

More plaints in medieval Welsh law

SARA ELIN ROBERTS
University of Chester

In the fourth volume of *The Journal of Celtic Studies* (henceforth *JCS*), I discussed plaints in medieval Welsh law, looking at their purpose and their contents, and presented an edition and translation of the first ten plaints in Book XII of Aneurin Owen's *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales*.¹ Those ten plaints appear as a collection in manuscript Q, NLW, MS. Wynnstay 36, and Ep, NLW, MS. Peniarth 258, with some of the ten also occurring in Dd, BL, MS. Additional 31055.² The ten plaints were selected because of their link to manuscript Q, and they were a study of the genre in that particular manuscript. However, in addition to the plaints from manuscript Q which I examined in *JCS*, Aneurin Owen gave editions and translations of seven further plaints, and in this article, a second part to the initial study, I will consider the plaints which make up the remainder of Owen's Book XII.

Plaints are rare in medieval Welsh law manuscripts, and there are very few examples – only three manuscripts contain a collection of plaints, and there is a sole example of a plaint in a further two manuscripts. There are also very few modern editions – apart from the full collection of all existing plaints in *Ancient Laws*, the plaints found in Q were published in *Leges Wallicae*,³ and the plaints from 'The Book of Trev Alun' were published by William Owen Pughe in *Y Greal*.⁴

As discussed in the article in *JCS*, the plaints are found in manuscripts belonging to the Blegywryd (Bleg) redaction. There may be an explanation for this in the way that additional material is incorporated into the law manuscripts; Bleg manuscripts are mainly later in date, and are the manuscripts most likely to have additional material appended to the main text.⁵ Therefore it may not be significant that the plaints are found in

¹ S. E. Roberts, 'Plaints in mediaeval Welsh law', *Journal of Celtic Studies*, 4 (2004), pp. 219–61. *Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales*, ed. & trans. Aneurin Owen (Quarto edition, 2 vols, London, 1841). Owen divided his work into two sections, published as two volumes in the quarto edition; vol. I contains his concept of the basic statement of medieval Welsh law, in three redactions, and vol. II contains material from the same manuscripts used in vol. I but material which he could not fit into his basic codes and therefore termed it 'Anomalous'. The second volume is divided into books, and the books are either based on a single manuscript or on a genre of text. Book XII is given to plaints.

² Manuscripts will be referred to by the sigla given to them by Aneurin Owen or others. I shall be concerned in particular with the following manuscripts: Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales,

MS. Wynnstay 36 (siglum Q); NLW, MS. Peniarth 258 (siglum Ep), seemingly a copy of Q; London, British Library, MS. Additional 31055 (siglum Dd); NLW, MS. Peniarth 40 (siglum K); NLW 24029A (siglum Bost, and until 2012 this was Boston (MA), Free Library, MS. 5); and 'The Book of Trev Alun'. 'The Book of Trev Alun' is a manuscript now lost, although there is a copy of the plaints in NLW, Llanstephan MS. 120; NLW, MS. 13246B; and BL, MS. Additional 15020. It is uncertain which manuscript Aneurin Owen used as his base text, and he may have used a manuscript now lost.

³ *Cyfreithjeu Hywel Dda ac Ereill seu Leges Wallicae Ecclesiasticae et Civiles Hoeli Boni et Alcomium Wallicae Principium*, ed. William Wotton and Moses Williams (London, 1730), taken from manuscript Ep.

⁴ *Y Greal* (London, 1806), pp. 281, 321–2.

⁵ Iorwerth manuscripts often have a copy of *Llyfr*

manuscripts of that redaction, and it may be ascribed to circumstance, although it should be noted that several of the manuscripts containing additional material of any type (not confined to plaints) have Marcher links, and this is a significant point to remember when considering these plaints.⁶

A study of what the plaints actually are was undertaken in the previous article, but it may be helpful to reconsider the matter briefly here. Plaints were the first stage in the legal process, and set out what had happened, giving details of time and place and any other relevant information; often including the likely compensation with any circumstances which may affect the value, such as a person's status. Most of the plaints close with a request for an answer, and the legal process could be expected to follow. The Welsh plaints, which are models, bear comparison with English model-plaints although the legal references are firmly based in Welsh law. They also compare with the model pleadings, *cynghawsedd*, in Welsh law, and the English procedural models, all potentially formulated for teaching purposes.⁷

The Plaints and Ancient Laws

Table 6.1 Owen's Book XII and its sources

Plaint, number in Book XII	Source
I. <i>Ach ac edryd</i>	Q and Ep
II. <i>Camwresgyn</i>	Q and Ep, Dd
III. <i>Camwresgyn trwy orchoidwat</i>	Q and Ep
IV. <i>Camwresgyn trwy y perchen</i>	Q and Ep
V. <i>Aredig tir yn anghyfarch</i>	Q and Ep
VI. <i>Torr Coet</i>	Q and Ep, Dd
VII. <i>Sarhaet</i>	Q and Ep, Dd
VIII. <i>Anghyfarch</i>	Q and Ep, Dd
IX. <i>Mach a chynogyn</i>	Q and Ep, Dd
X. <i>Lletrat</i>	Q and Ep, Dd
XI. <i>Galanas</i>	K, Bost, Dd
XII. <i>Amoby</i>	Trev Alun
XIII. <i>Tor croes</i>	Trev Alun
XIV. <i>Camgroes</i>	Trev Alun
XV. <i>Anghyfarch</i>	Trev Alun
XVI. <i>Ach ac edryd</i>	Dd
XVII. <i>Saraad</i>	Trev Alun

Damweiniau appended to the main text rather than a lengthy tail of a more miscellaneous nature. *Llyfr Damweiniau* is also added to the text in NLW, MS. Peniarth 37 (siglum U) of the Cyfnerth redaction, and NLW, MS. Peniarth 259B (siglum Z) of the same redaction does have a lengthy tail of miscellaneous legal material, but that particular manuscript is later in date, and also has a Marcher link. It has also been the focus of a recent study: see S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred: An Edition and Study of Peniarth MS 259B* (Leiden, 2011).

⁶ S. E. Roberts, 'Legal practice in fifteenth-century Brycheiniog', *Studia Celtica*, 35 (2001), 307–23, at pp. 307–8.

⁷ In *Ancient Laws*, ed. & transl. Owen, II, pp. 126–211, Books VII and VIII are called *Llyfr Cynghawsedd* ('Book of Pleading'): see T. M. Charles-Edwards, 'Cynghawsedd: counting and pleading in mediaeval Welsh law', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 33 (1984), 188–98; and Robin Chapman Stacey, 'Learning to Plead in Medieval Welsh Law', *Studia Celtica*, 38 (2004), 107–124. *The Court Baron, being*

Looking at the arrangement of Owen's Book XII, the complaints from Q were left in the same order in which they appeared in Q and in its copy, Ep. The next complaint, XI, is a singleton found in manuscripts K (used by Owen) and Bost,⁸ and is also in the collection of complaints in Dd. Then follow four complaints from the now lost 'Book of Trev Alun', but Owen inserted a complaint which only occurs in one manuscript, Dd, as his XVI, and then finished his collection with another complaint from 'The Book of Trev Alun'. His ordering of the final six complaints is misleading: they do not occur in the order found in Ancient Laws in any of the extant manuscripts, and there is no copy of complaint XVI in 'The Book of Trev Alun', although Owen makes it appear to be so, as the last complaint ends with a note stating that the previous complaints were taken from 'The Book of Trev Alun', and he has a note at the beginning of complaint XII stating that it is taken from 'The Book of Trev Alun'. Owen also mistakenly notes variants for complaint XI from Q – this complaint does not occur at all in manuscript Q.⁹ In this present edition, the order of the collection of complaints in the extant copies of 'The Book of Trev Alun' has been restored, and the two singletons have been placed at the end of the edition.

Table 6.2 Order of the complaints in the manuscripts and in this edition

Complaint in <i>Ancient Laws</i>	Source	Number
XIV. <i>Camgroes</i>	Trev Alun	I
XIII. <i>Tor croes</i>	Trev Alun	II
XV. <i>Anghyfarch</i>	Trev Alun	III
XII. <i>Amobyr</i>	Trev Alun	IV
XVII. <i>Saraad</i>	Trev Alun	V
XI. <i>Galanas</i>	K, Bost, Dd	VI
XVI. <i>Ach ac edryd</i>	Dd	VII

'The Book of Trev Alun'

Aneurin Owen's Book XII ends with the statement 'Ac velly y tervyna llyvyr Trev Alun, o law Gutyn Owain.'¹⁰ In the three copies of 'The Book of Trev Alun' complaints, the following note is found at the beginning of the collection: *Copiau o gwynion fel y maent yn scrifenedic o Law Gyttyn Owein gyda Mr. Trefor Trefalun*.¹¹ It appears that Owen took this note, omitted the part stating that the book was owned by Mr Trefor, and added it in English as a note on complaint XII.xii. He also has a reference to the end of 'The Book of Trev Alun' at the end of his final complaint; however, in the manuscript copies, the last words in the complaint are '*ac felly y terfyna*'. Owen may have invented the term 'Book of Trev Alun' as that is not found

Precedents for Use in Seignorial and Other Local Courts, together with Select Pleas from the Bishop of Ely's Court of Littleport, ed. & transl. Frederic William Maitland & W. P. Baildon (London, 1891). *Novae Narrationes*, ed. & transl. Elsie Shanks and S. F. C. Milsom (London, 1963). See also examples of English bills, which correspond to the complaints: *Select Bills in Eyre, A.D. 1292–1333*, ed. & transl. William Craddock Bolland (London, 1914).

⁸ For a discussion on the manuscript used by Aneurin Owen, see below, p. 176.

⁹ S. E. Roberts, 'Plaints in mediaeval Welsh law', p. 230.

¹⁰ *Ancient Laws*, ed. and transl. Owen, II, p. 474.

¹¹ From Llanstephan 120, p. 1; also in NLW, MS. 13246B and BL Add. MS. 15020.

in any of the manuscript copies either, and it is also unlikely that ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ ended with these plaints.

The Trefor family had two seats in north-east Wales: Trefalun (located between Chester and Wrexham), and Plas Têg in Flintshire.¹² The Trefalun branch of the family was established by Richard Trefor (1558–1638), but the book could not have been created at Trefalun as the Hall was not built until the sixteenth century, and the Trefor family was not established at Trefalun Hall during Gutun Owain’s lifetime either. The attribution and ownership linking the manuscript to the Trefor family of Trefalun therefore is later, but the link with Gutun Owain is an aid to dating the original manuscript.

Meredith Lloyd of London, fl. 1655–77, a lawyer by trade and a well-known antiquarian and collector of manuscripts, once owned *Q*, a manuscript with a separate collection of plaints, and discussed them with his cousin Robert Vaughan of Hengwrt. Lloyd also seems to have had access to ‘The Book of Trev Alun’.¹³ In his letter, he named the plaints of *Tor Croes* (Breaking a Cross) and *Cam Groes* (Wrong Cross), both plaints which occur only in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’.¹⁴ He seems to call them ‘declarations’ but urged Vaughan to have a look at the ‘declarations’ from ‘Guttyn Owen’; it appears that Lloyd had a copy of ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, or at least knew it well.¹⁵ In his reply to the letter, Vaughan asked Lloyd to make copies of the pleadings occurring in a manuscript he called ‘The Red Book of Hergest’ – Lloyd corrected him, stating that it is ‘The White Book of Hergest’.¹⁶ It appears that Lloyd had access to three sets of plaints: those in *Q*, ‘The White Book of Hergest’, and ‘The Book of Trev Alun’.¹⁷ He was probably one of the first people to work on these texts.

The plaints from ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ occur in three surviving manuscripts: Jaspas Gruffuth’s Llanstephan 120, and two eighteenth-century manuscripts linked with the London circle of antiquarians in the eighteenth century – NLW, MS. 12346B and BL, MS. Add. 15020, ‘Y Gell Gymysg’.¹⁸ Although there have always been Welsh people in London, by the eighteenth century the city had become a haven for Welsh literature enthusiasts, manuscript collectors and antiquarians, and several societies for the promotion of Welsh literature and academic work were created, including the Cymmrodorion and the Gwyneddigion. Some of the best-known scholars of Welsh literature from that period were involved in these societies, including the Morris brothers of Anglesey, Owen Jones (Owain Myfyr), Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg) and William Owen (Pughe).¹⁹ As well as creating their manuscript collections of Welsh literature and working on the texts, these antiquarians were also heavily involved in publishing, and London was the centre of the Welsh publishing world in the eighteenth century; they were responsible for bringing medieval Welsh literature to the wider world.

‘The Book of Trev Alun’ itself has not been seen for many years and has probably been destroyed; but it was an authentic manuscript, and a full copy was made before it was lost. The copies of the plaints attribute the manuscript to Gutun Owain, a well-known poet

¹² *Y Bywgraffiadur Ar-lein*, <http://wbo.llgc.org.uk/cy/c-TREV-TRE-1500.html> [accessed 25 February 2013].

¹³ S. E. Roberts, ‘Plaints in mediaeval Welsh law’, p. 228.

