Carieartheshire is no longer a political unit, nor was it a political unit in medieval times: the county which existed from 1544 (when Loughorne, Ystwyth, and Llansteffan were transferred to it from Pembroke) to 1974 brought together eastern Dyfed, Ystrad Tywi, and the three commotes (which were to give a name to the notorious Three Commotts Turnpike Trust) of Cunliff, Cwmdonkin, and Iscudra, the last-named having earlier been a part of Ystrad Tywi. For the present paper this mixed origin has the advantage that we can draw on material from three medieval areas, and we naturally look first to eastern Dyfed, to Whitland in the extreme west of Carmarthenshire, where Hywel Dda is said to have convened an assembly of representatives from all parts of his realm to revise the law.

Now it is unfortunately still necessary to emphasise that whatever Hywel may have done, at Whitting or elsewhere, he did not promulgate at Whitting in the mid-tenth century any of the law texts, in Welsh or Latin, which now survive. This has to be emphasised because the traditional name Cyfrif Hywel, 'the Law of Hywel', has led to the assumption, sometimes made by those who should know better, that anything found in a medieval law text from Wales represents the law or the social or economic circumstances of tenth-century Wales. We shall have more to say about texts and manuscripts later on; at this stage the important fact is that the evidence for the assembly at Whitting goes no farther back than the early thirteenth century.

This fact was the starting-point for the late Sir Goronwy Edwards' examination of the tradition about the Whitting assembly. His conclusion was that it could not be proved that Hywel had promulgated any law, but that if any book of laws was promulgated by Hywel, it would almost certainly be done with the concurrence of an assembly of the leading persons, ecclesiastical and lay, of the districts which acknowledged his rule:

he went on to say.

The mere location of Hywel's assembly (if there was one) is in itself, however, a matter of interest rather than of importance. So perhaps for the present we need neither accept nor reject the White House: having plucked it out, as Maitland would say, and inspected it in the modern daylight, we may once more tenderly put it back into the medieval haze.

Today most (if not all) students of Welsh Law would agree that Hywel did something for law which established the tradition that (save for certain local variations) the law was the same for all Wales; though Wales was so seldom anything like a political unity in the Middle Ages, it was a jurisprudential unity.

We can go a little farther, for if Hywel did his work with the help of a representative assembly, this was perhaps as likely to have been held at
Whiteland as anywhere else. There seems to be no positive evidence that Hywel was ever at any particular place in Wales, but it is very much more probable that he was sometimes at Whiteland—not because (as one version of the lawbook purports) he had a hunting lodge there, but because there was there a royal residence of the princes of Dyfed. Dyfed was the first part of Wales so extensively mentioned in a lawbook, and it would be obvious prudence to bring the representatives of other parts of Wales to the region in which his authority had been longest established. As for the objection that a journey to Whiteland would be intolerably burdensome to representatives from the northern districts, this can be countered by the persuasive suggestion, made at the Whiteland celebration in 1579, that those representatives would combine their journey to the assembly with a pilgrimage to St Davids. But however Hywel did for Welsh Law, he did not create it, and the Carmarthenshire connection with that law is much older than Hywel, for the earliest surviving written material in Welsh is the record of a transaction relating to land in Carmarthenshire—in Ystrad Tyws—written at the end of the eighth century. This is the record known from its first word as the Surenys memoriam, which is written on the marbled cover of the Lichfield Gospels. This volume has been ascribed to the Book of St Chad in honour of the patron of Lichfield Cathedral, where it has been since at least the thirteenth century, but it is now accepted that 'the Book of Lichfield' will be a better name, and that the volume's connections are with Llandaf rather than with Llandaff as was earlier thought. The Surenys memoriam is a mixture of Welsh with a little Latin, and in it we seem to catch the Welsh-speaking style (which was certainly already capable of dealing with highly technical matters) in the process of displacing Latin as the language of record; we can perhaps see the clerk beginning to translate into Latin according to his old custom, and realising as he went on that he could save himself trouble by recording the transaction in the Welsh in which it was conducted. He will have used Latin words where they came conveniently to hand, just as a Welsh-speaking clerk today would be as likely to write 'significat' at a BC as at a QC (Geoffreoth Dafydd Brydeinig). The text has been frequently studied in some detail, most notably by Sir John Rhys in Gwynogwrwyn Evans's edition of the Book of Llan Dafy and by Sir John Morris-Jones in his Taliesin.English translators have usually represented the Latin parts of the original, following the same general principles that we apply closely as our understanding of the text allows:

Turbuch son of Llun and the son-in-law of Tutu in the land of the son of Geling in the land of Bluc son of Geling and the son of Tutu in the land of Iogita. They contended long about it. At last they judged the son-in-law of Tutu by law. The good men bought one another ‘Let us make peace’. Bluc afterwards gave a horse, three cows, three newly-calfed cows, only that there might be no hatred between them from the ruling afterwards till the day of death. Tutubuch and his kin quarter afterwards no title- deed for ever and ever. As we hope to comment fully on the text elsewhere, we refer only to two points at which our departure from Morris-Jones's translation makes a significant difference to the sense of the passage. In the first place, we have inserted the definitive article before son-in-law in the first sentence, in order to leave open the question whether Tutubuch and the son-in-law are the same person—for the references in the later part of the text suggest that they are not. Secondly we have replaced Morris-Jones's 'dispossesses the son-in-law of Tutubuch by law' by 'judgeth by law' (using judjeuge to mean 'give an advantageous judgement against') because the Welsh 'disposes' is not translated into English, and it has in some thirteenth-century texts a modernised counterpart, 'difarnant y geirfeith', in which the element bares has replaced bare (both meaning judgement) and the more usual cyfeirch has replaced gair as the word for law.' From the legal effect of the document we turn to the location of Geling in Wales. There are several places in South Wales whose names include the element Telych, which looks like the Latin form of the name: the hamlet of Telych is a part of the parish of Llandilig (Llandover), and Professor Glanville Jones has drawn attention to a place in Mynach Llŷs immediately adjoining Llandogo as well as in Cefn Telych. 'A hill-slope a mile or so south-west of the gold mines of Dolau Cothi and within the parish of Cefn, which Melville recorded as "certain that . . . Telych . . . was in the parish of Cefn, eleven miles north of Llandilo-Fawr", he gave no grounds for his certainty, but one does not lightly dissent from Melville's Richard's judgement on Welsh place-names, mentioning that it is placed 'Tir Telych rather nearer to Llandilo Fawr'. At any rate we can feel sure that Tir Telych was in Carmarthenshire, as were other places named in marginal membranda in the Lichfield Gospels. These membranda have been examined in detail by Glanville Jones, and will be only briefly mentioned here. Manuscript mod dimunth (in modern spelling Maenor Meddyffrhyd), now represented by Myddynfach, a suburb of Ammanford; tref gwaed (Trefedyddog) was a bond township north of Pumsaint. From his study Glanville Jones draw the encouraging conclusion that these marginal entries suggest that already by the mid-ninth century settled rights in land were old-established in Wales. Viewed in terms of these entries, three of the customary tenures recorded in the lawbooks appear to have ancient roots. There are tir goedfl-og, tir eifryr, and tir cordian.

Carmarthenshife thus provides us with some evidence from well before Hywel's time which connects the practice of that era withised with the theory stated in the lawbooks well after Hywel's time. This supports the view that Hywel may well have been a reformer of Welsh Law, but was certainly not a lawyer innovating on a large scale.

