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It is of course a great honour to be invited to deliver a Sir John Rhîs Memorial Lecture of the British Academy, and I am very conscious of that honour and very grateful to the Academy for inviting me, however unworthy of the occasion I might feel. I live about thirteen miles from John Rhîs's birthplace, and when Celtic scholars from overseas come to visit Aberystwyth I try to take them to see the place. I never make the journey to that tiny ruined cottage in the fastnesses of Pumlumon without reflecting on the strength of that Nonconformist culture which provided Rhîs with the motivation and opportunity to take his first steps up the educational ladder, although it must also be remembered that the Established Church later played a crucial part in furthering his career. Rhîs was for several years a pupil teacher at Pen-llyn British School—Pen-llyn is a village some five miles from Aberystwyth—and a fellow pupil-teacher was John Cynddylan Jones, who later became a renowned preacher and theologian. (Of him the great London preacher Charles Haddon Spurgeon is reputed to have remarked, 'I don't know who this Mr Kindlin' Jones is, but he certainly kindles me!'). Cynddylan Jones once said about the time he and John Rhîs spent together at Pen-llyn: 'Rhîs loved roots [referring to his early passion for comparative philology], I loved fruits [referring presumably to the fruits of the Holy Spirit as listed in the fifth chapter of St
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Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians]. Even if we agree, as I do, with the system of values implicit in that statement, we can hardly deny that Rhŷs’s preoccupation with roots was later to prove immensely fruitful.

There have already been two lectures in this series that have dealt with what may be called Celtic vernacular grammar. In 1937 the great Osborn Bergin took as his theme ‘The Native Irish Grammarian’ and gave a lecture which summarised the results of many years of work on his part, work which was later refined and extended by such scholars as Father Lambert McKenna SJ, Professor Brian Ó Cuív and, most recently, Professor Anders Ahlqvist.¹ In 1961 my old teacher Sir Thomas Parry gave a Rhŷs lecture entitled ‘The Welsh Metrical Treatise Attributed to Einion Offeiriad’ and this too has been followed by a number of important studies during the last thirty years or so. Sir Thomas himself, as his title suggests, concentrated on the metrical aspects of Einion Offeiriad’s grammar, and so definitive was his treatment that this aspect has attracted very little attention since then. However, Professor J. Beverley Smith has shed new light on Einion Offeiriad’s life; Saunders Lewis on the possible philosophical implications of his work; Dr Rachel Bromwich on the use he makes of snatches of verse as examples of metres or metrical faults; Professor Ceri Lewis on his treatment of syllables and diphthongs (and much else); Professor Anne Matonis on virtually all aspects of his work; Dr Iestyn Daniel on the problem of authorship; and Professor Erich Poppe on Einion Offeiriad’s use of rhetorical and grammatical categories: the wide scope of Professor Matonis’s four contributions must particularly be stressed.²


All in all it has been a rich harvest, and we are certainly better placed today to appreciate the significance of Einion Offeiriad’s contribution than we were when Sir Thomas Parry read his lecture to the Academy in 1961. We still lack a general comparative account of grammatical studies in the four Western European vernacular languages where they took root—in Irish from perhaps the seventh century, in Old Norse from the twelfth, in Provençal from the thirteenth and in Welsh from the early fourteenth century—although Professor Pierre-Yves Lambert has begun to make good this deficiency in a valuable symposium edited by Professor Ahlqvist. It is noteworthy that in all the countries where these studies flourished there existed at the relevant time a strong tradition of professional or semi-professional court poetry.

But to turn at last to the theme of tonight’s lecture, ‘Wales’s second grammarian’. Before we fix our attention on him, however, we shall have to linger a little longer in the company of Wales’s first grammarian, namely (as I believe) that Einion Offeiriad, ‘Einion the Priest’, about whose metrical treatise, as he called it, Sir Thomas Parry gave his lecture. We know a certain amount about the life of Einion Offeiriad, thanks primarily to the researches of Professor Beverley Smith. He appears in records relating to southern Cardiganshire and northern Carmarthenshire between 1344 and 1354, and what seems to be a notice of his death is contained in a document emanating from northern Caernarfonshire—a document in which he is described as parson of Llanrug in the commot of Is Gwyrfa— in the year 1349: the likelihood


See the article by Professor Smith cited in n. 2, above.
is that he died during the first visitation of the Black Death. His grammar — if I may here anticipate my own conclusions — is contained in three medieval manuscripts and a mid-sixteenth-century copy of a fourth medieval manuscript. These are: Jesus College Oxford MS 111 ‘The Red Book of Hergest’ of around 1400; the National Library of Wales Aberystwyth MS Llanstephan 3 of around 1425; the University of Wales Bangor MS 1 of around 1450; and Balliol College Oxford MS 353, which was carefully copied around 1550 from an exemplar which is to be dated to around 1400. There are also several copies of the grammar in manuscripts dating from the late sixteenth century onwards, all of which are interesting but none of which is without its problems. In none of the four early versions is it stated that Einion Offeiriad was the author of the grammar, but in the two earliest—Jesus College 111 and Llanstephan 3 — it is said that it was he who devised three new metres, the *hir-a-thoddaid*, the *cyrch-a-chwta* and the *tawddgyrch cadwynog* (I tried to translate these technical terms into English, but despaired!).

One of the late sixteenth-century copies, however, that made by the humanist scholar Thomas Wiliems of Treffriw in Caernarfonshire and preserved in the National Library of Wales MS Mostyn 110, states in its colophon ‘Ac felly y terfyna y Llyfr Cerddwriaeth a wnaeth Einion Offeiriad o Wynedd i Syr Rhys ap Gruffudd ap Hywel ab Ednyfed Fychan er anhysedd a moliant iddo ef’ (‘And thus ends the Book of Versecraft which Einion Offeiriad of Gwynedd made for Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd ap Hywel ab Ednyfed Fychan in his honour and in praise of him’). Thomas Wiliems claims that his exemplar dated from c.1475, and we may suppose that it included the colophon. There seems no good reason to reject the information contained in the colophon, which at once tells us a great deal about Einion Offeiriad and his grammar. One might add that the information is confirmed, apparently independently, by another north Welsh humanist, Robert ab Ifan of Brynsiencyn in Anglesey, in a manuscript which he wrote in 1587. Moreover, the connection between Einion Offeiriad and Rhys ap Gruffudd is conclusively demonstrated by the existence, in nine manuscript copies, of an *awdl*, a panegyric ode, by Einion in praise of Rhys.

---

5 Details of all the manuscripts mentioned will be found in the work cited in n. 10, below. I wish to thank Mr Graham C. G. Thomas of the Department of Manuscripts and Records, the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth for generously sharing his knowledge of the manuscript tradition with me.

