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This thesis attempts to explain the papacy’s significance to Welsh polities and the Welsh Church prior to the Edwardian Conquest of Wales. Though there has been little sustained consideration of Wales and the papacy during this period, it has been thought that relations developed significantly after the eleventh century. The written work of Gerald of Wales, documents originating in the papal bureaucracy, Welsh chronicles, law codes, poetry, saints’ lives, charters and other administrative documents are used to test the veracity of this claim. The nature of the relationship between Welsh institutions and the papacy and changes in this relationship are also explored. Consideration is given as well to the influence of the papacy on Welsh society. It is hoped that the corpus of evidence identified might be used for further exploration of the history of Wales and the papacy.
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INTRODUCTION

This work examines the relationship between Welsh polities and ecclesiastics and the papacy before the Edwardian Conquest of Wales in 1282–83. It is not concerned with Welsh perceptions, uses and knowledge of Ancient Rome during the Medieval period. The corpus of evidence identified here will, it is hoped, be used as the basis for further work and the research presented aspires to fill a gap in Welsh historiography regarding relations with the papacy during this time.

Medieval historians interested in Wales have tended to concentrate either on internal political and social affairs, relations with the immediate neighbours of the Welsh polities or the fundamental work of editing texts. Given the cultural and historical significance placed upon Welsh poetry, it is surprising that texts of twelfth and thirteenth century poetry edited to modern scholarly standards were not available until the 1990s. An edition of the acts issued by Welsh rulers did not appear until 2005 and satisfactory texts of the Welsh Latin chronicles in their entirety appeared only during the lifetime of this project. Previously, much effort had been spent editing Middle Welsh chronicles, Welsh laws and some Saints Lives to scholarly standard. This is not to say that there has been no consideration of Welsh affairs and

---

3 H. Pryce with C. Insley, eds., The Acts of Welsh Rulers 1120–1283 (Cardiff, 2005). Segments of these chronicles had previously been edited and translated by Dumville, for which see Annales Cambriae, A. D. 682–954: Texts A–C in Parallel, ed. and trans. D. N. Dumville (Cambridge, 2002). Texts of the Welsh Latin chronicles were edited by Henry Gough-Cooper, and are available to download under the auspices of the Welsh Chronicles Research Group at http://croniclau.bangor.ac.uk/editions.php.en (viewed, April 15 2016). Full bibliographical references to each of the five chronicles are given in the bibliography.
developments in a European context. Huw Pryce has discussed the “europeanization” of Welsh society, and both Pryce and Charles Insley have analysed Welsh political and administrative culture in the light of developments elsewhere in Europe. Additionally, Chris Wickham has considered Wales’ importance to European history.

This being said, with editions of fundamental works missing, it is no wonder that there has been little consideration of the relationships between Wales and the papacy. Some effort has been devoted to this subject, with individual Popes and papal legates appearing in the historiography of medieval Wales, but there has been no sustained analysis of their importance to medieval Welsh polities and ecclesiastics. The paucity of evidence as well as its fragmentary nature must also be emphasised. However, in these limited analyses, certain themes emerge: travel and pilgrimage to Rome by laymen and ecclesiastics dominate references to the city in early Welsh chronicle entries. References to pilgrimage are also found in Welsh poetry and in Saints’ lives.


Much attention has been paid to the journey of Hywel ap Cadell of Deheubarth (also known as “Hywel Dda”, Hywel the Good) to Rome, recorded by several Welsh chronicles as occurring c. 928. Hywel’s demonstrable journey took on greater significance in the prologues of law texts from the thirteenth century, where it is claimed that Hywel had taken the laws of Wales, revised by him in accordance with the advice of wise clerics and laymen, to be blessed by the Pope. There is no evidence beyond these prologues to associate Hywel with a revision of Welsh law, let alone that he took laws with him to be blessed by the Pope. It seems more likely that Hywel’s tale was included to deflect contemporary criticisms of the law, perhaps most notably from John Pecham (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1279–92) and especially regarding hereditary rights.

Another pilgrim to Rome was Gerald of Wales, although he is best remembered not for his pilgrimage to Rome c. 1207, but for his campaign to raise St Davids to metropolitan status and for ratification of his election as bishop of St Davids. Gerald travelled to Rome three times for his campaign, often appearing in public and in some private meetings with Innocent III (1198–1216). At the same time, Gerald sought approval for the cult of Caradog Fynach, a hermit who had lived in the diocese of St Davids. Before he began his campaign, Gerald had acted as an agent of the papacy after being appointed by Richard of Dover, Archbishop of Canterbury and papal legate. Gerald concentrated on collecting tithes and imposing clerical celibacy. Elsewhere in his writing, Gerald demonstrates an interest in the papacy’s history.

---

9 Brut (RBH) 929 (pp. 12–13), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 8; 929, p. 6), BS 929 (pp. 30–1), Dumville, Annales Cambriae, 928, pp. 16–17.
Gerald’s was not the first appeal from a Welsh see to the Curia. Bishop Urban of Llandaff (1107–1134) had appealed to the papacy in a bid to expand the boundaries of his see earlier in the twelfth century. After Gerald’s time we see several trivial appeals from Welsh ecclesiastics for permission to hold additional benefices. Secular leaders also appealed to the papacy: Llywelyn ap Gruffudd (d. 1282) appealed for the release of his wife Eleanor de Montfort from captivity by Edward I (1272–1307) whilst his grandfather Llywelyn ap Iorwerth (d. 1240) had appealed for permission and subsequently disapproval of his proposed marriage to a princess of the Isle of Man.¹³

Llywelyn ap Iorwerth had also sought approval from the papacy of his arrangements for the succession of Dafydd, his son by his wife Joan, over Gruffudd his natural son by Tangwystl.¹⁴ Similarly, Richard Carew (Bishop of St Davids, 1256–80) sought approval from Alexander IV (1254–61) for an ordinance of vestments at St Davids.¹⁵ Several religious institutions in Wales and beyond sought confirmation from the papacy for land held in Wales. Such confirmations were utilised for Latin phrases for secular magnates’ grants such as the grant of Lord Rhys ap Gruffudd of Deheubarth (d. 1197) to the abbey of Strata Florida.¹⁶ Richard Carew, like Gerald, carried out work on the papacy’s behalf, being empowered to preach the crusade.¹⁷ Welsh ecclesiastics might be asked to conduct inquiries: Hywel, (Bishop of St Asaph, 1233–40), was asked to inquire into the dispute between Margaret de Lacey and her foundation at Aconbury, Herefordshire while the Abbots of Cymer and Aberconwy were instructed to inquire into Henry III’s apparent abuse of Dafydd ap Llywelyn’s rights.¹⁸ Equally, officials might be charged with overseeing instructions given by

¹³ Chapter 2, pp. 89–90 and pp. 82–3.
¹⁴ Chapter 2, pp. 84–5.
¹⁵ Chapter 2, pp. 69–70.
¹⁶ Chapter 3, pp. 113–15.
¹⁷ Chapter 2, pp. 80–1.
¹⁸ Chapter 2, p. 82 and pp. 87–8.
a Pope such as when the prior of Llanthony Prima was mandated to ensure that the
Dominicans did not establish themselves within Hereford so that other ecclesiastical
institutions were not impoverished.¹⁹

Welsh chronicles, perhaps reflecting the Cistercian milieu in which they were written, also
begin to take a greater interest in papal affairs. Whilst the early entries were devoted to
pilgrimages, later we are given notice of papal succession, the summoning of Church
councils and the activities of papal legates.²⁰ The legate Pandulf provided William of
Goldcliff for the vacant see of Llandaff whilst the most remarked upon contribution was that
of the legate Ottobuono.²¹ He was appointed by Clement IV (1264–68), his immediate
predecessor as legate, with explicit instructions to bring peace to the realm following the
second barons war. In this capacity, he conducted negotiations between Llywelyn ap
Gruffudd and Henry III, leading to the Treaty of Montgomery of 1267. This recognised
Llywelyn’s status, granting him the title “Prince of Wales” but ultimately proved to be his
undoing when a conflicting understanding of the relationship between the Crown of England
and the prince, allied with Llywelyn’s difficulties in meeting his financial obligations under
the treaty, came to the fore in the 1270s.²²

Documents containing financial information and issued as a result of papal directives also
mention Welsh churches. These include the Valuation of Norwich (1252-54) and documents
from the collectoriae, the accounts and records of taxes and annates collected in the papacy’s
name, of the Vatican Archives.²³ These documents describe the Welsh Church’s economic

---

¹⁹ Chapter 2, pp. 79–80.
²⁰ Chapter 3, pp. 97–112.
²² Chapter 3, pp. 120–21.
²³ W. E. Lunt, ed., The Valuation of Norwich (Oxford, 1926); L. E. Boyle, A Survey of the Vatican Archives and
standing, confirming its poverty in relation to English dioceses and indicating some problems associated with collecting taxes in Wales.

These examples give a flavour of the papacy’s influence on life in Wales during the period under consideration. In one of only two pieces which may be described in any way as sustained considerations of papal influence in Welsh affairs, R. R. Davies described Welsh relations with the papacy thus:

“In the eleventh century, Rome was no more than a distant shrine, a pilgrimage centre. Its ultimate authority over the church in Wales was recognized; but that authority barely impinged in a practical fashion on the country. As in so many other spheres, it was the first half of the twelfth century which witnessed the transformation… Unity with, and conformity to, international standards were increasingly the hallmarks of the Welsh church.”

Glanmor Williams reached similar conclusions in his introduction to the pre-conquest Welsh Church, stressing the correlation between the development of government and the manifestation of papal power in Welsh polities, stressing that “as the papacy evolved more intricate central and local machinery for governing the Church, so the Welsh dioceses, remote as they had previously been, were brought more firmly within its orbit.”

It is in consideration of these assessments that we shall move forward. In chapter 1 I shall discuss the numerous references to the papacy in the work of Gerald of Wales. Gerald refers frequently to the papacy, appealing to its history, treating the words of different Popes


24 AoC, p. 191 and p. 194; discussion of the papacy and Wales is found in ibid., pp. 190–4.

regarding, for instance, liturgical matters as authoritative and describing his own interactions with the papacy. These are used to explain Gerald’s importance to our understanding of the papacy’s role in medieval Wales. In chapter 2, I shall consider documents which ultimately originated in the Papal Curia, using them to discuss the interaction between the papacy and Welsh ecclesiastics and magnates. In chapters 3 and 4, I shall discuss the reception of the papacy and papal instruction in Welsh sources, examining Welsh chronicles, charters, letters patent, agreements, treaties, letters, lawcodes, poetry and saints’ lives.
CHAPTER 1: GERALD OF WALES AND THE PAPACY

The details of Gerald’s life and career are well known, but worth recounting briefly. Born in the castle of Manorbier to a prominent Marcher family around 1146, he was educated at St Davids, St. Peter’s Abbey, Gloucester and later spent three extended periods studying in Paris. He was appointed to the archdeaconry of Brecon by his uncle David fitz Gerald (Bishop of St Davids, 1148–76) before being made a royal clerk. He was twice nominated Bishop of St Davids and spent much of the period 1198–1203 attempting to have the second nomination confirmed and the see raised to metropolitan status. After his efforts failed, he retired from public life to concentrate on writing. He died c. 1223.

Gerald was a prolific author, writing historical works, ethnographies, hagiographies, polemics and autobiography. This chapter assesses the papacy’s role in Gerald’s writings. It first examines the place of the papacy in Gerald’s works and then discusses his encounters with Innocent III (1198–1216) and the Curia during the dispute and its aftermath.

---

1 Details of Gerald’s life, career and literary output are found in several places. The most detailed reconstruction is J. C. Davies, ‘Giraldus Cambrensis 1146–1946’, Archaeologia Cambrensis 99 (1946–7), 85–108 and 256–80, whilst M. Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis: The Growth of the Welsh Nation, 2nd ed. (Aberystwyth, 1976) gives a more concise overview at pp. 4–12. Robert Bartlett advanced the understanding of Gerald’s work enormously in his Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages (Stroud, 2006). Brynley Roberts gives a very valuable overview of Gerald’s life and work in B. F. Roberts, Gerald of Wales (Cardiff, 1982). All of these studies, combined with the other references on specific points, contributed to the information in this passage.


6 All of Gerald’s then known works were edited as part of the Rolls Series. At that time, it had not been realised that Gerald’s Speculum Duorum had survived. All references are given to this series unless the work has been superseded by more recent editions. Gerald of Wales (Giraldi Cambrensii), Opera, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. F. Dimock and G. F. Warner, 8 vols., Rolls Series 21 (London, 1861–91).
The papacy and its agents appear several times in Gerald’s writings, including recent events and actions, appeals to pseudo history, quotations from papal writings and the reproduction of apparently genuine papal letters. The *Itinerarium Kambriae* contains several types of references to the papacy which are typical of Gerald’s works.7 The third recension of this text, completed c. 1214, opens with Urban III (1185–87) at the head of a list of Europe’s rulers at that time.8 Despite the factual inaccuracy of Gerald’s statement- Clement III (1187–91) was Pope at the time of Gerald’s journey through Wales- it is interesting to note the pre-eminence Gerald accords the papacy. The list is highly structured, with precedence given to the Holy Roman and Byzantine Emperors over the Kings of France, England, Sicily, Hungary and Palestine. Gerald employs a similar device elsewhere in his work. The *Expugnatio Hibernica* records the death of Thomas Becket in relation to the reigns of Alexander III (1159–81), Frederick the Holy Roman Emperor (1155–90) and Louis VII of France (1137–80), a passage repeated in *De Principis Instructione*.9 This is but one of many instances where Gerald refers to earlier examples of his work. In her analysis of this “self quotation” in *Itinerarium Kambriae*, Henley suggests that part of Gerald’s reason for this was to “[position] himself as an authority on the same level of expertise as the other authorities he cites.” It seems certain that this may be applied to Gerald’s other works as well.10 Elsewhere in the *Expugnatio* Prince John’s arrival in Ireland is marked by reference to the papacy of Lucius III (1181–85) and the reigns of Emperor Frederick and Philip II of France (1180–1223).11 Gerald

---

11 Exp. II.32 (*Expugnatio*, pp. 228–9).
further deploys the device in his *Vita* of St. Hugh of Avalon, where the saint’s death is recorded by mention of Innocent III as Pope, Philip as King of France and John as King of England (1199–1216). In each case the Pope always appears first, demonstrating Gerald’s regard for the institution and the precedence it ought to take over secular powers.

Gerald frequently records the actions of the papacy and its agents. Some Popes are merely mentioned in passing. In the first division of *De Principis Instructione* for instance, where Gerald gives a history of Christianity, Adrian I (772–95) seeks Charlemagne’s help against the Lombards whilst Gerald also records the crowning of Charlemagne by Leo III (795–816). Closer to Gerald’s own time, Alexander III is mentioned as a benefactor of the Templars, Hospitallers and Cistercians and has having called a council in Tours. Gerald mentions that David, the then Bishop of St Davids and Gerald’s uncle, had raised a levy from his clergy so that he could attend, although the bishop seems not to have attended the council. Adrian IV (1154–59) is recorded granting privileges to the monks of St Albans.

In Gerald’s *Vita* of Geoffrey, Archbishop of York (1191–1212), Richard I (1189–99) sends a

---

14 Gerald of Wales, *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*, II (GCO iii.155); Gerald of Wales, *Speculum Ecclesiae*, III.12 (GCO iv.205).
15 R. Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163)* (Berkeley, 1973), pp. 24–25 and references. Gerald, claiming that this was the only time that his uncle had asked for money from his clergy, used his uncle’s example to admonish Geoffrey of Henlaw (Bishop of St Davids 1203–14) for being overly demanding of money from his clergy. Gerald of Wales, *Speculum Duorum or A Mirror of Two Men*, ed. Y. Lefèvre and R. B. C. Huggens, trans. B. Dawson and general ed. M. Richter (Cardiff, 1974), Letter 8.90–112 (pp. 266–9) and p. xlviii. On the career of Geoffrey, see Evans, ‘‘Bishops’, pp. 289–90.
delegation to the Curia to obstruct the election of Geoffrey, his brother, as the archbishop. Elsewhere, Gerald mentions the interdict placed on England. In each case, the papacy is seen as a powerful institution.

Twice we see the guidance of papal legates at Irish councils. Gerald describes the diocesan reform enacted under the instruction of the papal legate John Paparo and other reforms proclaimed at the Council of Cashel through the auspices of the Bishop of Lismore. A cardinal legate convenes a Church council in London whilst two other cardinals are sent to inquire into the death of Thomas Becket by Alexander III. Both this Pope and Becket are further associated when Gerald compares his own virtues with the latter, as both stood up to tyrants for the Church’s dignity. One of these cardinals, Vivian, is later seen serving in Ireland where he summoned a synod to discuss the Pope’s confirmation of the king of England’s rights over Ireland. Gerald himself received benefit from the papal legate John of Anagni, who absolved him from the need to go on crusade.

---

20 On this council, see below, p. 26.
22 Gerald of Wales, De Invectionibus, V.16 (Gerald of Wales, De Invectionibus ed. W. S. Davies, Y Cymmrodor 30 (1920), pp. 95–6).
24 Gerald of Wales, De Rebus a Se Gestis II.22 (GCO i.84–5 and Gerald of Wales, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, ed. and trans. H. E. Butler, (London, 1937, reprinted Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 116–17). See also Davies, ‘Giraldus’, p. 105 and Pryce, ‘Journey’, pp. 27–8. Following a change in papal policy, Gerald was forced to take the cross again so that he could pursue the matter of St Davids and his election without being excommunicated, but he was absolved of this necessity by Innocent III himself. See Inv., III.18 (Invectionibus,
individual Popes as well, with the consecration of John Cumin as Archbishop of Dublin by Lucius III and Gerald recording the event of the Third Lateran Council.\textsuperscript{25} In every instance the papacy is seen as an institution capable of expressing its jurisdiction.

Gerald made further use of the latter council in his writings. In a long letter to the chapter of St Davids, he complains over how he has been wronged by Bishop Geoffrey of Henlaw, whom he accuses of allowing unjustifiable charges to be levied.\textsuperscript{26} This, Gerald alleged, was against the express wish of the Lateran Council.\textsuperscript{27} It was a serious charge, but one of many used to assault Bishop Geoffrey’s reputation and later extended to others in Wales.\textsuperscript{28} In a further letter of complaint, this time written to the bishop himself, Gerald complains that he is acting contrary to the decreals of Alexander III regarding the revenues of vacant churches.\textsuperscript{29} Gerald clearly saw being in breach of a Pope’s instruction as a serious matter.

Gerald used a further reference to the Lateran Council and Alexander III to promote himself. He describes the departure of his former teacher Matthew of Anjou from Paris for the Council, having been summoned by Alexander III to be made a cardinal. Before leaving, Matthew suggested that Gerald should replace him as teacher.\textsuperscript{30} The implication is that if somebody is fit to be made a cardinal in the Pope’s eyes, his advice should be heeded.\textsuperscript{31}


\textsuperscript{26} Gerald of Wales, \textit{Symbolum Electorum}, XXXI (GCO i.323–4).

\textsuperscript{27} Gerald must be referring to Canon 4 of this council. For the Canons of this council, see N. P. Tanner, ed. and trans., \textit{Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils}, 2 vols. (London and Georgetown, 1990), pp. 23–25 and pp. 213–14.

\textsuperscript{28} De Reb., I (GCO i.48, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 67).


\textsuperscript{30} De Reb., II.2 (GCO i.48, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 67).

\textsuperscript{31} In an attempt at modesty Gerald refused the students’ overtures but later relented and lectured twice a day. De Reb., II.2 (GCO i.48 and \textit{Autobiography}, pp. 67–8).
Gerald turned to the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) in his *Speculum Ecclesiae*. In his old age, he sought to draw attention to abuses within the Church, seemingly composing this text prior to the council, but later revising it to reflect its proceedings. Gerald’s primary concerns in relation to the council were the securing of funding for the Curia and through it secure reform of the monastic orders. Gerald had been aware of the difficulty of funding the Curia for a long time and argued that the collection of Peter’s Pence from Wales and the introduction of a “great tithe” (*magnam decimam*) would be two advantages to the Roman Church of raising St Davids to metropolitan status.

Gerald also appeals to what modern scholarship might consider pseudo history. He describes how the Holy Roman Emperor Henry V (1111–25) was buried at Chester, having died there whilst atoning for his sins after conflict with Paschal II (1099–1118). The idea of Henry V as a penitent sinner appears to have become a trope by Gerald’s time. No contemporary Anglo-Norman chronicler mentions Henry in such a manner, and they are, if anything, complimentary about him, with William of Malmesbury making a direct comparison between the respective abilities of Henry V and Callixtus II (1119–24). Gerald also refers to Faganius and Duvianus, two missionaries supposedly sent by Pope Eleutherius to convert the

---

Britons. In both cases the papacy is shown to wield great authority, with Henry V becoming penitent having been bested by the Pope whilst the missionaries were operating with the papacy’s blessing. Whereas the references to Henry V’s burial or to the missionaries might have been recognised by contemporaries as pseudo-history, a third reference, to the forged ‘Donation of Constantine’ would have been unlikely to raise eyebrows at this date, since it was debunked only centuries later. This forgery draws on the fifth-century Legend of Silvester in which Emperor Constantine granted privileges and lands, including all islands, in the western empire to the papacy. In Gerald’s works, Pope Silvester, and by implication his successors, are shown ruling a wide dominion and so being in a position of power. The frequent references to the tale were also used by Gerald as a means of explaining how corruption was introduced to the Church.

As befits one who lectured on papal decretales in Paris, Gerald frequently quotes various Popes. Sometimes these quotations are on explicitly practical matters for churchmen. Gemma Ecclesiastica in particular is full of such references. Gerald quotes Clement I (92–99) when discussing the maintenance of implements used for mass and how to treat them when they wear out. Gerald refers to Urban II (1088–99) when discussing priests’ authority

---

37 Descr. I.18 (GCO vi.202, Journey, p. 253). For the setting of this text against its intellectual background see Bartlett, Gerald, pp. 147–71, and see also Richter, Giraldis, pp. 62–3 and Roberts, Gerald, pp. 87–9.
38 It was debunked by the humanists Lorenzo Valla and Nicholas of Cusa. W. Ullmann, A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages, 2nd ed. (London, 2003), p. 36, p. 77 and p. 317.
43 Gemma, I.10 (GCO ii.35–6, Jewel, pp. 29–30) and Spec. Eccl., IV.29 (GCO iv.331–2).
to hear the confession of someone under another bishop’s pastoral care, and to Fabian (236–50) and Gelasius I (492–96) on the frequency with which the faithful should receive the Eucharist. He quotes Popes when discussing the administration of other sacraments, such as his discussions on the reception of the last rites. He refers to Innocent I (401–17), Leo I (440–61), and Julius I (337–52) when discussing this topic. The frequency with which Gerald quotes Popes reflects the work of Peter the Chanter to whose *Verbum Abbreviatum* Gerald was indebted. The words of each Pope are treated with reverence and regarded as authoritative.

Such was Gerald’s regard for papal authority and jurisdiction that he felt that the papacy should deal with curious problems. In the *Topographia Hibernica* Gerald relates how a priest performed the last rites on a female werewolf. In response to a bishop uncertain what to do about the situation, Gerald suggests compiling accounts of the incident to send to the Pope for guidance. Beyond the obvious point concerning the existence of werewolves, Carey questions the reliability of Gerald’s tale as there was no synod in Meath in 1185 (the approximate date gleaned from Gerald’s statements in the *Topographia*), and as there is no record of any documentation being sent to Rome, concluding that Gerald’s story is indicative of it being an

---

“urban legend”. Regardless of this, Gerald’s opinion of papal authority is clear. If there was any doubt about correct procedure, then Gerald’s view is that the papacy’s advice could always be sought, no matter how odd the situation.

This is also true of the papal letters quoted at length by Gerald. The best known is the controversial papal bull Laudabiliter issued by Adrian IV in 1155. This bull, in conjunction with a later proclamation (Quoniam ea) attributed to Alexander III, was used to justify invading Ireland. Gerald also includes several letters concerned with the crusade and another letter on the Crown’s right to rule, which Gerald explicitly links to the Welsh in his rubric. Gerald is our only source for the latter letter and it is undatable beyond having been issued during the pontificate of Alexadner III. The letter describes England’s importance to Christendom, with particular mention of the kingdom of Jerusalem and the crusading orders and Alexander reassures Henry II that the pope cares for the unity and peace of his realm, and that any who rebel against his rule should be excommunicated unless they return to the king’s peace. There is no mention of Wales in the letter, and though Vincent is dismissive of

52 Instructione – Bartlett, p. 507, n. 216.
Gerald’s claim that it was issued in response to a threat from the Welsh we may reasonably understand the letter, given the references in it to the Holy Land, as reassurance for Henry II should he take the Cross.\footnote{N. Vincent, ‘Beyond Becket: King Henry II and the Papacy (1154–89)’, in P. D. Clarke and A. J. Duggan, eds., \textit{Pope Alexander III (1159–81): The Art of Survival} (Ashgate, 2012), pp. 257–300, p. 270, n. 48, \textit{Instructione - Bartlett}, p. 467, n. 93 and C. Tyerman, \textit{England and the Crusades 1095–1588} (Chicago, 1988), pp. 41–5} Part of a letter from Urban III to Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury (1184–90) is quoted with approval by Gerald, as are the criticisms of Henry of Blois (Bishop of Winchester, 1129–71) by Eugenius III (1145–53).\footnote{De Jure, I (GCO iii.124), Spec. Eccl., II.25 (GCO iv.76), Itin. II.14 (GCO vi.149, \textit{Journey}, p. 206); Vita Rem., XXVII (GCO vii.46). On Henry of Blois, see D. Knowles, \textit{The Monastic Order in England}, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 281–93.} In a letter to three clergymen of Hereford defending the tone of his \textit{De Invectionibus} and \textit{Speculum Duorum}, Gerald refers to a recent letter of Innocent III to Philip Augustus of France.\footnote{\textit{Spec. Duorum}, Letter 2.88–104 (pp. 164–7). Gerald also refers to the same letter in a letter to John, Prior of Brecon. Idem., Letter 5.132–6 (pp. 196–9).} Gerald was defending himself against accusations that his works were libellous and sought to show that he wrote in the same vein as the Pope.\footnote{Innocent’s letter does not appear to have survived. \textit{Spec. Duorum}, pp. xl–xli.} He further refers to papal letters to criticise the Cistercian order. Seeking to highlight the order’s greed, Gerald tells how the abbey of Aberconwy sought to acquire the possessions of a \textit{clas} church and only a papal letter prevented it.\footnote{Spec. Eccl., III.8 (GCO iv.167–8). See also B. Golding, ‘Gerald of Wales and the Cistercians’, \textit{Reading Medieval Studies} 21 (Reading, 1995), 5–30, pp. 16–17 and Rh. W. Hays, \textit{The History of the Abbey of Aberconway} (Cardiff, 1963), pp. 30–1, where the \textit{clas} church is suggested to have been Beddgelert. For an overview of \textit{clas} churches, see T. M. Charles-Edwards, \textit{Wales and the Britons 350–1064} (Oxford, 2013), pp. 602–14.} The doubts over the authenticity of the Irish documents might lead us to question Gerald’s judgement, but again Gerald treats words connected to the papacy as authoritative.

Not all references to the papacy and its agents are positive. Gerald quotes Bernard of Clairvaux’s remarks to Eugenius III on alleged corruption amongst papal legates.\footnote{Prin., I.19 (\textit{Instructione - Bartlett}, pp. 328–9, GCO viii.108).} Gerald
repeats charges of greed against several Popes.\textsuperscript{59} Both examples might be seen as constructive criticism however. Gerald elsewhere praises legates’ qualities because they prefer justice to money,\textsuperscript{60} and the reported greed of recent Popes was, according to Gerald, encouraged by their meek and humble nature.\textsuperscript{61} One might see these accusations forming part of Gerald’s argument for reform of papal funding.\textsuperscript{62}

Gerald has been shown to have had a high regard for the papacy, which is further reflected in his personal contact with papal power. He may have thought it appropriate to contact the papacy about the bizarre issue of werewolves, but he also appealed to it for practical assistance. Most examples of appeals are found in Gerald’s \textit{Speculum Duorum} and the letters appended to it. This work was originally a letter composed as part of the dispute between Gerald and his nephew, also called Gerald, and William de Capella, the younger Gerald’s tutor.\textsuperscript{63} In one letter, Gerald describes Rome as the “last refuge and remedy on earth.”\textsuperscript{64} He tells the story of a priest dispossessed by his son and of the father’s restoration by Innocent III as indicative of the youth’s lack of gratitude, clearly comparing his nephew to the youth.\textsuperscript{65} Appeal and counter-appeal to Rome formed part of Gerald’s conflict with his nephew.\textsuperscript{66} We also see the Abbot of Cîteaux securing papal censure against Bishop Geoffrey of Henlaw on behalf of Abbot Rhirid of Cwm Hir.\textsuperscript{67} By the time he composed \textit{Speculum Duorum} in its current form around 1216, appeal to Rome was well established but Gerald also tells of an

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Gemma, I.51 (GCO ii.153, Jewel, p. 117).
\item Spec. Eccl., IV.16 (GCO iv.294–6).
\item On this dispute see Spec. Duorum, pp. xxx–xxxix and Roberts, Gerald, pp. 50–2.
\item “ultimum refugium atque remedium in terris”. Spec. Duorum, Letter 7.73–4 (pp. 246–7).
\item Spec. Duorum, I.241–56 (pp. 14–17).
\item The younger Gerald and William threatened to appeal to the papacy regarding Gerald’s conduct and Gerald likewise complained to the papacy over his nephew and William. Spec. Duorum, II.196–205 (pp. 88–9), Letter 7.72–7 (pp. 246–7), and Letter 7.156–63 (pp. 250–1) and pp. xxxii–xxxiii.
\item Spec. Duorum, Letter 8.299–305 (pp. 280–1) and p. xlix.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
earlier appeal. Elsewhere, Gerald reports that his conflict with Peter de Leia (Bishop of St Davids, 1176–98) led to the loss of part of his income. He sought remedy by writing a letter of complaint and appeal to the papacy.

Gerald’s letter may have been the first direct contact with the papacy, but there is evidence that he had previously acted as a papal agent. As a young man he was appointed as an officer to assist Richard of Dover, Archbishop of Canterbury (1173–84) and the Pope’s legate from 1174 until his death in 1184. Gerald was clearly in the favour of the archbishop, later noting the archbishop’s support for his nomination as Bishop of St Davids in 1176. The pride Gerald took in being appointed to an important role is palpable and intensified by association with Rome. Two points emphasise the appointment’s importance.

Firstly, this was an opportunity for Gerald to display reforming zeal, if equally an opportunity for the problems that such zeal could create. With the powers entrusted to him, Gerald attempted to regularise clerical life by dismissing Jordan, Archdeacon of Brecon, for “concubinage”. Jordan, a colourful character, was originally deposed by Eugenius III (1145–53) for forgery, before successfully appealing to the papacy for reinstatement.

