The third, and largest, family is chiefly represented by Wolfenbüttel, Herzogliche Bibliothek, MS. Gudeanus lat. (fol.) 1 (W) of saec. xii\(a\) or xiii\(b\),\(^1\) written in southern Belgium or northern France. From this derives Leiden, Univ. Lib., MS. Voss. Lat. fol. 31, fols. 121–213 (L), of saec. xiii\(a\), written to supplement L.A. From another copy of W descends three fifteenth-century copies of the Liber Floridus: Chantilly, Musée Condé, MS. 724 (Ch) of saec. xvi\(a\), written for an abbot of St. Peter’s, Ghent; Genoa, Biblioteca Durazzo, MS. B. IX. 9 (Du) of saec. xvi\(b\) of unknown but perhaps Belgian origin; The Hague, Royal Library, MS. 72. A. 25 (Hg), written in 1450. From Hg, a French translation was prepared for Philippe de Clèves: the manuscript (H), written at Enghein in 1512, survives as The Hague, Royal Library, MS. 128. C. 4.

Finally, an eleventh copy has recently been discovered at Tongerlo, which probably belongs to this last group: it too is of the fifteenth century (after 1473).\(^2\) The recent publicity given to the Liber Floridus will probably result in the identification of further manuscripts.

The clear result of this investigation is to demonstrate that, in spite of the existence of a good number of copies of the Liber Floridus, knowledge of this work must have been confined to a small area of northern France and southern Belgium in which all the manuscripts originated and from which none strayed very far in the Middle Ages. The chance that Lambert’s text influenced other versions of the Historia Brittonum, or supplied a version of that text to later authors, is therefore remote.\(^3\) The importance for us of Lambert’s text will remain enshrined in its prehistory, not in its subsequent development.\(^4\)
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1 H. Swarsenski, L.J.C., p. 21, who conjectures a Marchenius origin for this manuscript.


4 I note here, for the sake of reference, the location of the Hg-extracts in the later copies of the Liber Floridus. The citations are found only in the first group (M, 114\(a\), where the initial C(ommentum) is omitted). The mirabilia (Lambert, ch. 72) occur at Ch. 43\(a\), Dc. 50, Dc. 40\(b\), Hg 47, Hg 97, L.A. 107, M. 175, P. 30\(b\), W. 43\(a\). The Historia Anglorum (Lambert, ch. 57) appears at Ch. 47, Dc. 12\(a\), Hg 54, Hg 109, L.A. 97, M. 111, P. 20\(a\), W. 46.

BRAINT TEILO

Braith Teilo is the supposed ancient charter of privileges accorded to the church of Teilo by the kings of Morganwg, which was utilized by the church of Llandaff in the early twelfth century in its attempt to clarify an area of episcopal jurisdiction proper to it. At that time, and probably before, Llandaff laid claim to be the church of Teilo and consequently heir to all of its traditions. Braint Teilo is accordingly incorporated in the Liber Landacensis, the work initially written between 1120 and 1129 in order to demonstrate the antiquity of the diocese.\(^5\) The book comprises a collection of charters recording grants made to the supposed bishops of Llandaff from fifth/sixth to eleventh century. They are arranged in what purports to be chronological order and begin with charters granted to the three patron saints of Llandaff, Dyfrig, Teilo, and Euddogwy, who are also its supposed first bishops. In the case of these founding bishops the appropriate charters are attached to Vita Teilo.

Within this general scheme of arrangement Braint Teilo is included in the narrative material about Teilo. It has no prominent position in the whole work and has clearly been included along with other miscellaneous material that was to hand. It is therefore extremely unlikely that it was composed especially for the book. It does, however, influence the writing of the book, for some of the formulae from its Latin version are written into the collection of charters and the privilege itself is included in shortened form in the narrative material pertaining to the other two saints, Dyfrig and Euddogwy. The full privilege is therefore stated four times in Liber Landacensis in some form or other: in Latin in association with the Vita Dubricii (pp. 69 f.); in Latin and in Welsh in association with the Vita Teliana (pp. 118 f., 120 f.); in Latin within the text of the Vita Oudocet (pp. 132 f.).

The precise context of each occurrence is as follows: the Vita Dubricii (pp. 78–84) is prefaced by a statement recording the so-called founding of Llandaff, consecration of Dyfrig, and statement of Llandaff privilege with papal confirmation—all headed De Primo Stato Landacensium Ecclesiae. Et Vita Archepiscopi Dubricii; by three brief narrative passages recording royal confirmation of the boundaries, Dyfrig’s consecration of churches and bishops, and the gift of Mochlos to Llandaff (p. 71); and finally by the charters (pp. 72–8). It ends with a description of the translation of the documents and the body of Dyfrig from Bardsey, and the beginning of the building of Urban’s new church at Llandaff (pp. 84–6.).

The Vita Teliana (pp. 97–117) is followed by a brief narrative statement of the growth of Llandaff and receipt of privileges from many kings; by the privilege of Teilo in Latin, with


2 For the date of writing see Wendy Davies, ‘Liber Landacensis: its construction and credibility’, English Historical Review, lxxxviii (1973), 318 f.

The work written between 1120 and 1129 is the original Liber Landacensis, i.e. that defined by Hand A of the manuscript, which accounts for more than two-thirds of the material now bound together.

