

D Cymmrodor.

VOL. XI.

“CARED DOETH YR ENGLION.”

PART 2.

THE TRUE OBJECTS OF WELSH ARCHÆOLOGY.

By J. W. WILLIS-BUND, F.S.A.¹

WHEN I was invited to address this Honourable Society on Welsh Archæology, I felt at first inclined to refuse, on the ground that I was not “sufficient for these things.” On reflection, however, I considered that although I should properly be here to-night rather to be taught than even to hope to teach, yet I ought not to decline, for two reasons: in the first place, as I entertain, I dare say wrongly entertain, opinions on certain points of Welsh archæology that are not in accordance with the received ideas, I ought to have the “courage of my convictions,” and not be afraid to state my views as to the aims and objects of Welsh archæological research; and, in the second place, as I have the honour of holding the office of Local Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries for South Wales, I should be wanting in my duty if I failed to try to help on, however little, archæological research in Wales, and to give to would-be explorers any aid or assistance in my power. I must, therefore, ask the kind indulgence of this Society, if in what I am about to state I at all run counter to the views of any of the members,

¹ The Inaugural Lecture of the Session 1890-1; read before the Society on Wednesday, December 17th, 1890.

or state nothing but what they already know, and must beg that if we "differ" we may "agree to differ."

It may sound something like a paradox to assert that there is no field of archæological research which is really richer or is more explored but which yields less than Wales and Welsh antiquities. The fault lies more in the mode than in the matter of exploration. Most of the workers have some special reason in view for their search; it may be a desire to make out the grandeur and greatness of what they term the Welsh nation, or to evolve an ideal hero of romance out of an ordinary Welsh chieftain. For each of these classes of searchers Welsh archæology must be barren ground. The Welsh nation, in the modern sense of the term, never existed; so the attempt to prove its grandeur and greatness must necessarily be unsatisfactory, if truth is in any way regarded. As the Welsh chieftain was "half a robber and but half a knight," any attempt to idealize him into a hero, if there is any adherence to accuracy, cannot be a success. Persons who enter upon antiquarian or historical research in order either to support particular views or to maintain particular opinions on special subjects, are foredoomed to failure. It is only to such as seek to ascertain the truth for the truth's sake, without any preconceived theories to maintain or purposes to serve, that antiquarian or historical research is really profitable. To such persons no richer or more tempting field exists than that of Welsh archæology, as almost nothing has been done, and the ground to be worked is most ample. The direction which Welsh archæological research should take, and the results that may be expected to follow from it, form the subject of this paper.

The modern Welsh habit of speaking of Wales as a nation, besides being historically inaccurate, is also objectionable as tending to keep out of sight the real key to all Welsh

history, the fact that it is the history of a number of distinct tribes. In the earliest existing records of Wales traces of the tribe appear, and even at the present day these traces are to be found among the Welsh. One of the primary aims of Welsh archæology should be to work out the history of these tribes. Clan societies exist in Scotland for preserving and publishing the records and history of the clan. Although patriotic Welshmen may deny the tribal theory, they cannot explain away the fact that in all Celtic countries the tribe forms the unit. In Scotland the clan, in Ireland the sept, form the basis of the nationality; and it seems clear that in Wales the unit is the tribe. So far from this being derogatory to the pride of the country, it is the reverse; for the tribe is the distinctive feature of Celtic history, the distinguishing mark of a free, as opposed to a conquered people. The tribe-theory shows a continuous thread running through the history of Wales, and this thread should form the real base from which research should be conducted.

I. EARLY INHABITANTS.

One of the primary and most interesting points of Welsh archæological research is the inquiry into the question as to who were the prehistoric inhabitants of Wales. The most bigoted Welshman will admit that the Welsh of to-day are a race sprung from different stocks. No one could pretend that the red and the black Welshman, or the North and the South Welshman, were sprung from a common ancestor. Who then were their respective progenitors? This it is the object of archæological research to discover. Is it true to say of the Welsh, as we English say of ourselves, "Saxon and Norman and Dane are we," or are the Welsh drawn from yet earlier invaders of these islands? There are plenty of existing data to determine who these early inhabitants were; they only require to be worked up. Beyond

this there is the still more important question : Is any trace to be found of the aboriginal inhabitants of the country ? If such trace is to be found anywhere it is in Wales ; for as invaders came from Europe the inhabitants would be driven further and further west, so that in the fastnesses of the Welsh hills, if anywhere, remains of the original people must be sought. One object of Welsh archæology should be to make this search. In the numerous Barrows, Cairns, and Stone Monuments that exist on the Welsh hills traces of the early inhabitants may probably be found. All these barrows and cairns require the most careful investigation ; as it is from their contents that the early history of the country has to be compiled. In England a good deal has been done in this direction by Canon Greenwell and others. Barrows have been opened and their contents examined and compared ; and the result has been that it is possible to assign to their proper period and place many of the barrows, and to say with a fair amount of certainty that a particular race of men made the barrows at a particular time. By comparing the results obtained in different districts it becomes possible to say that a particular tribe of men were found only in particular parts of the country ; and so the limits of the territory of a tribe may be to some extent inferred. The same process should be applied to Wales and the same results would be obtained, and the limits of the territory of the early tribes might be in some degree made out. For this purpose there should be a systematic examination of every barrow, cairn, and Stone Monument in Wales. Something has already been done in this direction with regard to the ancient Inscribed Stone Monuments in Professor Westwood's *Lapidarium Walliæ*, and some work has been done by Professor Rhys and others towards elucidating Welsh History from the point of view of Philology, aided by the evidence of the barrows and the monumental inscriptions ; but there is no

one who has paid any attention to the subject who will not admit that this branch of Welsh archæology has so far been scarcely begun. The work is much needed. In the western extremity of England the barrows and inscribed stones have been carefully examined and the contents of the former classified. The work that Borlase and Lukis have done for Cornwall some competent person should do for Wales. There is, however, need for caution; it would be more than a pity, it would be almost sacrilege, if the work were allowed to fall into incompetent hands. Only those who are experienced in such work can extract from the barrows and cairns all their contents. Workers who are zealous but ignorant destroy or overlook much that is important without knowing it. They displace or fail to note the arrangement or the construction of the barrows, and by not noticing all the contents, or misdescribing what they notice, do far more harm than good. It would be a public misfortune if the examination of the Welsh barrows fell into incompetent hands; for probably evidence as to the early inhabitants of the country which could never be recovered would perish. While, therefore, it is most important that the work should be done, it would be far better that it should remain undone than that it should be done by incompetent or inexperienced hands. If a practical suggestion may be made on the subject, the best course to take would be to prepare a list of all the barrows, cairns, *maenhirs*, mounds and Stone Monuments in Wales, and then let the Cambrian Archæological Association, or some other competent body, arrange for a systematic investigation, in order that the largest possible amount of information might be gained. There is also another reason why it is desirable that the investigation should be undertaken by a public body rather than by an individual. If an individual directs the investigation he usually keeps either the whole or part of whatever

