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THE SEVEN BISHOP-HOUSES OF DYFED

In the Latin lawbooks, in Llyfr Blegywryd, and in Llyfr Cyfnerth there is a short, well-defined section on the seven bishop-houses of Dyfed. According to Sir John Lloyd this section is clearly primitive and in all probability formed part of the original "law of Hywel". It seems to me that one can give detailed reasons for accepting the judgement that the section is primitive, without necessarily invoking the idea of the law of Hywel. Leaving aside the late Latin lawbook, Redaction E, which depends on Redaction B, there are five versions of the section. It is possible to determine, with some probability, the relationships between them.

First, they are all closely related to each other. Except for Redaction A, which inserted the church of Llawnhaden into the list, they all mention the same churches and list them in the same order. The other clauses of the section are also in the same order. To see this we may divide the section into fifteen clauses which in Llyfr Cyfnerth are as follows:

1. Seith escobty yasyd yn Dyfet.
3. Llan Ismael.
4. A Llan Degeman.
5. A Llan Vasyllt.
6. A Llan Telaw.
7. A Llan Teyludaw.
8. A Llan Gien.
9. Abadeu Teilaw a Theulidyawe ac Ismael a Degeman a dylyant vot yn yscol-leugon wr dolwyn.
10. Dduddie punt yw ebediw pop yn o hynny ac yr arglwyd Dyuet y telir.
11. A'r neb a del gwedy wynt a e tal.


Given this premise, it follows that, where one of the Latin versions agrees with *Llyfr Cyfnerth*, the two of them preserve the version not only of the archetype of all the versions, but also the archetype of all the Latin versions. There are two places in which Redaction D and *Llyfr Cyfnerth* agree against Redaction A and Redaction B. In clause 12 Redaction A adds the phrase 'quia prima', and Redaction B 'quia prima est', to show that the reason for Mynwv's exemption from ducus was its primacy among the churches in Wales. Neither Redaction D nor *Llyfr Cyfnerth* has a corresponding explanation. In clause 14 Redaction A and Redaction B give six pounds and a washerwoman as the compensation payment, but Redaction D and *Llyfr Cyfnerth* give seven pounds and a washerwoman.

In both cases there are reasons, quite apart from textual criticism, for supposing that Redaction D and *Llyfr Cyfnerth* are correct. The addition of 'quia prima' or 'quia prima est' merely makes explicit what is already obvious; and, in general, there are more additions than subtractions in Welsh legal manuscripts. If we turn to *Llyfr Iorwerth* we find that the penalty for misbehaviour in a mother church is fourteen pounds, of which seven pounds goes to the abbot—the same amount as in Redaction D and *Llyfr Cyfnerth*. The two other fines due to the church according to the same section of *Llyfr Iorwerth* are both of seven pounds.

The following stemma shows the probable relationship between the six versions, including Redaction E:

![Diagram]

Redaction A is further removed than Redaction B from γ. This analysis of the texts leads to the surprising conclusion that, of the three independent Latin witnesses, the least valuable is the oldest manuscript, and the most valuable the most recent manuscript.

Of the three lost exemplars, β and γ were almost certainly in Latin, not Welsh. Redactions A, B, and D agree sufficiently closely in details of phraseology to make it probable that they all derive from a Latin version of the section. The best example is the phrase 'sanguiunolentum fecerit unum abbatum sedium predictarum'. Redactions B and D both have exactly this wording in clause 14, and if my emendation to Redaction A is

---

1 Lloyd, op. cit., p. 205, n. 66.

correct, so also did Redaction A's exemplar except that it put 'predictarum' before 'saeudam'. 'Sanguinolentum fecerit' corresponds to 'sahari', 'may insult' in Llyfr Cynfarch. There is no inconsistency here since Llyfr Cynfarch itself defines saeudam as 'drychaf a gosset' blow and onslaught'.

Sanguinolentum facere is not, however, the regular Latin translation for the technical term saeudam. The regular translation is initia. The use of the phrase is, therefore, good evidence for the dependence of the three Latin redactions on a Latin rather than a Welsh archetype, and on a single Latin archetype (β in the stemma). Furthermore, the use of the phrase sanguinolentum facere for saeudam suggests that this section stands apart from the Latin lawbook tradition which had regular Latin equivalents for Welsh technical terms. Llyfr Blegywyr takes the phrase literally 'y neb a wned gwael', thereby betraying its ignorance of the significance of the phrase. Llyfr Blegywyr is normally very accurate in its translation of technical terms back into Welsh.