Gerald also enabled the collection of tithes in South West Wales, despite the local gentry’s

---

68 Spec. Duorum, p. xxi.
70 The letter of complaint does not survive, but an accompanying letter may have done so. See De Reb., II.7 (GCO, i.55–6, Autobiography, pp. 75–7), Synb El., XXX (GCO i.308–9), and Richter, Giralda, pp. 91–2.
72 De Reb., I.10 (GCO i.42–2, Autobiography, pp. 61–2) and Inv., V.7 (Invectionibus, pp. 188–9).
opposition, especially the Flemings who lived in the area.\textsuperscript{76} Following Bartlett, we may presume that it is unlikely that tithes were collected at all thoroughly before Gerald’s appointment.\textsuperscript{77} Gerald survived the unrest he caused by excommunicating opponents, by the threat of physical violence from members of his prominent Marcher family and by invoking his papal mandate.\textsuperscript{78}

Secondly, this is our earliest description of any papal representative’s work in Wales, though it is unlikely that it was the first visit legatine visit. That was perhaps the visit of Theophylact, Bishop of Todi, despatched as an emissary at the time of Offa of Mercia’s campaign over the status of the Lichfield diocese in 776.\textsuperscript{79} It also seems certain that John of Crema visited Llandaff during his legation of 1125–26 as he issued a letter granting indulgence to any who would support the church of Llandaff.\textsuperscript{80} There are no descriptions of these legates’ activities however.

In addition to the description of legatine activities, Gerald wrote the first account of a Pope by a Welshman of any description.\textsuperscript{81} The Pope in question was Innocent III, whom Gerald

\textsuperscript{77} Bartlett, Gerald, pp. 34–5.  
\textsuperscript{79} See Chapter 3, p. 105.  
met as part of a campaign to have his election as Bishop of St Davids recognised and to have St Davids raised to metropolitan status. These were the defining issues of Gerald’s life and his campaign had long lasting consequences for Welsh ecclesiastical organisation. Gerald tells the campaign’s tale through several of his works, but especially in *De Rebus a se Gestis*, *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae* and *De Invectionibus*. He gives accounts of various stages of the campaign, including arguments before the Curia, and reproduces letters apparently submitted to the Curia on behalf of his opponents. Gerald, in the words of Glanmor Williams, spent “many of his later years engaged in an attempt to describe, explain and justify what he had been trying to accomplish.”

St Davids status as a diocese had been raised by Bishop Bernard (Bishop of St Davids, 1115–48) earlier in the twelfth century, before several Popes. Bernard became interested in the metropolitan status of St Davids around 1125, Sharpe suggests, having been involved in the dispute between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York over the primacy of Britain and Ireland. The cathedral chapter of St Davids wrote to Honorius II (1124–1130), pressing the case on the basis that St. David had been chosen as archbishop by a synod and that he had been confirmed in the post by his predecessor Dubricius (Dyfrig). This claim was based on

---

82 The campaign is concisely summarised in Roberts, Gerald, pp. 40–4 and reconstructed in more detail and with a good deal of sympathy towards Gerald in Davies, ‘Giraldus’, pp. 258–70. See also Richter, Giraldus, pp. 83–127 and Bartlett, Gerald, pp. 44–52.
83 Richter, Giraldus, pp. 94–5 and Roberts, Gerald, pp. 46–50.
87 Inv., II.10 (Invectionibus, pp. 143–6) and EAWD i, D.80. See also Richter ‘Primacy’, pp. 187–9 and id., Giraldus, pp. 40–2. Gerald repeats this story in the *De Jure*, his *Vita* of St. David and in the *Itinerarium*.
tradition at St Davids and accords with the story advanced by the Vita of St. David composed by Rhygyfarch ap Sulien in the late eleventh century. This letter, like many documents concerned with the status of St Davids, only survives as a copy in the work of Gerald. As Gerald is our only witness to this letter and in many other instances, we must proceed with caution as Gerald does not always tell all that he knew. One should also note the significance of the saint chosen to consecrate David. Dubricius was claimed by the church of Llandaff, St Davids main rival for the position of premier church in Wales, as a patron saint. 

The letter introduces the story of Pope Eleutherius sending the missionaries Faganius and Duvianus to convert the Britons. This story is likely to derive from Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica and gives both the letter and Gerald’s repetition of the story a veneer of respectability. The inclusion of this tale led Barrow to doubt the letter’s authenticity. She

---


highlights verbal similarities to Geoffrey of Monmouth, suggesting that it was composed after *Historia Regum Britanniae* became popular and that Gerald might have amended the letter to suit his purpose.\(^{93}\) Crick also thought Gerald was indebted to Geoffrey in this instance.\(^{94}\) Brooke and Davies accepted the letter as genuine, though they too highlight the similarity between the letter and Geoffrey’s text. Basing his argument on the basis of the differences in content between Geoffrey and the letter, Brooke rejected the notion of the letter being dependent on Geoffrey as a source.\(^{95}\) In terms of content, W. S. Davies highlights the use of *conventus* rather than *capitulum* to describe the clergy of St Davids, suggesting that this is indicative of a *clas* still being in existence at St Davids when the letter was written.\(^{96}\)

Bishop Bernard is known to have reformed the organisation at St Davids, suggesting that the letter might have been written early in Bernard’s tenure. John Reuben Davies suggested that the story arrived at St Davids through propaganda produced on behalf of Llandaff.\(^{97}\) In any case, it is important to note that Rhygyfarch’s text, and therefore the tradition of David’s election, predates Geoffrey’s *Historia* by at least 40 years according to the most recent assessment of the date of composition of *Vita S. David*.\(^{98}\)

In addition to the tale of Faganius and Duvianus deriving from Bede, Gerald refers to Bede’s works on a number of occasions.\(^{99}\) Gerald lists Bede’s work amongst his proofs of the Welsh

\(^{93}\) Barrow, *St Davids*, p. 4.


\(^{96}\) *De Invectionibus*, pp. 19–20.

\(^{97}\) Davies, *Book*, p. 77 and p. 110.

\(^{98}\) Barrow gives a date of 1136–8 for the composition of *Historia Regum Britanniae* whilst Davies calculated that the *Vita S. David* was written 1091x1093. See Barrow, *St Davids*, p. 4 and see Chapter 4, p. 159, n. 126.

\(^{99}\) Richter implies that the original letter drew inspiration for using Bede from a letter of Ralph D’Escures (Archbishop of Canterbury 1114–22) to Calixtus II with which Bernard would have been familiar. See Richter, *Giraldus*, p. 41.
Church’s independence from Canterbury. At other times he summarises Bede’s narrative, referring, for instance, to Boniface V (619–25) granting a pallium to Justus when he became Archbishop of Canterbury. It seems likely that Gerald utilised Bede to give his own case a more respectable basis in history.

Upon discovering the St Davids chapter’s letter, part of Gerald’s strategy became to stress the apparent antiquity of St Davids as a see. To this end, he makes frequent references, including to St. Samson of Dol taking the pallium of St Davids to Brittany. Gerald used this tale to explain the lack of pallium to Pope Innocent, and utilised the recent history of Dol to argue for the return of the pallium to St Davids. An archbishopric had been established at Dol only during the pontificate of Gregory VII, although an attempt had apparently been made to become independent of Tours’ jurisdiction in the ninth century. Following appeals from Tours and the French Court, Dol lost the pallium in 1199. Another aspect is the diocesan structure of Britain espoused by Gerald, who claimed that several sees in England were once subject to the jurisdiction of St Davids. Though doubtless born of St Davids tradition this was also a necessary strategy as Canterbury could point to professions of obedience from
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100 Gerald of Wales, Retractiones (GCO i.426), De Jure, I and IV (GCO iii.111, 229), Itin. II.1 (GCO vi.105, Journey, p. 164), Inv., II.1 and IV.1 (Invectionibus, pp. 132–4 and p. 164). Gerald’s use of Bede in his argument is summarised in Richter, Giraldus, pp. 113–14 and see also Pryce, ‘Welsh Past’, pp. 27–8.
102 Inv., II.1 (Invectionibus, p. 130), Retractiones (GCO i.426), De Jure, I and II (GCO iii.111, 169, Autobiography, p. 254); De Jure, II (GCO iii.151–2, 166–7), Itin. II.1 (GCO vi.103, Journey, p. 162), Inv., II.1, II.5, II.6, II.10 and IV.2 (Invectionibus, pp.131–2, p. 139, p. 140, p. 145 and p. 165). See also EAWD i, p. 216. See also Pryce, ‘Welsh Past’, p. 25 and pp. 28–31.
103 De Jure, II (GCO iii.175–6, Autobiography, p. 188) and Richter, Giraldus, p. 114.
bishops of St Davids and papal confirmation of Canterbury’s metropolitan rights over St Davids from Adrian IV, Eugenius III, Alexander III and Celestine III (1191–98).  

After the chapter’s letter, Bishop Bernard continued his campaign for several years. He wrote to Innocent II (1130–43), apologising for and explaining the delay in pressing his suit, complaining that he was forced to profess an oath of obedience contrary to custom and emphasising the difference in “nation, language, laws, habits, judgements and customs” between the people of his province (prouincie) and those in the province of Canterbury.  

These final points, emphasising the difference between the people of St Davids and those in the province of Canterbury would later form part of Gerald’s argument.

Bernard’s arguments made some headway, with the bishop receiving the promise of an inquiry into the status of St Davids from Lucius II (1144–45). A letter to Eugenius III from the chapter of St Davids survives and it is known that Bernard argued before the same Pope in person. The letter emphasises the ancient dignity of St Davids and highlights the pressure put on both bishop Bernard and his predecessor Wilfred (d. 1115) to swear obedience to Canterbury. Bernard lost his case in 1147 because he had sworn an oath of obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury at the time of his consecration, a point confirmed in a letter to Eugenius III to Theobald of Bec (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1139–61). The case of St
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107 Inv., II.7 (Invectionibus, pp. 141–2), EAWD i, p. 192 and D.121. On the circumstances in which the letter was written and the potential result of the letter see Richter, Giraldus, pp. 42–4.  
108 De Jure, III (GCO iii.187), Inv., II.1 and II.3 (Invectionibus, p. 134 and pp. 136–7), EAWD i, p. 193 and D.123. Richter highlights a mistake in Davies’s translation of this letter. See Richter, Giraldus, p. 44 and especially n. 5.  
109 Inv., II.6 (Invectionibus, pp. 139–41), EAWD i, pp. 194–6 and D.131; De Jure, II (GCO iii.152–3) and p. 168, Itin. II.1 (GCO vi.105–6, Journey, p. 165), Inv., II.1 and IV.2 (Invectionibus, p. 134 and p. 166). See also EAWD, i.198 and Richter, Giraldus, pp. 47–8.  
110 De Jure, II (GCO iii.180–1, Autobiography, pp. 193–4), Itin. II.1 (GCO vi.105–6, Journey, p. 165), Inv., II.2 (Invectionibus, pp. 135–6), EAWD i, D.128. See also Davies, ‘Giralde’, p. 260, Roberts, Gerald, p.21 and Brooke ‘Archbishops’, p. 29. Bernard’s campaign caused a furious reaction amongst other bishops subject to Canterbury as is attested in surviving letters by the Bishops of Winchester, Ely, Bath, Exeter and Norwich. They
Davids itself was due to be heard at the Council of Rheims in 1148 but Bernard died before it was settled.111

After Bernard’s death, David fitz Gerald was elected Bishop of St Davids.112 He professed obedience to Canterbury, and further undertook not to raise the issue of St Davids’s status during his episcopacy.113 He could thus do nothing to support the clergy of St Davids as they protested their case before Hugh Pierleone of St. Angelo, the papal legate, at a council in London.114 Beyond the registering of complaints with Henry II and with the papal legate, nothing else is known about the protest at this council. The council took place as part of Pierleone’s legation and was used to discuss the pressing issues within the Church with Gerald noting elsewhere that the council was called to discuss the relationship between York and Canterbury.115 After failing to become Bishop of St Davids himself in 1176, Gerald attempted to persuade both Pierleone and Peter de Leia, the new bishop, not to act in such a way as to prejudice any future case regarding the status of St Davids. He was disappointed by both men and by his fellow clergy at St Davids whom he accused of cowardice.116


111 Roberts, Gerald, p.21 and Brooke ‘Archbishops’, pp. 29–30. Bernard had requested that Simeon, Archdeacon of Bangor, should support him at this council. See Inv., II.8 and II.11 (Invectionibus, p. 142 and p. 146) and EAWD i, D.139. On Simeon see Richter, Giraldus, p. 50.
113 EAWD i, p. 208 and Richter, Giraldus, p. 48 and pp. 54–5.
115 Vita Rem., XXVIII (GCO vii.62–3), Prin., II.2 and II.30 (Instructione - Bartlett, pp. 446–7 and 552–3, GCO viii.159 and 218, Instruction, p. 13 and 51), Exp., II.31 (Expugnatio, pp. 220–1)
The issue was raised again at the Third Lateran Council. Gerald had by then returned to Paris to study and information about the council was provided by a friend of his, Gerard la Pucelle, later Bishop of Coventry (1183–84). La Pucelle’s reported comments do not cast much light on the protest, noting only that the canons of St Davids protested “with great boldness and arrogance” and that they demanded a commission to investigate the metropolitan right which they claimed for their see. Gerald’s purpose in including this chapter in De Rebus a se Gestis was perhaps less to do with recording the longstanding metropolitan claims of St Davids and more a protest at the conduct of Peter de Leia, who, like David fitz Gerald, had sworn an oath of obedience to Canterbury and did not support the canons. The relationship between Gerald and Peter de Leia was to become fraught, with Gerald accusing the bishop of playing both the Lord Rhys and his sons on the one hand and Henry II and his court on the other against him. The issue of St Davids’s status was still under discussion in the late 1170s.

Perhaps the memory of these events prompted Archbishop Baldwin’s visitation to the Welsh dioceses in 1187 and for his celebration of mass at the four Welsh cathedrals during the Crusade preaching tour of 1188. Baldwin clearly had the metropolitan claims of his see in mind and wished to assert them. Hurlock has drawn attention to the importance of the

117 De Reb., II.3 (GCO i.48–9, Autobiography, p. 68), De Jure, I and II (GCO iii.109, 163 and 168), Inv., IV.2 (Invectionibus, p. 166). See also Davies, ‘Giraldu’, pp. 98–9, Roberts, Gerald, p. 23.
118 De Reb., II.3 (GCO i.49, Autobiography, p. 68).
119 Gerald repeated his concerns about the bishop’s conduct elsewhere. See De Jure, II (GCO iii.163) and Inv., II.1 (Invectionibus, p. 135).
120 Bartlett, Gerald, p. 24 and Richter, Giraldus, pp. 89–93.
archbishop’s visit to Llanddewi Brefi. It was here that St David was supposed to have preached against the Pelagian heresy, and that a mound had risen so that all present could see and hear him preach and was also the site of David’s apparent election to the archbishopric. 123 The symbolism of these visits, asserting Canterbury’s claims of superiority, was interpreted as a threat to their cause by some of St Davids’s clergy who protested against his presence in Wales. 124

It should be noted however, that the first recension of *Itinerarium Kambriae*, does not mention this protest, which only appears in Gerald’s revised second recension of c. 1199. This latter recension also fails to mention Baldwin’s celebration of mass at St Davids. 125 The changes made to the text may be explained by the fact that Gerald had, by the time of the second recension’s composition, begun his campaign to change the status of St Davids. At the time of writing the first recension of *Itinerarium Kambriae* in c. 1188, Gerald seemed content to accept Canterbury’s claims as is made apparent by Gerald’s comments on the state of St Davids in the same work. 126 Opportunities to advance his career became more limited after this time, especially after Hubert Walter became Archbishop of Canterbury (1193–1215). 127 Previously, Gerald had sought Hubert Walter’s favour, dedicating the first edition of the *Descripition Kambriae* to him, and claiming to have dedicated a version of the *Itinerarium*. 128 The change in their relationship stemmed from Gerald’s decision to support Prince John’s

---

126 Itin. II.1 (GCO vi.107, *Journey*, p. 166) and Bartlett, *Gerald*, p. 45.
127 Although discussing Gerald’s sense of changing identity, Richter’s comment that Gerald “became a more fervent Welshman after his hopes for a more attractive career in England had been destroyed” seem apt. Richter, *Giraldus*, p. 127.
rebellion during the incarceration of Richard I in Germany. With his chances of promotion in England limited, but with his ambition fully intact, Gerald rejected the offers of Irish and Welsh bishoprics and, having changed his mind on the question of St Davids, after the death of Peter de Leia in 1198, Gerald appears to have been determined to become Archbishop of St Davids.

Hubert Walter rejected Gerald’s arguments outright. As well as citing apparent papal approval of Canterbury’s right to treat the bishops of St Davids as suffragans, he raised the possibility of political instability should Welsh “barbarity” be unrestrained by obedience to the see of Canterbury. The latter is perhaps the most significant point. As Bartlett has highlighted any challenge to the jurisdiction of Canterbury over Welsh sees was an indirect assault on the Crown’s authority. The archbishop had soon secured royal support for his stance.

The case bought by Gerald and his predecessors in the cause of St Davids was entirely without merit on the arguments advanced by them. This is to say that there was no evidence of metropolitan status, even though there is some evidence that the Bishop of St Davids

---

131 In v., I.g (De Invectionibus, pp. 83–5 and Autobiography, p. 166–9). Walter’s letter was criticised for “lack[ing] conviction and persuasiveness” by Richter. This is too dismissive, and the letter is better understood as an expression of Canterbury’s claim of supremacy over all other bishops within the British Isles. Richter, Giraldis, pp. 109–10.
132 “Any attack on the English Church in Wales, then, involved and additional political dimension. The logic of such an attack led inevitably towards criticism of the policies which the English crown was pursuing towards the Welsh.” Bartlett, Gerald, p. 47.
133 The sentiments of Walter’s letter echoed the reported words of Henry II at the time of Gerald’s first nomination to St Davids and in a letter of King John (1199–1216) to the Curia during Gerald’s case. See Bartlett, Gerald, p. 48.
exercised “a kind of episcopal over-lordship from the latter part of the ninth century.”

The motivation for Bishop Bernard’s case had little to do with factual claims of metropolitan status and owed much to the competition initiated by Bishop Urban of Llandaff (1107–1134) between his see and St Davids. As W. S. Davies pointed out, it seems significant that in the letters concerned with Bernard’s suit in Gerald’s work the word dignitas is used sixteen times. The rights of his see were of primary concern to Bernard. At a time when claims of primacy were developing in Europe and especially given the dispute between Canterbury and York, and the reforms enacted by him at St Davids it is little wonder that Bernard sought to take advantage of the situation in defence of his see’s interests. Not only was the bishop involved in the latter dispute but he was purportedly party to Henry of Blois’s plan to create a province of Winchester during the reign of Stephen. Bishop Bernard would doubtlessly also have been aware of the efforts from the Irish Church to create archbishoprics that were independent of Canterbury at Cashel and Armagh following the synod of Ráith Bressail in 1111. One might further consider the political context of Bernard’s bid, especially after the death of Henry I (1100–35). Following Henry’s demise several Welsh rulers made substantial gains at the expense of the Anglo-Normans, creating an unstable atmosphere. Conditions were then ripe for Bernard’s case to be advanced.


135 The dispute is summarised in AoC, pp. 182–3.

136 Invectionibus, p. 37, n. 1.

137 For Bernard’s reforms in the diocese see EAWD i, pp. 136–41 and p. 144 and Evans, ‘Bishops’, pp. 274–6. On the establishing of metropolitan claims in Europe see Brooke ‘Archbishops’, pp. 24–6 and on the claims of metropolitan status discussed at the Council of Rheims (where the status of St Davids was due to be discussed prior to Bernard’s death) see EAWD i, p. 200.

138 On his involvement in the dispute between Canterbury and York see above, p. 21, n. 86 and for his involvement with Henry of Blois, see Invectionibus, pp. 34–5, EAWD i, pp. 200–1 and Knowles, Monastic Order, p. 288.

139 Flanagan, Irish Society, pp. 25–6, p. 32 and below p. 31, n. 141.


Both Bernard and Gerald sought to advance themselves by becoming powerful figures beyond the jurisdiction of Canterbury.\footnote{Before the end of his case, Gerald relented a little on his insistence on full independence. He offered Hubert Walter a compromise in September 1202 whereby he would become an Archbishop over Wales, abandoning St Davids’s claims to five dioceses in England, and still be subject to Canterbury albeit a subject of metropolitan rank. For the letter see above, p. 24, n. 105.} This idea also appealed to Welsh princes, who saw advantages in having their bishops under the jurisdiction of a Welsh see rather than Canterbury, and the lack of English royal control implied by this status. The Church was a weapon in the fight for their political survival and had been extremely important in cross-border conflicts since the coming of the Normans, with Davies observing that: “the subjugation of the Welsh church [sic] was at once politically essential and ecclesiastically necessary” to the Normans.\footnote{Aoc, p. 179.} There were a number of disputes with Canterbury’s candidates for Welsh sees within living memory. Amongst other examples, Owain Gwynedd (d. 1170) objected to Meurig (Bishop of Bangor, 1139–61) and his willingness to pledge obedience to
Canterbury and he also clashed with Thomas Becket over the appointment of a new bishop to Bangor following Meurig’s death in 1162.\textsuperscript{145}

Perhaps stemming in part from the opposition of Henry of Abergavenny (Bishop of Llandaff 1193–1218) to his case, Gerald sought to show the willingness of others in Wales to support his bid, and to demonstrate the longstanding nature of this support.\textsuperscript{146} As part of his evidence, he included a letter from Owain Gwynedd and his brother Cadwaladr (d. 1172), pledging obedience to Bernard and acknowledging the metropolitan rights of St Davids.\textsuperscript{147} There is some room to doubt the authenticity of this letter. Gerald’s is the only extant copy of the letter and it seems likely that Gerald altered the brothers’ original letter to emphasise their submission to St Davids.\textsuperscript{148} Although the letter in its current form is unlikely to be a genuine document it reflects the brothers’ objectives in seeking assistance against Bishop Meurig, whose reformist tendencies and profession of obedience to Canterbury had displeased them. This was a rare show of unity by the brothers as they would later fight each other, leading to Cadwaladr’s exile in 1152 and a later alliance with Henry II.\textsuperscript{149}

In his own time, Gerald found support amongst the sons of the Lord Rhys of Deheubarth, Llywelyn ap Iorwerth of Gwynedd, Gwenwynwyn ab Owain Cyfeiliog and Madog ap Gruffudd Maelor of Powys.\textsuperscript{150} For the commission of inquiry’s meeting at Worcester, in an attempt to stiffen the resolve of the canons of St Davids, Maelgwn ap Rhys and Rhys Grug ap

\textsuperscript{145} See below p. 37, n. 177, Chapter 2, pp. 75–6 and Chapter 3, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{146} Inv., I.3 (\textit{Invectionibus}, p. 93).
\textsuperscript{147} Inv., II.9 and II.12 (\textit{Invectionibus}, pp. 142–3 and pp. 146–7), AWR, 192 and EAWD i, D.122. See also De Jure, III (GCO iii.188).
\textsuperscript{148} AWR, p. 323.
\textsuperscript{150} De Jure, III (GCO iii.196, \textit{Autobiography}, p.221).
Rhys sent letters and messengers supporting Gerald whilst Llywelyn ap Iorwerth sent Lawrence, the prior of Bardsey, to the meeting along with an offer of sanctuary and recompense to the clergy of St David's should they suffer as a result of their support for Gerald’s highly political campaign. Llywelyn also assisted Gerald financially and Gwenwynwyn had promised to do so. From the chapter headings for a lost section of De rebus a se gestis, we can see that Gerald claimed to have received three further letters of support from the Welsh nobility, most probably during the summer of 1202. These were letters from, respectively, Llywelyn ap Iorwerth, Madog ap Gruffudd, and the Queen of North Wales (Litterae regiae Norwalliae).

Gerald gathered further support from the princes in a letter which formed part of his final appeal to the Pope. Butler suspected that this letter was Gerald’s own composition as it reflects his style and repeated a substantial part of his argument. One might further apply this to the speeches praising Gerald’s work and campaign put into the mouths of Llywelyn and Gwenwynwyn by the author. These reasons alone are not an argument for dismissing the letter out of hand, but greater doubt over its authenticity is cast by the princes named by Gerald. By the time of Gerald’s arrival in Rome with the letter in January 1203, one of the princes, Maredudd ap Rhys, had been dead for 18 months and another, Gruffudd ap Rhys, had been dead for almost as long. If the letter is genuine then it must have been written

---

151 De Jure, III (GCO iii.197, Autobiography, pp. 221–2). See also EAWD i, D.341–2 and AWR, 222.
153 De Reb (GCO i.13) and AWR, 223, 502, 275.
before Maredudd died in July 1201 and before Gerald’s arrival in Rome for his second extended stay from March until December 1201. Even if one were to dismiss the text as inauthentic, then the document, as Insley has argued, is at least valuable in that it provides an insight as to how Gerald “viewed the power of the princes of Pura Wallia.”

Whilst it seems likely that the princes sympathised with the letter’s arguments, it also reflects the arguments advanced by Gerald. One might consider the letter’s attacks on bishops from England in Wales and the abuse of excommunication during conflicts by the Crown and its agents. The comments about these bishops’ inability to hear confession or to preach without an interpreter is reminiscent of Gerald’s comments on the preaching tour of 1188, where he several times mentions the need for interpreters so that the Welsh could understand. That Gerald should highlight this complaint is ironic, given that although he had some familiarity with Welsh, he was probably unable to speak the language himself. The letter also makes familiar complaints about the greed of bishops and how they have been planted in Welsh sees by violence.

The misuse of excommunication is another familiar complaint. Hervé, the first royal nomination as Bishop of Bangor (1092–1108), was said to frequently excommunicate his flock. Gerald mentions four examples of excommunication. In the Itinerarium Kambriae, Gerald reports that Owain Cyfeiliog, ruler of Powys, had been excommunicated for refusing

---
159 Itin. I.1, I.5, II.7 (GCO vi.13–14, 55, 126, Journey, p. 75, p.114 and pp.185–6).
161 Gemma, II.34 (GCO ii.330–1, Jewel, pp. 251–2), De Jure, VII (GCO iii.370). See also Bartlett, Gerald, pp. 49–50.
to meet Archbishop Baldwin during the preaching tour.\textsuperscript{163} Earlier in the tour Gerald described how Baldwin had requested the exhumation of Owain Gwynedd from Bangor cathedral as he had died excommunicate.\textsuperscript{164} Whilst attempting to negotiate a settlement between the Lord Rhys and Richard I, Peter de Leia was captured and held hostage by the sons of the Lord Rhys. Once freed the bishop called a synod and excommunicated the Lord Rhys and his sons.\textsuperscript{165} Gerald also describes the excommunication of the Welshmen who had besieged Painscastle in 1198.\textsuperscript{166} He is ambivalent in reporting Owain Cyfeiliog’s excommunication, describing Owain’s character in addition to his sanction. Gerald makes no comment on the request for Owain Gwynedd’s exhumation, but it is difficult to imagine that he approved of the incestuous marriage between Owain and his cousin Cristin, who was related to Owain within the degrees of consanguinity prohibited by the Church, that had led to his excommunication.\textsuperscript{167} One is tempted to say that the latter two examples are simply opportunities for Gerald to vent invective against Peter de Leia and Hubert Walter. Gerald alleged that Peter de Leia had spread rumours that it was Gerald who was ultimately responsible for the excommunication of Rhys and his sons, which led to Gerald’s prebend of the church of Mathri being assaulted by Rhys’s sons in revenge.\textsuperscript{168} In the same manner, Gerald accused the archbishop of delighting in excommunicating Welsh soldiers.\textsuperscript{169} Gerald had such examples in mind when he composed the letter. If the letter is not entirely fraudulent, Gerald may have used it in Rome on his third visit to reinforce his argument or included it in his account of the third visit to Rome to strengthen his written argument.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{163} Itin. II.12 (GCO vi.144, \textit{Journey}, p. 202). See also Hurlock, \textit{Crusades}, p. 87 and p. 186. For Owain Cyfeiliog see Chapter 4, p. 146, n. 67.
\textsuperscript{165} Symb El., XXXI (GCO i.321), Richter, \textit{Giraldus}, pp. 91–2.
\textsuperscript{167} See Chapter 3, pp. 123–4.
\textsuperscript{168} Richter, \textit{Giraldus}, p. 91.
That Innocent III’s initial reaction to Gerald’s case was to commend care of the diocese to powerful secular lords such as Llywelyn ap Iorwerth and Meiler FitzHenry as well as the Cistercian abbeys in Wales and the clergy and general population would seem to confirm Hubert Walter’s worries.  

170 By March 1202 King John had come to the same conclusion, accusing Gerald of impinging upon the King’s dignity in letters patent.  

171 It is little wonder that Hubert Walter continued to emphasise this objection to Gerald’s case.  

172 He objected successfully, eventually compelling Gerald to bring his cause to an end and ensuring, by means of an oath prior to his consecration, that the new Bishop of St Davids, Geoffrey of Henlaw, would not raise the issue again.  

173 The extent of the archbishop’s victory is demonstrated by the infrequency with which the issue was raised after 1203. The issue of St Davids status was raised once more by Thomas Bek (Bishop of St Davids, 1280–93) in opposition to the visitation of John Pecham (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1279–92) to the diocese of St Davids and was also raised by Owain Glyndŵr in his negotiation with Charles VI of France (1380–1422).  

174 Throughout, Gerald’s election and the status of St Davids were intertwined.  

This is apparent from the letter which opened the case for Hubert Walter, with the archbishop

---

170 Inv., III.4–6 (Invectionibus, pp. 149–50), EAWD i, D.311–14 and Calendar, 223–6. The letter was addressed to the noble Llywelyn and other lords in Wales (nobilibus uiris Lewelino et aliis príncibus Wallie). Richter suggests that these letters represent a broad base of support for Gerald in Wales. See Richter, Giraldus, p. 106.  

171 EAWD i, D.346. John issued a further letter making similar accusations in September 1203. EAWD i, D.377.  


173 De Jure, VII (GCO iii.345) and Richter. Giraldus, p. 126. According to Gerald, administering the oath was against the instruction of Innocent III, Gerald criticised the oath in a letter to Gilbert, Prior of Lanthonys Secunda and further berates the bishop in another letter for raising the money to travel to Rome to appeal St Davids’ status only to decide against going. Spec. Duorum, Letter 7.205–10 (pp. 252–3), Letter 8.130–6 (pp. 270–1) and pp. xxix–xxx. For Innocent’s letter to the Bishops of Ely and Worcester see below, p. 40, n. 198. For Prior Gilbert’s career see D. Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke, V. C. M. London, eds., The Heads of Religious Houses England and Wales I 940–1216, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 2001), p. 172.  


arguing that Gerald had been improperly elected. Parallel to Gerald’s case is another disputed election in a Welsh see, that of Roland, a subprior of Aberconwy, who claimed that he had twice been canonically elected to Bangor only for others to be consecrated by Hubert Walter. Having made common cause with Roland, before a later estrangement, Gerald is our main witness to his cause.

Both cases offer a glimpse into the system of commission and judges-delegate used to settle such matters. They were initially heard by the same two cardinals, Suffredus and Peter of Capua. Gerald’s hearing highlighted inconsistencies in his opponents’ evidence, whilst the speech he gave at Roland’s hearing is a masterpiece of rhetoric. Gerald presents his facts at the beginning of his oration before proceeding to highlight what he regarded as the mistreatment of the Welsh by English ecclesiastical authorities and the Archbishop of Canterbury’s corrupt practices.

