 33.\(^{14}\) Phillimore’s views on this matter are scattered among many incidental references, but can be pieced together easily enough.\(^{15}\) He thought that Hengwrt 33 was a manuscript written in the thirteenth or

---


\(^{12}\) Often called part ‘iv’, but see Daniel Huws, *A Repertory of Welsh Manuscripts and Scribes* (forthcoming), s. ‘Peniarth 16’.


\(^{14}\) Phillimore’s own transcript of Cardiff 3.77 is preserved in the National Library of Wales: Egerton Phillimore Papers, N3/3: ‘Pedigrees of British Kings and Saints’. The transcript was made in March and April 1889.

\(^{15}\) For the work of Egerton Phillimore, see Ben Guy, ‘Egerton Phillimore (1856–1937) and the Study of Welsh Historical Texts’, *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion [= THSC]*, 21 (2015), 36–50. Phillimore’s references to Hengwrt 33 include the following: Phillimore *apud* H. F. J. Vaughan, ‘Welsh Pedigrees’, *Cymru* [= *Cy*], 10 (1889), 72–156 (85, n. 9, 91, n. 8, and 152–3, n. 8); ‘Errata, &c., in vol. ix’, *Cy* 10 (1889), 246–8 (248); ‘Notes on Place-Names in English Maelor’, *Bye-Gones relating to Wales and Border Counties*, 2nd ser., 1 (1889–90), 478–85 and 532–7 (480, n. 2, 484 and 535); Phillimore *apud* J. E. Lloyd, ‘Welsh Place-Names: A Study of Some Common Name Elements’, *Cy* 11 (1890–91), 15–60 (50); Phillimore *apud* J. W. Willis-Bund, ‘The True Objects of Welsh Archæology’, *Cy* 11 (1890–91), 103–32 (126); ‘The Publication of Welsh Historical Records’, *Cy* 11 (1890–91), 133–75
fourteenth century, and that its genealogical contents had been copied twice into Cardiff 3.77, within pages 1–100. The rationale behind the assumption that John Jones was copying directly from Hengwrt 33 is based on our knowledge of what would have been available to Jones in the library of Robert Vaughan in 1640. On page 22 of Cardiff 3.77, at the end of a section that Phillimore thought had been copied from Hengwrt 33, John Jones says the following about his source.

Ag fal hynn y terfyna y llyfr hwn yr hynn a ysgrifennais if, aplan o llyfr bycan o femrun (or eido yg kar Robert oycan, or Hengurty yn ymwy Dolgele yn sir Feirionydd) (yr hwn a ysgrifennesid yg kylich :400: mlyned kyn no hynny). Y :17: dyd o fis medi :1640: yn y fflut, yg kaer luad.

And like this finishes this book which I wrote out of a little book of vellum (belonging to my friend Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt near Dolgellau in Merionethshire) (which had been written about 400 years earlier). The 17th day of September 1640 in the Fleet in London.

(135, n. 4); Phillimore _apud_ John Rhŷs, ‘The Irish Invasions of Wales and Dumnonia’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5th ser., 9 (1892), 56–73 (63–5); ‘homo planus and Leprosy in Wales’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 6th ser., 20 (1920), 224–50 (246, n. 20); Phillimore _apud_ The Description of Penbrokshire [sic] by George Owen of Henllys, Lord of Kemes, ed. Henry Owen, Cymmerdonion Record Series, 1, 2 vols in 4 parts (London, 1892–1936), Li, p. 201, n. 1; II.i, pp. 277–8, n. 1; II.ii, p. 625.

The manuscript copied by John Jones into the beginning of Cardiff 3.77 was evidently a vellum manuscript belonging to Robert Vaughan, and, judging by what was copied, the only vellum manuscript in Robert Vaughan’s possession that would have included the relevant contents was Hengwrt 33, as can be deduced from William Maurice’s catalogue.

Phillimore’s views on this matter received only occasional notice in succeeding years until they were explored further by Peter Bartrum. Bartrum’s primary contributions were the delimitation of exactly which part of Cardiff 3.77 had been copied from Hengwrt 33 and the identification of two further copies of the manuscript. He argued that only pages 1–22 of Cardiff 3.77, the section immediately preceding the colophon quoted above, had been copied from Hengwrt 33. Pages 32–100, on the other hand, which Phillimore thought contained a ‘second copy’ of the material in Hengwrt 33, were actually copied from another lost medieval manuscript, which Bartrum named ‘Y’. Bartrum suggested that at least parts of Y ‘came from Hengwrt 141’, a Hengwrt manuscript no longer extant, but this is very unlikely. All that is known of Hengwrt 141 is that it was an ‘old book of pedigrees patched by John Jones’, and that it featured the title ‘Gynwyd Cevyn Blaidd Cynllaith’ in a prominent position. The latter is a subtitle that appears in Gutun Owain’s

---


19 Phillimore, ‘Notes’, 480, n. 2; EWGT 76.

genealogical compilation in Manchester, John Rylands Library, Welsh 1, written in 1497 in Gutun Owain’s own hand, which reads, at the top of the current folio 12r, *kymwd kefn blaidd kynllaith*. Since there is no evidence that Robert Vaughan or John Jones ever saw Rylands Welsh 1, I suggest that Hengwrt 141 derived from that manuscript, which was much copied in the sixteenth century.\(^{21}\)

Bartrum argued that two other extant manuscripts contain copies of the genealogical sections of Hengwrt 33: NLW Llanstephan 28, written by Gutun Owain, seemingly in 1456, and NLW Peniarth 182, written by Huw Pennant between 1509 and 1513.\(^{22}\) Bartrum realised that the genealogical material in these two manuscripts correlates with the material in Cardiff 3.77, pages 1–22, and with the contents list of Hengwrt 33.\(^{23}\) Most persuasively, all three manuscripts contain similarly corrupt texts of *Plant Brychan*. Peniarth 182 contains the opening section and the concluding triad, but nothing else. Llanstephan 28 contains the same opening section, followed additionally by Brychan’s son Cynog, and then begins its list of Brychan’s other children half way through the list of daughters, with *Kyngar verch Vrychan*.\(^{24}\) In Cardiff 3.77, John Jones begins with *Keyngaṛ fere Vṛyčan*, prior to which he left a six-line gap followed by the words *gwṛeig Tudaụl Pefyṛ*, the ending of the item that usually precedes Ceingar in other texts of *Plant


\(^{23}\) For a table comparing their contents, see Bartrum, ‘Achau’, 204.

\(^{24}\) Llanstephan 28’s text of *Plant Brychan* is printed in A. W. Wade-Evans, ‘Bonedd y Saint, E’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 86 (1931), 158–75 (174).
Brychan. The six-line gap probably indicates either that John Jones’ exemplar was damaged at this point, or that he realised that a significant portion of Plant Brychan’s text was missing. The same factor must lie behind the state of Plant Brychan in Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 182. It is likely that the latter two manuscripts derive their genealogical texts, directly or indirectly, from Hengwrt 33.

Three other Plant Brychan manuscripts shed some light on what may have befallen the missing text in Hengwrt 33. All three of them are linked to a confined area of Radnorshire: NLW Peniarth 137, part iii, written by one John ap Rhys of Llanfihangel Nant Melan sometime in the second half of the sixteenth century; NLW Peniarth 183, part ii, written by William Dyfi in 1586, a manuscript which received additions from residents of Glasgwm and Pilleth in Radnorshire during the seventeenth century; and London, British Library [= BL], Harley 4181, written by Hugh Thomas, who in 1710 copied into folios 25r–27r texts of Bonedd y Saint and Plant Brychan ‘taken out of an old Welsh manuscrip [sic] of Mr John Lewis of Lhuynweney in Radnorshire wrote about the time of Queen Elizabeth’. Like John ap Rees, John Lewis (d. 1615/16) became a resident of Llanfihangel Nant Melan parish around 1596, though he had maintained landed interests in the area for some time before. The copies of Plant Brychan in these three manuscripts

---

25 The following draws on a full study of all the manuscripts containing Plant Brychan, which I intend to publish elsewhere.


are very similar. The copies in Peniarth 183ii and Harley 4181 are particularly close. It is tempting to suggest that the common exemplar of the three had taken up residence in the vicinity of Llanfihangel Nant Melan in the second half of the sixteenth century. I call this common exemplar Λ.

What has all this to do with Hengwrt 33? The text of Plant Brychan found in these three manuscript shares some peculiarities with the known derivatives of Hengwrt 33. For example, Brychan’s ancestor Tathal appears in Peniarth 182 and Llanstephan 28 as Tuthal and in the Radnorshire manuscripts as Tvthal or Tythal, and the name of the daughter of Brychan usually called Ceindreg is spelled with an extra e between the d and r in the Radnorshire manuscripts, Cardiff 3.77 and NLW 21001Bii, another derivative of Hengwrt 33 discussed below. Λ cannot, however, derive from Hengwrt 33. Both Peniarth 137iii and Peniarth 183ii contain texts of Bonedd y Saint, which, while very similar to the copies in Peniarth 182 and Llanstephan 28, contain features of Bonedd y Saint’s archetype which have been altered in the latter two manuscripts, and which must also have been altered in Hengwrt 33. Λ must instead have been a sister copy of Hengwrt 33, or at least derived

---

28 The kinship between the two manuscripts was noted by Bartrum: ‘Late Additions to “Bonedd y Saint”’, *THSC* (1959), 76–98 (81). Peniarth 183ii also contains a copy of Achau'r saint, which in Harley 4181 has been combined with Bonedd y Saint and Plant Brychan. For Achau'r Saint, see *EWGT* 68–71 and A. W. Wade-Evans, ‘Achau’r Saint, A, Achau’r Saint, B’, *Études Celtiques*, 1 (1936), 281–91.

29 The manuscript may well, at some point, have been owned by John Lewis of Llynwene, a prominent collector of manuscripts: Payne, ‘John Lewis’, 15; Graham C. G. Thomas, ‘From Manuscript to Print: I. Manuscript’, in *A Guide to Welsh Literature c. 1530–1700, Volume III*, ed. R. Geraint Gruffydd (Cardiff, 1997), pp. 241–62 (243). However, Payne’s statement that Lewis owned Peniarth 137, including the portion by John ap Rhys of Llanfihangel Nant Melan, is misleading; Lewis owned part i of the manuscript, the former Hengwrt 251, which was copied by John Jones of Gellilyfdy into NLW 3041B (Mostyn 133), but there is no evidence that he owned part ii, the former Hengwrt 368, which was not bound with Hengwrt 251 until after the two manuscripts were catalogued separately by William Maurice in 1658.

30 The relevant idiosyncrasies of the texts of Bonedd y Saint in Peniarth 182 and Llanstephan 28 are the lack of Pedr’s pedigree and the appearance of Llawfrodedd’s epithet ‘Farfog’ as ‘Farchog’: cf. *EWGT* 55 and 62 (§§4 and 54). My knowledge of the textual tradition of Bonedd y Saint is to a large extent indebted to Barry Lewis, to whom I am immensely grateful for his time and assistance in tackling these matters.
from such a sister copy. This makes Λ’s arrangement of *Plant Brychan* all the more interesting. The three Radnorshire texts of *Plant Brychan* all begin with the introductory section on Brychan. Following this, Peniarth 137iii and Peniarth 183ii skip down to Ceingar, just like the copies of Hengwrt 33. Harley 4181 skips a little further still, to Gwawrddyd, because corrupt versions of the items on Ceingar and the following sister Golau have been moved to the end of the list instead. Unlike in the Hengwrt 33 copies, however, the intervening text has not completely disappeared. In the Radnorshire manuscripts, the missing daughters prior to Ceingar have been moved as a block to the end of the list of daughters. The missing sons are found only in Peniarth 137iii, but there they have become separated from the rest of *Plant Brychan* by the intervening text of *Bonedd y Saint* (cf. table 3 below). One cannot help but wonder if the common exemplar of Hengwrt 33 and Λ had become unbound at this point. Perhaps at one stage loose leaves containing the relevant portions of text were arranged out of order, leading to the state of Λ, whilst at another stage the loose leaves had been lost, leading to the state of Hengwrt 33. This idea is speculative, but it cannot simply be a coincidence that the closely related copies of *Plant Brychan* in Hengwrt 33 and Λ both jumped straight from Brychan to Ceingar.

There are two further manuscripts that would appear to contain genealogical texts derived from Hengwrt 33, each of which can tell us something new about the latter. One is NLW 21001B, a composite manuscript containing transcripts made for Edward Lhwyd.

---

31 See the text in Rees, *Lives*, p. 271, §60.
The second part of this manuscript is a transcript made in 1701 of a lost manuscript of William Salesbury (c. 1520–c. 1584), as is made clear on folio 180:

Adskriv o lyvyr ym medhiant M[rs] Wyn o vod ysgelhan A.d. 1701. yr hwn a sgrivennase (hyd yr w[í] yn i vedhw[í]) Wil[m] Salsbri o Lan Rwst ynghylch amser y vrenhines Elsbeth.

A transcript from a book in the possession of Mrs Wyn of Bodysgallen A.D. 1701, which William Salesbury of Llanrwst had written (so I think) around the time of Queen Elizabeth.

The former existence of William Salesbury's manuscript has been recognised for some time thanks to various references to it by Edward Lhwyd and others, but the survival of a full transcript was not appreciated before B. G. Owens brought NLW 21001B to the attention of Peter Bartrum, no later than 1976. Among the contents of NLW 21001Bii are texts of *Plant Brychan* and the material named by Bartrum 'Bonedd y Arwyr' which are very close to the texts in Cardiff 3.77, Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 182. Most persuasively, the version

---

of *Plant Brychan* preserved in NLW 21001Bii begins with *Kynger verch Bryc’han*, just like Cardiff 3.77 and Llanstephan 28.