The archetype of all the sections was probably in Welsh. Llyfr Cynfarch, compared with Llyfr Blegywyr, has none of the marks of a translation. This being so, it may be suggested that whereas the original Welsh document was the work of a lawyer, β was the work of an ecclesiastic without much legal training, if any, and hence 'sanguinolentum fecerit'.

The following is the reconstructed text of β, which can be compared with that of Llyfr Cynfarch given above:


With the two witnesses to α, β and Llyfr Cynfarch, now before us, it is possible to turn to an examination of the content of the section in the hope of establishing its nature, date, and antecedents.

The first question is the significance of clause 1, 'septem domus episcopales sunt in Dyuet', 'with escobly yssyd yn Dyfel'. Sir John Lloyd pointed out that, apart from clause 1, bishops are never mentioned in the section, and that there is independent evidence only for a bishopric at Mynyw. It is also noticeable that, leaving aside Mynyw, only four of the other six were required to have clerics in orders as abbots. This is not necessarily, however, an inconsistency as Sir John Lloyd appears to assume: the abbot and the bishop were not necessarily the same person. More important is the fact that there were seven cantref in Dyfel. The cantref appears to have often been the successor of the ancient tud, the old small kingdom ruled over by a tudyr (<*tudyr>) or a brewy (<*brogory>).

In Ireland, before the rise of the great monastic federations in the second half of the sixth century, each <tudyr> had its own bishop. Since <tudyr> and <brogory> mean 'people' as well as 'a petty kingdom', it is quite likely that the <brogory> with its bishop was called a <pleth>.<w/; pleytet; plethenn>. In any case, Dyfel was ruled by an Irish dynasty in the fifth and sixth centuries, so that we should expect the resemblances between the organization of the church in Dyfel and in Ireland at that period to be even closer than they were between the Irish and British churches in general. In the fifth and sixth centuries, therefore, we should expect there to have been seven bishops in Dyfel, even if there were no specific evidence to suggest it.

There is, however, one difficulty in accepting our section as just such specific evidence. Four of the seven churches can be identified with reasonable certainty: Mynyw (in Pembrok), Llan Ismael (St. Ishmael's in Rhos), Llan Degeman (Rhoscowther in Penfro), and Llan Teuladh (Old Carmarthen in Cantref Gwartha). Of the seven cantref each have, therefore, their bishop-house. Egerton Phillimore's identification of Llan Teulaw with Llandilo Llwyd in Daugleddau is correct and with that of the other Teilo churches in Dyfel, is supported by Redaction A. In its version of the section the churches of Teilo and Teulaw are united as 'egluyss Teylau et Teuladaw' in order to make room for Llwhaden, 'egluyss Hwledyn'. Llwhaden was in Daugleddau, like Llandilo Llwyd. Llan Usyllt, however, has been generally identified with St. Isis's.

---

1 J. E. Lloyd, A History of Wales, p. 302.
near Tenby (like Llan Degeman, in Penfro). This would leave two *cantref*, Cemais and Emlyn, with only one bishop-house between them, namely the unidentified Llan Geneu. The identification of Llan Usyllt is, however, by no means certain for William of Worcester says of Usyllt: ‘Sanctus Vssoldus confessor anglice Seint Vssalle plures ecclesie in Wallia.’ He got his information from John Smith, bishop of Llandaff (1457-8). Phillemin suggested that William of Worcester was mixing up Usyllt and Ismael, but this is not very likely, as he distinguishes between ‘Sanctus Ismael’ and ‘Sanctus Vssoldus’, and also between the two names Usyllt. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of connecting the seven bishop with the seven *cantref*. The coincidence of the numbers would be too much, particularly since we have good general reasons for expecting one bishop to every *tud*, later *cantref*, and since four of the seven *cantref* do each have an identifiable bishop-house in our section, and one of the others probably has. Furthermore, in the medieval diocese of St. David’s, the rural deaneries coincided with the *cantref*, so that the influence of the old political boundaries on church organization certainly persisted until the twelfth century reorganization.

The earliest manuscript in which the section is preserved is Peniarth 28, written towards the end of the twelfth century. The period during which one may reasonably suppose that the *tud* bishoprics were in existence hardly extends much beyond the eighth century, though it is quite impossible to be certain. There is, then, a gap of at least four hundred years between the earliest document and the probable date of the organization which the document describes. There is no reason, even, for dating the archetype of the surviving sections earlier than the twelfth century. This gap in time between the documents and what they describe must seriously diminish the value of the section as historical evidence, unless reasons can be given for believing, to use Sir John Lloyd’s term, in its ‘primitive’ character. That the section tells us what we would expect to hear is a point in its favour, but by no means a conclusive one.