6 I. Williams, ‘*Awdl i Rys ap Gruffudd gan Einion Offeiriad*’, *Y Cymmrodor*, xxvi (1916), 115–46; particulars of further manuscript sources will be found in *Gwaith Einion Offeiriad a Dafydd Ddu o Hiraddug*, ed. R. G. Gruffydd and Rh. Ifans (Aberystwyth, forthcoming).
Professor R. R. Davies has memorably described Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd as the ‘virtual governor of south-west Wales in the first half of the fourteenth century’, although he was of course of north Welsh origin, as his pedigree indicates. Ednyfed Fychan, his great-great-grandfather, was the powerful steward of prince Llywelyn ab Iorwerth of Gwynedd, and his descendants continued to serve the princes of Gwynedd loyally, until Edward I’s show of strength in 1277, foreshadowing the final conquest in 1282–3, persuaded some of them, Rhys ap Gruffudd’s grandfather included, to change their allegiance. We can think of Einion Offeiriad as a native of Gwynedd — witness his lordship of Llanrug — who became a clerical henchman of Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd’s in south-west Wales and who was granted lands by him in that area. It is entirely credible — for reasons that we shall have to explore briefly later — that Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd should have asked Einion Offeiriad to compose a handbook of instruction for the professional poets of his day, and that he should have done so drawing freely on the material available to him in his south Cardiganshire home, as Professor Beverley Smith has convincingly shown. Professor Smith has also supplied us with a terminus post quem for the composition of the grammar. Einion Offeiriad’s example of the toddaid metre is taken from an awdl composed by the court poet Gwilym Ddu of Arfon for Sir Gruffudd Llwyd of Tregarnedd in Anglesey and Dinorwig in Caernarfonshire when Sir Gruffudd was imprisoned in Rhuddlan Castle between December 1316 and April 1317, after which time he was removed to the Tower of London. In spite of this imprisonment, the circumstances of which remain obscure, Sir Gruffudd Llwyd was in fact a loyal servant of the Crown, playing a similar role in north-west Wales to that which his nephew-once-removed, Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd, played in south-west Wales. The grammar cannot therefore be earlier than 1317 and it cannot be later than c.1330 when, as we shall see, a second recension was promulgated. The best guess at present is that it was written perhaps fairly early in the 1320s.

What in fact was the nature of this grammar or handbook which Einion Offeiriad composed for Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd c.1325? This question can be answered with considerable confidence because all the important manuscripts, with the exception of Balliol 353, were edited in exemplary fashion by Griffith John Williams, with the help of Evan John Jones, in 1934—a landmark of twentieth-century Welsh scholarship.10 (Incidentally, Balliol 353 was not included because the editors only became aware of it when the book was already at press.) In the Williams-Jones edition the texts from Jesus 111 and Llanstephan 3 take up about 18 pages each: rather less than 10,000 words. Griffith John Williams himself divides the text into six sections, but I prefer, with Mr Euryd Rowlands,11 to split up his last section into three, thus giving us eight sections. These are discussions of:

1 the letters used in writing Welsh;
2 the syllables and diphthongs;
3 the parts of speech, syntax and figures of speech;
4 the traditional Welsh metres;
5 metrical faults to be avoided;
6 how everything is to be praised;
7 the duties of a professional poet;
8 triads relating to versecraft.

Such a scheme, combining instruction in grammar and in poetry, will not seem strange to those familiar with the Latin grammatical tradition of Western Europe or with the vernacular grammars we have briefly touched upon. On the other hand, of course, in its precise combination of elements it is presumably unique. Of the first three sections, the first and third—those on the letters and on the parts of speech, syntax and figures of speech—are heavily dependent on the handbooks of Latin grammar associated with the names of Aelius Donatus (a fourth-century Roman) and Priscianus (a sixth-century citizen of Constantinople) and the derivatives of those handbooks. Much work needs to be done to try to establish as far as possible the precise affiliations of the Welsh text, and a promising start has been made by Professors Matonis and Poppe; incidentally, Professor Matonis is surely right to argue, chiefly against Saunders Lewis, that there is no hint of the influence of the speculative grammarians or modistae on the

10 Gramadegau'r penceiriad, ed. G. J. Williams and E. J. Jones (Caerdydd, 1934) [hereafter cited as GP].
Welsh material. The second section of Einion Offeiriad's handbook is concerned, it will be remembered, with the syllables and diphthongs of Welsh, and this section is almost wholly based on the oral instruction imparted by the master-poets to their pupils during the course of their apprenticeship. If we look at the last five sections of the grammar as we have looked at the first three, we can say that the fourth, sixth and seventh sections—those describing the traditional metres, how everything is to be praised and the duties of a professional poet—are almost certainly the work of Einion Offeiriad himself, although it is naturally based on what he regarded as good practice among the professional poets of his day. On the other hand, the fifth and eighth sections—those listing metrical faults and the triads relating to versecraft—are again a distillation of the teaching of the master-poets to their apprentices, although the triads, in particular, give the impression of having been quite heavily edited by Einion. One not unexpected, but still striking, feature of Einion Offeiriad's work is the use he makes of examples drawn from earlier and contemporary verse to illustrate the metres which he describes and the faults to which the users of these metres were prone. Einion has thirty-nine of these examples, most (although not all) of them four-line stanzas, and they form a body of evidence the significance of which Dr Rachel Bromwich has done more than anyone to elucidate. Of the thirty-nine, no more than twelve can be assigned to known poets, most of them seemingly contemporary with Einion, although a few are earlier. We shall have to return briefly to the import of this body of verse later on.

So much then for Wales's first grammarian, Einion Offeiriad of Gwynedd. We now turn squarely to consider the true subject of this lecture (although some of you may have begun to despair of our ever reaching him), Wales's second grammarian, Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug. Dafydd Ddu, of course, means black or swarthy David. Hiraddug is, strictly speaking, the name of a township in the parish of Cwm in western Flintshire—the township may in fact have been split between Cwm and the adjoining parish of Diserth—but it also seems to have been used to denote the whole commot of which Cwm was a part, that is the commot of Rhuddlan. The commot of Rhuddlan, together with those of Prestatyn and Coleshill, formed the cantref or hundred of

---

Tegeingl or Englefield (the two names are interchangeable in fourteenth-century documents). In various Renaissance manuscripts which purport to be copies of Davydd Ddu’s work (possibly all deriving from the same source) he is called ‘Davydd Ddu Athro o Degeingl a Hiraddug’, which can plausibly be rendered ‘Magister David Black (or David the Black) from Englefield and Hiraddug’. Unfortunately we have virtually no episcopal records from the diocese of St Asaph in the fourteenth century. Between February and November 1357, however, the see was vacant through the death of bishop John Trefor I and was administered during the vacancy, according to custom, by Simon Islip, the Archbishop of Canterbury. In Simon Islip’s register in Lambeth Palace Library there are during that period eight references to a certain Magister David de Englefield, a canon of St Asaph, who was appointed by Archbishop Islip to be Vicar-General of the diocese and guardian of the spiritualities while the see remained vacant. I think it likely that this Magister David de Englefield is indeed our Davydd Ddu Athro o Degeingl a Hiraddug who is thus revealed—if I am right—as an important dignitary in the diocese of St Asaph during the middle years of the fourteenth century. The historian of the diocese, Archdeacon D. R. Thomas, made Davydd Ddu chancellor, but I do not know on what evidence, although (as we shall see) he may have been right. No other likely record reference to Davydd Ddu has yet come to light. In 1318 a certain Davydd de Rhuddallt was provided (that is, appointed by the pope) to a canonry with the expectation of a prebend in the diocese of Bangor, and indeed in 1328 he reappears as a prebendary; there is a village named Rhualt (from Rhuddallt) in the parish of Tremeirchion in the commot of Rhuddlan, otherwise known, as we have seen, as the commot of Hiraddug, so that in Davydd de Rhuddallt we may be looking at Davydd Ddu climbing the first rungs of the ladder of

