Tradition and Innovation in Some Later Medieval Welsh Lawbooks

The native laws of Wales—Cyfraith Hywel—are preserved in more than eighty manuscripts, of which a number are in Latin but the vast majority in Welsh, written between the end of the twelfth and the mid-eighteenth century. Almost a half of these law texts were compiled before the middle of the sixteenth century, during the period when Cyfraith Hywel was still practised in at least part of Wales, for we are now very much aware that native Welsh law did not die out with the demise of the last of the independent Welsh princes in 1282-3 but rather remained in force in certain areas until Henry VIII’s Acts of Union of 1536 and 1542.

Although there are basic textual similarities between almost all extant lawbooks, there are also many differences and variations between them, for until the sixteenth century these texts were the product of legal interpreters rather than mere copyists. Despite the tradition preserved on the pages of the majority of extant lawbooks that these laws were enacted by Hywel Dda, the very nature of their contents demonstrates that they cannot be royal ordinances: the words of F. W. Maitland, "Cyfraith Hywel ‘is lawyer-made law, glossators’ law, text-writers’ law." The structure of the Welsh lawbook allowed—indeed facilitated—editorial activity by the lawyers, since it comprises a ‘patchwork’ of independent sections or tracts, each dealing with a particular legal topic. It would appear that the main way in which the Welsh lawbooks developed was by the addition of new tracts, or novel arrangements of pre-existing tracts, to compilations already in existence.

While these textual variations within the Welsh lawbooks must be recognised, it is equally important that they are not overemphasised, for underlying the many superficial variations are definite, discernible textual patterns. The existence of these patterns was first recognised in the pioneering work of the seventeenth-century scholar, William Maurice of Cefn-y-braich, Llansilin (d. 1680), in his ‘Deddfiorwm’ or ‘Corpus Hoeeliam’ now preserved in NLW Wynnstan MSS 37 and 38. During the last century Aneurin Owen (1792-1851), in his two-volume Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales (1841), elaborated on Maurice’s rudimentary tripartite classification of the lawbooks, interpreting the differences between the three groups of manuscripts as politico-geographical variations in the laws of Hywel; this is reflected in the nomenclature he adopted to distinguish his groups: Venedoctan Code, Dinetican Code, Gwentian Code. Although this basic threefold classification of the Welsh lawbooks is still generally accepted, modern scholars believe that these groups do not so much represent the contemporary laws of three different territories in medieval Wales as reflect the legal development of both the period and area in which these laws were reconstituted. Consequently, MSS are now described as belonging to the Ionawrth, Blegywyd or Cyfnidr reductions respectively, in reference to jurists mentioned in the different versions. Furthermore, in order to avoid the implicit attribution of authorship to the eponymous jurists, recent years have seen a shift towards the use of the abbreviated and depersonalised forms Ior., Bleg. and Cyf.

In his Ancient Laws, Aneurin Owen adopted the questionable policy of bestowing the title ‘Codes’ on certain sections of the lawbooks, thereby selecting them for inclusion in his first volume, whereas other sections of the same lawbooks were branded ‘Anomalous’ and relegated to his second volume. This division of material into ‘Codes’ on the one hand and ‘Anomalous’ laws on the other was not only misleading with regard to terminology, as Sir Goronwy Edwards clearly demonstrated, but was also a gross oversimplification of the nature and structure of the vast majority of Welsh law-texts and has impaired the study of Cyfraith Hywel for more than a century. Most extant lawbooks indeed comprise a main text corresponding to one of Aneurin Owen’s so-called ‘Codes’—that is either Ionawrth, Blegywyd or Cyfnidr—but in addition many lawbooks include appendices or appendages of additional and varied legal material drawn from many, and sometimes apparently disparate, sources. Only comparatively recently has this material begun to receive the critical attention it deserves as the focus of Welsh legal studies has shifted from the question of the archetypal lawbook to that of the continued development of the lawbooks throughout the medieval period. Dr Aled Rhys Williams called these composite lawbooks deddfgronau, adopting the term coined by William Maurice for his great compendium of Welsh law. This paper will discuss the general structure and development of a group of deddfgronau compiled in south-west Wales during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Each comprises a Blegywyd main text together with an appendix of various other legal matters.

CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT OF DEDDFGRONAU

A chronological comparison of extant Blegywyd MSS is highly suggestive of an evolutionary development of deddfgronau during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, although it must be acknowledged that the true picture is confused by a number of factors: several key texts now lack their endings; the addition of material on blank folios by later hands; the binding together of what were probably distinct texts.

If it may be assumed that none of those tracts published by Stephen J. Williams and Enoch Powell in their edition of the Blegywyd reductions represent the maximum traditional content of that ‘Code’, then it is clear that the practice of appending material to a Blegywyd main text was not as late a development as we sometimes tend to believe, and was certainly not confined to those MSS produced in the fifteenth century, for its
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1 This article is the substance of a paper delivered to the Eighth International Congress of Celtic Studies, Swansea, 1987. For a more detailed discussion see my thesis, Gwyddf i RL, Add. 22, 335 to Cyfraith Hywel unigryf ag Astudiaeth Gymhant hydno a Llwch stat 116 (Ph.D. University of Wales, 1984).
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6 S. J. Williams & K. E. Powell (eds.), Cyfraith Hywel.

Dde yn ôl Llŷn Blegywyd (Caeledydd, 1942). References to the text of that edition are as follows: Begl. § 90(23); 90 refers to the tractate number; 23 to the number of the relevant sentence.
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scribe's use of rubric in introducing this section suggests that he too regarded this material as being in some way distinct from the preceding tracts.

If this additional material in L is indeed a rudimentary appendage, and not part of the Blegwydd 'canon', then on the evidence of extant MSS it must surely be deduced that this practice developed slowly during the fourteenth century. The chief scribe of Bos,1 also writing during the fourteenth century, included an appendage which is only slightly shorter than that of L. This does not necessarily imply that Bos is earlier than L, although William Wotton regarded it as being so,2 but might simply reflect an earlier exemplar. However, by the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth, the practice of appending material to a main Blegwydd text appears to have come into its own. The additional material in J (late fourteenth/early fifteenth century) is substantial, representing a little over one third of the whole lawbook: yet this lengthy appendage pales into insignificance when compared with the additional material in S and Tim (both mid-fifteenth century): the appendages in these MSS are lengthy and complex addenda, considerably longer than the main text which precedes them.

The addition of material to a Blegwydd main text appears to have reached its evolutionary climax in a group of closely-related MSS which also survive from the mid-fifteenth century, namely Q, E, and P. Here the additional material is no longer merely appended to the main text as one long amorphous string; although (with the exception of P, which is now incomplete) much material still remains in the ultimate position, a considerable proportion of the additional matter in these MSS has been incorporated thematically between the traditional Blegwydd tracts in the body of the main text.

In contrast with the text of the Blegwydd 'canon', in which it is possible to establish textual patterns and order,3 it is notable that (with the exception of Q and E, and L and its copy CrD), each and every appendage which has survived to the modern period is unique with regard to both its actual content and the order in which that content is presented. Although much work remains to be done on this material, it is possible to make some general statements concerning the textual relationship between one appendage and another and, interestingly, the evolutionary process outlined above—that is, the chronological development of the principle of adding material to a main Blegwydd text—appears to be reflected in the textual development of these appendages. The appendage in L opens with the additional material included in Bos, but adds some further tracts.4 The appendage in J opens with the Bos/L material, although this forms only a small proportion of the additional matter in J. In the fifteenth-century MSS, S, Tim, Q, and E, the Bos/L

---

1 It is customary to refer to manuscripts of Welsh law by the sigla adopted by Anmaria Owen in Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales, i (London, 1841), xxx-xxxii; common abbreviations have since been coined for manuscripts not used by him. The sigla for manuscripts alluded to in this paper are as follows: Tr Trinity College, Cambridge O.vi.1 (c.1300); tank of Gwilym Wasta.