The particular importance of NLW 21001Bii lies in the textual innovations that it shares with Llanstephan 28. For example, both of them omit Aneirin from the list of the children of Caw of Twrcelyn; both omit Tryderan, Meirchion and Uchno from the list of the children of Egri of Talybolion; and both omit to mention Elidir Lydanwyn as son of Meirchion ap Gorwst. However, individual errors in Llanstephan 28 show that William Salesbury cannot have copied his text directly from that manuscript. These features suggest that neither Llanstephan 28 nor NLW 21001Bii derive directly from Hengwrt 33; instead, both manuscripts derive from the same lost intermediary manuscript, which itself derived from Hengwrt 33.

The other new witness to the genealogical contents of Hengwrt 33 is Cardiff Central Library 2.108. This manuscript contains a single page (33r) of *Bonedd y Saint* transcribed from Hengwrt 33, as may be concluded from the title at the top of the page:


From a very old vellum manuscript codex called Hanesyn Hên.

The significance of the transcript lies, however, in the identity of the scribe. Cardiff 2.108 was written by Richard Thomas (d. 1780), as stated on folio 1r.\(^{33}\) Richard Thomas is

\(^{33}\) See William Llewelyn Davies, ‘Thomas, Richard (1753–1780)’, in *The Dictionary of Welsh Biography down to 1940, under the auspices of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, ed. John Edward Lloyd,
notorious for removing important medieval manuscripts from major libraries and never returning them. Most notably, he was responsible for the removal of the Hendregadredd manuscript, NLW 6680B, from the Hengwrt library, during his visit in 1778. While at Hengwrt in 1778, he evidently saw Hengwrt 33; although the beginning of Cardiff 2.108 contains the date 1775, it is likely that the transcript of Hengwrt 33 was not made until he obtained permission to use the Hengwrt library three years later. It is reasonably probable that he was responsible for the removal of that manuscript from the collection. It was certainly missing by 1806, as the Hengwrt cataloguer Richard Llwyd reports in a letter written to William Owen Pughe in that year. The date 1775 probably refers to the time at which Thomas saw the first manuscript that he copied into Cardiff 2.108, now Rylands Welsh 1. This was also the year in which Thomas graduated from Oxford with a BA. Rylands Welsh 1 seems to have remained in Oxford after Thomas’s death, because there appears on folio 66r a note that reads ‘J. Price Trin. Coll. Oxon’; this is John Price, the Welshman who was the Bodley librarian from 1768 until his death in 1813. John Price only moved to Trinity College in June 1789, so it is likely that he annotated the manuscript on or after that date.


See BL Add. 15031, f. 128; Huws, Repertory, s. ‘NLW 6680B’ and ‘Thomas, Richard (1753–80)’.

Richard Thomas describes his experience in the Hengwrt library in a letter to Owen Jones (Owain Myfyr), written in Peniarth on 17th May 1778 and printed in Handlist, i, p. ix.

The letter is preserved in NLW 13224B, p. 385.


A reasonable picture of the genealogical contents of Hengwrt 33 can be built upon the evidence of the derivative copies, particularly those of John Jones and Huw Pennant in Cardiff 3.77 and Peniarth 182, which were probably direct copies. It is clear that the genealogical sections of Hengwrt 33 all stem from the same corpus of early thirteenth-century material that is found so frequently in Welsh genealogical manuscripts of the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries. Since this corpus of material is associated particularly with the reign of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, prince of Gwynedd (d. 1240), I refer to it as the ‘Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies’. This genealogical collection encompasses the texts edited separately by Bartrum under his titles ‘Plant Brychan’, ‘Bonedd yr Arwyr’, ‘Achau Brenhinoedd a Thywysogion Cymru’, and ‘Hen Lwythau Gwynedd a’r Mars’.\(^\text{39}\) I treat the textual tradition of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies at length elsewhere, but a short summary of the conclusions from this study is pertinent for the current examination of Hengwrt 33.\(^\text{40}\) The textual tradition of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies divides into two main branches, which I call the ‘X-branch’ and the ‘Y-branch’. The X-branch features Hengwrt 33, initially called ‘X’ by Bartrum, while the Y-branch features Bartrum’s lost ‘Y’ manuscript, copied by John Jones into Cardiff 3.77, pp. 32–100.\(^\text{41}\)

[INSERT Figure 1: The X-branch of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth Genealogies]

\(^{39}\) EWGT 75–120.
\(^{40}\) The textual tradition is fully explored in my PhD thesis, entitled ‘Medieval Welsh Genealogy: Texts, Contexts and Transmission’.
So far we have discussed five manuscripts that descend, directly or indirectly, from Hengwrt 33, and a further three that stem from a sister copy (Λ). The suggested relationships between these manuscripts are shown in figure 1. It is instructive to consider all of the contents of these manuscripts that might be related to the contents of Hengwrt 33. In the following two tables I list all of the related contents, firstly of the five manuscripts that derive from Hengwrt 33, and secondly of the three manuscripts descended from Λ. For ease of comparison, the terms used to describe the texts do not stray far from the terms used by William Maurice to describe the contents of Hengwrt 33 in 1658.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derived from Hengwrt 33</th>
<th>Pages/fols</th>
<th>Related Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llanstephan 28</td>
<td>69–75</td>
<td>Bonedd y Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gutun Owain, 1456[?])</td>
<td>75–80</td>
<td>Plant Brychan etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80–86</td>
<td>Ach Llywelyn ab Iorwerth etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86–92</td>
<td>O Oes Gwrtheyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92–94</td>
<td>Cronicl byr yn dechrau yn oes Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94–96</td>
<td>Enwau Brenhinedd y Brytaniaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peniarth 182</td>
<td>13–21</td>
<td>Ach Llywelyn ab Iorwerth etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Huw Pennant, 1509 × 1513)</td>
<td>22–24</td>
<td>Plant Brychan etc. (part 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24–34</td>
<td>O Oes Gwrtheyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34–37</td>
<td>Cronicl byr yn dechrau yn oes Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Bonedd y Saint (frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39–41</td>
<td>Plant Brychan etc. (part 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to Hengwrt 33</td>
<td>Pages/fols</td>
<td>Related Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peniarth 183ii</td>
<td>259–266</td>
<td>Bonedd y Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(William Dyfi, 1586)</td>
<td>266–268</td>
<td>Plant Brychan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268–272</td>
<td>O Oes Gwrtheyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley 4181</td>
<td>25r &amp; 26r–27r</td>
<td>Bonedd y Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hugh Thomas, 1710)</td>
<td>25r–26r</td>
<td>Plant Brychan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peniarth 137iii</td>
<td>194–195</td>
<td>O Oes Gwrtheyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s. xvi²)</td>
<td>195–197</td>
<td>Cronicl byr yn dechrau yn oes Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197–198</td>
<td>Plant Brychan (sons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The contents of Hengwrt 33’s descendants that also appeared in Hengwrt 33
Table 3: The contents of A's descendants that also appeared in Hengwrt 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>199–204</th>
<th>Bonedd y Saint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Plant Brychan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be clear that, in most of the copies and relatives of Hengwrt 33, the order of the texts has been somewhat altered. Considering the contents lists printed in table 1, Llanstephan 28 would appear to be the only copy preserving the correct order. The order of texts in Llanstephan 28 agrees with Edward Lhwyd's 1696 catalogue against William Maurice in placing *O Oes Gwrtheyn* and the king-list either side of the *Cronicl byr*, and since this ordering is found too in Cwrtmawr 453, another copy of Hengwrt 33 discussed below, it would appear that the 1696 catalogue preserves the original order of the manuscript more faithfully than the Wynnstay 10 copy of the 1658 catalogue. The misplacement of *O Oes Gwrtheyrn* in Wynnstay 10 also had the effect of separating the two items labelled ‘Plant Brychann, a llawer o bethau Achawl (neu Geneologiol)’ and ‘Llyfr Bonedd’. If these two ‘items’ followed on immediately from each other in Hengwrt 33, however, there is no need to decide which sections of the genealogical material should be assigned to each heading. The two titles probably reflect William Maurice’s own perceived division of the material edited as §§1–10 of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies in the appendix to this article.

One interesting feature of tables 2 and 3 above is the appearance of *Llyfr Theophrastes* in Peniarth 182. This is a Welsh translation of a tract allegedly composed

---

42 Bartrum came to the same conclusion: ‘Achau’, 204.
43 EWGT 75.
by the philosopher Theophrastus, a pupil of Aristotle, preserved in Latin translation in Jerome’s *Adversus Jovinianum*. The tract argued that a wise man should avoid marriage to a woman. From the twelfth century onwards, thanks to the authority of Jerome, Theophrastus’s tract became widely known in the Latin West. Nevertheless, only two other vernacular translations survive from the period: an Italian translation, which appears in two fifteenth-century Italian manuscripts, and a Czech translation, published in print in 1509. The *Welsh* translation is a third, and it clearly existed as early as the time at which Hengwrt 33 was written.

The appearances of *Englynion Duad* in *NLW 21001Bii*, of *O Oes Gwrtheyrn* in Llanstephan 28, Peniarth 182, Peniarth 183ii and Peniarth 137iii and of *Cronicl byr yn dechrau yn oes Arthur* in Llanstephan 28, Peniarth 182 and Peniarth 137iii are equally notable, and these are dealt with more fully in the next two sections.

**Poetry**

---


48 Chotzen claimed that Huw Pennant had translated the work (‘La “Querelle des Femmes”’, 46), but this is based solely on the presence of Pennant’s signature at the bottom of the final page of the text. Pennant signed his name in a number of other places in the manuscript, regardless of which texts were present at those points (e.g. pp. 38, 41 and 45), and so no inference should be drawn from the presence of his signature in association with *Llyfr Theophrastes*. 
According to Maurice’s catalogue, Hengwr 33 contained several poetic texts. One was the prophetic poem *Anrheg Urien*, the earliest extant copies of which are found in the White Book of Rhydderch and Red Book of Hergest.\(^{49}\) Another was attributed to Taliesin and named *Marwnad Iago mab Beli*, presumably an elegy for the early seventh-century king of Gwynedd of that name.\(^{50}\) Marged Haycock has suggested that this may have been a version of the prophetic poem *Dygogan Awen*, found in the Book of Taliesin, which refers to the death of a Iago ap Beli.\(^{51}\) A third poem, referred to in *Wynnystay 10* as *Gwaith Merddyn yw Barchell*, may have been a version of the *Oianau*, one of the Myrddin poems found in the Black Book of Carmarthen.\(^{52}\) A fourth, absent from the list in *Wynnystay 10* but present in Lhwyd’s 1696 catalogue, was an awdl by the bard Adda Fras. Later poetic references to Adda Fras portray him as a master poet and composer of prophecies.\(^{53}\) The evidence for his floruit is unclear, but he seems to have lived at some point between the mid-thirteenth and mid-fourteenth centuries.\(^{54}\)

The reference in Lhwyd’s catalogue to an awdl of Adda Fras having been present in Hengwr 33 can help to certify the claim that a fifth poetic text in the manuscript,

---


\(^{50}\) According to the Harleian chronicle (the ‘A-text’ of *Annales Cambriae*), Iago ap Beli died about 613: Egerton Phillimore, ‘The *Annales Cambriae* and the Old-Welsh Genealogies from *Harleian MS. 3859*’, *Cy* 9 (1888), 141–83 (156).


Englynion Duad, has survived in extant copies. Englynion Duad refers to a series of five gnomic and religious poems, of which the first was edited by Jackson (as ‘Bidiau II’), the remaining four by Jenny Rowland, and the fourth on two further occasions by Nicholas Jacobs. Jackson was aware of three copies of this material, in NLW Peniarth 102, part i (John Davies, s. xvii), NLW 1983B (c. 1758; ‘Panton 14’), and BL Add. 14873 (William Morris, 1739–60), each of which derived, he suggested, from a lost manuscript written by Dr John Davies of Mallwyd. The situation was clarified a little by Rowland, who has been followed in this respect by Jacobs. Rowland identified another independent copy of the text, found in BL Add. 31055 (Thomas Wiliems, 1591–96), and also deduced that the copies in NLW 1983B and BL Add. 14873 actually derive from a second extant copy made by John Davies, interleaved into NLW 4973B, his Liber B (c. 1620–34) (see figure 2). Further related material is found in three other manuscripts, namely the Red Book of Hergest (Oxford, Jesus College 111), Oxford, Jesus College 20 and Peniarth 27, part ii, but since this material lacks the exactness in textual correspondence that is displayed by the copies previously mentioned, they do not enter the discussion here.

Rowland asserted that ‘the source of Davies’ copy can be identified with a great deal of certainty as the lost Hengwrt 33’. The statement is not accompanied by any particular

56 Jackson, Poetry, pp. 9–12. For Peniarth 102i, see Daniel Huws, ‘John Davies and his Manuscripts’, in Dr John Davies of Mallwyd: Welsh Renaissance Scholar, ed. Ceri Davies (Cardiff, 2004), pp. 88–120 (p. 113).
57 Rowland, ‘Englynion Duad’, 59–60. Since Jackson did not use Thomas Wiliems’ copy, variants from BL Add. 31055 for Bidiau II are printed in ibid., 70.
58 For recent consideration of the variation between all these copies, see Jacobs, ‘Englynion’, 73–5.
argument beyond the observation that two of the items attributed to Hengwrt 33 in the Wynnystay 10 catalogue are Englynion Duad and Duad. It is, nonetheless, supported by a few additional factors. In Peniarth 102i, John Davies claims that all of the poetry in his part of the manuscript (pages 1–16), including Englynion Duad, had been copied allan o hen lyfr ar fe[mrwn], ‘out of an old book of vellum’.\(^{60}\) Since Davies was a frequent user of Robert Vaughan’s library at Hengwrt, it is reasonable to suggest that the old book of vellum in question was Hengwrt 33.\(^{61}\) Davies’ statement would seem not only to encompass the various poems comprising Englynion Duad, but also another poetic text which follows them: a stray awdl by Adda Fras, concerning the events of judgement day. It is known from Lhwyd’s 1696 catalogue entry that just such a stray awdl appeared in Hengwrt 33. This strengthens the argument that the hen lyfr ar fe[mrwn] should be equated with Hengwrt 33.