14 Ibid. p. 202; an instance of the interchangeability of the two terms is at University of Wales Bangor Mostyn MSS 2801 (dated 1315/16) and 2803 (dated 1327).
15 The evidence is at GP p. xiv. All quotations from Welsh are given in normalised spelling.
16 London, Lambeth Palace Library, Register of Archbishop Simon Islip, ff. 218r–219r, 220r, 279v–280v. I am most grateful to Miss Melanie Barber, Deputy Librarian and Archivist at Lambeth Palace Library, for directing my attention to A. C. Ducarel’s index to the register and for verifying that the references in the index are correct. Evidence of princely interference with David de Englefield at this time will be found in Register of Edward the Black Prince (4 vols., Stationery Office, London, 1930–3), iii, p. 280.
17 D. R. Thomas, The History of the Diocese of St Asaph (2nd ed., 3 vols., Oswestry, 1909–13), i, p. 253 (cf. ibid., p. 62). Thomas here follows E. Edwards, Willis’ Survey of St Asaph, considerably enlarged (2 vols., Wrexham, 1801), i, p. 247. Thomas, op. cit. iii, p. 327 was the first to suggest that David de Englefield may have been the same as Davydd Ddu o Hiraddug.
ecclesiastical preferment in the diocese of Bangor, presumably before transferring later to his home diocese of St Asaph.\textsuperscript{18} Various shadowy canons of St Asaph flit in and out of the estate records of the period: in the massive Bangor Mostyn collection, for example, we have a Dafydd ap Hywel ap Goronwy and a Dafydd ab Ithel, but neither of these is styled magister.\textsuperscript{19} Perhaps more promising than all of these, however, is a reference by the great Renaissance scholar Dr John Davies of Mallwyd in Merionethshire to Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug as archdeacon of Diserth; Davies also assigns to Dafydd Ddu the date 1340.\textsuperscript{20} By the archdeaconry of Diserth Davies meant the archdeaconry of St Asaph itself, since the church of Diserth formed part of the endowment of the archdeaconry.\textsuperscript{21} By the end of the sixteenth century the bishop of St Asaph was permitted to hold the archdeaconry in commendam, and when Davies accompanied Bishop William Morgan on his translation from Llandaff to St Asaph in 1601, it was to the archdeacon’s house in Diserth that they went to live.\textsuperscript{22} Davies was therefore exceptionally well placed to consult any surviving records (if there were any) relating to the archdeaconry, and to receive any surviving oral traditions about former occupants of that dignity. It is pertinent to add that the vacancy of the see of St Asaph in 1357, over which Magister David de Englefield presided, came to an end when the then archdeacon, Llywelyn ap Madog ab Elis, was provided to the bishopric.\textsuperscript{23} and it is by no means impossible that Magister David de Englefield succeeded him as


\textsuperscript{19} University of Wales Bangor Mostyn MSS 3242 (Dafydd ap Hywel ap Goronwy, 1337/8), 2491 (Dafydd ab Ithel, 1341). On the collection see the typescript description at Bangor University Library by E. Gwynne Jones and A. Giles Jones, ‘A Catalogue of the (Bangor) Mostyn collection’ (six volumes, 1967).


\textsuperscript{21} John Le Neve, op. cit. above, n. 18, p. 43n2.


\textsuperscript{23} John Le Neve, op. cit. above, n. 18, p. 37.
archdeacon. Archdeacon Thomas states that William de Spridlington, a servant of the Black Prince, was made archdeacon at this time, but he gives no authority for this statement, and since de Spridlington eventually became dean — and, indeed, bishop — it is perhaps unlikely that he ever took what was technically the lesser office. By 1371 the archdeaconry was held by Ithel ap Robert, a notable patron of the important professional poet Iolo Goch, and the likelihood is that David de Englefield, if he ever held the post, was dead by then. It might be added that the canons of St Asaph at this time were a pugnacious lot, who in 1344 informed the pope that the 'people of Wales, inhabiting as they do wild places, are themselves untamed and fierce, so that they will hardly receive discipline from those expert in their own tongue, and... if they had a prelate ignorant of it they would be the more disobedient and rebellious': this, of course, was an argument for a bishop of their own choosing.

Regarding Dafydd Ddu’s final resting place, the antiquary Edward Lhuyd recorded in 1696 in the parish of Cwm a tradition, ‘Mae bedd Dafydd Ddu dan sylfaen, dan y ffenestr briodas yn eglwys y Ddiserth’ (‘the grave of Dafydd Ddu is under the foundation, under the marriage window in Diserth church’).

For what it is worth this tends to confirm the statement of Dr John Davies that Dafydd Ddu once resided in Diserth as archdeacon.

Before I move on to discuss Dafydd Ddu’s work as grammarian, there are two problems relating to his life which I should address briefly. Some years ago Professor R. R. Davies was good enough to mention to me that he had seen in the fourteenth-century court rolls of the Lordship of Dyffryn Clwyd references to someone who could be Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug, and Dr Oliver Padel, when he was working on the court rolls, kindly supplied me with transcripts of the references. They concern a certain David Duy de Hirrathok (or alternatively Hyr(r)ythok) who was accused in 1358 of attacking a certain Dafydd ab Iorwerth ap Cadwgan in his own house; David Duy failed to appear

24 D. R. Thomas, op. cit. above, n. 17, i, p. 246; John Le Neve, op. cit. above, n. 18, pp. 37, 40.
28 London, Public Record Office: SC 2/218/6, m. 28; SC 2/218/6, m. 24d; SC 2/218/7, m. 24.

I am most grateful to Professor Davies and Dr Padel for their kind assistance.
six times in succession, was found to be without property and was declared an outlaw. It is not so much the circumstances of the case that I find perplexing — although if the defendant were Dafydd Ddu it would seem that his fortunes had suffered a sea-change in a very few months — but the fact that the name of his home as spelt in the documents could be interpreted not only as Hiraddug but also as Hiraethog, and that the subsidiary court in which the case was tried was that of Clocaenog and Trefor, which was situated in the shadow of the uplands of Hiraethog. On balance, at present, I tend regretfully to the conclusion that the Dafydd Ddu of the court case was not our Dafydd Ddu, but I may of course be wrong.