To the lawbooks we can now turn, and first to the Latin texts. Here there has been a change of view in recent years as the result of certain debated studies. It was long believed that the oldest surviving lawbook from Wales was the Latin manuscript Peniarth 28 ("Latin A"), and (partly because of this belief) some scholars argued that the law was originally written in Latin, though it was admitted that the Welsh technical terms would have been left untranslated. This argument seemed to receive some support when it was shown that one of the terms used in the Welsh, the Blegywyrd Redaction, was a translation from a Latin exemplar related to a Bodleian Library manuscript, Rawlinson C.273 ("Latin D"); the most important evidence was provided by mistranslations or Latinisms in the Welsh version.1 Closer examination of the Latin texts, however, reveals hints of translation from the Welsh; if Latinisms betray the origin of the Blegywyrd Redaction, Latin A seems to have its Welsh.

Moreover, Latin A is no longer believed to be the oldest surviving text. Whereas it was dated by Gwynogwrwn Evans to the late twelfth century, Mr. Daniel Hawkes has now shown good reason to place it in the mid-thirteenth century, so that it is almost certainly later than one or two of the Welsh manuscripts of the Ionwort Redaction. However, Hawkes has also shown that Latin A was at one time at Canterbury, so that it may well have been from this manuscript that Archbishop John Peckham got the knowledge of Welsh Law which made him so uncharitably critical of it.11 It certainly seems most likely that the Latin versions were prepared for the use of great men in Church or State, who could not read the original Welsh texts. When we ask where or by whom the Latin versions were produced, we get no positive answer, but a reference to one Latin book (which does not survive) is suggestive. Among the books said to have been used in compiling the 'Justice's Test Book' was (according to some manuscripts) the 'old book of the White House' (bren hefr y Ty Gwyn).16 This can hardly have been the original record of the Whiteland assembly, or there would have been more reference to it; it is no doubt to be understood as a manuscript kept at the Cistercian monastery at Whiteland, and was certainly not a lawyer innovating on a large scale.

To the lawbooks we can now turn, and first to the Latin texts. Here there has been a change of view in recent years as the result of certain debates. It was long believed that the oldest surviving lawbook from Wales was the Latin manuscript Peniarth 28 ("Latin A"), and (partly because of this belief) some scholars argued that the law was originally written in Latin, though it was admitted that the Welsh technical terms would have been left untranslated. This argument seemed to receive some support when it was shown that one of the terms used in the Welsh, the Blegywyrd Redaction, was a translation from a Latin exemplar related to a Bodleian Library manuscript, Rawlinson C.273 ("Latin D"); the most important evidence was provided by mistranslations or Latinisms in the Welsh version.1 Closer examination of the Latin texts, however, reveals hints of translation from the Welsh; if Latinisms betray the origin of the Blegywyrd Redaction, Latin A seems to have its Welsh.

This sentence is the third after a lacuna (of one leaf) in the manuscript, so that it may refer to a comprehensive list of objections, set out on the missing leaf, rather than to the material from
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the Whittland Book already cited; hence we cannot be quite sure that that book was in Latin.

Be that as it may, the Whittland Book was evidently an important authority for the compiler of the Colun version, and this fact becomes the more notable when we remember that the nucleus of the version was the Isorwerth Redaction which came together in Gwynedd early in the thirteenth century in the favourable atmosphere created by the political success of Llywelyn the Great. The script and language of Colun show that it was written in Gwynedd; its reference to the Whittland Book and its identifiable borrowings from other versions show that those versions were also recognised as authoritative, and suggest that the scriptorium at Whittland Abbey may have been recognised as a storehouse of legal learning. At the very least we can say that even if Whittland never saw a codifying assembly in the tenth century, it had a famous lawbook in the thirteenth. From Whittland Abbey it is natural to turn to its most distinguished benefactor, Rhyd ap Gruffudd, the 'Lord Rhys', who died in 1207 after exercising for so many years the leadership over all the rulers of southern Wales which was recognised by the English crown when Henry II conferred on him the title of Justice of South Wales in 1172. This is not the place to elaborate on Rhys's importance in so many fields; but it would be surprising if so prominent a ruler had left no mark on the law, and there are in fact references to him in manuscripts of the Blegwyr Redaction and its Latin counterpart.