may be found, with the result that the remains are stowed away in his house and in time get lost, broken, or mislaid, or, if preserved, are wholly inaccessible to students, and cannot be examined or utilized as they would be in a public museum. Before any fresh excavations are attempted, some steps should be taken to provide a place to receive the results of the explorations, or, better still, to form a Welsh National Museum, in which it should be a rule, to which no exception should be allowed, that all objects found in Wales should be placed. Such a collection would be of the highest value and interest, while the same objects, scattered here and there about the Principality, would have but little value and less interest. Not only should the contents of barrows and cairns be placed in a Welsh Museum, but it should also contain models of all the Welsh inscribed and sculptured stones. In these Wales is especially rich; and although an attempt has been made to make a list of them in the *Lapidarium Walliæ*, no one would admit more readily than Professor Westwood that a revised list is an urgent need. General Pitt Rivers, the Inspector of Ancient Monuments, has prepared a series of models of some of the Welsh inscribed stones to illustrate the development of the figure of the cross. If this series were extended so as to include every Welsh inscribed stone, a student would be able to study these most important antiquarian monuments. It is by no means clear that a careful examination and comparison of these inscribed stones will not lead to the conclusion that many of them are of a later period than is usually assigned to them; but such a result would also have its value, for on their true date being ascertained their historical importance to some extent depends. If the series of models were extended so as to include the Scotch and Irish stones, to enable these to be carefully compared with the Welsh, important results would doubtless

follow. One of the first aims of Welsh archæology should be to collect, so that it might be utilized by students, all existing evidence, much of which is now inaccessible. If this were done, there can be no doubt that new and important light would be shed on the early inhabitants of Wales, and on other matters of which we are now comparatively ignorant.

II. THE ROMAN OCCUPATION OF WALES.

A kindred subject to which Welsh archæology should be specially directed, and one which the work already suggested would help to elucidate, is the details of the Roman occupation of Wales. This is a matter of more than mere antiquarian importance. If the limits of the Roman settlements in Wales were ascertained with precision, a great step would be gained in coming to a conclusion as to whether any parts of Wales could be regarded as free from Roman occupation; if so, it is to such parts, and the relics of antiquity in those parts, that we have to look for traces of the early Celts. But further, the question of the limits of the Roman occupation would throw great light on the question of the extent of the Roman civilization. What was the effect of the Second Legion garrisoning South Wales? what positions did they occupy? how far did they settle the country and—more important than all—how far did they Christianize it?—these are all subjects of the greatest historical importance. No one can pretend that as yet the question of the Roman occupation of Wales has been worked out on a satisfactory basis. It is true that there is plenty of literature with more or less tall writing and conjectures on the subject; but real accurate work, giving the details of what the Romans did, is sadly wanting. Recent excavations at Cardiff have shown that the works of the Romans were adapted by their successors; so that it becomes more than ever necessary accurately

to distinguish between Roman and British work. There is some evidence that in Glamorganshire a high degree of Roman civilization existed; it is important to ascertain how far any such civilization reached beyond the course of the so-called Via Julia. From every point of view, religion, language, civilization, it is important to ascertain with all possible precision the nature and limits of the Roman occupation. There are also such questions as these: Were the camps in North Wales more than forts to protect the mineral works, were they towns as well as camps? Have we to look to Chester, Uriconium, and Caerleon for our knowledge of the domestic life of the Roman settlers? Were Caersws and Loventium also important centres of civil life? Was the country so settled and so secure that the Romans found it safe to live in detached country houses, or were they, from the wildness of the Welsh, compelled to live in stations or camps? At present our knowledge of Roman domestic life in Wales is almost a blank. The excavations now being carried on at Silchester are bringing to light various points as to the condition of a Roman town in Britain. Nothing could be more interesting than that some excavations should be undertaken to ascertain if the Roman houses in Wales resembled or differed from the houses in the other parts of Britain, and how far the appliances of life were similar. It is also more than likely that in an examination of the relics of Roman occupation traces of the Celtic inhabitants will be found, and new light shed on the manners and customs of the country during the Roman period. There has been no lack of Roman houses found in Wales, but these houses have never been systematically examined; they have usually been excavated and destroyed, and all that we might have learnt from them has perished. Recent excavations in England that have been systematically conducted have shown that earthworks which were attributed to a prehistoric period were really of a later

date than the Roman occupation. Whether a like result would follow the examination of Welsh earthworks is questionable. But if by proper excavations an approximate date could be assigned to them, a flood of light would be thrown on Welsh archæology. For instance, the term *Castell* may now mean earthworks of any date from the earliest period to the Norman. If in each instance the real date could be fixed, a most important point would have been settled; very likely it would be found that the same works have been successively occupied by Briton, Roman, Dane, and Norman.

III. THE WELSH CHURCH.

The two objects of archæological research already mentioned, although both of great interest and importance, cannot compare either practically or historically with that of the Welsh Church. I use the term advisedly, and with full knowledge that the existence of this Church is denied by superior persons, who tell us that there never was any such Church; that the ecclesiastical establishment in Wales represents, not a Church, but merely four dioceses of the province of Canterbury which form an integral part of the Anglican establishment. This statement is strictly legal and strictly accurate, having regard to the legislation of Henry VIII., his son and his daughter. But "The Welsh Church" is the correct name by which to describe the form of Christianity that existed in Wales before the Anglican establishment was invented, before Canterbury was a Bishop's see. The popular idea, the one usually taught, is that the Welsh Church existed in a sort of semi-Christian state before the time of Augustine; that it differed only in some unimportant matters from the Latin Church, such as Tonsure, the date of keeping Easter, and unction in Baptism; that it soon adopted the Latin rule and became incorporated in the Latin communion. Nothing more

false has ever been passed off as history ; and I know no worthier object of archæological research than to show, as can be shown, the independence of the Welsh Church from that of Rome, and to narrate its struggles for freedom and existence. For patriotic Welshmen there is no nobler field in which to display their country's glory. The history of the Welsh Church has been deprived of its interest, and the documents relating to it rendered obscure and meaningless, by the zeal that writers have shown to maintain its identity in doctrine and discipline with the Latin Church. Pages have been written to prove its orthodoxy and its unity with the Latin communion. Its real interest has been wholly ignored ; it lies in the fact that the Welsh Church was entirely independent of the Latin ; that its customs, its usages, its rites were all at variance with those of that Church ; that it presents the almost unique spectacle of a Church that did not teach nor inculcate as part of its system Roman Law or Roman ideas, but adapted itself to, instead of destroying, local laws and local customs. It retained its independence longer, and fought a more stubborn fight for it, than almost any other of the Western Churches. The Norman tried to stamp it out, but he can hardly be said to have succeeded. It was not until Henry VIII. willed that Wales should be an integral portion of England, and that his laws for England should apply to Wales, that the Church of England in Wales became substituted for the Welsh Church.