The first candidate-argument to show that the section is primitive might be that the section did form part of the lawbook compiled and promulgated by the authority of Hywel Dda. It has generally been believed that such a lawbook was indeed compiled and promulgated, and that it is possible to make reasonable guesses about its contents. It is, however, uncertain quite what was produced or done under Hywel’s authority, though we may be fairly certain something was produced or done. It may have been a lawbook, as the prologues to the surviving texts would have us believe, or it may have been a short collection of rules like the Anglo-Saxon royal codes; and even if we admit that there was such a lawbook there is no good reason for saying that it contained the section on the bishop-houses of Dyfed. There are two possible arguments for assigning a particular section to Hywel’s lawbook, assuming just for the moment that there was such a thing: the first is that the section is found in all the surviving early lawbooks and so may be supposed to belong to a core which goes back to Hywel’s lawbook; the second is that we have reason to believe that the law of the section may owe something to Anglo-Saxon influence. Hywel Dda is known to have been a close ally of the kings of Wessex at a period when there was lawmaking activity at the court of Wessex. Such borrowings from England as the terms *editor* and *disteinf* in the Laws of the Court have with reason been assigned to Hywel Dda’s legal activities. This second argument is valid, even if one does not subscribe to the belief in Hywel Dda’s lawbook. Neither of the two arguments, however, can be used to show the antiquity of the section on the bishop-houses of Dyfed. The section does not appear in *Llyfr Forseith*, nor, even, in all versions of *Llyfr Gwynfor*, but only in a group of lawbooks which are known to be interrelated at a later period than the reign of Hywel Dda. The section owes nothing to Anglo-Saxon law. Furthermore, the document is essentially of local interest, and it is likely that it found its way into the legal tradition through a lawbook compiled in Dyfed. No doubt one of the reasons why Sir John Lloyd ascribed the section to Hywel’s lawbook was that he accepted the tradition that Hywel’s lawbook was compiled at Whitland in Dyfed. This tradition is, however, of little value.

Any argument for the antiquity of the section must be founded on internal evidence. There is good reason to believe that the last two clauses of the section, 14 and 15, do provide an argument for accepting its antiquity. In the Irish lawtracts of the early eighth and the seventh centuries there are three units of currency. These are, beginning with the least valuable, the *macht* or sack of grain, the cow, and the *cwnaol* or female slave. The cow in question was the milch cow, a heifer being worth half as much. The *szt*, literally ‘treasure’ but used for a unit of value equivalent to a heifer, was perhaps the commonest unit of all. Three kinds of chattel, then, provided units of currency: grain, cattle, and female slaves. In the Irish laws the compensation payment for insulting a bishop was reckoned in terms of the *cwnaol* unit.

This, I suggest, is the explanation of the strange fact that a man who insults one of the abbots of the seven bishop-houses must pay as part of his compensation a *lotrix*, *laxatris*, or *golhuris*. It is a survival from an older state of affairs when one of the units of currency in Dyfed was a female slave. Like the coincidence of the number of bishop-houses and the number

---

2 Owen’s Pembroke, pp. 295-8, 300-13.
of cantrefs, the survival of this ancient unit is not surprising if we accept that the section does derive in substance from an early document.

Before accepting this explanation it is necessary to examine clauses 14 and 15 in greater detail. The two versions run as follows:

Latin version (β): Qui sanguinolentum fecerit unam abbatum sedem predictarum, vel libras reddet ei, et lotricem de genere suo in obprobrium generis sui et in memoriam redditionis.

Welsh version (Llyfr Cynfwrth): Y neb a sarhau ym o'r abad gan hynny, talet seith punt idaw, a golchures o'r genedyl yr gwaratwyd y'r genedyl ac y gruffyd idaw. There is an important difference between these two versions. In the Latin version it is clear that the lotrix belonged to the kindred of the offender, and that her handing over was intended as an insult to the offender's kindred which would balance the dishonour previously done to the abbot. This is by no means so clear in the Welsh version. First, o'r could mean either 'from his' or 'to his', and the phrase 'gwaratwyd y'r genedyl' does not make it clear whether the dishonour is to the offender's kindred or the abbot's. The Welsh version, then, could mean the same as the Latin one, or alternatively it could be translated as follows: 'He who insults one of these abbots, let him (the insulter) pay seven pounds to him (the abbot), and a washerwoman to his (the abbot's) kindred because of the insult to the kindred and in memory of the ending of the feud.' Since the archetype was in Welsh, and the Latin version is a translation, it is important to know whether the Latin translation is correct or not. There are two aspects to this problem, first the question of what is linguistically probable, and, second, the question of which version makes better legal sense.