The second problem relating to the life of Dafydd Ddu is both more complicated and more vexing. As Mr Julian Roberts has amply shown, in 1574 that wayward genius John Dee undertook an antiquarian tour of his Welsh homeland and during the course of that tour he appears to have heard stories about Dafydd Ddu which convinced him that Dafydd was none other than Roger Bacon, the thirteenth-century Franciscan polymath who achieved posthumous fame as a magician: the fact that the two lived in different centuries appears not to have worried Dee overmuch. Since Dee also thought that he and Dafydd Ddu were related to each other, his discovery meant that he could now claim kinship with Roger Bacon, which pleased him greatly, since he regarded Bacon as his mentor. Dee appears to have convinced at least some members of the circle of Welsh humanists with whom he was in contact — that circle which had as its focus Richard Vaughan, later Bishop of Bangor, Chester and London in quick succession — since Henry Salesbury in his Grammatica Britannica of 1594 refers to Dafydd Ddu as ‘insignis mathematicus’ (a famous mathematician), which was certainly true of Bacon. On the other hand, another member of the circle, Maurice Kyffin, in his translation of Bishop John Jewel’s Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicaee the following year,


expresses caution about the equation: referring to Bacon he says ‘hwn a eilw rhoi ymhliath y Cymry, Dafydd Ddu o Hiraddug’ (‘this is he whom some among the Welsh call Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug’).32 but Kyffin, it should be added, was not only a very able but also an exceptionally level-headed person. By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries stories about Dafydd Ddu’s activities as a magician had proliferated, as Lewis Morris bears trenchant witness in 1757.33 He, and the stories about him, had also become associated with a fine late fourteenth-century canopied tomb in Tremeirchion parish church, a tomb with an effigy of a priest and bearing the inscription ‘HIC IACET DAVID FILIVS HOVEL FILIVS MADOC’ (‘here lies David son of Hywel son of Madog’).34 Thomas Pennant in 1781, Edward Jones ‘Bardd y Brenin’ (king’s harpist) in 1808, and Father C. A. Newdigate SJ in 1897 all testify to the fact that oral tradition was firmly of the opinion that this was Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug’s tomb, and that Dafydd Ddu was a notable magician.35 According to Father Newdigate the tomb was opened sometime during the 1830s and the remains left in the church porch overnight, ‘in mortal dread Satan should come and claim his property’, before they were reinterred the following day.36 It may be added that even in this century Jonathan Ceredig Davies and Evan Isaac were able to collect stories about Dafydd Ddu, although the stories they tell do not connect him with the tomb at Tremeirchion.37 Returning to that tomb, and in spite of the high authority of the late Colin Gresham,38 I have to say that I think the identification of its occupier with Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug is extremely dubious. First, there is no Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog in the relevant genealogical collections, heroically assembled by Dr Peter

32 Daffynniad Ffydd Eglwys Loegr a gyfeithwyd i’r Gymraeg ... gan Maurice Kyffin, ed. W. Prichard Williams (Bangor, 1908), p. [103].
34 Celtic Remains by Lewis Morris, ed. D. Silvan Evans (supplement to Archaeologia Cambrensis; London, 1878), pp. 122, 244; I wish to thank Professor Geraint H. Jenkins for kindly drawing my attention to Lewis Morris’s important evidence.
36 Ibid. 114.
37 J. C. Davies, Folk-lore of West and Mid-Wales (Aberystwyth, 1911), p. 250; E. Isaac, Coelion Cymru (Aberystwyth, 1938), p. 111. Davies’s account may be compared with Lewis Morris’s (above, n. 34) and Isaac’s with Edward Lhuyd’s (above, n. 27).
38 C. A. Gresham, op. cit. above, n. 33, p. 227.
Bartrum, who can plausibly be equated with Dafydd Ddu.\textsuperscript{39} Secondly, and much more important, in the Pennant of Downing collection of deeds and documents in the Clwyd Record Office at Hawarden there is a notable series of deeds which show a certain Madog Rwth ap Robert, together with his children and grandchildren, busily buying up small parcels of land in Tremeirchion and the vicinity, so as to form in the end, we may assume, a sizeable estate. One of Madog Rwth’s grandchildren was Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog,\textsuperscript{40} and I strongly suspect that it is he who lies in that stately tomb in Tremeirchion parish church. There is, incidentally, another tomb in the church, supposedly of Sir Robert Pounderling, keeper of Diserth Castle in the thirteenth century, and he would have been Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog’s great-great-great-grandfather.\textsuperscript{41} The parishioners of Tremeirchion will not thank me for depriving them of their most famous vicar (although John Roberts, vicar between 1807 and 1829, was also a man of considerable distinction), and if I am proved wrong about Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog I shall not be sorry. Two arguments might help the case against me.

1 The effigy on the tomb is that of a man dressed in a priest’s vestments, and there is no hint in the Pennant of Downing deeds that Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog was a priest (although I suppose he could have been ordained late in life).

2 None of the armorial crests on the tomb matches that ascribed to Madog Rwth by the greatest authority in the field of Welsh heraldry, Dr Michael Siddons.\textsuperscript{42}

Whatever the outcome of that debate, the existence of stories about Dafydd Ddu’s magical exploits is undeniable, and those stories may in fact tell us something about him as he was in real life. I am not

\textsuperscript{39} P. C. Bartrum, \textit{Welsh Genealogies A.D. 300–1400} (8 vols; Cardiff, 1974); see the ‘Index of persons born c.1215–1330’ in vol. v.

\textsuperscript{40} Hawarden, Clwyd Record Office, Pennant of Downing deeds and papers 226–9, 231–2, 475–8 (dates between 1340 and 1352), referring to Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog; other members of the family occur \textit{passim} in the collection; see the typescript schedule at the Record Office. ‘Report on deeds and papers of the Pennant family of Downing, Flintshire, 1299–1929’ (1981). I am extremely grateful to Dr A. D. Carr of the University of Wales Bangor for directing my attention to this collection, among others.

\textsuperscript{41} C. A. Gresham, op. cit. above, n. 33, pp. 174–5; E. Hubbard, op. cit. above, n. 33, p. 449; P. C. Bartrum, op. cit. above, n. 39, [iv], pp. 739–40 (‘Pounderling 1–2’). Dafydd ap Hywel ap Madog does not appear in the pedigree, which may be a marginal argument in favour of his having been a celibate.

suggesting that he was a magician, but he may well during his lifetime have made an impression on his contemporaries as a learned and bookish man, and such a man may then, as later, have attracted stories about mastery of the black arts, congress with demons and so forth. The title *magister* ascribed to David de Englefield in Archbishop Simon Islip’s register does suggest the possession of a university degree of some kind, or at least a period of residence at a university: the title *athro* ascribed to Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug may point in the same direction. In Dafydd Ddu’s case the university in question would almost certainly have been Oxford, and if he did graduate *magister* there, it would have involved at least seven years’ intensive study, concentrating at that time on logic and physics, although other branches of the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, and of the philosophies, would not have been wholly neglected.\(^{43}\) To his unlettered contemporaries, such a man would indeed have seemed a paragon of learning, and it would have been natural for stories of supernatural attainments to have become attached to him. That is, after all, exactly what happened to Dafydd Ddu’s *alter ego* (as John Dee thought), Roger Bacon.\(^{44}\)