It is doubtful, and will probably always remain so, from whence Welsh Christianity came ; but whatever was its origin, whether it was some relic of early British Christianity, driven to seek refuge in the Welsh hills, or whether it came from Gaul, is really unimportant. It existed as a Church before the Latin Church had laid hands upon Gaul or penetrated into Britain. How much of the old

Pagan worship it assimilated, how far its faith was orthodox according to Latin ideas, is very questionable. It seems to have possessed its own version of the Bible and its own liturgy. It is certain that it had two distinctive features which separated it from the Latin Church, the enormous number of its saints and the enormous number of its monks. No subject of Welsh ecclesiastical archæology deserves more careful study than that of the Welsh saints; they had special peculiarities; they were born, not made. It would seem that the true explanation of their origin and of their number is that each saint was not a saint at all according to our meaning of the word *saint*, but that the term was the title of the ecclesiastical head of the tribe, just as the chief was the temporal head. The fact of the saintship being hereditary and confined to particular families shows that the qualification for a Welsh saint did not necessarily consist in personal holiness, but in real or imaginary descent from some heroic or kingly ancestor, from Cunedda Wledig or Brychan Brycheiniog.¹ It is far from improbable that on the tribe becoming Christian the saint took the place of the Druid, the wise man of the tribe, the person who stated what was right to be done, what would please the God of the tribe. All early tribes have in some form or other a wise or holy man to direct them. The heathen Celts were no exception, and had their Druid; the Christian Celts were no exception, and had their saint. But such a saint in no way resembled the Latin or mediæval saint, who, irrespective of birth or descent, attained by a life of austerity and sanctity to the position of becoming a pattern of life for future ages. The idea of such a saint seems to have been wholly absent from the Welsh Church until Norman monks and Latin scribes undertook to supply the Celtic saints with what, in their

¹ See note (a) at end of article.

opinion, it was essential that they should have to fill that position. In the lives of Welsh Saints written by Latin monks we find acts of sanctity and austerity, and miracles, in abundance; but these are the transparent forgeries of lying monks.² There was, in fact, as great a contrast between the Welsh saint of fact and the Welsh saint as described by a Latin monk, as there was between the Welsh Church of the fifth century and the Church in Wales of to-day. If the tribal character of the Welsh Church explains its saints, it also helps to explain its other great feature, its monks. No one can fail to be struck in the history of the Welsh Church by the large number of its monks. We may safely deduct a considerable percentage from the reputed numbers of the inmates of the Welsh monasteries, but after making every deduction the fact remains that Wales was intensely monastic. Not the least striking fact is that the number of monasteries existing before the Latin Church came to Wales exceeded the number after its introduction. The explanation of this number of religious persons has always been a source of difficulty. The reason seems to be that the Welsh monasteries were not monasteries as we understand the term, not establishments where a body of men lived in accordance with a definite rule, but were the residences of the Priests of the tribe, or clan, inhabiting the district. Each tribe had its own territory, its own chief that ruled over its temporal affairs, its own saint that ruled over its religious affairs, its own monks who were its priests. Properly speaking, though monastic, these priestly establishments were not monasteries at all, but the residences of the religious men of the tribe under a religious head. Wherever the tribe had a settlement, there it had a temporal and spiritual establishment, an establishment of its wise men or priests. It was the custom to speak of establishments of

² See note (b) at end of article.

religious men as monasteries, and so the name became used to designate these establishments without regard to its fitness or to the confusion it caused. The fact of the Church being tribal, and the saint and the monastery being a necessary part of the tribal organization, led to another peculiarity in the Welsh Church, the mode in which its dioceses were formed. If the Celtic rule prevailed in Wales that the Abbot, not the Bishop, was the head of ecclesiastical affairs, it follows that the Abbot's jurisdiction extended not only over the original establishment, but also over its offshoots. Wherever there was an offshoot from the monastery, the Abbot had a claim to exercise jurisdiction over that offshoot, and to have the right of succession to its headship.

It often happens that the localities where these offshoots were placed were scattered all over the territory of the tribe. From originally holding a post as an official of the monastery, in time the Bishop became its chief, or, to speak more accurately, the Abbot assumed episcopal functions. It is one of the most curious facts in Welsh Church History that there is no trustworthy account of the consecration of the early Bishops, or of their transmutation into Abbots, or of the consecration of any Abbot as Bishop. The whole of this idea seems to have been the invention of a later age. As intercourse with England increased and the Welsh Bishops saw what the English Bishops really were, they sought to imitate them and, forgetful of their origin, claimed to exercise, as the English Bishops exercised, not merely a jurisdiction over certain religious establishments, but also over certain definite territory. Hence arose the disputes as to the boundaries of Welsh dioceses, disputes that lasted until the Welsh Church passed into other hands. If the ordinary episcopal point of view is taken as the standpoint, the contention of Urban, Bishop of Llandaff, as to the boundaries of his see is unintelligible. But if Urban is regarded as the head of

the chief religious establishment of St. Teilo² and as the head of all the offshoots from it, the reason why he claimed jurisdiction in places outside his diocese becomes clear, which on mere territorial grounds it never was.³

This view of the tribal origin of the Welsh Church, viz., that the saints were the head of the priests of the tribe, the monasteries the residences of the priests, it need hardly be said, is not the one usually adopted. It is, however, strengthened by passages in the Welsh Laws, and serves to explain various statements therein that are very hard to be understood. Should Welsh archæological research establish this to be the true account of the Welsh Church, a good deal of what is usually accepted as the history of that Church must be discarded—such as the archiepiscopal claims of Caerleon⁴ and St. David's, indeed all ideas of any Archbishop in the Latin sense of the term. But the loss of Archbishops, and the doubt as to the apostolic succession of the Welsh Bishops, will be more than compensated if it is shown that the Welsh Church was an instance of Western Christianity that withstood the influence of Rome. Without some such hypothesis it is difficult to account for the anger and hatred with which the Welsh regarded the Norman occupants of their sees, their intense dislike to Urban of Llandaff and Bernard of St. David's. The Welsh opposition to these men was not merely opposition to Norman prelates, but hatred of men who had destroyed their Church. There is no field of antiquarian research likely to yield a richer

² See the *Life of St. Teilo* in MS. Cott. Vespasian, A. xiv., fo. 58^a, where Llandaff is termed *archimonasterium*. The text of the *Liber Landavensis* is here defective. The correct reading of the passage printed at ll. 3-4 of p. 73 is: "nisi *archimonasterio* Landaviae et archiepiscopo Dubricio," &c.—Ed.