Following these hearings, both cases became subject to local inquiries. Roland’s case was to be examined by prior Josbert of Wenlock and the Prior of Bardsey, with Roland’s evidence to be heard in Wales and the evidence of Bishop Robert of Bangor (1197–1212) to be heard in England. Nothing more is heard of Roland’s case after the establishment of this

---

178 On these cardinals see Hays, ‘Rotoland’, pp. 11–12.
181 Innocent III issued letters forbidding any interference with the rights of Gerald and Roland to pursue their respective cases. See Inv., III.11–12 (Invectionibus, pp. 153–5), EAWD i, D.325–7 and Calendar, 336 and 338.
182 The commission for this letter survives in the register of Innocent III and edited in O. Hageneder, J. C. Moore, A. Sommerlechner with C. Egger and H. Weigl, eds., Die Register Innocenz’ III., 6. Pontifikatsjahr 1203/1204. Texte und Indices, Publikationen des historischen Instituts beim Österreichischen Kulturinstituts in Rom, 2. Abt., Bd. 6: Texte und Indices (Vienna, 1995), 79. See also Calendar, 481. Hays tentatively identifies the prior of Bardsey with Lawrence, an emissary of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth sent to strengthen the resolve of the Chapter of St Davids. Hays, ‘Rotoland’, p. 17 and see above, p. 33.
inquiry. Given that Robert remained bishop until his death in 1212 the judges presumably ruled against Roland, whose case would not have been helped by being declared a fugitive by the Cistercians’ General Chapter in 1202. Gerald referred to Roland once more at the end of his third period in Rome, by which time, they were estranged. He used Roland’s example to complain about the lack of faithfulness amongst the Welsh clergy.

Gerald, naturally, gives many more details about the inquiries into his own case. Prior to his appearance before the cardinals, there had already been one inquiry into Gerald’s case. A notice for this commission into both Gerald’s election and the status of St David’s is given by Gerald in his De Jure, with further reference to De Invectionibus. The letter does not survive in this text save in a chapter heading, which names the commissioners as the Bishops of Lincoln, Durham and Ely but gives no further details. The letter does not survive in the registers of Innocent III either, but amongst rubrics of now missing letters, copied in the Fourteenth century, we have a notice regarding Gerald’s election which reads as follows:

Lincolniensi, Dunelmiensi et Eliensi Episcopis, quod moveant Archipresbicopum Cantuarien confirmare et consecrare Electum Menevem: aliquo citent eum, ut apostolico conspectui se presentet. Gerald elsewhere claims to have appeared before the judges with the documents he had discovered in the register of Eugenius III and at St Davids, and to have secured a statement from them before proceeding to Rome for the second time.

---

186 Invectionibus, p. 77, De Jure, II (GCO iii.182, Autobiogrpahy, p. 195), EAWD i, D.316. See Calendar, 227 and EAWD i, p. 214, although note that Davies has named one of the commissioners as the Bishop of London in error here.
188 De Jure, III (GCO iii.188, Autobiogrpahy, pp. 202–3). See also EAWD i, p. 219.
Owing to the apparent shortcomings of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s proctors, the proceedings in both causes in Rome were delayed.\textsuperscript{189} The Pope granted a further commission on both matters with the Bishops of Ely and Worcester and the Archdeacon of Buckingham as judges.\textsuperscript{190} Gerald was also granted an intriguing letter by Innocent III, ordering the gathering of evidence from older men whose testimony might otherwise be lost regarding the status of St Davids.\textsuperscript{191} Their evidence is referred to by Gerald in his proposed compromise to Hubert Walter after the hearings before the judges-delegate at St Albans, but are otherwise unattested.\textsuperscript{192} It is at this point that Gerald appeared before the cardinals. He then returned to St Davids where he prepared for a series of meetings before the commissioners at, successively, Worcester (January, 1202), Newport (May, 1202), Brackley (June, 1202), Bedford (July, 1202), and St Albans (September, 1202).\textsuperscript{193} The meetings were frequently abortive with at least one of the three named judges absent. The hearings did not go well for Gerald as he had by this point lost the support of the St Davids’ chapter. As a result, the judges refused to rule on either the status of St Davids or on Gerald’s election, transferring both cases back to Rome.\textsuperscript{194}

Once arrived, Gerald argued before the consistory several times both for his election and for the status of St Davids. He reiterated his arguments and produced the letter of support from

\textsuperscript{189} De Jure, III (GCO iii.189–90, Autobiogrpahy, p. 204) and Inv. III.16 (Invectionibus, pp. 156–7), EAWD i., D.332.

\textsuperscript{190} De Jure, III (GCO iii.191, Autobiogrpahy, p. 206). The text of the commission is again mentioned in a chapter title in De Invectionibus but does not survive. Invectionibus, p. 77 and EAWD i, D.324. The judges of this commission are not named but assumed from a remark of Gerald’s that the judges were sent another letter of Pope Innocent’s concerning the literacy of the Abbot of St. Dogmael’s. This must refer to the letter sent from Segni on 27 July 1201 in which the judges are named as above. Gerald’s remarks on the judges and the dual commission are found in De Jure, III (GCO iii.190, 191 and Autobiogrpahy, p. 205, p. 206). The letter on Walter of St. Dogmael’s is found in Inv., III.15 (Invectionibus, p. 156), EAWD i, D.331 and Calendar, 343. Davies mistakes the judges of the first commission for the second in EAWD i, p. 219.

\textsuperscript{191} De Jure, III (GCO iii.194, Autobiogrpahy, p. 219).

\textsuperscript{192} On Gerald’s proposed compromise see above, p. 24, n. 105.


\textsuperscript{194} Davies, ‘Giraldus’, p. 268.
the Welsh princes.\textsuperscript{195} It was to little avail, as Gerald’s appeal to be confirmed as bishop ended on April 10, 1203, when Pope Innocent ruled against Gerald and the preferred candidate of the King and Archbishop.\textsuperscript{196} Richter hints that Innocent’s decisions were influenced by his need to appease John diplomatically. Gerald himself discusses that representations were made to the Pope by both King John and Otto of Saxony immediately prior to issuing a judgement regarding the election. Whilst Innocent was doubtless aware of the need to keep John happy, there were plenty of justifiable reasons for declaring Gerald’s election invalid.\textsuperscript{197} This did not seem like the end of the affair at the time because when it came to rerunning the election, Gerald scored a minor victory. He secured a letter from the Pope to the Bishops of Ely and Worcester, insisting that the newly elected bishop should not take any oath which forbade him from pursuing the matter of St Davids’ status.\textsuperscript{198}

The cause of St Davids remained alive, with Gerald receiving the benefit of papal appeal. Unsatisfied with the conduct of the judges-delegate in the case, he appealed against their decision on procedural grounds and Innocent granted an enforcing letter.\textsuperscript{199} The Pope eventually dismissed the judges and appointed three judges from the province of York, rather than Canterbury, to conduct the inquiry.\textsuperscript{200} This inquiry seems unlikely to have even begun its’ work as Gerald had already made his peace with Hubert Walter and King John.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{195} For Gerald’s speech see De Jure, IV (GCO iii.242–3, Autobiography, pp. 267–9). For the Welsh princes’ letter see above, pp. 32–3.
\textsuperscript{196} De Jure, IV (GCO iii.267–8, Autobiography, pp. 297–8), EAWD i, D.364 and Calendar, 468. See also Davies, ‘Giraldus’, p. 268.
\textsuperscript{197} Richter, Giraldus, pp. 118–19.
\textsuperscript{199} Inv., III.19 (Invectionibus, pp. 159–60), EAWD i, D.368 and Calendar, 489.
\textsuperscript{200} The judges appointed were the Bishop of Durham and the Dean and Prior of Holy Trinity, York. This letter survives in Innocent III’s register. Die Register Innocenz’ III., 6, 89, De Jure, V (GCO iii.282–4, Autobiography, pp. 306–7), EAWD i, D.374, Calendar, 494.
\textsuperscript{201} EAWD i, pp. 226–7.
Through Gerald’s campaign we see several stages of appeal from initial inquiry, to the testing of evidence in front of judges delegate to the final appeal before the Pope himself.

During his campaign, Gerald made three journeys to Rome and met Innocent III several times. In addition to the great public arguments, Gerald was also granted several more intimate meetings. He first met Innocent around St. Andrew’s day in 1199 and presented him with six of his own compositions. By J. Conway Davies’s reasoning these were the Welsh works, the Irish works, *Gemma Ecclesiastica* and the now lost *Vita* of St. Caradog. Gerald took advantage of this first meeting to demonstrate his wit by stating that whilst some men brought him money (*libras*), Gerald brought him books (*libros*). The Pope was seemingly pleased by the presents and kept them by his bedside for a month before sharing them with others. Gerald proudly reported that the Pope had kept hold of *Gemma Ecclesiastica*.

Gerald records that Innocent was well disposed to him. He describes him as friendly and affable, notes how he greeted him with a kiss at the beginning of his third period in Rome and how he made the Pope laugh. On the latter occasion, Gerald believed that he had made some people jealous as he had conversed with Innocent for a long time. He also notes Innocent’s willingness to defend his character, regardless of what his opponents might say.

---

203 Davies, ‘Giraldus’, p. 261, n. 3. Gerald only names *Gemma Ecclesiastica* in his account of the meeting in De Reb. III.18 (GCO i.119, *Autobiography*, p. 165) and De Jure, VII (GCO iii.336). During the pontificate of Celestine III, Gerald had sent copies of the *Topographia Hibernica* and *Descriptio Kambriae* to Rome (Symb EL, XXX (GCO i.308) and Richter, *Giraldus*, p. 92, n. 1). Gerald elsewhere mentions that he carried the life of Caradog with him on his first journey to Rome and that he read it to Innocent III (Gerald of Wales, *De Giraldo Archidiacono Menevensi* (GCO i.399) and Inv., IV.9 (*Invectionibus*, p. 177). It seems likely that Gerald’s *Vita* is what led to Pope Innocent organising an inquiry into the life of Caradog and whether he was a suitable candidate to become a saint. For the historical Caradog see Davies, *Book*, pp. 125–6 and J. E. Lloyd, *A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest*, 2 vols., 3rd ed. (London, 1939), pp. 591–3.
against him. Gerald never missed an opportunity to display the Pope’s compliments to him either. He delights in noting how the Pope had publicly called him the elect of St Davids and how soon Gerald would leave Rome after being consecrated bishop. Doubtless such comments led to Gerald’s listing of reasons why the Pope thought him a suitable candidate to be bishop.

He attempted to take advantage of this friendliness in their private meetings to press his case in the first such meeting he records. When Gerald returned to Rome the second time he proceeded as soon as possible to present his newly discovered evidence to the Pope. By the time of the final hearings in Rome, Innocent was advising Gerald on how best to proceed with a swift resolution to the case and the best means of dealing with the insults of his opponents. With the case of the election ended and Gerald about to give up on the status of St Davids, the Pope still had kind words of consolation for him. Although Gerald could not hide his disappointment in his recorded replies, his tone is still respectful towards the Pope.

One may doubt whether any of these meetings took place as Gerald describes. The last two encounters with Innocent III seem particularly suspect, given that Gerald writes longer eloquent passages for himself and puts shorter sentences in the Pope’s mouth. Beyond their use as literary devices, highlighting as they do Gerald’s eloquence, these encounters, with the attendant impact of recording such meetings would have on Gerald’s audience, portray his respect and admiration for Innocent and the great joy he personally took from association with the papacy.

211 De Jure, II (GCO iii.165–76, *Autobiography*, pp. 182–8). It is at this meeting that the document identified tentatively by Poole as being a *provinciale* was discussed. See below, p. 43, n. 220.
In addition to the political importance of his campaign and the interest of these personal encounters, Gerald records other notable features. One is the use of papal records and correspondence made by him. The use and impact of Innocent’s letters has already been discussed, but we also see Gerald receiving Innocent’s permission to search in the register of Eugenius III for records of Bernard’s campaign.\textsuperscript{215} Gerald also found several documents for consideration at St Davids, including many describing Bernard’s campaign.\textsuperscript{216} It was here that Gerald found Eugenius III’s letter to Theobald of Bec confirming that Bernard would be bound by his profession of obedience to Canterbury-a copy of the same letter he had already discovered in the register of Eugenius.\textsuperscript{217} These documents were later examined in consistory, with particular emphasis on examining the seal attached to each letter.\textsuperscript{218} After this, the manuscript was examined and the letters’ contents verified, in order to ensure that the formulas used were correct and that the letters were not forgeries.\textsuperscript{219} Gerald is also witness to what Poole identified as being either a provinciale or an earlier register of Alexander III, which listed the four Welsh sees under a different rubric to those of English sees.\textsuperscript{220}

\textsuperscript{215} De Giraldo Archidiacono Menevensi (GCO i.398), GCO iii.179–81, Inv., IV.2 and IV.9 (Invectionibus, p. 166 and pp. 176–7, Autobiography, pp. 192–4). The letter discovered by Gerald is the letter from Eugenius to Theobald of Bec confirming that Bernard had lost his personal case. See above, p. 25, n. 110. See also ‘EAWD i, p. 218 and Davies, ‘Giraldus’, pp. 263–4.

\textsuperscript{216} De Jure, III (GCO iii.186–8, Autobiography, pp. 200–1) and EAWD i, p. 218–19.

\textsuperscript{217} Richter, Giraldus, p. 48. For the letter see above, n. 215.


\textsuperscript{219} R. L. Poole, Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery (Cambridge, 1915), pp. 149–50. Forgery of Papal letters seems to have been a problem at the beginning of Innocent III’s pontificate. A letter sent during his first year as pope to bishops throughout the Christian world warned that fake letters had been sent in both his name and in the name of Celestine III. The letter drew attention to the false seals that these letters carried. The letter is edited in O. Hageneder and A. Haidacher, eds., Die Register Innocenz’ III., 1. Pontifikatsjahr 1198/1199. Texte, Publikationen der Abteilung für historische Studien des Österreichischen Kulturinstituts in Rom, 2. Abt., 1. Reihe, Bd. 1: Texte, (Graz-Cologne, 1964), 235, and see also Calendar, 18. The letter is discussed in Poole, Papal Chancery, p. 153.

\textsuperscript{220} De Jure, II (GCO iii.165–6, Autobiography, pp. 182–4). See also Poole, Papal Chancery, p. 151 and pp. 193–6, EAWD i, p. 215 and Richter, Giraldus, pp. 49–50 and p. 112. See also the comments in Z. N. Brooke, The English Church and the Papacy: From the Conquest to the Reign of John (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 15–17. Poole was very tentative in his identification, and discussed the document with far less confidence than Richter.
Accordingly, Gerald argued, the papacy should treat the Welsh sees separately from those of England. Gerald is also seen to insist on recording the three letters of commission regarding the status of St Davids in a register belonging to Innocent III. Each of these incidents shows the emphasis Gerald placed on the importance of evidence for his cause. Perhaps more importantly, we see that a process for ensuring the validity of these documents was in place.

Throughout the case, Gerald gained several benefits from contact with the papacy. He received letters in his favour from Innocent and some cardinals. The most important was the right to administer the bishopric until a new bishop was elected. After the end of Gerald’s first period in Rome in May 1200, the Pope conferred these rights and reiterated his position in July 1201 and 1202. At the same time as the first letter, the Pope wrote to King John and Archbishop Hubert asking them to treat Gerald kindly. With the rights of Canterbury to defend, and with the King wishing to maintain the royal privilege of administering sees during vacancies, neither archbishop nor monarch responded well to Innocent’s request.

---

221 De Giraldo Archidiacono Menevensi (GCO i.398), Inv., IV.9 (Invectionibus, p. 176), EAWD i, p. 226. It is unclear as to exactly which register Gerald refers here, given that the only commission text to survive in the register of Innocent III is that of the third proposed inquiry into the status of St Davids, with the only proof for the other commissions being the contents list of Gerald’s De Invectionibus. For these, see above, p. 38, nn. 186–8, p. 39 n. 190 and p. 40, n. 200.

222 The letters are found in Inv., IV.7–8 (Invectionibus, pp. 173–5). The first text contains words in Gerald’s favour by Ottoviano di Paoli (Cardinal Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, 1189–1206) and Guido Papareschi (Cardinal Priest of Santa Maria in Trastevere). In the second text, the cardinals urge that the bishops addressed (Eustace of Ely and Mauger of Worcester) should do the right thing by the church of St Davids itself and ignore any external pressure put upon them. The authors are again Bishop Ottoviano, but also John of Viterbo (Cardinal Bishop of Albano, 1199–1210) and Leo (Cardinal Priest of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, 1202–24). For other occasions on which the Bishop of Ostia helped Gerald, see De Jure, IV (GCO iii.270, 272, Autobiography, p. 300, p. 303) and Davies, ‘Giraldus’, p. 269.

223 De Jure, II (GCO iii.179, 184, Autobiography, p. 192), Inv., III.1 (Invectionibus, p. 147), EAWD i, D.319, Calendar, 233. See also Richter, Giraldus, p. 114; Inv., III.2 (Invectionibus, p. 148), EAWD i, D.322 and Calendar, 337; Inv., III.10 (Invectionibus, pp. 152–3) and EAWD i, D.330.


225 Richter, Giraldus, pp. 118–20. Richter elsewhere casts doubt over whether Gerald did have any real control over the diocese, drawing attention to the fact that Hubert Walter still had control over the bishopric’s income. M. Richter, ‘Gerald of Wales: A Reassessment on the 750th Anniversary of His Death’, Traditio 29 (1973), 379–90, p. 387.
Gerald used these powers at home to his advantage and applied them to his vision of how an archbishop should act. The role of a metropolitan bishop according to Gerald was to consecrate bishops, call councils and restore the lost dignities of his see. With the obvious exception of consecrating another bishop, though he would doubtless have claimed this right had his case been successful, Gerald attempted to enact each of these functions. He attempted to reclaim the apparently lost dignity of St Davids through his case, and also called synods during his time in Wales in 1202. He called four synods in all at Carmarthen, Pembroke, St Davids and Brecon. The first three synods were prevented from taking place, Gerald tells us, as a result of Hubert Walter’s instructions. The fourth synod did take place, but Gerald’s account of it was contained in the now lost portion of his *De Rebus*. He records one incident from the synod in his *De Jure*, namely that Osbert and Reginald Foliot, two fellow canons of St Davids who opposed Gerald’s campaign, arrived with changed terms of reference for the inquiry into the status of St Davids which were to Gerald’s disadvantage. This was a blow to Gerald’s cause, especially as he had hoped to use the synod to highlight the shortcomings of Walter of St. Dogmael’s as a candidate to be bishop.

Gerald was unable to take advantage of his power on this occasion but was successful in his later dealings with Walter of St Dogmael’s. Walter had been elected during Gerald’s first visit to Rome on the instruction of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Gerald claimed that Walter was illiterate, and therefore unsuitable to be bishop. In order to prove the illegitimacy of Walter’s candidacy, Gerald secured a letter from Innocent III ordering the testing of Walter’s

---

228 Three chapter headings in the list of contents of De Reb. point to an account of the Synod may be found in GCO i.11–12. Gerald also refers to this account in De Jure, IV (GCO iii.218, 225, *Autobiography*, p. 242, p. 248).
abilities by the Bishop of Ely, Dean of London and Archdeacon of Buckingham. The Pope also sent Walter a letter demanding that he return the revenues that he had earned from properties in the diocese which Gerald should have received. Gerald refers to the Pope’s orders in a letter to Walter inviting him to the synod at Brecon. In the same letter, Gerald orders Walter to preach a sermon at the Synod, presumably in order to embarrass him publicly and further demonstrate his unsuitability to be a bishop. The test of Walter’s literacy occurred during the hearings before the commissioners at St Albans, where he failed to read letters from the Pope or from a Missal.

Some of Gerald’s decisions as bishop-elect were later confirmed by Innocent III. He had excommunicated Nicholas Auenel, William FitzMartin and other unspecified people for despoiling Gerald’s church at Llanwnda and his prebend of Mathri. Gerald had also seen fit to grant prebends to three men who Richter describes as “the last faithful followers of Giraldus.”

Other benefits to Gerald included restitution. Gerald claimed to have suffered at the hands of two fellow archdeacons, the aforementioned Osbert and another called Pontius, of St Davids. In response, the Pope wrote to the Bishops of Ely and Worcester and the Archdeacon of Buckingham to ensure that Gerald received restitution and would be treated peaceably in future.

---

231 See p. 39, n. 190.
232 Inv., III.14 (Invectionibus, p. 155), EAWD i, D.328 and Calendar, 340.
234 De Jure, IV (GCO iii.234, Autobiography, p. 259).
235 Inv., III.20 (Invectionibus, p. 160), EAWD i, D.369 and Calendar, 490. Gerald had excommunicated these men during the final hearing at St Albans. See De Jure, IV (GCO iii.235, Autobiography, p. 260).
236 Richter, Giraldus, p. 125. Phillip, priest and Canon of St Davids was confirmed the prebend of the church of St Davids as was the deacon Ithenard, whilst a priest called John was confirmed in the church of St. Bride. See Inv., III.21–3 (Invectionibus, pp. 160–2), EAWD i, D.371–3 and Calendar, 491–3. On Ithenard and his work see Walker, ‘Gerald of Wales’, pp. 67–8.
237 Inv., II.3 (Invectionibus, pp. 148–9), EAWD i, D.323 and Calendar, 343.
against two further adversaries at St Davids, Walter, Abbot of St. Dogmael’s, and Reginald Foliot, and demanded that they make restitution to Gerald.\textsuperscript{238} Those who had been excommunicated for attacking Gerald’s churches were also ordered to provide restitution to him.\textsuperscript{239} The long case had been a heavy financial burden for Gerald and he was granted some relief of his expenses by Innocent.\textsuperscript{240}

One final contribution by Gerald remains to be discussed. After his failed campaign, Gerald returned to Rome for a fourth time in c. 1206.\textsuperscript{241} Ambition was not the motivation this time, but pilgrimage. Gerald worried greatly about the effect of worldly corruption on the Church. He had a personal interest in this as he had himself benefited, and had helped another to benefit, from nepotism. When he was Bishop of St Davids, Gerald’s uncle David had secured the archdeaconate of Brecon for Gerald. As part of his settlement at the end of the St Davids dispute, Gerald had arranged for the archdeaconry to be transferred to his nephew, also called Gerald.\textsuperscript{242}

That Gerald felt the need to travel as a pilgrim is significant. The only other individual’s pilgrimage to Rome discussed by Gerald is that of Offa of Mercia in his \textit{Vita Ethelberti}.\textsuperscript{243} Offa made his journey to Rome, according to Gerald, as part of his atonement for instigating

\textsuperscript{238} This is the same letter which ordered the inquiry into the Abbot of St. Dogmael’s ability to read, for which see above, p. 39, n. 190.
\textsuperscript{239} For this letter, see above, p. 46, n. 235.
\textsuperscript{240} De Jure, V (GCO iii.284), Inv., III.17 (\textit{Invectionibus}, pp. 157–8), EAWD i, D.375 and Calendar, 496.
the murder of Æthelberht. Although his crime was not as serious as murder, Gerald clearly felt the need to atone for his sins. It seems likely that penitential pilgrimage to Rome to receive absolution from the Pope was well established in Wales by 1200 and that Gerald would have been familiar with the concept.

Gerald’s account of his pilgrimage is mainly concerned with penance. Between Epiphany and the end of Lent he accrued ninety-two years of indulgence by visiting basilicas and attending the stational masses during Lent as set out, Gerald erroneously claimed, by Gregory the Great (590–604). He made the figure one hundred years by becoming a brother of the Hospital of the Holy Spirit, founded on the site of the old Schola Saxonum by Innocent III. Gerald’s account of his visit highlights his credentials as a reformer, emphasising his preoccupation with devotion and the Church. It is in stark contrast to the contemporaneous account of Master Gregorius, whose De mirabilibus urbis Romae concentrates on the sites of Ancient Rome.

---

244 “Two Lives of St. Ethelbert, King and Martyr”, pp. 229–30. Although it is probable that Offa arranged the death of Æthelberht, it is unknown whether, and perhaps unlikely that, Offa travelled to Rome. See A. T. Thacker, ‘Kings, Saints and Monasteries in Pre-Viking Mercia’, Midland History 10 (1985), 1–25, at pp. 16–18.


Describing his final journey to Rome, Gerald does not detail which churches he visited, beyond his comments about following the stational masses.\textsuperscript{250} In the \textit{Speculum Ecclesiae} however, Gerald describes Rome naming the five principal churches of St. John Lateran, St. Peter’s, St. Paul’s, Mary Major and St. Lawrence beyond the Walls as well as a list of other churches within and without the walls.\textsuperscript{251} Of these churches it seems likely that Gerald at the very least visited the Lateran, St. Peter’s and St. Paul’s. He gives details of St. Paul’s, the tomb of St. Peter built by Constantine\textsuperscript{252} and an exhaustive list of relics held at the Lateran.\textsuperscript{253} He also discusses the Uronica and Veronica, held by the Lateran and Vatican respectively.\textsuperscript{254} If Gerald did indeed visit St. Peter’s, he would have joined Welshmen there. Gerald noted:

\begin{quote}
“Of all pilgrimages, they prefer going to Rome, and when they reach St. Peter’s they pray there most devoutly.”\textsuperscript{255}
\end{quote}

Gerald also testifies to the presence of many Welsh pilgrims during his second visit to the city in 1201.\textsuperscript{256}


\textsuperscript{252} Spec. Eccl., IV.5 (GCO iv.276–7). In a later chapter Gerald attempts to give the measurement of each basilica. Spec. Eccl., IV.10 (GCO iv.283–4).

\textsuperscript{253} Spec. Eccl., IV.3–4 (GCO iv.272–6) and Birch, \textit{Pilgrimage}, p. 111. An error occurs in Birch’s text throughout, as she states that Gerald’s pilgrimage occurred in 1204. It is unclear exactly when Gerald visited Rome, but based on Gerald’s remarks in \textit{De Invectionibus}, it seems more likely to have occurred in 1206 or 1207. See Inv., V.12 ((\textit{Invectionibus}, p. 192).


\textsuperscript{255} Descr. I.18 (GCO vi.203, \textit{Journey}, p. 253).

\textsuperscript{256} De Jure, II (GCO iii.193, \textit{Autobiography}, p. 208).
During the visit, Gerald again met Innocent III.\textsuperscript{257} Gerald presented care of his churches to Innocent in repentance for the worldly influence by which he had gained control of them.\textsuperscript{258} The Pope forgave him, returned the churches to Gerald and advised him how to govern the churches in his charge and how to live a better spiritual life. Gerald was relieved to receive the Pope’s blessing and ends with a poignant plea to the “diligent reader” to consider whether Gerald’s efforts had been in vain. In Gerald’s writings, we gain a glimpse of how a pilgrim might experience Rome at the end of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

Through all this we see the scope of Gerald’s contribution to our understanding of Welsh relations with the papacy in the medieval period. Having been both an agent and a supplicant of the papacy, Gerald provides a unique insight into this relationship. As one educated in Paris and therefore familiar with contemporary conceptions of the papacy, Gerald provides an insight beyond the reach of Welsh sources. As a supplicant before Innocent III, with the apparent backing of some Welsh princes, Gerald acted as a representative of Welsh political ambition before the papacy. In his writings Gerald utilised history and pseudo-history to demonstrate his knowledge of the papacy and always treated the writings of Popes as authoritative, whether he quoted short remarks or letters. Throughout all this, as Williams noted: “No one could mistake the unbounded respect [Gerald] cherished for the Pope and his Curia.”\textsuperscript{259} He contributes to our understanding of legatine work and indicates the importance of the Pope’s role as a symbol of authority. His desire for redemption through pilgrimage is echoed elsewhere in Welsh sources. In short, Gerald is a microcosm of the relationship between the Welsh polities and ecclesiastical organisations and the papacy in the medieval period.

\textsuperscript{257} Inv., V.13 (Invectionibus, p. 193, Autobiography, p. 352).
\textsuperscript{258} Richter highlights that this was in imitation of Thomas Becket. See Spec. Duorum, p. xxxii.
\textsuperscript{259} Williams, ‘Old Man’, p. 17.
CHAPTER 2: WALES IN PAPAL DOCUMENTS

Gerald of Wales represents the mainstream view of the papacy. Between his formal education and personal reflections, we see the papacy as a powerful body capable of administering justice and providing restitution. Examining the extent to which this ideal was reflected in Welsh contact with the Holy See should begin with papal documents concerned with Wales. Documents held at the Vatican Archives and those which survive at other archives were considered. Consultation of the papal registers held at the Vatican Archives allowed me to check the accuracy of the relevant entries printed in the calendar of papal registers.¹

The papacy may have begun conserving records as early as the fourth century.² There is stronger evidence for the time of Leo I (440–61) and certain evidence for the existence of a register by the time of Gregory I (590–604).³ An archive was formed and travelled with the itinerant papacy. By the mid-seventh century the Archives had found their first permanent home near the Lateran palace.⁴ Some of the Archives continued to travel. Innocent IV (1243–54), for instance, took part of the Archives to the First Council of Lyon in 1245 and it remained in the care of Cluny Abbey for some time.⁵ Further movements of the Archives included stays at Perugia and Assisi.⁶ Following the move to Avignon in the fourteenth century some records were kept there and approximately 500 volumes remained there as late

⁴ Boyle, Survey, p. 7. This said, the archive was kept for some time at the basilica of St. Laurentius in Parsina during the Fourth century. See J. Richards, The Popes and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages 476–752 (London, 1979), p. 290.
⁵ Boyle, Survey, p. 7.
⁶ Boyle, Survey, pp. 7–8.
as 1783. At the command of Napoleon, the Archives were transferred to Paris in 1810.

Although much of the Archives has returned (some original papal registers are now kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), they suffered great losses on the journey with one boatload of documents ending up at the bottom of Lake Garda and others going astray in France or being deliberately destroyed.

With the Vatican Library’s founding by Nicholas V (1447–55), a distinction began to be made between literary and documentary material. In the succeeding century Pius IV (1559–65), promoted the idea of a central archive of the Church to be held in the Vatican palace. He and his successors, Pius V (1566–72) and Paul V (1605–21), encouraged the return of documents associated with the papacy to the Archives. It was during the latter’s pontificate that the main part of the Registra Vaticana, from which most of the Vatican Archives documents under discussion here are taken, arrived in the Archives. The contents of this original core with later additions are described thus by Leslie MacFarlane: “The Vatican Archives contain the diplomatic and administrative correspondence of the Holy See, and are mainly a vast collection of the working records emanating from, and received by, the various departments of the papal Curia.”

The papal chancery produced several kinds of documents but the most common were the “privilege” and the “letter”. The “privilege” was used to grant or confirm rights of property

---

7 Material began to be returned to Rome following the schism’s end during the period 1419–22. The returned volumes continued to travel with the papacy to Church councils. Boyle, Survey, p. 8 and p. 11.
9 Boyle, Survey, p. 11.
10 Boyle, Survey, p. 9.
12 Boyle, Survey, p. 10. Five documents are taken from the collectoriae, a series of papal tax accounts. For the collectoriae see ibid., pp. 165–8 and MacFarlane, ‘Vatican Archives’, p. 41.
13 MacFarlane, ‘Vatican Archives’, p. 29, n. 1.
and jurisdiction. Letters were originally simpler documents used for administration, but grew in importance during the twelfth century, which led to their being further classified into two groups—littere de gratia and littere de iustitia. The former “grant or confirm rights, confer benefices, promulgate statutes or decrees or decide causes” whilst the latter “convey the Pope’s administrative orders, by injunction or prohibition or by the appointment of some commissioners to carry out some definite work; they include also the mass of his official correspondence on matters of all sorts, both political and administrative.”