The additional copy of Englynion Duad found in NLW 21001Bii, the copy of William Salesbury’s lost manuscript, as delineated in table 2 above, clarifies the scenario in a number of ways (cf. figure 2). Firstly, since it can be demonstrated that some of the genealogical texts in NLW 21001Bii derive from Hengwrt 33, it is very likely that its text of Englynion Duad does too. Secondly, the version of Englynion Duad in NLW 21001Bii is very closely related to Thomas Wiliems’ copy in BL Add. 31055, both of them sharing idiosyncrasies and defects that are absent from John Davies’ copies. For example, both texts

\(^{60}\) The rest of the text is obscured due to damage to the corner of the page, but a similar heading is given in NLW 4973B: allan o hen lyfr arall ar femrwn fel hyn, ‘out of another old book, as follows’: Rowland, ‘Englynion Duad’, 60.

\(^{61}\) For Davies’s use of Robert Vaughan’s library, see Huws, ‘John Davies’, p. 90. For Robert Vaughan’s tribute to John Davies upon the latter’s death, see Rhiannon Francis Roberts, ‘Dr John Davies of Mallwyd: A Biographical Survey’, in Dr John Davies, pp. 17–59 (p. 58).
end prematurely at the same place, half way through a stanza.62 This should be considered alongside Rowland’s observation that the appearance of the form Deo for Duw in BL Add. 31055 indicates that Wiliems’ copy derives from ‘an intermediate copy by William Salesbury or his school’.63 The use of Latinate Deo for Duw is a peculiar feature of Salesbury’s Welsh writing.64 The presence in the BL Add. 31055 copy of Camberaen for Gymraeg, another of William Salesbury’s forms, argues for the same thing.65 Both of these features are, needless to say, present in NLW 21001Bii, leading one to conclude that Thomas Wiliems’ copy of Englynion Duad was, like the copy in NLW 21001Bii, taken from the lost book of William Salesbury, which itself contained texts ultimately derived from Hengwrt 33.

[INSERT Figure 2: The suggested relationships between the witnesses to Englynion Duad]

If the copies of Englynion Duad in Peniarth 102i, BL Add. 31055 and NLW 21001Bii all derive from Hengwrt 33, the independent status of the partial copy in Liber B is put into question. Liber B contains only the first fourteen stanzas, those labelled ‘Bidiau II’ by Jackson. The text is virtually identical to that of Peniarth 102i. It is indeed possible that the Liber B text was copied from Peniarth 102i, rather than directly from Hengwrt

33. Only two small details point either way, neither conclusively. At 3c, Liber B has *deueiriawg* (‘deceitful’) and Peniarth 102i has *daueiriawc*, against *edeveiriawc* in BL Add. 31055 and NLW 21001Bii and *deueiry梭c* in the Red Book. Liber B preserves an older spelling than Peniarth 102i, although John Davies, if he did take the Liber B copy from Peniarth 102i, might have corrected what he knew to be his own accidental modernisation.

At 14c, both of Davies’ copies, probably incorrectly, have *cost* for *tost*, the latter being the reading of BL Add. 31055, NLW 21001Bii and Jesus 20. Either this error was copied from Peniarth 102i, Davies’ full copy of Englynion Duad, to his partial copy in Liber B, or else he made the same simple mistake while copying Hengwr 33 on two separate occasions.

_Chronicles_

Hengwr 33 apparently contained two chronicles. One was the vernacular chronicle known as _O Oes Gwrtheyrn_. This text is found in Peniarth 182 and Llanstephan 28, two derivatives of Hengwr 33, as shown in tables 2 and 3 above. It also appears in Peniarth 137iii and Peniarth 187ii, two descendants of Λ, and so must have been transmitted along the same channels as the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies. The other chronicle is listed in Wynnstey 10 as _Chronicl byrr yn dechreu yn Oes Arthur, Pan las Arthur_, ‘A short chronicle starting in the age of Arthur, when Arthur was killed’. This is undoubtedly the short chronicle called ‘_Oed yr Arglwydd_’ by Owain Wyn Jones, which follows directly on

---

from *O Oes Gwrtheyrn* in Peniarth 182, Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 137iii. The first line of this text, as printed in the appendix to this article, is *Oyd ar Arglwyd pan las Arthur yg gad Gamlan: pim cant a deugeint mlined oed y oyd,* ‘The age of the Lord when Arthur was killed in the battle of Camlan: five hundred and forty years was his age’. Maurice seems to have attempted to identify the chronicle by printing a few words (‘*pan las Arthur*’) from its first line.

The only serious attempt to study the manuscript tradition of *O Oes Gwrtheyrn* was made by Owain Wyn Jones in his 2013 doctoral thesis. Jones identified fifteen copies or partial copies of the text, of which seven derive from other extant copies. The remaining witnesses resolve themselves into two groups, belonging to two separate branches of the textual tradition. One of these two branches includes Llanstephan 28 and Peniarth 182. It is more than reasonable to assume that the texts of *O Oes Gwrtheyrn* in both of these manuscripts derive from Hengwrt 33. Jones notes that Peniarth 182, the later manuscript, cannot derive from Llanstephan 28. The latter contains a text that has been subject to numerous shortenings and omissions, of a piece with the treatment of the genealogical texts copied into the same manuscript.

The picture is complicated by two further witnesses that Jones identifies as members of the same branch. These witnesses are NLW Peniarth 135, a composite manuscript

---

70 See the stemma in Jones, ‘Historical Writing’, p. 298.
71 Ibid., p. 296.
written by Gruffudd Hiraethog and other contemporaries between 1556 and 1564 (\textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn} on pages 66–71 in the hand of Gruffudd Hiraethog), and NLW Cwrtmawr 453, pages 9–24, written by Robert Vaughan between \textit{c.} 1615 and 1630.\textsuperscript{72} Jones argues that Peniarth 135 derives from the same common source as Peniarth 182 and Llanstephan 28. Since we know this source to be Hengwrt 33, it would appear that Gruffudd Hiraethog had access to the latter. Jones positions Peniarth 135 on his stemma slightly closer to Peniarth 182 than to Llanstephan 28, though it would appear that the evidence quoted for this arrangement is indicative of the idiosyncrasy of Llanstephan 28 rather than the shared innovation of Peniarth 135 and Peniarth 182. The text of \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn} in Peniarth 135 would appear then to be an independent copy of the text in Hengwrt 33.

Cwrtmawr 453 exhibits a more complex copy of \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn}, as Jones explains.\textsuperscript{73} Robert Vaughan prefaces his copy with the following statement:

\begin{quote}
Allan o hen llyvrae memrwm wedi eu scrivennu ers gwell no .300. mlynedh y cawd y cofion hynn.
\end{quote}

These records were taken out of old vellum books written more than 300 years ago.

According to Jones, Vaughan has attempted to combine two texts of \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn}, one taken from each branch of the textual tradition. One of these copies was close to the derivatives of Hengwrt 33, but further precision is made impossible by the act of textual

\textsuperscript{72} For Peniarth 135, see Bartrum, ‘Further Notes’, 109.
\textsuperscript{73} Jones, ‘Historical Writing’, p. 297.
conflation. However, Vaughan also copied two other texts into this part of Cwrtmawr 453, which he did not attempt to conflate. The first was the short chronicle *Oed yr Arglwydd*, prefaced by the statement that: *Allan o vn or llyfrae dywededic vchod y cawd hyn sydh yn calyn [sic]*74, ‘that which follows was taken out of one of the books mentioned above’. The second was a list of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s kings of Britain: *or vn llyfr y cawd hyn*, ‘this was taken from the same book’. Each of these texts, like *O Oes Gwrtheyrn*, is found in Hengwrt 33. What is more, comparison with the copies of these texts in Llanstephan 28, Peniarth 182 and, for the king-list, Cardiff 3.77, shows that the Cwrtmawr 453 texts derive from the common source. Hengwrt 33 was evidently one of Vaughan’s *Illyvae memrwm wedi eu scrivennu ers gwellyn no .300. mlynedh*, showing that Vaughan had probably acquired the manuscript for his library by 1630. Vaughan’s copies of these texts are particularly useful because of the care that he took to preserve the form of his exemplar. For this reason, Cwrtmawr 453 is used as the base text for the versions of *Oed yr Arglwydd* and the king-list edited in the appendix to this article.

**Date and Provenance**

The only previous attempt to estimate the date of Hengwrt 33 was made by Peter Bartrum.75 Bartrum based his opinion on John Jones’ suggestion that the manuscript dated to 400 years before 1640, namely to c. 1240. Bartrum pointed out that Jones placed

---

74 Cf. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*, s.v. calynaf.
75 *EWGT* 76. Nesta Lloyd expressed scepticism about Bartrum’s methodology: ‘History of Welsh Scholarship’, p. 155.
Peniarth 16vi, a fragment of the late thirteenth-century Dingestow manuscript, about 600 years before his own time, and so went on to suggest that, if Jones had overestimated the date of Hengwrt 33 by the same proportion, the latter manuscript should date to c. 1400. In my opinion, what this information actually tells us is that John Jones was not a reliable judge of manuscript date. Robert Vaughan, on the other hand, who guessed that the manuscript was written just over 300 years before his own time, may not have been too far wide of the mark.

Valuable testimony to the manuscript’s date is provided by the chronicle text *Oed yr Arglwydd*. The final item in this chronicle is the death of Edward I and accession of Edward II in 1307. This is the only good and reliable evidence for the *terminus post quem* of Hengwrt 33. Moreover, the fact that the chronicle is not continued further than 1307 might suggest that Hengwrt 33 was not written too much later than that date, though this argument cannot be pushed too far.

An early fourteenth century date is suggested by another plank of evidence: the orthography of Hengwrt 33’s copies. Of these copies, only John Jones’ Cardiff 3.77 and Robert Vaughan’s Cwrtmawr 453 make any attempt to preserve the medieval orthography of their exemplar. Cardiff 3.77 is particularly useful. John Jones’ orthographical habits in this manuscript are readily discernible through a comparison between his copied texts and those of his exemplars that survive. Two such exemplars are Peniarth 16vi, the detached portion of the Dingestow manuscript, and Peniarth 27ii, the texts of *Bonedd y Saint* in each of which were copied by John Jones into Cardiff 3.77.\(^{76}\) A comparison between these

---

\(^{76}\) See above, p. ???, n. 13. For the orthography of Peniarth 16vi, see Russell, ‘What did Medieval Welsh Scribes do?’, 94–6.
two manuscripts and Cardiff 3.77 shows that John Jones might change any aspect of the orthography of his exemplar, but that he does so far more frequently and consistently with consonants than with vowels. For example, he regularly changes initial c for /k/ to k; internal and final c for /g/ to g; and ll for /ɬ/ to ṭ or l. He also invariably changes the fricative spellings ch for /χ/ and th for /θ/ to c and t respectively.\(^{77}\) Spellings of vowels, on the other hand, whilst occasionally modernised, are often left as they are in his exemplars. This makes particularly striking the prevalence of spellings in y in Cardiff 3.77’s copy of the genealogical sections of Hengwrt 33. For example, of the 116 occurrences of the diphthong /eɨ/, 28 of them (24%) use the spelling ey rather than ei.\(^{78}\) This is especially notable because Cardiff 3.77’s copy of Peniarth 27ii shows that Jones might update spellings in ey to ei, as with ymeysyn, copied as yMeisyn into Cardiff 3.77. It is reasonable to assume that in Hengwrt 33 itself, within the relevant portion of text, the relative proportion of spellings in ey to spellings in ei was actually greater than 24%. Cardiff 3.77’s copy of Hengwrt 33 also displays occasional instances of y used for /i/, /ɨ/ and /i̯/, as in Vendygeyd, Heylyn and Ledyeyṭ. Spellings such as these are particularly characteristic of the Welsh manuscripts of North Wales written in the second half of the thirteenth century.\(^{79}\) The orthographical systems of such manuscripts has been described as ‘i-shy’, because they exhibit a marked preference for spellings in y over spellings in i, particularly

---

\(^{77}\) See too the introduction to the appendix of this article.

\(^{78}\) The following were excluded from the analysis: Keynweyn (second syllable), Kyndyyrn, mibion, Rydyrn, Endyrrn, Deynllug (twice), Geneilles, gwraig, Kadeyrn, Gwrthyrn, Rydeyrn, Endeyrn, Gorthyyrn.

when compared with the more balanced use of the two letters in the fourteenth century. Perhaps this suggests that the date of Hengwrt 33 cannot be pushed too far beyond the _terminus post quem_ of 1307, and that it might belong to North rather than South Wales. A difficulty is that the only useful example of a contemporary vernacular manuscript from South Wales is the Black Book of Carmarthen, the spelling system of which might not be typical of the south during that period. For this reason it is not possible to ascertain if the spelling system witnessed in northern manuscripts of the thirteenth century, and perhaps at one time in Hengwrt 33, was used more widely elsewhere in Wales during the thirteenth century.

Other noteworthy features of the orthography of Cardiff 3.77’s copy of Hengwrt 33 include the occasional use of _e_ for /ə/ and _t_ for final /ð/ (e.g. _Kenedyr, Lantewyn, e, err, Gweurdyt, Nefyt, Rut_). _e_ for /ə/ was not unknown in the fourteenth century, when _y_ for /ə/ prevailed, though it was far more common in the thirteenth century. _t_ for final /ð/, on the other hand, was never common, though was used occasionally in both the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Given the 1307 _terminus post quem_, any fourteenth-century comparisons might prove to be more informative than earlier ones. Of particular significance are the orthographical correspondences with Peniarth 20, a manuscript written in the Cistercian abbey of Valle Crucis in the north-east of Wales in the years

---

82 Ibid., 433.
around 1330. Hand B of Peniarth 20 in particular displays many of the same spelling characteristics of Cardiff 3.77’s copy of Hengwrt 33: frequent use of ey for /eɪ/; occasional use of t for final /-ð/; and, perhaps most strikingly of all in a fourteenth-century manuscript, relatively frequent use of e alongside y for /ə/. Hengwrt 33 would fit comfortably into the milieu of Peniarth 20; indeed, an association with Valle Crucis itself may not be too far wrong.