2 NLW Penarth 306 (c.1300); same hand.

3 NLW Penarth 306b (c.1300); same hand.

4 BL Add. 22,350 (mid-fifteenth century).

5 NLW Llantrisant 116 (mid-fifteenth century); same hand as S.

6 Crd Cardi 2 (second half of fifteenth century).
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The end of Tr, although lacking, merits further notice. The text ends with an incomplete sentence at the foot of 167, see Bleg. 89:84. The head of 68 has been torn, and it is possible that the remainder of the incomplete sentence was originally inscribed on the lost portion, before the colophon which survives on that folio. However, the missing portion is too small to account for the remainder of Bleg. 89 as preserved in L: if 89:35-8 is originally included in Tr, they must have been written elsewhere. The catchword preserved at the foot of 66:56 implies that 67 represents the first folio of a new quire. If 67 and 68 are a single bifolium, then it is possible to interpret the end of this MS in one of two ways. Did the scribe—who names himself in his colophon as Gwilym Wasta—come to the end of a gathering at 166v, realise how little he had written and therefore use only a single bifolium for the remainder of his lawbook (an interpretation which precludes the possibility of Tr including 89:35-8)? Or did he, on reaching the foot of 66v, take up another quire of (say) 6 folios in order to copy considerably more text than is preserved on 67—that is, a text which, like L and Bos, went beyond 89—the same bifolium of which alone remains? Such an interpretation would allow for the inclusion in Tr of not only 89:35-8, but also of an appendage similar in length to that of L and, if correct, would take the se- quence in a quo for the appending of 'additional' matter to a Blegwydd law text back to the beginning of the fourteenth century and the earliest surviving manuscripts of that reduction.
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1 That portion of the MS copied by hand 'a'; see Morfydd E. Owen, 'Llawenydd Gyfreithiol Goliad', ante, XXIII (1900), 328-43.

2 William Wotton, Cyflwyniad Hwyl Dda ac erwli, see Legi Wallinae (London, 1730), under the sigla Cont. 4 (4)-1 (xxii), and P (+Bos) [l:xxxix].

3 Manuscripts of the Blegwydd redactions may be subdivided into two main groups using the criteria of contents and tractate order: those which recite the Laws of Court and incorporate groups of trials within the body of the text (and which I have argued elsewhere represent the traditional version of this 'Code'), and those which omit the Laws of Court and gather the triads in a lengthy tractate near the end of the lawbook (which I have argued represent an edited form of this reduction); see my thesis above, p.151, n.1.

4 For the text of the additional material in Bos and L, see Mervile Richards, Cyflwyniad Hwyl Dda yw ei Llawenydd coleg yr Iaues Uelyg (Cardiff, second ed. 1990), 89, 5-91, 27 and 89, 5-91, 2 respectively. It is interesting that hand 'c' (fifteenth century: Owen, above, n.1) adds further material corresponding to the remainder of the additional matter in L, cf. Richards, Cyflwyniad Hwyl Dda, 91, 2494. 15.
appendage is no longer used as an introduction to the additional material; however much of its content is incorporated at various points in their appended texts.

Having established what appears to be an evolutionary principle in the structure of the Welsh *ddeligwnau*, there remains a need to analyse the various types of material incorporated in each. Lack of critical editions of some relevant texts and the sheer bulk of the material involved precludes the possibility of a comprehensive comparative study at this stage. However, it is hoped that the framework adopted below in relation to S will prove suggestive of the various strata of material incorporated in a *typical* *ddeligwnau*, and useful as a model with regard to further studies of the Blegwyd *ddeligwnau* as a genre.

S is a substantial lawbook of more than 145 folios, compiled around the middle of the fifteenth century. The first 60 folios comprise a main Blegwyd text of what I have elsewhere described as the 'edited' version of that reduction; this is followed by an appendage of more than 80 folios, containing additional material of various types.¹

MATERIAL FROM OTHER 'CODES'

From statements made in the lawbooks it is clear that their compilers were very conscious of the regional divergencies of Welsh law, and that some of the customs enshrined in lawbooks emanating from other parts of Wales were very different from those of their own tradition. In the context of the Blegwyd reduction, this consciousness goes back at least as far as N, one of the three earliest extant Blegwyd texts (cf. Bleg. §§322-25), and the compiled S was no less conscious of this state of affairs. For example:

Pan symudafed Hafael Da gycfiethau lyfrddin Kymr o dd Ysbryd yr un fel yr y byddaf y bresyllyd y daeth eu culhaen; ac eir eil yn Niniof o i wresni Deheubarth; yr iâddyn yn Ysgrifedig o i wresni Gwynedd a Phlosys. Amâneiriaeth yw omamrhodwyd y lawes ac y maenafael yysoc; a helyd ygwynnod y Phlosys ym bradafwriaeth yw, ac ymwybodol ac adalwyd, a’r ddathwyr bywyd a phrifath a ddiwedd, ac dryl yr byth y brodor, ac yr oedd y cariad y byw a ddiweddar y gwadodd (§§81,858-9).