On the linguistic aspect it is clear that, if the Latin translator did make a mistake in his translation of o'r, he must have been translating a Middle Welsh and not an Old Welsh document. If we turn Llyfr Cynfwrth's version back into Old Welsh on the assumption that o'r means 'to his', we have the following: 'a golchures do ci ceneti ir gwaratwyd ci ceneti'. Here there is no ambiguity, since we have 'do ci ceneti' and not 'o ci ceneti'. It is not at all unlikely on other grounds that the archetype was in Middle Welsh. The surviving versions of the section differ very little from each other, compared with most of the other sections in the same lawbooks, so that it is likely that they are not far removed from the archetype. Elsewhere, Redaction A sometimes preserves Old Welsh spellings, but there is nothing which betrays an Old Welsh original in its version of this section. As far as the linguistic evidence goes, therefore, it is not at all unlikely that the Latin translator had in front of him the ambiguous 'o'r genedyl'.

The legal arguments are definitely in favour of the conclusion that the translator did make a mistake. The circumstance is that a man has insulted the abbot of one of the bishop-houses. Such an insult would create hostility between the two men and their kindreds. The compensation payments were intended to end this hostility. This is the implication of the word dial, the meaning of which is not fully conveyed by its Latin equivalent redditio. As the Old Welsh forms digal shows, it is a compound of di- < de- and gal, the same gal as in galumas and gelyn.1 Dial covers any act or transaction designed by law to end the state of hostility. It may refer either to the revenge which the injured party and his kindred are entitled to take, or to the compensation paid by the offender and his kindred to the injured party and his kindred. It may, therefore, refer either to acts of the injured party and his kindred or to acts of the offender and his kindred. In clause 15 it refers to the compensation paid to the abbot by the man who has insulted him. The vital difference between the two forms of dial is that revenge was much less likely in practice to end the hostility. Often, of course, revenge only led to new hostilities and so failed to provide a dial at all. The original offender, if he survived, and his kindred treated the revenge as an insult. It was this danger which the payment of compensation was intended to avoid. Compensation, it was hoped, would prevent any act being performed which the offender and his kindred must treat as an insult to their honour. In the Latin version there is both just such a new insult and the payment of compensation. Indeed, part of the compensation itself is regarded as expressly designed to dishonour the offender's kindred. This is entirely against the spirit of the transaction, and must be regarded as a mistake on the part of the translator, who, as we have already seen, was probably a cleric ignorant of the law.

We must, then, regard the genedyl in the phrase 'yr gwaratwyd y'r genedyl' as being the kindred of the abbot, and not the kindred of the offender, the gwaratwyd in the same phrase as being the insult done to the abbot and therefore to his kindred, and not any new insult, and yr must be translated 'because of', and not 'as', as Wade-Evans translates it. This in turn suggests that the genedyl in the phrase 'a golchures o'r genedyl' is also the kindred of the abbot, and that o'r means 'to his' and not 'from his'. The Latin translator has, then, misinterpreted o'r as 'from his' and the two occurrences of genedyl as referring on both occasions to the offender's kindred, whereas in fact the abbot's kindred is meant.

If these arguments are correct, they prove that the archetype was a document in Middle Welsh, and, therefore, no older than the twelfth century, and that the Latin translation was made by a man ignorant of the law. He was probably a cleric, and may well have been interested in the document because clause 2 asserts the primacy of Myñw over the other Welsh churches. The arguments also show that the meaning of clauses 14 and 15 is that if a man insults the abbot of one of the bishop-houses of Dyfed then he must pay two distinct compensations: the first, consisting of seven pounds, to the abbot, and the second, consisting of a golchures, to

---

1 Annales Cambriae, ed. E. Phillimore, Y Gymnmodur, 9 (1888), 166, s.s. 82o: Guilt Company, digal Rhys a Deu, 'the battle of the Convoy: a vengeance for Rhodri at the hand of Gwilym'.

2 Welsh Medieval Law, p. 264. Wade-Evans's whole translation of this clause is wrong, if my arguments are right.
the abbot's kindred, because the insult to the abbot is also an insult to his kindred.\footnote{These conclusions do not, of course, apply to any other section in the lawbooks except the one on the seven bishop-houses. Different sections in the same lawbook often have quite different textual antecedents. The stemma, for example, applies only to this one section.}

The archetype must be of twelfth-century date, and yet appears to contain rules which can hardly have been in force for centuries. In comparison with other late eleventh- and early twelfth-century documents, the section on the bishop-houses of Dyfed appears to contain far more reliable evidence of the nature of early church organization. It is very probable, then, that the twelfth-century archetype is far from being the original. This raises the question of whether there is any clue in the document to the date when it was originally put together. I think it is possible to make a reasonable guess at the approximate date of the document, but before doing so it is necessary to consider what are the main outlines of the development of the Welsh church during the sixth and the twelfth centuries.