¹⁴ N. Lloyd, ‘Meredith Lloyd’, *Journal of the Welsh Bibliographical Society*, 11 (1975–6), 133–92, at p. 163.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Lloyd, ‘Meredith Lloyd’, p. 165.

¹⁷ For the White Book of Hergest, see S. E. Roberts, ‘Plaints in mediaeval Welsh law’, pp. 229–30.

¹⁸ G. J. Williams, ‘Bywyd Cymreig Llundain yng Nghyfnod Owain Myfyr’, *Y Llenor*, XVIII (1939), pp. 73–82 and 218–32, at p. 76.

¹⁹ M. Stephens, *Cydymaith i Lenyddiaeth Cymru* (new edition, Cardiff, 1997), p. 143. The connection continues, as William Owen (Pughe)’s son was Aneurin Owen, the editor of the Welsh laws.

and also a professional scribe – several manuscripts in his hand survive, most written between 1475 and 1495.²⁰ One of Gutun Owain's surviving manuscripts can be linked to John Trevor.²¹ Gutun Owain was a local of Llandudlyst-yn-y-Traean near Oswestry, in the north-eastern March, and he wrote poetry to various patrons who were also from that area.²² The complaints from 'The Book of Trev Alun' are a different collection from that found in Q, and, in contrast to the other complaints in Owen's *Ancient Laws*, they are from north Wales. There is no reason to disregard the attribution of 'The Book of Trev Alun' to Gutun Owain, and there is reason to believe that he composed the complaints himself from existing models.

The manuscript copies of the complaints also state that 'The Book of Trev Alun' was owned by a Mr Trefor of Tref Alun. According to Daniel Huws, this was probably the third Siôn Trefor, who died around 1539. The Tref Alun manuscripts were dispersed, but Siôn Trefor had a number of scribes copying for him, amongst them the circle including Jaspas Gruffuth, *ob.* 1614, a cleric, manuscript collector (he owned two manuscripts of Welsh laws), and a scribe, who wrote Llanstephan 120 ('The Book of Jaspas Gruffuth'), perhaps better known as a large collection of the work of Dafydd ap Gwilym.²³ Llanstephan 120 opens with these complaints, and it also has several *englynion* by various poets, taken from '*hen llyfr oedd gyd a S. Trefor Trefalun*'.²⁴ Some of the poems by Dafydd ap Gwilym in Jaspas Gruffuth's volume were taken from a '*vetustus codex*' which is now lost but was an important collection of Dafydd's *cywyddau*, and Jaspas Gruffuth also copied parts of the Black Book of Carmarthen into Llanstephan 120.²⁵ It is known that Jaspas Gruffuth owned The White Book of Rhydderch at one stage, and also what is now BL, MS. Cotton Caligula A.iii, the earliest version of Llyfr Iorwerth of the laws of Hywel.²⁶ Jaspas Gruffuth therefore had access to some important manuscripts and probably copied the original 'Book of Trev Alun'.

'The Book of Trev Alun' may have been in London for a while; Meredith Lloyd certainly knew of it and had probably seen it. The remaining two copies of the complaints occur in NLW, MS. 12346B, and BL, MS. Add. 15020. NLW, MS. 12346B is in the hand of William Owen Pughe, and contains a copy of all of the complaints from 'The Book of Trev Alun'. A note at the end of the complaints refers to 'Llyfr Gwyrdd R. Morris Yswain'. The 'Llyfr Gwyrdd' may be BL, Add. 14909, created by Richard Morris when he was in prison in London in 1735, but the manuscript does not contain a copy of the complaints; it may be that the note belongs with the next section, or that the 'Llyfr Gwyrdd' is now lost.²⁷ Owain

²⁰ J. E. Caerwyn Williams, 'Gutun Owain', in *A Guide to Welsh Literature 1282–c.1550*, ed. A. O. H. Jarman and G. R. Hughes (Cardiff, 1997), p. 265

²¹ T. Roberts, 'Llawysgrifau Gutun Owain, a thymor ei oes', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 15 (1953), 99–109, at p. 102.

²² M. Stephens, *Cydymaith i Lenyddiaeth Cymru*, p. 296.

²³ On Jaspas Gruffuth, see R. Ovenden, 'Jaspas Gryffyth and His Books', *The British Library Journal*, 20 (1994), pp. 107–39; and on the manuscript, see J. Gwenogvryn Evans, *Report on Manuscripts in the Welsh Language* (2 vols, London, 1899), vol. II, part II, p. 603.

²⁴ Evans, *Report*, p. 603.

²⁵ Evans, *Report*, p. 603.; D. Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts* (Aberystwyth, 2000), pp. 99–100.

²⁶ Huws, *Medieval Welsh Manuscripts*, pp. 248, 301, 192.

²⁷ D. W. Wiliam, *Cofiant Richard Morris* (Llangefni, 1999), pp. 84, 87. The manuscript may have been bound in green, but it has been rebound since its arrival at the British Library and no trace of the original binding has survived. The Llyfr Gwyrdd appears to have contained poetry, as well as possibly these complaints; there is a reference in a letter from Richard Morris to Lewis Morris, written in London, 18 January 1763, and Richard Morris had the Llyfr Gwyrdd in his possession – he refers to a poem by Dafydd Niclas in the collection. *The Letters of Lewis, Richard William and John Morris of Anglesey (Morrisiaid Môn) 1728–1763*, ed. John H. Davies (2 vols, Oxford, 1907–9), vol. II, p. 531.

Myfyr (Owen Jones) also copied the complaints into a miscellany which he started in 1768, and the same reference to the ‘Llyfr Gwyrdd’ is found in his manuscript, BL, MS. Add. 15020.²⁸ The material in this manuscript was gleaned mainly from the Morris manuscripts, and there are several references to items taken from the ‘Llyfr Gwyrdd’.²⁹ Both Owen Jones and William Owen Pughe’s copies of the complaints are very similar indeed, including the distinctive orthography (*x* is used for /*χ*/, and *δ* is used to represent /*ð*/), and both have the same reference to the ‘Llyfr Gwyrdd’ after the final complaint, but it may be the case that Pughe copied BL, MS. Add. 15020, as much of the material in NLW, MS. 13246B was taken from Owen Jones’s manuscript, and a Lewis Morris manuscript, BL, MS. Add. 14908 (there is no copy of the complaints in the latter manuscript). At the beginning of each complaint in BL, MS. Add. 15020, there is a note stating that the complaint is found in *Y Greal*. The complaints do indeed occur in *Y Greal*, a quarterly publication which was published anonymously in London, but linked with Pughe.³⁰ There is also some glossing on the complaints in BL, MS. Add. 15020, but it is uncertain whether this was done by a different hand; the ink is, however, slightly different. The glossing hand changes many of the *fs* in the complaints to *v*, and also changes an example of *fel* to *val*, and *Madog* to *Madoc*. This suggests that the person making the emendations had seen a manuscript with older orthography, but as Richard Morris’s ‘Llyfr Gwyrdd’ or the original source is now missing, it is uncertain whether that had a direct copy from ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ showing the older orthography in it, or, less likely, the glossator saw the original ‘Book of Trev Alun’. Aneurin Owen’s edition of the complaints also has differences in orthography compared to the manuscript copies of ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, consistently using *v* for /*v*/ and *-aw* for *-o* e.g. in the name ‘Madog’, and in *nog ei dywysaw* (*no’i dwyso* in the manuscript copies); this suggests an older orthography. It appears that Owen was not copying any of the extant manuscripts but was using their exemplar – perhaps the ‘Llyfr Gwyrdd’ or the exemplar for one of the other manuscript copies, or less likely, ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ itself, although the variations between Owen’s text and the manuscript copies are not enormous, and the content is very similar in each of the copies. It does mean, however, that it is uncertain which manuscript Owen was using for his edition in *Ancient Laws*, and that the complaints are witness to the only manuscript used for *Ancient Laws* which has since been lost.

‘The Book of Trev Alun’ and its contents will remain a mystery, but for the complaints presented here, the oldest copy, that in Llanstephan 120, will be followed, and this is probably the closest we can get to Mr Trefor’s manuscript.

The complaints in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’

The complaints found in the collection in Q and those in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ are very similar as far as the structure is concerned, and although there are differences between the two collections, both use formulae, and each complaint within the collection is organised

²⁸ A note on the first page of the manuscript states ‘A ddechreuodd ef ei sgrifenny yn Llundain y 5^d dydd o fis Medi B.A. 1768’.

²⁹ G. Phillips, *Dyn Heb ei Gyffelyb yn y Byd* (Cardiff, 2010), p. 21.

³⁰ *Y Greal* (London, 1806), pp. 281, 321–2; M. Stephens, *Cydymaith i Lenyddiaeth Cymru*, pp. 230, s.n. ‘*Greal, Y*’.

in the same way. In my previous article, a simple structure for the complaints as found in the Q collection was given, and it is useful to reproduce it here.

A. Introductory address

1. Address to the court, naming parties

B. Definition of the complaint

2. *Defnydd ac achos* ('substance and cause')
3. *Maint* ('measure' / 'amount')
4. *Y mod a'r ffurf* ('the ways and means')
5. (a) *Amser* ('time' / 'dating')
- (b) *Amser y edryd* ('the time when reparation is / was due')

C. Preliminary requirements before complaint

6. Parties competent in law
7. Plaintiff applied to defendant – denied

D. Final plea

8. Request for a timely answer³¹

A, the Introductory address, is actually only found in three of the complaints in Q – the first, then numbers 5 and 6 – and it is a little different in each case. The introductory address in the first and sixth complaint in Q are closest and they state the name of the claimant, present, and the name of the defendant, also present, and also state, by title, the officials to whom the complaint is being presented – this is all very formulaic and in the first and sixth complaint it could be said that the same formula is being adapted for both complaints. The fifth complaint in Q, however, has a slightly different introductory address and looks as if it was meant to be read out or announced in the court – but it also states the names of the persons present, and also the officials. The remaining seven complaints in Q do not have an introductory address but start with B, the definition of the complaint, and each of the seven begins with the formula *defnydd ac achos*. This is closer to the complaints from 'The Book of Trev Alun', which are shorter than those in the Q collection mainly because they do not have the introductory address. Each of the five complaints in 'The Book of Trev Alun' collection begins in almost exactly the same way, with the definition of the complaint, starting with '*mesur*', and they combine the naming of the parties with the definition. All but one of the complaints (III) state that the parties are present at the bar – there is no mention of the bar in the Q complaints, but rather, the older form *gorsedd* is found. The definitions of the complaints in 'The Book of Trev Alun' have the same sections as those in Q, giving names, times and stating what happened and how, but section (b), *amser i edryd* in Q, is not found in any of the complaints in 'The Book of Trev Alun'. The third part of the complaints in Q, section C, the preliminary requirements before a complaint, is again different in 'The Book of Trev Alun' complaints, and again shorter. The amount of money owed is usually given – and usually refers to the sovereign's coin rather than the traditional method of referring to currency in the Welsh laws, and as found in the Q complaints³² – and in one complaint, the defendant is given two options, to deny, with a consequent appeal to a jury, or to admit

³¹ See S. E. Roberts, 'Complaints in mediaeval Welsh law', p. 227.

³² Cf. *Ceiniog cyfraith*, 'legal pence', and *ceiniog cwta*, 'curt pence' in the Q complaints, but *xv^s o aur neu arian o funai dda daladwy o iawn fath y dywededig Edward Frenin*

Lloegr y pedwerydd wedi y goncwest, 'xv^s of gold or silver of the good current money of the right coin of the said Edward, king of England, the fourth after the conquest' in 'The Book of Trev Alun'.

the crime and pay the money owed. Another plaint, IV, states how the case will be proven. Apart from the first plaint in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, the ending is the same, and abbreviated; in Q, the final plea is usually a request for a timely answer, but ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ plaints do not give the final formula, but usually end with ‘and so’, which could be followed by an extended final plea. An abbreviation of this sort, where the ending would be known, is often found in English court rolls and formulaic documents.

The subjects covered in the two collections of plaints are also different. Although both ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ and Q have plaints of *sarhaed* and *anghyfarch*, they do not appear to originate from the same source. As expected, there are differences in the actual details of the offences – but the plaints are models, and each offence would be filled in as necessary, with actual details, so they would not necessarily match a description found, for example, in a lawbook. However, as the wording of the plaints in both collections is different, and different formulae are used, it appears that, although belonging to the same genre of texts, these plaints are not from one original. The model for the Q plaints and the model for ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ plaints were based on a similar model, perhaps a basic structure offering a preamble, leaving blanks for names, dates, and details, and giving a closing formula, but the situations and details added are different.