Many features of the contents of Hengwrt 33 point towards a Cistercian origin for the manuscript. In particular, a number of the texts seem to have been composed in Aberconwy Abbey. Owain Wyn Jones has argued convincingly that Aberconwy was the centre responsible for the composition of O Oes Gwrtheyrn, a text which was last revised in c. 1265. Likewise, it would appear that the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies were produced in Aberconwy Abbey between 1216 and 1223, as I argue at length elsewhere. According to both Tudur Aled and Guto’r Glyn, Adda Fras, the only named poet whose work was included in the manuscript, was buried at Maenan, the site to which Aberconwy Abbey was moved following Edward’s conquest of Gwynedd in 1282.

---

85 Jones, ‘Historical Writing’, pp. 298–301.
86 Guy, ‘Medieval Welsh Genealogy’.
A significant part of the contents of the manuscript seems to have derived from Aberconwy, but it does not necessarily follow that the manuscript itself was written there. When the whereabouts of the manuscript begin to be discernible, through the copies of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it is located in the north-east of Wales. The earliest derivative is that of Gutun Owain in Llanstephan 28, which, given the evidence of NLW 21001Bii, seems to have been copied at one stage removed from Hengwrt 33. It is well-known that Gutun Owain maintained strong links with Valle Crucis Abbey, where his uncle Siôn ap Rhisiart was abbot.\(^{88}\) He may too have been associated with the Cistercian abbey of Basingwerk, as evidenced by his role as the second scribe of the Black Book of Basingwerk, although, considering the use made of Peniarth 20 in the compilation of the version of *Brenhinedd y Saesson* in that manuscript, it is possible that the Black Book of Basingwerk was written in Valle Crucis.\(^{89}\) Basingwerk may have been where Huw Pennant, the scribe of Peniarth 182, worked, whose brother or uncle Thomas Pennant (d. 1522) became abbot of Basingwerk in 1481.\(^{90}\) Thomas Pennant may also have been

---


\(^{90}\) Matonis, ‘Gutun Owain’, 164; Lloyd-Morgan, ‘Manuscripts’, p. 215. For the question of the relationship between Huw Pennant and Thomas Pennant, see Jane Cartwright, ‘The Middle Welsh Life of St Ursula
associated with education at Valle Crucis in the second half of the fifteenth century, perhaps as a student.\footnote{David Thomson, ‘Cistercians and Schools in Late Medieval Wales’, \textit{Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies}, 3 (1982), 76–80.}

Hengwrt 33’s association with the Cistercian abbeys of the north east, and particularly with Valle Crucis, may well predate the fifteenth century. Two texts in the manuscript show particular links to Valle Crucis. One is the short chronicle text \textit{Oed yr Arglwydd}. This text is formed of a series of brief chronological notices extending from the death of Arthur in 540 to the death of Edward I in 1307, but focussing particularly on Welsh political events in the middle decades of the thirteenth century. The first few items are stock events in Welsh chronicles, such as Cadwaladr’s journey to Rome and the death of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, while others are stock events of a broader British significance, such as the arrival of the Normans in Britain in 1066 and the death of Thomas Becket in 1171. The Cistercians find a place among these miscellaneous records, with their apparent ‘foundation’ being recorded under 1126.

Carreghosa castle (near Llanymynech in Powys) in 1257\(^93\) and the destruction of Hawarden castle on 26th September 1265; the latter event is only otherwise recorded in the Annals of Waverley and \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn}, without an exact date.\(^94\) Among obituaries, some are of general significance for North Wales, such as the deaths of Gruffudd ap Llywelyn (1244) and Dafydd ap Llywelyn (1246), whilst some have a greater local significance for the area of Valle Crucis, such as the deaths of Madog ap Gruffudd Maelor, founder of Valle Crucis, in 1236;\(^95\) his son Hywel ap Madog in 1268, a unique notice among Welsh records;\(^96\) and John de Warenne, earl of Surrey and, more importantly in the present connection, lord of Bromfield and Yale, in 1304.\(^97\) Cumulatively, given the otherwise sparse nature of the chronicle, these notices suggest that \textit{Oed yr Arglwydd} may have been constructed, using various sources, in Valle Crucis itself, sometime after 1307.

One of \textit{Oed yr Arglwydd}s sources would appear to have been \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn}. The two chronicles share a number of items in common, particularly for the section of \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn} covering the middle decades of the thirteenth century.\(^98\) Most striking,

\(^93\) The text reads \textit{mccxlvii}, or 1247, but, since the event is associated with the battle of Cymerau, 1257 must have been intended. Presumably an \textit{x} was omitted at some point while copying the numeral. The most substantial account of the battle of Cymerau is found in the Breviate chronicle (the ‘B-text’ of the \textit{Annales Cambriae}): \textit{Annales Cambriae, the B Text, from London, National Archives, MS E164/1, pp. 2–26}, ed. Henry Gough–Cooper (2015), pp. 82–3 <http://croniclau.bangor.ac.uk/editions.php> [accessed 15 March 2016]; cf. Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, pp. 98–9; Lloyd, \textit{History}, ii, pp. 720–1.

\(^94\) \textit{Annales Monastici, volume 2: Annales monasterii de Wintonia (AD 519–1277), Annales monasterii de Waverlei (AD 1–1291)}, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London, 1865), p. 366; Jones, ‘Historical Writing’, pp. 414 (line 95), 420 and 429; Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, p. 172; Lloyd, \textit{History}, ii, p. 738. Note that, whereas Cwrtnawr 453 reads \textit{vi kl’ Obtob’}; Peniarth 182 reads \textit{öi kl’ o öis tachwedd}, dating the event a month later. It is more likely that the Latinate date in Cwrtnawr 453 reflects the reading of Hengwrt 33. This is supported by Peniarth 137iii, which agrees with Cwrtnawr 453.

\(^95\) The text has \textit{mccxxiv}, or 1235; presumably a minim has been lost from the end of the numeral.


\(^98\) Jones, ‘Historical Writing’, p. 414, lines 87–95.
however, is the chronology of the first three items in *Oed yr Arglwydd*: the battle of Camlan in 540, Cadwaladr’s journey to Rome in 653, and the rule of Offa in 781. The dates, particularly the latter two, are certainly unorthodox. Nevertheless, they were clearly calculated using the relative chronology provided by *O Oes Gwrtheyrn*, taking as a starting point the battle of Camlan in 540, a date close to that suggested by various Welsh Latin chronicles.99

The second text linked to Valle Crucis is the particular version of *Bonedd y Saint* that was included in Hengwrt 33. This text is best preserved in Peniarth 182, since the text in Llanstephan 28 has been altered in various ways, whilst the text in NLW 21001Bii has seen a degree of conflation.100 Related versions also appear in Peniarth 137iii, Peniarth 183ii and Harley 4181, the descendants of Λ. The same version was evidently present in the archetype of the extant manuscripts of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, for it is found in the copy of Y in Cardiff 3.77, the principal witness to the ‘Y-branch’ of that textual tradition (see figure 3).

[INSERT Figure 3: *Bonedd y Saint* and *Oed yr Arglwydd* in manuscripts descending from the archetype of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies]


100 My thanks to Barry Lewis again for his advice on these points. The version in Peniarth 182 is known as ‘H’, and the version in Llanstephan 28 as ‘E’: they are edited respectively in Wade-Evans, ‘Bonedd y Saint, F’, 378–84 and *idem*, ‘Bonedd y Saint, E’, 163–70.
In comparison with earlier copies of *Bonedd y Saint*, such as that in NLW Peniarth 45 (s. xiv\(^1\)), the version in Peniarth 182 and Cardiff 3.77 has received a particular group of additions.\(^{101}\) Unfortunately, the version of *Bonedd y Saint* closest to that of the archetype of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, that in Cardiff Central Library 1.363 (s. xiv\(^1\)), is defective at the end, and so one cannot be certain that the additions did not once occur there too.\(^{102}\) Table 4 shows the subjects of these additions, along with their primary cult centres:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint (Cardiff 3.77, p. 39)</th>
<th>Cult centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elfod sant</td>
<td>Abergele(^{103})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saeran</td>
<td>Llanynys(^{104})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keada o Ṛedynvre</td>
<td>Farndon(^{105})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanffreid</td>
<td>Llansantffraid Glyn Ceiriog, Llansantffraid Glyndyfrdwy etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kynhafal sant(^{106})</td>
<td>Llangynhafal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{101}\) For the Peniarth 45 text, see Baring-Gould and Fisher, *Lives*, iv, pp. 371–3. Peniarth 45 is useful in this respect because, unlike some of the other early copies, the manuscript remains legible until the end of the text, which reads *yma y teruyna bonhed seint kymry*, ‘here finishes the lineage of the saints of Wales’.


\(^{104}\) Wade-Evans, ‘Bonedd y Saint, E’, 172, n. 2; *idem*, ‘Bonedd y Saint, F’, 383, n. 5.

\(^{105}\) *EWGT* 144, n. 66; Wade-Evans, ‘Bonedd y Saint, E’, 172, n. 3. The localisation of St Chad in *Redynvre* confirms Melville Richards’ speculation that Rhedynfre was the Welsh name for Farndon during the medieval period: ‘Arthurian Onomastics’, *THSC* (1969), 250–64 (256, n. 21). Chad was also venerated in Hanmer, near Wrexham, and, more significantly, in Lichfield, making him the patron saint of the entire diocese to the east of Valle Crucis.

\(^{106}\) Following *Kynhafal*, Cardiff 3.77 lists *Kadfar* as the beginning of a new item, but, as Bartrum shows, *Kadfar* should be a continuation of the item about *Kynhafal*. *EWGT* 144, n. ‘68 and 69’. The error
Table 4: The additions to the version *Bonedd y Saint* in manuscripts of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies

The cult centres are almost all in the north east of Wales (Farndon being just over the border), and lie in a broad ring around Valle Crucis: Abergele, Llanynys and Llangynhafal to the north west, Farndon to the north east, and Llansanffraed Glyndyfrdwy, Llansantffraid Glyn Ceiriog and Oswestry to the south (see figure 4). Valle Crucis had particular connections with some of them: the church of Llansanffraed Glyndyfrdwy had been appropriated to it; at some point between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries it had acquired fairly extensive lands in the parish of Llansantffraid Glyn Ceiriog; Farndon was some six miles north-east of its extensive manor of Wrexham Abbot; Oswestry was some six miles south of its appropriated church at Chirk and seven miles south of its manor at Halton; and it may have had a grange at Llanynys. All this implies that the lost manuscript of the archetype of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies contained, in addition to a major genealogical text originally composed in Aberconwy, a copy of *Bonedd y Saint* that had received additions focussed on the area of Valle Crucis’s interests. This might suggest that the archetypal manuscript itself was, at some point, associated with

---

107 Following Oswallt, Cardiff 3.77 begins a new item with *Eda Glintur*, but that name should really continue the genealogy of Oswallt, as in Peniarth 182; cf. *EWGT* 144, n. ‘70 and 71; Wade-Evans, ‘Bonedd y Saint, E’, 173, n. 8.

that abbey.\textsuperscript{109} Taken together with the evidence for the composition of \textit{Oed yr Arglwydd} in Valle Crucis, the close correspondence between the orthography of scribe B of Peniarth 20 and the Cardiff 3.77 copy of Hengwrt 33, and the early association of Gutun Owain and Huw Pennant with Hengwrt 33, I would suggest that Hengwrt 33 was written in Valle Crucis, sometime in the first half of the fourteenth century.

\[\text{INSERT Figure 4: A map of the cult centres of the additional saints (circles) in the}\]
\[\text{version of } \textit{Bonedd y Saint} \text{ that accompanies the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, in}\]
\[\text{relation to Valle Crucis and some of its properties (crosses)}\]

It should be emphasised that this tentative conclusion is only made possible by an analysis that takes into account the textual histories of all the various contents of the manuscript: genealogy, poetry and chronicle. Hengwrt 33 has previously only received attention from scholars focussed on a single genre of text, who therefore did not have to hand as many of the pieces of the now fragmentary puzzle as can be discovered. Holistic approaches to manuscript studies and especially textual history may indeed continue to prove to be a useful tool for advancing our understanding of the past. In the case of Hengwrt 33, it may have provided a new \textit{terminus ante quem} for almost every text once found in the manuscript (with the exceptions of \textit{Bonedd y Saint} and the \textit{Oianau}, both occurring in thirteenth-century manuscripts), and it certainly helps to add nuance and

\textsuperscript{109} Wade-Evans suggested that the additions were the work of Gutun Owain, on account of their geographical orientation, but he was not aware of the implication of the presence of the same additions in Peniarth 182 and Cardiff 3.77 as well as in Llanstephan 28: ‘Bonedd y Saint, E’, 161; cf. \textit{EWGT} 78.
complexity to our understanding of the literary world of the Welsh Cistercians during the high and later Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{110}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{110} I would like to thank Paul Russell and Barry Lewis for suggesting improvements to various drafts of this work. I would also like to thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for generously supporting me during the period of research for this article.
APPENDIX: TEXTS FROM HENGWRT 33

Below is an attempt to edit a series of texts deriving from Hengwrt 33. These include various sections of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, an awdl by Adda Fras, a short chronicle called *Oed yr Arglwydd*, and a list of kings taken from *Brut y Brenhinedd*. Neither the Adda Fras awdl nor *Oed yr Arglwydd* have appeared in print before, whilst Hengwrt 33’s genealogies and king-list have only appeared as part of Bartrum’s conflated editions of the relevant texts.¹ The titles of the texts are taken from the item entries of either the 1658 catalogue or the 1696 catalogue, as listed at the beginning of the article. Following the titles in the headings are the manuscripts used for the base texts. The awdl by Adda Fras, taken from Peniarth 102, is a relatively straightforward transcription, requiring little additional editorial comment. The editing method for the genealogies, chronicle and king-list is more complex, due both to the peculiarities of John Jones’ orthographic system and to the necessity to include more extensive variants from other manuscripts.