³ See note (c) at end of article.

⁴ We know of no real evidence outside Geoffrey of Monmouth and the *race moutonnière* of his copyists, that there ever was even a *Bishopric* at Caerleon.—Ed.

harvest to an explorer than Welsh ecclesiastical history. For Ireland much has been done: Celtic scholars have given us glowing accounts of the Irish Church. The Welsh Church is as interesting and as important, but it has yet to find its historian. Among Welshmen who profess to have the glory of Wales so much at heart it is to be hoped that some one will devote himself to the task of writing the history of the Welsh Church, and showing that Anglican Christianity in Wales is really an alien Church in a sense very different from that in which that expression is ordinarily used.

IV. THE NORMAN SETTLEMENT.

Another object of Welsh archæological research to some degree forming part of the history of the Welsh Church, is one that has been so far only partially investigated, namely, the Norman settlement of the country. In almost every other place which the Normans invaded they succeeded in establishing their system of administration and in settling the country in accordance with their ideas. For 400 years, from 1066 to 1485, their system was tried in Wales without success. Ample materials are in existence for a complete history of that period, but as yet no one has undertaken the task. That the labour would be great may be admitted, but mere labour should not deter those who desire to elucidate Welsh history, especially when that history forms the best record of the power and the glory of the Welsh tribes. If Welsh writers, instead of making everlasting moans over the death of Llywelyn and writing high-flown panegyrics on Owen Glendower, would devote their time towards working out parts of the Norman history of Wales, they would be rendering real service to their country. Granted that the narrative is largely made up of intrigue and treason; still there is something more: there

is the fact to be accounted for that outside the moats of their castles the Norman rule never extended. The position of the Welsh chieftain, both before and after the Edwardian conquest, is also an important matter. The dealings of Henry II. with the Welsh, and his negotiations and wars with them, deserve most careful study. The position and jurisdiction of the Earls on the Welsh border, the conflicts that were always going on between Norman law and Welsh custom, also require investigation. The progress and extent of Norman castle-building in Wales, and the system on which the castles were extended along certain lines of country to the exclusion of others, are also points worthy of notice; as are the special circumstances that led to the erection of each of the Norman castles, the ruins of which are still so conspicuous.

If the Norman tried to settle the country by means of his castles, it was only one of his modes; he also used another that is equally deserving of archæological research, the establishment of cells of foreign religious houses, a mode which had some effect on the history of the country. Unlike the case of England, where Benedictine monasteries had existed before the Normans were heard of, where all the greatest and richest foundations dated from a period anterior to the Norman conquest, it was not until Wales knew the Norman invader that she became acquainted with this great religious order of the Latin Church. On their introduction the Benedictines were distinctly hostile to the Welsh. The monastery was the religious, the castle the civil fortress of the conquerors. Hence also it was probably owing to the existence of the Welsh tribes that the influence of the monastery was confined to its own possessions. How certain of the monasteries, notably the Cistercian, subsequently won over the Welsh princes to their side and

induced them to become most generous benefactors to their enemies is a point in Welsh history that has been too much neglected. The modern historian of the great monastic movement treats the establishment of monasteries in Wales in the same way as the establishment of monasteries in England, and sees no distinction between the endowment of a religious house by a Welsh chieftain and an English landlord. This is certainly not the true view. In England piety or superstition led the landowners to endow a religious house. What was the motive in Wales—where the monasteries were founded, and the order of monks selected, so that they might assist in the Norman settlement—which induced Welsh Princes to endow these hostile establishments, it is hard to say. Yet the history of the attempt, and its failure, to establish an alien aristocracy, alien monks, and alien laws in Wales is one that, from whatever side it is regarded, is full of interest, and will amply repay the most minute investigation. But it must always be remembered that it is not the history of the dealing of the English king with a people or nation; it is the history of his trying to play off one tribe against another; and to this fact is due in a great degree the protracted and successful resistance to English domination. Had the country been united under the rule of one man it could have been dealt with once and for all; as it was, to deal with the tribes in detail was more than the English kings could manage. The story of how they succeeded and how they failed; how they tried resort to force, and when that failed to flattery, and when that did not succeed tried force again, is most curious and instructive. Any one who will work out the history of this period in relation to some town, some castle, some monastery, deserves well of his countrymen. At present any such work has this great advantage; the worker is obliged to have recourse to the original authorities, as the materials are to a large extent unpublished.

V. THE TUDOR SETTLEMENT.

The failure of the Plantagenets did not deter the Tudors from trying their hand at settling Wales. The legislation of Henry VIII. made, as far as statutes could make, Wales a portion of England, treated the Welsh Church as part of the English Church, and dealt out to each the same degree of justice or injustice. To the present day these statutes are law, and form the basis on which the government of Wales is carried on. It cannot be said that the Tudor settlement has been an entire success. Its failure is due in a great measure to a statute for the further extension of which Wales is now agitating, the statute that disestablished and disendowed the monastic part of the Church. The result of the measure was to transfer a large part of the property and a larger part of the revenue of the Church to absentee landlords. The Church was so impoverished that the clergy have ever since had to struggle with poverty; the lands passed into the hands of English courtiers who knew little and cared less about Wales, whose sole object was rent. The effect of the dissolution of the monasteries in Wales forms a very interesting point for antiquarian research.

VI. LOCAL CUSTOMS.

The three centuries of the Tudor settlement by no means did away with distinctive Welsh customs and ideas. Probably up to fifty or seventy-five years ago there was but little change in the remote parts of Wales from the habits and customs that had existed under the Tudors. Now Railways and School Boards have altered all this, and the old customs and ideas are fast dying out. A most important task for Welsh archæologists is, before it is too late, to collect and record the customs, legends, and superstitions of Wales. Nothing can be more valuable and more important; they contain traces of popular ideas and beliefs that are fast

disappearing, but which are the relics of ideas, beliefs and customs that have prevailed in the country for centuries. If the opportunity is lost and no steps are now taken to record them, they will perish, and Welsh history will suffer a grievous loss ; for these legends and customs form links between the present and the past, and throw a cross light on the investigation of historical matters, which if once allowed to go out cannot be relit. Much of what has already been done in the direction of collecting them has been the work, not of any learned society,⁵ but of the energy and spirit of a local newspaper, *The Oswestry Advertiser*; and no one who knows *Bye-Gones* but will admit the value of the work. I am aware that there are one or two periodicals in South Wales which to some extent deal with the same subject ; but they merely make a selection from the local customs and legends, and do not record them all. Another branch of the same subject should not be forgotten : the importance of collecting and preserving a record of the various local peculiarities in buying and selling, in measuring land and crops. The old local names of fields should not be allowed to perish, as they are most valuable in tracing out and identifying past events in connection with localities.