3 The intended beginning is unclear since Dyfrig is alternatively dated by his consecration by Germanus, in Britain in 420 and 420–7 (LL., p. 60), and by his death in 612 (LL., p. 84).
papal confirmation, and then by Braint Teilo; finally by the charters (pp. 121-9). The last page and a half of the life relate Teilo to Llandaff. The Vita Oudoci (pp. 130-9) includes within its reference to Euddogwy travelling to Canterbury for consecration, followed by royal confirmation of his episcopal privilege with statement of that privilege (pp. 132 f.). The charters follow the life (pp. 140-60).

The privileges associated with Dyfrig and Euddogwy are more closely related to their surrounding texts than Braint Teilo, and diverge from it in some respects. The variations are as follows: they add the boundaries of Llandaff and diocese, put the consent of British kings into historical context, expand the synergetic phrase, and rephrase de communi
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Braint Teilo has two versions in Liber Landavensis, one Latin and one Welsh. It is quite clear that the Latin version is a rendering of the Welsh version, and not vice versa. Thus, dy thir hac di dair is merely rendered by et terris suis; heb cyhoedd daulma y mens gulaet hac ny diethyr is merely sine consuetudo intus nec extra; heb gauayl is omitted; heb gyliwn is omitted sine sua regione; o cynhwn is omitted; o amryon can gauayl a heb gauayl is reduced to de rixa de sanguine; y dirwy hay camcu yndi didi ym hollla is omitted; o dorri aed ym lann hac ny diethyr lann is rendered de reigio uolato ubique in terrae sanctae; o rachot ym . . . diethyr luhun is omitted; dy lytu yr echeu y gundu Teliau ym Lantaf hac nyl is rendered as de omni populcos sanctoi Telian in curia Landavensae; rac meaning ‘from’ is translated as pro, ‘before, in front of’, the second meaning of rhog is sarshyry har camb har ennueth is reduced to omni inuertia; hay gwr har gywas is rendered as et sui homines; and the Latin version omits most of the section beginning . . . di am y cam a dincos derh y escop Teliau . . . including the final sanction. One may also note the various translations of the word cyfreith, which occurs as legibus, tuttitia, rectum, lex, words which express different concepts in Latin. The Welsh, then, is the source of the Latin version.

Turning to the Welsh original, even a superficial reading indicates that the privilege has two distinct parts, distinguished by content. Part One runs to . . . a discynno my thir y pop mawn ym noy. Part Two then continues Ryd rae brwnin a rae pop namyn dy Teliau . . . echeu Lantam ha dy escop . . . to the end. Part One is rendered more or less faithfully in its Latin translation; Part Two is very haphazardly summarized. Part One refers in general to the kings and princes of Wales; Part Two specifies the king of Morganwg. Part One details the range of rights and privileges claimed, carefully classifying regalian, jurisdictional, and property rights: beginning, middle, and end each have a different point to make. The beginning, (a), is concerned specifically with regalian rights over land and Llandaff’s exemption from these. It therefore frees Llandaff not only in general terms from any royal service that might be exacted and from disdain, but from obligations to royal officers, to attend public courts, and to provide military service. These are the rights which most early medieval western European kings would expect from all landholders in normal circumstances. The middle, (b), from y cyfreith id i yn hollla, o leitwr . . ., is concerned with rights of jurisdiction. It allows the church of Teilo jurisdiction and the fines in cases committed on Teilo’s land of theft, violence, homicide, secret killing, arson, brawling with and without bloodshed, breach of sanctuary, ambush, and assault. The practice of explicitly permitting major landowners, as landowners, rights of jurisdiction which properly belonged to the king and/or community was common in western Europe from the tenth century. By the early twelfth century, when they begin to be limited in England, such rights were normally the possession of most bishoprics and of many major monastic houses. The advantage to the landowner was psychological as well as financial and such concessions were therefore very jealously

1 For the text see Appendix One.
2 See Appendix Two.
3 See Elizabeth H. H. Colwell (1973), 243 and in more detail in my forthcoming book. The chapters appear to have been initially collected at different centres, the main collection being made at Llandaff in the early eleventh century. They were therefore subject to a number of stages of editorial emendation, the last of those being undertaken at the time of the compilation of Liber Landavensis, i.e. 1120-1140.
4 For a convenient summary of lands disputed between Llandaff and St. David’s in the early twelfth century, and the course of the disputes, see Episcopal Acts and Canons Documents relating to Welsh Dioceses 2056-2739, ed. J. Conway Davies (Historical Society of the Church in Wales, 1948-8), i, esp. pp. 152-64.
5 For full texts, and English translation, see Appendix One.
6 I am grateful to Professor Foster for pointing this out.

guarded. The end, (e), from dafur ha guell hae choyt ha mayr, is concerned with the full use of rights over land proper to any piece of land. It therefore permits full use of all appurtenances to the land—water, meadow, woods, and pasture—by the community, and allows it rights to trade and mint, privileges normally only permitted by explicit grant, and harbour. The aim of this section is to establish the community of Teloa as full rights over its land as any landholder might expect to have. The significance of market, mint, and harbour was largely financial, since each would provide considerable income to the holder in dues and tolls. By contrast, Part Two makes a much more general statement that the church of Teloa is to be exempt from royal interference and is to have a quasi-royal jurisdiction, and that the king of Morganwg is to come to Llandaff to suffer judgement for any wrong that he might do the bishop and community. It adds a solemn religious sanction. It is repetitive of Part One in the phrases that remark that the land be free from hosting and distrain.