We now turn from Dafydd Ddu the man, as it were, to his work as grammarian. That work is contained in a single medieval manuscript, National Library of Wales MS Peniarth 20, which has been dated by Mr Daniel Huws (whose authority in the field is unrivalled) to c.1330, a date confirmed by Dr and Mrs Thomas Charles-Edwards in a recent valuable study.\(^{45}\) The manuscript was produced in the scriptorium of the Cistercian abbey of Glynegwesyl, Valle Crucis, near Llangollen in Denbighshire, which is about twenty-five miles from St Asaph, a day’s journey in the fourteenth century. The text of the grammar in Peniarth 20 was included by Williams and Jones in their edition of 1936, so that it is as easily accessible as the two oldest texts of Einion Offeiriad’s grammar. Like them Peniarth 20 contains no ascription of authorship within the text itself, as in an incipit or colophon, but again like them it states that the three new metres, *cyrch-a-chwta*, *hir-a-thoddaid* and


tawddgyrch cadwynog, were devised, not by Einion Offeiriad this
time, but by ‘Dafydd Ddu Athro’. It is again National Library of Wales
MS Mostyn 110 which includes a copy of the grammar with a colophon
which states: ‘Ac felly y terfyna llyfr celfyddyd y gerddwriaeth o
awdurddod Dafydd Ddu Athro o Degeinfl a Hiraddug. Allan o hen decest
ar femrwn’ (‘And thus ends the book on the art of versecraft authorised
by Magister Dafydd Ddu of Englefield and Hiraddug. Out of an old text
on vellum’). As it happens, that particular copy is of Einion Offeiriad’s
original grammar and not of Dafydd Ddu’s revision of it, which means
that the textual tradition had become hopelessly confused during the
two and a half centuries which separate Peniarth 20 and Mostyn 110,
but that need not vitiate the colophon’s witness to an early belief that
Dafydd as well as Einion had compiled a grammar-book. I think we
may confidently accept the Peniarth 20 text as a very early copy of
Dafydd Ddu’s recension. It is in fact a much earlier and rather better
text than any that have survived of Einion Offeiriad’s original grammar,
but that should not blind us to its essentially derivative nature.

How then did Dafydd Ddu set about revising Einion Offeiriad’s
work? To answer that question in detail would require much more
time than I have at my disposal and would also, I fear, try your patience
 sorely. Ideally, too, it would require the use of a definitive edition
of Einion Offeiriad’s grammar, which is an urgent desideratum: it is good
to know that Professor Matonis has such an edition in contemplation.
The first point to make is that Dafydd Ddu’s work is firmly based on
Einion’s: he follows the same general arrangement, uses many of the
same definitions, is content to cite many of the same metrical examples.
But, secondly, he also feels free to amend Einion’s treatment at virtu-
ally every point: within sections the order of material is rearranged,
the wording of definitions is changed, some examples of metres and
metrical faults are dropped and new ones introduced, a certain amount
of fresh material is added and a rather smaller amount of material
included by Einion is omitted. To take an extreme example, at the
end of Einion’s third section there is a short disquisition on figures of
speech of which the third and last is ymoralw, possibly corresponding to
the Latin evocatio. This is supposed to excuse the fault known as gwyyd
ac absen (‘presence and absence’). Einion defines this fault only in
terms of non-agreement of the subject and finite verb, but Dafydd Ddu
adds a second category in which two different tenses of the verb occur
in the same sentence. This enables him to cite as the second metrical
example in his recension an englyn which Einion cites last but two, as
an example of the metrical fault *carnymorddiwes* (‘hoof-clash’), in which the last two lines of an *englyn* are both accented on the penultimate syllable rather than alternately on the penultimate and ultima. The *englyn* in question was composed by the court poet Gwilym Rhyfel towards the middle of the twelfth century:

Pei prynwn seithbwn sathrgrug — i’th oddau,
Pedolau pwyll gaddug
Mangre grawnfaeth, saeth seithug,
Main a’u nadd yn Hiraddug!

If I were to buy seven sackfuls cast into a heap for you,
Sackfuls of horseshoes meant to cover
The hooves of a stud fed on grain, that would be a vain thing to attempt,
Stones will wear them down in Hiraddug!  

One cannot resist the suspicion that Dafydd Ddu saw in this *englyn* a chance early on in his work to make honourable mention of his own home ground and that he rearranged his material accordingly.

Many more examples could be cited of Dafydd Ddu’s free and easy way with Einion Offeiriad’s material, and I must here be selective (although, it must be stressed, not particularly systematic). A clearer instance of relocation than the one above has to do with Einion’s rule on how to identify the quality of a syllable by putting the word in which it occurs into the plural, a rule which is found in his fifth section: Dafydd moves it to his second section and amplifies it somewhat. Dafydd sometimes not only amplifies but also adds: Einion has nothing to correspond to Dafydd’s innovative discussion of the two values of the vowel y in the first section, nor to his rather acerbic comment on the *englyn cyrch* metre:

A’r modd hwnnw ar englyn ni pherthyn ar brydydd ei ganu namyn ar deuluwr diwladaidd, rhag ei hawsed a’i fyrred.

And it is not appropriate for a master-poet to compose that kind of *englyn* but only for a cultivated apprentice-poet, because it is so easy and short.

On the other hand, possibly because he thought such matters relatively unimportant, Dafydd omits Einion’s interesting directive on how to interpret ambiguous material (the more favourable sense is always to

46 GP pp. 25, 45–6.
48 GP pp. 32, 41–2.
49 GP pp. 39, 48.
be preferred), and his stern demand that professional poets should observe the strictest moral standards.\textsuperscript{50} In the section on metres, Dafydd does not follow precisely the order adopted by Einion in describing the various metrical forms, nor (as I have already mentioned) does he always use the same examples. His treatment is also rather more expansive. Compared with Einion’s thirty-nine examples of metres and metrical faults, Dafydd has forty-seven, of which eleven are new, more than balancing the six examples used by Einion which Dafydd omits. Finally the section ‘How everything is to be praised’ is much more elaborate in Dafydd Ddu’s version than it is in Einion Offeiriad’s. Dafydd has twenty categories of people worthy of praise compared to Einion’s eight (although it should be noted that there are interesting variations in this section between the various texts of Einion’s grammar itself). Since Dafydd refers to himself as ‘athro’ within the text of the grammar itself, it is interesting to compare his and Einion’s treatment of that term. Einion defines ‘athro’ as one of the lower clergy and describes him thus (I follow the Llanstephan 3 and Balliol 353 versions):

\begin{quote}
Athisawn a folir o ddoethineb a chymhendod a haelioni a thegwich a defodaun da a dyfnder deall ac athrylith a goruchelder celyfyydau a synhwyrau, a buddugoliaethau yn ymyrsonau a phethau eraill arderchogion.

Teachers are praised for wisdom and talent and generosity and beauty and laudable customs and depth of understanding and innate ability and high mastery of arts and experiments, and victories in disputation and other exalted things.\textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

Dafydd Ddu’s version is longer and, I think, displays a greater awareness of the university curriculum of the day. He defines ‘athro’ as ‘a secular scholar’ who is not, however, a layman: perhaps he thought of him as someone in minor orders.

\begin{quote}
Athisawn a folir og eu celyfyydau a’u gwybodaun ac uchelder natur, a chyfreithiau, a blaenwydd canon, a buddugoliaethau yn ymyrsonau, a doethineb ar ofynnau a gollyngau drwy athrylith a celyfyydau a dosbarth.

Teachers are praised for their arts and sciences and their mastery of nature and laws [presumably civil law] and supremacy in canon law, and victories in disputation and wisdom when dealing with questions and conclusions by means of innate ability and arts and discernment.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{GP} pp. 33–4, 35.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{GP} p. 34.
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{GP} p. 56.
Incidentally Dafydd, unlike Einion, also has a section on how ‘disgynblion’ (pupils) are to be praised, and this may be worth quoting for the light it may throw on Dafydd’s own activities at the time when his revision of the grammar was written:

Disgynblion a folir og eu dysg a’u hathrylith a’u gwybodau a’u haddfwynder ac o’u bod yn ddefnyddiau gwyra.