The proper and systematic investigation of the different matters already mentioned with relation to Wales and Welsh archæology must be done by united, not by individual effort. There are plenty of persons who would willingly devote, who even do devote, time and labour to the subject, but who do not obtain any, or, if any, but very slight results from not working on any method or plan. I

⁵ *Non detrahere ausim, &c.*, from *Bye-Gones* ; but it should be pointed out that a most valuable and exhaustive collection of one class of Welsh folk-lore (including many items never previously printed) has been contributed by Professor Rhys to *Y Cymmrodor* ; which has also printed many smaller contributions by others to Welsh folk-lore.—ED.

have tried to-night to indicate six main subjects of Welsh archæology, to some of which a person desiring to work might devote his attention. These subjects are :

1. The early inhabitants.
2. The Roman occupation.
5. The Norman settlement.
4. The Tudor settlement.
5. The Welsh Church.
6. The collection of the local customs, legends and beliefs of Wales.

Each of these subjects, if investigated in a proper and systematic way, will lead to important results. I shall not, I hope, be considered impertinent if I venture to state that it would be a great help to any such work if this Honourable Society would try to organize systematic research on these points of Welsh archæology. To two points its attention might be specially directed, both of the utmost importance, and both essential to any really good work. One has been already referred to ; the establishment of a National Welsh Museum, in which whatever antiquarian objects are found in Wales should be placed. The other : the establishment of a National Welsh Library, which should contain all books and publications relating to Wales. I am well aware of the difficulties in the way of carrying out both or either of these objects. Yet unless something of the kind is done, Welsh archæology can never be properly studied. One practical suggestion I may perhaps be allowed to make : that pressure be brought to bear on the British Museum authorities to place all the various antiquities from Wales that are at present scattered about that collection in one room. We should then get some sort of idea of what Welsh art was and what Welshmen were. The other suggestion is the setting apart of a Welsh room in the Library, where all books relating to Wales should be placed ; or, if this cannot be done, the making of a

separate catalogue of all books, MSS., and documents relating to Wales in the Museum might be insisted upon. No one who has not gone into the matter has any idea of the mass of materials for Welsh History that lies stowed away in the British Museum and at the Record Office.⁶ Until this store of materials is utilized, little really good work can be done; and the difficulty of access to the materials deters many workers.

Another thing which urgently requires to be carried out in the interest of Welsh archæology, and which some of the Welsh societies might reasonably be asked to undertake, is the making of an archæological survey of Wales, in which should be mentioned every earth-work, *maen hir*, camp, cairn, and all that is of importance or interest in churches, houses, or elsewhere, and all the contents of private collections. The destruction of antiquities that has been going on and that is still going on is deplorable, and in the interest of the country should be stopped. A list that was gone over and revised from time to time would tend greatly to stop the destruction or appropriation of antiquarian objects. This is a matter that almost admits of individual exertion. An archæological survey has already been made in several English counties, and in others is in course of being made. Will not some patriotic Welshman make a beginning on some Welsh county, or even on some Welsh town? Every Welsh antiquarian, nay every Welshman, should determine to do all in his power to prevent any further destruction of Welsh antiquities, and do his best to render those that remain accessible to study. It is not the more important objects that are in such great danger; it is the smaller ones, the

⁶ And in many private collections, especially that of the Hengwrt MSS. at Peniarth, which, as a Welsh collection, is equal in value (if we except the one item of "Welsh Records" such as those preserved at the Record Office) to all the other existing Welsh collections, public and private, put together, as is well known to scholars.—ED.

fragments, the odds and ends that are often considered useless, but which may yet serve to give the clue to some difficult questions in Welsh archæology. For it is the duty of the antiquary, by means of such different fragments, to piece together, bit by bit, the subject on which he is at work, until at last he is able, in fact as well as in fancy, to reproduce the whole by means of the process that is thus well described: "Often, when wandering through our villages or fields, despoiled of their ancient glories, where every day the traces of our ancestors are in course of demolition, some relic is met with that has escaped the destroyer; it may be a moss-covered figure, a pointed door, a traceried window. Whatever it be, our imagination begins to work, our sentiment and our curiosity are alike aroused. In fancy we begin to wonder what part the fragment served in the whole; involuntarily we are driven by reflection and study bit by bit to picture the whole building to our imagination, until the complete work of reconstruction is accomplished. We then see some abbey, some church, some cathedral, restored in all its noble beauty; we imagine ourselves wandering under the gorgeous roof, joining in the prayers of a faithful people, surrounded by the symbolical pomp and the ineffable harmony of the ancient worship." Thus out of the fragments we have left we have to reconstruct the history of early Wales. The task is not easy, but by a careful comparison of each fragment, however insignificant, it is far from an impossible one, particularly to any student who has no special end in view, no direct purpose to serve, and who cares not what may be the result of his work on present theories or existing history, whose only object is to ascertain "*y gwir, yr holl wir, a dim ond y gwir.*"

⁷ Montalembert's *Histoire de Sainte Elizabeth de Hongrie*, p. 11.

NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

NOTE (a) (on p. 113, *supra*).

The only instances we can think of in Welsh hagiology where both father and son are authentically recorded as having been termed or considered as "saints" are: that of St. Cadoc and his father St. Gwynllyw; that of St. Llywelyn and St. Gwrnerth, father and son, the patron saints of Welshpool, from whom the speedwell (*Veronica officinalis*) is called in Welsh both *Llysiaw Llywelyn* (whence our English name *fluellen*) and *Gwrnerth*; that of St. Gildas (who however is not, or at least not now, commemorated in Wales) and his sons Sts. Gwynnog and Noethon; and that of St. Teilo and his father Usyllt, commemorated at St. Isel's (in Welsh *Llan Usyllt*) near Tenby; to which we must add the case of St. Nonn (or Nonnita), mother to St. David.