The Q plaints tended to follow the legal ideas in *Llyfr Blegywryd* (Bleg) quite closely, and there is a legal section, usually in Bleg, which corresponds with the subject of each of the plaints.³³ Also, the subject matter of the Q plaints is quite limited – four of them are on land law; a further four, theft, surreption, cutting timber and ploughing without permission are on the subject of breach of personal right; then there is one plaint each given to *sarhaed* and suretyship. Looking at the plaints from ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, the third plaint, *anghyfarch*, and the fifth, *sarhaed*, have counterparts in the Q collection, and the corresponding plaints in the two collections are, not surprisingly, very similar, although the case described is not the same case in the two manuscripts. Although the plaints in Q tend to follow the subjects for which *cynghawsedd* is also found, so there are plaints on land law, suretyship, theft, and the detention of something which has been borrowed, it was noted in the previous article that the plaints also have a wider scope – in Q, there was a plaint of *sarhaed*.³⁴

The plaints in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ are even more varied – only two of the five plaints are on subjects for which there are models of *cynghawsedd* found in *Llyfr Cynghawsedd* (these are III, *anghyfarch* and V, *sarhaed*, discussed in the previous article on the Q plaints), and of the remaining three, two are on the subject of crosses – wrong cross, I, and breaking a cross, II – and the other plaint, IV, is on the subject of *amobr*.

Amobr is well known in the Welsh lawtexts, and it is also commonly found in the court rolls. In his study of women in the evidence found in the court rolls, mainly from Dyffryn Clwyd and the north-eastern March, R. R. Davies noted that *amobr* did occur but the pleas were mainly for debt and contract, which may explain why the title of this plaint is *amobr* but the subject matter is debt.³⁵ In Welsh law, *amobr* was a virginity payment, but by the

³³ S. E. Roberts, ‘Plaints in mediaeval Welsh law’, pp. 222–3. The Bleg texts are predominantly southern in origin, whereas the *Llyfr Iorwerth* (Ior) texts are northern, and reflect the political and legal situation in Gwynedd in the thirteenth century.

³⁴ S. E. Roberts, ‘Plaints in mediaeval Welsh law’, pp. 222–3.

³⁵ R. R. Davies, ‘The status of women and the practice of marriage in late-medieval Wales’, in *The Welsh Law of Women*, ed. D. Jenkins and M. Owen (Cardiff, 1980), 93–114, at p. 96.

time of the court rolls discussed by Davies, it could also be used as a penalty for sexual wrongdoing.³⁶ It is uncertain how close to the Welsh lawtexts this plaint of *amobr* is. The concept, like *anghyfarch* and *sarhaed*, is well known, but the situation may be closer to that found in the court rolls. The case is brought by the *amobrydd*, the *amobr* collector, an official found in the court rolls but unheard of in the Welsh lawtexts, against Catrin, an *uchelwr*'s daughter.³⁷ In the Bleg texts, it is stated that if a woman elopes, then she pays the *amobr* herself (or it is collected from where she is) as her family are no longer responsible for her – in a 'normal' situation, her father would pay the *amobr* to the lord.³⁸ It is unusual to find a case brought against a woman, as they were usually of no consequence as far as Welsh law was concerned, but Davies notes that in cases of *amobr*, women were given status in the courts – women could, for example, be used as a sort of jury to decide on such cases.³⁹ The reason the *amobr* was due in the plaint was that Catrin had entered into a public sexual partnership, *gwelyogaeth gyhoeddog*, sleeping with a man and the situation was publicly known, and therefore her *amobr* was due. *Gwelyogaeth gyhoeddog* is a Welsh legal term, and it occurs in a triad stating the three situations where *amobr* is due: the other two are pregnancy and marriage where the woman is given by gift of kin.⁴⁰ The triad is found in the Ior law of women, but not in any of the Bleg or Cyfn texts, so this plaint may be following a different redaction to the plaints found in Q, which are closer to Bleg than to Ior. This can be explained simply – the plaints are from north-east Wales, and the Ior texts are also northern.

The remaining two plaints in 'The Book of Trev Alun' take us even further from the standard Welsh law texts. They are both actions for crosses, and there is no section in any of the main law texts on crosses, but there are sections found amongst the additional material in some later manuscripts.⁴¹ In Irish law, a tree could be marked with a cross to show that it was an 'appropriated tree', where the tree has been marked as being private property although it would be on common land; a cross could also be used to prohibit access to land.⁴² Perhaps the most significant section in the Welsh laws is found in four manuscripts, within a collection of what appears to be additional *cynghawsedd*, presented in AL IX, rather than a form of the better-known *Llyfr Cynghawsedd*; it is in fact two combined collections of *cynghawsedd*, with the section on crosses found in the second collection focusing on land law.⁴³ Crosses are linked to land law, but the section, whilst found amongst *cynghawsedd*, gives rules and procedure rather than model pleadings on crosses. Perhaps the most important point to be made about this section on crosses is that it is found in four manuscripts: Z, H, As and Mor, and all of these manuscripts have a

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 111

³⁷ R. R. Davies et al., *Dyffryn Clwyd Court Roll Database, 1294–1422* (Colchester, UK Data Archive, 1997). There are several references to the *amobrydd* or *amobrwr* in the court rolls, and references are usually to the same person, so it appears that it was an official post, held by the same person for several years; throughout the 1390s, Einion Gogh is the *amobrwr* in Ruthin, and in the Llannerch and Ruthin courts Einion ap Cyn Loid appears throughout the 1340s to the 1370s, along with Dd. Loyd and Dd. ap Madog. Madog ap Llywelyn, however, is not found in the Dyffryn Clwyd Court Rolls as *amobrydd*. On *amobr* and the *amobrwr*, see L. Johnson, 'Amobr and Amobrwr: The Collection of Marriage Fees and Sexual Fines in

Late Medieval Wales', *Transactions of the Honourable Society of the Cymmrodorion* (2012), pp. 10–21.

³⁸ *Llyfr Blegywryd*, ed. S. J. Williams and J. E. Powell (Cardiff, 1942; 2nd edn, 1961), p. 63.3–9.

³⁹ Davies, 'The status of women', p. 111.

⁴⁰ S. E. Roberts, *The Legal Triads of Medieval Wales*, pp. 182–3.

⁴¹ See in particular S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 40–1, with an edition of the *cynghawsedd* sections at pp. 200–75.

⁴² F. Kelly, *Early Irish Farming* (Dublin, 2000), p. 407; Kelly notes that little detail has survived about this action.

⁴³ This collection is discussed by S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 40–1.

north-east Wales origin – there would be an expectation therefore that the references in the north-east Wales ‘Book of Trev Alun’ complaints would be similar to the material in the *cynghawsedd* from the same area.⁴⁴ The section also starts, coincidentally, with a reference to a complaint in the first sentence.⁴⁵

There is also an important fifteenth-century statement of local custom from Brycheiniog describing the use of a cross in a legal procedure for land, the *dadl croes*.⁴⁶ The individual references to crosses in the Welsh law texts, although very few in number, demonstrate that placing a cross in a piece of land would show that a legal action had been initiated, and, as in the Irish examples, would prohibit use of the land. The section of *cynghawsedd* discussing crosses and their use focuses on how to use the cross – it must be taken from the lord, and it is placed to prevent further use of land as there is a claim upon it. However, the *dadl croes* evidence suggests that the placing of the cross is a ceremonial move to mark the land as being under dispute, and the person holding the land at the time must take the cross – to show that he is aware that legal proceedings have been initiated against him – and once he has agreed to a court appearance to discuss the dispute, it seems that the land is free to be used once again (the procedure is too lengthy and time-consuming for it to be practical to prohibit use of the land as it would more than likely span key agricultural periods of land use).

The two complaints from ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ are important sources from the lawtexts for the use of crosses in Welsh law, and they give more detail than is found in any of the redactions. In the first complaint, wrong cross, the defendant placed a cross in the land, but it seems that he was not entitled to do so, possibly because the claimant’s ownership of the land is clear – *gwir briodolder*. The term *croes pendant* is not found in any of the lawtexts, and it is unclear whether there were many different types of crosses – although it may simply be referring to the cross in question rather than a certain type of cross. Further information on wrongful uses of crosses is detailed in the section in the *cynghawsedd* from north-east Wales. The section begins by stating that certain types of crosses are not valid – perhaps ‘wrong cross’ as in the complaints – and the first example is that a woman’s cross is not valid if she has a husband, and it adds that, in the same way, a woman’s complaint is also invalid, so immediately there is a link to complaints which were probably well-known sections of law.⁴⁷ In that section, all crosses are to be taken from the lord except for one, a cross put up by a proprietor to prevent another person using his patrimony, but the text also states that he had no time to get the cross from the lord, as the other person was already using his land.⁴⁸ This seems similar to the situation outlined in the complaint, although it is still unclear why the cross is deemed a wrong cross.

The second complaint, on breaking a cross, has the same litigants, but their position is reversed. This time, John Holland placed the cross in his own land to start the legal process. However, the defendant brought cattle to graze the land, and this ‘broke’ the cross. It seems that once a cross had been placed in the land, the land was not to be used – although looking at the procedure outlined in the *dadl croes*, which was very lengthy, this

⁴⁴ S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 40–1. The manuscripts are: NLW, MS. Peniarth 259B (siglum Z); NLW, MS. Peniarth 164 (siglum H); NLW, MS. Peniarth 175 (siglum As); and NLW, MS. Peniarth 36C (siglum Mor). As was used as the base manuscript for the text in AL IX, with variants given from Mor and Z.

⁴⁵ S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, p. 206, §1679.

⁴⁶ S. E. Roberts, ‘Legal Practice in Fifteenth-century Brycheiniog’, *Studia Celtica*, 35 (2001), pp. 307–23.

⁴⁷ S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 207–8, §1697; AL IX.xvii.4.

⁴⁸ S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 207–8, §§1698–9; AL IX.xvii.1.

was not a practical solution. The cross in the plaint was placed in the land with two witnesses, which is very similar to the *dadl croes*, where it is said that two tenants are needed to witness the placing of the cross.⁴⁹ The *dadl croes* combined Welsh law and elements of English law, such as trial by jury and the *essoin*, and the text could be said to be a ‘Marcher’ piece. Although only the initial part of the *dadl croes* is comparable to these plaints – the *dadl croes* goes on to explain the whole process, whereas by their nature the plaints only give the situation – the fact that both the plaints and the *dadl croes* show the use of a cross in starting a legal procedure for land is significant. Looking at the section of *cynghawseidd* from north-east Wales, there is a procedure outlined for charging and denying a cross – and it is clear that the case outlined is for ‘breaking a cross’, as in the plaint. In that text, the person claiming must take a relic and swear three times that the cross was broken, and the other must deny, thrice, in the same way. Then it seems that the person denying must swear an oath with three other men, within a set period of time, and at his parish church.⁵⁰ The plaints are also interesting because they provide additional details on the practice of using crosses in land cases in this way – and also provide a parallel with the *dadl croes* evidence – as the second plaint states that the person setting up the cross did so in the presence of witnesses, a detail found in *dadl croes* but not in the section from the north-east Wales *cynghawseidd* collections.

There is very little evidence in the laws, but using crosses to instigate land claims seems to be a Welsh legal practice rather than an English one, and was perhaps more commonly known in the fifteenth century. The practice was certainly known in Dyffryn Clwyd, at least, as there are several cases of breaking a cross and unjust placing of a cross in the court rolls, so these plaints may have been chosen as they were well known actions locally.⁵¹ However, there is one interesting reference in the Welsh lawtexts on using crosses: in the *cynghellor*’s section in Cyfn it is stated that the *cynghellor* has the duty of placing a cross and restriction for every claim, ‘*ev bie dodi kroes a gwardd ar bob dadl*’.⁵² The sentence is found in all of the Cyfn texts, and the fact that it is there but provides no additional material may attest to the extremely common nature of using a cross in this way to instigate a claim for land; it may be that there was no need for additional detail as using crosses in this way was common knowledge, rather than a very rare action which would need explanation.⁵³

The plaints in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ are, like the plaints in Q, models of how to start a procedure, and they are rooted in Welsh law, using several well-known terms. The actions would have been recognisable in Welsh law, but the plaints from ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ appear to be more similar to the law which would be found in the fifteenth

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 313.

⁵⁰ Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 207–8, sentences 1704–5; AL IX.xvii.5–6.

⁵¹ *Dyffryn Clwyd Court Rolls Database*.

⁵² S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 106–7, sentence 532; *WML*, 29.6–7; AL GC I.xxxv.16; *WKC*, 470, §37/19. The fact that this is the *cynghellor*, a high-ranking official, may provide a clue as to the identity of the *uchelfaer* in the *dadl croes* procedure – the *cynghellor* was closely linked to the *maer* but may have been slightly higher in rank.

⁵³ T. P. Ellis, *Welsh Tribal Law and Custom in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1926), vol. II, pp. 273–6, has a

section devoted to ‘The Injunction of the Cross’ in the second part of his book (on ‘The Law of Procedure’), and he lists various ways in which crosses could be used as an injunction, largely taken from material from *Ancient Laws*, vol. II. He suggests that the use of crosses developed in south Wales as a means of forcing people to submit to curial jurisdiction; on quoting this section, Aled Rhys Wiliam, *Llyfr Iorwerth* (Cardiff, 1967), p. 134, states that this was ‘an old practice’.

⁵⁴ The officials known as *amobrwy* tended to hold their offices for some time, and their names are known in the Dyffryn Clwyd Court Rolls – sadly there is no Madog ap Llywelyn in the list although the

century, as the monarch is an English king, and the lord is also English. The two complaints regarding crosses are possibly the most interesting, and although the terminology and concepts have much in common with Welsh law, they may be representing law which is later than that found in the lawbooks.