Pupils are praised for their learning, and innate ability, and knowledge, and docility and because they are potential gentlemen.  

That last point suggests strongly that Dafydd Ddu may have taught lay children as well as those who aspired to holy orders, and it may confirm Archdeacon D. R. Thomas’s suggestion that Dafydd may, as chancellor, have been responsible for the cathedral school of the diocese. That laymen as well as clergy attended such schools is proved by a well-known passage in an amusing poem by Iolo Goch to Ithel ap Robert, whose aspirations to become a bishop were never realised and who had finally to be content, as we have seen, with the archdeaconry of St Asaph. Ithel ap Robert was a BCL, presumably of Oxford, but he seems to have received his basic education in Latin grammar and liturgical singing within the diocese of St Asaph, possibly at the cathedral school:

Cydwersog, cof diweirsalm,
Fûm ag ef yn dolef dalm
Gyda’r un athro, clo clod,
A’n henfeistr . . .

Singing together the same verses, memorising the chaste psalm [i.e. Psalm 51],
Was I with him chanting awhile
Under the same teacher, most deserving of praise,
And our old instructor . . .  

It would be pleasing to think that the ‘old instructor’ was in fact Dafydd Ddu himself, but I am afraid chronological considerations make that unlikely (although not impossible).

It may be profitable to linger for another few minutes over the question of whether there is anything further his grammar can tell us about Dafydd Ddu. There are intriguing hints here and there, especially in the examples Dafydd gives to illustrate points of grammar. Sometimes he gives examples when Einion Offeiriad has none, and some-

53 Ibid.
54 Gwaith Iolo Goch, p. 56.
times Dafydd’s examples differ from Einion’s. For instance, Einion has nothing to correspond to Dafydd’s mention of Gwrecsam, then as now an important town in the diocese of St Asaph, nor to his plain statement, of the kind one meets constantly in medieval grammar-books, ‘Mi yw Dafydd’ (‘I am Dafydd’). 55 On the other hand we find Dafydd replacing Einion’s ‘Mynnwn fy mod yn gyfoethog’ (‘I would like to be rich’) by ‘Mynnwn fy mod yn esgob’ (‘I would like to be a bishop’). 56 Einion’s ‘Ieu an a gær Gwenllian’ (‘Ieuan loves Gwenllian’) becomes in Dafydd’s hands ‘Mi a garaf Gweirful’ (‘I love Gweirful’); and, most daring of all, Einion’s conventional ‘gwraig wen ei dwylo’ (‘a woman with white hands’) is transformed by Dafydd into ‘gwraig wen ei hesgeiriau’ (‘a woman with white legs’). 57 In view of this, it is perhaps not surprising to find that Dafydd has substituted for Einion’s example of the gwawdoddyn metre (whatever that example may have been: the texts differ on the point) four lines from a delightful love poem by Iorwerth Fychan ab Iorwerth ap Rhotbert of which the last line of the four is ‘Mor wen ei hesgair uwch ei hesgid’ (‘How white is her leg above her shoe’). 58 Nor is it surprising to find that one of the examples of the englyn proest cited by both Einion and Dafydd is a snatch of love-lyric composed by Dafydd himself:

Llawn dan glaerwen len laes,
Lleddf olwg gloyw amlw glwys;
Llathrlun manol a folais,
Llariaidd foneddigaidd foes.

Joyful under a glowing-white long robe,
With downcast, shining, clear and comely eyes;
A lovely bright form that I have praised,
Of generous and courteous custom. 59

55 GP pp. 39, 45; it may be worth noting that the Rectory of Wrexham belonged to Valle Crucis Abbey: see D. R. Thomas, op. cit. above, n. 17, iii, pp. 293–6.
56 GP pp. 23, 43.
57 GP pp. 24, 45; ibid. pp. 25, 45. The conventional nature of ‘gwraig wen ei dwylo’ was pointed out to me by Miss Morfydd E. Owen.
58 GP pp. 9, 28; ibid. p. 49. In her edition of Iorwerth Fychan’s poem, Dr Christine James argues that the two amendments by Dafydd cited in the preceding note are also evidence of Iorwerth’s influence on him (Gweirful is the name of the girl celebrated in the poem); see Gwaith Bleiddyn Fardd a beirdd eraill a’i hanner y drydedd ganrif ar ddeg, ed. Rh. M. Andrews et al. (Cardiff, 1996), p. 311. Since Iorwerth in another poem (ibid. pp. 320–30) mentions the obscure river Fyddion, which joins the Clwyd near Rhuddlan, it is tempting to relocate him in this area, although it is unlikely on chronological grounds that he is to be connected with the family to which Ithel ap Robert belonged: see P. C. Bartrum, op. cit. above, n. 39, [ii], p. 263 (‘Ednywyn Bendew 2’).
59 GP pp. 27, 48.
That last example raises a more general point. If a stanza by Dafydd Ddu was included in Einion Offeiriad’s original grammar, Einion must at least have known of Dafydd’s work. More than that, they may have been known to each other, the one presumably a middle-aged cleric with his base in the diocese of St David’s but with connections with the diocese of Bangor, the other a rising young scholar also with possible connections during the 1320s with the diocese of Bangor before transferring to St Asaph. It is not impossible that the grammar may have been to some extent a work of collaboration from the beginning, which could explain the fact that the invention of the three new metres is ascribed to Einion Offeiriad in one group of texts and to Dafydd Ddu in another text. At least this theory would enable us to avoid having to charge Dafydd Ddu with plagiarism, if that concept had any meaning then. Were the theory to be accepted, it would mean that the Peniarth 20 text represents a later revision by Dafydd Ddu of the original grammar compiled by both Einion Offeiriad and Dafydd Ddu together: it is, if you like, a second revised edition undertaken by one only of the two original authors. But clearly this argument cannot be pressed too far.

Finally, we might ask the question ‘What is it all about?’ Why did Sir Rhys ap Gruffudd, possibly with the knowledge and support of Sir Gruffudd Llwyd,60 encourage Einion Offeiriad, possibly with Dafydd Ddu as collaborator, to undertake the compilation of the grammar at all? I think there may be a threefold answer to that question. First, there was certainly a pedagogic motive, an attempt to supply the professional poets with a manual of useful knowledge, which at least bowed in the direction of the dominant educational tradition of the day, that of Latin grammar, although of course the manual could not hope and did not aim to include all the information necessary to enable a professional poet to practise his art—the most obvious example of omission is of course the lack of any discussion of cyngghanedd or metrical ornament. Secondly, there was probably an attempt in the manual to redefine the function of Welsh panegyrical poetry after the catastrophe of the Conquest, and also to set it on an overtly Christian basis: if there were no longer royal courts to welcome professional poets and royal law to guarantee their status, the new Welsh élite in both church and secular society would make them

60 It may be worth noting that Sir Gruffudd Llwyd’s court at Dinorwig was no more than a mile and a half away from Einion Offeiriad’s church of Llanrug.
welcome in their halls and provide them with a livelihood; the career of Iolo Goch, with his judicious mixture of secular and ecclesiastical patrons—something of the ratio of eight to five—exemplifies this point.\textsuperscript{61} Thirdly, the manual may be seen as an attempt by the Welsh secular and clerical élite to regulate the practices of the Welsh professional poets. If we take sections 6 and 7 of the classification suggested above together (those are the sections on ‘How everything is to be praised’ and ‘The duties of a professional poet’) it is clear that the poets were forbidden to compose:

1. satire;
2. love-poetry to married women;
3. anything smacking of their primitive mantic function, particularly (it may be assumed) vaticination.