What is at first sight rather surprising is that one of these references is to be found in the Laws of Court. In its section on the Chief Groom Latin Redaction D, after saying that the Groom is entitled to the king's cavalry and other riding equipment, add:26

Ræzus filius Grithulfii dicit quod postquam clandert portu cum intrantur tier illa die vel statam liber sit, numus reddet.

This passage does not appear in the corresponding Welsh texts; it may be translated:

Rhyd ap Gruffudd says that after he crossed the gate after entering, though that day or immediately he be free, he should pay money.

The meaning is not obvious, but it seems clear that the reference is to a payment connected with the formal organisation of the court. Its presence indicates that if the court was no longer the focal activity of the Heroic Age which the Laws of Court so often suggest, its formal constitution was still important in Rhys's day.

The other references to Rhys are all to a change in the law relating to the value of animals. An important tractate in the law manuscripts is simply a list of the standard values of animals; it is to this tractate that the lawbooks refer when they speak of Gwyth Gwythli a Dof ('the value of wild and tame') as part of the knowledge essential to an yndal. These standard values would be the normal measure of compensation in cases involving animals; and to cover the cases not specifically provided for, the Blegwyr Redaction had a blanket provision:

Pob ydd ym y gwerth kyfreith awen, damwng a gold ym yndaw lawery kyfreith Hywel

That is,

For everything which has no legal value, appraisal is obtained according to the law of Hywel.

One group of manuscripts (that represented in Williams and Powell's Llyfr Blegwyrd by MS. L) adds:27

Rys ab grufftf arbennig deheubarth trwy deunwed at what a onesed gwerth damwng ar llwyddin nyt ams aegur, or percynn y talhyn y lwylon y gwerth y wnedel ariau ac y cadfif yu ystadaw.

Rhyd ap Gruffudd the successor of Deheubarth by agreement with his country prescribed appraisal value for every animal, so that the owner should swear that his animal was worth the value which he set on it, and that he would get that for it.

The references at Lat D 361.35 and 380.30 are less clear, but seem to mean much the same thing. We can safely assume that the law was changed because prices had so fluctuated that the standard values could not, in the late twelfth century, be safely accepted as reflecting the economic conditions of the time. For the legal historian, however, the significance of the actual change made in the law is perhaps not that of the fact that any change was made at all. In medieval Wales political authority was so variable that anything in the nature of legislation was rare, and this change made by Rhys is a small but clear sign of his unusually strong position. What agreement with his country meant is not easy to say; the phrase certainly echoes the assertion of the Blegwyr preface that Hywel

laid the course of God and his own and that of all Wales in whose sphere he did not accept the law as promulgated, unless it could be improved by the consensus of country and lord.

The Blegwyr Redaction (a re-translation from the Latin, as we have seen) has a special association with Carmarthenshire. It gives a special status, in its version of the Laws of Court, to the Lord of Dinefwr, and it has recently been realised that some manuscripts of the Redaction were written in the immediate neighbourhood of Dinefwr, though this happened after the fall of the dynasty of Rhyd ap Gruffudd. One of these manuscripts, in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, was re-discovered there by Mr. J. Enoch Powell and described by him in 1936; it is remarkable as one of the few manuscripts of Welsh Law which tell us anything about their scribes. It has a Latin incipit:

Gulielmus Wasta hoc opus scriptit:

and a Welsh colophon, beginning:

Llywio diwedodd
wel a ucyfrewn
gylliwn wasg a heurteiced
Dinefrhwyd 5 y ric ydol y tat ar