Because of the differences in substance between texts of the Blegwyd reduction on the one hand and those of Cyfaeth and loral Cyfaeth on the other, the most recognisable and most easily defined material in the appendage in S is that which ultimately derives from lawbooks of the other so-called 'Codes'. Not surprisingly perhaps, the borrowed tracts are, on the whole (but not exclusively), ones for which there are no obvious Blegwyd equivalents, and much the greater part of the material in this class derives from the more sophisticated loral tradition.² For example, the appendage in S includes a short tract on 'Deed' (§§312-25), the first part of which derives from the loral Cyfaeth (Lor. §§91,29-31). There is also an unfinished tract on 'Cymru' (§§364-74) which derives from the same source (Lor. §§148-50), and there is also a lengthy tract on 'Llygaid' (§§237-306) which must ultimately derive from loral material on that subject (Lor. §§154-60) although that material has undergone considerable change before its inscription on the pages of S. All complete Blegwyd texts include a tractate on 'Meicliu' (Lor. §§440-80), and this tractate is to be found in its normal place in the main Blegwyd text in S (§§144-80). But there is another discussion of this subject in the appendage in S (§§1219-57), one which bears no textual relationship whatsoever to the traditional Blegwyd tractate. This second tractate on 'Meicliu' appears to derive from material in the tradition of that 'second edition' of the loral reduction, namely Lyfr Colan.³ Although much less obvious than the loral material in terms of bulk, some material deriving from the Cyfaeth tradition has also been included in S, for example, the tractate on 'Pedair Alawedd yr Noddaeth' (§§81,897-11), which is an expanded version of material also found in L.⁴

The second type of material found in the appendage is that which Anserin Owen branded 'anomalous' and relegated to his second volume. This material varies widely in its age, type and quality, and much more work remains to be done with regard to identification of sources and significance before it will be possible to make valid general statements concerning it. However, as a starting point at least, this additional material may be subdivided into two main types, namely traditional additional material on the one hand, and later additional material on the other.

TRADITIONAL ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Collections of *damwenuin* are one of the most common types of traditional additional material incorporated into the later Blegwyd *ddeligwnau*, and these are certainly amongst the most important of the additions with regard to practical significance. Essentially a body of case law, and therefore pragmatic, its name derives from the fact that many cases open with the formula 'O damwenuin...'; ('If it happens that...'). There are several series of *damwenuin* in this second section of S (e.g. §§8,915-19; 2,147-68; 2,227-35). Although a large proportion of the *damwenuin* incorporated here may be traced to the 'Book of Damwenuin' associated with texts of the loral reduction,⁵ many others have no such ancestry and appear to be later statements of law encapsulated in this traditional form.

Tragic arrangement of material is a commonplace of Welsh medieval literature and it is not surprising that the lawbooks exploit to the full the mnemonic and didactic potential of the form. Every extant lawbook includes some legal triads, although these are not always gathered into distinct tractates. However, all *ddeligwnau* include collections of triads, and in general the later the MS the longer the collection. These late texts often include long series of extended triads, the detailed discussion and explication of which are in complete contrast to the epigrammatic expression of triads found within the 'Codes'. There are several collections of such extended triads in S (e.g. §§1,657-62; 2,000-117).

Some *ddeligwnau* include material which was possibly originally intended for use by a teacher for the instruction of his pupils in the particulars of Welsh law. At least, that is the

¹ See p.153, n.3; for the text of S and an analysis of its contents together with a comparative conspectus of relevant MSS and published texts, see my thesis, where p.153, n.1. References to the text of S in this paper are to numbered sentences in my edited text.

² See Aed White (ed.), *Llyfr Iwerth* (Cardiff, 1966). References to the text of that edition are as follows: Lor. §§111,29-111 refers to the tractate number; 29 to the number of the relevant sentence.

³ Lyfr Colan is the usual name given to the revised version of the loral reduction found in NLW Peniarth 37 (fourteenth century); cf. A. W. W. Davies-Evans, *Welsh Medieval Law* (Oxford, 1969), 112-9.²

⁴ See Davies-Evans (ed.), *Damwenuin Colan* (Cardiff, 1966).