As the number of petitioners increased, particularly after the pontificate of Alexander III (1159–81), the bureaucracy needed to produce and record the letters increased in complexity. Greater emphasis was placed on the use of formularies in writing letters. The need to guard against forgeries grew, with several Popes following Alexander III in issuing guidance on detecting them. These guidelines emphasised external features such as the seal and cord and the document’s internal features.

Given the amount of travel, allied with the usual disasters that may affect archives, it is remarkable that any documents survive. This is especially true given that records only began

---

14 The privilege and its form is detailed by Sheehy in PH, i., pp. xvi–xvii and see also Meyer, ‘Chancery’, p. 242.
to be recorded on parchment, rather than papyrus, in the early eleventh century.\textsuperscript{20} That the earliest continuous records survive from the time of Innocent III (1198–1216) should not be a surprise as he appears to have been the first Pope to regularise papal record keeping.\textsuperscript{21} These are mainly part of the \textit{Registra Vaticana}, a series which runs until the registers of Clement VIII (1592–1605).\textsuperscript{22} They contain letters sent, and occasionally received, by the papacy. The registers are divided for each pontificate and then further divided by a book for each year of a pontificate.\textsuperscript{23} Only two collections of documents from before Innocent III’s time survive in the current Vatican Archives.\textsuperscript{24} One is an eleventh-century copy of the register of John VIII (872–882) for the last six years of his pontificate, the other an incomplete copy of those for the reign of Gregory VII (1073–85).\textsuperscript{25} We have a limited idea of what the original registers were like before the pontificate of Gregory VII, but we know that they were utilised for standard phrases, accumulating legal proof and setting precedents.\textsuperscript{26}

Not all letters were registered by the chancery.\textsuperscript{27} Cheney draws attention to the 36 papal letters in the bishopric of Glasgow’s \textit{registrum} from the thirteenth century, but that only one

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{20} Boyle, \textit{Survey}, p. 7 and \textit{PH}, i. p. xv.
\item\textsuperscript{21} Boyle, \textit{Survey}, p. 7, MacFarlane, \‘Vatican Archives\’, p. 30.
\item\textsuperscript{23} \textit{PH}, i. pp. xxx–xxxi.
\item\textsuperscript{24} On the fragments of registers from the twelfth century see Blumenthal, \‘Papal registers\’.
\item\textsuperscript{26} Meyer, \‘Chancery\’, p. 253, \textit{PH}, i. p. xxx, Baumgarten, \‘Vatican\’, p. 474. See also Blumenthal, \‘Papal registers\’, pp. 142–5.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
is to be found in the papal registers.\textsuperscript{28} Similarly, Meyer notes that the notary Ciabattus transcribed eighty-one papal letters in his personal registers between the pontificates of Gregory IX (1227–41) and Gregory X (1271–76), but only one of these is found in a papal register.\textsuperscript{29} Referring to the work of Franco Guerello, Sheehy drew attention to estimates of between 0% and 23% of letters being registered, that is to say “of every 100 documents found [at non Vatican Archives] between 77 and 100 of them were not registered.”\textsuperscript{30} That letters were not always registered might explain why Gerald of Wales insisted on having letters regarding the status of St Davids entered in the register of Innocent III.\textsuperscript{31}

Relevant documents also survive outside the Vatican Archives. Many survive because they were associated with some great cause, such as the letters that were copied into Liber Landavensis, the Book of Llandaff, as part of the campaign by Bishop Urban of Llandaff (1107–34) to expand his diocesan boundaries.\textsuperscript{32} As we have seen, Gerald of Wales conserved numerous letters in his writings on the twin campaigns about his disputed election as Bishop of St Davids and raising the see to metropolitan dignity. Letters of Alexander III concerning the election of a Bishop of Bangor survive because they were amongst the letters of Thomas Becket.\textsuperscript{33} Letters also survive in the archives of ecclesiastical establishments such as Margam Abbey.\textsuperscript{34} Documents confirming land in Wales for ecclesiastical establishments beyond its borders are also preserved for this reason.\textsuperscript{35} Notices of several documents also survive in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{28} C. R. Cheney, \textit{The Study of the Medieval Papal Chancery}, The Edwards Lectures 2 (Glasgow, 1966), p. 15.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Meyer, ‘Chancery’, p. 240.
\item \textsuperscript{30} See \textit{PH}, i. p. xxxviii, n. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{31} See Chapter 1, p. 44.
\item \textsuperscript{32} See below, pp. 63–5.
\item \textsuperscript{33} See below, pp. 75–6.
\item \textsuperscript{35} See below, pp. 61–3.
\end{itemize}
Llyfr Coch Asaph, The Red Book of Asaph, a source originating in the fourteenth century that has not survived in its original form. Five transcriptions of extracts from the text survive as well as the Summa Libri Rubei Asaphensis, compiled in 1602, from which the original manuscript’s contents as well as some extracts are known. The original contained documents relevant for the history of the see of St Asaph from the first quarter of the thirteenth century to the second half of the fourteenth century, with the majority of documents dating from the episcopates of Anian II ap Ynyr (1268–93) and Llywelyn of Bromfield (1293–1314).36

In total, 372 items of correspondence concerning the Welsh in the period before the Edwardian conquest or sent to recipients within Welsh dioceses survive. They are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source and date</th>
<th>Number of documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 1198–1283</td>
<td>28737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Archivio Segreto Vaticano, 1198–1283</td>
<td>5218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Archivio Segreto Vaticano, pre 1198</td>
<td>6239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 O. E. Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph: A Textual and Historical study (University of Wales, MA thesis, 1968), i. pp. i–xlvi and R. I. Jack, Medieval Wales (London, 1972), pp. 131–2. Several papal letters are known only from the Summa, and only a few details of their contents remain. They are often undatable or beyond the scope of this work. See Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph, i, p. 53, p. 56, p. 83, p. 86 and p. 151.
37 This project considered all the holdings of the Archives for documents produced before the capture of Dafydd ap Gruffudd in 1283, but also examined the registers of Martin IV (1281–85) in their entirety. A further four documents concerning Wales were issued after the capture of Dafydd. Three letters from this total concern Gerald of Wales and are discussed in Chapter 1.
38 Twenty-six of these letters are preserved in the work of Gerald of Wales, and discussed in Chapter 1.
39 Three of these letters are preserved in the work of Gerald of Wales, and discussed in Chapter 1.
Amongst the documents kept at the Vatican Archives, one may further observe the following divisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents concerning the realm of England or the province of Canterbury</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents which name Wales, but provide no relevant information</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents directly concerned with Welsh affairs</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is little of specifically Welsh interest in the largest of these groups. These letters were addressed either to all suffragan bishops in the province of Canterbury or to all bishops, all the faithful, all men or to a specific religious order in the realm of England. It seems likely that many of these letters made their way to Welsh polities because there is no consistent distinction between Wales and England, unlike the more common distinction between England, Ireland and Scotland. Not distinguishing between Wales and England caused a small problem for Innocent III when he threatened to place England under an interdict during the reign of King John (1199–1216). The first letter threatening an interdict, which did not mention Wales explicitly, was issued in August 1207. At the request of Mauger (Bishop of
Worcester, 1199–1212), Innocent III clarified the situation by reissuing the letter in November 1207, this time mentioning Wales.40

Other letters mention Wales as a separate entity but provide little or no information about Welsh concerns. Innocent IV made the distinction in three letters addressed to the Bishop of Worcester concerning the crusade.41 Urban IV (1261–64) also made the distinction in five of his letters of introduction and instruction for the tax collector Master Leonard, cantor of Messina and papal chaplain during his time in England.42 Most of the letters which mark the difference are the letters of authority and instruction associated with Clement IV (1265–68).

Twenty-one letters sent to his legate Ottobuono mention Wales,43 five are concerned with the papal tax collector Master Sinicius,44 whilst a further twenty-four were sent to him during his time as legate in England when he was known as Guy le Gros.45 The difference from

---


previous and subsequent practice is explained by the fact that he had spent time in England immediately before his election as Pope, becoming aware of the distinctions and tensions in the years preceding the Second Barons’ War. The most useful thing to be said of these two groups is that it is through them that appeals for assistance in the wider Church (such as appeals for assistance in the Holy Land),\textsuperscript{46} declarations for the whole Church (such as the excommunication of Emperor Frederick by Gregory IX)\textsuperscript{47} or notifications of papal approval for activities within the wider Province of Canterbury (such as the letters associated with the translation of Thomas Becket’s relics issued by Honorius III (1216–27)) reached the Welsh polities.\textsuperscript{48}

These documents show the papacy exercising its jurisdiction and authority. It was to be obeyed when instructions were issued, but could assist in resolving disputes or problems. In this, the Welsh experience seems no different from that of other parts of Europe. It would be surprising if that were not the case given ever-increasing papal activity from the age of Innocent III onwards.\textsuperscript{49} Some cases however do provide illuminating details about medieval Wales. Let us first turn to the common experiences.

Many institutions wished to associate themselves with papal power by receiving confirmation of land grants. They wished to secure their rights and there could be no higher authority on


\textsuperscript{47} L. Auvray, ed., \textit{Les registres de Grégoire IX}, 4 vols., Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 2\textsuperscript{nd} ser. ix (Paris, 1890–1955), 5102 and CPR, p. 188.


earth than the head of the Church. Institutions looked to the papacy as the ultimate guarantor of their rights and property. Many letters are concerned with land and churches held in Wales. The brothers of Llanthony Prima, initially under the influence of their former prior, Robert de Béthune (Bishop of Hereford, 1131–48), sought confirmation of their possessions from Innocent II (1130–43) and Eugenius III (1145–53). Three similar confirmations were granted to Margam Abbey. Strata Florida was confirmed in possession of a grant of land and given privileges by Alexander III. Urban III confirmed properties to Monmouth priory, whilst lands belonging to St. John’s Priory, Brecon were confirmed twice by Innocent III and Honorius III. The latter also confirmed a grant by Bishop Reiner of St Asaph (1186–1224) of half the church of Wrexham to Valle Crucis Abbey in 1223. A confirmation of a grant of


53 For this Bull, see Chapter 3, pp. 113–14.


55 Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph, i. p. 111 and ii, p. 139. Only a record of Honorius’s confirmation survives, dated 16 Kalendus Januarii, Pontificatus sui anno 7. Three other letters were sent by Honorius III on this date (17 December 1222), but this confirmation is unrecorded. See Reg. Hon. iii, ii, p. 102. For Valle Crucis, see AP, pp. 213–17.
land to the Abbot and convent of Tintern Abbey was the first item of the eleventh year of Innocent IV’s reign.56

Land and churches in Wales were confirmed to institutions outside Wales.57 Sherborne Priory was confirmed in possession of St. Mary, Cydweli and of other churches in Wales by Alexander III.58 He confirmed St Peter’s Abbey, Chertsey in possession of churches in and near Cardigan, a grant further confirmed by Alexander IV.59 Alexander III appears to be confirming part of a grant to Chertsey made by Rhys ap Gruffudd of Deheubarth (d. 1197), who may have been reaffirming a grant to Chertsey by the Clare lords. The confirmation by Alexander IV may have been prompted by research following a serious fire at Chertsey in 1235.60 Alexander III also confirmed unspecified lands in Wales and the March to the Abbot and monks of Reading.61 The prior and monks of St Andrew’s Priory, Stogursey were confirmed in possession of several properties including the right to the tithe of the church of Llangybi in Monmouthshire by Innocent III.62 Honorius III confirmed lands to Hereford cathedral, including some adjacent to Llanthony Prima and an estate in Brecknockshire to

56 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 23, f. 1r, Reg. Inn. IV, 6820 and CPR, p. 288. For Tintern Abbey, see AP, pp. 204–9.
61 Papsturkunden in England, iii,300. Pope Alexander also confirmed Reading in possession of Leominster, the Isle of May and other possessions in Scotland.
Malvern Major Priory. He further confirmed an indulit to the Abbot and monastery of Tewkesbury by “W. and H., bishops of Llandaff”, concerning the church of St. Mary in Cardiff, a grant further confirmed by Gregory IX in 1230. The H. is certainly Henry of Abergavenny (Bishop of Llandaff, 1193–1218) but the W. could be William of Saltmarsh (Bishop of Llandaff, 1186–91) or William of Goldcliff (Bishop of Llandaff, 1219–29). The latter was the subject of papal correspondence through the papal legate Pandulf who notified Henry III of his election.

The letters confirm land in Wales to institutions outside the British Isles. These include the confirmation of land to Letard, Abbot of Bec, by Lucius II (1144–45), and of churches in the diocese of Llandaff. The income of the church of St. Mary, Abergavenny was confirmed to the Abbey of St. Vincent, Le Mans by Innocent III. Between 1239 and the Edwardian conquest, nine documents concerned the grant of St. Leonard’s church, Magor by Gilbert Marshal, Earl of Pembroke to the Abbey of St. Mary in Glory, Anagni. Although originally given during the pontificate of Gregory IX, a later copy of the grant is preserved in the register of Innocent IV. This Abbey was a pet project of Gregory IX, whom Earl Gilbert appears to have met whilst travelling to or returning from the Holy Land.

64 Honorius gave a general confirmation of lands and benefits to Tewkesbury mentioning the Bishops of Llandaff in Reg. Hon. III, 3292, CPR, p. 81 and EAWD ii, L.330. W. and H. and St. Mary’s are mentioned in Reg. Hon. III, 3323, CPR, p. 82 and EAWD ii, L.331.
66 EAWD ii, L.322.
69 This transfer was also the subject of a letter by Elias of Radnor (Bishop of Llandaff, 1230–40), for which see Chapter 3, p. 131. For the history of this Abbey see G. Ercolani, D. Fiorani, G. Giammaria, with D. Durante, and I. Sanpietro, La Badia della Gloria, Monumenti di Anagni (Anagni, 2001). The church remains the parish church of Magor, Monmouthshire but was later rededicated to St. Mary.
two letters concerning the grant, one confirming Gilbert’s gift and the second mandating the legate Otto to ensure that letters patent regarding the transfer were given to Deodatus, Abbot of St. Mary.\textsuperscript{72} The grant was confirmed by Innocent IV who granted farming rights for the church of Magor to the monks of Anagni for twenty years and mandated two canons of Anagni cathedral to ensure that the abbot and monks were not harmed when collecting the money due to them.\textsuperscript{73} Alexander IV twice confirmed the grants of Gregory IX and Elias of Radnor, Bishop of Llandaff, and granted the farming rights in perpetuity to the monks of Anagni.\textsuperscript{74} The lands would eventually be transferred to Tintern Abbey in 1442 because the income was not worth the expense of collection.\textsuperscript{75}

Of the cases concerned with Welsh land, attention must be paid to the contest detailed in \textit{Liber Landavensis}.\textsuperscript{76} It is a fantastically interesting source for the history of the Church in twelfth-century Wales and has been extensively studied by J. Conway Davies, Christopher Brooke, Wendy Davies and John Reuben Davies.\textsuperscript{77} A collection of charters, saints’ lives and papal documents, as well as a partial copy of St Matthew’s Gospel, it is a “liturgical manuscript of high status” composed at the behest of Urban, Bishop of Llandaff.\textsuperscript{78} He

\textsuperscript{72} Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 19, f. 131v, Reg. Greg. IX, 4932 and 4933 and CPR, p. 183.


\textsuperscript{75} This transfer is recorded in the register of Eugenius IV (1431–47). See J. A. Twemlow, \textit{Calendar of Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland, Volume 9: 1431–1447} (London, 1912), p. 266.


employed these documents to project a vision of the diocese of Llandaff going back to the age of the saints whose *vitae* it contains. He used this projected history to protect his diocese from incursion by local magnates and especially from the rival territorial claims of the bishops of St Davids and Hereford. At times, Bishop Urban’s enthusiasm may have got the better of him as the book contains charters which were either genuine documents edited in the aid of Urban’s cause or outright forgeries.79

The earliest papal letters concerned with Welsh land are contained here, and unlike the charters, the correspondence contained in the book is likely to be genuine. Although they are copies, the bulls conform to the rules and styles used in the papal chancery at the supposed time of their composition during the pontificates of Callixtus II (1119–24), Honorius II (1124–30) and Innocent II.80 The book contains forty six documents relating to the papacy dating to between October 1119 and March 1132.81 These include papal privileges for the diocese of Llandaff, letters sent to Llandaff and other dioceses from the papacy and letters sent to the papacy outlining Llandaff’s case and appeal over its lost territories.

John Reuben Davies fashioned a narrative out of these documents, reconstructing the process and stages of Urban’s direct appeals to the papal Curia.82 The case’s details therefore need not detain us, but it is worth highlighting some aspects. This is the first documented contact between the papacy and a Welsh diocese. In itself this is unimportant, but in light of later

79 Charles-Edwards provides a very useful discussion on the charters from the Book of Llandaff, concluding that: “as documents claiming that Llandaff was the beneficiary of the grants, the charters are admittedly forgeries; but the argument that genuine grants to churches other than Llandaff underlie most texts is persuasive.” See. T. M. Charles-Edwards, *Wales and the Britons 350–1064* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 248–67.
82 Ibid., pp. 37–45.
events we see Urban’s appeals to the Curia establishing templates for Welsh ecclesiastics and magnates to follow.

Around the same time, there was contact between Bishop Bernard of St Davids and the papal court. It is tempting to suggest that this was in response to Urban’s actions, especially given the direct threat to the size of his diocese that Urban’s case posed. Bernard secured a papal bull in favour of St Davids from Calixtus II, protecting the lands of his church from further alienation and ordering the restoration of lands seized by violence. This bull, Sharpe suggests, is responsible for the notion of St. David’s canonisation by this Pope and may explain William of Malmesbury’s remarks regarding two journeys to St Davids being the equivalent of a pilgrimage to Rome.

The fact of Urban’s appeal and Bernard’s securing of some privileges is their main attraction. This was the main manner of interaction between the Welsh and the papacy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as seen from minor appeals for permission to hold additional benefices and from magnates like Llywelyn ap Iorwerth (d. 1240) and Llywelyn ap Gruffudd (d. 1282) seeking papal approval for their actions. There was also Gerald of Wales’ appeal over the status of St Davids and his election as bishop. Through Urban’s case we see the first

83 Chapter 1, pp. 21–6.
contact with a papal legate to provide any information about Wales and the first recorded Welsh participation at a legatine council. Additionally, it provides an early example of the appointment of papal judges-delegate. Beyond the Book of Llandaff, Bishop Urban makes one further appearance in papal letters. Having heard of Urban’s death, Innocent II wrote to William of Corbeil (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1123–36), ordering him to maintain and defend the see of Llandaff during the vacancy.

The Llandaff case was far from the final territorial dispute involving a Welsh diocese. Gregory IX appointed three officials from Lincoln to resolve a boundary dispute between Coventry and Lichfield, St Asaph and Worcester. Gregory launched a further inquiry a few weeks later on the Bishop of Hereford’s behalf, this time with three officials of Worcester charged with deciding on the boundaries between the diocese of St Asaph, Llandaff, St Davids and Hereford.

Another boundary dispute may be found in an indult Thomas Wallensis (Bishop of St Davids, 1247–55) received from Innocent IV granting him permission to build suitable dwellings near churches in Glascwm, Radnorshire, and Ceri, Montgomeryshire. Both were located at the medieval diocese of St Davids’ northern extremity, with Ceri in particular a contentious place having been the scene of a confrontation between Gerald of Wales and Adam, Bishop of St

---

88 Davies, Book, pp. 43–4.
90 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 18, f. 102r, Reg. Greg. IX, 2936 and CPR, p. 150. The letter was sent on 28 January 1236.
91 Councils, i, pp. 464–5, Reg. Greg. IX, 3013, CPR, p. 151 and EAWD i, D.510. The letter was sent on 15 March 1236.
Asaph (1175–81), during the former’s time as Archdeacon of Brecon. It seems that Bishop Adam sought to expand his territory during the vacancy in St Davids following the death of Gerald’s uncle David fitz Gerald (1148–76), an endeavour in which he was supported by Cadwallon ap Madog of Maelienydd. Cadwallon may have been attempting to escape the overlordship of Rhys ap Gruffudd by removing his territory from the diocese of St Davids (and the lay influence of Rhys) to that of St Asaph and the lay influence of Rhys’s rival Owain Cyfeiliog. Adam later appealed to Alexander III, with the Pope mandating Bishops Bartholomew of Exeter (1161–84) and Roger of Worcester (1164–79) to hear the case between Adam and Peter de Leia of St Davids (1176–98) in a letter dateable to January 1177 x September 1179. There is no surviving evidence regarding this commission but, as Cheney indicates, given that Ceri remained in the diocese of St Davids, Adam’s appeal must have failed.

The papacy is also seen granting privileges to institutions, with several surviving from the archives of Margam Abbey. As a Cistercian monastery, Margam was granted special protection by Innocent III, who charged the Archbishop of Canterbury and others who held ecclesiastical offices to ensure that his orders were enacted. A further letter from Innocent, in addition to confirming lands held by the monks, granted Margam several privileges such as freedom from paying tithes and the right for the abbey’s brothers to give evidence in civil and

96 On Margam and its scriptorium see R. B. Patterson, The Scriptorium of Margam Abbey and the Scribes of Early Angevin Glamorgan (Woodbridge, 2002)
97 Clark, Cartae, CCLXXX, Birch, History, pp. 170–1, Calendar, 514, EAWD ii, L.258 and Original, 27.
criminal cases. The former privilege was confirmed in another letter from Innocent, who suggested excommunicating any who demanded payment of tithes from the abbey. Three letters granting privileges are addressed to the Abbot of Cîteaux and fellow Cistercian abbots but survive in the charters of Margam. Innocent IV granted a licence “to depute to their priors the ability to absolve monks of the order from sentences of excommunication for violence”. Two letters from Alexander IV grant exemption to the Cistercians from being summoned to synods and other meetings without a specific mandate and confirm that the constitution of Innocent IV regarding the summoning of persons by ordinaries does not impinge on Cistercian privileges. Clement IV also assisted Margam, confirming an agreement with the Abbot and convent of Tewkesbury over the collection of tithes in Newcastle Emlyn.

Two other Welsh Cistercian houses to benefit from the papacy were Cwm Hir and Valle Crucis. Owing to their remote location, both received permission from Gregory IX to hear confession and administer the sacraments to their households. Evidence from Llyfr Coch Asaph suggests that Valle Crucis received privileges from several Popes. None of the notices regarding these privileges are dated nor are any regnal numbers given, but the sequence of names (Innocent, Gregory, Honorius, Alexander and Urban) suggests that the documents were issued during the thirteenth century. Other beneficiaries were the brothers of the

---

98 These rights were confirmed by Alexander IV. See above, p. 60, n. 51.
99 Clark, Cartae, CCLXXI, Birch, History, p. 171, Calendar, 519, EAWD ii, L.260 and Original, 29. A similar letter was issued to the monks of Llantarnam Abbey five years later by the same Pope. It mentions tithes specifically and other indults granted to the Cistercians. London, British Library Add. Ch. 20406, Calendar, 805, EAWD ii, L.271 and Original, 40. For Llantarnam see AP, pp. 125–7.
100 Clark, Cartae, DXVI, Birch, History, p. 253 and Original, 253.
101 Clark, Cartae, DC and DCI, Birch, History, p. 271 and Original, 637 and 639.
102 Clark, Cartae, DCXLII, Birch, History, pp. 282–4, EAWD ii, L.545 and Original, 730.
103 For Cwm Hir see AP, pp. 80–3.
104 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 16, f. 53r–v and f. 92v, Reg. Greg. IX, 963 and 1112 and CPR, p. 131. Bliss misspelled Cwm Hir as Cumhir in his calendar and does not record the letter to Valle Crucis.
105 Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph, p. 114.
Augustinian Priory of Haverfordwest to whom Alexander IV granted the right to be served by chaplains appointed by themselves.106

Individuals might also petition for aid. Abraham, a monk of Aberconwy who was illegitimate, was addressed by Honorius III who, in view of support for Abraham from his fellow brothers, the King of England and Stephen Langton (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1207–28), granted him permission to enter religious life in April 1225.107 Papal dispensation for illegitimacy was also granted to an individual from the see of St Asaph.108 Another illegitimacy case concerned Richard Carew (Bishop of St Davids, 1256–80), who had been elected by the chapter of St Davids in August 1255 but refused royal assent by Henry III.109 It is not clear why the King objected to Richard (he does not, for instance, raise the bishop's illegitimacy) but in a draft letter, dated 12 November 1255, Henry appeals to Alexander IV not to admit the postulation of Richard, along with that of a new Archbishop of York, promising that messengers will explain his reasons at the Curia.110 Alexander IV cannot have found their reasons convincing because he consecrated Richard in Rome and sent a series of letters in support of the new bishop in February and March 1256. Ecclesiastical officials were to ensure that Richard received his due rights in his diocese.111 The chapter, clergy and people of St David’s were to receive and obey Richard as their bishop despite his

106 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 24, f. 156v, Reg. Alex. IV, 1243, CPR, p. 329 and EAWD i, D.630.
108 Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph, p. 114. The dispensation was given by an unknown Pope Urban, but as the notice of this dispensation is at the end of a sequence of papal letters discussed above in p. 68, we may legitimately conclude that the original document dates from the thirteenth century.
111 Councils, i, pp. 481–2, Reg. Alex. IV, 1159, CPR, p. 327 and EAWD i, D.623.
illegitimacy.\textsuperscript{112} He was commended to Henry III, and the King was commanded to ensure that the new bishop received his temporalities, to which end Henry directed his agents in May 1256.\textsuperscript{113} The bishop was encouraged to govern his diocese well, a directive taken to heart as the chapter of St David’s submitted an ordinance of diocesan accounts for Alexander’s approval.\textsuperscript{114} Richard’s case was not an unusual one, as there are other comparable examples such as the case of Mauger, Bishop of Worcester and Geoffrey de Liberatione, Bishop of Dunkeld (1236–49).\textsuperscript{115} It is another example of the similarity of Welsh experiences to those elsewhere in the Christian world.

Richard Carew’s case was not the first time a Pope had overridden the Crown’s objections when choosing a bishop for a Welsh see. In February 1248, Innocent IV ordered the Archbishop of Canterbury to consecrate the newly elected Anian I (1248–66) as Bishop of St Asaph.\textsuperscript{116} The King objected on procedural grounds that the chapter had not first sought permission to hold an election. Royal assent was eventually granted in May 1248.\textsuperscript{117}

Several letters are addressed to clerics who requested permission to hold additional benefices,\textsuperscript{118} mostly to men from the see of St Davids, including Archdeacon Jordan “of the

\textsuperscript{112} Reg. Alex. IV, 1158, CPR, p. 327 and EAWD i, D.624; Councils, i, pp. 482-3, CPR, p. 328 and EAWD i, D.625-6.
\textsuperscript{113} Councils, i, p. 483, CPR, p. 328, and EAWD i, D.627; D.632–3 and Evans, ‘Bishops’, p. 298.
\textsuperscript{114} Councils, i, pp. 483-4, CPR, p. 329, EAWD i, D.628; Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 25, 245r, Reg. Alex. IV, 3098 and EAWD i, D.649. This document should be read with Barrow, St Davids, 130, the document which established the treasurer at St David’s. See also Chapter 3, pp. 131–2.
\textsuperscript{115} For Bishop Mauger see below, pp. 94–5, and for Bishop Geoffrey see Barrell, ‘Scotland’, pp. 172–3.
\textsuperscript{116} Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 21, f. 510v, Reg. Inn. IV, 3669 and CPR, p. 242.
\textsuperscript{118} On the provision of benefices by the papacy during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see K. Pennington, Pope and Bishops (Pennsylvania, 1984), pp. 115–53, especially pp. 135–48 on the prohibition on holding two benefices following the Fourth Lateran Council.
Three Mountains”, 119 Canon Edward de la Cnoll, 120 Richard, Rector of Manorbier, Pembrokeshire, 121 Simon of Radnor, Rector of Llanbister, Radnorshire, 122 Robert de Berken, Rector of Rhosili, Glamorganshire, 123 and William, Rector of Stackpole, Pembrokeshire. 124 Maurice, rector of Abernant, Carmarthenshire, was granted permission to hold two additional churches at Dinas and Llanboidy, Carmarthenshire, at the request of Annibale Annibaldi, Cardinal Priest of the church of the Twelve Apostles. 125 From the diocese of Llandaff, Michael Odin, Rector of St. Nicholas on the Mount 126 and Richard de Kenfex, Rector of St Donats, Glamorganshire, received permission to hold additional benefices 127. A further, unknown applicant from St Asaph was also granted the right to hold an additional benefice, but neither the date nor the Pope who issued the permission is known, though the two dated


120 The letter is recorded as being sent in the same manner (in eundem modum) as a letter sent at the same time to John de Button, a canon of Wells. Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 21a, 218r (but cf. Reg. Vat 21a, 217v–218r), Reg. Inn. IV, 4465, CPR, p. 254 and EAWD i, D.563. Edward de la Cnoll was subsequently given papal dispensation for illegitimacy. See 'Canons whose prebends cannot be identified', in FEA 9, pp. 61–72. British History Online http://www.british-history.ac.uk/fasti-ecclesiae/1066-1300/vol9/pp61-72 [accessed 7 January 2016].

121 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 22, ff. 107v–108r, Reg. Inn. IV, 5424, CPR, p. 273 and EAWD i, D. 583. The mandate from Innocent IV to the Bishop of St Davids describes Richard only as a rector. It is impossible to identify him as there were at least two known Richards amongst the clergy of St Davids in the 1250s, one of whom was Precentor of St Davids 1253–1259/60. See 'Precentors', in FEA 9, pp. 50–51. British History Online http://www.british-history.ac.uk/fasti-ecclesiae/1066-1300/vol9/pp50-51 [accessed 10 January 2016].