As is well known, John Jones used a peculiar system of dotting to write Welsh.² The dots would be cumbersome in a modern edition, not least because they can be so easily forgotten or ignored. Since the purpose of the present edition it to reconstruct texts in Hengwrt 33, it has been thought best to interpret Jones’ orthography in light of what we know about the norms of medieval Welsh orthography, compared with Jones’ treatment of those norms in his other transcriptions. Some of his dots signify that he has

¹ *EWGT* 75–120.
changed the medieval orthography of his exemplar in a predictable way, and these dotted letters have been transcribed as follows: \( \varepsilon = ch, \, \breve{p} = ph, \, \breve{t} = th, \, \breve{u} = w \). Other dots were usually added by Jones to clarify the phoneme indicated by particular letters, without any basis in the medieval orthography, and these dots have been ignored: \( \breve{d} \, \breve{e} \, \breve{g} \, \breve{k} \, \breve{o} \, \breve{r} \, \breve{y} \). Most confusing of all is his system of using \( \breve{l} = /l/ \) and \( l = /ɬ/ \), since he frequently neglected to add the dot where the \( l \) should stand for \( /l/ \), spelt \( l \) in modern Welsh. In the edition below, \( l \) is usually transcribed as \( l \) and \( l \) as \( ll \), but instances in which undotted \( l \) clearly stands for \( /l/ \) have been transcribed with an italicised \( l \). This has been done so as to avoid an overabundance of \( ll \) for \( /l/ \), which would look absurd in the Welsh of any period. Overall, this approach to John Jones’ orthography should hopefully result in a text which is both more accessible to readers and a closer approximation to Hengwrt 33’s orthography than a literal transcription of Cardiff 3.77 would have been, but one which does not impose upon the text any orthographical feature that is not somehow indicated by John Jones.

The following sigla are used for the variants in the footnotes:\(^3\)

B: Cardiff Central Library 3.77, pp. 1–22 (John Jones, 1640).
D: NLW Llanstephan 28, pp. 75–86 and 94–6 (Gutun Owain, 1456[?]).

\(^3\) The sigla ABD follow Bartrum’s usage in *EWGT* 78–9.
B has been used as the base text for the genealogical sections, with variants provided by ADS, generally quoted in that order. V has been used as the base text for Oed yr Arglwydd, with variants from AD, and for the king-list, with variants from BAD. If a reading in any of the supporting witnesses has been judged more likely to represent the reading of Hengwrt 33 than the corresponding reading in the base text, then that reading appears in the main text in italics and the reading of the base text is given in the footnotes. The variants are designed to provide a comprehensive indication of the contents of the supporting witnesses. Common variations of orthography have been ignored, as have common variations of popular names, such as Caradog/Cradog or Llywarch/Llowarch. In any footnote a particular variant may be listed as present in multiple witnesses; in these cases, the variant quoted has been taken from the first witness listed, and it can be assumed that the other listed witnesses have an approximate, though not necessarily identical, version of the same reading. In all footnotes the readings of every witness available at that point are indicated. Omission of readings by particular witnesses is indicated by an en-dash (–), while readings that are probably additional to Hengwrt 33’s original text are indicated by the function add(s).

Punctuation has been added and the initial letters of all proper nouns, including epithets, have been capitalised. Contractions have been expanded in italics; contractions are therefore distinguishable from the readings of other manuscripts incorporated into the main text (also italicised) by the fact that expanded words begin in normal type and are not followed by a footnote. Contractions among the readings of other witnesses included in the main text, which are already italicised, are expanded in normal type. The readings
of all witnesses have been taken as they were left by their original scribes, including scribal corrections/additions but ignoring later marginalia. Any gaps that appear to have been left deliberately by the scribes are indicated by [GAP]. Any lacunae or portions of illegible text are indicated by an ellipsis enclosed in square brackets […]. The page numbers of the base texts appear in square brackets in normal type. The extracts from the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies have been organised into sections and numbered according to the scheme used in my forthcoming edition of the full archetypal text. Since Hengwrt 33 only contained selected excerpts from the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, the section numbering in the edition below is not entirely continuous (e.g. §§13–26 of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies were not included in Hengwrt 33). Both the awdl by Adda Fras and Oed yr Arglwydd are followed by translations into English, which have been enclosed in square brackets.

Plant Brychan a llawer o bethau achawl and llyfr bonedd (Cardiff Central Library 3.77, pp. 10–19)

[§1.1]⁴ Brychan Brycheiniawg ap Cormoc⁵ brenin Iwerddon⁶, a Marchell verch Teudrig ap Teithffalt ap Teithan ap Tuthal ap Annón⁷ Ddu brenin Groeg i vam.⁸

---

⁴ This section is absent from B. The text has been provided by A. See below, n. 9.
⁵ D: Tormoc A.
⁶ A: Ewerddon D.
⁷ A: mam D.
⁸ D adds the first portion of text from §1.2.1: Kynoc ap Brychan.
[§1.3.10] [10] gwreig Tudaw\(^9\) Pefyr.

[§1.3.11] Keyngar\(^11\) ferch Vrychan, mam Kenedyr sant.

[§1.3.12] Gόku ferch Vrychan yn Llanhesgyn\(^12\).

[§1.3.13] Gweurdyt\(^13\) ferch Vrychan yn Llantewyn.

[§1.3.14] Tidyei\(^14\) ferch Vrychan yManaw.

[§1.3.15] Éñet\(^15\) ferch Vrychan yGrug Gorsabaw\(^\circ\).

[§1.3.16] Keyndereg\(^17\) ferch Vrychan yn Tregabae\(_{\text{x}}\)gfar\(^18\).

[§1.3.17] Gwen ferch Vrychan yn Ta\(_{\text{garth}}\).

[§1.3.18] Kenod\(_{\text{hon}}\)^19 ferch Vrychan yMynyd\(^20\) Kymorth.

[§1.3.19] Klydyei\(^21\) ferch Vrychan yn Emlyn.


---

\(^9\) See above, p. ???. B leaves a six-line gap before beginning with the last part of §1.3.10. A begins with §1, then skips down to §1.5, omitting the partial text on Brychan’s daughters preserved by B. D also begins with §1, followed by the first words of §1.2.1 (\textit{Kynoc ap Brychan}), but then skips to §1.3.11, the first full section preserved by B. S similarly begins with §1.3.11.

\(^10\) \textit{Recte} Tudwal.

\(^11\) B; Kyngaer D; Kynger S.

\(^12\) BD; Llan Hesbyn S.

\(^13\) B; Gwenddydd D; Gwawrddydd S.

\(^14\) B; Tydie D; Tydei S.

\(^15\) BD; Elinor S.

\(^16\) BD; Gorsawl S.

\(^17\) B; Keindrec D; Keidderec S.

\(^18\) B; Hir gà6aelogwir D; Trigabac lognay S.

\(^19\) B; Kendlon D; Kenedlon S.

\(^20\) BS; yn y Mynnydd

\(^21\) BS; Clydai D.

\(^22\) B; Keinwen DS.

\(^23\) B; – DS.

\(^24\) B; Dwynwen DS.
[§1.3.21] Tudwysti/ferch Vrychan.  

[§1.4] Teir gwraged a²⁶ vu y Vrychan: Eurbrawst²⁷ a Rybrawst a Proestri²⁸.


§3 Plant Yaen: Dirmig Corneu m. Yaen, Gwinn Golthon m. Yaen, Siaun m. Yaen, Karadawc m. Yaen, Yeuanwy m. Yaen, Llychlyn m. Yaen, Ekirch ferch Yaen, mam Kyduan m. Arthur.

§5] Plant Egri o Dalebolion\textsuperscript{71} a vuant\textsuperscript{72} yn oes Faelgwyn\textsuperscript{73}; [14] Nud\textsuperscript{74} m. Egri, Roney\textsuperscript{75} m. Egri, Aeardur\textsuperscript{76} m. Egri, Geiriat\textsuperscript{77} m. Egri, Tryderan\textsuperscript{79} m. Egri, Meyrchiawn m. Egri, Uchno m. Egri\textsuperscript{80}, Hed m. Egri, Eblyt m. Egri, Colli\textsuperscript{81} m. Egri, Glassan\textsuperscript{82} m. Egri, Alân m. Egri, Kamo m. Egri, Belyn\textsuperscript{83} m. Egri, Elinwy\textsuperscript{84} m. Egri, Llurig Ros\textsuperscript{85} m. Egri, Tryrnawg\textsuperscript{86} m. Egri, Nwy\textsuperscript{88} m. Egri (y gwr y gelwit oe enw\textsuperscript{89} Karnwy), Lleuned\textsuperscript{90} ferch Egri\textsuperscript{91}.

§6\textsuperscript{92} Plant Llywarch Hen\textsuperscript{93}; [15] Gwen m. Llywarch\textsuperscript{94}, Pill m. Llywarch, Llawr\textsuperscript{96} m. Llywarch, Mechyd\textsuperscript{97} m. Llywarch, Maen m. Llywarch, Dwywg\textsuperscript{100} m. Llywarch, Nefyt\textsuperscript{101}.

\textsuperscript{71} BAD; Dalybolion S.
\textsuperscript{72} BDS; wnant A.
\textsuperscript{73} BS; aelgwyn AD. D adds Gwynedd.
\textsuperscript{74} BAS; Rudd D.
\textsuperscript{75} ADS; Rouyu B.
\textsuperscript{76} BAS; Iarddor D.
\textsuperscript{77} BA; Keiriad D; Giriat S.
\textsuperscript{78} BAS; Egri D.
\textsuperscript{79} B; Tryderaw A.
\textsuperscript{80} Tryderan... Uchno m. Egri BA; – DS.
\textsuperscript{81} ADS; Kol B.
\textsuperscript{82} ADS; Giassan B.
\textsuperscript{83} BS; Kelyn A; Köähelyn D.
\textsuperscript{84} ADS; Elinw B.
\textsuperscript{85} BS; – AD.
\textsuperscript{86} B; Tyrnawg AS; Tyrnynoc D.
\textsuperscript{87} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{88} BA; Rwyo D; Nwr S.
\textsuperscript{89} y gwr... oe enw BS; ag oí henw y gelwir A.
\textsuperscript{90} B; Llenôedd A; Llenedd S. y gwr... Lleuned BAS; – D.
\textsuperscript{91} ferch Egri BAS; – DS.
\textsuperscript{92} A omits this section.
\textsuperscript{93} B adds o Benllyn.
\textsuperscript{94} S omits all epithets in this section except that of Riell.
\textsuperscript{95} D adds Morudd ap Llôwarch.
\textsuperscript{96} D adds Rennyd ap Llôwarch.
\textsuperscript{97} BS; Llaëgor D.
\textsuperscript{98} BS; – D.
\textsuperscript{99} m. Llywarch B; – D.
\textsuperscript{100} BD; Dwyws S.
\textsuperscript{101} B; – D; Nenyd S.
m. Llywarch\textsuperscript{102}, Sander\textsuperscript{103} m. Llywarch, Sehyf m. Llywarch, Dihg m. Llywarch, Lliuer\textsuperscript{104} m. Llywarch, Deigyr\textsuperscript{105} m. Llywarch, Rut m. Llywarch, Madawg m. Llywarch, Medel\textsuperscript{107} m. Llywarch, Heylyn m. Llywarch, Gwell\textsuperscript{108} m. Llywarch, Sawy\textsuperscript{109} m. Llywarch, Llorien\textsuperscript{110} m. Llywarch, Keny m. Llywarch, Llyngedwy\textsuperscript{112} m. Llywarch, Kynllug m. Llywarch, Llewenyd m. Llywarch, Gorwynon\textsuperscript{113} m. Llywarch, [16] Riell\textsuperscript{114} ferch Llywarch.

\textit{[§7.2]}\textsuperscript{115} [16] Plant\textsuperscript{116} Kynfarch\textsuperscript{117} mab\textsuperscript{118} Meyrchiawn\textsuperscript{119}: Llew m. Kynfarch, Arawn m. Kynfarch, Urien m. Kynfarch, Anarawn\textsuperscript{120} m. Kynfarch, archesgob Llydaw.

\textit{[§7.1]} Plant Urien mab Kynfarch\textsuperscript{121}: Eweyn\textsuperscript{122} m. Urien, Run\textsuperscript{123} m. Urien, Riwallawn m. Urien, Elffyn m. Urien, Pasken m. Urien, Kateel m. Urien\textsuperscript{124}.

\textsuperscript{102} m. Llywarch B; – D.
\textsuperscript{103} BD; Sandes S.
\textsuperscript{104} B; Lliner DS.
\textsuperscript{105} DS; Beigir B.
\textsuperscript{106} S adds Alarch.
\textsuperscript{107} BD; Medyl S.
\textsuperscript{108} BS; Gwel D.
\textsuperscript{109} BS; Sawl D.
\textsuperscript{110} D; Lloryeu B; Klorien S.
\textsuperscript{111} S adds Kyndylan, Briw un dr \textit{recte unde} Tref Briw hoc e Trefriw, Brwyn unde Moel Drefwrwyn apud Garth Garmon yn tervyny a Nant Trefguraedd. Hec David Loid ap Edward.
\textsuperscript{112} D; Llyngeddyf B; Llyngeddwy S.
\textsuperscript{113} B; Gorwynion D; Gowynion S.
\textsuperscript{114} BD; Rell S.
\textsuperscript{115} In B §7.1 and §7.2 have been transposed, as they are in witnesses of the later tradition associated with Gutun Owain. ADS follow the original order. In §7, S omits all epithets except for those in headings and that of Mabon ab Idno.
\textsuperscript{116} BAD; – S.
\textsuperscript{117} BAD; Llywarch S.
\textsuperscript{118} BAD; – S.
\textsuperscript{119} BAD; Meiriawn S.
\textsuperscript{120} A; Anarun B; Anaran D; Annawn S.
\textsuperscript{121} BDS; Kyndrwyn A.
\textsuperscript{122} B; Owain A; Ywain D; Gwelyn S.
\textsuperscript{123} BAD; – S.
\textsuperscript{124} Pasken... Kateel m. Urien BAS; – D.
§7.1.1 Kyndeyrn\textsuperscript{125} Garthwys m. Yweyn m. Urien.