With regard to the second prohibition, forbidding the composition of love-poetry to married women, it is noteworthy that love-poetry to young unmarried women was allowed, especially by young poets, and was indeed tacitly encouraged by the high proportion of fragments of love-lyric quoted as examples of metres and metrical faults. Taken together, these three prohibitions appear to reflect fairly accurately the situation obtaining during the time of the court poets of the Welsh princes in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, whose complete works the Centre which I had the honour to direct has just finished editing;\textsuperscript{62} but they do not seem to reflect what was happening during the Conquest and in the ensuing turbulent period when satire, in particular, flourished mightily. The publication of the poets’ manual has been plausibly seen as an attempt to get a grip on this situation.\textsuperscript{63} To what extent it succeeded may partly be obscured by the towering figure of Dafydd ap Gwilym, whose work consists largely of what purport to be love-poems to married women. (I choose my words carefully because Dafydd ap Gwilym is an extraordinarily complex figure.) But if we look past him, we see that the more typical professional poets largely conform to the prescriptions of the manual. Praise of God and man, and of young women, was their stock-in-trade, although they never entirely renounced satire, and when occasion demanded, as during the War of

\textsuperscript{61} Gwaith Iolo Goch, passim.
\textsuperscript{62} The seventh and last volume of ‘Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion’ (the Poets of the Princes Series) was published by the University of Wales Press in Cardiff in March, 1996.
Independence of Owain Glyndŵr and the Wars of the Roses, their old facility for vaticination was again found useful.\textsuperscript{64}

Before we bid farewell to Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug, I would like to consider very briefly two further aspects of his work. In the first place he was not only a grammarian but also a considerable religious poet in his own right. Three poems by him have been preserved, all of them in manuscripts typically dating from the later sixteenth and earlier seventeenth centuries. The first of them, a long cywydd outlining the History of Redemption from the Creation of Christ, was apparently immensely popular, since it is still extant in more than seventy manuscript copies.\textsuperscript{65} After stating what happened on each of the six days of Creation, the poet describes Adam’s fall (at Eve’s instigation), his exile to the Valley of Hebron, his death and committal to Hell for 4,604 years, and then the coming of Christ to redeem him. The poem ends by reminding the reader (or hearer) that there is only one sacrifice for sin:

\begin{verbatim}
Ac nid oes, gwedi’i foes Fo,
Mab Brenin mwy a’i pryno.
\end{verbatim}

And there will not be, after what He has achieved,
Any other King’s Son that will once more redeem him.

The second poem is again a cywydd, rather shorter than the first and extant in far fewer manuscript copies—some twenty-one have come to light to date.\textsuperscript{66} It is a metrical recital of the Ten Commandments, except that the order of the commandments and to some extent their content is curiously different from the normal medieval version (which corresponds to the Hebrew version in the Book of Exodus except that it omits the second commandment (against graven images), and splits the tenth (against coveting a neighbour’s property) into two). The reason for this discrepancy is that Dafydd Ddu attempts to combine the Dominical precepts about loving God and one’s neighbour with the Ten Commandments, and I would be glad to know to what extent this happens elsewhere. The poem ends with an appeal to the pupil to learn and heed every word of the commandments, which shows clearly its educational intent:


\textsuperscript{65} e.g. Cardiff, South Glamorganshire Libraries MS 5.167, ff. 7'–8'; see further the second work referred to in n. 6 above.

\textsuperscript{66} e.g. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales MS Brogynyn 1.2, ff. 337'–338'; see further the second work referred to in n. 6 above.
Disgyblaeth, fab, arfaeth fu,
Disgybl a gár eu dysgu;
Diangall ydyw’r Dengair:
Dysgwn ac eurwn bob gair!

To be a pupil, my son, was foreordained,
A pupil will love to learn these;
Full of wisdom are the Ten Precepts:
Let us learn and honour every word!

Dafydd Ddu’s third and last poem is an awdl and it occurs in a mere seven manuscripts: it is, however, better known than the two cywyddau because it was printed in the *Mwyvrion Archaiology of Wales* in 1801. It is a prolonged and moving meditation on the fate awaiting a man or woman’s body in the grave, no matter what his or her rank or pretensions might be, concluding with an appeal to God, the Virgin Mary and the saints for clemency and succour on the Day of Judgement:

Yno y diolchir
Ymadrodd cywir;
Yno y dielir
Pob anwriedd.

There each just utterance
Will be rewarded;
There each act of wrongdoing
Will be punished.

This is of course a common theme of late medieval religious verse, but Dafydd Ddu handles it with skill and conviction, foreshadowing to some extent the powerful macabre poetry of Siôn Cent a generation or two later. One wonders whether Dafydd Ddu’s sombre view of the human condition may not have been coloured somewhat by his experience of the Black Death, the first onslaught of which he apparently survived. His religious poetry, as both Dr Brynley F. Roberts and Sir Glanmor Williams have emphasised, is essentially didactic in character and forms part of that considerable body of prose and verse which was intended to instruct and enlighten the Welsh clergy and laity, the origin of which must at least partly be sought in Archbishop John Peckham’s Constitutions of 1281 and, ultimately, in the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.

67 *The Mwyvrion Archaiology of Wales*, ed. O. Jones *et al.* (3 vols., London, 1801–7), i, pp. 536–7; see further the second work referred to in n. 6 above.
There is one other point about Dafydd Ddu that I want to mention before I finish. In about ten manuscripts, the earliest of which dates from around 1400, there is extant a Welsh version of the text known in Latin as *Officium Parvum Beatae Mariae Virginis*, ‘the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary’, otherwise known as ‘The Hours of the Virgin’; the Welsh title is ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ (‘The Office (or Service) of Mary’). As its Latin title implies, the text is modelled on the Divine Office contained in the Breviary, but is much shorter and simpler: it includes brief services for the seven canonical hours and consists of psalms, hymns, lessons and prayers. The Little Office originated in the religious orders but was soon adopted by the secular clergy and spread from them to the laity. The Welsh version was impeccably edited by Dr Brynley F. Roberts in 1961.\(^6^9\) It is a metrical version: the twenty-eight psalms and four canticles are rendered, with one exception, into a flexible ‘free’ metre consisting basically of a ten-syllable line bearing four accents and rhyming in couplets (although there is wide variation); whereas the hymns, four of which are Marian and the fifth the ‘Te Deum’, are given a more formal garb of ‘strict’ metres, in which the line-length is quite firmly regulated and a measure of ornamentation obligatory — the metres used are the *toddaid*, the *cyhydedd hir*, the *rhupunt*, the *rhupunt hir* and the *hir-a-thoddaid*. Considering the difficulty of the task which the translator set himself, it seems to me that he succeeded admirably. Our greatest authority on Welsh Biblical translation, the Revd Dr Isaac Thomas, has remarked on how well the author of ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ conveys the spirit, if not the exact wording, of the Vulgate Psalter.\(^7^0\) These are the first four lines of his rendering of Psalm 129 (130), which correspond to the following two verses of the Authorised Version:

‘Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, Lord.
Lord, hear my voice: let thine ear by attentive to the voice of my supplication.’