The twelfth century saw the establishment of four dioceses in Wales. The number and boundaries of these dioceses owed something to the strength of the claims to ancient honour and superiority on the part of four churches, St. David's, Llandaff, Bangor, and St. Asaph's, and something also to the power of four old kingdoms, Gwynedd, Deheubarth, Powys, and Morganwg, two of which, Deheubarth and Morganwg, had been partly overrun by the Normans. In this reorganization of the church St. David's came off best. From later documents we discover that it had acquired the lordship of Pevidiog, the ancient \textit{cantref} where the church of St. David's stands; and lordship of commote or \textit{cantref} meant the possession of royal rights. These were explicitly claimed by the bishop of St. David's.\footnote{e.g. Llandanbard and the family of Sulien, St. David's in Gisburn's time.} As a result mainly of its estates in Pevidiog and also in the rest of Pembrokeshire it was easily the richest of the medieval Welsh sees.

Before the arrival of new orders, and even later in the areas dominated by Welsh princes, there were two types of monasticism. The normal \textit{clas} church was hardly monastic any more, since the \textit{classey} no longer had to take monastic vows such as the vow of celibacy, but formed a corporation, usually consisting of one or more kindreds, in possession of the church and its lands.\footnote{K. Hughes, \textit{The Church in Early Irish Society} (London, 1966), pp. 161-7.} Its origins, however, were undoubtedly monastic, for, apart from the individual cases where it is possible to prove that an ancient monastery turned into a medieval hereditary ecclesiastical corporation, there is an exact parallel in Ireland where just the same development can be documented in some detail.\footnote{Welsh \textit{Medieval Law}, p. 97, 11:15-17; cf. \textit{Latin Texts of the Welsh Laws}, p. 123, 1, 1.} There was, however, another type of monk, called in the laws the \textit{diofredate}. This was the man who had taken a vow of chastity and of abstinence from meat and riding horses.\footnote{A man who would undoubtedly be a \textit{diofredate} was the \textit{meudoy}, 'servant of God'.} This division is attributed to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dr. Asser's \textit{Life of King Alfred}, ed. A. W. Wade-Evans (Cardiff, 1944), p. 165. A noble episcopus Teild (Teilo) is mentioned among the witnesses to the ninth-century monasticism of Bleikind in the Lichfeld Gospels.}
thus showing that it is a counter-claim to that put forward by Rhugyfarch on behalf of St. David's. Since it was the claim of St. David's which was gaining ground in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, this passage in the life of St. Padarn was probably a last-ditch attempt to safeguard ancient authority, and, therefore, may give a good idea of the traditional area within which the bishop of St. David's exercised authority.

Asser also describes Hyfaiddd, king of Dyfed, as plundering 'illud monasterium et parochiam Sancti Degui', and the specific act of oppression which he mentions is the expulsion of its bishops. He does not explain from what place or area they were expelled, whether merely from St. David's itself, or from Pebidiog, or from Dyfed. But the phrase makes one wonder whether by the parochia Sancti Degui he meant, as he would have meant if he were a contemporary Irishman, the area under the overlordship of the bishop of St. David's namely, as I have suggested, the kingdom of Dyfed. A contemporary Irishman would probably have described Pebidiog as the terminus Sancti Degui and Dyfed as the parochia Sancti Degui, but whether Asser's parochia has this meaning is uncertain. What is probable is that, as the bishop of Armagh, for example, exercised direct authority in the small kingdom in which Armagh lay, but overlordship over the territory of the Airgialla and parts of the Ulaid and Dal n-Araide kingdoms, so the bishop of Mynyw exercised direct authority in Pebidiog, but overlordship in Dyfed. If this is correct, then the later possession by the bishop of the lordship of Pebidiog is an echo of his earlier direct ecclesiastical authority over Pebidiog as opposed to his overlordship elsewhere.

Under the year 768 the Annales Cambriae record the adoption of the Roman Easter by the Welsh: 'Pasca commutatur apud Brittones emendante Ebodugo nomine Dei.' The Peniarth 20 version of the Brut y Tywyosigion Chud was used for a kingdom of undoubted antiquity. While Ystrad Tywi appears to have formed part of the kingdom of Dyfed at an early period, it was probably, as the rarity of Osog inscriptions within its borders suggests, an under-kingdom rather than part of the immediate territories of the Irish dynasty of Dyfed. By adopting the theory of the monks of Llandaff that their church was the main Cell of the foundation, the author of the Life of St. Padarn enabled himself to claim the whole of Seisyllwg, both Ceredigion and Ystrad Tywi, for Llandaff. His claim may have some justification, however, for Seisyllwg was formed by the conquest of Ystrad Tywi by the kings of Ceredigion, and this may have given the bishop of Llandaff some authority over Ystrad Tywi.