The leaf has been damaged by rats, which have removed the letters representing dots. In the first line we can confidently restore llywyr a gwyth-
reith yu by y cerdd and in the second we can complete ucyfrewn y yst and supply ym at the end of the the leaf; between these two words there is perhaps room for the name of the place where the copy was made, or (rather less probably) that of the person for whom it was made. Y Dinefrthwyd could be one of several places in Wales: it was in fact the New Town of Dinefwr, which seems to have lain where the present mansion of Dinefwr stands, there being an older town adjoining the old castle. The new town was apparently established in 1298, and there is in the Public Record Office a redditus avisella de Dinefwr for the year Edward I (1302-3) which includes the entry:28

Burgenses Anglice de villa inferiori que vocatur nossa villa

Johannes de Mora tenet | burgum super j acram terre mesure 14 de Kermertun redditi
Willelmus de Lyci tenet | burgum super j acram terre redditi xi d.

Though Gwilym Was Da was an 'English Burgess', we need not assume that he was English in any other sense, for among his fellows there were many whose names show how Welsh they were: Thomas Wyndol, Gronou Coch, Thomas ab Hosei, Hosei Kyyorg, Jehwan ab Mathew, Grufftf Went (to give them in the spelling of the record).

The Trinity College manuscript (Tr) is the only one which bears Gwilym's name, but he also wrote the two manuscripts of the Blegwyr Redaction which are now in the National Library of Wales as Peniarth 36A and 36B (the O and N respectively of Ascurrin Owen's edition). The three manuscripts have some features in common, the most notable being their omission of the Laws of Court, which were discarded as being out of use. Gwencryg Evans took this as meaning that the manuscripts concerned had been written after the fall of Llywelyn ap Gruffudd in 1282, but as Powell pointed out in 1942, there is no reason to connect the omission, in a text written in Deheubarth, with the catastrophe of Gwythydd. The elaborate court ritual of the Heroic Age must have fallen into disuse long before.29 There may however be some significance in the fact that it was the English burgesses of Neutron Dinefwr who first realised how anachronistic this tractate had become. He can hardly have failed to be conscious of the contrast between Dinefwr and the château of Peterborough by this time.

Having thus seen how social or political changes were perhaps affecting even the cloistered lawyer who was expected to be a compendium of law for daily use, we turn back about a quarter of a century to see what some people in Carmarthenshire thought the practice of the law was—or at least what they thought they should tell those in authority they thought it to be. In 1281 Edward I sent into Wales as commissioners of inquiry Thomas Bek, Bishop of St De Davids, Reginald de Grey, and Walter de Hopton, with instructions to inquire29
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and to answer more detailed questions. Among those who gave evidence at Lampard's inquest, that is, at the new borough chartered by Edward in 1377, which we now call Aberystwyth, was the Abbots of Whitland; and it may be worth noting that the Latin is de Alba Domino (a literal translation of the Welsh Ty Gwyn), not the de Alba Lundo which we should have expected. The Abbots agreed with the evidence given by an earlier witness, but he added that if a party wish to make plain of false judgment twelve men ought to be convened from each liberty together with the judge of St Davids, and if it be found before them that it was badly judged before, the court shall be convicted of false judgment by their decree.

The next witness was the Abbots of Strata Florida, who agreed with the Abbots of Whitland in everything, except that he knew nothing of the judge of Ystrad Tywi. We should not expect a man from Ceredigion to know of the judge of Ystrad Tywi except by hearsay, and the fact that there is no mention of a judge of Ceredigion suggests that the judicial hierarchy was less fully organised in Ceredigion than in Ystrad Tywi. The reference to the judge of Ystrad Tywi certainly indicates that the professional administration of justice had been carried further by the princes of Deheubarth in the country surrounding their chief seat than could have been deduced from any of our lawsbooks. For the lawsbooks, if they had been written at all, are scattered and not related to the English lawsbooks and records of Deheubarth, and there is no mention in any of Gwilym Waw Da's manuscripts of any kind of judicial system.