Part Two is both coherent and complete as it stands. It is concerned with the relationship between Teloa’s bishop and community and the king of Morganwg. Part One, on the other hand, is making a detailed, comprehensive statement, of general application.

Attempts to determine the date of either part of Bráith Teloa are bedevilled by the paucity of comparative Welsh material of similar or earlier date. Many of the concepts are also to be found in the Welsh laws, but although it is clear that some parts of the Welsh laws must considerably antedate the Conquest there is as yet no secure or agreed procedure for establishing which are these parts. Strict comparison is therefore invalid. Consideration of the Latin terminology is much more fruitful and parallels are abundant, but since the Latin translation of the privilege is subsequent to the Welsh this need provide no necessary clue to the date of the original. Some relevant comment can nevertheless be made on the occurrence of both the Welsh and Latin terms of Part One and this may be indicated as follows (Part Two is not capable of the same treatment since the terms of reference are more general and the translation less full):

heb mair, heb cygfheular i sine consule, sine proconsule—both Welsh and Latin versions refer to specifically royal officers, although their offices are somewhat different. Maer and canghellor are the representatives of the royal king, whose function was to collect royal dues and preside over the king’s courts in the commotes. As such, they both appear in the laws, while the maer appears frequently as royal steward in the earlier evidence of Old-Welsh poetry. 2 Consul is ‘count’ and proconsul his representative, in practice ‘sheriff.’ 3 Although the office of count tends to become hereditary both count and sheriff are certainly and

obviously royal appointments in the early Norman period in England, though the function of the former is more political than fiscal and judicial.

heb cyfoeth dalima y mewn galac ha my ci diethyr i sine consenta intus nec extra—The Welsh usage clearly signifies ‘public court’; the Latin consensus is used very generally to mean ‘meeting’ in twelfth-century contexts, but also more specifically in the sense of ‘corporate assembly’, both of monasteries and towns. 5 The import of the phrase is clearly to free the community from the general obligation on landholders to attend public courts, which were as much an instrument of taxation as justice by the twelfth century. This was clearly obligatory in England; explicit Welsh evidence of the pre-Conquest period is wanting. 6 heb lloyd i sine expediuntone—both usages signify ‘hosting’, the obligation to accompany the king on a military expedition theoretically incumbent on all subjects, but usually assessed in terms of landowning/holding. The institution is as much Celtic as Germanic and is of course not restricted to insular societies of the early medieval period. In Wales the institution continues late into the post-Conquest period so that tenants holding under Welsh law in the south in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are obliged to accompany their lord at their own expense for three days and nights or at his expense beyond their boundaries. Even though English landholding and military service is predominantly feudal after the Conquest the theoretical obligation to serve continues. Similar Latin exemption phrases are of course common in Anglo-Saxon charters—sine expediuntone—and continue into the early tenth century—quinta de expediuntone (1115–25). 4

heb gaunul—this is presumably intended as a guarantee against seizure by the king, i.e. dafur. Again, the practice was common in twelfth-century England, so common as to provoke considerable aristocratic reaction late in the century, but early Welsh evidence is wanting. 5

1 dafur: cf. dal(n), dal(n), and dal glossing curia, concus, and fora in Bodleian MS. Auct. F. 4–32, W. Stodder, The Old-Welsh Glosses at Oxford, Trans. Philological Soc., 1861, 135 ff.; and The Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws, ed. H. D. Emanuell (Board of Celtic Studies, History and Law Series, xxii, Cardiff, 1967), p. 152. ‘In consitorio dominii, id est, dubult’. 2 See A. Lane Poole, From Domensky Book to Magna Carta, and edn. (Oxford, 1923), p. 386. Compare, in Wales, the Welsh custums of the Archfield recorded in the Herefordshire Domensky, which include the comment that six or seven of the nobility should go when the sheriff (sicocus) calls them to the thirtieth, Domensky Book, ed. A. Parley (London, 1783), i. 179; and the statement of Llwyf Blogavwyd, p. 76, ‘...many dichiun neb anfus yr golywydd yr y brenhin ym dalima a chyfreith’. One of the two conditions of holding land by knight service in the lordship of Glamorgan was attendance at court, presided over by the sheriff; see The Glamorgan County History, iii, ed. T. B. Pugh (Cardiff, 1977), p. 16; cf. below, p. 128.

2 For the general phenomenon: Laws of Ine, c. 51, The Laws of the Earliest English Kings, ed. F. Attenborough (Cambridge, 1921); Grith Gabel, ed. D. S. Binchy (Dublin, 1961), c. 37, p. 20; Llyfr Colun, 665–6, p. 40; Llyfr Iorweth, 94, p. 61; Llyfr Blogavwyd, pp. 47, 76. For Welsh continuity: W. Rees, South Wales and the March c.1225–1227, pp. 163 f. For English continuity: the fyrdwite in Lagos Heneri Princii, ed. L. J. Dormer (Oxford, 1927), c. 10, p. 108; the obligations of the assise of armo, A. Lane Poole, From Domensky Book to Magna Carta, p. 395 f. Cf. the Welsh custums of the Archfield, which prescribe the penalties for those who fail to accompany the sheriff when called on expediuntone, Domensky Book, i. 179.