126 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 27, f. 75r, Reg. Urban IV, 274 and EAWD i, L.507. The name given in the letter of Urban IV is ecclesiam beati nicolai supra montem. I have been unable to identify this church satisfactorily, but two possibilities present themselves. Perhaps the likeliest is St. Nicholas in Grosmont, Abergavenny, Monmouthshire. The other candidate is the village of St Nicholas, Glamorganshire.

documents surrounding the record of the permission in the Red Book of Asaph, date from 1266 and 1270 respectively.\textsuperscript{128}

Another possible recipient of a benefice in Wales was Adam de Mora.\textsuperscript{129} He was a relative of William of Bitton I (Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1248–64), whom Innocent IV commanded to arrange a benefice for Adam either in his own diocese or in the “principality of Wales” as compensation for voluntarily giving up a benefice in the see of Bath and Wells.\textsuperscript{130} One who did hold a benefice in Wales was Master Giles of Avenbury, treasurer of the diocese of Hereford.\textsuperscript{131} Amongst the churches held by Master Giles was that of “Merthir” in the diocese of St Davids, perhaps identifiable as the modern district of Merthyr, Carmarthenshire.\textsuperscript{132}

These documents show bishops assisting others. One letter provides an example of Welsh bishops acting in concert with other suffragans of Canterbury. Following a request by, amongst others, the Bishops of St Davids and St Asaph, Innocent IV wrote to the Abbots of St Albans, Bury St Edmunds and Waltham warning against vexatious appeals. The letter is clearly meant to warn the abbots that they must be subservient to their bishops.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{128} Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph, i, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{132} Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 27, f. 80r, Reg. Urban IV, 292 and CPR, p. 390. This must be the church that is in the diocese of St Davids as the others named are in Herefordshire (Avenbury), Cambridgeshire (Kimbolton) and Shropshire (Clun). See also W. G. Clark-Maxwell, ‘The advowson of Clun in the 12th and 13th centuries’, Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural Society 34 (1911), 342–8, at pp. 344–6.
Bishops also benefited from papal letters. A letter to the Bishop of Llandaff from Gregory IX gave him the power to unite churches when their individual incomes were not sufficient to support a rector. Welsh bishops were granted permission not to travel. William de Burgh (Bishop of Llandaff, 1245–53) was excused from attending the First Council of Lyon in 1245 as was Anselm le Gros (Bishop of St Davids, 1230–47) in the final months of his episcopate. Almost a decade later, John la Warre (Bishop of Llandaff, 1254–56), was granted permission not to travel from his diocese by Innocent IV.

The benefit of travel to Rome itself is apparent in the case of Bishop Thomas Wallensis. His return from Rome to St Davids is recorded by all versions of Brut y Tywysogion for 1253. He benefited directly from three letters issued by Innocent IV. In July 1252 a letter was written on his behalf to Henry III (1216–72), ordering restitution to be made to Thomas following conflict over the right to administer ecclesiastical patronage in the diocese of St Davids. Henry followed Innocent IV’s instructions, mandating the bailiff of Carmarthen to oversee the restitution in January 1253. In August 1252 Innocent wrote on behalf of Bishop Thomas to John de Cheham, a papal chaplain and Canon of St. Paul’s, asking for a prebend of St. Paul’s to be assigned to the bishop. Thomas claimed it had been granted to his predecessors by virtue of his dignity as Bishop of St Davids. The letter, along with other

134 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 20, f. 19r, Reg. Greg IX, 5238, CPR, p. 190 and EAWD ii, L.402. This letter was probably intended for Elias of Radnor, but he had died in office around a month before the letter was issued. For this bishop see Crouch, Llandaff, pp. xvi–xvii.
135 Councils, i., p. 473; Councils, i., pp. 473–4 and EAWD i, D.537. For William de Burgh see Crouch, Llandaff, p. xvii and for Anselm le Gros, see Evans, ‘Bishops’, pp. 292–5.
139 EAWD i, D.596.
papal letters concerning St Davids known from other sources, is included in the Statute Book of St Davids, compiled during the episcopacy of Edward Vaughan (Bishop of St Davids, 1509–22). Which prebend was claimed by Bishop Thomas is unknown as this letter is the only surviving evidence of such a claim.

Ecclesiastical discipline features in papal letters concerning Wales. The earliest letters survive in the *Liber Eliensis* and concern the case of Hervé, a chaplain of King William II (1087–1100), appointed Bishop of Bangor in 1092 after the initial Norman incursions into North Wales. He proved unpopular, being driven from the see c. 1095 by the men of Gwynedd after the Norman gains were reversed. Letters mentioning the events at Bangor in a highly uncomplimentary manner were issued by Paschal II (1099–1118) at Hervé’s behest. Their main purpose is to advise Henry I (1100–35) and Anselm (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1093–1109) on establishing a new bishopric at Ely. The Pope recommends Hervé’s transfer to the new diocese on account of his learning and the “excessive ferocity and harassment” and the “savagery of barbarians” which had forced him out of Bangor. The see of Bangor was unreformed at the time and if it is taken that the voice of Hervé speaks

---

through the letter of Paschal II, we may be seeing the frustration of an unwelcome reformer unaccustomed to Welsh ecclesiastical practices.\textsuperscript{147}

A continuing lack of reform in Wales is evident from a letter from Theobald of Bec (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1139–61) to probably Pope Adrian IV (1154–59).\textsuperscript{148} Theobald outlines a long-running dispute between Nicholas ap Gwrgant (Bishop of Llandaff, 1148–83) and Robert, son of Nicholas’s predecessor Uhtred (Bishop of Llandaff, 1140–48).\textsuperscript{149} Nothing is said of the dispute’s cause, but allegations of violence and carnal vice against Robert are levelled by an archbishop frustrated at being unable to resolve the matter. Both sides appear to have acquired papal letters in their support, even though Robert’s were suspected as forgeries by the archbishop because of their internal features.

There was further indiscipline in Bangor around the same time in a dispute between Owain Gwynedd (d. 1170) and Thomas Becket.\textsuperscript{150} They argued over the appointment of a new bishop to Bangor following the death of Bishop Meurig (1139–61), and over Owain’s marriage to his first cousin Cristin. The latter had been brought to the papacy’s attention by Theobald of Bec in a letter written to support Meurig, who had had to escape from Gwynedd. The letter complains about the standard of Welsh learning and Welsh ideas of marriage but particularly against Owain.\textsuperscript{151} Alexander III wrote to the chapter of Bangor in December 1165 mandating the election of a bishop within two months and annulling the apparent

\textsuperscript{147} For Bangor before Hervé’s election see Pryce, ‘Esgobaeth Bangor’, pp. 38–43 and on the Welsh Church in general see AoC, pp. 172–9.


\textsuperscript{149} Crouch, Llandaff, pp. xiii–xiv.

\textsuperscript{150} The most thorough account of the controversy is by Davies in EAWD ii, pp. 417–36 and discussed further in Chapter 3, pp. 123–4.

practice of hereditary tenure of the archdeaconry. When his instructions were not followed, he wrote to the laity and clergy of Bangor in February 1166 again ordering a swift election. He had previously written to Becket instructing him to encourage the same in January 1166. With the vacancy still not filled in October 1168, Alexander wrote to Henry II (1154–89) complaining that he kept bishoprics vacant for his own benefit. Finally, Becket was ordered to take severe sanctions against Owain and David, the archdeacon, over the matter of Owain’s wife and his intransigence over the vacant see. This last letter implies that Alexander III had written directly to Owain concerning his marriage to Cristin, but that Owain had refused to read the Pope’s letter. This letter does not survive.

Almost a century later Welsh attitudes to marriage continued to trouble the Church. In 1252, Innocent IV granted Thomas Wallensis of St Davids the faculty to permit the continued marriage of two couples who had married within the degrees of consanguinity permitted by the Church and another who had married within the degrees of affinity. These contraventions of Canon law were not exclusive to Wales, and we have several examples from all over Christendom, including from, for instance, Norway, Sweden, Scotland and Ireland. The granting of the faculty demonstrates the papacy's increasing influence on Welsh life.

154 *Correspondence*, i.67 and EAWD ii, pp. 422–3.
155 *Materials*, vi.CCCLX and EAWD ii, pp. 427–8. There were many vacancies, with Bangor and St Asaph amongst them. Becket complained that the same sees were empty and of Henry II’s abuse of them almost a year later (August 1169) to Hubald, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. See *Correspondence*, ii.216.
156 *Correspondence*, ii.190 and EAWD ii, pp. 428–9.
The letters concerning Owain Gwynedd were the first of several groups sent by Alexander III. Becket caused Alexander III to write to a number of bishops following the crowning of Prince Henry (d. 1183) in June 1170, supporting Becket in whatever action he took against the participating officials, who included Godfrey (Bishop of St Asaph, 1160–75) and his archdeacon, David. They were suspended with Nicholas ap Gwrgant of Llandaff in a letter of 16 September 1170. It seems that the Pope had written to the Bishop Godfrey earlier, commanding him to return to his see, but this letter is lost and known only through a letter from Becket to Godfrey in August or September 1169. In the letter, Becket orders Godfrey to return to his see or resign as per Alexander III’s instructions. The bishop appears to have fled St Asaph following the Welsh successes of 1165. Alexander also replied to the Bishop of Hereford who had enquired about the correct day to make ecclesiastical appointments. The bishop had complained that clerks were promoted to Holy Orders outside Ember Days by bishops in Scotland and Wales, a practice condemned by Alexander, who insisted that clerks be promoted on appropriate days. This is an example of a minor point that the papacy, with the beginnings of a reformed bureaucracy in place and improved means of imposing discipline, could now insist on enforcing.

---

161 Correspondence, ii.226.
163 EAWD ii, L.160.
164 AoC, p. 194.
Other practices were far more important. For instance, Urban IV instructed all Welsh ecclesiastics to obey the commands of his legate Ottobuono.\textsuperscript{165} Honorius III reminded all cathedral chapters in Wales and England to elect bishops who were faithful to the Church and King (Henry III), and to pay attention to the advice of his legate Pandulf.\textsuperscript{166} Having granted Cadwgan of Llanddyfai (Bishop of Bangor, 1215–36) permission to resign his see, Gregory IX wrote to the chapter of Bangor commanding it to canonically elect a new bishop and to use the former bishop’s effects, barring his books and clothes, to pay the church’s debts.\textsuperscript{167}

The papacy sometimes sought assistance from Welsh ecclesiastics. Some instances were direct appeals for aid. Urban IV wrote to the Bishops of St Davids, St Asaph and Llandaff asking for assistance in paying the debts incurred by the papacy during the Sicilian affair.\textsuperscript{168} The main letter in Urban’s register is addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury but it is noted that letters were sent to the bishops of the named sees. After noting the letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, there is a sizeable gap on the manuscript page before the next entry in the register. It seems likely that the scribe left a gap either to enter a record of another letter or to note that more copies of this letter were sent. Given the letter’s nature, and to how few bishops it was addressed (the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Coventry, Bath and Exeter are named), the latter possibility is more appealing. It is unknown whether Urban received any aid from the Welsh bishops. Innocent IV asked an earlier Bishop of St Davids, Anselm le Gros, to act as a conservator on the Bishop of Bath and Wells’s behalf.\textsuperscript{169} This

\textsuperscript{165} Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 32, f. 9r, Reg. Clement IV, 41, CPR, p. 426.

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{PH}, 123, Reg. Hon. III, 2027 and CPR, p. 65. For the legate Chapter 3, p. 130, n. 215.


\textsuperscript{168} Reg. Urban IV, 128 and CPR, p. 383.

\textsuperscript{169} Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 21, 539r–v, Reg. Inn. IV, 3953 and 3955, CPR, p. 246 and EAWD i, D.564. Bliss omitted to note that the Bishop of St Davids had been appointed a conservator in the second letter. On the
intervention stemmed from the dispute between the canons of Wells and the monks of Bath over voting rights for the election of Roger of Salisbury (Bishop of Bath, 1244–45; Bishop of Bath and Wells 1245–47). Similarly, Innocent instructed Anian I of St Asaph to ensure that transactions conducted by William, sub-prior of Coventry, during his brief tenure as Abbot of Shrewsbury, were reversed. Following a disputed election, Innocent had previously ordered William to resign the monastery and give any proceeds he had received as abbot to Henry, whom the Pope appointed as the new abbot; the Bishop of St Asaph was named executor for this process. Innocent IV also mandated the Prior of Llanthony Prima, with the Prior of Leominster, to prohibit the Dominicans from establishing themselves at Hereford in order to avoid impoverishing other ecclesiastical institutions there. The matter arose again during the pontificate of Urban IV, who ordered the Bishop and Archdeacon of Llandaff to decide the case between the dean and chapter of Hereford and the Dominicans. The case became a long-running one, with the involvement of ecclesiastical officials from Wales acting as two brief windows on a sometimes violent dispute, which began in 1246 and was not permanently settled until 1342. Alexander IV asked a prior of Llanthony to assist the chapter of Hereford by overseeing the return of unlawfully alienated goods.


174 Hereford, Hereford Cathedral Archives, 2526 and *Original*, 506.
mandate was issued by the same Pope in January 1261, this time charging the precentor of Llandaff to assist the Abbot and convent of Dore, Herefordshire.\footnote{The mandate survives amongst miscellaneous administrative records in the records of the Court of Augmentation in the National Archives. See London, The National Archives, E315/40/146, and EAWD ii, L.494. The precentor’s identity is unknown, with the last recorded precentor of Llandaff being Maurice Gobion in 1254. ‘Precentors’, in FEA 9, p. 20. British History Online http://www.british-history.ac.uk/fasti-ecclesiae/1066-1300/vol9/p20 [accessed 22 March 2016].}

Other letters ask for aid in preaching the crusade. Innocent IV mandated the Bishop of St Davids, along with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishops of Chichester and Exeter, the Prior of the Dominicans and the Minister of the Franciscans, by Innocent IV to preach the crusade with promises of indulgences to all who took the cross.\footnote{T. Rymer, and R. Sanderson, Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae etc., ed. A. Clarke and F. Holbrooke, 4 vols. in 7 (London, 1816–69), I.272 and Original, 365 and EAWD i, D.604. See also Lunt, Financial Relations, p. 440.} Urban IV sent letters to bishops throughout Europe asking for assistance for the crusade. They are mainly addressed to Walter de Cantilupe (Bishop of Worcester, 1236–66) or occasionally to the Bishop of St Andrews. It is noted in the manuscript that five of these letters were sent to the Bishop of St Davids, with Richard Carew the likely recipient. On the Pope’s behalf, he was to grant remission to those who participated personally and those who assisted participants as well as granting plenary indulgence to those who attended processions and sermons.\footnote{Reg. Urban IV, 466, Thomas Mathew's Welsh Records in Paris, ed., D. Rees and J. G. Jones (Cardiff, 2010), ‘Welsh Records in Paris, 1910’ , pp. 13–16 and 65–70 and CPR, p. 394. Thomas Mathew’s Welsh Records in Paris was reissued with new introductory notes in 2010. Page references in this and succeeding footnotes are to the texts and translation of the original volume, which was reissued in full in the reprint.} He was empowered to collect a hundredth of Church revenue in Wales for five years to assist the crusade, and granted the right to summon crusade participants beyond his diocese.\footnote{Reg. Urban IV, 468 and 470, ‘Welsh Records in Paris, 1910’ , pp. 7–12, 59–66 and p. 17, CPR, p. 394 and EAWD i, D.665. It does not appear that this tax was collected in Wales. See Hurlock, Crusades, p. 36 and pp. 202–4 and see also Lunt, Financial Relations, pp. 290–1 and p. 446. Edward I (1272–1307) was later granted the right to collect a tenth for the crusade in the 1270s but does not seem to have been able to collect it as the grant was incumbent on an immediate departure to the Holy land. See ibid., pp. 334–5.} Urban IV addressed all the other bishops of Wales, encouraging them to assist the Bishop of St Davids regarding the crusade.\footnote{Reg. Urban IV, 471, ‘Welsh Records in Paris, 1910’ , p. 18 and p. 72, CPR, p. 394 and EAWD i, D.664. The notice of Wales in the manuscript also mentions archbishops. This is clearly an error.} Similarly, a letter was addressed to all manner of
ecclesiastics, encouraging them to welcome the bishop on his journey and granting him safe passage as he went about his business, though Lunt was doubtful whether any of these commissions took place given how close to the outbreak of civil war they were issued. In the case of Urban IV, Hurlock suggests that the Bishop of St Davids was chosen for the task as the papacy required an agent with local knowledge and that this is an example of the papacy taking more direct control of Welsh affairs. She is undoubtedly correct on both counts and it is important to note that the letters directed to the Bishop of St Davids are but some of Urban IV’s letters to name Wales as a separate entity. His letters of instruction and introduction concerning the legate Guy le Gros also distinguish between Wales and England.

Welsh ecclesiastics are seen assisting the papacy in conducting inquiries. The Abbots of Strata Florida and Valle Crucis and the Prior of Valle Crucis were asked to inquire into the burning of documents concerning the possessions of Cormeilles Abbey. In 1222, Honorius III directed the Abbot and Prior of Whitland and the Abbot of Cymer to investigate allegations of corruption against the Bishop of St Asaph. Reiner (Bishop of St Asaph, 1186–1224) apparently permitted priests to succeed to their fathers’ churches on payment of a fine, clergy to have concubines and illiterate clerks picked by their families to serve the

---

183 See above, p. 58, n. 45.
185 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 16, f. 100v, Reg. Greg. IX, 1155 and CPR, p. 152. See also Sayers, Papal Judges Delegate, p. 91, where the importance of having documentary proof of their possessions for the Abbot and convent of Cormeilles is emphasised.
diocese. We perhaps see here a remnant of the old Clas churches. Gregory IX instructed the Bishop of St Asaph (Hywel, Bishop of St Asaph (1233–40) at the time of the Pope’s letter), with the Abbot of Dore, to resolve the dispute between Margaret de Lacey and her endowed foundation of Aconbury Priory, Herefordshire. William of Radnor (Bishop of Llandaff, 1257–66) was one of several bishops asked to inquire into the avaricious practices of certain monks.

Through such inquiries, we catch a glimpse of the papacy’s influence on Welsh society. Three letters from the register of Innocent III concern the proposed marriage of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth, the ruler of Gwynedd known as Llywelyn the Great, to an unknown daughter of Rögnvaldr King of the Isles (1187–1229). She had previously been betrothed to Llywelyn’s uncle Rhodri ab Owain Gwynedd (d. 1195). Llywelyn was seeking papal blessing for the union in a bid to ensure that he did not contravene Canon Law. In the first letter, written in November 1199, the Bishop of Man, the Archdeacon of Bangor and the Prior of Ynys Lannog were asked to investigate the matter. The Pope provides some background

189 Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 25a, 36r–46v, Reg. Alex. IV, 3240, CPR, p. 375 and EAWD ii, L.495. For William of Radnor, see Crouch, Llandaff, p. xviii.
190 The events are discussed in the context of Manx history in R. A. McDonald, Manx Kingship in its Irish Sea Setting 1187–1229: King Rögnvaldr and the Crovan dynasty (Dublin, 2007), pp. 101–4.
and some points for the commission to consider. About three years later the Pope confirmed the first inquiry’s findings, which had found no impediment because the marriage between the princess and Rhodri had not been consummated. After restating the background, he instructed the Abbot of Aberconwy, the Prior of Bardsey and a canon of Beddgelert to ensure that the decision was observed. The final letter was addressed to the Bishops of Ely, Norwich and St Asaph, to whom Innocent gave new information, namely that although the princess had been young at the time of her marriage to Rhodri, they had spent two years in each other’s company and in the same marriage bed, so it was to be presumed that they had known each other carnally. This was an impediment to legal marriage, and therefore he directed the bishops to conclude the affair. Pryce highlights Llywelyn’s use of Canon Law in this incident to secure his position. The first use of Canon law concerned the possibility of securing an ally in his fight to establish himself in Gwynedd; Rögnvaldr had sent military aid to Rhodri ab Owain Gwynedd in 1193 and Llywelyn’s position in Gwynedd may well have remained precarious until as late as 1202. Indeed, the dates of the papal letters support the conclusions reached by Insley in his assessment of the civil war in Gwynedd between the death of Owain Gwynedd in 1170 and Llywelyn’s eventual triumph. Llywelyn needed the Manx alliance to win his position, but once he had gained prominence, a better alliance became a more appealing possibility and hence his second appeal to Canon law.

---

Llywelyn’s change of heart on marriage is perhaps understandable. Marriage to an illegitimate daughter of King John (1199–1216) was preferable to an alliance with the Kingdom of Man as it offered greater stability.\textsuperscript{197} Llywelyn took further steps towards stability, including having Joan legitimised by Honorius III in 1226.\textsuperscript{198} Four years previously he had gained recognition from Honorius of Dafydd ap Llywelyn (d. 1246), Joan’s son, as his sole heir, a scheme previously approved by the legate Pandulf, Henry III and Archbishop Langton at a meeting in Shrewsbury in 1220.\textsuperscript{199} Welsh law allowed natural children publicly acknowledged by their fathers to have an equal share of patrimony. Llywelyn had previously recognised Gruffudd, the son of Tangwystl, as his son. One must accept Smith’s argument on Honorius’s letter, namely that Llywelyn was not seeking, as has sometimes been assumed, to use this document to eradicate the principle of partible inheritance in Wales but to establish the principle of a legitimate son taking precedence over a bastard in matters of inheritance.\textsuperscript{200} Another letter of Honorius to the Bishops of St Davids, Bangor and St Asaph reveals that Llywelyn had obtained, by order of Henry III, a pledge of fealty to Dafydd from the leading men of Wales.\textsuperscript{201} Llywelyn had his agreements with King John confirmed by Pope


\textsuperscript{198} Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 13, f. 122v, Reg. Hon. III, 5906, CPR, p. 109 and AWR, 279. For the effect of this confirmation of legitimacy and the letters regarding the naming of Dafydd as heir in enhancing Joan’s status see Wilkinson, ‘Joan’, p. 88.

\textsuperscript{199} AWR, 253, Reg. Hon. III, 3996, and CPR, p. 87: Rymer, Foedera, I.i.159 and AWR, p. 416.


Honorius. All this formed part of Llywelyn’s strategy for securing Dafydd’s succession in Gwynedd.

The significance of Llywelyn’s seeking papal approval in these matters cannot be overstated, especially as it illustrates a change of attitude in Gwynedd and a recognition of the papacy’s increased importance for Llywelyn and his advisers. His grandfather, Owain Gwynedd, had repeatedly ignored Alexander III on marrying within the permitted degrees of consanguinity. Diplomatic correspondence with the French court shows that Owain regarded the papacy as an important institution but one which could be ignored without much harm to his position. Llywelyn saw the papacy as an institution which could strengthen his hold on Gwynedd. Its support was essential to his strategy of securing the unity of Gwynedd for his son. The change in attitude mirrors the papacy’s growing power and influence.

This is not to say that Llywelyn had everything his own way in his encounters with the papacy. Several letters were sent to remind Llywelyn to keep the peace with Henry III. Honorius III reminded him of his duty to the King and instructed him to abandon any oaths given to Louis of France, whilst legate Pandulf was later charged with reminding Llywelyn of

---

202 J. G. Edwards, ed., Littere Wallie (Cardiff, 1940), Littere, 303. This letter, along with the previous two documents, was issued within a short space of time in 1226. Stephenson and Jones suggest that the reason for this flurry of activity may have been that Dafydd was to come of age under Welsh law (at fourteen years old) when Llywelyn wrote to Honorius seeking his approval. See D. Stephenson and C. O. Jones, ‘The Date and Context of the birth of Dafydd II ap Llywelyn’, Flintshire Historical Society Journal 39 (2012), 21–32, at pp. 28–30. The text of the letters edited by Edwards derives from ‘Liber A’, a compilation of letters on a similar subject made in the reign of Edward I, for which see Edwards, Littere, pp. xxvii–xxxv and AoC, p. 307.

203 The most celebrated account of Llywelyn’s strategy is G. A. Williams, ‘The Succession to Gwynedd 1238–1247’, BPCS, 20 (1962–64), 393–413 and see also AoC, pp. 249–50.


205 AoC, p. 194.


207 Llywelyn’s respect for Innocent III’s position allied to what he feared might happen to Gwynedd should he incur the Pope’s wrath plausibly explains his abandonment of his perpetual alliance with Philip Augustus of France (1180–1223) less than a year after concluding a treaty with him. See Chapter 3, p. 109, n. 80.
his obligations under oaths sworn to Henry III. Following the hostilities of 1223, Llywelyn’s lands were placed under interdict by the Pope in October, with letters sent to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and their suffragans. By March 1234, Llywelyn stood accused by royal envoys of disturbing the peace of the realm, possibly for his involvement in the rebellion of Richard Marshal, Earl of Pembroke. The suffragan bishops of Canterbury doubted whether the situation was as bad as described by the envoys and, as the see of Canterbury was vacant, they would not take action against Llywelyn because he was not under their pastoral care. Gregory IX reminded the Bishops of Durham and Rochester that ecclesiastical censure could be deployed to bring peace to the realm. The Pope’s letter may have arrived a little late to have any effect, as Llywelyn had reached accommodation with the Crown in April 1234, before signing the Pact of Myddle in July of that year. A final reminder to Llywelyn was issued two years later in April 1236 when the Archbishop and Archdeacon of Canterbury were instructed to remind Llywelyn of his oaths to Henry III. Llywelyn again stood accused of fomenting rebellion and disturbing the peace of the realm, in contradiction of papal instruction that there should be peace for four years for the sake of the Holy land. Precisely what led to the issuing of this letter is unknown as Llywelyn does not appear to have made any aggressive move against the Crown. Given the importance Llywelyn placed upon the papacy, it is easy to see how such a letter would have strengthened

---

the Archbishop of Canterbury’s hand in negotiating an extension to the Pact of Myddle in July 1236.\textsuperscript{213}

Others in Llywelyn’s family appear in these documents. Dafydd ap Llywelyn is mentioned in two letters from Innocent IV. In an attempt to improve the miserable situation he faced in 1241 after being forced to humiliating terms by Henry III, Dafydd appealed to the papacy for arbitration in July 1244, perhaps because of the changed situation following the death of his brother Gruffudd in March of the same year.\textsuperscript{214} It is clear from the letter appointing the Abbots of Aberconwy and Cymer as papal judges-delegate that he requested an inquiry into the manner in which Henry III had negotiated with him in 1241.\textsuperscript{215} He was not, as has previously been argued, seeking to give himself as a vassal to the papacy in a similar manner to King John, his grandfather, or Rögnvaldr, King of the Isles, but he did seek to remind the papacy of the protection granted him by Honorius III.\textsuperscript{216} Dafydd clearly timed his appeal well as it took Henry III by surprise when he heard of it in November 1244 when many of the leading bishops had left England for the First Council of Lyon.\textsuperscript{217} In April 1245 the Pope revoked the abbots’ commission, asking two judges more favourable to Henry, the Bishops of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{213} AWR, 271.
\item \textsuperscript{217} Wiedemann, ‘Fooling’, pp. 216–17.
\end{itemize}
Carlisle and Ely, to execute his orders.\footnote{Counsels, i., pp. 471–2 and Original, 277. See also Richter, ‘David’, pp. 214–215 and Wiedemann, ‘Fooling’, pp. 218–19.} Richter’s explanation of the Pope’s rejection of Dafydd ap Llywelyn at first seems compelling. He argues that papal protection was withdrawn from Gwynedd in exchange for the payment of tribute due from Henry III and for English support for papal policy at the First Council of Lyon. Innocent IV was able to use Dafydd ap Llywelyn’s political manoeuvring to strengthen the papacy’s financial and political positions in his conflict with Emperor Frederick II (1220–50).\footnote{Richter, ‘David’, pp. 215–217.} This line of argument has recently been criticised by Wiedeman, who emphasises Dafydd’s use of the “routinization” of papal bureaucracy in an attempt to challenge the humiliating terms of 1241 and earn himself room for political manoeuvre.\footnote{Wiedemann, ‘Fooling’, especially pp. 213–16, pp. 219–20 and pp. 231–2. See also Meyer, \textit{Political Power}, pp. 33–4, especially p. 33, n. 29 and for the appointment of judges-delegate see Müller, ‘Omnipresent Pope’, p. 212.} Dafydd certainly chose the judges he nominated well given his family’s support for the Cistercians and for Aberconwy and Cymer in particular.\footnote{See Stephenson, \textit{Political Power}, pp. 33–4, especially p. 33, n. 29 and for the appointment of judges-delegate see Müller, ‘Omnipresent Pope’, p. 212.} Although this move ultimately failed to protect Dafydd, it again demonstrates an appreciation of the papacy’s power.

Two of Clement IV’s letters to the legate Ottobuono concern Llywelyn ap Gruffudd, the grandson of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth. The first mandates the legate to induce Llywelyn to end his alliance with Simon de Montfort and pay compensation for damage done in his name.\footnote{Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 32, ff. 62r–v, Reg. Clement IV, 231, CPR, p. 431 and Original, 709.} If he did not comply, Llywelyn was to be excommunicated and his lands placed under interdict. The second letter granted Ottobuono the right to absolve Llywelyn and others of their oaths of fealty to de Montfort.\footnote{Vatican City, ASV Reg. Vat. 32, f. 62v, Reg. Clement IV, 232, CPR, p. 431, Original, 710 and EAWD i, L. 505.} Both letters were issued at Perugia in September 1265, a month after de Montfort’s defeat at Evesham. Although they were therefore without purpose, the letters set the tone for Ottobuono’s interaction with the Welsh. He would
eventually lead peace negotiations between Llywelyn and the Crown, resulting in the Treaty of Montgomery in 1267.\footnote{AWR 363 and see J. B. Smith, \textit{Llywelyn ap Gruffudd: Prince of Wales} (Cardiff, 2014), pp. 177–180.}

Observance of this treaty lies behind a letter of Gregory X to Edward I written from the Second Council of Lyon in 1274.\footnote{London, The National Archives SC 7/47/3, and \textit{Original}, 766.} Gregory reminded Edward to observe the agreement made between his father and Llywelyn.\footnote{The Pope may have been aware of the treaty’s details as he had served Ottobuono during his time as legate in England. See Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, p. 381, p.389 and AWR, p. 570.} On the same day, he issued two further letters concerning Llywelyn’s affairs. He confirmed the agreement made between Llywelyn and his brother Dafydd, which had been mediated by the Bishops of Bangor and St Asaph, and wrote to Robert Kilwardby (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1273–78), asking him not to summon Llywelyn and his subjects to England, provided that they were willing to appear before commissioners in Wales.\footnote{\textit{Councils}, i., pp. 501–2, AWR, 382 and \textit{Original}, 765. See also Stephenson, \textit{Political Power}, p. 175; \textit{Councils}, i., pp. 500–1, AWR, 381 and \textit{Original}, 767.} The latter two letters appear to be directly concerned with the conspiracy to overthrow Llywelyn with which Dafydd was involved and with Llywelyn’s quarrel with Anian II, Bishop of St Asaph (1268–93).\footnote{Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, pp. 369–82, \textit{AoC}, pp. 323–6 and Stephenson, \textit{Powys}, pp. 144–51.} In all three cases, Llywelyn was using the papacy to secure his own position.\footnote{It is presumed that all three letters were issued in response to petitions made to Pope Gregory by Llywelyn which do not survive.}

The capture of Eleanor de Montfort and her brother Amaury de Montfort, a papal chaplain, by Edward I in the Winter of 1275 is another incident of note in papal letters.\footnote{The situation is explained in Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, pp. 390–402.} Llywelyn had married Eleanor \textit{per verba de presenti} and arranged for her to travel to him from France.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 393–6 and pp. 397–8. They would be married in person at Worcester in 1278. Edward I paid for the wedding feast and gave the bride away. See ibid., pp. 448–50.} Eleanor and Amaury were the children of Simon de Montfort, and the renewal of
this old alliance clearly posed problems for the King. Even leaving aside his understandable animosity towards the de Montfort family after the Barons’ War, the King further distrusted them after the murder of his cousin and emissary Henry of Almain by Simon and Guy de Montfort in a church in Viterbo in 1271. Edward captured the siblings at sea, detaining Eleanor for almost three years and Amaury until December 1282. These differences are reflected in the papal letters. Several Popes were concerned with the case including, amazingly given that his reign as lasted from 11 July to 18 August 1276, Adrian V. Edward I wrote to him twice to explain the situation, arguing that Llywelyn had arranged the marriage to cause disturbances in the realm and that he would only release Amaury if the archbishops and bishops would guarantee Amaury’s good conduct. The second letter was used by the King to complain of Llywelyn’s failure to pay homage to him. In January 1277, John XXI (1276–77) asked Edward I to release Eleanor and also wrote to the prelates of the realm asking them to press the King to release Amaury. Three further letters concerning Amaury’s release were sent by Nicholas III (1277–80) in February 1280, and a final three were sent by Martin IV pleading Amaury’s case in September 1281. It seems unlikely that these letters had much influence on Edward I. Eleanor was released after the conclusion of hostilities in 1276–77 and Amaury at their commencement in 1282. In this case, the King paid far more heed to his domestic concerns than to the papacy’s requests.