No legal historian will be much surprised by this contrast between reported practice and the theory of the lawyers' books, and we must be careful in assessing the next piece of evidence about Welsh Law in Carmarthenshire, which on the face of it seems to depict law in action in Ystrad Tywi, but which probably in the fifteenth century —a hundred years after Gwilym Waw Da. The material with which we are concerned is a small collection of what Asarem Owen called *plante*: they are in fact precedents for pleading in various kinds of action, statements of claim, to use the modern English term of art. They were examined by the Rev. Gruffydd Evans nearly seventy years ago, and our conclusions will not differ materially from those of his.

The plantes are printed in Owen's Book XII. Owen's primary source for Plantes 1-8 was the manuscript in which he gave the sigillum Q, which is now the deposited Wynnstay manuscript 36 at the National Library; this is a handsome copy in excellent condition, written by a scribe who also wrote a copy of the Welsh translation of Geoffrey of Monmouth's History, in MS. Penrhyn 263. It has all the appearance of being a 'library edition' as contrasted with the well-worn pocketable little books which seem to have been made for the day-to-day use of practitioners. According to Owen, Plant xi, for which his primary source was MS. Penrhyn 40 (his K) was also in Q; this is unfortunately not true, and the variant readings in this plant, which Owen attributed to Q, are in fact those of the manuscript which is now in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston, and which has been identified as that once owned by William Phillips of Brecon and used for Leges Walliciae (1730) where it has the sigillum P. Hence the early dates cited by Owen for this manuscript's variants are evidence for the terminus a quo of the Boston manuscript rather than of Q, and we have no materials which is both lost and located—for Plant xi has no reference to any place.

Plant 1-8, however, all place the land in dispute, or the act which gave rise to the action, at specific points which are known to the local community. The plantes, then, contain the records of the marches and lords, which undertakes it; we must confine ourselves to mentioning briefly some of the points made in the first plant, a claim for land by land by kin and de- scendant (a chwv y sistro). Here the plaintiff first identifies the land claimed; then he traces his descent and that of the defendant from their common ancestor, of which it has been excluded from the land, and asserts that he has not acquiesced in this exclusion but has followed the proper procedure of breaking ploughs on the land and complaining to the court. He offers to prove his descent by the oath of elders of the county, and affirms that 'law is open', because the date is 9 May, when access to the law was again available after the spring recess for ploughing and sowing.

These precedents can thus be taken as authentic, in the sense that they are appropriate to the law. Whether they are authentic in the sense that they are based on actual cases is another question which we cannot now answer, and which it may never be possible to answer; but there can be no doubt about their Carmarthenshire interest. This appears at its most striking in the dating of certain incidents by reference to dawns Gwyl Dafydd 'afydd (the last St Teilo's Day, i.e. 9 February), but the location of the plantes is more important. We have already noticed that two of the plantes seem to be located within the borough of Llanllwydi.

One other is evidently from the country outside the borough: it is a claim to land in Cwmwad Hirfryn, which was served by the church of Llandadog and its chapels and was not subdivided for administrative purposes as Cwmwd Peredffaid: the moor and borough of Llanllwydi made up the whole of the commune. Because of this subdivision of Cwmwd Peredffaid, that commune is not named in any of the plantes: instead they are named in Maenor Lan y Deudsant (Plantes i and ii), Maenor Ffâdfeiri (ii, vii), Maenor Wynaf (vii), and Maenor Fabion (v), i.e. Llanddeusant, Myddfai, and Gwyrne will be familiar to everyone, but Maenor Fabion needs explanation. To quote Gruffydd Evans.

The name still lives in Maenwdfordd, on the left bank of the Tywi, opposite Llanyrafon (also called Mahon Hen) was one of the Saints Llandabon, subject to Llanyrafon, and is dedicated to him. Maenor Fabion, however, was not served by a Llanfabon, but by a Llan Dyddysol.

and as he points out, Plant x places the theft complained of ymwyll Llan Dyddysol o'r ynoedd y caemau Ystrad Tywi. Llan Dyddysol, the church of the place called on the Ordnance Survey map Capel-tybyst (grid reference 667240), which one of us visited in 1979, when the farmer, Mr Arwyn Davies, was able to identify the main gables of the church and the site of the churchyard. The matter of the church on the site and to tell her that the field below the farmhouse was called Caer' Ysgoldigion. To a modern ear ysgoldigion are scholars, but there can be little doubt that the word has here its medieval meaning and that the ysgoldigion were the clerks who served the church.