3 Early Yorkshire Charters, i, ed. W. Farrer (Edinburg, 1914), p. 119, no. 130; for an Anglo-Saxon example, see Liber am am obi, faciis tributio ... sine expediuntone et pontis auctarum instructions (Wiltshire, 1920), W. de Gray Birch, Calendarium Saxonicum (London, 1888–90), no. 935.

4 J. E. A. Joffe, Angrein Kingship (London, 1955), esp. Part One, c. 3, 4; cf. discussion as a means of compelling offenders to justice, Lagos Heneti
the peace, and assault, and also ambush. 1 Of the Bright Telio terms not included in these lists, letir and far are of course the criminal rather than the crime; amrkon and rixa are used in other sources to refer to the idea of dispute but not to legal offences; rachot, ambush, though paralleled by a distinct legal concept in English law, does not appear as such in the extant texts of the Welsh laws. 2 It remains to note that though the practice of private jurisdiction was common enough in western Europe from the tenth century, indisputable evidence of its existence in Wales before the Conquest is wanting, unless we accept the doubtful claims of Liber Landavensis that Llandaff had been exercising such powers since the seventh century.

Section (c), rights over land:

dafur ha guell ha choch ha myw sa cyfrifin dy llytu/Sian d/eine/siun einau ae herba capi e siau populo ecclesiae sanctiTelian—similar references to the appurtenances of land granted are standard throughout the main western Welsh charter traditions from sixth to fifteenth centuries, though they are very uncommon in the small body of Celtic charter material. 3 The yn cyfrifin/de comminione element is very unusual under charter formulae. 4 The import seems clear: Telios' lydau are to share equally in these appurtenances. The problem lies in the interpretation of lydau: it is the ecclesiastical familia, the community


2 Amrkon means disputed claims and arguments over land, Llyfyll Colom, 157, 158, 159, p. 111; Llyfyll Blasorgyr, pp. 1, 101. The term rixa is not normal in English law, though it is used commonly in mediaeval narratives to refer to minor disputes. The translation of rixa de sumungue might suggest that the translator was confused by the Welsh, translating amrkon literally and then adding de sumungue. The association of both Welsh and Latin terms with the possibility of bloodshed suggests that the writer was being more serious than that implied by the single word, i.e. physical brawling. This, of course, has its counterparts in Irish and English law.

3 There is a comparable example in a grant of the church at Llanfyrrngh in Cardigan to Robert Abel, of 1165, c. 418–70: '... personae eiusdem ecclesie in omnibus liberis communionibus in bovino in & omnibus locis omnes liberam & omnes liberalibus suis in appurtenantibus, terram meam & omnas liberalibus comunitates que ante-censeres mei ecclesie iam dicte concesserint.' (P.R.O., C. 116A/1/6, fol. 6683 section XV item 8). I am very grateful to Dr. R. J. Jack for sending me a transcript of this charter. The law texts occasionally employ a similar phrase, sometimes of land, sometimes of actions or responsibilities, with the clear meaning in connexion, translated, for instance, as Llyfyll Blasorgyn, 12 and 21, pp. 19, 615; Llyfyll Blasorgyr, p. 6.
in the narrow sense, or the whole range of Llandaff dependents? The former may perhaps be the more likely, for the phrase would thereby guarantee the interests of the whole religious community as against that of the bishop alone and might prevent reservation of income to the bishop. The point clearly continued to be important to Llandaff in the twelfth century since the Latin phrase is repeated in the twelfth-century edition of nearly all the charters and also in the papal bulls received in the 1120s, whose text was presumably prepared at Llandaff.

cyfnofat ha bathoriath ym Lanmawr/cum mercato et moneta in Lanuasia—rights to hold market are of course a common characteristic of English charters of eleventh and twelfth centuries, and there is nothing remarkable in the fact of such a grant in itself. Pre-Conquest Welsh evidence is markedly wanting.2 Minting rights were by no means so common, but it was not rare for bishops to have them: the bishops of Bath, Hereford, Lichfield, Chichester, Canterbury, Lincoln, Norfolk, Durham, and York do so in the early twelfth century, as do the abbots of Glastonbury, Peterborough, Reading, St. Edmunds, and St. Augustine’s Canterbury. Borough charters normally include minting rights. Permission to have a moneyr was only by the king’s special grant and there were extremely strong penalties for bad and false moneyings.3 All this evidence comes from the English side; there is to date no hint that coins were being minted by the Welsh before the Conquest. Only the single problematic Hywel Dda penny has been found, of common Anglo-Saxon type, and there are no references to the practice of minting in the Welsh laws, though there are references enough to coins.5 The existence of a Welsh word for mint, bathoriath, need not of course imply the existence of Welsh mints.

hae aeruwa ar dir Telyau dyr logyn a discymyn ny thir/cum applicatione nasium ubique per terras sancti Teliav—reference to harbour rights is rare in both Welsh and English cases, though the long history of the disputed warthines at Sandwich seems to refer to a comparable situation.6