---

232 Ibid., pp. 391–3.
233 Ibid., pp. 396–7 and pp. 399–401.
234 N. Denholm-Young, ed., The Liber Epistolaris of Richard de Bury (Oxford, for the Roxburghe Club 1950), 23. Denholm-Young suggested that Edward I was inspired to write to Adrian V by their personal connection; Adrian V was the papal legate Ottobuono who had negotiated the Treaty of Montgomery.
236 Reg. John XXI, 78–9 and CPR, p. 452. See also Smith, ‘Offra’, p. 365. It is apparent in this letter that Llywelyn had written to Gregory X to complain of the matter. AWR, p. 580.
The involvement of the Marcher Lords and the English Crown in Welsh matters is noticeable in these letters. We have already seen that accusations against Welsh princes by the Crown might be brought before the papacy but we also see the papacy granting benefits in Wales. As he had taken the Cross, Innocent IV granted Henry III protection of his family, possessions and lands, with lands in Wales amongst those listed.\(^{238}\) Gregory X granted similar protection to the future Edward I in July 1272 so that he could prosecute his crusade more vigorously.\(^{239}\) A similar guarantee of protection, though without the crusading vows, had previously been given to Gilbert Marshal, along with his brothers Walter and Anselm, by Gregory IX who granted them protection of lands in Wales and Ireland.\(^{240}\) Gilbert and his brothers had returned to the King’s favour following the unsuccessful rebellion of their elder brother Richard Marshal for just over a year when this letter was issued, and they perhaps sought to secure their lands should any complication arise.\(^{241}\) Henry III was also granted the right to collect tithes in Wales by Innocent IV, a right confirmed and extended by Alexander IV in March 1255.\(^{242}\) The King received a similar privilege from Clement IV in June 1266.\(^{243}\) There are glimpses of Welsh life in the documents. In September 1264, Urban IV issued a mandate to Homodeus de Crema, papal subdeacon, and Bartholomew de Turano, canon of St. Timothy's, Rheims, to compel the debtors, including clerks and laymen, of a group of Florentine merchants to repay their debts. The original letter discusses debts owed in France, but the manuscript demonstrates that the mandate extended to Welsh debtors.\(^{244}\) By the time

---


\(^{239}\) Rymer, *Foedera*, I.495 and *Original*, 739. Whilst still known as Tedaldo Visconti, the pope had met Edward at Acre. For Edward as a crusader see M. Prestwich, *Edward I*, Yale English Monarchs (Yale, 1997), pp. 66–85 and for Welsh and Marcher participation in Edward’s crusade see Hurlock, *Crusades*, pp. 115–19.


\(^{241}\) For the life of Gilbert Marshal, see above, p. 62, n. 71, and for the problems he faced following his return to favour see D. Crouch, ‘Earl Gilbert Marshal and his mortal enemies’, *Historical Research* 87 (2014), 393–403, at pp. 399–403. For the lives of his brothers, see Crouch, *Acts and Letters*, pp. 32–7.

\(^{242}\) PH, 400, Reg. Alex. IV, 384 and CPR, p. 314.


\(^{244}\) Reg. Urban IV, 945 and CPR, p. 404.
the letter was issued, Welsh clerics and laymen had already borrowed enough from Italian merchants to be worth pursuing.

A letter from Alexander IV to Boniface of Savoy (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1241–70) offers a similar glimpse of Wales’s economic state.245 Alexander chided Boniface in a letter of April 1255 for failing to visit the four Welsh dioceses on account of war and the lack of sustenance available.246 Visits by the metropolitan were very rare. Baldwin (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1184–90) and John Pecham (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1279–1292) visited in 1187 and 1188, and in 1284 respectively, but no other visits are known.247 Assuming that the reasons for not visiting the Welsh dioceses were originally given by Boniface, they must have seemed poor excuses to Alexander IV.248 However, the reasons highlighted by Alexander deserve greater attention. The reference to war perhaps suggests the fighting between the sons of Gruffudd ap Llywelyn ap Iorwerth before the battle of Bryn Derwin in June 1255.249 The letter mentions the lack of food to sustain a visit by the archbishop. Perhaps this indicates the high standards a noble of Savoy might expect of his surroundings. It might also lead us to conclude that there were poor economic conditions in the Welsh dioceses in the mid-1250s, chiming with Gerald of Wales’s comment that all the Welsh sees were poor.250 We may consider in this context the information provided in the assessment of the value of

246 Reg. Alex. IV, 407 and CPR, p. 315. The letter’s first sentence reads: Ex parte tua fuit propositum coram nobis quod, cum tuam provinciam visitas, quatuor dioceses ipsius provincie in Wallia constituta propter guerrarum discrimina, penuriam victualium et plura impedimenta alia interdum non potes commode visitare.
248 The words plura impedimenta alia suggest this.
250 See R. Bartlett, Gerald of Wales: A Voice of the Middle Ages (Stroud, 2006), p. 46, n. 97 and the references found there. For the measures taken by bishops of St Davids to counteract this poverty see H. Pryce, ‘In search of a Medieval Society: Deheubarth in the writings of Gerald of Wales’, WHR 13 (1986–87), 265–81, at pp. 275–7.
ecclesiastical property known as the *Valuation of Norwich*, undertaken by Walter Suffield (Bishop of Norwich, 1244–57) at the behest of Innocent IV. This valuation formed the basis for the payment of annates to the papacy until the *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* of 1291. The valuation as we have it is incomplete, but provides information regarding the value of property in the dioceses of Bangor, Llandaff and St Asaph. In the surviving survey the total value of properties in Bangor was assessed at £160 4s 7d, in Llandaff at £838 8s 4d and in St Asaph at £290 9s 2d, all of which are considerably less valuable than comparable sees in England. Boniface of Savoy’s complaints may not have been baseless.

A similar picture emerges from the documents of the *collectoriae* held at the Vatican. These are concerned with tax gathered in the papacy’s name. Two documents mention Wales, giving the recipients the power to demand that tax be collected. Wales is also mentioned in a report on the collection of tax. One difficulty mentioned in collecting tax in these records is the war of 1276–77 between Llywelyn ap Gruffudd and Edward I. The collectors, Arditio of Milan and John of Darlington, were informed that it would be dangerous to collect tax in England as all the King’s armies would be in Wales and no one would protect them from robbery; as a result of the war, collection in Wales appears to have been impossible. No record of what, if anything, was collected survives.

---


253 Lunt draws comparison with the dioceses of Durham, Ely and Norwich which were valued respectively at £3839 4s. 3d., £2635 8s. 10.5d and £14,487 8 s. 9.75d. As Lunt highlighted, the figure for Bangor may be incomplete due to a defect in the manuscript. Lunt, *Valuation*, p. 118.

254 The relevant documents for Britain are printed in W. E. Lunt, ‘A Papal tenth levied in the British Isles from 1274–1280’, *EHR*, 32 (1917), 49–89.


Despite papal authorisation, it seems unlikely that other papal levies, such as Peter’s Pence, were ever collected in Wales.\textsuperscript{258} Urban IV instructed Master Leonard, Cantor of Messina, to collect Peter’s Pence in Wales in 1262 and Martin IV instructed Geoffrey of Vezzano to do so in a letter of March 1282.\textsuperscript{259} Subsequent letters instruct Geoffrey to inquire into how papal levies had been conducted.\textsuperscript{260} A further list of the expected payments from different churches does not mention a foundation in Wales at all, though Wales is mentioned at the start of the letter.\textsuperscript{261} Martin IV also authorised Geoffrey to collect money for use in the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{262} The export of this tenth was halted by Edward I in May 1282 and may have been used to finance his campaign against Llywelyn and Dafydd ap Gruffudd in 1282–83.\textsuperscript{263}

A final letter concerns Bishop Mauger of Worcester, who wrote to Innocent III complaining that he and his people could not appear before judges in Wales without risking their safety owing to the permanent state of conflict between the Welsh and English.\textsuperscript{264} Innocent advised Mauger to refer all such requests to appear before judges to the jurisdiction of the Apostolic See. Read alone, the letter might be taken as evidence for conditions along the Welsh border at the turn of the thirteenth century, perhaps an indication of the aftermath of the campaign led by Gwenwynwyn ab Owain Cyfeiliog of Powys (d. 1216) between 1196 and 1198.\textsuperscript{265}

\textsuperscript{258} Lunt, Financial Relations, pp. 18–19. See also Chapter 1, p. 13, n. 34.
\textsuperscript{260} Das Kammerregister Papst Martins IV, 123 and 124 and CPR, p. 475. Wales is not mentioned directly in the first of these letters.
\textsuperscript{261} Das Kammerregister Papst Martins IV, 125 and CPR, pp. 475–6. Das Kammerregister Papst Martins IV, 127 and CPR, p. 476.
\textsuperscript{264} Stephenson, Powys, pp. 80–1, AoC, p. 229 and HoW, pp. 582–7.
might even be taken as suggesting that the Bishop of Worcester was at times subject to Welsh law. Seen in its full context, the letter offers a greater interest. Mauger was known personally to Innocent III, having travelled to Rome to secure his election as Bishop of Worcester. As the illegitimate son of a knight and a free woman, Mauger was seemingly barred by canons of the Third Lateran Council from becoming a bishop. Whilst accepting that Mauger had been elected illegally, therefore quashing the election, Innocent III exercised his discretion in allowing the monks of Worcester to secure a dispensation for Mauger, before consecrating him personally.\footnote{Cheney, *Innocent III*, pp. 142–3 and *English Episcopal Acta 34: Worcester 1186–1218*, ed. M. Cheney, D. Smith, C. Brooke and P. M. Hoskin (Oxford, 2008), p. xxxv.} The bishop seems likely to have been a contemporary of Gerald of Wales at Paris, and one from whom Gerald presumed support at the beginning of his campaign to ratify his election as Bishop of St Davids.\footnote{EEA 34, p. xxxiv.} Even if he had had sympathy for Gerald’s cause, by the beginning of 1202 Mauger would have come under great pressure to align his position with that of the Crown and the Archbishop of Canterbury, at least to judge by the correspondence of Hubert Walter (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1193–1205) and letters patent of King John.\footnote{EAWD i, D.335 and D.346.} This was a time when Mauger had been named as a papal commissioner inquiring into Gerald’s twin causes of the status of St Davids and his election. Caught between the Scylla and Charybdis of disappointing an acquaintance and contradicting the wishes of two men to whom he had sworn obedience, Mauger sought to extricate himself from a difficult situation by appealing to the papacy for assistance. He exaggerated the dangers for Englishmen in Wales in order to achieve his aim.\footnote{If this thesis is correct, it is likely that Mauger wrote to Innocent III following the first abortive hearing at Worcester on January 26, 1202 for which see Gerald of Wales, *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*, III (GCO iii.200–210), *Autobiography*, pp. 227–30, EAWD i, pp. 220–2 and J. C. Davies, ‘Giraldus Cambrensis 1146–1946’, *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 99 (1946–7), 85–108 and 256–80, pp. 266–7. Mauger was not present at this hearing.}
Through the documents issued by the papacy we see that the ideal represented by Gerald of Wales’s work was reflected in reality. It certainly seems that St Davids benefited from Gerald’s example because more papal documents concerning St Davids survive than for the other Welsh sees even without Gerald’s own substantial contribution. Furthermore, individuals and institutions are seen turning to the papacy for assistance and restitution. Urban of Llandaff attempted to use the papacy to secure an enriched future for his diocese; Llywelyn ap Iorwerth and his descendants repeatedly used the papacy to try to secure their polity’s future. This was in contrast to Owain Gwynedd, who saw the papacy as an institution which might be safely ignored. We also see the integration of the Welsh Church into the European mainstream through papal confirmation of the acquisition of land by foreign churches, the issuing of orders to assist the papacy and the imposition of ecclesiastical discipline in Welsh lands. The chance glimpses of Wales are fascinating in their incidental detail. We also see the limited development of knowledge of Wales in Rome. By the end of the period under consideration, the Welsh were no longer Paschal II’s barbarians, but well enough known to be treated on an equal footing with England and Scotland regarding preaching the crusade (even if institutional knowledge of Wales did not progress beyond this point). It seems that Rome was indeed becoming more important to Welsh life than the distant pilgrimage centre it had been before the twelfth century.
CHAPTER 3: ROME AND THE PAPACY IN WELSH SOURCES, PART I

Gerald of Wales’s idea of the papacy was to a degree reflected in Welsh contacts with the institution as revealed in papal documents. What might be said of Welsh knowledge and acknowledgement of the papacy? What evidence is there in Welsh sources to support Davies’s contention that Rome was more than a pilgrimage centre at the end of our period?

Rome and the papacy in Welsh chronicles

Surviving evidence suggests that historical writing began in Wales during the late eighth century, both at St Davids and in North Wales, quite probably at Abergele. The motivation for compiling annals remains unknown, but Hughes suggested that it may have been sparked by interest in calculating the date of Easter. The original language of these annals was Latin, and for some time they have been known under the modern collective title *Annales Cambriae* despite growing recognition that this title is unsuitable and misleading as it gives the impression that the five principal manuscripts are variations on one chronicle. Although they are interrelated, they are five separate chronicles mainly concerned with Welsh history until around the time of the Edwardian conquest.

The five manuscripts considered here are given the following sigla by Dumville, with the names recently adopted by the Welsh Chronicles Research Group also given:  

---


2 Hughes ‘The Welsh Latin chronicles’, p. 69, n. 15.

A, the Harleian Chronicle: London, British Library, MS. Harley 3859, ff 190r–130r [s. xi/xii]4

B, the Breviary Chronicle: London, National Archives, MS. E.164/1, ff. 1r–13r [s. xiii/xiv]5

C, the Cottonian Chronicle: London, British Library, Cotton Domitian A. i, ff. 138r–155r [s. xiii]6

D, Chronica ante adventum domini: Exeter Cathedral Library, 3514, pp. 523–8 [s. xiii]7

E, Cronicon de Wallia: Exeter Cathedral Library, 3514, pp. 507–19 [s. xiii]8

---


It is customary to connect this group of chronicles with another group written in Middle Welsh and known collectively as Brut y Tywysogion. In this group, we deal with three different redactions. Two are known under the name Brut y Tywysogion, with one based on the Peniarth 20 manuscript and another on the Red Book of Hergest. The third redaction is known by the title Brehinedd y Saeson. All three redactions were consciously designed as continuations of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regnum Britanniae, with each one beginning where Geoffrey’s narrative ends. In his lecture ‘The Welsh Chronicles’ Lloyd demonstrated that Brut y Tywysogion was three independent translations of the same Latin chronicles. Brut y Tywysogion tends to have far fuller entries than the Welsh Latin annals, which led Thomas Jones and J. B. Smith to argue that the translators of Brut y Tywysogion elaborated their sources. More recent research by David Stephenson and O. W. Jones has reconsidered this position, with it being argued that the fourteenth-century translators of Brut y Tywysogion were using fuller Latin chronicles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which are now lost, as the basis of their translation, thus making Brut y Tywysogion a more contemporaneous source than previous scholars had considered it to be. Lloyd described Brut y Tywysogion as a “sober, pedestrian chronicle, occasionally waxing eloquent, but as a

---


10 Brut y Tywysogion: Peniartih MS. 20, ed. T. Jones (Cardiff, 1941) and translated in Brut y Tywysogion: Peniartih MS. 20, trans. T. Jones (Cardiff, 1952).


rule content to record the simple facts.”\textsuperscript{17} It is a fair reflection of \textit{Brut y Tywysogion}, and might equally be applied to the Welsh Latin Annals.

Another relevant text is the little studied chronicle known as \textit{O Oes Gwrtheyrn Gwrthenau}.\textsuperscript{18} Focussed on Gwynedd, it was written at some point in the first half of the thirteenth century, with a significant revision c. 1265.\textsuperscript{19} The information it contains suggests that it was produced at the Cistercian abbey of Aberconwy.\textsuperscript{20}

The earliest entries in the chronicles provide few details of Welsh relations with Rome. Three early entries pertain to the date of Easter. The first records the changing of the date by Pope Leo in 453.\textsuperscript{21} The entry for 665 notes the first celebration of Easter by the Saxons,\textsuperscript{22} whilst the changing of the date of Easter by Elfoddwy is noted for 768.\textsuperscript{23} From these entries we gather that the annalist had a particular interest in calculating the correct date of Easter. Why 768 was chosen as the date to change Easter is unknown, although Dumville, following Harrison, suggests that it might have been to avoid a crisis of calculation the following year.\textsuperscript{24} The annals record Elfoddwy dying in 809 and little more is known about him.\textsuperscript{25} Through his

\textsuperscript{17} Lloyd, ‘Welsh Chronicles’, p. 370. On the literary qualities of \textit{Brut y Tywysogion}, especially the eulogies for the Lord Rhys of Deheubarth (d. 1197) see G. Henley, ‘Rhetoric, Translation and Historiography: the Literary Qualities of \textit{Brut y Tywysogion}’, \textit{Quaestio Insularis} 13 (2012), 94–123.


\textsuperscript{19} Jones, \textit{Historical Writing}, p. 299.

\textsuperscript{20} Jones, \textit{Historical Writing}, pp. 300–1.

\textsuperscript{21} A 453 (p. 1; p. 156), \textit{B} 453 (p. 21; p. 164), \textit{C} 453 (p. 9; p. 203). This is incorrect and is likely to refer to Pope Leo’s letters concerning the calculation of the date of Easter. See D. N. Dumville, ‘\textit{Annales Cambriae} and Easter’, \textit{The Medieval Chronicle} 3 (2004), 40–50, pp. 41–2.

\textsuperscript{22} A 665 (p. 11; p. 158), \textit{B} 665 (p. 29; p. 166). Another confused statement, but this must refer to the aftermath of the Synod of Whitby in 664.

\textsuperscript{23} Dumville, \textit{Annales Cambriae}, 768, pp. 6–7.

\textsuperscript{24} Harrison gives examples of different methods of calculating Easter providing different answers as to the correct date of celebration. When these methods were in concord, an opportunity arose to change from one method of calculating to another without disturbance. See K. Harrison, \textit{The Framework of Anglo-Saxon History to A.D. 900} (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 59–61 and pp. 92–3. 768 may also have been at the end of an 84-year cycle, and therefore the following year may have marked an appropriate time for reform to occur. See Dumville, ‘\textit{Annales Cambriae} and Easter’, p. 45.

actions, or at least through intermediaries, we see the first recorded influence of the Roman Church on the Welsh.

Several early entries follow the form ‘x died in Rome’, and provide little further information. All the people mentioned in annals that follow this pattern are male, and all but one is a secular ruler. In both the Peniarth 20 and the Red Book of Hergest traditions of Brut y Tywysogyon a death in Rome occurs in the very first entry, that of Cadwaladr Fendigaid, Cadwaladr the Blessed.\(^{26}\) It seems likely that this record derives either from the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who confuses Cadwaladr with the West Saxon ruler Cædwalla who Bede mentions as dying in Rome, or from an earlier work of “pseudo-learning”.\(^{27}\) The entry for Cadwaladr is followed by the deaths of Cyngen of Powys,\(^{28}\) a Hywel\(^{29}\) and Joseph, Bishop of Teilo.\(^{30}\) Two references to external rulers journeying to Rome are also found in all versions of the Brut. These are Dyfnwal of Strathclyde\(^{31}\) and Donnchadh uí Brian.\(^{32}\) Both entries conform to the same pattern as for the Welsh rulers of recording the event but not providing further information.

---

\(^{26}\) Brut (RBH) 682 (pp. 2–3), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 1; 682, p. 1).


\(^{28}\) Brut (RBH) 856 (pp. 8–9), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 5; 856, p. 4), Dumville, Annales Cambriae, 854, pp. 12–13.

\(^{29}\) Brut (RBH) 886 (pp. 8–9), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 6; 886, p. 5), BS 886 (pp. 24–5), Dumville, Annales Cambriae, 886, pp. 12–13.

\(^{30}\) Brut (RBH) 1045 (pp. 24–5), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 18; 1045, p. 14), BS 1045 (pp. 60–1), B 1045 (p. 47, p. 173). J. E. Lloyd, A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest, 2 vols., 3rd ed. (London, 1939), i. p. 204, n. 44. Lloyd calls Joseph a Bishop of Llandaff, but this is not strictly accurate. Excepting manuscript B, Joseph is referred to as being the Bishop of Teilo. Based on the charter evidence of the Book of Llandaff, it might be possible that Joseph was responsible for moving the centre of Teilo’s cult from Llandeilo in Carmarthenshire to Llandaff. See J. R. Davies, ‘The Saints of South Wales in the Welsh Church’, in A. Thacker and R. Sharpe, ed., Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West (Oxford, 2002), pp. 361–95 at pp. 366–9.

\(^{31}\) Brut (RBH) 975 (pp. 14–15), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 10; 975, p. 8), BS 975 (pp. 40–1).

\(^{32}\) Brut (RBH) 1065 (pp. 26–7), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 19; 1065, p. 25), BS 1065 (pp. 72–3). Donnchadh uí Brian is said to have died on his way to Rome.
Of the Welsh rulers, the easiest to trace is Cyngen of Powys. Two reasons have been suggested for Cyngen’s journey to Rome: he was prompted to travel by Anglo-Saxon aggression or he died in Rome after being driven there by Rhodri Mawr of Gwynedd (d. 878). More light is thrown on this matter by the monument known as The Pillar of Eliseg, a “fragmentary free-standing pillar-cross of the round shaft variety.” It is thought that the pillar originally had a cross on top of it, whence the name of the nearby abbey Valle Crucis derives. The monument was constructed by Cyngen in memory of victories over the English secured by his great-grandfather Eliseg and to assert the rights of Cyngen’s dynasty to rule in Powys. On the basis that the Pillar is “an intensely self-conscious monument” whose main purpose is to “justify the right of Cyngen and the Gwrtheyrning to rule over Powys”, Jones argues that dynastic insecurity forced Cyngen to leave Powys for Rome; he rejects outright the notion of Mercian aggression as a reason in itself for Cyngen’s departure, noting that Mercia was in as perilous a position as Powys by 853. That Rome was considered an appropriate destination for the exiled Cyngen indicates its importance to Welsh princes.

If Cyngen’s journey to Rome was caused by pressure from Rhodri Mawr, we must consider this entry alongside the external entries. Both Dyfnwal’s journey to Rome and that of Donnchadh uí Brian were to a certain extent caused by dynastic instability. In the case of Dyfnwal it might well have been the death of Edgar (d. 975) in England which allowed him to transfer the kingship of Strathclyde to his son and take the opportunity to journey to Rome. Donnchadh uí Brian on the other hand was defeated by his nephew in a struggle for

---

36 Jones, ‘*Hereditas*’, p. 78.
the kingship of Munster. Given this connection between these three entries, we may expand our consideration of the unknown Hywel’s journey to Rome. One might identify him with Hywel ap Rhys of Glywysing whom Asser, in his Life of King Alfred, mentioned as being oppressed by Ealdorman Æthelred of Mercia. This Hywel ap Rhys sought Alfred’s protection. Under such circumstances, it is understandable why Hywel should leave his polity and travel to Rome as an exile.

The exception to this pattern of recording only deaths in Rome is Hywel ap Cadell of Deheubarth (d. 950), also known as Hywel Dda (Hywel the Good). Although Hywel survived, no chronicle gives details beyond noting that Hywel visited Rome in 928. The only detail of Hywel’s journey that can be gleaned is that he began it after he had witnessing a charter of King Æthelstan (924–39) as one of the Welsh sub-reguli at the royal assembly in Exeter in April 928. Lloyd portrayed Hywel as something of an anglophile, arguing that he sought to model himself on Alfred the Great of Wessex (871–899). Kirby challenged this idea, drawing attention to the history of conflict between Hywel’s family and the West Saxon dynasty and arguing that there is no “need” to view Hywel’s pilgrimage as a deliberate

38 S. Duffy, Ireland in the Middle Ages (Basingstoke, 1997), p. 39.
39 S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, trans., Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and other Contemporary Sources (Harmondsworth, 1983), 80 (p.96) and WB, pp. 489–90.
40 Brut (RBH) 929 (pp. 12–13), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 8; 929, p. 6), BS 929 (pp. 30–1), Dumville, Annales Cambriae, 928, pp. 16–17. Hywel’s pilgrimage is also recorded in O Oes Gwrtheyrn Gwrthenau. It is used to denote the time between the death of Anarawd and the pilgrimage, and then as the starting point to note the number of years until Hywel’s own death (both figures are at odds with other sources). See O Oes Gwrtheyrn Gwrthenau, l.19–20 (Jones, Historical Writing, p. 410 and p. 417).
41 HoW, i. pp. 334–5.
43 HoW, i. pp. 335–9.
imitation of Alfred’s journey to Rome.\textsuperscript{44} Loyn argued for the importance of what Hywel and other Welsh rulers might have gained from regularly visiting the Anglo-Saxon court and highlighted the co-operation between Welsh rulers and the Anglo-Saxons on mutual defence from Scandinavian raids as a possible precedent for defending Hywel’s lands during his absence on pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{45} Hywel’s visit to Rome took on greater significance in the thirteenth century, when he had become associated with a revision of Welsh laws.\textsuperscript{46} Compilers of the Welsh lawbooks used Hywel’s recorded journey, suggesting in prologues to the law codes that he had taken a copy of his laws with him to gain papal approval. This seems unlikely, as the prologues are better evidence for the importance of papal approval in the thirteenth century than for events of the tenth.

\textit{Brenhinedd y Saesson} mentions three further events unattested in the other Brut traditions: the journey of Æthelwulf of Wessex to, and the “consecrating” of his son Alfred in, Rome,\textsuperscript{47} gaining papal approval for Edgar’s expulsion of secular clerks from the Old Minster from John XIII (965–972),\textsuperscript{48} and the journeys of Cnut to Rome.\textsuperscript{49} We may add to these three entries a notice of the presence of a legate and two cardinals in Winchester in 1072.\textsuperscript{50} The

\begin{footnotesize}
\bibitem{45} Loyn, ‘Wales’, pp. 298–301.
\bibitem{46} This aspect of Hywel’s pilgrimage is discussed in Chapter 4, pp.135–7.
\bibitem{47} \textit{BS} 837 (pp. 16–19). Both journeys made by Alfred to Rome are described in one entry, which also suggests that Æthelwulf decimated lands belonging to him after his return from Rome. For the journeys made to Rome by Alfred and Æthelwulf, and for Æthelwulf’s preparations see R. Abels, \textit{Alfred the Great: War, Kingship and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England} (London, 1998), pp. 57–75.
\bibitem{48} \textit{BS} 961 (pp. 36–7) On Edgar’s dealings with the papacy see F. Tinti, ‘England and the Papacy in the Tenth Century’, in D. Rollason, C. Leyser, H. Williams, eds., \textit{England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947)}, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 37 (Leiden, 2010), pp. 163–84, at pp. 173–7. Tinti discusses the problem of dating a permission granted to Edgar to expel the secular clerks from the Old Minster. The entry in \textit{Brenhinedd y Saesson} suggests that Edgar gained papal approval after the monks’ expulsion.
\bibitem{50} \textit{BS} 1072 (pp. 78–9).
\end{footnotesize}
entry gives some information on the deposition of Archbishop Stigand (d. 1072). These notices are testimony to the wide interest of Brenhinedd y Saesson’s sources.

In this context, one should also discuss a legatine report by George, Bishop of Ostia, and Theophylact, Bishop of Todi. In 786, they were sent by Pope Hadrian I (772–795) in response to the controversy caused by Offa of Mercia (d. 796) when he tried to raise the see of Lichfield to metropolitan status following his failed attempts to conquer the kingdom of Kent, and the hostility of Jænberht, Archbishop of Canterbury (765–792). Offa wanted his son Ecgfrith anointed as his successor and Jænberht refused his request. Jænberht provided the impetus for the papal legation by spreading rumours that Offa and Charlemagne (768–814) were plotting to overthrow Hadrian. The legates attended Church councils and visited different parts of Britain. George visited Northumbria, whilst Theophylact visited Mercia and, perhaps, Wales. Sadly, no details of Theophylact’s possible visit to Wales survive, but his visit demonstrates the Roman Church’s occasional interest in the extremities of its provinces.

The later entries in the Brut are much fuller and more frequent. By far the most common are records of one Pope’s death and the name of their successor. Between the Welsh Latin annals

---

55 Theophylact is described as visiting Britannie partes (Duemmler, Alcuni Epistolae, 3 (p. 20)). Whitelock’s identification of this as Wales found in EHD I, p. 770.
and the *Brutiau*, there are eleven such notices.\(^5^6\) Clearly not all papal deaths and successions are recorded, nor are all these deaths and successions recorded in every chronicle. The two entries which appear most frequently, both recorded in five chronicles, are the death of Innocent III (1198–1216) and his succession by Honorius III (1216–1227)\(^5^7\) and the election of Clement IV (1265–68).\(^5^8\) The former entries reflect the importance assigned to the pontificate of Innocent III and the Church council he had called. The latter are the most interesting in the Latin annals as they also give Clement’s name before his election (Guy le Gros), perhaps reflecting knowledge of his time as legate in England. We can treat two other entries with this group: the death notice for Hubert Walter of Canterbury\(^5^9\) and a notice of Stephen Langton’s translation of the relics of Thomas Becket.\(^6^0\) The connection of both men to the papacy is explicit in these entries, with Hubert Walter’s role as a legate and the fact that Langton was a cardinal noted. These entries reflect a growing knowledge of the papacy amongst Welsh chroniclers.

For the first time, we also see notification in the chronicles of major events in the history of the Church. Several Church councils are recorded.\(^6^1\) These are the Third Lateran Council,\(^6^2\)

---

\(^5^6\) Aside from those mentioned below, the Popes involved are Alexander III (1159–81), Lucius III (1181–85), Urban III (1185–87), Gregory IX (1227–41), Innocent IV (1243–54), Alexander IV (1254–61) and Gregory X (1271–76).

\(^5^7\) *Brut (RBH)* 1216 (pp. 208–9), *Brut (Pen. 20)* (p. 172; 1216, p. 95), *BS* 1216 (pp. 216–17), *C* 1216 (p. 46; p. 222), and *E* 1215, (p. 13; p. 240).

\(^5^8\) *Brut (RBH)* 1265 (pp. 256–7), *Brut (Pen. 20)* (p. 216; 1265, p. 114), *BS* 1265 (pp. 246–7), *D* 1264 (p. 9) and *E* 1264 (p. 23; p. 245).

\(^5^9\) *Brut (RBH)* 1205 (pp. 186–7), *BS* 1205 (pp. 200–1), *C* 1205 (p. 44; p. 220). The influence of Gerald of Wales is evident on the latter chronicle. It describes Hubert Walter as diligent and clever, but as having very little learning.

