Kings, Lords, and Princes: the Nomenclature of Authority in Thirteenth-century Wales

The starting-point for this paper can be found in a passage in a lecture by the late Professor T. Jones Pierce, first given in 1945, published in 1950, and now reprinted in his collected papers. There are some who maintain that the lawyers of the period did not consciously distinguish between the terms 'king' and 'lord'. But although I have for convenience used both terms in the same context earlier on, I believe that the lawyers of the thirteenth century knew perfectly well what was the difference between them. Indeed, in the first book of the laws of Gwynedd the term *brenin* is used almost exclusively. That book, of course, contains the laws of the court, and as I shall try to prove later on, is made up almost entirely of archaic matter. Such is not the case with the second and third books, the laws of the country and the book of judgement. In these books *arghydd* is the term commonly used. Occasionally 'king' and 'lord' appear synonymously. It is almost as if the copyist, having decided to write *arghydd* instead of *brenin*, slips back sometimes into the form contained in the original. I do not press this point. But if I am right, what reason was there for this substitution of terms?

Jones Pierce went on to offer an explanation based on the political situation in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Wales: after quoting evidence from Brut y Tywysogion (to which reference will be made later), he suggested that it indicated some form of agreement among the leading princes to drop the title of king, an understanding which coincided with the assertion by Henry II of the principle of Anglo-Norman lordship over Wales.

The whole question needs a more detailed examination—and a more detailed examination than will be presented here. Most of the lawbook evidence to be cited will be drawn from what Jones Pierce meant by 'the laws of Gwynedd'—i.e. the text which Anwedd Owen called the 'Venedotian Code' and which is now usually called the 'Book of Ioerwyth'.

---

1 This paper is a revised version of a short communication presented to the Fifth International Congress of Celtic Studies at Perneun on 7 April 1955.

2 *The Age of the Princes*, The Historical Basis of Welsh Nationalism, ed. D. Myddin Lloyd (Cardiff, 1942), pp. 50-51; MWS, pp. 87-8; 29. Like Jones Pierce in this quotation, I have in this paper used *brenin* and *king* as interchangeable, and likewise *arghydd* and *lord*, *tyr/tyning* and *prince*. Modern spellings have been used for the Welsh words, except in quotation from a single text.

3 In his edition of the law texts, Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales (Record Commission, London, 1841).

4 *Llyfr Ioerwyth*, ed. Aled Rhys Wiliam (Cardiff, 1956) is a critical edition of this text, to which references of the form for § 48/5 (indicating numbered
supplemented by the 'revised edition' of that book, Llyfr Colan. This material is accepted as having been put together in the thirteenth century, and though found in older manuscripts than the compilations known as the Book of Cyfnerth (Owen's 'Gwentian Code') and the Book of Blogyrwyd (Owen's 'Dimetian Code'), it represents a more highly developed and sophisticated stage of the law than they do. Before examining the lawbooks we may take a hurried look at the titles used in other sources, beginning with the handful of Anglo-Saxon royal charters to which Welsh rulers' names are appended as witnesses. Not surprisingly, the usual designation for these rulers is regular or subregulus, or in Anglo-Saxon undercynning; only once is even Hywel Dda rex. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is more generous, with references to kings of North Wales, West Wales, and Gwent; Gruffudd ap Llywelyn is called king of the Welsh. Post-Conquest chronicles from England also use the title rex freely, in spite of Florence of Worcester's statement that after the death of Rhys ap Tewdwr in 1106, 'no king ceased to rule in Wales;' Gruffudd in a reference to his death in 1197; to Gwenswynwyn of Powys in 1198; and to Gruffudd ap Rhys in 1200. Most surprising of all, perhaps, is the casual reference to Dafydd ab Owain Gwynedd as Dafydd regem Walliae in a legal document (the endorsement of a final concord) of 1198.