1 Llyfr Foraswth, 43, p. 33, and Llyfr Bywiau, p. 43, make provision for just these circumstances when they allow half of the fine for infringement of sanctuary to the abbot and half to the priests and canons.
2 See my forthcoming book, chapter one, for full discussion of the incidence of cum omnibus communis in the Llandaff charters. In the papal bulls of Calixtus II of 16 October 1119 (LL., pp. 89-90) and Honorius II of 19 April 1128 and 5 April 1139 (LL., pp. 30-31, 41-42) the phrase liber hominum eorum recurs (LL., pp. 33, 44, 60). It is obvious that some part of the papal bull texts must have been prepared at Llandaff since they include long lists of Welsh properties confirmed to Llandaff. The phrase is likely to be of Llandaff origin since it is not a regular feature in papal bulls to other religious houses.
3 The Latin translator clearly understood cyfynyf as ‘market’, though the Welsh term is used much less specifically to mean ‘exchange’, ‘barter’, ‘trade, commerce’, and ‘merchandise, things exchanged’, in mid-

medieval texts; see Geirradur Pryfysgol Cymru, p. 704, under cyfnofat.

4 There is a story in the Vita Sancti Gundulmi, c. 13, of English merchants who refused to pay the customary tolls at the mouth of the Usk; in the mid eleventh century; Vitae Sanctorum Britanniae et Hiberniae, ed. A. W. Wade-Emma, p. 136.

7 For Sandbach, see A. J. Robertson, Anglo-Saxon Charters (Cambridge, 1938), 82, pp. 258 ff. and 91, pp. 174 ff.; cf. Henry’s grant of Lewinham and Greenhich with wharfage by land and strand, 1114-
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In considering the content of Part One it goes without saying that the absence of Welsh examples of an institution may merely be a reflection of the paucity of source material and not of the absence of that institution. Equally, formulation of a concept in Welsh does not imply that the institution is necessarily exclusively Welsh. It is nevertheless notable that, though it may have its appropriate Welsh term, no single institution that is mentioned is distinctly and exclusively Welsh; each has an English and/or European counterpart, even the untranslated cynilegan and rhaged; and a few points only appear to be relevant in the context of Norman Wales. Thus, heb gwlma appears to be an explicit reference to arrangements made for landholding subsequent to the Conquest, and cyfynyf ha bathoriath refer specifically to a common English practice. The inclusion of minting rights is particularly significant: in the absence of both coin and references to minting, even in the laws, it is highly improbable that the practice was current in pre-Conquest Wales. Such a situation was not unique in the context of Norman Wales: it claims rights and exemptions which were all current and desirable in the early twelfth century. The privilege confirmed by Honorius II to Reading abbey, of April 1125, proclaims land rights, exemptions from royal taxation, and rights of jurisdiction in an entirely comparable way.1 It is a useful demonstration of the relevance of Part One of Breuit Teilo to the twelfth-century situation:

...cum ecclesiis, capelliis, cimiteriis, oblationibus, decima, situs, agris, pratis, aquis, molendinis, piscaris et ceteris appendicdis, cum moneta et uno monetario apud Rading(um)... Nulla autem persona... aliquid... exigit, non equamtionem sive expedditionem, non pontium sive castrorum edificationem, non vebuliu, non summagia, non uctegilia, non nautigia, non opera, non tributa, non xenia... absoluta ab omni geldo et theoldene... cum forisfacto intercpta hundreda et placita omnia cum socca et sacca et toll, theam,... cum forisfacto intercpta...hundreda et placita omnia cum socca et sacca et toll... cum forisfacto intercpta hundreda et placita omnia cum socca et sacca et toll...

But Part One of Bruid Teilo is not merely relevant in the general context of the early twelfth century, it is particularly relevant in the particular circumstances in south-east Wales at that time. Robert of Gloucester held the lordship of Glamorgan from 1107 and became earl in 1122. Unusually among the Norman counts he is known as comm in Latin documents rather than cormer. As lord of Glamorgan Robert had rights which were normally reserved to kings, rights of holding courts, creating boroughs and markets, issuing coin, taking tolls, etc., assumed by right of conquest in the initial stages of the Norman takeover and confirmed in the establishment of the lordships. With a marcher lord on the doorstep, section (a) of the privilege is particularly relevant; exemption from regalian rights not only per se but as exercised by Robert of Gloucester in his capacity as marcher lord. It is also particularly relevant in the light of the establishment of the new borough of Cardiff just down river from
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whose name is perpetuated in Morganwg and not an earlier king of that name.\(^1\) The genesis of the new idea should therefore be attributable to Morgan himself or to his sons, particularly since there are intrusive dynasties in the area from the mid tenth century. Since Morgan died in 974, it is unlikely to be of earlier origin than the mid tenth century. For what it is worth, therefore, one may define the period of composition of Part Two of Brains Teilo as between c. 950 and c. 1090, the time of the Norman Conquest. Within that wide timespan the most likely period for its production is perhaps the episcopate of Joseph (1022-45): he was undoubtedly very energetic in securing grants of land in the Llandaff area and seems to have been responsible for the first major collection of charters which were to form the basis of the Llandaff collection.\(^2\) The elaborate confirmation of privileges by Rhys Derch ap Iestyn recorded on LL, pp. 255 f., stresses Joseph’s consciousness of the problem and may even reflect the occasion for the drawing up of the privilege.