As demonstrated in the previous article, there are two types of model possible: the Q complaints supply names to fill the blanks, but the complaints in Dd give an X, N or leave a blank space where the names should be. The complaints in 'The Book of Trev Alun' follow the former model. It was apparent with the Q complaints that the names were made up, and it also appears to be the case with the complaints in 'The Book of Trev Alun' too, as complaints I, II and IV give the same claimant and defendant, John Holland and Ieuan ap Llywelyn ap Madog. Complaint III has a Catrin as the defendant, but her father is Ieuan ap Llywelyn ap Madog again, and the claimant is a Madog ap Llywelyn, the *amobr* collector.⁵⁴ The final complaint, V, has a Ieuan ap Jenkin ap Madog as the claimant, which again is suspiciously similar to the other complaints. The complaints are all located in north-east Wales, with I, II and IV again in the same place, Tref Reifiad in the commote of Rhufoniog Is Aled. Complaint III is also located in Tref Reifiad, but the commote given is Ceinmeirch, which may be an error. Complaint V is located in a different place: Tref Bacheurig in the commote of Llannerch, in the lordship of Sir Edmund Grey.

Although these complaints are models and 'pretend' cases, the people and places may actually have existed. John Holland, who appears in three of the complaints, has a distinctive name, and there was a Holland family who lived in the Dyffryn Clwyd area.⁵⁵ According to Bartrum's genealogy of the family, there was a John Holland of Ruthin, who was of the thirteenth generation, so born some time around 1430. The date given in the first complaint, the only date for these complaints, is 20 Edward IV, so 1480–1.⁵⁶ It may well be that whoever composed these complaints knew, or knew of, this John Holland and rather than make up a name, he used a name he was familiar with. Another distinctive name is used in complaint III – the man with whom Catrin is said to have slept is called John Mytwn. Bartrum has Muttons, spelt as Myton or Mytwn. The Ruthin Court Rolls in the time of Edward I, published in 1893, also have a reference to a Ieuan Motun, and a Jordan le Deye of 'Muttoon', modernised to Mitton.⁵⁷ It may have been a well-known name in the area: there are some examples of 'de Merton' in the Dyffryn Clwyd court rolls, and there was a Mytton family, originally from Shrewsbury, with strong links to Rhuddlan.⁵⁸ Finally, the man with the Welsh patronymic, Ieuan ap Llywelyn ap Madog, may be significant. Although it is likely to be a common name, there was a poet called Ieuan ap Llywelyn Fychan who flourished around the second half of the fifteenth century, and was based in Dyffryn Clwyd.⁵⁹ He was a Ieuan ap Llywelyn, but his grandfather was not called Madog. However, he did have a daughter called Catrin. There was also another poet called Ieuan

earlier examples do have Welsh names. See Johnson, 'Amobr and Amobrwy', pp. 12–14.

⁵⁵ P. C. Bartrum, *Welsh Genealogies AD 1400–1500* (Aberystwyth, 1983), 'Holland' 2.

⁵⁶ *Handbook of Dates for Students of English History* ed. C. R. Cheney (London 1945; 3rd rev. imp. Cambridge, 1996), p. 23.

⁵⁷ *The Court Rolls of the Lordship of Ruthin or Dyffryn Clwydd [sic] of the Reign of King Edward the First*, ed. and transl. Richard Arthur Roberts (London, 1893), pp. 24, 25.

⁵⁸ *Dyffryn Clwyd Court Rolls Database*; ODNB, www.oxforddnb.com, q.v. Mutton, Sir Peter [accessed 28 April 2014].

⁵⁹ *Gwaith Ieuan ap Llywelyn Fychan, Ieuan Llwyd Brydydd a Lewys Aled*, ed. P. Bryant-Quinn (Aberystwyth, 2003), pp. 3, 8. I wish to thank Paul Bryant-Quinn for pointing this out to me and for his helpful suggestions on this topic.

Llwyd Brydydd in Dyffryn Clwyd, and although nothing is known of his biographical details, he wrote a praise poem to the Holland family, probably the same family mentioned in the complaints.⁶⁰ If the complaints were actually composed by Gutun Owain himself (the scribe of the manuscript), who, incidentally, was alive contemporary to the date in the complaints, then he may well have chosen the names of people he was familiar with – and perhaps used the name of a fellow-poet well known to him.

The final name found in the complaints is that of the Lord of Llannerch, Sir Edmund Grey. He was in fact the fourth Lord of Ruthin (and the first Earl of Kent), and died in 1489, further evidence that the author of the complaints was local to Dyffryn Clwyd, and knew the lordship and area very well.

The place-names also support this theory. Two of the place-names appear to be names of parcels of land – Gardd Hic and Plas Heilin – and are untraceable.⁶¹ There is no modern Tref Reifiad in Dyffryn Clwyd, and it is odd that the same name is given to a town in the commote of Is Aled and also the commote of Ceinmeirch – the latter may be a mistake. However, the place-name is preserved in the name of two farms in the area: Eriviat Bach and Eriviat Hall, both using the Anglicised form for Ereifiad.⁶² Both farms are in the modern parish of Henllan, just over two miles from Denbigh. The fifth complaint, the only one located in the commote of Llannerch, gives Tref Bacheurig as the town, which was the old name for Llanfair Dyffryn Clwyd, a town two miles south of Ruthin.⁶³

A Complaint of Galanas

The eleventh complaint in Owen's *Ancient Laws* is, according to Owen's apparatus, taken from manuscript K, with variants given from manuscripts Q and Dd.⁶⁴ The title is taken from manuscript K but it is in fact a misnomer – this is actually a complaint of *sarhaed*. The complaint occurs on the final page of manuscript K, and it is also found in the collection of complaints in Dd. It is not, however, found in manuscript Q; only ten complaints occur in that manuscript, and the complaint of *galanas* is not one of them. However, it does occur on the final pages of another Welsh law manuscript, a manuscript which was until recently kept in the Massachusetts History Society library in Boston.⁶⁵ The manuscript was bought at auction by the National Library of Wales in 2012, and has been given the shelfmark NLW, MS. 24029A, but it retains its siglum Bost. Bost appears not to have been used by Aneurin Owen. The wording and order of M of the Welsh laws is very close indeed to that in Bost, and the main text of the manuscript may be a copy of Bost.⁶⁶ The end of M is wanting, so it is impossible to tell whether M also had the tail of additional material found in Bost, but in any case, the complaint was unlikely to have been in M. The evidence for this is in Bost,

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 93–4, 128–32.

⁶¹ Both may be based on personal names: Hic may be a diminutive form of Richard, and Heilin or Heilyn is an attested Welsh personal name. Both, of course, may have existed and were known to the author as local field names.

⁶² Ordnance Survey (2003), *Denbigh and Colwyn Bay* 1:50000 (Landranger map, second series, Sheet 116), Eriviat Bach SJ 012 670, Eriviat Hall SJ 014 660; M. Richards, *Welsh Administrative and Territorial Units* (Cardiff, 1969), p. 66. It occurs as 'Eryvyot' in

Vinogradoff and Morgan (eds), *Survey of the Honour of Denbigh 1334* (Oxford, 1914), pp. 107–16.

⁶³ M. Richards, *Welsh Administrative and Territorial Units*, p. 8. There is a modern farm called Bacheurig SJ 15 57, which shows the site of the old township of Bacheurig.

⁶⁴ *Ancient Laws*, pp. 466–8, XII.xi.

⁶⁵ M. E. Owen, 'Llawysgrif Gyfreithiol Goll', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 22 (1966–8), pp. 338–43.

⁶⁶ S.E. Roberts, *The Legal Triads of Medieval Wales* (Cardiff, 2007), p. 30. M is NLW, MS. Peniarth 33.

and the evidence has only recently come to light following the detailed examination undertaken by the National Library of Wales after its acquisition of the manuscript.

Bost is a manuscript with a main Bleg text followed by a short 'tail' of additional material, which includes this plaint. It has always been assumed that manuscripts would have their tails copied in addition to the main text of the manuscript in a systematic manner; however, recent work on the collation of Bost undertaken by the National Library of Wales and Professor Paul Russell has shown that there is another method, although this may be unique to Bost.⁶⁷ It was discovered, on taking the original binding from the manuscript prior to rebinding, that whilst the text in the tail of Bost was continuous at one time, a gathering of six leaves was inserted into the manuscript after f. 93, with the text either side of this insertion being continuous; ff. 94–9 are the insertion.⁶⁸ As the plaint occurs on ff. 96v–98r, it is part of this additional gathering, and is in the same hand as the material preceding it and following it; it occurs towards the middle of the inserted gathering. This indicates that this material – including the plaint – was a later addition, inserted once the manuscript had been copied although perhaps not long after it had been finished, and thus it may not have been copied into M if it was not part of the Bost material when M, possibly a copy of Bost or using the same exemplar, was being made. It also shows that there was additional legal material available, as booklets or shorter sections but not as part of the main legal manuscripts, and that this plaint was part of that additional material; but the material is also more miscellaneous in nature – this is not necessarily a section of a longer legal material as the text following the plaint is not law but a religious piece. The preceding sections, however, are Bleg sections on theft. The plaint may therefore have been additional legal material available to copyists, but not originally intended as part of the main collections of legal material, and preserved almost by accident. This particular plaint was also copied into manuscript K, but some plaints are only attested in one manuscript, and there may have been more plaints available at one time. But the evidence of Bost may suggest that the plaints are 'additional' legal sections, in this case existing separately from the traditional law manuscripts, and this may be a rather tantalising clue as to what would have been available. As Bost is dated between the end of the fourteenth century and the early fifteenth century, it is the earliest manuscript containing a plaint.

Manuscript K is thought to be in the hand of Lewys Glyn Cothi, originated from Cefn Llys in Radnorshire, and is dated to the late fifteenth century. Lewys Glyn Cothi is also thought to be the scribe of part of the now lost White Book of Hergest, and the collection of plaints in Dd, including this plaint, are attributed to the White Book of Hergest. However, the plaint in K and that in Dd are not taken from the same source as the readings are too different. Manuscript K is a Ior manuscript, but was mistakenly called Bleg by Aneurin Owen; it is therefore the only non-Bleg manuscript to have a copy of a plaint. However, the manuscript has some unusual features for an Ior manuscript, including a triad collection which is similar to the Bleg triad collection, and this plaint: both sections are likely to have been additional legal material which existed separate to the main law manuscript tradition.⁶⁹ Owen noted many, but not all, of the variant

⁶⁷ See Paul Russell's discussion on this at <http://anglosaxonnorseandceltic.blogspot.co.uk/2012/11/a-medieval-manuscript-comes-home-to.html>, accessed 25 November 2013.

⁶⁸ See the digital copy at <http://www.llgc.org.uk/>

drychdigidol/bst/BST00001/index.html, accessed 25 November 2013.

⁶⁹ The triad collection is in fact an additional collection, probably modelled on the main Bleg collection, but one which existed separately from the

readings for this plaint from Dd, and he also claimed to be giving variant readings for the *galanas* plaint from Q, but the plaint does not occur in Q. Which was this manuscript mistaken for Q, only used for variant readings? K was Owen's main text, and variants were given from Dd; only one other copy of the plaint survives – that in Bost. The plaint contains a regnal year: 8 Edward IV (March 1468–March 1469) in K, and in Bost, the year is 2 Henry IV (September 1400–September 1401).⁷⁰ The latter is the date quoted in the supposed Q variant by Owen. It is unlikely that Owen saw Bost; the manuscript was in the United States by 1840, and its last known owner, before the manuscript went to Boston, was William Phillipps II, who died in 1721.⁷¹ It is known, however, that both Moses Williams and Edward Lhuyd saw Bost before it left Britain.⁷² Moses Williams co-edited the first published text of the Welsh law, *Leges Wallicae*, with William Wotton, and the book closes with eleven plaints, the ten from Q, and the plaint of *galanas*.⁷³ The text for the first ten plaints was taken from Ep (Wotton and Williams's S.3; it does not appear that Wotton and Williams saw or used Q), and the final plaint was taken from a manuscript they called P – now known to us as Bost.⁷⁴ It appears that Aneurin Owen took his text of the plaints, or at least the plaint of *galanas*, directly from *Leges Wallicae*, but failed to notice that the final plaint was not taken from Q (or Ep) and that a different manuscript was used. This explains the variants from Q for this plaint in *Ancient Laws*.

The plaint itself is very different to the other plaints, and the subject matter appears to be different – there is no other plaint on the subject of *galanas*, although there are two versions of a plaint of *sarhaed*, and in any case, the real subject of this plaint is not *galanas* but *sarhaed*. The plaint starts by giving the man's status and his worth, and the authorities are addressed – it is made clear that the claimant (who miraculously survived the attack) is present. This makes an interesting case, and perhaps shows a fatal flaw in the plaint; *galanas* is an action of homicide, and the claimant is still alive, as he is stated to be present. This, then, is in actual fact a plaint of *sarhaed*. Of the three manuscript witnesses to the plaint, only K has a title, calling it a plaint of *galanas*. The scribe of K may have made the assumption that the victim died – possibly because the attack was so bloody, or perhaps led by the word *lleas* in the second sentence, which whilst it often means death, can also mean a serious injury or trouble⁷⁵ – and put this third example of a plaint of *sarhaed* in the wrong legal category.