By this date, however, the normal title of a Welsh ruler will at best be princeps in Latin, tymysog in Welsh, and in the thirteenth century that title will acquire a special aura, to be consecrated in 1215 by the recognition of Llywelyn ap Gruffudd as princeps Walliae and feudal suzerain of other Welsh rulers—whom English authority will now call barons. This change can be clearly seen in the Welsh chronicle, in which the contrast in terminology between the eleventh century and the late twelfth century is much sharper than it is in the English chronicles. References are also given, where appropriate, to Ancient Laws . . . in the form 'VG' [i.e., indicating Book, chapter, and section]. The abbreviation 'RG' is also used when this lawbook is contrasted with the other books similarly designated Cynfeiliog, Blog, and Col. Llyfr Colan, ed. Dafydd Jenkins (Cardiff, 1903); references of the form Col § 343 are to numbered sentences in this edition. This text is derived from a single thirteenth-century manuscript, Peniarth 35; the second half of that manuscript is a text of the Book of Case Law ('Llyfr y Darniwsianol') and is published in Darniwsian Col, ed. Dafydd Jenkins (Aberystwyth, 1973).

William of Malmesbury, Lat., ed. A. W. Wade- Evans (Oxford, 1900), a critical edition of this text, is cited by page number only, using the abbreviation WML.  

3 Cyfrifiadau Hywel Dda yn ei Llyfr Blogyrwyd, ed. R. J. Williams and J. J. Powell (Cardiff, 1914), a second edition 1965); a critical edition of this text, is cited by page and line, using the abbreviation BLY.


English chronicles. Until the eleventh century there are in Brut y Tywysogion references to the brenhinedd of Ceredigion, Dyfed, Gwent, Glamorgan (Gwlad Morgan), Gwynedd, and Powys; to kings of the Britons (who include Gruffudd ap Llywelyn), and to Rhys ap Tewdwr, king of the South. But with his death, for the Brut as for Florence of Worcester, 'the kingdom of the Britons fell'; and in the twelfth century the Brut seems to give the title of king to only three rulers, and only once to each of them—to Owain Gwynedd in 1149, to Madog ap Maredudd of Powys in 1150, and to Maredudd ap Gruffudd ap Rhys of Ceredigion, Iarad Tywi, and Dyfed, in 1155. In other passages they are given other titles, and in Annales Cambriae Owain alone is rex, and he only at his death, in other references he is princeps Norwirca, as he is usually tymynyw Grynddiu in the Brut. Madog ap Maredudd is tynynyw Powys in one passage, arglwydd Powys in another: rulers of Powys seem to be called arglwydd more often than anything else.

This part of the subject can be left, with two comments. First, though the Welsh chronicler seems reluctant to give the title of tyrwydd to rulers of less impressive standing than those of Gwynedd, he frequently uses the plural tyrwyddin for groups of these. Thus the rulers of Maenliwydd, Elsaf, Gwernhrydian, Glamorgan, Senghenydd, Caereon, and Higher Gwent, whom Rhys ap Gruffudd took with him to be reconciled with the English king at Gloucester in 1175, are called 'all the princes of Wales who had incurred the king's displeasure,' though Rhys himself is given no title. Again, it is holl dysnywygon kynnyr who swear fealty to Dafydd ap Llywelyn in 1238.

Secondly, the word tymysog needs a little attention. Welsh seems to have no nomenclature for this title of honour—no names like thane, conte, Graf, which were in origin ministerial but included titles of honour because they were applied to those who ministered to the king. At first sight tyrwydd seems like an exception: just as dux and Herzog grew into titles of longer one, and most (if not all) of the dynasties represented seem to have been the 'Asheb Brenhinedd a Tywysogion Cymru' in P. C. Bartram, Early Welsh Genealogical Tracts (Cardiff, 1966), pp. 95-107. The title must have been widely used, and it is difficult to say whether it is too much to hope that some scholar will very soon produce a dictionary of medieval Wales which would give an account of the fluctuating meanings of the word. However, it is used by many contemporary writers, and it is useful to work up some sort of dictionary of the word. Attempts made by some of the Penmachno audience indicated that such a dictionary would be useful to workers in several fields of study.