§7.3\textsuperscript{126} [17] Plant Keneu mab Koe\textsuperscript{127} Padern\textsuperscript{128} m. Keneu, Gorust m. Keneu, Garmoniawn\textsuperscript{129} m. Keneu, Maesgwig K\textsuperscript{130} m. Keneu.

§7.3.1 Edern\textsuperscript{131} m. Padern\textsuperscript{132} m. Keneu.

§7.4 Plant Gorwst mab Keneu: Meyrchiawn m. Gorwst, Eliuer\textsuperscript{133} Gosgordfawr\textsuperscript{134} m. Gorwst m. Keneu m. Koe\textsuperscript{135}.

§7.5 Plant Meyrchiawn m. Gorwst\textsuperscript{136}: Kynfarch m. Meirchiawn, Eliur Lydanwyn\textsuperscript{137} m. Meirchiawn\textsuperscript{138}, Idno m. Meirchiawn.

§7.6 Plant Idno m. Meirchiawn\textsuperscript{139}: Meurig\textsuperscript{140} ap Idno\textsuperscript{141}, Mabon\textsuperscript{142} m. Idno m. Meirchiawn\textsuperscript{143} ap Gorwst\textsuperscript{144} m. Keneu\textsuperscript{145} m. Koe\textsuperscript{146}.

\textsuperscript{125} B: Kyndeyrn AD; Kyndern S.
\textsuperscript{126} S omits this section.
\textsuperscript{127} B: Padarn AD.
\textsuperscript{128} BA; Garmon D.
\textsuperscript{129} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{130} B: Edyrn AD.
\textsuperscript{131} B: Padarn AD.
\textsuperscript{132} BAS; Eliuer D.
\textsuperscript{133} BA; – D; Gosgorrd D.
\textsuperscript{134} m. Keneu m. Koe/BA; – D. A adds Godebawg.
\textsuperscript{135} BA; – D; Grwst S.
\textsuperscript{136} Eliur Lydanwyn BA; – DS.
\textsuperscript{137} m. Meirchiawn BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{138} m. Meirchiawn BAS; – D.
\textsuperscript{139} BAS; – D.
\textsuperscript{140} ap Idno BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{141} BAD; Mabo S.
\textsuperscript{142} ADS; – B.
\textsuperscript{143} A; – B; Grwst DS.
\textsuperscript{144} m. Keneu BAD; – S.
[§8] Helygu¹⁴⁵ ag Eluedan¹⁴⁶, meibyon *Hilon*¹⁴⁷ Hwylfawr or Gogled¹⁴⁸.

[§9.1] Elidir¹⁴⁹ Mwynfawr mab Gorwst Priodawr m. Gwydwaľ⁵⁰ m. Dyfynyewal¹⁵¹ Hen m. Ednyfet m. Maxen Wledig¹⁵² m. Llywelyn ewyther¹⁵³ Elen Luydawg.

[§9.2] Ryderch Hae/Glær ag¹⁵⁴ Arderch Drut a¹⁵⁵ Morgant Mwynfawr, meibion Tudwal Tutklyt.


[§9.3.1] Yeuaf a Cheneu, meibion¹⁶² y Vrwyder Dirieit¹⁶³ mab Gwydien¹⁶⁴ Austrus m. Deigir mab Dyfynyewal¹⁶⁵ Hen¹⁶⁶ m. Ednyfet mab Maxen m.¹⁶⁷ Llywelân.¹⁶⁸

¹⁴⁵: Helygy A; Helyg D; – S.
¹⁴⁶: ag Eluedan BAD; – S.
¹⁴⁷: S; – B; Bibon A; i Lonn D.
¹⁴⁸: S adds Belygyn ac Elnedan.
¹⁴⁹: BAS; Elididir D.
¹⁵⁰: BA; Gwydawl DS.
¹⁵¹: B; Dyfnwal AD; Dynynyenal S.
¹⁵²: BAD; – S.
¹⁵³: B; Dyfnwal AD; Dynynyenal S.
¹⁵⁴: BAD; – S.
¹⁵⁵: A adds A.
¹⁵⁶: BS; Gwyddien A; Twyddien D.
¹⁵⁷: A; Euuael B; Enael D; Enael S. S adds a Dobion a Dos, brodorion.
¹⁵⁸: ADS; mibion B.
¹⁵⁹: B; Dyfnwal AD; Dynynael S.
¹⁶⁰: S adds ap Edyn¥ved ap Maxen Wledic.
¹⁶¹: BAD; – S.
¹⁶²: BAD; Ddiriert S.
¹⁶³: B; Gwyddien AD; Gwyddion S.
¹⁶⁴: B; Dyfnwal AD; Dynynael S.
¹⁶⁵: BAD; – S.
¹⁶⁶: BAS; a D.
¹⁶⁷: Hengwrt 33 omitted §9.3.2.
§10.1

Plant Don o Arfon: Gwydyon\(^{170}\) m. Don, Gofannon\(^{171}\) m. Don, Amaethon\(^{172}\) m. Don, Hunawg m. Don, Ydwal m. Don, *lenuydd\(^{73}\)* m. Don, Elestron\(^{174}\) m. Don, Digant m. Don, Gylfaethwy\(^{175}\) m. Don, Kymman\(^{176}\) m. Don, Hed m. Don, Adyen\(^{177}\) m. Don\(^{178}\), Elawg\(^{179}\) m. Don, Aryanrod\(^{180}\) ferch Don.

§10.2

Plant Math mab\(^{181}\) Mathonwy: Llew Llaw Gyffes\(^{182}\), Dylan\(^{183}\) Eil Tonn\(^{184}\), *Blodeuwedd\(^{86}\)* eu chwaer\(^{187}\), o\(^{188}\) Aryanrot\(^{189}\) ferch Don\(^{190}\).

*AUDYL A GANT ADAF VRÂS* (Peniarth 102, pp. 11–12)


Cyfoethau’r drindod cyfoethau

---

\(^{169}\) S omits all epithets in §10 except those of Arianrhod ferch Don and Math ap Mathonwy.

\(^{170}\) BA; Gwyddien D; Gwddion S.

\(^{171}\) BAS; Soutónon D.

\(^{172}\) BAS; Maethon D.

\(^{173}\) A; Yeuny B; E6n6dd D; – S.

\(^{174}\) BAD; – S.

\(^{175}\) BS; Gylnaethwy A; Glanaethwy D.

\(^{176}\) B; Kynnan A; Kynan D S.

\(^{177}\) BAS; – D.

\(^{178}\) m. Don BA; – D.

\(^{179}\) BAS; Eloloc D.

\(^{180}\) BA; Ariannoc D; Arianrawt S.

\(^{181}\) Math mab BAS; – D.

\(^{182}\) B adds m. Math.

\(^{183}\) BAD; – S.

\(^{184}\) B adds m. Math.

\(^{185}\) AD add a.

\(^{186}\) AD; Blodeufed B; Blotennedd S.

\(^{187}\) eu chwaer BAD; – S.

\(^{188}\) S adds chwaer.

\(^{189}\) BAS; Ariannoc D.

\(^{190}\) AS add eu mam.
[The riches of the Trinity, the riches,
opulent, numerous, of the holy oils,
Let us hail, let us play a horn on Thursday
before the certain sounding of the Lord’s horn,
they will quake on account of desiring sins,
they, the vast multitude, will deny the deeds,
[...] from wondrous things,

 [...] the time of judgements,

 a fortress conspicuous to the clean souls,

 he who sings for the fortresses sings well,

 there will be pain and misfortune, the enforcement of dues,

 there will be warfare, battle and vengeances,

 there will be the dragon of Powys involved in bloody carnage,

 there will be the ravens of Gwynedd in feasts together,

 there will be the fierce English after tumults.]

ACH LLYWELYN AB IORWERTH DRYNWDN (Cardiff Central Library 3.77, pp. 1–10)


David Callander suggests to me that [...]eryddau might be ceryddau, ‘rebukes, chastisements’.

My thanks to David Callander for assistance with this translation.

D adds Drynwdwn.

m. Idwal.. Mawr BA; – D.

BA; Molwynoc D.

m. Katwaladyr... Katwallawn BA; – D.

BD; Maelgwyn A.

---

198 BA; Kaswallan D.
199 B; Llawir AD.
200 B; Einion AD.
201 BA; Edurn D.
202 B; Padarn AD.
203 B; Tegid AD.
204 BA; Gwrgan D.
205 B; Amwerydd A; Aniwerid D.
206 B; Onwedd A; Onwed D.
207 AD; Dwiwg B.
208 AD; Dyfnarch B.
209 BA; Paedd D.
210 D adds Wledic.
211 B; Ragaw A; Rregaw D.
212 D adds ap Rr6dd.
213 m. Run BA; – D.
214 Baladr Bras B; – AD.
215 BA; Llywelydd D.
216 Darian Las BA; Ysgwyddir D.
217 BA; Membyr D.
218 BA; ddoeth D.
219 BA; yna D. D adds yr honn a elwir Ynys Brydain.
220 or byd A; – D.
221 dynu [recte dyuu] A; doeth D.
222 A; – D. ag ym yma AD; – B. D adds yw gwladych6. A honn yman yw i ach ef, nid amgen.
223 B; Silnius A; Sili6s D.
224 B; Ysgannus AD.
Enchises\textsuperscript{225} m. Kapis\textsuperscript{226} m. Assarakus m. Tros\textsuperscript{227} m. Eriktonius\textsuperscript{228} m. Dardanus\textsuperscript{229} \textit{ap}\textsuperscript{230} Iupiter m. Sadwrn\textsuperscript{231} m. Sīlus\textsuperscript{232} m. Kretus m. Siprius m. Ketun\textsuperscript{233} m. Iauan\textsuperscript{234} m. Iaffeth m. Noe Hen m. Lamech\textsuperscript{235} m. Matusak\textsuperscript{236} m. \textit{Enoc}\textsuperscript{237} m. Iareth\textsuperscript{238} m. Malaleel\textsuperscript{239} m. Kaynan mab Enos\textsuperscript{240} m. Seth mab Adaf\textsuperscript{241}

\[\text{\S 11.1.1}\] Mam Llywelyn\textsuperscript{242}: Mareret\textsuperscript{243} ferch Madawg m. Moredydd\textsuperscript{244} m. Bledin m. Kynfyn m. Gwerystan\textsuperscript{245} m. Gweithfoet m. Gwrhidyr m. Kradowg\textsuperscript{246} m. Lles Llawdeawg\textsuperscript{247} m. Ednifet m. Gwinnan m. Gwineawc\textsuperscript{248} \textit{Varyf Sech}\textsuperscript{249} \textit{[4]} m. Keidaw\textsuperscript{250} m. Kori\textsuperscript{251} m. Kaenawg\textsuperscript{252} m. Tegonwy m. Teon m. Gwineu Deu

\textsuperscript{225} BA; Enethes D.
\textsuperscript{226} BA; Kapius D.
\textsuperscript{227} BA; Tors D.
\textsuperscript{228} B; Ericconius A; Erigonius D.
\textsuperscript{229} BA; Darda D.
\textsuperscript{230} AD; – B.
\textsuperscript{231} BD; Saturnus A.
\textsuperscript{232} BD; Selius A.
\textsuperscript{233} BA; Setem D.
\textsuperscript{234} BD; Iaenan A.
\textsuperscript{235} BA; Lameth D.
\textsuperscript{236} BA; Matusalem D.
\textsuperscript{237} AD; Enoch B.
\textsuperscript{238} BA; Iafeth D.
\textsuperscript{239} BA; Malaeliol D.
\textsuperscript{240} BA; Cwnos D.
\textsuperscript{241} D \textit{adds} ap Duw.
\textsuperscript{242} A \textit{adds} ap Iorwerth; D \textit{adds} oedd.
\textsuperscript{243} B; Maröred A; 6ared D.
\textsuperscript{244} B; Meredydd A; Myredudd D.
\textsuperscript{245} B; Gwrystan A; Gwrysengan D.
\textsuperscript{246} B; Bardawg A; Caradoc D.
\textsuperscript{247} BA; Llann Ddwywc D.
\textsuperscript{248} BA; Gwineawc D. D \textit{adds} ap.
\textsuperscript{249} B; Sych A; Lech D.
\textsuperscript{250} B; Keidiaw A; Keiddau D.
\textsuperscript{251} B; Korf AD.
\textsuperscript{252} BA; Kagnawc D.
Vreudwyt m. Bywyr\textsuperscript{253} Lew m. Buwdeg\textsuperscript{254} m. Run Rud Baladyr m. Llary\textsuperscript{255} m.\textsuperscript{256} Kasnar\textsuperscript{257} Włędig m. Llud m. Beifers Mawr.