The plaint is very similar to *cyngawsedd* found only in manuscript G, Peniarth 35, which is on the topic of *sarhaed*, although it is not clear why the stabbing with the sword was also described in the plaint – this is a feature which is not present in the *cyngawsedd*.⁷⁶ The *cyngawsedd* in G is short and instructive – it starts with the situation, 'if it happens that a *bonheddig* causes *sarhaed* to another *bonheddig*' and then states: 'the claimant should claim the *sarhaed* like this.' There is the specification that the person should be present and should be named, and then the wording is strikingly similar to the plaint, with only the details on the sword used (in the plaint) missing in the *cyngawsedd*. Naturally, as this

Bleg manuscripts. S. E. Roberts, *The Legal Triads of Medieval Wales*, pp. 33–4.

⁷⁰ *Handbook of Dates*, ed. C. R. Cheney, pp. 22–3.

⁷¹ M. Owen, 'Llawysgrif Gyfreithiol Goll', p. 343.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 342.

⁷³ *Cyfreithjeu Hywel Dda ac Ereill seu Leges Wallicae Ecclesiasticae et Civiles Hoeli Boni et Alconium Wallicae Principium*, ed. William Wotton and Moses Williams (London, 1730), pp. 506–14.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 514 and *Notitia* (no page numbers given).

⁷⁵ *GPC*, s.vv. *lleas*; *ymliasaf*, *ymleasaf*; *cyflafan*.

⁷⁶ AL VIII.vii.1–6; also edited in A. Rh. Wiliam, *Llyfr Cynog* (Pamffledi Cyfraith Hywel, Aberystwyth, 1990), pp. 17–19.

is *cynghawsedd*, there is an answer from the defendant, and direct speech, but it looks as if the plaint could be modelled upon part of the *cynghawsedd* from G, with additional details on stabbing with a sword. Manuscript G is earlier than the other manuscripts, so it is less likely that the *cynghawsedd* was formed from the plaint. The main similarities are found between the first description of the act in the *cynghawsedd*, AL VIII.vii. 2, and the main body of the plaint, 3 and 4 in this edition. The same main points and descriptions are found in both the plaint and the *cynghawsedd*, with two additions in the plaint: the description of the sword, and a description of the blood loss. On the whole, the *cynghawsedd* and the plaint have the same items in the same order, but there are some cases where the plaint in Dd agrees with the *cynghawsedd* rather than with the other two manuscripts. There also appears to be a close relationship in the plaint between Bost and K, with Dd being slightly different; for example, where K has *anghyuiabn*, Bost has *anghyuyabn*, but Dd has *godefabn*, and the *cynghawsedd* also has *godefabn*; Bost and K have *cleys a bryb ag yssig a chythyaw* whereas Dd has *bonclust a briw a chlais ac yssic a chraith*, and the *cynghawsedd* has *bonclust a briw a chlais ac yssic a chnith*. Often, Bost and K have versions of the same word whereas Dd has a different word altogether: Bost has *pochelgrbn*, K has *bogelgrbn*, and Dd has *pedrogl*. Dd also has omissions which do not occur in K and Bost: for example, both Bost and K give the year of the reign of King Henry IV, but Dd does not, and where Bost and K give the feast of St John, nothing is given in Dd. Whilst it does not appear that either of the three versions of the plaint is a direct copy of part of the *cynghawsedd* in G, particularly as they all share the additional section about the sword, it does look as if the text of the plaint was drawn from the *cynghawsedd*, and the version in Dd is closer to the *cynghawsedd* in G than the version of the plaint in Bost and K.

As with the plaints found in Q and ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, personal names are given in this plaint, but different names are given in each manuscript: for example, the name of the claimant is given as Ieuan ap Dafydd ap Hywel ap Gruffudd ap Dafydd ap Cadwgan in Bost, Ieuan ap Madog ap Jenkin ap Dafydd ap Madog in K, and as Ieuan ap Dafydd in Dd. Most of the other names are different in each manuscript, but in some cases Dd simply gives N. rather than fill in the name. There are no place-names in this plaint, but there are dates – religious holidays – and the three manuscripts usually have the same dates. The different personal names can tell us something of the exemplar each manuscript was copying. Firstly, it must have been a written text as the version found in each manuscript is too similar for it to be from an oral source or from various texts. Although neither manuscript appears to be a direct copy of either of the others, the close relationship between Bost and K suggests that there may be two, rather than three, independent copies of the one plaint. Finally, there may have been a blank rather than personal names in the original – in most cases, the personal names are not remotely similar in the manuscripts: for example, the house where the crime was said to have happened belonged to a Gwilym Leya in Bost, Rhys ap Maredudd in K and no name is given in Dd. It is unlikely that the scribe of Dd replaced the personal names in his original with a blank. Of the exemplars for the plaint, the exemplar used by Dd was closer to the *cynghawsedd* in G than that used by Bost and K, and may even have been formed from a copy of that *cynghawsedd*.

The orthography in Bost is different from that found in the other two manuscripts, and it is also different from other Welsh manuscripts; the scribe of Bost appears to be using some form of Anglo-Norman orthography. Key features include the ‘silent’ *e* at the end of words to mark that the preceding vowel is long, for example, *bleyde*, *a6re*,

gwallte.⁷⁷ These do not occur regularly, so it may be that the scribe had them in his exemplar and was changing the orthography to a more recognisable form of middle Welsh, but left some over. There are also two examples of *th* for /ð/: *argl6thyaeth*, and *deunethe* (*defnydd* in the other manuscripts), another Anglo-Norman feature.⁷⁸ Both features are the exception rather than the rule in this plaint, so they are probably leftovers from his attempt to adapt his exemplar. The orthography of this plaint may suggest that the exemplar was from the borders or the Marches of Wales where there was considerable Anglo-Norman influence. This is interesting, as the orthography of the remainder of Bost is the more recognisable orthography of Middle Welsh, and so the plaint was probably from a source separate to the rest of the lawbook. This is supported by the location of the plaint in the middle of the inserted collation.⁷⁹

The style of the plaint appears to be formulaic, like the other plaints considered, but this plaint does not have the same or even similar formulae to the plaints found in Q or 'The Book of Trev Alun'. It does not have the usual preamble, but instead starts with a statement making it clear that it is a plaint. The situation is set out quite early on in the plaint, and the description of the violent act is odd – adjectives are piled high, and it is all rather dramatic. The weapon is then described in detail, as is the injury; again, no stone is left unturned and every single injury the man received seems to be described. The description of the event and the weapon used, and also of the injury, is a medieval Welsh *tour de force*, and it is rare to see such poetic and flowery language in the legal texts, although it may be earlier than this plaint, in the *cynghawsedd* in G. Nine adjectives are used to describe the nastiness of the attack, seven different features are given to describe the sword, and the description of the twelve features of the wound is almost *cynghanedd*, with alliteration, rhyme, pairs of words, and a build-up in the seriousness of the blood flow. This description of the wound, including the flow of blood, parallels the laws. There is a triad on the 'three stays of blood' which measures the seriousness of a wound according to how far the blood flows; some versions of the triad also echo the last part of this description with the reference to making the lord's land bloody.⁸⁰ The descriptive sections in this plaint are comparable to the *areithiau pros*, short sections of prose on various topics, often derived from the poetry and the triads, and some of the *areithiau pros* share some features with this plaint, such as compound words, alliteration and lists of adjectives.⁸¹ Although some of the adjectives and descriptive phrases are found elsewhere (including in poetry, and elsewhere in the laws) this section appears to be original and composed as part of this legal passage.

⁷⁷ P. Russell, 'Scribal (In)competence in Thirteenth-century North Wales: The Orthography of the Black Book of Chirk (Peniarth MS. 29)', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 29 (1995), pp. 129–76, at 156–60; cf. also 'Orthography as a Key to Codicology: Innovation in the Work of a Thirteenth-Century Welsh Scribe', *CMCS*, 25 (1993), 383–90, at 386.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ See above, p. 184.

⁸⁰ S. E. Roberts, *The Legal Triads of Medieval Wales*, pp. 150–1.

⁸¹ D. Gwenallt Jones (ed.), *Yr Areithiau Pros* (Cardiff, 1934), pp. xiv–xv, and cf. pp. 21–2; M. E. Owen, 'Y Cyfreithiau (2) – Ansawdd y Rhyddiaith', in G. Bowen (ed.), *Y Traddodiad Rhyddiaith yn yr Oesau Canol* (Llandysul, 1974), pp. 220–44 at pp. 238–9.

A Complaint of Ach ac Edryd

The final complaint in the edition occurs in one manuscript only – Dd, or the White Book of Hergest.⁸² Although most of the complaints in Dd are also found in Q, and Dd has a copy of the complaint of *galanas*, this complaint is not the same as the *ach ac edryd* complaint found in Q, and neither Aneurin Owen nor I found it possible to give variant readings from Dd against the text of *ach ac edryd* in Q. The complaint, as with most of the complaints in Dd, leaves blanks rather than giving names, but occasionally a name is given, probably to avoid confusion between the many generations (although this is not entirely successful). Also, at one point, the scribe makes it clear that anyone wishing to use the model complaint may put in the appropriate place name – *o'r tu vrywn y'r plas a'r orsed a vynnuch di*. The situation found in the complaint is very similar to that found in the corresponding complaint in Q, and the matter is who is the true proprietor of the land under dispute. The common ancestor had two sons, Thomas and Rhys, and Rhys held the land but for some reason Thomas did not – he was entitled to a share as he was a lawful son. Then each brother has a son, and a grandson, and it appears that the person claiming is Thomas's grandson, against Rhys's grandson. With the complaint in Q, there was some question as to how the generations were being counted – the Ior and Bleg texts had different ways of counting the generations for *ach ac edryd*, and the complaint in Q gave the claimant as the fifth man from the common ancestor. In the complaint in Dd, the claimant is the third man, exclusive of self, and therefore following the Bleg situation of *tair oes rieni* (three generations of ancestors) more or less to the letter.⁸³ After the situation with the generations has been outlined in the complaint in Dd, the language becomes much more formulaic, and it is very similar indeed to the second half of the *ach ac edryd* complaint in Q – it appears that the original text used by the scribes of both Dd and Q is the same for this section. The triad found in Bleg is quoted, and the legal statements found in the complaint in Q are also found here. It may be the case that there was one model for a complaint of *ach ac edryd* available, and that one scribe did not keep to his original as closely as the other scribe; alternatively, both may have diverged from the model in different ways, but it is difficult to prove one way or another with only two manuscript witnesses. It would be surprising to have two separate models for a complaint of *ach ac edryd*, particularly as all but one of the other complaints in Dd also occur in Q, and the differences between the two complaints of *ach ac edryd* are more easily explained as showing the creativity of the redactors of the complaints. The complaint in Dd finishes a little differently, by stating that compelling justice is one of the packhorses of the lord. In the Bleg texts, there is a section called *Wyth Pynfarch Brenin*, the eight packhorses of the king, which list eight sources of easy revenue for the king, for example, death duties and items thrown up by the sea.⁸⁴ It does not appear that the statement in the complaint bears any relation to the section in Bleg, as in the complaint, the 'packhorse' is something the lord is obliged to do rather than something which gains him an income. There appear to be two different readings of the 'packhorse' metaphor: in the more conventional lawtexts, the eight packhorses are a burden placed on others by the king, involving little effort on his part and easy revenue; but in this complaint, and this may be the secondary reading, the eight packhorses refer to a burden or obligation placed on the king himself.

⁸² This manuscript was discussed in detail in S. E. Roberts, 'Complaints in Mediaeval Welsh Law', pp. 229–30.

⁸³ *Llyfr Blegywryd*, pp. 76.29–77.3.

⁸⁴ *Llyfr Blegywryd*, p. 47.1–6. See also S. E. Roberts, *Llawysgrif Pomffred*, pp. 214–15.

Conclusion

Although very few complaints survive – and perhaps this is because of their very nature – they are an invaluable source for medieval Welsh law. They show the later, fifteenth-century, development of Welsh law, and may show regional variations – the complaints in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ are probably the best example of the regional nature of Welsh law, and they have a great deal in common with Marcher texts such as the *dadl croes* from Brycheiniog and later manuscripts from north-east Wales. Although they are not actual cases, they have their own significance in that they are models, and may well have been used for training purposes; it is uncertain whether model complaints like these were actually used in real legal cases, but the scribe of Dd, for example, shows that the redactors of the complaints were able to adapt their model and even move some distance away from their original in their composition. Seventeen complaints have survived, but in actual fact there are about half that number of individual topics. Of the seventeen complaints, two, from different sources, are on *ach ac edryd* (and probably from the same original model), and two each, from Q and ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ on *sarhaed* and *anghyfarch*. There is also a third complaint on the subject of *anghyfarch*, but with a different case, in the Q collection. Then some of the complaints in each collection double up – there are two complaints on crosses in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, and three, very similar, complaints on *camweresgyn* in the Q collection. The complaint of *amobr* in ‘The Book of Trev Alun’ is actually on the subject of debt, money owed for *amobr*, and there is a complaint of debt in Q. In all, eight subject matters are covered. The complaints are on varied aspects of law, including land law, criminal (theft, homicide) and debt cases. There may have been complaints for every aspect of law which came up in the courts in fifteenth-century Wales, or the lawyers may have been expected to adapt a small number of complaints to the case they had. However, as examples of models and the way they could be used, these complaints are invaluable, and offer a rare insight into the later stages of medieval Welsh law.