1 BTTP, p. 258, Tr. p. 109; BTRBH, p. 341; BS, p. 84.
2 'Owein ap Gruffudd ap Kynan, brethyn Grynedd, BTRBH, p. 127; 'Madoc ap Maredudd, brethyn Powys', BS, p. 154.
3 'Maredud ap Gruffudd ap Grynhyd, brethyn Kjërodjegywn ac ystrat Tywi a Dyfret', BTRBH, p. 125; 'Tymysog kajjigydiegwyn ac ystrat tywi a dyfret', BTRBH, p. 125; 'O Kajjigydiegwyn ac Ystrat Tywi a Dyfret', BS, p. 156.
4 'Brychog, BTRBH, p. 197, Tr. p. 61; BS, p. 162; correspon
ding to tymynyw Powys BTRBH, p. 129.
5 'BTRBH, p. 225, Tr. p. 99; BTRBH, p. 134; corresp
ding to tyrwydd Powys BS, p. 136.
6 'BTRBH, p. 226-9, Tr. p. 21; BS, p. 136. Graf, which corresponds to the Anglo-Saxon earl, went up in the world on the Continental and down in England, where it gave the name reiws for the 'land-agent' or 'farm manager' of villen status. There is a Welsh analogy to this in the word breiwyth (free holder of land) derived from *brong-riu (king of a region). Wales also knew the office of distraint (steward), which rose in the world as chamberlain did in England (see BRCs xii, 227; but distain, like chamberlain, never became a title of rank.)
in a particular passage, especially since (as will appear later) the patron-lord might exercise a certain jurisdiction over his clients. The patron-lord might be of any status: if an alien attached himself to a villan (tuaeg or allit), for want of a better patron, that villain would be the alien lord, and would be so referred to where necessary or appropriate. Argyllayd may appear in this sense in any of the law texts, and does so appear in all parts of the Book of Iorwerth.

The incidence of argyllayd in the sense of ruler, on the other hand, varies from one part of the Book of Iorwerth to another, as Jones Pierce showed. Thus in the Laws of Court (Owen’s Book 1; §§ 2–43 of Llyfr Iorwerth) the term bremi is used almost exclusively. In most of the manuscripts the most striking instance of argyllayd in the early part of the Book of Iorwerth is in the Preface, and will be referred to later; the Precept of courts stands apart from the Laws of Court, and must have been a comparatively recent addition to the core of the lawbook, which surely included the Laws of Court, probably in a form not very different from that of the extant texts.

But if most of the Laws of Court can be discounted as obsolete, a great deal of the rest of Ior was living law in the thirteenth century. Owen’s Book III (Pierce’s ‘book of

Below, p. 460. The provision of Des Col’s § 441, that a woman who speaks shameful words to her husband must pay him a summol (the smaller of the two financial penalties of Welsh criminal law) because he is her lord, is particularly difficult to classify. The proverb Mewn drae ian yw argyllayd seems to have been applied to lords of both kinds. In the trial Tri Chuddëg Eol (‘Three strong cases of the world’, WML, pp. 139, 281), the lord is associated with the drað (‘an idiot’, for it is not possible to compel an idiot against his will) and the ddimun (‘a person without anything, for it is not possible to exact anything whatever there is nothing’), and the proverb is translated ‘a stone on edge is a lord’, as though emphasising the power of the lord to maintain his full rights; cf. Davies, Dic. Dduall, a. ian, ‘Caith s. good liet licet.’ Elsewhere, however, the proverb is clearly understood as making the lord a (strong) stone in place of drað (a ‘weak’ piece of ice: so, for instance, in the provision enabling him to secure a bail-clairancy of property to whom he cannot say ‘bremi’ (breni), a piece of stone, not a piece of ice). The assertion of the suzerainty of the king of Aberffraw over all Welsh rulers has a strong flavour of thirteenth-century feudalized politics, though it may well have some earlier basis; in any case, such suzerainty does not imply that within his own realm the feudal vassal is the suzerain’s deputy. Evidence about local lords is scanty: when Dafydd ap Gruffudd was lord of Cymystraen presided in 1252 over proceedings between the secular canons of Aberdon and the new abbey of Bardsey, he was not his brother Llywelyn’s deputy but one of the rulers of Llywelyn, which he shared with his brother Owain; Jones Pierce, MWS, p. 466 and n. 37; Rec. Caern., p. 352.

post nearest to the bremi which he is forbidden to strike (26, 3). The Latin original of Bleg (Lat. D 347, 348, 349) likewise has dominus and regi, but J 10, 11, 14, has breni at both points, and so has Cyfie (WML, p. 29, 10, 24). The editorial note to Bleg 27, 26, to the effect that from this point on argyllayd occurs frequently for breni, must be taken as referring to the text as a whole rather than to the remaining pages of the Laws of Court. It is probably significant that the bridging passage to the Laws of the Country speaks of ‘swydgyngyn hynedd ysdaf reg yr argylliaw a gywir y wlad’ (29, 14–15), and that the trackway on the Seven Bishop-Houses of Dyfed (84, 11–25, and WML, p. 124, 14–25) refers to payments to argeuilh Dyfed. There is a parallel to Ior’s designation of Hywyn as tywyn in the reference of Bleg (4, 2) and Cyfie (WML, p. 3, 7–8) to the justiciar of Dyfed, it is a parallel to Ior’s designation of Hywyn as tywyn in the reference of Bleg (4, 2) and Cyfie (WML, p. 3, 7–8) to the justiciar of Dyfed, it is