1 Asser's Life of King Alfred, cap. 79, pp. 65-6.
2 It might just refer to Pebidiog, the area later known as Dewi's land. It depends on whether there was a contrast between pleva, Welsh plant (< pellenn) = field, and parochia. In the Book of Llandaff the document giving the boundaries of the diocese speaks of 'Llandauinn silicia cum territorio suo et parochia, udielice Cantrcebacham, Chedulli, Guoh', etc. This forms part of a Bull attributed to Honorius II, but, of course, the description of territories and boundaries must be a Welshman. See Book of Llan Daf, p. 42. A large part of parochia is also mentioned on pp. 456, 459. This is not, however, proof that parochia referred to a large unit in the ninth century, since, even granted the most favourable view of the Book of Llandaff, its documents were certainly edited and partly rewritten in the twelfth century.

1 Y Gynwysod, 9, p. 162; Brut y Tywyosigion, Peniarth MS 20, ed. Thomas Jones (Cardiff, 1941), p. 2; Brut y Tywyosigion, Red Book of Hergest Version, ed. Thomas Jones (Cardiff, 1953), p. 4.
3 R.I.A. Contributions to a Dictionary of the Irish Language under mag. In the later Middle Ages the meaning of Magh De was further limited to 'hermit'. The meانey in Pereriel, White Book Mehhobon, ed. J. Gwynog Evans and John, 1907, p. 120, was closely a hermit, but Sir John Lloyd (History of Wales, p. 217) is no doubt correct in treating the meáney as originally 'group of celibates'. In the gloss Wb. 30.256 mag De translates servus Dei (Tinunear Polcunobhirtersia, ed. Stokes and Strachan, vol. i, Cambridge, 1901, p. 694). In Ml. 303 cèle De refers back to the family mentioned at the end of L. 30 where the gloss (30.25) translates symborium as tum mugan (Thecueria, p. 65).
4 Gerald of Wales's description of the monks of Ynys Eilot as 'monochaterial' is translated in procollosies vel Colbod vocant (Tinunear Krmbrin, Bk. ii, cap. VI, ed. Dimock, p. 124), may contain a version of the term cèle De in colobos (see Revised Medieval Latin Pendant, v. Colbod). If this is so, it supports the idea of a connection between the Colbee revial in Ireland and the strict monasticism of early medieval Wales.
In the Brat y Tywysogion we find Jonathan described as tywyso  Abergale, and sechnap has its Welsh equivalent, seqnadh. It is amply clear, then, that as far as the extremely scanty evidence will take us, it points to a Welsh Church closely resembling the contemporary Irish church, not only in the fifth and sixth centuries when Ireland was being converted largely through the efforts of Welsh missionaries and their Irish disciples, but in subsequent centuries right up until the Hildebrandine reform reached Wales in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

Where then does the section on the bishop-houses of Dyfed fit into the pattern? Four of its clauses provide some clue. None of these clauses is decisive evidence on its own, but added together their testimony has weight. The first is clause 2 which asserts the primacy of Mywyd among the churches of Wales. At no period have we any evidence that Mywyd exercised practical authority over the whole of Wales. We do, however, have good reason to believe that men sympathetic to its claims accepted it as the leading church of Wales by the tenth century, for the poem ‘Armes Prydein’ written before 937, makes several references to St. David which imply a special reverence for that see. The author of ‘Armes Prydein’ would have accepted Mywyd as ‘y penhaf y Gwyrr’. This is not surprising, for with Rhodri Mawr there had come a fundamental change in Welsh politics. Before his acquisition of Powys, in 855 or soon after, and Seisyllwg, in 872 or soon after, Welsh kings could hope for direct supremacy only within the old over-kingsdom of Gwynedd. Powys, Dyfed, and Gwyddym, and the more recent over-kingsdom of Seisyllwg. Wales contained two types of kingdom, the small kingdom like Rhufon or Meirionnydd, and the over-kingsdom like Gwynedd. With the extinction of several ancient dynasties in the period 855-905, those of Powys, Seisyllwg, and Dyfed, proceeded only by a generation by the dynasty of Gwynedd, the political arena was greatly enlarged. A king could now hope to rule both in Gwynedd, Powys, and Deheubarth. As we have already seen, claims made by the Ul Néill kings to overlordship in Ireland went hand in hand with parallel claims by the bishops of Armagh, the coarchs of St. Patrick. These claims to ecclesiastical overlordship were buttressed by several important texts like the lives of St. Patrick and the Liber Angelorum. I suggest, then, that, unless one supposes that Rhigfarch put together all the pseudo-historical arguments in favour of the primacy of St. David’s which occupy such an important part of his Vita, one must accept that he was building on the work of his predecessors. The references in ‘Armes Prydein’ would be all the more