On the other hand, the oldest Welsh *Bonedd y Saint* (with which may be included the old version of *Cognatio de Brychan*) furnishes several instances where all or many of the children of one man became saints; and there were certain families in particular (not all mentioned in the *Bonedd* itself) which each produced a very large number of saints. The best known of these families are:

(1) That of Brychan Brycheiniog, very many of whose children, and some of whose grandchildren, became saints. But it should be stated that the numbers are not nearly so great as is stated in the modern lists cherished and quoted as authentic by your average Welsh antiquary, the products of hundreds of years of blunders, duplications, and forgeries, elucubrated by innumerable scribes, compilers, and "editors." Most of the best-authenticated saints descended from Brychan are commemorated in South Wales. The question of these Brychan saints is a very puzzling one. As we have pointed out (*Y Cymmrodor*, xi., 100-1), the best-authenticated ones are pretty clearly the children of at least two distinct Brychans, one belonging to Breconshire, the other to what is now Southern Scotland. But this is not all. In Irish, in Cornish, and in Breton hagiology we find a King Brychan with many children, who all or mostly became saints. The Breton one (the names of whose children are mostly not preserved to us) is traced to Scotland, and admits of being plausibly identified with one of the Brychans who together made up the composite Brychan of Welsh hagiology; but the names of the children of the Irish and Cornish one respectively differ entirely (except one or two) both from each other and from those of the Welsh Brychan's progeny.

(2) The children of Caw, father of Gildas. Mostly commemorated as saints in Anglesey, and, all but one, omitted in the old *Bonedd*.

(3) The descendants of Ceredig of Ceredigion, son of Cunedda.

(Putting these aside, the saints descended from Cunedda, are only about six in number.) Mostly commemorated in Central Wales, with the grand exceptions of St. David and St. Teilo.

(4) The descendants of a Breton (unknown to Breton records, though others of his sons occur in Welsh legend and tradition) known as Emyr Llydaw ('Emyr of Brittany'), who came over *en masse* (probably with St. Teilo in about 550), and are mainly commemorated in Central Wales.

The following is the original and genuine form of the often-quoted Triad of the "Three Holy Families of Britain":

"Teir gwelygordd Seynt Kymru. Plant Brychan; a phlant Kunedda Wledig; a phlant Kaw o Brydyn ('The three stocks of Welsh Saints; the children of Brychan, those of Cunedda, and those of Caw of Pict-land')." This is found first in the *Hanesyn Hên*, a now lost MS. of the 13th or 14th century (once forming Hengwrt MS. 33), and occurs at pp. 11, 44, of the Cardiff copy of that MS., and likewise in the *Book of Ieuan Brechfu* (Hengwrt MS. 114=414), a great part of whose contents is copied from the *Hanesyn Hên*. The late and made-up document known as the "Third Series of Triads" purports to be partly based on the "Book of Ieuan Brechfa" (perhaps the MS. now known as such); but in Triad No. 18 of the Series (*Myv. Arch.*, ii. 61) the "stock (or family) of Caw" of the original Triad is deliberately replaced by the "stock of Brân Fendigaid," the importation of whom from Welsh legend into Welsh hagiology (only found in the latest hagiological documents concocted in Glamorganshire or thereabouts, and not countenanced by anything in the genuine literature of the subject), and the ancillary details connected with the process, especially the links by which Brân and his son Caradog are connected with the Lucius Christianization-legend, form altogether what is perhaps (next to Geoffrey of Monmouth's performances) the most impudent forgery in Welsh literature.

It should be added that in the same documents which contain this master-forgery and many minor ones, numerous fathers, mothers, and ancestors of authentic Welsh Saints, who themselves never had the slightest claim to sainthood (or to any but a purely secular reputation), are deliberately or ignorantly added to the ranks of Welsh Saints. Often they are identified with real Saints (or at least with persons after whom particular churches were named, who were not necessarily the saints to whom those churches were dedicated) who in name happen to be identical with, though in personality they were wholly distinct from, these new candidates for saintship. (A great many of these and similar forgeries of the Glamorgan documents will be found pointed out by the present writer in *Bye-Gones* for 1890, pp. 448-9, 482-5, 532-6.)

NOTE (b) (on p. 114, *supra*).

We should like to say a few words as to the date when the few Welsh Saints' Lives (often, alas! but meagre epitomes of lost Lives, or mere commemoration homilies) that time has preserved to us were composed. The oldest of them are those of Welsh Saints who went to Brittany and became naturalized there; of whom the chief were St. Samson, St. Brienc, St. Pol de Léon, and St. Malo. The oldest life of St. Samson was written in about 600 (shortly after his death), in Brittany, but by an author who himself informs us that he had visited Llanilltyd Fawr in search of materials for his biography (much of which was based on the information of a cousin of the saint), and also parts of Cornwall; this life will be found printed in the first volume of Mabillon's *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Benedicti* (and see *Revue Celtique*, vi. 4, note 3). St. Pol's Life was compiled (partly from an older one then existing) towards the end of the ninth century, and St. Malo's Life exists in a MS. of the eleventh century at the British Museum (Royal MS. 13 A. X.). But perhaps it is to the Welsh Saints' Lives of (at least locally) purely Welsh *provenance* that Mr. Willis Bund's remarks mainly apply. As to the two most important of these, it should be pointed out that we know their authors to have been men who, though they survived the Norman Conquest, belonged by birth and education to a period before that of Norman influence on the Welsh Church. We refer first to the Life of St. Cadoc (infinitely the most important of all the Welsh Lives of Saints written in Wales). With the exception of the last fifteen sections (which are on their face but a kind of appendix, mostly drawn from some lost Chartulary of Llanancarvan), this Life is stated at its conclusion (*Cambro-British Saints*, p. 80) to be the work of one *Lifris*, whom it is almost impossible not to identify with the *Lifricus*, son of Bishop Herwald (Bishop of Llandaff 1056—1104; he died at a great age in the latter year)¹, who is stated (*Lib. Land.*, pp. 261-2) to have been "filius Episcopi, Archidiaconus Gulat Morcant, et magister Sancti Catoci de Lannancarvan." Secondly, we refer to the Life of St. David, written by Ricemarchus or Rhygyfarch (yclept by the charlatans *Rhyddmarch*), who died in 1097-9, aged 43, and was the son of Sulien, who himself died in 1089, aged 75 or 80, and was the last Bishop of St. David's under the pre-Norman *régime*,² as Herwald had been of Llandaff; they

¹ See *Lib. Land.*, 84, 254-5, 268. He had held the Bishopric 48 years.