From being descriptive names for military leaders, so tynwyg might seem to have been coined as a translation for dux. It is indeed so used in the Brut for the duked of Normandy,1 Burgundy,2 and Austria;3 and conversely, in Annales Cambriae Llywelyn the Great (for instance) appears as Lancelus dux Normanniae on occasion.4 But if the analogy was a live one for the chroniclers, it was an analogy between words which had come into being independently, as we can deduce from the existence of the Irish cognate toisnech and the use of tynwyg for other kinds of leader, e.g. for the head of the clu at Abergale.5

Tynwyg was certainly an important word in thirteenth-century Welsh politics, but it is ‘a word which is almost entirely absent from the laws,’6 and its few occurrences in the lawbooks certainly have political significance. So far as my observation goes, it occurs not at all in Cyfie or Bleg, and only three times in Ior. In the account of the avenging of the death of Mynyddog Mapynfawr the word has no legal or political significance, and was rightly translated leaders by Aneurin Owen;7 the other two instances are in the Preface to the whole text and the Preface to the Judges’ Test Book found in some manuscripts. In both of these, Hywel Dda (who is king (bremi) of all Wales in the other versions) is called tynwyg Cymry,8 thus seeming to reflect the claim of the thirteenth-century rulers who styled themselves princes of Gwynedd or Normwallia, or of Aberffraw, or of Wales, to suzerainty over all Wales.

Turning now to bremi and argyllayd, it must first be recognized that though argyllayd always implies some relation of superiority, it is used in different contexts with very different emphases. On occasion it seems to translate a Latin dominus in the sense of owner,9 more often it designates the personal lord or patron of a man or woman; often, again, it designates a territorial ruler,10 and it will not be always easy to decide which of the last two senses it has
Secondly, where rights of the ruler as ruler are in question, the word is always brenin.

It is the king who is entitled to be maintained by food renders from his free and villein subjects; to lead his free subjects on military expeditions, subject to prescribed limitations; and to have labour services (both civil and military) from villeins. Again, the officials who organize the resources of the realm do so on behalf of the king, and it is to a new king that application must be made by a church for confirmation of any special privilege which it claims, in relation thereto, for instance.

The third head, that of the Law of Women, seems to present a special problem, with a few references to the king and many to the lord: thus it is arglwydd who receives the amobr in respect of a maiden on her first marital union, cohabitation, or pregnancy, and it is arglwydd also who may join with the kindred of an eloping maiden to recall her. The solution to the problem is suggested by the fact that the Cyfnerth and Blegywyrdd texts also refer most often to the lord: the lord is not normally the supreme ruler over the district concerned (though that ruler will no doubt have some immediate clients, whose daughters' amobrai will be paid to him), but a personal lord or patron—in many cases the patron-lord of a client father, but in many cases also not a patron of that kind: the court smith, for instance, was entitled to the amobrai of other smiths' daughters. In a few cases the king will receive the amobr in respect of a maiden for whom he is not the immediate lord. This is because there must be someone who can claim it, and if no other lord is entitled the king steps in: the rule of Llyfr y Damenziniau that a daughter who has been rejected by her alleged father's kin (so that she has no legal father, and hence no father's lord) pays amobr to the king, shows that this is the significance of the statement 'Diffeth brenin y dywedir not morwyn', 'A maiden is said to be the king's waste'.

The fourth head provides the most interesting passages from our point of view, in a miscellaneous collection drawn from several tracts in the Test Book and Book II. These tracts deal with the law of contract, with various public offices (i.e. crimes), and with land law; what they have in common, and what gives them their interest for us, is an exception: there the arglwydd is the villein's patron-lord (of whatever status) whose permission is necessary if the villein's fostering of a freeman's son is to give that foster-son the right to share in the villein's goods on his death.