⁶ See Davies-Evans (ed.), *Damwenuin Colan* (Cardiff, 1966).
most obvious interpretation of the long section of unique cases in the form of question and answer to be found in S (§§1.535-89) and other deddfyfroiau.

Taken together, the damawiniu, triads and unique cases suggest that much of the traditional additional material incorporated in the deddfyfroiau might derive from a vigorous oral legal tradition, and it is not impossible that the compilers of these composite texts drew substantially on their own local, oral tradition as they set about gathering material for their extended lawbooks.

LATER ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

The final stratum of material in the deddfyfroiau is that which may be recognised as later additional material. Texts compiled at the end of the fourteenth and during the fifteenth century often elaborate extensively on principles which are but mere allusions in earlier lawbooks, or perhaps appear there in a somewhat shadowy form. They also expound on matters which appear on their pages either for the very first time or in completely revised form.

For example, the Blegwyryd redaction has much to say about 'Dosbarth', but the appendage to S has much more. It includes a tractate on 'Cameldosbarth' (§§1.305-11) which, while following the principles laid down in the Blegwyryd tractate, represents a more developed form of that material. It is here, for example, that we first find reference in the lawbooks to the existence of dosbarthfach, there being no suggestion in the earlier texts of this level of curial activity. Dosbarthfach were legal officials—individuals well-versed in the intricacies of Cyfrrith Hywel—appointed by the Crown to act on its behalf in cases of appeal against alleged misjudgement by the breuddwy o frawst tir, amateur judges on which legal organisation in south-west Wales was founded until the Acts of Union, and whose amateur status was in stark contrast with the class of professional, highly-trained and elitist judges—brauddwy o frawst sir wydd—more specifically, yndiaid—described in the lawbooks of Gwynedd. Small wonder, then, that the later texts include additional material on this aspect of legal activity.

Probably the best example of later additional material included in any deddfyfroiau is a long tractate included near the end of S (§§2.382-472), where the compiler appears to stand apart from his lawbook in order to give a lucid and objective description of what he calls 'Gwyddor Kynfeyth Ho'fel Da'.

Pwy bynnac a synno hyfryd beth y6 kynfeyth a eu ranacen, ac aethod o deyled hafl, ac pha b6d yr tategger y hafl, a bynnac ar ddi'1 a gwyn teir testyn o'r busllyfry, m'ngan teir ran maeawael kynfeyth, ac ar dri deyled hafl, ac ar dri y6t ateb ysdww y y gynfeyth, yr bygr b6d a elsw Gwyddor Kynfeyth Ho'fel Ha (§§2.382).

This tractate bears all the appearances of being a handbook for a brauddwy o frawst tir or perhaps a dosbarth, and the organisation and classification, summary and explanation of Welsh law contained within it would seem to be a comprehensive attempt to assist an amateur lawyer in finding his way around the complexities of the legal system he was required to administer.

In each part of S—and assuming that S is typical of the deddfyfroiau as a genre—its compiler (or one of his predecessors) has assumed an editorial stance: the main Blegwyryd text has been edited and re-arranged; some tractates from the parallel legal traditions have been selected for inclusion, as has some other traditional legal material; and new tractates containing novel discussions on the traditional principles of Welsh law and on contemporary developments have also been selected for inclusion. I use the word 'selected' advisedly, for the fact that each deddfyfroiau which has survived to the modern period (with the exceptions already noted) is a unique compendium of legal material in terms of both its actual content and arrangement would seem to suggest that the compilers of these great lawbooks had at their disposal, for inclusion or otherwise, a wealth of legal material, possibly in both oral and written forms, of which we may have no other evidence.

AIMS AND ATTITUDES

What deductions may we make with regard to the aims and attitudes of the compilers of these deddfyfroiau as they selected material for their volumes? Comments made by Professor Dyfyd Jenkins with regard to the compiler of J are surely applicable to each and every deddfyfroiau:

...dichon iddo fawr i mewn bosech nad oedd yn cofio ei fod esoes yn yr Iflfr, ond dichon hefyd iddo ychwanegu'r pechau a oedd o'r gwerth ymarferol oedd yn ei gynfolof ef.