\(^6^0\) *Brut (RBH)* 1220 (pp. 218–20), *Brut (Pen. 20)* (p. 181; 1220, p. 97). See also Chapter 2, p. 59 n. 48.


the Fourth Lateran Council, the First Council of Lyon and the Second Council of Lyon. Amongst these accounts, chronicle C of the Welsh Latin annals is the most informative and shows a particular interest in tithes. A legatine council described as being held in London in 1175 is mentioned by the Brutiau, as is a synod led by the legate John of Ferentino. The former entries give colourful descriptions of the conflict between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and though the legate mentioned in them is unnamed, he is to be identified as the Archbishop of Canterbury Richard of Dover (1173–84). The entries on the councils demonstrate interest in the wider Church which might also explain an entry in chronicle C of the Welsh Latin annals, which discusses the ending of schism in the Church. As a result of the Peace of Venice of July 1177 between Alexander III and Frederick Barbarossa, the Emperor withdrew his support for the Antipope Callixtus III. The entry must refer to the reconciliation between Alexander and Callixtus at Tusculum in August 1178. We may add to this category another entry from C which makes a cryptic reference to the See of St. Peter escaping from captivity in 1228. This might well refer to the conflict between Gregory IX (1227–41) and the Emperor Frederick II, and perhaps the peace agreed between

---

63 Brut (RBH) 1215 (pp. 204–5), Brut (Pen. 20) (pp. 167–8; 1215, p. 91), BS 1215 (pp. 212–13), B 1215 (p. 72; pp.188–9), C 1216 (p. 46; p. 222), D 1214 (p. 6), E 1214, (p. 12; p.238). B does not mention the summoning of the Church council, but mentions bishops travelling from all over Europe to Rome. From the Welsh bishops, Geoffrey of St Davids is named amongst the participants. For Welsh participation see AoC, p. 194 and p. 207 and F. G. Cowley, ‘The Church in Medieval Glamorgan’, in T. B. Pugh, G. Williams and M. F. Williams, eds., Glamorgan County History Vol. 3: The Middle Ages (Cardiff, 1971), pp. 87–166, at p. 119.

64 D 1244 (p. 7).

65 Brut (RBH) 1274 (pp. 260–1), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 220; 1274, p. 116), C 1274 (p. 54; p. 227).


68 C 1177 (p. 40; p. 218).


70 C 1228 (p. 49; p. 224).
the two parties at Ceprano in 1230. These are further instances of Welsh chroniclers being more aware of events in the wider Church.

The deeds of several papal legates are recorded. We see the arrival of Guala and his crowning of Henry III (1216–1272). Attention is drawn to the arrival and departure of Otto, who is almost always linked to the Emperor Frederick’s excommunication. Noted too is Ottobuono’s work regarding gaining Clement IV’s approval for the Treaty of Montgomery.

The papacy’s influence is seen in the case of Thomas Becket and in events connected to the interdict placed on England by Innocent III. Chronicle Latin C is again the most informed manuscript, with far more detail about the initial controversy and it makes an explicit link between Innocent III and the French invasion in the entry for 1213. Of particular interest is the record of Innocent releasing Llywelyn ap Iorwerth of Gwynedd, Gwennywn ab Owain

71 Ullmann, Short History, p. 230.  
72 Though, of course, not by any means all their deeds. We know for instance that John of Crema visited Llandaff in 1125 and that Nicholas of Tusculum visited Llandaff in 1214. See Davies, Book, pp. 39–40 and Cowley, ‘Church’, p. 125.  
76 B 1167 (p. 63; p. 182). This entry records the appeals of the bishops and magnates against Becket; Brut (RBH) 1171 (pp. 150–1), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 116; 1171, p. 66), BS 1171 (pp. 172–3). All these entries note Alexander III summoning Henry II to Rome, but Brenhinedd y Saeson adds that Henry feared excommunication.  
77 C 1205, 1206, 1207 (p. 44; pp. 220–1); Brut (RBH) 1208 (pp. 186–7), Brut (Pen. 20) (pp. 150–1; 1208, p. 83), C 1208 (p. 45; p. 221), E 1207 (p. 7; p. 235); Brut (Pen. 20) (pp. 161–2; 1213, p. 88), BS 1213 (pp. 208–9), C 1213 (p. 46; p. 222), E 1213 (p. 11; p. 238). See Chapter 1, p. 11, n. 18.
of Powys and Maelgwn ap Rhys of Deheubarth from fealty to King John.\textsuperscript{78} This action is not recorded in the Pope’s register.\textsuperscript{79} The release from fealty allowed Llywelyn to negotiate a treaty of perpetual alliance with Philip Augustus of France (1180–1223) in July or August of 1212.\textsuperscript{80} Treharne makes the intriguing suggestion that the alliance may have been formed at the instigation of Innocent, to whom Treharne, following Lloyd, credits an “accurate understanding of the position in Wales.”\textsuperscript{81} This perhaps overstates the case for Innocent’s knowledge of Wales as he had to reissue a letter threatening interdict to include Wales in November 1207.\textsuperscript{82} His suggestion that Llywelyn called off the alliance following John’s submission to the papacy must be correct, and perhaps demonstrates Llywelyn’s recognition of Innocent III’s power. Collectively, these deeds create the impression of a powerful institution, an impression further confirmed by an entry which records Giles de Braose, Bishop of Hereford (1200–15) being reconciled to King John “from fear of the Pope.”\textsuperscript{83} The papacy’s power is demonstrated again.

We have far fewer notifications of journeys to Rome. These are the journey of the Lord Rhys’s brother Cadell to Rome,\textsuperscript{84} the return of Thomas Wallensis (Bishop of St Davids, 1248–55) from Rome in 1253\textsuperscript{85} and the return of Amaury de Montfort to Rome in 1282.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{78} Brut (RBH) 1212 (pp. 194–5), Brut (Pen. 20) (pp. 158–9; 1212, p. 87), BS 1212 (pp. 206–7), E 1211 (p. 10; p. 237).
\textsuperscript{79} Not all letters were recorded in the papal registers, and the register of Innocent’s letters for this year (Registra Vaticana 8) only survives in a fourteenth-century copy. See Chapter 2, pp. 54–5.
\textsuperscript{82} Chapter 2, p. 57, n. 40.
\textsuperscript{83} Brut (RBH) 1215 (pp. 204–5), BS 1215 (pp. 212–13).
\textsuperscript{84} B 1156 (p. 60; p. 180), C 1156 (p. 37; p. 216). All versions of Brut y Tywysogion record that Cadell departed on pilgrimage and gave up his worldly goods and power to his brothers before departing but do not give his destination. Brut (RBH) 1153 (pp. 132–3), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 101; 1153, p. 58), BS 1153 (pp. 156–7).
\textsuperscript{85} Brut (RBH) 1253 (pp. 244–5), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 206; 1253, p. 109), BS 1253 (pp. 238–9). On Bishop Thomas see Chapter 2, p. 66, n. 92.
\textsuperscript{86} Brut (RBH) 1275 (pp. 264–5), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 223; 1275, pp. 117–8), BS 1275 (pp. 252–3). Although this information is contained in the entry for 1275, Amaury’s release was at a later date. The description of his
The first two appear to have been pilgrimages, whereas Amaury de Montfort, a papal chaplain was returning to Rome after being held prisoner by Edward I (1272–1307). These entries are comparable to entries in Irish chronicles recording journeys to Rome. Like their Welsh counterparts, early notices of travel to Rome in Irish chronicles are more frequent and reduce in number from the twelfth century. Ó Corráin argues that journeys to Rome became so common as to be unremarkable. The same may be said of the Welsh chronicles and these journeys are part of the process which Davies described as “formal and regular links with Rome” becoming the “norm”.

Like the journeys to Rome discussed previously, the examples cited here involve high-status individuals. Pilgrimage to Rome however was, as Pryce observed, not the preserve of the “secular (and ecclesiastical) elite.” This is a point reinforced by Davies and Olson, who emphasise that Welsh pilgrims came from all social classes. Olson speculates that Rome proved particularly popular with Welsh pilgrims because of the large number of relics available for veneration. St Davids, which possessed the relics of St. Caradog and St. Justinian, was the most popular pilgrimage destination in Wales. Relics also played a prominent part in swearing oaths in Welsh law, and continued to do so even as the use of

---

88 *AOC*, p. 191.
Gospel books for swearing oaths became more commonplace elsewhere.\textsuperscript{93} Welsh law also allowed that if a person should carry a relic on their person, that relic could act as sanctuary for that individual.\textsuperscript{94} It seems likely that the relics mentioned by the law texts were secondary relics. There are plentiful references to these in the work of Gerald of Wales, in hagiography and in poetry.\textsuperscript{95} There are fewer references to corporal relics, perhaps because of reluctance to dismember a saint’s body. A saint’s burial place was considered particularly efficacious for those seeking cures.\textsuperscript{96} If Olson is correct, it was Rome as the burial place of saints that particularly attracted Welsh pilgrims.

Rome was not the only pilgrimage destination; there were plenty of sites in Wales and people often travelled to other external destinations including Canterbury, Walsingham, Santiago de Compostela and Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{97} The chronicles provide a notable example of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem by Morgan ap Cadwgan of Powys who travelled there in 1128 to atone for the murder of his brother Maredudd.\textsuperscript{98} In addition to curiosity and politics we may add penance to our list of the attractions of pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{99}

\begin{itemize}
\item[94] Ibid., pp. 201–2.
\item[98] \textit{Brut (RBH)} 1128 (pp. 110–11), \textit{Brut (Pen. 20)} (p. 84; 1128, p. 50), \textit{BS 1128} (pp. 142–3, B 1128 (p. 56; p. 178), and C 1128 (p. 34; p. 214). See also \textit{AoC}, p.72.
\item[99] For further information about penitential pilgrimage and the Welsh, see \textit{NL}, pp. 68–9.
\end{itemize}
The papacy is also seen participating directly in Welsh affairs. This includes the disputed
election of St Davids, granting permission for Cadwgan of Llanddyfai (Bishop of Bangor,
1215–36) to retire, the commendation for the Treaty of Montgomery and appeals for the
release of Eleanor de Montfort. We also have papal will triumphing over royal desire in the
appointment of Richard Carew (1256–80) to the bishopric of St Davids in the 1250s.

Collectively, the chronicles show an interest in the papacy’s affairs. They grow from sparsely
recording pilgrimages in the early period to providing fuller annals by the thirteenth century.
They demonstrate a greater interest in the papal matters from the second half of the twelfth
century by noting the deaths and elections of Popes, the activities of papal legates and events
of importance for the wider Church such as Church councils. This of course reflects the
papacy’s own expansion but is also indicative of the fact that these chronicles were now
being written in Cistercian monasteries. The chroniclers, due to the network of Cistercian
houses, had far easier access to information from all over Europe than had been the case
when historical writing began in Wales. Their work demonstrates the papacy’s direct
influence on Welsh affairs.

---

100 C 1203 (p. 43; p. 220). C is the only chronicle which refers to the controversial election, and links it to the Curia.
101 Brut (RBH) 1236 (pp. 234–5), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 196; 1236, p. 104), BS 1236 (pp. 230–1). This is confirmed
by a letter sent by Gregory to the chapter of Bangor. On Cadwgan and the letter, see Chapter 2, p. 78, n. 167.
102 See above, p. 108, n. 75, and below, p. 125, n. 185.
103 Brut (RBH) 1275 (pp. 262–3), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 222; 1275, p. 117), BS 1275 (pp. 252–3). For this entry, see
above, p. 109, n. 86.
104 Brut (RBH) 1256 (pp. 248–9), Brut (Pen. 20) (p. 209; 1256, p. 110), BS 1256 (pp. 242–3) and E 1256 (p. 21;
Rome and the papacy in Charters.105

Only two surviving charters originating in Wales refer to the papacy but considered together they offer insight into Welsh rulers’ views of the papacy and its power. The papacy is invoked in charters for two Cistercian foundations, by Rhys ap Gruffudd (d. 1197) in an 1184 charter for Strata Florida and by Llywelyn ap Iorwerth (d. 1240) in an 1209 charter for Cymer Abbey.106 In both cases, Rhys and Llywelyn, with their successors, confirm their own grants of land and pledge to protect the privileges granted to both foundations by the papacy.

Rhys ap Gruffudd’s charter is particularly interesting as it refers to lands that have been granted to Strata Florida by Popes.107 This presumably refers to a papal bull issued to Strata Florida, a copy of which is in the formulary book of Richard de Bury, a diplomat, royal official, papal chaplain and Bishop of Durham (1333–45).108 De Bury used his prominent public position to collect manuscripts, compiling a collection of around 1,500 letters now known as the Liber Epistolaris in around 1324.109 The bull is undated but, as Davies has

---

107 The charter’s key clause is: Tres etiam filii mei scilicet Griffinus, Resus et Meredud eandem donationem eodem tempore et loco in manu abbatis de Stratflur optulerunt , statuentes firmiter coram multis de exercitu in ecclesia Sancte Brigide apud Randir mecum ut quascumque possessiones quaecumque bona idem monasterium in presentiarum possidet et custodit sive concessione pontificum, largitione principium, oblatione fidelium vel aliis iustis modis Deo propitio a depta fuerit, firma monachis illius et eorum successoribus ab omni seculari et ecclesiastica consuetudine et debito immunia et illibata permaneant. AWR, 28 (p. 173).
109 J. C. Davies, ‘A papal bull of privileges to the Abbey of Ystrad Fflur’, NLWJ 4 (1943–4), 197–203 at pp. 197–8. and N. Denholm-Young, ‘Richard de Bury (1287–1345)’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fourth Series, 20 (1937), 135–168, at pp. 140–4. Denholm-Young argued that as many of the collection’s letters were written in the period 1318–22, with none dating from after 1324, it must have been compiled around this time. The entire collection of letters may be found in N. Denholm-Young, ed., The Liber Epistolaris of Richard de Bury (Oxford for the Roxburghe Club, 1950).
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shown, it must be from the pontificate of Alexander III.\textsuperscript{110} The privileges outlined in the bull are standard guarantees by the papacy, and as such contribute to the image of the papacy as a source of protection.\textsuperscript{111} Rhys ap Gruffudd’s charter, as Pryce has shown, also deploys strikingly similar phrases to Alexander’s bull.\textsuperscript{112} Although, as Pryce concedes, similar phrases are employed elsewhere in ecclesiastical documents, this is surely an example of a papal document being mined as a source of authoritative Latin phrases.\textsuperscript{113} This habit was not confined to the court of Rhys ap Gruffudd. In a charter for the Abbey of Aberconwy purportedly by Llywelyn ap Iorwerth, but rejected as inauthentic by Pryce and Insley, there are clear examples of similarity between Alexander III’s bull for Strata Florida and a bull of Urban III for Margam Abbey.\textsuperscript{114}

Pryce suggests that a papal bull may have influenced the drafter of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth’s charter too, although the Cymer Abbey charter “exhibits no precise verbal parallels” with known papal bulls.\textsuperscript{115} Llywelyn, like Rhys ap Gruffudd before him, pledges to protect the papal privileges granted to Cymer, invoking the papacy’s power and specifically naming Peter and Paul.\textsuperscript{116} The original privileges are unknown, but must have been granted by Innocent III, since the abbey was founded in 1198 and Llywelyn ap Iorwerth’s charter dates

\begin{footnotes}
\item[110] Davies, ‘A papal bull’, pp. 201–2. Like virtually all papal registers prior to 1198, the register of Alexander III does not survive in the Vatican Archives. See Chapter 2, pp. 54–5.
\item[111] Davies’s transcription of the Bull is found at ‘A papal bull’ at pp. 200–1 with a summary of the Bull’s contents in English at p. 202. See also Williams, ‘Cistercians in West Wales: 2’, p. 243.
\item[113] AWR, pp. 99–100.
\item[116] In omnibus quoque et ante omnia domini papae preceptis obedientes, prefatis fratribus donavimus ut summi pontificis privilegia, beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate roborata, ipsique monachis sive data sive danda in omnibus vim suam obtineant et inconcussa atque inviolata permaneant. AWR, 229 (p. 382).
\end{footnotes}
from 1209. After a list of possible transgressions against the monks and against apostolic authority, Llywelyn pledges to exercise his might as a layman against offenders and to uphold any ecclesiastical sanction against them. As Smith speculated, the brothers of Cymer may have been particularly keen to include such a list either due to their own experiences at Cymer or because many of the monks had abandoned the abbey at Cwm Hir to settle at Cymer. The invocation of the apostles in the charter is significant. It is not only Llywelyn’s secular authority that will be brought to bear on transgressors but the papacy’s full might of the papacy, which, in seeking to emphasise the double apostolicity of its claim to primacy, had adopted an image of the two apostles on the recto of the papal seal as standard from the pontificate of Paschal II (1099–1118). Llywelyn’s charter, by twice invoking the papacy, emphasises its protection over Cymer Abbey.

Rome and the papacy in Letters Patent, Agreements and Treaties

This section will examine the papacy’s presence in agreements of any sort. It will consider letters patent, agreements and treaties.

During the war of 1276–77, several Welsh magnates in Deheubarth, including Rhys ap Maredudd (d. 1292) were compelled to submit to Edward I by Payn de Chaworth. Rhys broke several agreements with Llywelyn ap Gruffudd, as had his father before him. Unlike several of his relatives in Deheubarth, Rhys was rewarded by being allowed to keep much of his territory intact and later expanded it to become Lord of Ystrad Tywi. Rhys was

---

117 Pryce, ‘Medieval Church’, p. 278.
120 Smith, Llywelyn, pp. 418–22.
amongst the earliest supporters of Edward I during the events of 1282–83 and was richly rewarded for it in the rebellion’s aftermath though he would eventually rebel against the Crown in 1287.\footnote{Smith, *Llywelyn*, pp. 523–4, R. A. Griffiths, ‘The Revolt of Rhys ap Maredudd, 1287–8’, *WHR* 2 (1966–7), 121–43, reprinted in and referenced from R. A. Griffiths, *Conquerors and Conquered in Medieval Wales* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 67–83, A. Chapman, *Welsh Soldiers in the Later Middle Ages 1282–1422*, Warfare in History (Woodbridge, 2015), pp. 17–19, and *AoC*, p. 323, p. 349, p. 361 and pp. 380–1.} Letters patent, dated to 11 April 1277, confirm an agreement between Rhys and Payn de Chaworth.\footnote{The agreement is AWR, 92 and the letters patent AWR, 93. Letters patent are open letters, essentially public proclamations used to transact Royal business. See also Smith, *Llywelyn*, pp. 420–1.} Rhys placed himself and his heirs under the jurisdiction of the Churches of Rome and Canterbury as well as his diocesan bishop, pledging never to rebel against the King on pain of losing his lands forever and having the Church’s full ecclesiastical might turned against him.\footnote{AWR, 93.} The Pope tops this list, demonstrating his exalted position. It was clearly a very solemn undertaking on Rhys’s behalf. He wanted to ensure that Edward I and his forces took his pledge of fealty seriously so that his lands were not attacked.

A similar clause of ecclesiastical sanction was included in an agreement of November 1257 between Llywelyn ap Gruffudd and Gruffudd ap Madog of Bromfield.\footnote{AWR, 323.} Though the manuscript gives the date as 20 November 1250, this was rejected as inaccurate by Lloyd in 1941 as it was “far too early.” This contention was developed more recently by Stephenson, who argues that the political circumstances of 1257 provide a more favourable context for the agreement.\footnote{Stephenson, *Powys*, p. 123 and AWR, pp. 495–6. Lloyd’s work is cited by Smith who disagrees that the date is too early. See Smith, *Llywelyn*, p. 68, n. 123.} Llywelyn and Gruffudd both submitted themselves to the Pope’s jurisdiction, each allowing the other to ask for a sentence of excommunication and interdict on the one who broke their alliance.\footnote{AWR, 323, p. 495. Quite how effective this clause might have been is open to question however. See D. A. Carpenter, ‘Confederation not Domination: Welsh political culture in an age of Gwynedd imperialism’, in R. A. Griffiths and P. R. Schofield, ed., *Wales and the Welsh in the Middle Ages* (Cardiff, 2011), pp. 20–28, at pp. 25–6.} This reciprocity is reflected elsewhere in the agreement, with
Stephenson emphasising the “assumption of equality between the parties”.\textsuperscript{129} Earlier in 1257, Gruffudd ap Madog had been forced to flee to England by Llywelyn’s forces.\textsuperscript{130} He had been on the side of the Crown in the 1241 war against Llywelyn’s uncle, Dafydd ap Llywelyn (d. 1246).\textsuperscript{131} The alliance clearly held despite entreaties to Gruffudd from the Crown in 1262, in response to a rumour that Llywelyn ap Gruffudd had died and seeking, should the rumours prove accurate, to prevent Welsh magnates from pledging support for Llywelyn’s brother Dafydd ap Gruffudd.\textsuperscript{132} The alliance went from strength to strength as Gruffudd ap Madog was seen to act on Llywelyn ap Gruffudd’s behalf several times. He was one of the Welsh parties to an “agreement of confederacy of friendship” between the Welsh magnates and the magnates of Scotland in 1258, and represented Llywelyn in several meetings with the Crown and de Montfort’s party.\textsuperscript{133} The sanctions demonstrate the solemnity and seriousness with which both parties took their agreement.

In both the letter patent and the agreement, we saw how the mere threat of ecclesiastical censure helped ensure the keeping of agreements. The papacy might also take a more immediate role in Welsh affairs, for example through papal judges-delegate. We see two examples of this in agreements between Iorwerth (Bishop of St Davids, 1215–1229) and two sons of the Lord Rhys (d. 1197), Rhys Gryg and Maelgwn ap Rhys.\textsuperscript{134} The case of Rhys Gryg

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., p. 120 and Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, p. 94.
concerned lands connected to Llandeilo Fawr whilst the Maelgwn case concerned land in Llanymddyfri. There is no indication of the immediate reason behind bringing the disputes before the judges-delegate, but one reason may have been that the lands had been lost or alienated by St Davids during the preceding century. This is one example of the papacy at work in the Welsh polities.

Whilst the disputes between the brothers and the bishops were highly localised, arbitration also applied to cross-border politics. Thus, Dafydd ap Llywelyn and Henry III submitted themselves to the arbitration of the legate Otto, the Bishops of St Asaph, Worcester and Norwich, and leading noblemen in May 1240 to resolve a dispute concerning lands claimed by the King’s barons, perhaps most notably Gruffudd ap Gwenwynwyn of Powys. Despite being the designated heir, Dafydd was in a very weak position at the time of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth’s death. The treaty shows him to be willing to settle for recognition of his lands in Gwynedd, rather than of the wider polity that his father had held. His weakness is further shown by the agreement stating that the Welsh magnates’ fealty was to be given directly to the King rather than to Dafydd. The prince made these concessions to alleviate the immediate pressure on him, though they ultimately led to the dismantling of the polity his father had built. During the autumn of 1240, Dafydd became uncooperative with the arbitration process, leading to conflict in the following spring and ending in Dafydd’s acceptance of further debilitating terms at Gwerneigron in August 1241 and Westminster in
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136 AWR, 291. See also AoC, p. 300, Smith, Llywelyn, p. 185, n. 178 and Stephenson, Powys, p. 134. For Otto’s legation, see above, p. 108, n. 74.
138 AWR, p. 459.
139 Williams, ‘Succession’, pp. 397–8 and Smith, Llywelyn, p. 29.
October 1241. The threat of ecclesiastical sanctions clearly had no effect on Dafydd when the political imperative took over.

Almost a quarter of a century earlier, Dafydd’s father Llywelyn ap Iorwerth had submitted to intervention by the papal legate Guala Bicchieri, who led negotiations on the Crown’s behalf. Unlike Dafydd, Llywelyn was in a position of strength following successful military campaigns in 1215–17. Three surviving letters patent describe the agreement reached between the young Henry III and Llywelyn at Worcester in 1218. One granted Llywelyn the right to act as guardian of the lands of Gwenwynwyn ab Owain’s heir. In another, Llywelyn transferred custody of the castles of Carmarthen and Cardigan to the legate and promised to ensure that all Welsh magnates would pledge fealty to Henry III and that he would pursue the King’s enemies as if they were his own. In the final letter, Llywelyn received custody of the castles until the King should come of age and promised to dispense English law to the English and Welsh law to the Welsh. He demonstrated his commitment to the last agreement by swearing on relics in the legate’s presence.
some recognition of his position even if the negotiations were not wholly triumphant.\textsuperscript{148} Guala had fulfilled his role as a peacemaker.\textsuperscript{149}

There was some similarity in the circumstance which led to the papacy’s influence in Welsh affairs reaching its apogee during negotiations between Llywelyn ap Gruffudd of Gwynedd and Henry III in 1267. Cardinal Ottobuono de Fieschi was sent to England by Clement IV with the mission of pacifying the realm.\textsuperscript{150} Clement, when still known as Guy le Gros, had been legate in England before his election and had a nuanced understanding of the situation.\textsuperscript{151} The new legate was clearly well briefed.

Ottobuono led the negotiations for the royal party and within a few days the Treaty of Montgomery had been agreed.\textsuperscript{152} This was the peak of Llywelyn ap Gruffudd’s power because the treaty, and through it both the King and the Pope, recognised him as Prince of Wales to whom, along with his heirs, the fealty of the “Welsh lords of Wales” was due, and confirmed him in his possessions.\textsuperscript{153} In this act we again see the papacy’s influence at work.

Both sides appear to have trusted Ottobuono and he made a particular impression on the young Lord Edward. When he became Edward I, he felt compelled to write to Ottobuono,


\textsuperscript{149} On Guala’s wider brief to make peace see Vincent, Letters and Charters, pp. xlix–lii.

\textsuperscript{150} Ottobuono’s mission is detailed in a series of several mandates contained in the registers of Clement IV. E. Jordan, ed., Les registres de Clement IV, Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 2\textsuperscript{nd} ser. xi (Paris, 1893–1945), 40, 43–75. See also Chapter 2, pp. 88–9.

\textsuperscript{151} Clement IV distinguishes between the Welsh, English, Irish and Scots more regularly than any other Pope. See Chapter 2, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{152} AWR, 363.

\textsuperscript{153} J. G. Edwards, The Principality of Wales 1267–1967: A Study in Constitutional History (Denbigh, 1969), pp. 5–7, Smith, Llywelyn, pp. 177–86 and AoC, pp. 314–17. Although Llywelyn’s preeminent position was recognised in the treaty, it is important to bear in mind that “throughout the document the legate was careful to uphold the king’s superiority over Llywelyn and... there was no attempt to imply any equality of status by using the language of friendship in a way comparable to that used when twelfth-century kings of England gave homage to the kings of France for the duchy of Normandy.” Pryce, ‘Anglo-Welsh agreements’, p. 6.
who had by then been elected Adrian V (1276), explaining his actions in the kidnapping of Eleanor de Montfort and her brother Amaury.\textsuperscript{154}

One consequence of the discussions at Montgomery was peace negotiations between Llywelyn and his brother Dafydd. The treaty obliged Llywelyn to make provision for Dafydd in Gwynedd.\textsuperscript{155} The agreement was recorded in letters patent of 1269.\textsuperscript{156} The brothers agreed, should either wish it, papal confirmation of their agreement, which Llywelyn received from Gregory X (1271–76) in 1274.\textsuperscript{157} By then Dafydd had been identified as a conspirator in a plot to murder Llywelyn, with dissatisfaction at the lands granted to him under the agreement a possible motive for his actions.\textsuperscript{158} In this instance, we see two aspects of the papacy’s work in Wales combining. Under the influence of Ottobuono, the Treaty of Montgomery had forced the two brothers to discuss peace terms. Secondly, the clause allowing the seeking of papal approval demonstrated the respect in which the papacy’s jurisdiction was held by the two brothers.

\textbf{Rome and the papacy in Letters}

If one common theme unites surviving letters and judgments which mention or were sent to Popes and their legates by members of the Welsh episcopacy or by Welsh magnates before the Edwardian conquest, it is assistance. In all cases, the authors either ask for assistance or are assisting someone else.

\textsuperscript{154} See Chapter 2, pp. 89–90.
\textsuperscript{155} Clause 11 in AWR, 363. See also Smith, \textit{Llywelyn}, pp. 180–1 and AoC, p. 315.
\textsuperscript{156} AWR, 368.
\textsuperscript{157} See Chapter 2, p. 89, n. 227.
\textsuperscript{158} See Chapter 2, p. 89, n. 228.
By far the most common are direct appeals to the Pope. One early appeal is mentioned in the *Vita Wulfstani* of William of Malmesbury. It is a letter from Bernard (Bishop of St Davids 1115–48) to Eugenius III (1145–53) describing the survival of Wulfstan’s shrine at Worcester after a fire.\(^{159}\) The letter requested that Wulfstan be celebrated throughout the Church, but nothing came of it. Wulfstan was not formally canonised until 21 April 1203.\(^{160}\) Nicholas (Bishop of Llandaff, 1148–83) sought to act to Gloucester Abbey’s advantage by writing on its behalf to Alexander III in its dispute with Gilbert de Montfichet, the hereditary forester of Essex.\(^{161}\) The bishop had been a monk of Gloucester and sought to defend his mother church against Gilbert’s claims to the incomes of the churches of Wraysbury and Langley Marsh. Roger, Bishop of Worcester (1163–79), used Nicholas’s testimony in his own letter to Alexander.\(^{162}\) This shows the value of Nicholas’s letter to the Gloucester party but the fact of the letter’s existence demonstrates appreciation of the papacy’s importance in appeals amongst the Welsh episcopate.\(^{163}\)

Bishops also asked for personal favours. Two bishops of Bangor asked the Pope’s permission to resign their see.\(^{164}\) Bishop Richard of Bangor (1236–67) petitioned Clement IV to allow him to retire on the grounds of age and illness.\(^{165}\) The letter must have been written after the arrival of the legate Ottobuono, whom it mentions, in England in October 1265 and before

\(^{159}\) Barrow, *St Davids*, 8.