1 For §96, VC ii. 17. In a case of rape, amobr goes to arglwydd, directly to brenin (but to arglwydd in MSS. A. E.).
2 For §§90-91, VC ii. 18; Col §654, 655.
3 For §90, 19, 20, VC ii. 11, 11a, 12; Col §§625, 657, 673.
4 For §§9, 92, VC ii. 18, 19, 20; Col §§634-7, 669-74.
5 For §§71, 72, VC ii. 11, 12. In relation to §§40 (VC ii. x. 10) to sub eft o arglwydd is not

so a o e n in: the writer was careful to make his meaning quite clear, though he was perhaps using arglwydd under the influence of the political situation. Neither of these passages appears in Col.
is that they show the part played by public authority in enforcing rules of law. And in these passages we seem to see arglweddlydd increasingy replacing brenin: in Cyfn and Bleg the ruler who enforces the law is normally, if not always, brenin; in Ior he is often arglweddlydd (and sometimes brenin in one manuscript version of a particular passage and arglweddlydd in another). In Col he is more often arglweddlydd than in Ior.

So in the long tractate which deals with the formal contract created by the giving of a macc (an enforcing surety), we find incidental references to prosecution by the lord for perjury, and to recourse to the lord for authority to take an otherwise irrevocable pledge. A very revealing passage deals with the case of a debtor who dies without a son who can represent him as defendant: the lord is required to take the place of a son, but the next sentence of the passage lays it down that if the debt is denied, the compurgators who support the denial must be relatives of the king, not of the debtor. This disqualification, which shows that the lord in question is not a patron-lord, is removed in Col, which has arglweddlydd throughout the passage.

In the second form of contract, briddu, which has a strong religious basis, Col again shows its preference for arglweddlydd, where Ior speaks of payment of camlmerce to the king (in a passage which does not appear in Col) and of the church and king as enforcing a briddu (in a passage whose counterpart in Col enlists enforcement to the lord). In the third form of contract, the legal amod (which is probably a thirteenth-century innovation, since Cyfn and Bleg know nothing of it), Ior and Col alike speak of the lord.

When we turn to the law of crime, we can detect a very clear contrast between Cyfn and Ior. The excellent word index to Wade-Evans’s Welsh Medieval Law has fifteen page references for tri bydyo camlmerce yr brenin, and the text seems to have no clear indication of the payment of camlmerce to a lord; for the larger financial penalty, dirwch, there is one reference which should no doubt be read as implying payment to the lord. In Ior, on the other hand, dirwch and camlmerce go to the lord; it is the lord who banishes offenders in appropriate cases, who is entitled to remit the penalty, and who is disinherited and edebite in respect of a man put to death by him. The banished criminal is given a day to cross each tractref of the lord who banishes him; and (in the law of crime as elsewhere in the lawbook)

the tractref or the comettes of a particular ruler are his arglweddlydawr. Only rarely does a manuscript substitute brenin for the arglweddlydawr found in others.

In the tractate on procedure in a claim to land, to which nothing corresponds in the earlier lawbooks, we seem to have a transitional document, in which the brenin of an archetypal tractate has been imperfectly replaced by arglweddlydd. Most of the Ior manuscripts have a sketch-plan of the arrangement of the tractate, which shows the king as presiding; in the text (including that of Col, which is the sketch-plan) the chief place is taken by the king or him who is in his place; and in later passages brenin and arglweddlydd seem to be interchangeable. In particular, the persons who are given as pledges by the parties are committed to the custody, sometimes of brenin, sometimes of arglweddlydd. Here we certainly seem to have a traditional description of procedure, slightly modified to meet thirteenth-century conditions; and as a pendant to this tractate we may note two more passages in Ior which relate to land. In one of these the rule (no doubt a late one) is laid down that dadanymud is available only where there has been gift and investiture with the land by an arglweddlydd; in the other, the arglweddlydd is associated with the kindred of a landholder in releasing the land from the kindred’s claim so that it can be paid over in satisfaction of the landholder’s liability for galanau.

What is the explanation of the complex pattern thus revealed? As I have already suggested, Jones Pierce’s political explanation is probably right for the rare examples of tynysog, and for the use of arglweddlydd in the prefatory material, but the pattern in the body of the texts seems to be too variegated for that explanation, and I suggest that it reflects a different development, a development of social organization with political implications—namely the increasing importance of franchial jurisdiction in thirteenth-century Gwynedd. The lawbook editors changed brenin to arglweddlydd in this or that particular rule, although they still regarded brenin as the proper title for a ruler, because they recognized that the right to be independently and optionally governed by that rule might not be in the king, but in the holder of a franchise.