*De profundis clamavi ad te Domine*

*Domine exaudi vocem meam: fiant aures tuae intendentes in vocem deprecationis meae.*

O’r eigion y llefais arnat. Arglwydd.
Arglwydd, gwarando fy ngweddí yn rhwydd.

\(^6^9\) See Brynley F. Roberts, op. cit. above, n. 68.

Bỳnt dy glustiau yn ystyredigion
Wrth lef fy ngweddì a gwawdd fy nghalon.71

In the translator’s renderings of the hymns in ‘strict’ metres, it is clear from the outset that he could not hope to reproduce the succinctness of the original Latin, but he substitutes for that a certain majestic sonor-ousness. The third stanza of one of the Marian hymns, ‘Ave maris stella’, might be translated roughly as follows:

‘Loose the chains of prisoners.
Give light to the blind;
Repel our evil deeds,
Ask [on our behalf] for all good things.’

*Solve vincla reis,
profer lumen cecis;
mala nostra pelle,
bona cuncta posce.*

In Welsh those four lines become:

Gollwng rwym echwng achwyn llu bedydd,
Gwrthladd, Fair, o’n gradd greddfawl aflonydd;
Cynnul olau dull y deillion efrydd,
Cynnal i’th ardal eurdeul gyfлюydd;
Cannerth didrafeth drwy ffydd—a geisiwn,
Credwn y caffwn coffa cerennydd.72

But why am I talking about ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ in a lecture about Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug? In a copy of the text made in 1631, but transcribed from a manuscript dated 1537, Dr John Davies of Mallowd, whom we have already met, says that the translation was done ‘I gan Ddafydd Ddu o Hiraddug hyd y mae pawb yn tybiaid’ (‘by Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug, as everyone supposes’), and he repeats the statement the following year in a printed book which includes the ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ text of the ‘Te Deum’ ‘a gyfleithwyd i gan Dafydd Ddu o Hiraddug fel yr ydys yn tybiaid’ (‘translated into Welsh by Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug as is supposed’).73 You will have noticed that there is a hint of reservation about those two statements, and Dr Brynley F. Roberts in his edition is very properly cautious

71 Gwasanaeth Mair, 30.
72 Ibid. 34.
about the ascription to Dafydd Ddu. On the other hand there are two considerations that I think may just tilt the balance in favour of Dafydd’s authorship.

1 First, he makes use, as we have seen, of the *hir-a-thoddaid* metre. This, as you will recall, is one of the metres devised by Einion Offeiriad according to Einion’s grammar and by Dafydd Ddu according to Dafydd’s. As far as I have been able to discover, the only examples of the *hir-a-thoddaid* metre from the whole of the fourteenth century are in the texts of the grammar, in Einion Offeiriad’s panegyric ode for Rhys ap Gruffudd, and in ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’. Although we cannot be fully certain about this matter until the Centre where I work completes — in a year or two’s time, it is hoped — its edition of the whole corpus of extant fourteenth-century Welsh verse,74 I think that even now we may feel reasonably certain about it. That fact — the strictly limited occurrence of the *hir-a-thoddaid* metre — seems to me a powerful argument for accepting John Davies’s tentative ascription of ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ to Dafydd Ddu.

2 Secondly, Dr Roberts has discovered that the liturgical use most nearly reflected in ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ is that of the Order of Friars Preachers, the Dominicans. While there is no good evidence that Dafydd Ddu was a Dominican, in spite of his epithet, there was a flourishing Dominican friary in Rhuddlan, a bare two miles from Diserth, where we may assume Dafydd Ddu resided.75 If he had been so minded he could easily have acquired a copy of the Dominican Use of the *Officium Parvum Beatae Mariae Virginis* from the friary at Rhuddlan.

I have no wish to appear greedy on behalf of the subject of my lecture this evening, but I think I have to point out before finishing that in 1596 Thomas Wiliems of Trefriw came to the tentative conclusion that Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug was also the author (or rather, as he thought, the translator) of the notable Middle Welsh mystical treatise ‘Ymorth yr Enaid’ (‘Food for the Soul’). He arrived at this conclusion on the slender basis that a fragment of the treatise in the same hand as a copy of Dafydd Ddu’s grammar (as he thought) had

---

74 In the series known as ‘Cwyns Beirdd yr Uchelwyr’ (the Poets of the Nobility Series) published by the University of Wales Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies at Aberystwyth; five volumes have so far appeared.

come into his possession, and he may even have thought, as did later the humanist John Jones of Gellilyfdy in Flintshire, that the hand was that of Dafydd Ddu himself. 76 However, ‘Ymborth yr Enaid’ has recently been very carefully edited by Dr Iestyn Daniel, and he argues strongly that the treatise — and indeed the grammar and ‘Gwasanaeth Mair’ as well — are all to be ascribed to a thirteenth-century Dominican author, possibly a poet named Cnewyn Gwrtherbynion. 77 While accepting the force of Dr Daniel’s arguments, I feel at present that his conclusions have to be regarded with a measure of reserve, as you will perhaps have gathered. Another possibility that presents itself is that a text in the same manuscript as Dafydd Ddu’s recension of the grammar, Peniarth 20, a text known as ‘Y Beibl yng Nghymraeg’ (‘The Bible in Welsh’), which is essentially a translation of Promptuarium Bibliae by Petrus Pictaviensis, may also be the work of Dafydd Ddu, and may have reached Valle Crucis abbey at the same time as the grammar. 78 But there is no external evidence to support this possibility, and it can only be tested, if at all, by minute linguistic analysis.

I hope that as a result of this lecture the figure of Dafydd Ddu of Hiraddug emerges from the mists of the fourteenth century with rather more solid lineaments than he possessed before. He was, it seems, an important dignitary of the cathedral church of St Asaph during the middle years of the century, possibly as chancellor and then as archdeacon. Before c. 1330 he completed a revision of the poets’ grammar or manual of verscraft which had been compiled by Einion Offeiriad a few years previously, and he may even have had a hand in its original compilation. He was a good poet in his own right, devoting his talent to the edification of his fellow clergy and of those members of the laity who were able to appreciate Welsh verscraft, of which there must have been many. It is, I think, not unlikely that he translated the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary into Welsh metre, with notable success. We need not press his claim to have written ‘Ymborth yr Enaid’ and ‘Y Beibl yng Nghymraeg’ as well. But even without them I think he has done enough to secure for himself an honoured place in the literary history of Wales during the crucial first half of the fourteenth century.

77 Ymborth yr Enaid, ed. R. I. Daniel (Caerdydd, 1995), pp. 1–1v.
Perhaps he may even have done enough to claim a modest mention in the New Dictionary of National Biography!

*Note.* I wish to thank Professors Emeriti R. M. Jones and J. E. Caerwyn Williams for their perceptive comments.