² He was consecrated in 1071. See *Annales Cambriæ* and *Brut y Tywysogion* under the years 1071, 1076, 1078, 1083, 1089; also the

were succeeded by Bishops Wilfred and Urban respectively. Leofric himself was presumably the last Abbot of Llancarvan. These two lives are preserved in the great collection of Welsh Saints' Lives (now forming part of the volume numbered "Vespasian, A. xiv." in the Cottonian MSS.) written (we suspect at Brecon) in about 1200, but largely, if not entirely, transcribed from earlier documents. Without having made a detailed examination of the only other two lives in this volume which are of any length or pretensions (those of St. Gwynllyw and St. Iltyd), we should judge from pp. 155-6, 181, of the *Cambro-British Saints* that they were originally composed in their present form at about the same period as the Lives of St. David and St. Cadoc, viz., not far from the year 1100. With regard to the other Lives of Welsh Saints in the MS., they are quite short, mostly very short, epitomes. They consist of Lives of St. Brynach, St. Carannog, St. Tathan, St. Padarn, and St. Cybi; a second Life of St. Cybi, a Life of St. Dubricius, a second Life of St. Dubricius (taken largely from Geoffrey of Monmouth), and Lives of St. Teilo and St. Clydog. All these, except the five last-named documents, are shamefully edited in the *Cambro-British Saints*, in which are also printed the two remaining Lives of the MS. volume, those of St. Aidan of Ferns and St. Brendan (only the first leaf or two of the last is preserved), two Irish Saints specially connected, the one with St. David's and parts of Dyfed, the other with Llancarvan. As for the Lives of St. Dubricius, St. Teilo, and St. Clydog, they are copies (abridged in places) of the same lives in the *Lib. Land.*, transcribed, not from the present *Lib. Land.*, which is itself a transcript not earlier than 1150, but from an older MS., probably the original compiled by Bishop Urban in 1132 or thereabouts. That these three lives (and also a Life of St. Oudoceus or Euddogwy, found in the *Lib. Land.*, but not in Vesp. A. xiv.) were compiled under Norman influences there can be no doubt; and the same remark applies, only to a still greater degree, to the Lives of St. Ninian and St. Kentigern (both written in the North of England or the South of Scotland) and the various Lives of St. Winifred. John of Tinmouth's collection, made in the fourteenth century,

former chronicle under 1099 and 1115, and the latter one under 1097 and 1112. Wilfred is called *Wilfre* in MS. B, and *Wilfridus* in MS. C, of the *Annales* (p. 35), and *Wilfre* in the *Brut*, p. 52; but at p. 118 of the *Brut* his name is corrupted into *Ieffrei* or *Geffrei*. Rhygyfaroeh also had a son called Sulien, who died (see the *Brut*, p. 166) in 1145. There was another "Rigewarc clericus," who delivered up Cardigan-Castle to Rhys ap Gruffudd (*Annales*, under 1166).

contains a few other short Lives of Welsh Saints, as well as those epitomized from the works already mentioned: viz., the Lives of St. Petrock, St. Keyne (in Welsh St. *Cein*, who has nothing to do with St. *Ceneu* of Llangeneu, as Welsh antiquaries and English guide-book hacks are apt to inform us), St. Justinian, and St. Cenydd; and Capgrave, who printed John of Tinmouth's collection in the following century, adds Lives of St. Decumanus, and of St. Dochau, alias Cyngar, the saint who gave name to Congresbury in Somersetshire, and to the Llandough's, which are called in Welsh *Llandocho*. All the originals of these six epitomes have perished; but John of Tinmouth tells us that he used an old and often illegible Life of St. Cenydd (commemorated at Llangenydd in Gower), existing "in one place only in Wales" (Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ*, fo. cevi^b). The only other Life of a Welsh Saint (except the Welsh Life of St. Collen and a few shorter ones, also in Welsh, and not found in MSS. earlier than the sixteenth century) preserved to us is that of St. Beuno, the compiler of which Life (written in Welsh) expressly states that he had many more materials before him than those of which he made use; this Life is of the thirteenth century. We have made no mention of the other Lives of St. David, either Welsh or Latin; for they are all mainly based upon Rhygyfarch's work, though here and there they contain details (such as names of persons or places) which are not in the older work (at least as we now have it), and must have been drawn, directly or indirectly, from still older sources. There are also extant some details of the life of St. Beuno not found in the now existing biography of that Saint, and clearly traceable to the original documents or traditions on which the latter work was based.

NOTE (c) (on p. 116, *supra*).

The claims of Bishop Urban of Llandaff were twofold: (1) for episcopal jurisdiction within a certain boundary, comprising considerably more territory than the present limits of the diocese, which boundary is set forth in *Lib. Land.*, pp. 126-7, and abstracted and confirmed in the bull of Pope Honorius II. on pp. 41-2; (2) for the ownership, as Bishop, of certain estates (most of them including, and named from, churches), the majority of which estates were inside the diocesan boundaries claimed, but many of which were not.

It is very noteworthy that not one of the places specified as "confirmed" to Bishop Urban in the above-named bull and two others (commencing at pp. 31 and 85 respectively, the first of which contains a virtually identical list, and the second an abridged list, the same so far as it goes) is outside the diocesan boundaries claimed by the Bishop. There seems to have been some reason for the

omission in these bulls of the places claimed by him outside these boundaries. On the other hand, there are two bulls of Innocent II. addressed to Bishop Bernard of St. David's (pp. 54, 59), in which he is summoned to answer the claims of Bishop Urban to several places inside the narrowest possible limits of Bernard's, but outside the widest limits of Urban's, diocese ("quæ omnia [loca]," say the bulls, "juris Landavensis ecclesiæ, sicut ipse asserit Episcopus, esse viuentur").³