This Edition

Complaints I–V are from ‘The Book of Trev Alun’, which is now lost, but the complaints are attested in three manuscripts: NLW, MS. 13246B (NLW), BL, MS. Add. 15020 (BL), and NLW, MS. Llanstephan 120 (Llst). In addition, the text in *Ancient Laws* appears to be a fourth witness, from a manuscript now lost. The base text in this edition has been taken from NLW, MS. Llanstephan 120, and is followed closely but with variant readings given from the other two manuscripts as well as from *Ancient Laws*. NLW and BL share several of the same readings and the text is closer in those two manuscripts than that found in Llst. The orthography of Llst has been followed faithfully unless noted in the apparatus.

The text of the complaint of *galanas*, VI in this edition, has been taken from NLW, MS. 24029A, known as Bost, which is the earliest manuscript to contain a Welsh complaint. Variant readings are given from K, NLW, MS. Peniarth 40, and Dd, BL, MS. Additional 31055. The orthography of Bost has been followed; it is different to that in K and Dd (see above).

The final complaint, VII, on *ach ac edryd*, occurs in one manuscript only: Dd, a copy of the White Book of Hergest which survives in BL, MS. Additional 31055. The only notes in the apparatus indicate where the text has been amended.

TEXT

¹Copiau o gwynion fel² y maent yn scrifennedic³ o []⁴ Law ⁵Gyttyn Owein gyda⁵ Mr. Trefor Trefalun.¹

I. ⁶Cwyn Camgroes⁶

1. Messur⁷ cwyn John Holant, yr hwn y⁸ sydd yn gynhyrchiol⁹ ar y barr, rhac Ieuan¹⁰ ap Llewelyn¹¹ ¹²ap Madoc,¹² yr hwn sydd gynnhyrchiol¹³ ar y barr.
2. Cwyn cam groes fu ddyfod y¹⁴ dywededic¹⁵ Ieuan dduw Sul nessaf wedi digwyl yr Holl Saint diweddaf ar a fu yn y flwyddyn hon – sef yw¹⁶ hon, yr vgeinfed flwyddyn o goronedigaeth Edward frenhin Lloegr,¹⁷ y pedwerydd wedi y Cwncwest – o fewn Tref y¹⁸ Reifiad, o fewn cymwd Is Aled, o fewn cyfoeth Edward frenin¹⁹ Lloegr,²⁰ arglwydd y wlad hon.
3. Ac yn y lle, dydd, a'r amser yr henwid,²¹ roi o'r dywededic Ieuan gam groes, nid amgen, croes pendant, mewn parcel o dir, yr hwn a elwir Plas Heilin, a'i berthynasseu,²² o wir briodolder y dywededic John.
4. Yr hwn ni fynnai y dywededic John, roddiat y cam groes hon er xv^s o aur neu arian o fwnai dda daladwy ²³o iawn²³ fath y dywededic²⁴ Edward Frenin Lloegr²⁵ y pedwerydd²⁶ wedi y cwnquest.
5. Os²⁷ y dywededic Ieuan a fydd mor daer a haerllyd a gwadu rhoddiad y gam groes yn y ffurf²⁸ a'r modd y dywedpwyd, Duw a deuddec ei rhoddi o honaw ef.
6. Os efo a addef taled xv^s o'r fwnai a ddywedpwyd o'r blaen i'r arglwydd.

Copies of plaints as they are written by the hand of Gutun Owain in the possession of Mr. Trefor of Trefalun.

I. A *Plaint of Wrong Cross*

1. The extent of the plaint of John Holland, who is present at the bar, against Ieuan ap Llewelyn ap Madoc, who is present at the bar.
2. The plaint of wrong cross was that the said Ieuan came on the next Sunday after the last feast of All Saints which was in this year – this year is the twentieth year from

¹ Not in AL
² NLW 13246B = NLW; BL Add. 15020 = BL;
 NLW Llanstephan 120 = Llst
 Llst; *fal* NLW, BL
³ Llst; *ysgrifenedig* NLW, BL
⁴ Although there appears to be a gap in Llst,
 nothing is missing according to NLW and BL.
⁵...⁵ Llst; *Guttyn Owain gyd â* NLW, BL
⁶...⁶ NLW, BL, AL; not in Llst
⁷ Llst; *mesur* NLW, BL
⁸ Llst; not in NLW, BL, AL
⁹ *gymrychiol* AL
¹⁰ NLW; *Jeuau* BL; in all cases the name Ieuan is
 written as Jenn with an abbreviation mark in Llst.
¹¹ On each occasion, this name is written as *Llen*
 with a suspension mark in all manuscripts.
¹²...¹² *ab Madawg* AL

¹³ *gymrychiol* AL
¹⁴ Llst, NLW; *dy* BL
¹⁵ Llst; *dywededig* NLW, BL
¹⁶ Llst; not in NLW, BL, AL
¹⁷ *Lloegyr* AL
¹⁸ Not in BL, AL
¹⁹ Llst; *frenhin* NLW, BL
²⁰ *Lloegyr* AL
²¹ *enwid* AL
²² Llst; *berthnasau* NLW; *berthynasau* BL, AL
²³...²³ NLW; not in Llst
²⁴ Llst; *dywededig* NLW, BL
²⁵ *Lloegyr* AL
²⁶ Llst; *4^{dd}* NLW, BL, AL
²⁷ Llst; *o* NLW, BL
²⁸ *fyrv* AL

the coronation of Edward, king of England, the fourth after the conquest – within Tref Ereifiad, within the commote of Is Aled, in the territory of Edward, king of England, lord of this land.

3. And in the place, day and time which was named, the said Ieuan set up a wrong cross, namely, that particular cross, in a parcel of land, which is called Plas Heilyn, with its appurtenances, which belonged in true ownership to the said John.
4. That person which the said John did not wish, the setting up of the wrong cross for xv^s of gold or silver of the good current money of the right coin of the said Edward, king of England, the fourth after the conquest.
5. If the said Ieuan shall be so persistent and blatant as to deny the setting up of the wrong cross in the form and manner that has been said, God and twelve [shall give a verdict] to its having been set up by him.
6. If he acknowledge it let him pay xv^s of the money named before to the lord.

II. Cwyn torr Croes

1. Messur cwyn John Holant¹ rhac Ieuan ap² Llewelyn³ ap Madoc,³ cwyn tor croes.
2. Nid amgenach achos a defnydd y cwyn, dyfod o'r dywededic Ieuan dduw⁴ Llun yn yr wythnos gyntaf o fis Mehefin⁵ o fewn tymor⁶ haf o fewn y flwyddyn hon,⁷ o fewn Tref Reifiad⁸ yng hymwd⁹ Is Aled o fewn yr arglwyddiaeth hon.
3. Ac yn y lleoedd a'r amser, torri croes pendant, yr hon a roes y dywededic John¹⁰ mewn parcel o dir o'i briodolder ef, yr hwn a elwir Gardd Hicc.
4. Nid amgenach fodd¹¹ y torres no phori y tir a¹² gwarthec duon a chochion, yr hwn y rhoesswn y groes¹³ bendant y nawfed dydd o fis Mai yngwydd tystion,¹⁴ ac nis tariawdd yn gyfreithlawn.
5. Yr hwn dyli gollu naw vgain¹⁵ o aur neu arian i'r arglwydd.
6. Ac felly

II. A Complaint of Breaking a Cross

1. The extent of the complaint of John Holland against Ieuan ap Llewelyn ap Madog, a complaint of breaking a cross.
2. Namely the cause and substance of the complaint, the said Ieuan came the Monday in the first week of June within the summer season within this year, within the Tref Ereifiad, in the commote of Is Aled in this lordship.
3. And in those places and at that time, he broke that particular cross, the one which the said John set up in a parcel of land of his proprietorship, the one which is called Gardd Hic.

¹ Llst; *Holand* NLW, BL; Holland AL

² Not in AL

³ ...³ *ab Madawg* AL

⁴ *ddyw* AL

⁵ *Myhevin* AL

⁶ *tymhor* AL

⁷ the words *ac yn y* have been crossed out BL

⁸ Llst; *Reifiad* NLW, BL

⁹ Llst; *hymwd* NLW, BL

¹⁰ *Ieuan* AL

¹¹ *modd* AL

¹² Llst; *â* NLW, BL

¹³ The words *y groes* have been crossed out BL.

¹⁴ Llst; *tystiau* NLW, BL, AL

¹⁵ Llst; *ugain* NLW, BL

4. He broke it in no other way than by grazing the land with black and red cattle, in that I had set up that particular cross on the ninth day of May in the presence of witnesses, and he did not tarry for it lawfully.*
5. He should lose nine score of gold or silver to the lord.
6. And so

III. *Cwyn anghyfarch*

1. Messur¹ cwyn John Holand rhac *Ieuan* ap *Llewelyn*, cwyn anghyfarch.
2. Achos a defnydd yr anghyfarch: dyfod o'r dywededic² *Ieuan* dduw *Llun* nessaf³ wedi gwyl *Fihangel* *Archangel* diwaethaf⁴ ar a fu o fewn y flwyddyn hon, o fewn *Tref Reifiad*,⁵ o fewn cymwd⁶ *Isaled*, o fewn cyfoeth *Edward*⁷ frenin *Lloegr*,⁸ arglwydd y wlad hon.
3. Ac yn y lle, dydd, a'r amser a henwais,⁹ myned a march, du ei liw, o'm da yn anghyfarch, yr hwn a dalai ddec¹⁰ swllt o aur neu arian o fwnai daledic o iawn fath *Edward* frenin¹¹ *Lloegr*.¹²
4. Nid amgen fodd¹³ no'i dwyso¹³ mewn cebystr¹⁴ o rawn¹⁵ du, o nerth ei law ddeheu,¹⁶ a'i fraich a'i gorff¹⁷ am ben hynny, a gwneuthur ei ddefnydd o honaw,¹⁸ yr hwn ni fynnwn¹⁹ yr anghyfarch er x^s or dywededic²⁰ fwnai a henwais yn y blaen.
5. O bydd y dywededic *Ieuan*²¹ mor daer a haerllyd a'i wadu, Duw a deuddec²² i wneuthur o honaw²³ ef a'i haddef.²⁴
6. *Parod*²⁵ wyf²⁶ i gymeryd fy²⁷ nissyf,²⁸ a gwnaed ynteu iawn i'r llys.
7. Ac felly

III. *A plaint of surreption**

1. The extent of the plaint of John Holland against *Ieuan* ap *Llewelyn*, a plaint of surreption.
2. The cause and substance of the surreption: the said John came on the next Monday after the last feast of St Michael the Archangel which was within this year, within

* 'It' refers to the cross, and *Ieuan* did not change his behaviour when the cross had been placed.

¹ Llst; *mesur* NLW, BL

² Llst; *dywededig* NLW, BL

³ Llst; *nessaf* NLW, BL

⁴ NLW, BL; *diawaethaf* Llst; *diweddar* AL

⁵ Llst; *Reifiad* NLW, AL

⁶ Llst; *cymwd* NLW, BL

⁷ NLW, BL; *Edw.* Llst

⁸ *Lloegr* AL

⁹ *enwais* AL

¹⁰ Llst; *ddeg* NLW, BL, AL

¹¹ Llst; *frenhin* NLW, BL

¹² *Lloegr* AL

¹³...¹³ *nog ei dywysaw* AL

¹⁴ NLW, BL; *iebystr* Llst; *cebystyr* AL

¹⁵ Llst; *iawn* NLW

¹⁶ Llst; *ddehau* NLW, BL; *ddeau* AL

¹⁷ Llst; *gorph* NLW, BL; *gorf* AL

¹⁸ *hono* AL

¹⁹ Llst; *fynawt* NLW; *vynaw* AL

²⁰ Llst; *dywededig* NLW, BL

²¹ Llst; not in NLW; *Ieuan* AL; a later addition in BL

²² Llst; *deuddeg* NLW, BL, AL

²³ *hono* AL

²⁴ Llst; *adel* NLW, BL, but changed to *adev* in BL; *addev* AL

²⁵ *parawd* AL

²⁶ *wyfi* BL; *wyv vi* AL

²⁷ Llst; not in NLW, BL, AL

²⁸ *nissyv* AL

* Surreption is the accepted translation of *anghyfarch*, which refers to taking another person's property, without violence and without concealment, but not borrowing as the owner has not given permission (T. M. Charles-Edwards and P. Russell (eds.), *Tair Colofn Cyfraith, The Three Columns of Law in Medieval Wales: Homicide, Theft and Fire* (Bangor, 2005), p. 308).