[§11.1.2] Mam Fadawg ap Moredud\textsuperscript{258} oed\textsuperscript{259} Hunyd ferch Einud m. Gwenlliant ferch Rys fab Marchan m. Kynwrig m. Kyndelw Gam m. Egwy\textsuperscript{260} m. Grwisnat\textsuperscript{261} m. Dwyywg Lyth\textsuperscript{262} m. Tegawg m. "Dwyfnerch"\textsuperscript{263} m. Madog Madogiawn m. Sandef Bry\textsuperscript{264} Egil m. Llywarch Hen m. Elidir Lydanwyn m. Meirchiawn Gul m. Gwrwst Letlwm m. Keneu m. Koe/ Godebawg m. Tegfan m. Deheweint\textsuperscript{265} m. Tudbwyll m. "Vrban"\textsuperscript{266} m. Grad\textsuperscript{267} m. Rifedel\textsuperscript{268} m. "Rydeyrn"\textsuperscript{269} m. Endigant m. Endiyrnn m. Eneid\textsuperscript{270} m. Endos m. Endoleu m. Afallach "Ap Aflach"\textsuperscript{271} m. Beifers Mawr.

[§11.1.3]\textsuperscript{272} Mam Faredud mab Beifers oed Huar ferch Vleidrud.

\textsuperscript{253} B; Pywyr A; Powyr D.
\textsuperscript{254} B; Bywdec A; Pywydec D.
\textsuperscript{255} BA; Llaryf D.
\textsuperscript{256} BD; – A.
\textsuperscript{257} B; Kasuar A; Kasar D.
\textsuperscript{258} B; Meredydd A; Myredudd D.
\textsuperscript{259} BD; – A.
\textsuperscript{260} BA; Elgynt D.
\textsuperscript{261} BD; Gwrysuaad A.
\textsuperscript{262} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{263} AD; Dwyferch B.
\textsuperscript{264} BA; Bric D.
\textsuperscript{265} B; Dehenwaint A; Dehe6waint D.
\textsuperscript{266} A; Wrban B; Eôrban D.
\textsuperscript{267} B; Gradd AD.
\textsuperscript{268} BD; Runedel A.
\textsuperscript{269} AD; Rydymn B.
\textsuperscript{270} BA; Einid D.
\textsuperscript{271} AD; – B.
\textsuperscript{272} D omits this section.
§11.1.4 [5] Mam Vkedyn ap Kynfyn\(^{273}\): Angharat ferch Fareud m. Yweyn m. Hywel Da m. Kadell Deyrnllug\(^{274}\) m. Rodri Mawr m. Merfin\(^{275}\) Vrich m. Gwryat m. Elidyf m. Sandef m. *Alkwr*\(^{276}\) m. Tagit\(^{277}\) mab\(^{278}\) Gweir m. Dwg\(^{279}\) m. Llywarch Hen m. Elidir Lydanwyn.

§12 P\(\text{Á}nt\) Ywein Gwyned\(^{280}\).

§12.1 Iorwerth\(^{281}\) a Mægwn a Gwenliant mam Wenwynwyn m. Yweyn Kyfei\(\text{á}w\).g, p\(\text{Á}nt\) Yweyn Gwyned, a\(^{282}\) Gwladus oed eu mam\(^{283}\), ferch Llywarch m. Trahearn m. Karadawg m. Gwynn m. Golwynn m. Ednywein m. Bkedint m. Bketrus m. Kynawg Mawr m. Iorwerth Hirw\(\text{á}ut\)\(^{285}\) m. Tegonwy m. Teon.

§12.2 Dafyd a\(^{286}\) Rodri a Chatwallawn\(^{287}\) abat Enlly ag Angharat gwr[6]eig Gruffud Mæ\(\text{á}wr\), meibyon\(^{288}\) Ywein Gwyned, a Christin ferch\(^{289}\) Ronw\(^{290}\) m. Ywein m. Etwyn eu mam.

\(^{273}\) D *adds* oedd.

\(^{274}\) BA; Deyrnll6c D. This epithet is erroneous, since it should properly belong to Cadell Deyrnllug, progenitor of the Cadelling dynasty of Powys. John Jones was aware of the error and placed the epithet in square brackets. The error must have appeared in Hengwrt 33, since it is reproduced in BAD.

\(^{275}\) BA; Mer\(\text{ó}ryn\) D.

\(^{276}\) AD; Alkwri B.

\(^{277}\) B; Tegid AD.

\(^{278}\) BA; – D.

\(^{279}\) BD; Diwg A.

\(^{280}\) P\(\text{Á}nt\) Ywein Gwyned B; – AD.

\(^{281}\) BA; Idnerth D.

\(^{282}\) BA; meibion D.

\(^{283}\) BD; ai mam oedd A.

\(^{284}\) oed eu mam B; – A; yw mam D.

\(^{285}\) B; Hirwalwdd A; Hirwlad D.

\(^{286}\) BA; ap D.

\(^{287}\) BD; Chysswallawn A.

\(^{288}\) BD; plant A.

\(^{289}\) B *adds* i.

\(^{290}\) B; Oronw A; Ronwy D.
§12.2.1 Mam\textsuperscript{291} Gristin\textsuperscript{292} oed\textsuperscript{293} Geneilles\textsuperscript{294} ferch Hoedliw m. Ithael\textsuperscript{295} m. Edrit\textsuperscript{296} mab Inethan\textsuperscript{297} m. Iaseth\textsuperscript{298} m. Karwet m. Marchud.

§12.2.2 Mam Oronwy\textsuperscript{299} m. Ywein\textsuperscript{300}: Morwyl\textsuperscript{301} ferch Etnywein Pentew m. Nemiad\textsuperscript{302} m. Gweithfoet m. Gwridir.

§12.2.3 Mam Ywein ap Etwyn\textsuperscript{303}: Iweryd\textsuperscript{304} ferch Gynfyn m. Gweristan.

§12.2.4 Mam Iweryd\textsuperscript{305}: Angharat ferch Faredud m. Ywein m. Hywel Da m. Kadell m. Rodri Mawr.

§12.3 Kynan m. Ywein: Angharat oed y fam, ferc Peredur m. Mae/ m. Bledynt o Feirionyd.

§12.4 Llywelyn m. Yweyn\textsuperscript{306}: Gwenllyant\textsuperscript{307} [7] ferch Etnywein m. Gwrydyr\textsuperscript{308} m. Dyfneint oed y fam\textsuperscript{309}.

§12.5\textsuperscript{310} Mere\textsuperscript{311} dydd Ddu ap Owain: Morvydd ferch 6erwydd Hir i 6am.

§12.6 Idwal m. Yweyn: Afandreg ferch Wrgi o Penn Mynyd Gradifel y fam.

\textsuperscript{291} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{292} BA; Cy6eilles D.
\textsuperscript{293} BD; – A.
\textsuperscript{294} B; Genilles A; Gristin D.
\textsuperscript{295} BA; Ithel D.
\textsuperscript{296} B; Edrydd A; Adryd D.
\textsuperscript{297} B; Methan A; Nethan D.
\textsuperscript{298} BA; Iasedd D.
\textsuperscript{299} B; Oronw A; Ronwy D.
\textsuperscript{300} D adds oedd.
\textsuperscript{301} BA; Morwy D.
\textsuperscript{302} Nemiad [recte Neiniad] A; Feinniat B; Minniad D.
\textsuperscript{303} D adds oedd.
\textsuperscript{304} B; Iewerydd A; Weyrnydd D.
\textsuperscript{305} B; Iewerydd A; Weyrlydd D. D adds oedd.
\textsuperscript{306} BA; Rrodi D.
\textsuperscript{307} A adds oedd i 6am.
\textsuperscript{308} BA; Rrodi D.
\textsuperscript{309} oed y fam BD; – A.
\textsuperscript{310} B omits this section. The text is provided by A.
§12.7 Run m. Yweyn: Aned ferch Wrgi y fam, chwaer Afandreg.

§12.9 Hywel m. Yweyn: Ffynnot Wydeles oed y fam.

§12.10 Deu Gynwrig a vaunt feibyon y Yweyn.

§12.10.1 Un o nadunt a wystws Ywein y Henri vrenhin yg Koet Keiryawg, ag y dallwyrt y gyt ar gwystlón pann dorres Yweyn; ag o hynny y bu farw.

§12.10.2 Y Kynwrig arall a e/wyt Kynwryg fab y færones.

§12.11 Ffylp m. Yweyn: Morfud ferch Efân m. Sandef o Ros y fam.


§27 En tri lle y dy/lit argwydiaeth Wyned o gogeil:
§27.1 Un o nadunt\textsuperscript{337}: Stratweu\textsuperscript{338} ferch Gadeann\textsuperscript{339} m. Kynan m. Eudaf m. Karadawg m. Bran m. Llyr Lledyeyth, gwreig y Goe/Godebog\textsuperscript{340} oed\textsuperscript{341}, mam Dyfywr\textsuperscript{342}, a mam\textsuperscript{343} Geneu fab Koe/.

§27.2 Ei\textsuperscript{344} yw\textsuperscript{345} Gwaw/ferch Koe/Godebawg, mam Guneda W\textit{kedig}, gwraig Edern\textsuperscript{346} m. Padern\textsuperscript{347} Peysrud.

§27.3 \textsuperscript{348}Trydyd\textsuperscript{349} yw\textsuperscript{350} Esil ferch Gynan Dyndaethwy, gwreig Ferfyn\textsuperscript{351} Vrich, mam Rodri Mawr.

§A4\textsuperscript{352} Llyma ach Ednyfet Vychan\textsuperscript{353}:

§A4.1 \textsuperscript{9} Ednyfet Vychan m. Kynwrig m. Iorwerth m. Gwgawn m. Idnerth m. Edryd m. Inethan\textsuperscript{354} m. Iassed\textsuperscript{355} m. Karwet m. Marchud m. Kynan m. Elfyw\textsuperscript{356} m. Mor m.

\textsuperscript{337} A \textit{adds} yw; D \textit{adds} oedd.
\textsuperscript{338} A; Ystradwel D.
\textsuperscript{339} BA; Gadoan D.
\textsuperscript{340} A \textit{adds} hon.
\textsuperscript{341} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{342} BA; Ddyfir D.
\textsuperscript{343} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{344} D \textit{adds} lle.
\textsuperscript{345} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{346} B; Edyrn AD.
\textsuperscript{347} B; Padarn AD.
\textsuperscript{348} AD \textit{add} Y.
\textsuperscript{349} D \textit{adds} lle.
\textsuperscript{350} B; oedd A; – D.
\textsuperscript{351} BA; 6er6ryn D.
\textsuperscript{352} As is explained in my forthcoming edition of the archetypal text of the Llywelyn ab Iorwerth genealogies, sections beginning with ‘A’ were probably not part of the original text, but were probably added at an early stage in the textual tradition.
\textsuperscript{353} Llyma... Vychan B; Llwyth Marchudd A; – D.
\textsuperscript{354} B; Methan A; Nethan D.
\textsuperscript{355} B; Iasseth A; Siasedd D.
\textsuperscript{356} B; Eluwyw A; El6yw D.
Mynan m. Yspwys m.\textsuperscript{357} Mwyntyrch m. Yspwys m. Kadrawt Kalchfynydd m. Kynwyt
Kynwydyawn m. Kynfe\textsuperscript{yn} m. Mar\textsuperscript{358} m. Keneu m. Koe/Godebawg.

[\textsuperscript{§A4.1.1}] Mam Ednyfer\textsuperscript{359}: Angharad ferch Hwfa m. Kynwrig m. Riwallawn m.
Dingat m. Dudur m. Ymyr\textsuperscript{360} m. Kadfarch m. Gwern\textit{en} m. Gwaedgar\textsuperscript{361} m.
Bywyn\textsuperscript{362} m. Byorderch\textsuperscript{363} m. Gwy\textit{awr} m. \textit{Gwynan}\textsuperscript{364} m. Kadell Deyrnllug\textsuperscript{365} m.
Pasken m. Brydw\textsuperscript{366} m. Rydfed\textit{e}\textsuperscript{67} Vrych m. Kad\textit{e}yrn m. \textit{Gwrth\textit{eyrn}}\textsuperscript{368} Gortheneu
m.\textsuperscript{369} Rydeyrn m. Deheu\textit{e}i\textsuperscript{370} m. Endigant m. Endeyrn m. Eneid\textsuperscript{371} m. [10] Endos
m. Endoleu m. \textit{A6allach}\textsuperscript{372} m. Aflech m. Beli Mawr.

\textit{CHRONICL BYRR YN D\textit{ECHREU YN OES ARTHUR, PAN LAS ARTHUR}} (Cwrtmawr 453, pp.
27–31)

\textsuperscript{357} BA; – D.
\textsuperscript{358} BA; Mor D.
\textsuperscript{359} A \textit{adds} \textit{6ychan}; D \textit{adds} \textit{oedd}.
\textsuperscript{360} BA; Ymyr D.
\textsuperscript{361} BA; Gweddg\textit{ar} D.
\textsuperscript{362} BA; Ywain D.
\textsuperscript{363} B; Byorder\textit{ch} A; Iordderch D.
\textsuperscript{364} A; Gwyn\textit{nyw} B; Gwyn\textit{i}an D.
\textsuperscript{365} BD; Dyrnllug A.
\textsuperscript{366} B; Prydw A; Prydaw D.
\textsuperscript{367} B; Ruddn\textit{edel} A; Rud\textit{d} Wyddel D.
\textsuperscript{368} AD; Gwrth\textit{yrn} B.
\textsuperscript{369} BA; a D.
\textsuperscript{370} B; Deheu\textit{waint} AD.
\textsuperscript{371} BA; Enid D.
\textsuperscript{372} AD; Afallath B.
[27] Oyd yr Arglwyd pan las Arthur yg\textsuperscript{373} gad Gamlan: pim cant a deugeint mlined\textsuperscript{374} oed y oyd\textsuperscript{375}.

\textsuperscript{376}Oyd yr Arglwyd pan haeth Cadwaladyr Vendigeit\textsuperscript{377} i Ruuein: 653.

\textsuperscript{378}Oyd er Arglwyd pan vw Offha\textsuperscript{379} vrenhyn\textsuperscript{380}: seith cant ag vn vlwidyn a phedwar ugeint.