I am convinced that the key to our understanding of the deddfyfroiau as a genre is neatly summarised in that last line, 'yr gwerth ymarferol oedd yn ei gynfolof ef'. It is generally recognised that the majority of extant medieval Welsh lawbooks were indeed working texts used by lawyers in the native courts of law; Professor J. Beverley Smith and the late Professor T. Jones Pierce have presented what appears to be inadmissible proof of this in the case of the fifteenth-century deddfyfroiau by drawing attention to actual court cases—in Cydwell in 1510 and Caer in 1540—the records of which contain quotations from such composite books of Welsh law. It must therefore be only reasonable to deduce that at least the bulk of this varied additional material was appended to S and the other deddfyfroiau because of its continuing practical interest. Traditional additional material in the form of case law, as found in the damawiniu, or in mnemonic form such as the triads and the list of unique cases, would inevitably be extremely useful in a legal system founded on amateur judges. Material explaining and expounding ancient principles or describing later developments would be equally invaluable in such a system. And an amateur judge might well be more than grateful to be able to turn to material from the parallel legal traditions in order to gain assistance in coming to a fair and appropriate judgement in a particular case.

Why then, in addition to this material of obvious practical interest, is there also included in these texts much legal material pertaining to a social order which had long since disappeared at the time these lawbooks were being compiled, not to mention a quantity of material in S, and even more particularly in Q, the legal connections and customations of

1 Dyfyd Jenkins, reviewing Melville Richards, Cyfri financially Hywel, H.R.I., 1 (1960), 106.
2 J. Beverley Smith in an unpublished lecture discussing the later lawbooks in their historical context drew attention to the quotations from a lawbook incorporated in PRO Just. 1/1156, 6: T. Jones Pierce, 'The Law of Wales, the Last Phase', Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, 1963, 7-82.
which are tenuous if not obscure. While it is not impossible that these texts also reflect a cultural and antiquarian interest in the laws of Hywel Dda and their regional and historical variations, either on the part of the scribe or of his patron—one cannot, for example, ignore the like of Rhyderch ab Ieuan Llyw, an active dawbarth in Cardiganshire between 1380 and 1392, who was also a member of a family renowned for its patronage of Welsh literature—it is nevertheless difficult to resist the conclusion that this antiquarian and miscellaneous material was of chief interest to the compilers of the *ddigfrygarn* for the simple reason that it pertained to the order and customs out of which contemporary practice had developed. In many respects an understanding of the present was only possible through an understanding of the past.

However, it should be remembered that this principle was not taken to extremes. In omitting the Laws of the Court, for example, S—together with O, Tr and I—excludes antiquarian material which no longer bears any relevance to the contemporary situation with a brusque disclaimer:

Peidia weithion a ddafarnu a chryfheithu sgödogion illa y breiniol, kant y oes arner eu reit ffrithu, nam ym blinder eu hyscironno a choisti memfni a dy un ddiwylio (§§ 30-1).

Yet the same lawbooks continue to recite the law of *galwans* and give details of the *galwans* kindred despite the fact that *galwans* as an institution had long since declined and ultimately disappeared. The compilers of the later texts continued to copy the rules of *galwans* until the end of the Middle Ages for the simple reason that the concept of the kindred lay at the heart of many principles with which lawyers were still very much concerned: in particular, the knowledge of the structure of the *galwans* kindred was essential for the execution of the *rhith* system which continued to survive until the very end of the period during which Welsh law was practised, and which plays a very prominent part in the later lawbooks.

Taken as a whole, the evidence would seem to suggest that these later lawbooks, the *ddigfrygarn*, were the product of an essentially practical attitude. In them was included anything, from any source, which might prove useful one day. The records from Cydweli in 1519 and Caer in 1540 prove that the law reprinted in the *ddigfrygarn* was considered good law, practised in certain parts of Deheubarth until the second quarter of the sixteenth century. It was for this most practical of purposes—to assist the amateur lawyers in the native lawcourts of south-west Wales in the later Middle Ages—that tradition and innovation were brought to bear on one another, as material was drawn from every conceivable quarter and appended to basic Blegwyrd texts. It is against this practical background that we must view both the structure of the Blegwyrd *ddigfrygarn* and their textual analysis.
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