Franchial jurisdiction was not a novelty in thirteenth-century Wales. The detailed account given in the Book of Llandaff of the privileges of the Bishop of Llandaff shows the recognition of extensive rights in the eleventh century at the latest, and the exercise of some rights of the same kind by the other Welsh bishops is attested in the Black Book of St. David’s, the Record of Caernarvon, and the Survey of the Honour of Denbigh. Monastic establishments, too, might have such rights; and where those rights belonged to a

lord were made by the compiler of Col or in his Latin exemplar.

1 See below, n. 10.

2 Col derives some of its material from a Latin source; the material which is not one of the reductions now known, nearly all the Latin-derived sections of Col appear in one or other of those reductions, sometimes with nos for the arglweddlydd of Col. Thus nanachth brat arglweddlydd (Col § 284) = rogat prudendem (Lat. B 231, 15), and arglweddlydd a ddeiliaw brecon (Col § 332 = Rex vero tercium partem ... pro kynunnail (Lat. A 140. 10 - Lat. D 309. 6). But tolet e’r arglweddlydd xex on oem domino dopiliog (Col § 297) = domino dopiliog roddat (Lat. A 124. 49); yn llyw arglweddlydd (Col § 292) = in curia domini (Lat. B 250. 28 - Lat. D 259. 38), but yn llyw xex great y brenin in Bleg 8a. 4-5. It is of course impossible to say whether the changes from king to

the argument of a particular archetypal tractate are his arglweddlydawr. Only rarely does a manuscript substitute brenin for the arglweddlydawr found in others.

In the tractate on procedure in a claim to land, to which nothing corresponds in the earlier lawbooks, we seem to have a transitional document, in which the brenin of an archetypal tractate has been imperfectly replaced by arglweddlydd. Most of the Ior manuscripts have a sketch-plan of the arrangement of the tractate, which shows the king as presiding; in the text (including that of Col, which is the sketch-plan) the chief place is taken by the king or him who is in his place; and in later passages brenin and arglweddlydd seem to be interchangeable. In particular, the persons who are given as pledges by the parties are committed to the custody, sometimes of brenin, sometimes of arglweddlydd. Here we certainly seem to have a traditional description of procedure, slightly modified to meet thirteenth-century conditions; and as a pendant to this tractate we may note two more passages in Ior which relate to land. In one of these the rule (no doubt a late one) is laid down that dadanymud is available only where there has been gift and investiture with the land by an arglweddlydd; in the other, the arglweddlydd is associated with the kindred of a landholder in releasing the land from the kindred’s claim so that it can be paid over in satisfaction of the landholder’s liability for galanau.

What is the explanation of the complex pattern thus revealed? As I have already suggested, Jones Pierce’s political explanation is probably right for the rare examples of tynysog, and for the use of arglweddlydd in the prefatory material, but the pattern in the body of the texts seems to be too variegated for that explanation, and I suggest that it reflects a different development, a development of social organization with political implications—namely the increasing importance of franchial jurisdiction in thirteenth-century Gwynedd. The lawbook editors changed brenin to arglweddlydd in this or that particular rule, although they still regarded brenin as the proper title for a ruler, because they recognized that the right to be independently and optionally governed by that rule might not be in the king, but in the holder of a franchise.

Franchial jurisdiction was not a novelty in thirteenth-century Wales. The detailed account given in the Book of Llandaff of the privileges of the Bishop of Llandaff shows the recognition of extensive rights in the eleventh century at the latest, and the exercise of some rights of the same kind by the other Welsh bishops is attested in the Black Book of St. David’s, the Record of Caernarvon, and the Survey of the Honour of Denbigh. Monastic establishments, too, might have such rights; and where those rights belonged to a

lord were made by the compiler of Col or in his Latin exemplar.

1 e.g. for §1076, Col §874; cf. DuCl §250. In Col §10 arglweddlydd arall corresponds to terra nova in Lat. B 213, 25 and Lat. D 336, 99, for my phelpea in Bleg 35, 12, which suggests a mis-translation in Col: cf. p. 454 n. 9 above. Bleg has brenhinscyth in the territorial sense at 6a. 2, in the jurisdictional sense at 107, 11 = WML, p. 116, 18.

2 For §721/11, VC ii. xi. 13.

3 For §731/13, VC ii. xi. 19; Col §449.

4 brenin in Ior §76715, 77158 (VC ii. xi. 23, 30); arglweddlydd in Col §§479, 593, corresponding to these, and in Ior §§738 (VC ii. xi. 11).