---

1 Tafestus is used for ‘abbot’ in the document quoted by Miss Kathleen Hughes, The Church in Early Irish Society, p. 157, which she dates early ninth century.
2 D. A. Birch, ‘Some Celtic Legal Terms’, Celtica, 3, p. 228. For some objections to Professor Greene’s argument (Christianity in Brittan, pp. 296-298), see my article ‘The Heir-Apparent in Irish and Welsh Law’, Celtica, 9, p. 180f.
3 Armes Prydein, ed. J. Williams (Cardiff, 1955), II, 51, 91, 129, 149, 166.

The obvious moment for them to press their claim was when Rhodri Mawr reached the zenith of his power, when, in other words, there was a potential patron sufficiently powerful to make a reality of their dream. One at least of Rhigfarch’s arguments looks very much like a borrowing from the Armagh armoury. St. David’s great circuit which took him over much of England as well as Wales is very like the circuit made by St. Patrick according to the Armagh propagandists. A circuit in Welsh as in Irish law was a normal expression of lordship.

In the 9th century the abbot is named as ‘y sechnap y hudlon’. The two words are synonyms meaning men in orders. In Manawydan three clerics come in succession to persuade Manawydan to release the mouse, first the y sechnap, then the officier, and finally the escab. When the monastic movement was in its prime in Ireland, it was expected that an abbot would be in major orders; but by the eighth century this rule was not always observed. The assumption in our section that some abbots may be laymen suggests, therefore, a date after 900 rather than before.

In clause 10 the ebedew is stated to be twelve pounds. In clause 14 the compensation paid to the abbot is seven pounds. The older type of payment was in cows, or other such goods. Professor Binchy has pointed to the parallel between the bouch lyulo, ‘cow in calf’, and the bò inleag. There is also a parallel between the bò trelag, ‘cow having a calf through her’ and the naebe noddiligi, ‘newly calved cows’, of the Suresit memorandum. These distinctions were important because cows were used as currency, and the different values of different kinds of cows had, therefore, to be taken into account. The classification appears to have been the same both in Ireland and in Wales, a fact which is evidence for the antiquity of the system. The Suresit memorandum probably belongs to the second half of the eighth century. One of the later documents in the Lichfield Gospels, probably of the tenth century, records the manumission of a man called Bleidud. He bought his liberty for four pounds and eight ounces. In the Liber Comonoi, which was compiled in 820, a unit of currency is mentioned called a scribel (Lat. scrupulus). This unit is much used in the glosses on the Old Irish Law tracts, but only rarely in the tracts themselves which date from the early eighth century and the seventh century. The use of cows as currency lasted right up to the period of the Welsh lawbooks, but it is likely that units of currency like the scribel became generally used somewhere around 800, both in Ireland and in Wales.

---

1 Peter Keeny Mulvany, ed. I. Williams (Cardiff, 2nd edn., 1951), pp. 61-3.
4 For the bò trelag see D. A. Birch, ibid. For the naebe noddiligi, see Book of Llan Daf, p. xlii.
5 The Book of Llan Daf, p. xlv.
6 Sir Hor Williams's edition is in BGBS, 5, p. 229-38.
7 There is one early example (certainly seventh century and possibly early seventh century) in Codex Usski Thorism, ed. D. A. Birch, Eria, 17 (1933), p. 79, § 10.
APPENDIX

The Welsh equivalent of the Ir. curnal, 'female slave', unit of value occurs also in a section on the galanus of a certain propositus or local official. One version occurs in Redaction B, the other in a fifteenth-century Welsh MS. The section shows certain analogies to that on the seven bishop-houses. First, if one takes those places common to both lists which can be identified with some probability, they all belong to the cantref of Penbro. The section, therefore, is probably a local Dyfed document copied into later lawbooks because of its antiquarian interest. It is very likely that from before the Normans conquest of Penbro, and the propositus may perhaps be seen as the king's official in charge of Penbro. Its local background, therefore, is more probable early date, and its mention of the locativus or golycheid demonstrate its connections with the section on the bishop-houses.