³ One of the places stated in the *Lib. Land.* to have been granted to the Bishops of Llandaff (by Awst, king of Brycheiniog, and his sons; see p. 138) was Llangors (corruptly spelt Llangorse) in Breconshire, which lay just outside the limits claimed for his diocese by Bishop Urban. Professor Rhys has, with reference to the statements in the above note, directed our attention to the passage in *Lib. Land.*, 227-9, where Tewdwr ab Elisse, king of Brycheiniog at the beginning of the 10th century, inflicts an insult on Bishop Llibio of Llandaff, while the latter was staying "in monasterio suo Lancors." Lumberth, Bishop of St. David's (who died in 944), is thereupon called upon to arbitrate between Llibio and Tewdwr, and the matter is settled by the grant by the king to Bishop Llibio of Llanfihangel Tref Ceriau (this would now be *Tre Geiro* or *Tre Giro*), otherwise Ll. Meibion Gratlaun (see also *ib.*, 244), which had previously been granted by another Tewdwr, the son of Rhain, to Gwrfan, Bishop of Llandaff (see pp. 158-160). This place is in the *Lib. Land.*, pp. 413, 499, doubtfully identified with Llanfihangel Cwm Du, on the ground of one of the MS. transcripts of the original MS. reading the name of the stream mentioned in the boundaries at pp. 160, 228, as "Riangoll" (which is the name of the river at Ll. Cwm Du) in the first of these two places; but the MS. reads *Tauguel* at p. 160, and *Taugeiel* at p. 228 (see Rhys and Evans' *Book of Llann Dav*, pp. 168, 238), and there can be little or no doubt that the word *tavel*, 'quiet,' is intended; that the stream meant is identical with the *Nant Tavel* in the boundary of Llangors at *Lib. Land.*, p. 138, a tributary of the Llyfni; and that the church meant is Llanfihangel Tal y Llyn, which is situated on a tributary of the Llyfni and adjacent to Llangors. It is worth mentioning that the church of the parish adjacent to Llangors on the other side, viz., Cathedine (anciently Llanfihangel Cathedine, as in Leland's *Itinerary*, 1769, vol. v., fo. 69), is also dedicated to St. Michael; it and Llanfihangel Tal y Llyn are just outside the boundaries claimed by Bishop Urban, whilst Llanfihangel Cwm Du was just within them. It should be added that Llanfihangel Cwm Du is mentioned in the *Lib. Land.*, at

Another noteworthy point for students of the *Liber Llandavensis* (of which a thoroughly trustworthy edition is now being brought out by Mr. Gwenogvryn Evans, to supersede the old edition, which swarms with textual blunders) is that while the lists in the Bulls on pp. 31, 41, and 85 contain some places which are not elsewhere in the *Lib. Land.* specified as having been granted to the see, they omit far more places lying within the limits claimed for the diocese, the grants of which places to the See of Llandaff are recorded or fully set forth in the same book.

With reference to the theory that some of Urban's claims really represented the survival of the jurisdiction of the *archimonasterium* of Llandaff over the subordinate establishments both within and without the diocese, it is a very striking fact that every place now or ever called "Llandeilo," or known to be dedicated to St. Teilo (with the exception of Llandeilo at Hentland⁴ in Herefordshire, and the possible exceptions of Trelech a'r Bettws in Carmarthenshire, which we suspect to be identical with the Llandeilo Tref y Cernyw

p. 267, where it is described as the "ecclesia Sancti Michael" "in Istratyu;" the other two Llanfihangels just mentioned were outside the limits of Ystrad-yw. At p. 244 a third church in this part of Brycheiniog, Llan y Deuddeg Saint, is also mentioned as claimed by Llandaff; it was within or adjacent to Llangors, as may be seen by a reference to the end of p. 138. It is interesting, by the way, to note that the church of Llangors is dedicated to St. Paulinus, a saint chiefly known as the teacher of St. David.

⁴ This church was in the same enclosure (*in eodem coemeterio*) as the earlier church dedicated to St. Dubricius. See *Lib. Land.*, p. 263, where a list of the churches of Erging or Archenfield will be found. In that list *Henllan Dibric* or Hentland and *Lann Tydiuc* (or *Lanntidwic*, p. 264) are mentioned as different churches; and it seems almost if not quite certain that the *Henllann Tituic* (also on the Wye) of *Lib. Land.*, pp. 174, 221, which was granted to the Bishops of Llandaff, was identical with Llandydiwg, not with Hentland. Probably *Llan-dydiwg* is identical with *Dix-ton* (called *Dukeston* in the *Tax. Eccl.*, p. 160, col. 2), which was in Erging, and whose church adjoins the Wye.

Since writing the above we have found two more exceptions, viz., the church of Brechfa, dedicated to St. Teilo, and Capel Teilo in the parish of Talley (*Tal y Llychau*). But it is by no means certain that these places may not be identical with some of the places in Cantref Mawr claimed by the Bishops of Llandaff in the *Lib. Land.*, which places there bear other names that cannot now be identified.

⁵ *Lib. Land.*, 117, 244, 363, 521.

claimed by Urban, Llandeloi, the derivation of whose name from St. Teilo we doubt without further evidence, and Merthyr Dovan, which presumably had an earlier dedication to Dyfan), was claimed by Bishop Urban as the property of his See. It would be interesting to know whether any of the many places called "Llanddewi," or dedicated to St. David, within the diocese of Llandaff were ever claimed, either ecclesiastically or otherwise, by the Bishops of St. David's. But we only have one side of the case presented to us, the old records of St. David's having long since perished.*

It is of course possible that in some cases where no grant of the estates has been preserved to us, but we simply have the statement that such and such a church (or maybe parish—for if we are merely given such a name as *Llandeilo Cilrhedyn*,⁷ it is impossible to say whether church, or parish, or merely territory inclusive of the church is meant) was claimed by the Bishop of Llandaff, the claim may not have been one for more or less complete ownership, but for some kind of dues, or merely for some ecclesiastical jurisdiction. But in truth the whole subject requires working out by some one who will make it the object of special research, and bring to his task a thorough knowledge, not only of Welsh (ancient and modern) and of Welsh topography, but also of the history and antiquities of the English, Irish, and Scottish churches. But unfortunately Wales has as yet shown no disposition to produce Todds or Reeves:

* It appears from Giraldus' *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesie*, &c., that the first non-Welsh Bishops of St. David's, Wilfred (we presume he was not a Welshman), Bernard, and David, were more noted for parting with than for reclaiming the possessions of their See. Amongst these possessions was Cenarth (anciently called *Cenarth Mawr*, to distinguish it from a *Cenarth Bychan*, near Pembroke), which was also claimed by the Bishops of Llandaff. See the Rolls Edition of Giraldus' Works, iii. 152, and *Lib. Land.*, 120-2, 244.

The *manerium* of St. Ishmael's in Rhôs or Roose (Giraldus, iii. 154), if (as appears from passages in the *Life of St. Caradoc* in Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ*, fo. lv^b., and in Owen's *Welsh Laws*, i. 558, ii. 790) identical with the "Lann issan mainaur" in Rhos of *Lib. Land.*, 54, 60, 117, 244, was also claimed by both Bishops. Mathry (see *Lib. Land.*, 120-2, 244) was also, we believe, so claimed.

We may add that there was at least one, and probably were two or three places, which were claimed both by Llancarvan and by Llandaff. At p. 232 we actually find a grant of Llancarvan itself to Llandaff; but made to Bishop Gwgon, who also held the Abbacy of Llancarvan.

⁷ *Lib. Land.*, 117, 244.