5 For §§466, VC ii. xiii. 6; Col §571.

9 JDH, pp. iv, xxi, 47, 150.
Celtic establishment of the old tradition, they might be in secular hands, like those of the 'abbot's of the progeny of Cynan ap Llywarch,'1 or those which held the abadeth of Aberaron.2

There are a few references to these ecclesiastical franchises in the lawbooks. Apart from the little tractate on the Seven Bishop-Houses of Dyfed,3 the only references in Cyfn and Bleg are very oblique, as in the provision that the king is entitled to the penalty payable for fighting on his land between men of an abbey or a bishop, as well as for fighting between any of these and the king's men; the implication is that the jurisdiction of abbots or bishop in this matter is territorial rather than personal.4 In Ior and Col the references are more direct, but though here also the emphasis is on the king's interests. The passage in question begins with the assertion that it is not right for any land to be 'kingless,'1 and goes on to apply the principle by specifying the rights retained by the king in relation to abbots' land, to bishops' land, and to hospital land.

What we do not find in the lawbooks of the classical period is any clear indication of the extent of franchial rights held by laymen. There may be an oblique reference to some kind of franchise in the rule that 'unprivileged' land must not be given in substitution for 'privileged' land, such as which carries an office or rhudd—literally freedom, translated franchise by Aeneurin Owen.6 Ior records the right of the ussher to exercise lordship (arglwyddiaeth) over his aliens,7 but the wording of the corresponding passage in Col suggests that what is in question is the right or duty to hold a court for these dependants, a right which was surely regarded in the thirteenth century as tenurial rather than franchial.

So much appears from the quo warranto proceedings conducted in North Wales during the principate of the Black Prince: when Llywelyn ap Grwnw claimed to hold a court for his men and tenants of the manor of Trefcastell and vill of Gwredog, for all pleas except pleas of the Crown and effusion of blood, the court held that this was no more than was conceded to everyone as incidental to his tenure, and could be allowed to him without proof of special entitlement.8

1 SHD, p. 187. Cynan ap Llywarch was roughly contemporary with Llywelyn the Great, for he bought from Tangywyl Coch (mother of Cynulliad ap Llywelyn) land at Blodugain given to her by Llywelyn: SHD, p. 128.
3 See T. M. Charles-Edward, BBCC xxiv (1971), 242–47.
4 Bleg 80, 7. WML, pp. 38, 10, 60, 1; the latter (Cyfn version raises a new problem, since the land in question is called tir teyrn and the teyrn receives the privilege, though the men involved are gwyd breocs. Cf. WML, p. 22, 19. 'Pan archo bard y teryn' (= Bleg 22, 18; 'Or dewd bard telyn y credh at y brechyn') and WML, p. 114, 11, 'Or yr hy llog af tir teyrn y teyrn brenin, ac yr teryn llog yr tir escloc dau hanher yw rhy g y brenhin ar ar y crech' (= Bleg 81, 27–81. 1, 'Or yr teryn llog yr tir escloc, dau hanher yw cynnlw y brenhin y brenhin'.

The same sessions of the royal justices, however, show more extensive claims; in support of these, some of the religious houses produce charters of Llywelyn the Great and Llywelyn ap Grwnw to Grwnw, but the lay claimants rely on prescription from time out of mind. This does not prove that the laymen's rights did not originate in a prince's grant: the grant may not have been put into writing, the writing may have been lost, or the claimants may have doubted whether it was wise to draw English attention to the grant of a Welsh prince. But whatever the reason for the claimants' silence, the probability is that some of these special rights were created by the prince for a few favoured laymen, of whom the most important were certainly the family of civil servants from which was to spring the Tudor dynasty of England, the descendants of Ednyfed Fychan. The privileged tenure of 'Wyron Eden' is of course well known, and need not be discussed here:1 what has perhaps not been adequately considered is that the rights held by branches of this family were so extensive as to amount to a franchise, which means that certain royal rights were exercised, not by the head of state, whom lawbook writers still called breynin, but by the holder of the franchise, whom they could only call arglwydd.2

This explanation of the increasing use of arglwydd in the thirteenth-century lawbooks cannot be conclusively proved correct. Nor can it stand alone as an explanation of the fluctuating terminology of the various parts of the various manuscripts of the various lawbooks. It does, however, seem to correspond to some significant facts of the thirteenth-century situation.3

Aberystraeth

Dafydd Jenkins

ABBREVIATIONS

AC Annales Cambriae, ed. J. Williams ab Ithel (Rolls Series, 1860).
AL Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales (see p. 451 n. 3).
BS Brenhined y Saeson, ed. Thomas Jones (Cardiff, 1971).
Bleg see p. 452 n. 3.
Col see p. 452 n. 1.