These precedents may not be based on actual cases: they may owe as much to the idle ingenuity of some draftsmen as to the practice of the courts which really administered the law in the
lordship of Llandovery. We are on safer ground when we come to two cases from the early sixteenth century, which were transmitted some years ago by Mr J. Beverley Smith and kindly made available to us by him. Both these cases come from 'The Three Commotes', the first from Iscanwen, the second from Cydweli.

In the first case, heard at the commote court of Iscanwen held at Llanddarog on 10 December 1507 before Howel ap Henry, deputy for Gruffudd ap Hen, the commote court held that the plaintiff's ancestor was the legal owner of land in the commote of Cydweli. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question.

In the second case, heard at the commote court of Iscanwen held at Llanddarog on 10 December 1507 before Howel ap Henry, the deputy for Gruffudd ap Hen, the commote court held that the plaintiff's ancestor was the legal owner of land in the commote of Cydweli. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question. The court's decision was based on the claim of a man known as 'Edmund ap Siôr', who claimed to be the rightful owner of the land in question.

[The text continues with further case descriptions and detailed legal analysis, which are not transcribed here.]
Welsh Law in Carmarthenshire

1 For our use of 'Ystrad Tywi' we can offer the excuse that this was a convenient geographical description, but brings out unmistakably the fact that the district had no ancient or traditional boundaries. (Later History of Wales 1965) during which the fact was in the mind set of the laws that the labour of Holywell': 'History of Carmarthenshire (1961) by dyspry, the Book of Waes 280, also named in MS. F. (Pen). 34, a fifteenth-century manuscript: J. Evans, 'The Old Testament in the Welsh Language', p. 267. The readings attributed in AL to W were apparently taken from Robert Vaughan's transcription in Penrith 278: Report i. 956. It now seems that H, a court-hand manuscript, may be approximately earlier than the early fifteenth-century date given by Gwenogvryn Edwards, Report i. 956.

2 LWT. 457, 14-30.


4 Dr. R. Gervais Gruffydd has suggested that the Black Book of Carmarthen (MS. Pen. 1117) may prove to have been written at Whittington Abbey rather than at the Augustinian Priory of Carmarthen with which it has usually been associated: 1969 a Ysgubor Hinaidol 16. If so, the Whittington scrivener was much more important than has yet been admitted.

5 LWT. 250-6; 46-64.

6 S. J. Williams and J. E. Powell, Life Bryngwyn (Cardiff, 1942; second edition, 1961, hereafter B.93)

7 Bleg 115-15.

8 Bleg 3, 26-9. 4-6. The use of asylgwyd in the second of the 'three authorities'; 'a large spurious presence in its form in the present time.


10 The record was altered by D. Llewellyn Thomas, January 1962 in a text:


12 Bleg 91-175; 18-47; 105-25.

13 This sum corresponds to that calculated from the lawbooks. Thus Bleg 35. 1-2 the relevant 'members of the hall' being identified by 57. 2-3, eyes, two years, two lips, and the nose, each of which is based on xvi: another, and in a similar text: since a cow is valued at £6, the value of each member is 1 £4, and the total of the items in £4.

14 The text is said to be worth as much as the total of the members already named, which is the same as the total of the parts of the body is finally stated in £8.

15 Bleg 101. 25-7.

16 Life Bryngwyn by A. S. T. Williams (ed. J. Beverley Smith; Cardiff, 1972), 370-79.

17 See Dafydd Innis, 'Wales and the Welsh Law' (Aberystwyth, 1968), passim.