Tref Ereifiad, within the commote of Is Aled, within the territory of Edward king of England, lord of this land.

3. And in the place, day, and time which I named, took a horse, black in colour, of my property in surreption, which was worth ten shillings of gold or silver of the current money of the right coin of Edward king of England.
4. In no other way than by leading it in a halter of black hair, by the strength of his right hand, and his arm and his body as well as that, and made his use of it, that surreption which I did not want for ten shillings of the money I named before.
5. If the said Ieuan be so persistent and blatant as to deny it, God and twelve to his having done so and to admit it.
6. I am ready to accept my *nisi*,[†] and let him do right to the court.
7. And so

IV. *Cwyn amobyr*

1. Messur¹ cwyn ²Madoc ap² Llewelyn, amobrydd i Harri frenin³ Lloegr,⁴ arglwydd y wlad hon, yng nghymwd⁵ Cynmeirch, rhac Catrin *verch* Ieuan ap⁶ Llewelyn ap⁷ Madoc,⁸ vchelwr o'r dywedig⁹ cymwd,¹⁰ yr hwn yssydd¹¹ gynhyrchiol¹² ar y barr.
2. Nid amgenach gwyn¹³ no chwyn dyled, nid amgenach dyled¹⁴ no x¹⁵ aur neu arian o fwnai dda¹⁶ o iawn fath goronoc¹⁷ Edward¹⁸ frenin¹⁹ Lloegr,²⁰ a ddylya²¹ fi o amobr²² i'r ddywededic²³ Gatrin.
3. O'r achos²⁴ a'r defnydd y dyleaf:²⁵ gwneuthur ohoni hi gwliogaeth gyhoeddoc²⁶ ac vn²⁷ John²⁸ Mytwn, duw Llun yn yr wythnos gyntaf o fis Gorphennaf, o fewn tymor²⁹ haf o fewn y flwyddyn hon ynn Tref³⁰ Reifiad³¹ yng³² nghwmwd Ceinmeirch,³³ o fewn cyfoeth Edward³⁴ frenin Lloegr,³⁵ arglwydd y wlad hon.
4. Yr hwn yr wyf fi³⁶ yn barod³⁷ i'w brofi drwy dystion a gwybyddiaid fel³⁸ y barno cyfraith.
5. Ac felly

[†] Whilst *deisyf*, a request or petition, is known in the complaints, this complaint has the form *fy nissyf* (*nissiv* in BL, NLW, AL) and Aneurin Owen has translated it as 'take nisi', referring to the legal decree or order which would take place when certain conditions were met. Whilst *nissyf* is not in *GPC*, the usage in this sentence is different to the use of *deisyf* and I have taken Aneurin Owen's reading to be correct.

¹ Llst; *mesur* NLW, BL

^{2..2} *Madawg ab* AL

³ Llst; *frenhin* NLW, BL

⁴ *Lloegyr* AL

⁵ Llst; *ngghwmwd* NLW, BL

⁶ Llst; *ab* BL, AL

⁷ Llst; *ab* NLW, BL, AL

⁸ *Madawg* AL

⁹ Llst; *dywededig* NLW, BL, AL

¹⁰ *gwmwd* BL; *gymwd* AL

¹¹ Llst; *ysydd* NLW, BL

¹² *gynnyrchiawl* AL

¹³ *cwyn* AL

¹⁴ Llst; *dyled* NLW, BL, AL

¹⁵ *deg swllt* AL

¹⁶ *da* AL

¹⁷ *goronawg* AL

¹⁸ NLW; *Edu.* Llst

¹⁹ Llst; *frenhin* NLW, BL; *vrenin* AL

²⁰ *Lloegyr* AL

²¹ Llst, NLW; *ddylya* BL; *ddylyav* AL

²² *amobyr* AL

²³ *dywededig* AL

²⁴ *achaws* AL

²⁵ *dylyav* AL

²⁶ *gyhoeddawg* AL

²⁷ Llst; *un* NLW, BL

²⁸ NLW, BL; *Jhon* Llst

²⁹ *tymhor* AL

³⁰ *nhrev* AL

³¹ Llst; *Reifeiad* NLW

³² *yn* AL

³³ Llst; *cynmeirch* NLW, BL

³⁴ NLW, BL; *Edu.* Llst

³⁵ *Lloegyr* AL

³⁶ Llst; *wyfi* NLW, BL

³⁷ *barawd* AL

³⁸ Llst, NLW; *fal* BL, AL

IV. *A Complaint of amobr*

1. The extent of the complaint of Madog ap Llewelyn, *amobr* collector to Harry king of England, lord of this country, in the commote of Cynmeirch, against Catrin daughter of Ieuan ap Llewelyn ap Madog, a nobleman from the said commote, who is present at the bar.
2. No other complaint than a complaint of debt, no other debt than x^s of gold or silver of good money of the true coin of Edward crowned king of England, which I am entitled to as *amobr* for the said Catrin.
3. This is the cause and substance for which I am entitled: that she committed open fornication with one John Mytwn, on the Monday in the first week of July, within the summer season within this year, in Tref Ereifiad in the commote of Cynmeirch, within the territory of Edward king of England, lord of this land.
4. This I am ready to prove through witnesses and eye-witnesses as the law shall judge.
5. And so

V. *Cwyn sarhaed*

1. Messur¹ cwyn Ieuan ap Jankyn² ap³ Madoc,⁴ yr hwn ysydd yn⁵ gynhyrchiol⁶ ar y barr, cwyn sarhaed.⁷
2. Nid amgen no dyfod o'r dywededic Domas duw Merchur,⁸ gwedi hanner dydd, yn yr wythnos gyntaf o fis Mawrth o fewn tymor⁹ gwanwyn o fewn y flwyddyn honn, o fewn Tref Facheuric,¹⁰ yng nghwmwd¹¹ Llannerch, yn arglwyddiaeth Syr Edmund¹² Gray, arglwydd y wlad honn.
3. Ac yn y lle, dydd a'r amsser, gwneuthur dyrch a gossod¹³ ar y dywededic Ieuan, a'i daraw yn ei fraich asswy oni dorres croen¹⁴ a chig a gweliau, oni lithrodd¹⁵ gwaed hyd lawr, a gwaew o dduw a haearn ei ben, a'e baladr o bren onn, o nerth ei law a'e¹⁶ fraich ddehau,¹⁷ a'i law¹⁸ asswy, a'i fraich asswy, a¹⁹ chryfder ei gorph²⁰ am ben hynny.
4. Yr hwn y mae yn cynhebrwng²¹ i ddeisyf²¹ yma heddyw o dair buwch²² dan eu harddyrchaf, o xx^{s22} o arian dda ar bob buwch,²³ a xxiiii^{dd24} o werth gwaed.
5. Sef achos²⁵ y mae yn gwneuthur ei ddeisyf, rhac²⁶ na mwy na llai²⁷ i fod²⁷ yn²⁸ fonheddic cynhwynol.²⁸
6. Ac felly y terfyna.²⁹

¹ Llst; *mesur* NLW, BL

² *iankyn* AL

³ Llst, NLW; *ab* BL, AL

⁴ *Madawg* AL

⁵ not in BL, NLW

⁶ *gymrychiol* AL

⁷ *saraad* AL

⁸ *Merchyr* AL

⁹ *tymhor* AL

¹⁰ Llst; *Baxeurig* NLW; *Vacheurig* AL

¹¹ NLW, BL; *hymwd* Llst; *ngwymwd* AL

¹² Llst; *Edmund* NLW, BL, AL

¹³ *gosawd* AL

¹⁴ *groen* AL

¹⁵ *lithroedd* AL

¹⁶ Llst; *ai* NLW, BL, AL

¹⁷ *ddeau* AL

¹⁸ Llst; not in NLW, BL

¹⁹ *ai* AL

²⁰ *gorf* AL

^{21..21} NLW, BL; *a ddeisyf* Llst; *i ddeisyv* AL

^{22..22} BL; *dan eu harddyrchaf o xx.d* AL; not in Llst,

NLW

²³ Llst, BL; not in NLW

²⁴ *xxiv.d.* AL

²⁵ *achaws* AL

²⁶ *rhag* AL

^{27..27} *ei vod* AL

^{28..28} *voneddig cynmwynawl* AL

²⁹ + *Ll. Gwyrdd. R. Morris Yswain* NLW, BL; + *llyvyr Trev Alun, o law Gutyn Owain* AL

V. *A plaint of sarhaed*

1. The extent of the plaint of Ieuan ap Jenkin ap Madog, who is present at the bar, a plaint of *sarhaed*.
2. Namely that the said Thomas came on Wednesday, after midday, in the first week of March within the season of spring in this year, within Tref Bacheurig, in the commote of Llannerch, in the lordship of Sir Edmund Grey, lord of this country.
3. And in the place, day and time, made an assault and onset upon the said Ieuan, and struck him on his left arm until skin and flesh and wounds were broken, until the blood flowed to the ground, with a spear of steel and iron its head, and its shaft of ash wood, by the strength of his right hand and arm, and his left hand, and his left arm, and the strength of his body as well as that.
4. That one brings [the plaint] and requests here today three kine subject to their augmentation, for twenty pence of good silver upon each cow, and xxiii^{dd} for the value of blood.
5. The reason he is making his request, for his being neither more nor less than an innate nobleman.
6. And thus it ends.

VI. *¹Llyma g6yn galanas¹*

1. Llyma g6yn ²Ieuan ap Dafydd ap Howel ap Gruffudd ap Dauyd ap Kadogan,² herwyd bod³ y deuparth o bleit y tat, a'r trayan o bleyde⁴ mam⁵ Ieuan⁶ ap Dafydd.
2. Y'r h6n a doeth ⁷Hywel ap Gruffudd⁷ ac a vnaeth lleas y'r enwedyc Ieuan⁸ h6nn6.
3. Nyd amgen vod no deuod⁹ y rag dywededyc Hywel¹⁰ yna ¹¹dy6 g6yl Ieuan,¹¹ o vy6n wythnos y Nodolyc,¹² oed yr argl6yd vrenhin Henri¹³ ¹⁴petweryd gwedy conquest, d6y vlened,¹⁴ y ty ¹⁵Wylm Leya,¹⁵ yn a6re¹⁶ hanner dyd, a kyrche¹⁷ kyrch kyhoyda6c anghyua6n,¹⁸ drwy lyd,¹⁹ a bar,²⁰ a gwenwyndra, ag agchyvarch,²¹ ac amarch y'r argl6yd, ²²ag y'r²² argl6thyaeth,²³ ag y'r genedyl, ²⁴dr6y ryn a gosgryn,²⁴

The text of this manuscript is available to view online at <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/cy/ms-page.php?ms=Bost5&page=1>, and the digitised images of the manuscript are available at <http://www.llgc.org.uk/drychdigidol/bst/BST00001/in dex.html>.

^{1...1} K; not in Bost, Dd

^{2...2} Bost; *Jeñ ap madoc ap Jankyn ap dd ap madoc* K; *Jem ap dd* Dd. In their transcription, *Rhyddiaith Gymraeg* have expanded the contraction as 'Gronwy', but the contraction is not entirely obvious: it could be either. The other manuscripts do not have the same name. <http://www.rhyddiaithganoloesol.caerdydd.ac.uk/cy/ms-page.php?ms=Bost5&page=188>.