The section on the propositus of Castel Arcyl, on the other hand, is only to be found in Redaction B. This place was shown by Sir John Lloyd to be very close to Dinefr. The local background is, therefore, different. The galanus assigned to this propositus is implausible high. I suggest, therefore, that this section was composed in the twelfth century on the basis of the other, older, section, in other words at a period when Dinefr was the capital of Deheubarth.

Professor Thomas Jones has kindly drawn my attention to the late Dr. Emanuel's tentative identification of Llan Genau with Llanganau in the parish of Clydai, Pemb. (LTWL, p. 543). Professor Jones tells me that Emanuel based his theory on the two modern farm names Llanganau Fanr and Llanganau Fach. Neither is named on the 1st OS map, but Llanganau Fawr may be found on the 25" map. It lies north-west of Tegryn near the western boundary of the modern parish of Clydai. Its grid reference is SN 222339. If this identification is correct, as I think it is, then Llan Genau lay in the cantref of Emlyn. This leaves only Cemais without a house-house.
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SYLWADAU AR ‘ARMES PRYDEIN’

Yn ei Ragymadrod i w i argraffiad o ‘Armes Prydein’ dywedodd Syr Ior Williams nad y rheu feiddgar yw tybio . . . . fod a wneiti bardd hwn rywbeth ‘A’r Eglwy’ (1), a rhoes ei reisnym strus y dybiacheth hon. Hoffwn agwrmu rhad rhwn arall y gellid ei chyfansugio at y rheiga nodiau yr ‘Armes’ a’r ‘Eglwys’.

Ym Mae’r hwyba’r fod duall Gildas o sgrefennu hyd ei De Excitatio Britanniae hyd defaid haid haid y rosi gwydydd yr Hen Destament a bod ei flordd o sgrefennu hanes ym flordd a oedd wedi ei meithrin trwy weithiau sgrefennu eglwys gwiried. Yn hyyn yr taroo dyn yw fod awdur yr ‘Armes’, megis Gildas, yntau’n ymlawio fel gwydydd yr Hen Destament. Sylwer, er enghraifed, fod y fuddgoliadaeth a ddaw’r Cymry ym y dyfodol da ar arweinydd Cynon a Chwaladar ym fuddgoliadaeth dilynwyr y ffryd. Yn ôl yr ‘Armes’, pan fydd y Cymry ym y dyfodol yr trechur Sbaesen ‘deu orsegyn Sbaesen o pleit Dolwyd’ (Ll. 166) fydd eu dau dywsog. Am arweinywyr y nhaledd a ffordd dydd ym chyfansigwyr gyda’r Cymry ym yr ffrydwy sydd i ddechrau, ‘A theynyng Dewa ryggedwy eu ffryd’ (Ll. 180). Ddu, ‘trwy eirwa Dewi a saint Prydy’ (Ll. 183), fydd eu òl i waredaeth y Cymry. Ar allwedd eu gwerthu (os yw’r pum llinell olaf yn perthyn i’r gwerth wreddi’r cei gweddai ar i Dduw roddi Dewi’i ddywsog i’r milwyr:

Iolwn i i ri a grewys nef ac elyd.
poet tyfysawse Dewi yr kynfiwy.
(lau. 195-6)

Oni fu’r Sbaesen mor hy a thorri ddefdau Dewi a sarnu breintiauaint Prydy?

| Neu vreint an seint ppyr y saghysant. |
| neu reithau Dewi ppyr y torrassant. |
| lalau. 139-40 |

Ar ben hyn yr oeddant wedi torri ar drefn naturiol a chyfanswethe trwy eu bod hwy, yn gaethon a ‘cheicynn’, wedi dod i ym yn Mhrhydain:

eu kynidyw bu y wthyn yn amhoedd.
gwydd rin dilein keith y mynner. |
| lalau. 33-34 |

Gwiriau fford mater gwleidyddol llwyddiant y Sbaesan a chhynghyniadu hynny
yn cael eu lliwio fel materion crefyddol. Ar y naill law y mae’r Cymry, sydd wedi cael eu tylwylo o ran helaeth a’u hiteflediant gwyfion: ar y llaw arall

1 Dymunau gyfnodwyd o ddod o’r Athro Melville Richards a Mr. Brinley
2 Rose, M.A., am heddiwgrwch ym llyfr ‘Sylwadau.’
3 The Williams (Col.), Armes Prydein (Caerdydd, 1955), t. xxi.
4 Robert W. Hanning, The Vision of History in Early Britain (Columbia University
6 Prydein yn ei llage; evel ym. Hor Williams, op. cit., t. 44.
7 Cw. Adygiadd yr Athro A. O. H. Jarman ar Armes Prydein yn Lliw Cymru, iv
8 (1936), t. 11.