\textsuperscript{381}Pan wu varw Llywelyn ap Ioruerth,\textsuperscript{382} eil dyd\textsuperscript{383} o Ebrill: mil a deucant a deugein oyd oed [28] yr\textsuperscript{385} Arglwid\textsuperscript{386}.

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan doyd Normannieit\textsuperscript{387} ir\textsuperscript{388} ynys hon: mlxvi.

\textsuperscript{389}Oyd yr Arglwyd pan wneithbwit\textsuperscript{390} Sistos: mcxxvi.

\textsuperscript{373} VA; yn y D.
\textsuperscript{374} VD; mlwydd A.
\textsuperscript{375} oed y oyd VA; – D.
\textsuperscript{376} A omits this annal.
\textsuperscript{377} V; – D.
\textsuperscript{378} A omits this annal.
\textsuperscript{379} D \textit{adds} yn.
\textsuperscript{380} Peniarth 137 \textit{adds} a wnaeth clawdd Offa.
\textsuperscript{381} D \textit{adds} Oed yr arglwydd.
\textsuperscript{382} VA; – D.
\textsuperscript{383} A \textit{adds} yr.
\textsuperscript{384} V \textit{adds} cyntaf.
\textsuperscript{385} A; yn V.
\textsuperscript{386} oyd oed yr Arglwid VA; – D.
\textsuperscript{387} VA; Normand D.
\textsuperscript{388} AD; yn V.
\textsuperscript{389} A omits this annal.
\textsuperscript{390} V; waeth bwyd D.
Oyd yr Arglwyd pan las Thomas archescop *Kain*\(^{391}\): mclxxi\(^{392}\).

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan fu varw Madauc ap Gruffid Maelawr: mcccxxv\(^{393}\).

\(^{394}\)Oyd yr Arglwyd pan gad castell Carreckoua: mccxlvi\(^{395}\). Ag y bu vroydir yny Cymereu y uloydin honno.

\(^{396}\)Oyd yr Arglwyd pan [29] gad castell Carrecphaelan: mccxli.

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan vv uarw Gruffid ap Llewelyn: mccxliii\(^{397}\).

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan vv\(^{398}\) uarw Dauid ap Llewelin iii kalendas Marcias\(^{399}\): mccxlvi.

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan grynauḍ y dayar: x kalendas Marcias\(^{400}\): mccxlvi.

\(^{391}\) AD; – V.
\(^{392}\) VD; mil a chant a thairblynedd ar ddeg a thrugain A.
\(^{393}\) Recte mccxxxvi.
\(^{394}\) A omits this annal.
\(^{395}\) Recte mccxlvi.
\(^{396}\) A omits this annal.
\(^{397}\) VA; m\(\text{d}\) a CC a viil [i.e. 1243] D.
\(^{398}\) VD; – A.
\(^{399}\) iii kalendas Marcias VA; – D.
\(^{400}\) x kalendas Marcias VA; – D.
Oyd yr Arglwyd pan dorrad castell Maishyeid\(^{401}\), wedi gwyl saint Freid\(^{402}\): mcclxiii\(^{403}\). Ac y cad castell e Diserth Aust\(^{404}\), ac y gad\(^{405}\) castell Dyganwy y\(^{406}\) gwyl Vihangel\(^{407}\).

[30] Oyd yr Arglwyd pan las Simownd iii kalendas Augustias\(^{408}\): mcclxv. Ac y distrywt\(^{409}\) castell Penhardalauc vi kalendas Obtobras\(^{410}\) yny flwydyn hono\(^{411}\).

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan vv uarw Hywel ap\(^{412}\) Madauc: mcclxvii.

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan gad Caerfili iii idus\(^{413}\) Octobras\(^{414}\): mcclxix\(^{415}\).

Oyd yr Arglwyd pan vv uarw lewan yarll Warant\(^{416}\): mccciii\(^{417}\).

\(^{401}\) VA; Maes y6ed D.
\(^{402}\) saint Freid V; Sanffraid A; Ffann Ffraid D.
\(^{403}\) VA; m\(\text{\`a} \) CC a lxiii D.
\(^{404}\) VA; – D.
\(^{405}\) ac y gad VA; a D.
\(^{406}\) V; – AD.
\(^{407}\) D \textit{adds} ar hwnn y Ddiserth Awst kynn hyny.
\(^{408}\) iii kalendas Augustias VA; – D.
\(^{409}\) V; distrywiwyd AD.
\(^{410}\) V; o 6is Tachwedd A.
\(^{411}\) vi kalendas... hono VA; – D.
\(^{412}\) D \textit{adds} Howel ap.
\(^{413}\) iii idus VA; – D.
\(^{414}\) Octobras V; o 6is Rag6yr A; – D.
\(^{415}\) Recte mcclxx.
\(^{416}\) VD; Waraut A.
\(^{417}\) A \textit{adds} blynedd.
Oyd yr Arglwyd pan fu farw Edward ureyenyn Lloe[31]gyr: mccccvii. Ar\textsuperscript{418} nawuet dyd o Iulii\textsuperscript{419} yn yr\textsuperscript{420} vlydyn y gwisgywt\textsuperscript{422} goron e dyurnas am ben Edward y vab.

[The age of the Lord when Arthur was killed in the battle of Camlan: five hundred and forty years was his age.

The age of the Lord when Cadwaladr Vendigaid went to Rome: 653.

The age of the Lord when Offa was king: seven hundred and eighty-one years.

When Llywelyn ab Iorwerth died, on the second day of April: one thousand, two hundred and forty was the age of the Lord.

The age of the Lord when the Normans came to this island: 1066.

The age of the Lord was the Cistercians were founded: 1126.

The age of the Lord when Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, was killed: 1171.

\textsuperscript{418} VD; y A.
\textsuperscript{419} o Iulii VA; or Sulwyn D.
\textsuperscript{420} A adds ag.
\textsuperscript{421} yr vn VD; y gyse6in A.
\textsuperscript{422} V; gwisgyw A; gwisgod D.
The age of the Lord when Madog ap Gruffudd Maelor died: 1235\textsuperscript{423}.

The age of the Lord when Carreghofo castle was taken: 1247\textsuperscript{424}. And in that year there was a battle in Cymerau.

The age of the Lord when Carreg Faelan [Diserth] castle was taken: 1241.

The age of the Lord when Gruffudd ap Llywelyn died: 1244.

The age of the Lord when Dafydd ap Llywelyn died on the 4th day from the kalends of March: 1246.

The age of the Lord when the earth shook on the 10th day from the kalends of March: 1247.

The age of the Lord when Maesyfed [New Radnor] castle was broken, after the festival of St Brigit: 1263. And Diserth castle was taken in August, and Degannwy castle was taken on the festival of Michael.

\textsuperscript{423} Recte 1236.
\textsuperscript{424} Recte 1257.
The age of the Lord when Simon was killed on the 3rd day from the kalends of August: 1265. And Penarlâg [Hawarden] castle was destroyed on the 6th day from the kalends of October in that year.

The age of the Lord when Hywel ap Madog died: 1268.

The age of the Lord when Caerphilly castle was taken on the fourth day from the ides of October: 1269\textsuperscript{425}.

The age of the Lord when John Earl Warenne died: 1304.

The age of the Lord when Edward, king of England, died: 1307. And on the ninth day of July in the same year the crown of the kingdom was worn around the head of Edward his son.]

\textit{ENWAU BRENHINOEDD YNYS PRYDAIN} (Cwrtmawr 453, pp. 33–8)

[33] Henwe y Brenhyned\textsuperscript{426}:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{425} Recte 1270.
\textsuperscript{426} Henwe y Brenhyned V: Henway brenhinoed Ynys Brydaen o distrywedigaeth Toea i distrywedigaet Ynys Prydaen B; Henwa6 y brenhinedd or Brytтанieid A; Llyma henwa6 brenhinoedd Kymry kynn kael or Sæsonn veddiant ar y dyrnas D.
\end{flushright}
Eneas ysgwythwyn⁴²⁷, gwedy yntau Ascanus, gwedy ynteu Silius, gwedy ynteu Brutus⁴²⁸, gwedy ynteu Locrinus⁴²⁹, gwedy ynteu Madauc, gwedy ynteu Membyr⁴³⁰, gwedy ynteu Efrawc, gwedy ynteu Brutus Darian Las, gwedy ynteu Lleon, gwedy ynteu Run, gwedy ynteu Bleidud, gwedy ynteu Lyr, gwedy ynteu Cordoilla⁴³¹, gwedy hozmo Cuneda, gwedy ynteu [34] Riwallawn, gwedy ynteu Gwrrwst, gwedy ynteu Seissill, gwedy ynteu Iago, gwedy ynteu Cynvarch, gwedy ynteu Gwrwyw, gwedy ynteu Porrex, gwedy ynteu Dyfynwal Moel Müt, gwedy ynteu Beli, gwedy ynteu Gwrgant Varfdwrch⁴³², gwedy ynteu Cuelyn⁴³³, gwedy ynteu Seissill, gwedy ynteu Cynvarch, gwedy ynteu Danwyw, gwedy ynteu Moruḍ, gwedy ynteu Gwrrwyw, gwedy ynteu Arthal, gwedy ynteu Ywein, gwedy ynteu Peredur, gwedy ynteu Elidir, [35] gwedy ynteu Rys, gwedy ynteu Margan⁴³⁴, gwedy ynteu Einyawn, gwedy ynteu Idwal, gwedy ynteu Run, gwedy ynteu Gereint, gwedy ynteu Cadell, gwedy ynteu Coel, gwedy ynteu Porrex, gwedy ynteu Eidol, gwedy ynteu Auarwy, gwedy ynteu Vrien, gwedy ynteu Eludyd, gwedy ynteu Cludawg⁴³⁵, gwedy ynteu Gwrrwe³⁶, gwedy ynteu Meiryawn, gwedy ynteu Bleidud, gwedy ynteu Caph⁴³⁷, gwedy ynteu Ywein, gwedy ynteu Seissillt, gwedy ynteu Blegywryt⁴³⁸, gwedy ynteu Arthmael⁴³⁹, [36] gwedy ynteu Eidol, gwedy ynteu Ryderch,

⁴²⁷ V; Ysgwydwn B; Ysgwyyddwyn D.
⁴²⁸ Eneas... Brutus VBD; Brutus ap Siluius 6ur kyntaf A.
⁴²⁹ ABD; Locrnus V.
⁴³⁰ VB; Mymbyr A; Embyr D.
⁴³¹ VBA; Kordilla D.
⁴³² BA; Varfdwrch V.
⁴³³ VB; Kuhelyn A.
⁴³⁴ VB; Morgant A.
⁴³⁵ V; K'ydawg BA.
⁴³⁶ BA; Gwrwic V.
⁴³⁷ VA; Kath B.
⁴³⁸ B; Blegwryt V; Blegerwyd A.
⁴³⁹ VB; Arthavael A.
gwedy ynteu Sawyl, gwedy ynteu Pyrr, gwedy ynteu Pab⁴⁴⁰, gwedy ynteu Mynogan, gwedy ynteu Beli Mawr, gwedy ynteu Lluð, gwedy ynteu Caswallawn⁴⁴¹, gwedy ynteu Tenefan⁴⁴², gwedy ynteu Cynvelyn, gwedy ynteu Gwydyr, gwedy ynteu Gweirydd⁴⁴³ Adarweinidawc⁴⁴⁴, gwedy ynteu Meuric, gwedy ynteu Coel, gwedy ynteu Lles, gwedy ynteu Seuerus, gwedy ynteu Basianus, gwedy ynteu Carawn, gwedy ynteu Alectus⁴⁴⁵, [37] gwedy ynteu Ascla, gwedy ynteu Coel, gwedy ynteu Constans, gwedy ynteu Custennin, gwedy ynteu Trahayarn, gwedy ynteu Eudaf, gwedy ynteu Maxen, gwedy ynteu Gratiam⁴⁴⁶, gwedy ynteu Custennin, gwedy ynteu Constans, gwedy ynteu Gorthyyrn⁴⁴⁷ Gortheneu⁴⁴⁸, gwedy ynteu Gwerthuyur⁴⁴⁹, gwedy ynteu Emreis⁴⁵⁰, gwedy ynteu Vthyr Bendragon, gwedy ynteu Arthur, gwedy ynteu Custennin, gwedy ynteu Kynan⁴⁵¹ gwedy ynteu Mortiporus⁴⁵², gwedy ynteu Maelgwn⁴⁵³, gwedy ynteu Ceredic, gwedy ynteu Einiawn⁴⁵⁴ [38] gwedy ynteu Beli, gwedy ynteu Iago, gwedy ynteu Catvan, gwedy ynteu Cadwallawn, gwedy ynteu Catwaladyr Vendigeit.

⁴⁴⁰ VB; Pabyr A. In V a v has been expuncted at the end of this word.
⁴⁴¹ VBD; Cadwallawn A.
⁴⁴² B; Tynnvan V; Tynevan A; Tynn6a[...] D.
⁴⁴³ VBA; Gweuydd D.
⁴⁴⁴ VBA; Ada wenydawc D. In V this word is underlined and arwyneddog is written in the left-hand margin.
⁴⁴⁵ VBA; Alactus D.
⁴⁴⁶ V; Grasian B; Gracian A; Gradian D.
⁴⁴⁷ VB; Gwrtheyrn A; Gwreyrn D.
⁴⁴⁸ VB; – A; Gwrthena6 D.
⁴⁴⁹ VD; Gwerthefur B; Gwrtheuyr A. A addš Vendigaid.
⁴⁵⁰ VBA; Emrys D.
⁴⁵¹ BAD; – V.
⁴⁵² V; Mortiporws B; Moreporys A; Morti[...] D. An error in Hengwrt 33 for Vortiporus.
⁴⁵³ VB; Maelgwyn A. A addš Gwynedd.
⁴⁵⁴ B; Enuawn V; Einawn A.