³ Bost; *bot* K

⁴ Bost; *blait* K

⁵ Bost; *mam* K

⁶ Bost; *Jen* K, Dd

^{7...7} Bost; *m'edud ap ph'* K

⁸ Bost; *Jen* K, Dd

⁹ Bost; *dyuot* K

¹⁰ Bost; *m'edud* K; *H_* Dd

^{11...11} Bost; *dig6yl Jen* K; not in Dd

¹² Bost; *nadolic* K; *natic* nyt amgen no die gwyl *Jem* Dd

¹³ Bost; *ed6ard* K; *E I* Dd

^{14...14} Bost; *bed6yryd g6wedi conquest viii mlyned* K; not in Dd

^{15...15} Bost; *Rys ap meredud* K; *N.* Dd

¹⁶ Bost; *awr* K, Dd

¹⁷ Bost; *chyrchu* K, Dd

¹⁸ K; *anghyua6c* Bost; *godefawc* Dd

¹⁹ Bost; *lit* K, Dd

²⁰ Bost, K; *ber* Dd

²¹ Bost; *anghyuarch* K; *anghyfraith* Dd

^{22...22} Bost, K; *ae* Dd

²³ Bost; *argl6ydiaeth* K; *arglwydhiaeth* Dd

^{24...24} Bost, K; *drwymu ar olorynn* Dd

- a dyrchaf²⁵ a gossot, a chledyf²⁶ tri chana6l,²⁷ pochelgr6n,²⁸ blaynllym, llyvedyc,²⁹ awcha6l, tri chuppyng³⁰ yn ei³¹ hyt a lled palpha³² o³³ led ynda6.³⁴
4. A dyrchaf³⁵ a gossod o rag dywededyc Hywel³⁶ hwnnw ar yr³⁷ enwedyc Ieuan,³⁸ a³⁹ gwneuthur cleys a bry6 ag yssig a chythyaw³⁹ gwallte⁴⁰ bonwyn a gwartherydya⁶⁴¹ 42 arleysse6 a thon⁴² ar groen ag ar gig ag ar asg6ne,⁴³ a gwely agoret, a brath tri na6ueddyd⁴⁴ peryg6lys⁴⁵ angheuawl, a gwaed gellygedig llytheredig⁴⁶ colledig⁴⁷ o benn⁴⁷ hyt ran, o ran hyt len, o len hyt lin, o lin hyt troet, o troet⁴⁸ hyt llawre,⁴⁹ a gweuthur tir yr arglwyd yn waedlyd drwy amarch ag angchyvarch⁵⁰ a mefyl a chewlyd a saraed⁵¹ a lleas a chollede⁵² ag eyseu y'r arglwyd ag y'r genedyl.
 5. Ag oss adeue⁵³ deysyf y werth, megys y mae y vrain.⁵⁴
 6. Y uraint⁵⁵ yw y vod e⁵⁶ yn vchelwr ryd vreyna6l.
 7. Ag⁵⁷ od amheuyr y mae⁵⁸ git ac⁵⁸ ef a'e gorchy6ira.⁵⁹
 8. Gwerth vchelwr⁶⁰ 61 tr6geint morke.⁶¹
 9. Deysyff y⁶² gowyn blayde⁶² hon⁶³ atta6ch ch6yteu,⁶⁴ y medyanysseyde,⁶⁵ herwyt na vnaethe kyfreith⁶⁶ y'r argl6yd ran o werth neb onnyt⁶⁷ tr6y beri y'r ymovyn bleid⁶⁷ eu ch6byl.
 10. A hyn⁶⁸ yw deunethe⁶⁹ k6yn yr enwedig kwynwyr hyn rac yr enwedig Jeuan⁷⁰ 71 rako, yssyd⁷¹ yn gyntrichol.⁷²

VI. *This is a plaint of galanas*

1. This is the plaint of Ieuan ap Dafydd ap Hywel ap Gruffudd ap Dafydd ap Cadwgan, because two parts are on behalf of the father, and the third on behalf of the mother of Ieuan ap Dafydd.
2. To whom Hywel ap Gruffudd came, and caused injury to that named Ieuan.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>25 Bost; <i>drychaf</i> K
 26 K; <i>chedef</i> Bost
 27 Bost; <i>a6cha6l</i> K; <i>chenawl</i> Dd
 28 Bost; <i>bogelgr6n</i> K; <i>pedrogl</i> Dd
 29 Bost; <i>llifedic</i> K, Dd
 30 Bost; <i>cupyt</i> K; <i>chuput</i> Dd
 31 Dd; not in Bost, K
 32 Bost; <i>palyf</i> K; <i>palf</i> Dd
 33 Bost; <i>yni o</i> K
 34...34 Bost, K; not in Dd
 35 Bost; <i>drychaf</i> K
 36 Bost; <i>m'edud</i> K; <i>h6</i> Dd
 37 K; not in Bost
 38 Bost, K; <i>Jem hwnnw</i> Dd
 39...39 Bost; <i>g6neuthur klais a bri6 ac yssic a chnithia6</i> K;
 <i>bonclust a briw a chlais ac yssic a chraith</i> Dd
 40 Bost; <i>gwallt</i> K; <i>gwalht</i> Dd
 41 Bost; <i>g6arthrudia6</i> K; <i>gwarthrudiaeth</i> Dd
 42...42 Bost; <i>ar leissieu a th6nn</i> K; <i>a fu6m</i> Dd
 43 Bost; <i>asgwrn</i> K, Dd
 44 Bost; <i>tri na6etyd</i> K, <i>nawuet dydh</i> Dd
 45 Bost; <i>periglus</i> K, <i>p'ulys</i> Dd
 46 Bost; <i>llithredic</i> K
 47...47 Bost, K; not in Dd
 48 K, Dd; <i>toret</i> Bost
 49 Bost; <i>la6r</i> K; <i>llawr</i> Dd</p> | <p>50 Bost, K; <i>anghyfreith</i> Dd
 51 Bost, K; <i>sarhaet a chywilyd</i> Dd
 52 Bost; <i>chollet</i> K, Dd
 53 Bost; <i>os adef</i> K, Dd
 54 K, Dd; Bost <i>vrayte</i>
 55 K, Dd; <i>vrayt e</i> Bost
 56 Bost; not in K, Dd
 57 Bost, K; not in Dd
 58...58 K; <i>dyt ac</i> Bost; <i>ydhaw</i> Dd
 59 K, Dd; <i>gorchyra6</i> Bost
 60 Bost; <i>uchelwr</i> K; <i>vchelwr yw</i> Dd
 61...61 Bost; <i>morck</i> K; <i>chwe bu a chweugeinmy gann dri drychavel y sarhaet hwebu a chweugaint ariant a hynny yw</i> Dd
 62...62 Bost; <i>amounbleit</i> K; <i>hawblait</i> Dd
 63 Bost; not in K
 64 Bost, K; <i>chwi</i> Dd
 65 Bost; <i>medianusseit</i> K; <i>medianussieit</i> Dd
 66 Bost, K; <i>K</i>. Dd
 67...67 Bost; <i>tr6y beri ir amovynbleit</i> K; <i>trwyr gwyn blait gael</i> Dd
 68 Bost, K; <i>hynny</i> Dd
 69 Bost; <i>defnyd</i> K; <i>defnydh</i> Dd
 70 Bost; <i>m'edud</i> K; <i>Jem</i> Dd
 71...71 K, Dd; gap in Bost
 72 Bost; <i>gyndrychawl</i> K, Dd</p> |
|---|---|

3. In no other way than that the aforementioned Hywel came on the day of the feast of St. John, within the week of Christmas, in the time of the lord king Henry the fourth after the conquest, two years, to the house of Gwilym Leia, at the hour of midday, and made an unjust and public attack, through fury, and rage, and malice, and surreption, and disrespect to the lord, and to the lordship, and to the kindred, through [causing] trembling and shaking, and assault and battery, with a three-edged, round-pommel, sharp-edged, honed, whetted sword, three cubits in length and with the width of a palm in its breadth.
4. And the aforementioned Hywel made assault and battery on the said Ieuan, and made a bruise and a wound and an injury and snatched hair by the roots and boxed the ears,* and a gash on the skin and on flesh and on bone, and an open wound, and a mortally dangerous stab the third ninth day, and loss of flowing blood lost from the head to a [body] part,† from a [body] part to the cloak, from the cloak to the knee, from the knee to the foot, from the foot to the ground, and making the lord's land bloody through disrespect and surreption and disgrace and shame and *sarhaed* and injury and loss and want to the lord and to the kindred.
5. And if he admits it, he seeks compensation for his worth, as is his status.
6. His status is that he is a free privileged nobleman.
7. And if there are any who doubt, he has with him [enough] who will verify it.
8. The worth of a nobleman is sixty marks.
9. The request of this claiming party to you, the ones in authority, because the law did not give to the lord a share of the worth of anyone except through causing the claiming party to have the whole.
10. And this is the matter of the plaint of those named claimants against the named Ieuan there, who is present.

VII

1. [A]nyanawl yn cyndrychol N. ysydh, o'r defnydh ac achos yw nit amgen yw na bot y cyndrychol N. yn camgynnal maint hyspys o vrehyrdir Camraic, o'r tu vywn y'r plas a'r orseð a vynnych di.
2. Sef modh y mae y cyndrychol N. yn camgynnal yr enwedic dir, yn erbyn cyfiawnder y rhagdywededic N.
3. Nyt amgen vodh no bodh neb vn gynt yn berchennoc ar y dywededic dir, nyt amgen noc N., ac y'r dywededic N. y bu dau vab priodawl *kyfreithiawl*, nyt amgen no Thomas a Rys, yr hwnn R. a gynhaliodh y dywedic dir yngham ac yn anghyfreithus yn erbyn Thomas.
4. Ac y'r Thomas vchot y bu vab priodawl *kyfreithiawl*, nyt amgen no Morgan ap Thomas.

* *gwartherydyab arleysse6* is problematic. 'Gwarthruddio' means shame, and 'arleisiau' refers to the temples. Aneurin Owen offered 'reddening of the temples', but it seems that some sort of insult or attack involving the head is intended here. Hitting around the head would be shameful. In the *cyngawsedd* in AL VIII.vii, this wording is replaced by 'gwalltrwch', which refers to pulling out hair and fits with the

previous part of the attack in both the *cyngawsedd* text and this plaint.

† Aneurin Owen has 'brow', but the triad with a similar description has 'chest' in all versions (S. E. Roberts, *The Legal Triads of Medieval Wales* (Cardiff, 2007), p. 150). Since there are no other examples of 'rhan' meaning either chest or brow, I suggest this refers to a body part, probably in the upper body.

5. Ac o'r parth arall y bu vab nyt amgen no Reth ap N.
6. Yr hwnn Reth a gynhaliodd y dywededic dir yn erbyn cyfiawnder y dywededic N. .
7. Ac y'r dywededic N. y bu vab, nyt amgen no M. cyndrychol.
8. Ac o'r parth arall y bu vab priodol, nyt amgen no N., yr hwnn ysydh cyndrychawl ac yn camgynnal y dywededic dir yn erbyn cyfiawnder [106] y cyndrychol N. a'i hynaif yn erbyn eu racdywededic hynaif, ac yn anuvudh y eturyt mal y dlyai herwydh rhann, a herwydh achoedh y gael y drydedh rann, yr honn a ðyscynnai ydaw ef y wrth y racðywededic cyph cynhaliawdr.
9. Ac ef M. yn drydedh dyn or cyph cynhalawdr, ac yn amser agoret *kyfreith* am dir a ovynner o ach ac etryt, nyt amgen no'r nawuet dydh o vis Mai.
10. A bot y dywededic N. yn dala hynny mewn golyf a diebryt – yn y trydydh diebryt ysydh yn erbyn *kyfreith*: diebryt dyn o'e dlyet, dros amser y edryt.
11. Amser y edryt oedh dydh Lhun a dydh Mawrth a dydh Merchur a vanegais i o'r blaen, nyt amgen yr amser ar dydhia y camgynhaliawdh y dywededic dir, nyt amgen no dydh Lhun a dydh Mawrth wedy¹ dydh calan Mai diwethaf a lithrodh yn y vlwydhun honn.
12. A bot yn cyndrychol N. yn berson cwbyl mewn K. y ovyn iawn ac y [d]erbyn, a bot N yn berson cwbyl mywn K. mal y dily gwneuthur iawn ac ateb o bydh a'i govynno.
13. Cyvarch N. y wybot a wnelai iawn a wneuthym cynn cwyn, a necydhiaeth a vu o barthret N., ac am ei negydhiaeth ef y mae vynghwyn.
14. A'm bot inau yn barot y orchywirowy amserolder a'm priodolder y wirionedh.
15. A daisyf ateb amserawl, herwydh bot yn bynvarch yr arglwydh, cymmelh gwir a chyfraith y bawb.

VII

1. The true heir N. who is present, of the substance and the cause is namely that the present N. is wrongly holding a certain amount of Welsh free land, within the place and session that you wish.*
2. The way the present N. is wrongly holding the named land, against the just claim of the aforementioned N.
3. In no other way than that someone was once the owner of the said land, namely N., and that the said N. had two legitimate genuine sons, namely Thomas and Rhys, and that R. held the said land wrongly and unlawfully against Thomas.
4. And to the above Thomas there was a legitimate genuine son, none other than Morgan ap Thomas.
5. And on the other side there was a son, none other than Reth ap N.
6. The one Reth held the said land against the just claim of the said N.
7. And to the said N. there was a son, none other than the present M.
8. And on the other side there was a legitimate son, namely N., the one who is present and is wrongfully holding the said land against the just claim of the present N. and his ancestors against their aforementioned ancestors, and is unwilling to return it

¹ *wedy calan Dd*

* This first sentence is problematic and the text may well be faulty.

as he should according to sharing, and according to the lineages to have the third part, that which fell to him from his aforementioned ancestral holder of the land.

9. And that he M. is the third man from the common ancestor, and in the time that law is open for land which is claimed through kin and descent, namely the ninth day of the month of May.
10. And that the said N. is holding that in concealment and deprivation – in one of the three deprivations which are against the law: depriving a man of his entitlement, beyond the time for restoring it.
11. The time for restoring it was the Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday which I named before, namely the time and the days when he wrongfully held the said land, namely Monday and Tuesday after last Mayday eve which passed in this year.
12. And that the present N. is a person competent in law to ask for justice and receive it, and that N. is a person competent in law so that he should give justice and answer if there are any who require it.
13. I addressed N. to know whether he would give justice before plaint, and there was denial on the part of N., and my plaint is about his denial.
14. And I am ready to offer proof of my timeliness and my proprietorship to the truth.
15. And a petition for a timely answer, because it is one of the packhorses of the lord, to compel truth and law for everyone.