The differences between what I have termed Part One and Part Two of Brains Teilo involve both aim and content of each part. Their distinction is a useful analytical tool. Part Two is meaningful and coherent as it stands and would appear to have been produced within the period c. 950-c. 1090. It provides a written example of a notion—that of brains, ‘privilege’—which is evidenced not only in the Welsh laws, but in the older texts of Welsh poetry.\(^3\) There is clearly no reason therefore to suppose the notion derivative from the papal grants of privilege common from the late eleventh century, and there is no reason to suppose Part Two other than complete for its original purpose of clarifying the relationship between bishop of Teilo and king of Morganwg. The content of Part One, on the other hand, is not concerned with Morganwg and is concerned with the definition of a very specific range of rights and exemptions common in western Europe in the twelfth century. It points to a Norman Welsh rather than pure Welsh origin. Its composition is most satisfactorily explained as the response of the newly refurbished community of Llandaff to political developments in the area early in the twelfth century and to the threat to power, income, and independence which those developments represented. This would suggest that the elaboration of the older idea took place within the period c. 1110-c. 1129. The Welsh privilege was subsequently provided with a Latin translation, and that translation provided the model for the shorter privileges of Dyfrig and Eddogwyg and for some of the interpolations made in the charter collection at the time of the writing of Liber Llandavensis. It would seem therefore that the idea of Brains Teilo is by no means new in the twelfth century but that its elaboration into its present form was carried out only a little before the composition of Liber Llandavensis itself.\(^4\)
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2 LL, pp. 27-8.
3 I am most grateful to Dr. Evans for drawing these points to my attention, and also for suggesting that the forms annedw, penrhynú, and gwr in Part Two could be derived from an earlier orthographic convention.
4 LL, pp. 249, 255 f., 257 f., 258 f., 260 f., 262 f., 263. For the activity at Llandaff in collecting and editing charters under Joseph, see my forthcoming book, chapter one.

---

Language and Literature

whose name is perpetuated in Morganwg and not an earlier king of that name.\(^1\) The genesis of the new idea should therefore be attributable to Morgan himself or to his sons, particularly since there are intrusive dynasties in the area from the mid tenth century. Since Morgan died in 974, it is unlikely to be of earlier origin than the mid tenth century. For what it is worth, therefore, one may define the period of composition of Part Two of Brains Teilo as between c. 950 and c. 1090, the time of the Norman Conquest. Within that wide timespan the most likely period for its production is perhaps the episcopate of Joseph (1022-45): he was undoubtedly very energetic in securing grants of land in the Llandaff area and seems to have been responsible for the first major collection of charters which were to form the basis of the Llandaff collection.\(^2\) The elaborate confirmation of privileges by Rhys Derch ap Iestyn recorded on LL, pp. 255 f., stresses Joseph’s consciousness of the problem and may even reflect the occasion for the drawing up of the privilege.

The differences between what I have termed Part One and Part Two of Brains Teilo involve both aim and content of each part. Their distinction is a useful analytical tool. Part Two is meaningful and coherent as it stands and would appear to have been produced within the period c. 950-c. 1090. It provides a written example of a notion—that of brains, ‘privilege’—which is evidenced not only in the Welsh laws, but in the older texts of Welsh poetry.\(^3\) There is clearly no reason therefore to suppose the notion derivative from the papal grants of privilege common from the late eleventh century, and there is no reason to suppose Part Two other than complete for its original purpose of clarifying the relationship between bishop of Teilo and king of Morganwg. The content of Part One, on the other hand, is not concerned with Morganwg and is concerned with the definition of a very specific range of rights and exemptions common in western Europe in the twelfth century. It points to a Norman Welsh rather than pure Welsh origin. Its composition is most satisfactorily explained as the response of the newly refurbished community of Llandaff to political developments in the area early in the twelfth century and to the threat to power, income, and independence which those developments represented. This would suggest that the elaboration of the older idea took place within the period c. 1110-c. 1129. The Welsh privilege was subsequently provided with a Latin translation, and that translation provided the model for the shorter privileges of Dyfrig and Eddogwyg and for some of the interpolations made in the charter collection at the time of the writing of Liber Llandavensis. It would seem therefore that the idea of Brains Teilo is by no means new in the twelfth century but that its elaboration into its present form was carried out only a little before the composition of Liber Llandavensis itself.\(^4\)
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2 LL, pp. 27-8.
3 I am most grateful to Dr. Evans for drawing these points to my attention, and also for suggesting that the forms annedw, penrhynú, and gwr in Part Two could be derived from an earlier orthographic convention.
4 LL, pp. 249, 255 f., 257 f., 258 f., 260 f., 262 f., 263. For the activity at Llandaff in collecting and editing charters under Joseph, see my forthcoming book, chapter one.
APPENDIX ONE

BRAINT TEILO (LL, pp. 118 f., 120 f.)