1 See Glyn Roberts, 'Wyron Eden', Aspects of Welsh History, pp. 179–214. Llywelyn ap Grwnw was himself one of this family.
2 The quo warranto proceedings deserve detailed study in the light of Professor Donald W. Sutherland's Quo Warranto Proceedings in the Reign of Edward I (Oxford, 1963): the most superficial examination will show the application in the Welsh proceedings of principles developed in the period studied by Sutherland.
3 I did not see Mr. Donald Howells's article, 'The Four Exclusive Possessions of a Man' (Cymdeithas Cylch, viii–ix, 48–60), until I had finished revising the present paper for publication; so my only comment on this valuable new contribution must be that Mr. Howells seems to have removed the difficulty which I felt over the lord to whom a boy is commended, by his interpretation in terms of a client-patron relationship which is in a proper sense feudal, though it does not necessarily involve any tenure of land as Anglo- Norman feudalism does.
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History and Law
Gruffydd Llwyd and the Celtic Alliance, 1315–18

The importance of Sir Gruffydd Llwyd in political and administrative affairs in the early fourteenth century has long been recognized. His career is characterized by a consistent loyalty to Edward II; he attended court, he served on the king's campaigns in Scotland, and he participated in the administration of the principality of Wales by serving in several offices and upon innumerable special commissions. Llwyd played a key role in the conflict of 1322 as a supporter of the king; he was prominent among those who remained faithful to Edward II even after his deposition. This paper examines the part which Gruffydd Llwyd played in a critical situation which arose between 1315 and 1318. The problems considered are studied by particular reference to a group of documents, printed below, which have a bearing on both Llwyd's career and our understanding of the broader problems of political allegiance in this period. In the summer of 1315 the king's council was faced with a vigorous campaign which was being waged in Ireland by Edward Bruce and a Scottish force supplied by his brother Robert Bruce. Bruce's campaign was launched in May, and during the next month the king issued the first of a number of orders intended to provide for the defence of Wales if the Scots were to endeavour to extend their activities from Ireland to Wales. It is clear, from several sources, that more was involved than the maneuvering of castles and the guarding of coasts. There was an underlying anxiety lest the Welsh might themselves be inclined to rise with the Scots if an invasion of Wales were attempted. This evidence is important since it reveals an awareness on the part of the Crown that there was discontent within the communities of the royal lands of Wales which might affect their loyalty. Thus in June the justices of the principality were ordered not only to see to the defence of the coasts and the supply of castles but to 'suppress tumults'. Three weeks later a judicial commission was appointed to inquire into allegations of oppression by the king's officers in the principality. The same features are noticeable in the measures taken during the autumn. Late in September information concerning the state of North Wales was sent from Caernarfon to Westminster by the justice, and the appointment of a royal clerk, Stephen le Blund, to survey and supply

1 My thanks are due to Dr. Patricia Barnes, Professor A. M. Duncan, Dr. R. F. Frame, and Dr. Brynley F. Roberts for their most helpful suggestions upon the problems raised in this study. Dr. Barnes drew my attention to the petition, P.R.O., S.C. 58/8/11, and very kindly allowed me to publish her transcript of the text, which appears below, Text I, ii. I am also grateful to Mr. Ceri Davies and Dr. R. T. Fritchard, both of whom kindly agreed to read the letters printed in Text II and offered valuable comment upon questions of Latin orthography.

2 J. G. Edwards, 'Sir Gruffydd Llwyd', E.H.R. x (1914), 569-601; idem, 'Sir Gruffydd Llwyd', D.W.R., p. 319. For the older and erroneous view see T. F. Yoos, D.N.B. xxvii (1893), 1, and for a late instance of its influence see Hor Williams, Y Balam, v (1915), 131-2.

3 These problems will be considered in an essay by the present writer which will appear in The Welsh History Review, viii (1916-17). Further references will be made in that study to the sources relevant to the broader theme.