PART ONE

(a) Lynmna y cynreith ha breyn eclyys Teilau o Lanntaf
Priuilegium sancti Teilau est et ecclesiæ suae Landauiae,
a rodes breenhined hinn ha touyssonion Cymry yn tryeuygdaul
datum sibi et omnibus successoribus suis in perpetuo
dy eclyys Teilau hac dir escioll gueti ef,
ab regibus isis et principibus Britanniae,
amcyttaredic o aurdurad papou Rumein,
confirmatum apostolica auctoritate,
y holl cyfreith ddi ac'dy thir hae di dair,
cum omnibus legibus suis in se plenariis sibi et terris suis,
ryd o pop guasaith brennin bydaul,
lbera ab omni regali seruitio,
heb mair, heb cyghellau,
sine consuile, sine proconsule,
heb cyhoth dadhna y meun gulan hae ny dieithyr,
sine conuentu intus nec extra,
heb luyl, heb gauyli, heb gulyma.
sine expediontio, sine uiglinda regione.

(b) Y cyfreith idy ynhollai, o leityr o iatr, o tres, o dynnyorm,
Et cum omni iustitía suas, de fure et forto, de rapina, de homicidio,
o cynhyn hae o lase, o amrson can guyait a heb guyai,
de amioni, de riza, de sanguine,
y diruy hay camcul yndi ddi ynhollai,
o dorri raud ynh lann hae yn dieithyr lann,
de refugio iulato ubique in terra sancti,
o ruchot ynh... diethyr luyl,

---
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o cyrech y pop mynyct ar tir Teliau,
de assaltu iurum et extra uias,
hae guir ha bratuy yr lytu yr eculs y gundr Teliau ynh Lantaf
de faciendo iudicio et patiendo de omni populo sancti Teliaui
hae ny lys;
in curia Landauiae;

dufy ha 'gel ych dty hae ynh mays yn cwyrytin dy lytu Teliau,
de compunioi aquae et heriae campi et situae populo ecclesiæ sancti Teliaui,
cyfnofut ha batheriaty ynh Lantaf,
cum mercato et moneta in Landauia,
hae apervia ar dir Teliaui dyr logeon a discynno ny thir y pop mynyct yt uoy,
cum applicatione nauium ubique per terras sancti Teliaui.

PART TWO

Ryd rac breynin a rac paup namyn dy Teliau . 3 eclyys Lantam
Liberar pro regibus et omnibus nisi ecclesiæ Landauiae
ha dy escyp, 4
et episcopit eius,
har meyl har sarbatr har cam har ennuet
de approbrio et omni iniuria
a gunech breynnin Morcanhuc hay guar hay guus dy escop Teliau
quad rex Morcanhuc et sui homines fecerint episcopo sancti Teliaui
hae dy gur hay dy guas,
et sui hominibus,
dyo brenhin Morcanhuc y gundy Teliau yn Lanntuf
idem rex Morcanhuc et sui homines
da gunethor guir ha cyfreith ha diguased braut di am y cam
rectum faciant episcopo et sui hominibus et iudicium patiuntur
a diconher dy escop Teliaui ha dy gur ha dy guas,
in curia Landauiae.
Y thir hay dayr dy luyl, dy uuer, dy gauyli,
ha pop cyfreith a wo dy breynin Morcanhuc ynh lys
Omnis lex quae fuerit regali
ou bot oll ynh holallai dy escop Teliaui ny lys yntou,
onnis etiam et in curia plenari episcopali Landauensi.

---

1 does not, of course, imply their sequiessence in my judgements.
2 There is some considerable eraseure and ower-witing of the Welsh text in the manucriipt, but most
of these changes are noted by Evans (LL, pp. 349 f.), whose own text is difficul to leact. E. D. Jones pub-
lished a text in Nat. Lib. Wales Journal, iv (1945/6), 138 f., which gives on the whole the emended read-
ings. I have attempted to supply the original, bref erendum; it is occasionally impossible to read. I
have modernized punctuation and expanded abbreviations in both Latin and Welsh versions.
3 ae over eraseure of three letters, presumably hae.
4 I find it impossible to read the eraseure, but
Evans's suggested -nu luyl hae would fit the available space.
5 This clause could arguably belong to Part One.
Iaith a Llên

Hay bot yn *melldicet* hac yn yscymunet y* neb ai torro
hac ay dimanno y breint hunn, hac ef hay plant guety ef.
Hymn bendicet hue ef hay plant ay enyrededoco y breint hunn
hac ay cat.  . . AMEN.

TRANSLATION

I have attempted to render the Welsh into intelligible modern English for the benefit of those who are unfamiliar with the language. I have therefore expanded, in brackets, where the meaning may not be clear, and have commented in the notes on passages where the translation is uncertain.

Here is the law and privilege of the church of Telio of Llandaff which these kings and princes of Wales gave to Telio’s church and to all the bishops after him for ever, confirmed by authority of the popes of Rome. All the law (shall be) available to it (the church) and to its lands (tir a daer), free from every service royal and secular, from mæter and cænghefór, from public courts within the gêlad and without, from military service, distraint, and keeping watch. Jurisdiction (shall be) to it completely, over theft and theft, violence, homicide, secret killing and arson, brawling with and without bloodshed—all the fines (diray a chámpag!) to it completely—over breach of protection within the enclôse (ilân) and without, over ambush in the woods and outside, and over public assault in every place on Telio’s land; right and judgement to the people of the church of Telio’s (Gundwy) at Llandaff and in his court. Water and pasture and woods and meadow equally to Telio’s people; trade and mint at Llandaff, and harbourage on Telio’s land for the ships which may disembark on its land, wherever it may be. Free from king and everyone except Telio and his church of Llandaff and its bishops. For any disgrace, insult (sarhad), wrong, and injury which the king of Morgannwg and his men and servants might do to Telio’s bishop and his men and servants, the king of Morgannwg shall come to Telio’s (Gundwy) at Llandaff to do right and justice and suffer judgement for the wrong that may be done to Telio’s bishop and his men and servants. Its lands may have in his court, Telio’s bishop shall have completely in his court likewise. He shall be cursed and excommunicate who shall break and diminish this privilege, both he and his children, who honours this privilege and keeps it. Amen.

1 The first letter is almost completely erased; Evans suggests ‘e’.
2 The second letter is completely erased; Evans suggests ‘r’.
3 Also is added over an erasure.
4 i.e. abdication, robbery with violence.
5 Literally ‘in it to it completely’.
6 I cannot suggest a satisfactory translation of this word; it may be an ancient corruption of t5 gwy, ‘white house’, but if so it lacked any significance for the Latin translator, who ignored it. I am most grateful to Mr. R. J. Thomas for supplying information from the Ossetian Prince Cyrilus archive. No additional information on the Welsh usage is available to date, but Mr. Thomas draws attention to Ninian’s *Condita Castrum* at Whithorn, presumably a white-washed stone building. The name is suggestive and it may well be that the Welsh usage is analogous, signifying a whitened church.
7 Literally ‘its woods’.

APPENDIX TWO

THE PRIVILEGES OF DYFRIG AND EUDDOWGY (LL, pp. 69 L., 132 l.)

Dyfrig:

Hac dignitate ei a Germano & Lupo data, constituerunt ei episcopalem sedem concessu
Mourici regis, principum cleri & populi, apud
podium Lannatam, in honore sancti Petri apostoli
fundatum, & cum finibus istis a Henrici Gunna
usque ad Riu Finison, & a Gungleis usque ad
mare totum infra Taf & Elei, cum piscibus &
coritibus suis omnibus, & cum omni sua digni-
tate & liber ab omni regali & securali seruitio,
nisi tantum ortatione cotidiana & ecclesiastico
seruitio pro anima illius, & animalibus parentum
suorum regum & principum Britanniae, &
onium fidelliam defunctorum, & cum isto
privilegio, sine consule, sine proconsule, sine
conuentus intus nec extra, sine expeditione, sine
uigilanda regione infira nec extra, & cum tota curia sua plenaria,
& libera et integra ut regia, et cum suo refugio
non ad tempus, sed sine termino, quandu
uouerit profugus, manueat tutus sine protegent
clipeo humano sub eius asyl, & cum datis
corporibus et commendatibus regum dextralis
Britanniae, Landauiae in perpetuo, & sicut
Romana ecclesia excidit dignitatem omnium
ecclesiarum catholicae fidei, ita ecclesia illa
Landauia excidat omnes ecclesias totius
dextralis Britanniae in dignitate et in privilegio
et in excellencia, & cum tota comminuionem
incolis et habitaturis in campo et in aquis,
in silvis et in priscis, & cum finibus istis, a
Gungleis infra Taf & Elei, totum territorium
usque ad mare, & per dies et temporam totam
parrochiam a Mochros usque ad insula Teithi
in pace tenetur.

Euddowgy:

. . . ubi sacratus est ecclesiae Landauiae in
honore sancti Petri fundate. Rex Mouricus
cum duebus filiis suis & uxor suae Onbrau
illa Gurcani magni et tribus abbatibus trium
conobitarum, et cum omnibus principibus regni
su et tota familia sanctorum Dubricii et Teliau
ecclesiae Landauensis suscepit eum cum gaudio,
dans et confirmans idem privilegium datum
antea sancto Dubricio sanctuo Teliau et suis
successitibus cum omni dignitate sua et
defertate ... et confirmingo idem privilegium
datum ante sancto Dubricio, id est sine con-
sule, sine proconsule, sine conuentu, intus nec
extra, sine expeditione, sine uglilanda regione
infra nec extra, & cum tota curia sua plenaria,
& libera et integra ut regia, et cum suo refugio
non ad tempus, sed sine termino, quandu
uouerit profugus, manueat tutus sine protegent
clipeo humano sub eius asyl, & cum datis
corporibus et commendatibus regum dextralis
Britanniae, Landauiae in perpetuo, & sicut
Romana ecclesia excidit dignitatem omnium
ecclesiarum catholicae fidei, ita ecclesia illa
Landauia excidat omnes ecclesias totius
dextralis Britanniae in dignitate et in privilegio
et in excellencia, & cum tota comminuionem
incolis et habitaturis in campo et in aquis,
in silvis et in priscis, & cum finibus istis, a
Gungleis infra Taf & Elei, totum territorium
usque ad mare, & per dies et temporam totam
parrochiam a Mochros usque ad insula Teithi
in pace tenetur.