\(^{163}\) For another example of Welsh bishops acting in concert with English bishops see Chapter 2, p. 72, n. 133.


the election of Anian (1267–1307) as bishop in November 1267. It seems likely however that
the bishop died before receiving the right to resign.\textsuperscript{166} Richard’s predecessor bishop,
Cadwgan of Llandyfai, made the same request of Gregory IX in 1236, and retired to Abbey
Dore, Herefordshire.\textsuperscript{167}

We also see increasing awareness of the papacy’s importance amongst Welsh magnates
around this time. Owain Gwynedd (d. 1170) was excommunicated for deliberately
disobeying a papal directive by remaining married to his cousin Cristin, a marriage within
prohibited degrees of consanguinity.\textsuperscript{168} This was set against the background of a previous
dispute over the appointment of a new Bishop of Bangor.\textsuperscript{169} More light is thrown upon these
events by the correspondence between Owain Gwynedd and Louis VII of France (1137–80),
which refers to mediation by Louis VII with Alexander III on Owain Gwynedd’s behalf.\textsuperscript{170}

Let us turn to Owain’s marriage. Owain had angered both Archbishop Thomas Becket (1162–
70) and Alexander III by marrying within the degrees of consanguinity prohibited by the
Church. In the 1150s, Becket’s predecessor, Theobald of Bec (1139–1161), complained to the
papacy, Probably to Adrian IV (1154–59), about Owain’s marriage.\textsuperscript{171} It seems unlikely that
Louis VII, famous for his piety, would have intervened on Owain Gwynedd’s behalf in

\textsuperscript{166} H. Pryce, ‘Esgobaeth Bangor yn Oes y Tywysogion’ in W. P. Griffith, ed., ‘\textit{Ysbryd Dealltwrus ac Enaid
Anfarwol’} (Bangor, 1999), pp.37–57, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{167} See above, p. 112, n. 101.
\textsuperscript{168} \textit{HoW}, ii. p. 522, \textit{Aoc}, p. 194, Williams-Jones, ‘Thomas Becket’, p. 357. Under Welsh law, only marriage on
the father’s side was considered incestuous and Cristin was related to Owain through his mother. See H. Pryce,
‘Welsh Custom and Canon Law, 1150–1300’ in K. Pennington, S. Chowdrow and K. H. Kendall, eds.,
\textit{Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law}, Monumen\textit{ta iuris canonici., Series C,
\textsuperscript{169} \textit{EAWD} ii, pp. 417–36.
\textsuperscript{170} Two of which were addressed directly to Louis VII and the other to Louis VII’s chancellor Hugh de
Millor, H. E. Butler and rev. C. N. L. Brooke, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford, 1986), 87. See also Pryce,
defence of “a blatantly incestuous marriage”, so French intervention on Owain’s behalf related to the Bishopric of Bangor.\textsuperscript{172}

Following the death of Bishop Meurig in 1161, Owain Gwynedd wished to appoint his own candidate, Arthur of Bardsey to the see. This was strongly opposed by Becket.\textsuperscript{173} By 1165, with Becket in exile, Owain wished to send Arthur to be consecrated abroad.\textsuperscript{174} Becket again objected, and this time enlisted Alexander III to aid him in maintaining control of episcopal consecration in his own metropolitan see.\textsuperscript{175} It is at this point that Louis VII is likely to have intervened (unsuccessfully) on Owain’s behalf. These letters demonstrate that Owain set some store on gaining papal support regarding the Bishop of Bangor, even if he was obstinate regarding marriage. As Pryce has observed, these letters also indicate “a shrewd perception of the wider political arena” on the part of Owain Gwynedd. By enlisting international support through contacting Louis VII, in an attempt to win over Alexander III, Owain demonstrated the papacy’s increasing importance in his world view.\textsuperscript{176}

Two more letters involve episcopal elections. One was the election for Bath and Wells in spring 1206.\textsuperscript{177} In this letter, all four Welsh bishops, with the Bishops of London and Hereford, sought confirmation of Jocelin of Wells’ election by Innocent III. The other letter

\textsuperscript{172} Pryce, ‘Owain Gwynedd’, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{174} \textit{Correspondence}, i.57, AWR, 195, Pryce, ‘Owain Gwynedd’, p. 9 and Williams-Jones, ‘Thomas Becket and Wales’, p. 357.
\textsuperscript{176} Pryce, ‘Owain Gwynedd’, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{177} Barrow, \textit{St Davids}, 63. A copy was sent to John of Ferentino, the papal legate and appears as Barrow, \textit{St Davids}, 64. See also EAWD i, D.390 and D.391. For the election see N. Vincent, ‘Jocelin of Wells: the making of a bishop in the reign of King John’ in R. Dunning, ed., \textit{Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier} (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 9–33 at pp. 25–30. For the legate and the documents issued by him see above, p. 107, n. 67.
deals with electing a successor to Hubert Walter as Archbishop of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{178} There was a dispute between the monks of Canterbury and the province’s suffragan bishops over who had the right to elect the new archbishop, and this letter represents the bishops’ appeal to Innocent III. The involvement of King John (1198–1216) in the affair would eventually lead to the interdict on England.\textsuperscript{179} Welsh bishops recognised the advantage of papal arbitration, as well as the importance of gaining papal approval for elections to bishoprics.

This was a lesson that Henry III had clearly learned when, some forty years later, he enlisted Dafydd ap Llywelyn to write to Gregory IX in 1241 about the election of Boniface of Savoy as Archbishop of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{180} Henry III hoped to attract papal support for his candidate, who was a relative of his queen, Eleanor of Provence.\textsuperscript{181} Dafydd wrote to Gregory IX to support Boniface of Savoy’s candidacy. The letter demonstrates Dafydd’s status as a client of Henry and shows the importance of papal approval for an episcopal candidate.\textsuperscript{182}

Dafydd and his father Llywelyn ap Iorwerth are known to have contacted the papacy to further their political ambitions. Their letters do not survive, though we know of their existence through the replies of Innocent III, Honorius III and Innocent IV.\textsuperscript{183} Llywelyn ap Gruffudd also contacted the papacy, writing at least three times to Gregory X. Two of these letters are known from the Pope’s replies.\textsuperscript{184} The only extant letter is a complaint to Gregory X regarding the application of the Treaty of Montgomery.\textsuperscript{185} Llywelyn attempts to explain to

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{} Barrow, St Davids, 62.
\bibitem{} Chapter 1, p. 11, n.18.
\bibitem{} AWR, 294. On Boniface see Chapter 2, p. 92, n. 245.
\bibitem{} See above, pp. 118–19.
\bibitem{} See Chapter 2, pp. 82–5 and pp. 87–8.
\bibitem{} See Chapter 2, p. 89. Llywelyn also evidently wrote several letters to the papacy concerning the capture of his wife Eleanor de Montfort and her brother Amaury by Edward I. See AWR, 396 and Chapter 2, pp. 89–90.
\bibitem{} AWR, 390. The Treaty of Montgomery is AWR 363.
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the Pope why he has not paid homage to Edward I at Chester in August 1275 by outlining how he believed the King had contravened the treaty.186 As a younger man, Gregory had served in Ottobuono’s legation to England and would therefore have been well acquainted with the subject.187 The Pope’s response to this letter is unknown, but he had previously encouraged Edward to adhere to the treaty.188 Glanmor Williams’ characterisation of Llywelyn’s relationship with Gregory X as one of sympathetic benevolence seems apt.189

Llywelyn ap Gruffudd was writing at a time of great political difficulty, as arguments with Bishop Anian II of St Asaph (1268–93) and Edward I became prominent,190 The dispute with Anian centred on the extent of secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, particularly relating to testamentary issues and criminal jurisdiction.191 In turn, Edward used this case to justify the war against Llywelyn in 1276–77.192 Under the political pressure of Edward’s invasion, Llywelyn was forced to issue a charter to Bishop Anian (and his namesake the Bishop of Bangor), conceding his position on many issues.193 Before this settlement, Anian had made his complaints and those of his church known publicly and they are likely to have been made known to the Pope.194 Cistercian abbots felt Llywelyn ap Gruffudd’s plight, and wrote to Gregory X defending him against Anian’s accusations.195 In March 1275, seven abbots from

188 See Chapter 2, p. 89.
192 AoC, p. 326.
the family of Whitland Abbey wrote to the Pope praising Llywelyn’s history of supporting
the Church and in particular his defence of their order and other monastic orders in Wales.196

Anian also appears to have written to Pope Gregory regarding discipline within his own
diocese. It seems that a cleric of St Asaph had ignored instructions from Anian in favour of
orders from another bishop. Anian received permission to suspend the cleric for some time.197
The safety of his own position concerned him on another occasion, when he appealed to
Martin IV for permission to move his see to Rhuddlan, perhaps because of the greater
protection offered by the town’s castle. He was supported in this by Edward I, though the
move never occurred.198

The papacy’s power was also displayed by other means such as the appointment of papal
judges-delegate. Popes frequently deputised the hearing of disputes to local officials,
providing guidance and varying the judges’ powers as appropriate.199 The judges-delegate for
instance could issue summons for witnesses. In a letter, Bishop Thomas Wallensis cites a
papal mandate from Innocent IV summoning him to appear before the Bishops of Worcester
and of Bath and Wells, who were acting as papal judges-delegate.200

David fitz Gerald (Bishop of St Davids, 1148–76) appears as a papal judge-delegate on
behalf of Alexander III in a case concerning the rights of St. Peter’s, Gloucester to the church
of Llanbadarn Fawr. According to a judgment issued by the bishop, Gloucester alleged that

197 Councils, i., p. 498 and O. E. Jones, Llyfr Coch Asaph: A Textual and Historical study (University of Wales,
198 Councils, i., pp. 529 and pp. 530–1, and T. Jones-Pierce, ‘Einion ap Ynyr (Anian II), Bishop of St Asaph’,
200 Barrow, St Davids, 119.
“certain persons” had denied its rights to the church during war in 1175. The abbey had been granted the rights to the church earlier in the twelfth century, when Bernard of St Davids witnessed the founding document. Bishop David ruled in favour of Gloucester. The judgment was roundly ignored as the area remained under Welsh control until the Edwardian conquest.

Further disputes with Gloucester occurred during the pontificate of Innocent III, this time over the status of Llanthony Prima and Llanthony Secunda. In 1204, Bishop Geoffrey of St Davids (1203–14), a former prior of Llanthony Prima, complained to the Pope about encroachment by the Earl of Hereford on the right to appoint a prior to Llanthony Secunda. Pope Innocent responded by appointing the Bishop of Rochester and the Abbots of Reading and Chertsey to investigate the dispute. These judges-delegate never met because a compromise was negotiated between the two parties. Despite Cheney’s scepticism about the papacy’s role in settling the matter, this is an example of how it might contribute to dispute resolution.

In another letter from Urban IV, the Bishop and Archdeacon of Llandaff were ordered to decide the case between the Dean and chapter of Hereford and Dominicans who had established themselves near Hereford. The case’s details are preserved in letters and,

201 Barrow, St Davids, 32 and EAWD i, D.186.
202 EAWD i, D.79.
203 Gloucester would continue to contest its rights to Llanbadarn until the fourteenth century. See J. Knight, South Wales from the Romans to the Normans: Christianity, Literacy and Lordship (Stroud, 2013), p. 154 and the references found there.
204 Barrow, St Davids, 66. Some evidence provided for the case is found in Barrow, St Davids, 67.
205 Cheney, Innocent III, p. 192.
206 Barrow, St Davids, p. 89.
administrative documents in the archive of Hereford Cathedral, which detail the organisation of the repeatedly delayed hearings. Eventually, the Treasurer of Llandaff ruled in the chapter’s favour, though his decision was overturned on appeal to the papal legate Ottobuono, owing to the violent methods used to expel the Dominicans from Hereford.

Disputes also lie at the heart of Anian II of St Asaph’s encounters with the Curia. A dispute over the jurisdiction of the border commote of Gorddŵr with Thomas de Cantilupe (Bishop of Hereford, 1275–82) had been referred to the Curia by November 1277 and, was referred there again in 1283 following the accession of Richard Swinefield (1282–1317) to Hereford. The matter was finally resolved in Hereford’s favour through a local commission of enquiry in 1288. Anian had also assisted John fitz Alan in his dispute with the Abbey of St Peter’s, Shrewsbury over the advowson of St. Oswald’s which was referred to the Curia in 1272.

The Abbot of Valle Crucis appealed to Rome against Anian over the rights to present vicarages in Llangollen and Wrexham and the case was delegated by Gregory X to the Abbot of Talley in 1274. The Abbot’s case may have been subsidised by Llywelyn ap Gruffudd, whose dispute with Anian was ongoing at this time. As in the litigation against Shrewsbury, the dispute was settled privately by the parties.
The papacy could take an even more direct role through papal legates. Under the guidance of the papal legate, Theobald of Bec (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1138–61), Bishop Nicholas of Llandaff oversaw the case between Gloucester Abbey and Picot, chaplain to Robert and William, Earls of Gloucester and Lords of Glamorgan.214 Gloucester won the case, regaining control over the church of St. Gwynllyw, Newport, in the process.215

Llywelyn ap Iorwerth sought to make use of the papacy through legates in his attempt to govern Gwynedd. He wrote twice to the papal legate Pandulf about the application of the Treaty of Worcester.216 In the first instance, Llywelyn complained that the men of Pembrokeshire were not adhering to the terms agreed with the legate.217 The second letter deals with Llywelyn’s own breach of the agreement.218 Llywelyn justified his refusal to transfer Maelienydd to the King as expected under the treaty.219 As in his letters to Honorius III regarding the succession to Gwynedd, Llywelyn here attempted to use the papacy’s power for his own ends.

Honorius, along with the legate Guala, is mentioned in a proclamation by Bishop Iorwerth of St Davids (1215–29) concerning a dispute over tithes due to Brecon priory.220 During the

---

214 The relevant documents are Crouch, Llandaff, 11–14 and Hart, Historia et Cartularium, DIX, DX, DXII and DXIII. See also EAWD ii, L.133–140.
218 AWR, 247.
220 Barrow, Si Davids, 77 and EAWD i, D.442. For the life and career of Guala see above, p. 108, n. 73.
dispute, Hywel of Ystrad Yw and Hywel ap Cynan, who claimed part of the tithes for themselves, obtained letters issued by Honorius and Guala to support their case. These letters delayed the case, much to the bishop’s displeasure. Even if the judgment suggests the letters were obtained under false pretences, they were clearly considered important. That an inquiry should be delayed by letters from the Pope and his officer demonstrates this.

In one instance, the power of the judge-delegate system and legatine power is concurrent. Elias of Radnor (Bishop of Llandaff, 1230–40) is responsible for a proclamation regarding the quitclaim of tithes from the parish of Kenfig, Glamorganshire by Tewkesbury Abbey. Tewkesbury had resorted to litigation against Margam Abbey to secure its due. For the sake of peace, Robert Abbot of Tewkesbury had given up its claim to the tithes in the presence of Bishop Elias. The case was heard by an unidentified ‘S’, Prior of Chepstow whose authority derived from the legate Otto. This is yet another example of the papacy’s influence in Welsh affairs.

The papacy’s growing importance is further reflected by a notification from Elias concerning the abbey of St Mary in Glory in Anagni. Elias caused the placing of the church of St. Leonard’s, Magor, to be transferred to brother Deodatus of the abbey because of his love for Gregory IX. This followed a grant of the lands of St. Leonard’s by Gilbert Marshal.

The desire to please the papacy is also seen in a proclamation by Richard Carew of St Davids. He proclaimed fifteen days’ remittance from penance for any who attended Mass. These

---

221 He describes the effect of obtaining the letters as “disturbing and impeding” (turbaretur et impederetur) the negotiations. Barrow, St Davids, 77 and EAWD i, p. 348.
222 Crouch, Llandaff, 78 and EAWD ii, L.378.
223 Crouch, Llandaff, 67 and EAWD ii, L.381.
225 Barrow, St Davids, 135 and EAWD i, D.670.
masses were for the soul of the Pope, the Church, the King and Queen and all the benefactors of the University of Oxford and were based on a proclamation by the legate Ottobuono. Richard had a close relationship with Alexander IV as he had been consecrated bishop by him in Rome, and sent several letters of commendation in his favour. With such a close connection to the institution, it is little wonder that Richard made a point of promoting prayers for the papacy’s spiritual wellbeing.

See Chapter 2, pp. 69–70.
CHAPTER 4: ROME AND THE PAPACY IN WELSH SOURCES, PART II

Rome and the papacy in Welsh law

Some forty medieval manuscripts of Welsh law survive, dating from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries.\(^1\) With the exception of six manuscripts written mainly in Latin but peppered with vernacular legal terms, all are written in Middle Welsh.\(^2\) The Middle Welsh manuscripts are divided into three redactions, each called after jurists named in their prologues as associated with their creation: Iorwerth (associated with Gwynedd), Cyfnerth (associated with Maelienydd, an area of Radnorshire) and Blegywryd (associated with south-west Wales).\(^3\) The law described in each manuscript is customary law compiled by lawyers and cannot, for the most part, be associated with an individual ruler or piece of legislation.\(^4\) The full texts are compilations curated and edited by lawyers and divided into tractates

---

\(^1\) For an overview of Welsh law see T. M. Charles-Edwards, *The Welsh Laws* (Cardiff, 1989) and H. Pryce, ‘Lawbooks and Literacy in Medieval Wales’, *Speculum* 75 (2000), 29–67 at pp. 34–41. See also the brief introductory notes by S. E. Roberts on the website of the ‘Cyfraith Hywel’ (‘Law of Hywel’) project (http://cyfraith-hywel.cymru.ac.uk/). It should be noted that I was employed as a research assistant for this project, compiling the database of the manuscripts’ contents. For examples of Welsh law being committed to writing before the surviving manuscripts see H. Pryce, ‘The Context and Purpose of the Earliest Welsh Lawbooks’, CMCS 39 (Summer, 2000), 39–63, at pp. 43–5.


dealing with different aspects of law.\textsuperscript{5} The laws portray a greater legal unity for Wales than was ever achieved by Welsh polities and thus project an image of Welsh nationhood.\textsuperscript{6}

Given this purpose as propaganda and the political circumstances in which the lawbooks were produced in the thirteenth century, it is perhaps unsurprising that the laws are associated with Hywel ap Cadell (d. 950), who ruled a vast swathe of what is now Wales in the tenth century. Hywel has traditionally been associated with a revision of Welsh law, as most medieval Welsh law manuscripts contain in their prologue the story of how Hywel, during Lent, gathered lay and ecclesiastical men from each \textit{cantref} to the White House on the Taf to discuss the laws of Wales.\textsuperscript{7} Through this story, it is implied that Welsh people were civilised, Christian and that they valued wise and just law. Hywel’s responsibility for codifying the law is open to doubt, as there is no evidence independent of the prologues to confirm what they report.\textsuperscript{8} However, it is evident that by the thirteenth century Hywel’s name and therefore his authority was associated with Welsh law.\textsuperscript{9} Perhaps Stacey best summarises the situation: “Hywel’s actual connections with the written law are still a matter of some controversy among historians, but few would dispute the tremendous symbolic importance he exercised on the political imagination of the day. In a climate in which the traditional was equated with the authoritative, Hywel’s textual legacy was a card not easily to be trumped.”\textsuperscript{10} The fact that

\textsuperscript{6} Pryce, ‘Context and Purpose’, pp. 50–1 and \textit{AoC}, p. 18 and p. 134.
Hywel predated two English kings associated with the law, Edward the Confessor (1042–66) and Henry I (1100–35), and was a contemporary and associate of another, Æthelstan (924–39), would also doubtless have appealed to Welsh lawyers who sought to emphasise the antiquity claimed for the law.¹¹

Perhaps taking advantage of the fact that Hywel is known to have travelled to Rome in c. 928, some manuscripts state that Hywel took the laws with him to be blessed by the Pope.¹² Indeed, some later manuscripts even go so far as to (incorrectly) name the Pope concerned as Anastasius.¹³ The passage in this text continues by supplying the date of Hywel’s visit to Rome as 914. Clearly, this contradicts the date given by Annales Cambriae for Hywel’s visit, and as it does not even match the regnal dates of any Pope by the name of Anastasius (Anastasius III had died in the autumn of 913). It may be explained by Anastasius being in power when Hywel began to reign.¹⁴ There is no evidence that Hywel Dda took any laws with him to Rome. Indeed, the fact that this story only appears in texts of the thirteenth century and later would seem to confirm that it was later propaganda.¹⁵

In the late thirteenth century Welsh law, from a Welsh lawyer’s perspective, was under attack from secular rulers who preferred using the laws of England, a King prepared to exercise his authority and ecclesiastical reformers.¹⁶ Pryce has argued that, in addition to Hywel’s

¹³ See Roberts, Llawysgrif Pomffred, 1616 (pp. 198–9).
¹⁵ Owen, ‘Royal Propaganda’, p. 228.
inclusion in the text as an authority figure that he was included to provide an example to contemporary rulers of a ruler engaged in protecting Welsh law. This appears to have been a concern for contemporary lawyers, especially those involved with compiling the Iorwerth redaction, and is reflected in the number of narrative tales concerned with predecessor rulers.\(^{17}\) The Arwystli Case between Edward I and Llywelyn ap Gruffudd, as Davies argued, though superficially about the application of law in Arwystli was really about the wielding of political power following Llywelyn’s defeat of 1276–77, and would also have concerned Welsh lawyers.\(^{18}\)

Another impetus for the inclusion of this tale in the prologue at this time may have been the attacks upon the Law of Hywel by John Pecham, Archbishop of Canterbury (1279–92), who had claimed that Welsh law was ungodly.\(^{19}\) If this was the reason for the story’s incorporation into the law texts, then one may easily justify Owen’s contention that “the Roman story might well have been added to the prologues as a further defence of Welsh law in the face of attack from Canterbury, by appealing to the authority of the head of Christendom.”\(^{20}\) Inclusion on these grounds would demonstrate a clear regard by thirteenth-century Welshmen for the


papacy as a font of authority and legitimacy, or at the least the belief that English churchmen would have such a regard.

This view is given added credence when one considers the prologues as a whole. The meeting at Whitland took place during Lent and Hywel, according to the Iorwerth redaction, solicited advice from two ecclesiastics “lest the laymen should set down anything which might be against Holy Scripture.”21 The prologues give the impression of being an attempt to justify the laws associated with Hywel to Church reformers as the laws were deficient with regards to Canon law.22 These successive accretions of associating the revision of laws to an ancestor figure and then crediting him with holding a meeting during a time of repentance, being guided by the Church’s advice and receiving the consent and blessing of its spiritual leader all amount to a case for the defence of the laws.23 It might even be implied that Hywel’s pilgrimage to Rome was the main reason for his association with the Welsh law in the first place.

The papacy makes a second appearance in the Iorwerth text at the beginning of the tractate discussing suretyship.24 It occurs in a didactic section of the text, which bears a close resemblance to cynghawsedd, the genre of medieval Welsh legal writing used to instruct

---

lawyers in pleading cases. The purpose of learning *cynghawsedd* was to “encourage creative thinking about how to manoeuvre within established pleading structures as they were to communicate a knowledge of the workings of those structures in the first place.”25 Although the term *cynghawsedd* is not used in this section, and is indeed confined to the tractate on land law, this passage is clearly related to this type of legal writing.26 *Cynghawsedd* was a newly developing genre in twelfth-century Gwynedd and the passage in question shows signs of being altered to reflect the most recent developments.27 The passage’s contents are perhaps best summarised by Charles-Edwards: “We are taken through a case in which a debtor denies having given a particular man as a surety, though the surety himself and the creditor concur in accepting his suretyship... In this instance, then, the legal story includes verbatim interchanges between creditor, debtor, surety and judge, in the course of which the debtor is gradually pushed from mere denial to denial on oath and finally to compurgation.”28 When it comes to swearing the veracity of his case, the judge asks the debtor to swear against the protection of God, the Pope and the debtor’s secular Lord that he will not give false testimony.29 The religious dimension is further emphasised by the fact that the swearing must take place on a relic held in the judge’s hand.30

Relics were held in high regard in Welsh society, as seen in the works of Gerald of Wales and the references to them in Welsh law.31 They represented a saint’s authority and power.

26 Charles-Edwards, ‘*Cynghawsedd*’, p. 190.
28 Charles-Edwards, ‘*Cynghawsedd*’, p. 190.
31 Ibid., and Chapter 3, pp. 110–11.
Should the debtor lie whilst swearing on a saint’s relics, he risked incurring that saint’s wrath. Allied with this possibility was the threat of earthly vengeance by the debtor’s secular superior and spiritual sanction for lying before God. In such company comes the Pope, a figure who bridges the secular and spiritual divide and could impose penalties in both worlds. Describing the effects of lying having sworn on a saint’s relic, Pryce argued that the “threat of saintly vengeance... provided a potent substitute, or at least reinforcement, for the secular and ecclesiastical penalties”. The same principle could be extended to the oath read by the Judge. Sanction from these three figures and the saint of the relics was aimed at preventing perjury, and is but one example of Welsh law’s dependence on religious presuppositions and ecclesiastical cooperation. This connection with perjury led Charles-Edwards to suggest that the Pope’s inclusion in the text was inspired by the fact of perjury being an offence against Canon law. That the Pope should be mentioned in what is an up-to-date section of the text demonstrates the high regard that the Iorwerth text’s redactors had for the papacy.

High regard for the papacy’s power is revealed in several later redactions, notably in three which qualify for consideration here. These are ‘Latin B’, dating from the mid-thirteenth century and probably originating from Gwynedd; ‘Latin D’ a text from the later thirteenth century from South Wales; and ‘Llyfr Colan’, a revised version of the Iorwerth redaction displaying similar features to the aforementioned Latin redactions. We see that, following the loss of inheritance for the most serious homicides (killing in “secret”, betraying a Lord and killing a pencendl (head of a kin) in ‘Latin B’), the killer could travel to Rome, undertake penance as prescribed by the Pope and then be restored to the inheritance if they could

---

32 NL, pp. 43–4.
33 Pryce, ‘Dduw yn le Mach’, p. 47.
produce a letter from the Pope proving the completion of penance. Homicide triggered the concept of “kin-responsibility” under Welsh law, meaning that the killer’s family up to the fifth cousin would have to pay galanas, a life price of appropriate value for the victim. Given the societal impact of homicide, it is unsurprising that a killer would have to undertake such a dangerous journey to a source of divine authority to regain his patrimony.

The papacy’s influence may well be seen elsewhere in ‘Latin D’. The manuscript’s compiler, probably a cleric, emphasises the importance of written law to a greater degree than other contemporary manuscripts. Pryce draws attention to the emphasis in ‘Latin D’ on law being guided by reason and the need for judgements to conform with what was written in law texts, drawing a comparison between these points and the similar emphasis in the Liber Extra promulgated by Gregory IX. Although a direct influence on the compiler of ‘Latin D’ by the Liber Extra cannot be proven, the similarities highlighted by Pryce are worth noting.

The only comparison of Welsh Law with any other legal system in the Welsh law books occurs in the Iorwerth redaction:

---


“Keureyth eglues a dyweyt na dele un mab tref tat namen e mab hynaf e’r tat o’r wreyc pryaut. Keureyth Hewel a’e barn e’r mab yeuhal megys e’r hynaf, ac a uarn na dotter pechaut e tat na’e agkeureyth en erbny e mab am tref e tat.”

This section claims to contrast the law of the Church with the law of Hywel, which allowed illegitimate sons to inherit their father’s patrimony provided that the father acknowledged paternity, with regards to the law of partible inheritance and illegitimacy. It was doing nothing of the sort. As Jenkins and Pryce have pointed out, the law being compared with that of Hywel was English Common law and practice, albeit Common law that had assimilated aspects of Canon law. Although Canon law provided the concept of legitimacy and disapproved of illegitimate children inheriting patrimony, it did not specifically prohibit inheritance by them. As Pryce suggests, the passage also implies that preference was given to Welsh customary law over Canon law, and that the passage’s author emphasised defending the right of illegitimate children to inherit property rather than an outright rejection of Canon law.

40 Llyfr Iorwerth, 87.4–5. “Church law says that no son is entitled to patrimony save the father’s eldest son by the wedded wife. The law of Hywel adjudges it to the youngest son as to the eldest, and judges that the father’s sin and his illegality should not be set against the son for his patrimony”. Jenkins, The Law, p. 110. A version of this passage in another group of manuscripts belonging to the Iorwerth redaction does not mention Church law at all, merely that the law had said another time that no son is entitled to patrimony safe for the eldest son of the father’s wife. See NL, pp. 98–9.

41 For the Welsh law of affiliation see Llyfr Iorwerth, 100.1–103.4 and Jenkins, The Law, pp. 132–7. Walters draws attention to a triad in ‘Latin B’ which does not allow for partible inheritance between a son born before the parents were married and a son born after the parents were wedded. It is not an exact parallel with the case of Llywelyn and his sons outlined below, but it is interesting to note the influence that Llywelyn’s actions might have on lawbooks in Gwynedd. See LTWL, p. 231.4–16 and D. B. Walters, ‘Roman and Romano-Canonical Law and Procedure in Wales’, Recueil de mémoires et travaux publié par la Société d’histoire du droit et des institutions des anciens pays de droit écrit, 15 (1991), 67–102, at p. 72, n. 14.


Given the lack of substance behind the statement, *keureyth eglues* would seem a strange choice of words by the Iorwerth text’s compilers. One way of explaining this discrepancy is by reference to a letter from Honorius III to Llywelyn ap Iorwerth which granted Llywelyn permission to alter the law of his land so that Dafydd ap Llywelyn would be recognised as Llywelyn’s sole heir. This gave Dafydd, Llywelyn’s son by his wife Joan, preference over Gruffudd, Llywelyn’s son by his mistress Tangwystl. Both letter and law discuss the same subject, which are the arrangements for inheritance. Although Honorius does not concern himself with the principle of primogeniture in his letter, the texts are otherwise comparable. There is a striking similarity between the description of Joan as *uxor tua legitima* and the reference to *gwrwyc pryaut* in the law text. One might also highlight the different concepts of illegitimacy expressed by letter and law text. The former has the burden of illegitimacy placed upon the children, whilst the latter places any notion of illegality on the children’s father.

We know that the Iorwerth redaction was extensively reworked and developed during Llywelyn’s reign as prince of Gwynedd and that the text reflects the concerns of the prince and his advisors in places. It is also thought to have been influenced by contemporary European legal thought, particularly regarding *cynghawsedd* and in the focus on royal

---

44 Honorius III’s letter is presumed to contain much of the text originally sent by Llywelyn requesting the change. See Chapter 2, p. 84, n. 199.

45 *AWR*, p. 415.

46 Jenkins explained the phrase thus: “In this context *priod* [Jenkins uses Modern Welsh orthography] must imply a union recognised by the church, which does not require any particular formality or Christian ceremony.” Jenkins, *The Law*, p. 265.

revenues and prerogatives in the Laws of Court tractate.\textsuperscript{48} Contemporary influence is also seen in the section of the texts concerned with the value of animals, with the prices given reflecting English market value at around c. 1200.\textsuperscript{49} The Iorwerth text was then a thoroughly up-to-date text. There was concern about succession and inheritance, particularly of royal succession and the Queen’s role at court. This is reflected by alterations to the relevant passages of the Iorwerth text.\textsuperscript{50} The case of Dafydd’s succession is Pryce’s explanation for the inclusion of this passage in the first place.\textsuperscript{51} As it is presumed that the lawmen were intimately connected with the court of Gwynedd, it is not unreasonable to suggest that they would have known of Honorius’s letter. Given the respect for the papacy’s authority and power expressed by the learned classes in other sources, it might be considered sufficient reason to include a comparison between Welsh law and the Pope’s directive. The letter’s influence would explain the reference to \textit{keureyth eglues}. In addition to the political circumstances of the text’s creation, it is not beyond the realms of possibility that the passage was influenced by Honorius’s letter.

If the above is accepted, this tells us a little more about the attitudes of Welsh lawyers towards the papacy. We must consider the spirit in which the passage is written. It is evident that the compiler’s sympathies lie with Welsh law’s protection of the rights of illegitimate sons. This passage, much like the prefaces to the lawcodes, was written to defend Welsh law and easily add it to Owen’s list of examples of Welsh lawyers deploying the law texts to defend Welsh law against perceived hostile external influences and challenges.\textsuperscript{52} One might conclude that whatever the respect of Welsh lawyers for the papacy, and whatever references

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{48} Stacey, ‘Learning to Plead’, p. 123, ead., ‘King, Queen and \textit{Edling}’, p. 45 and ead., ‘Archaic Core’, p. 18.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Pryce, ‘Lawbooks’, pp. 35–6 and the references in n. 26.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Stacey, ‘King, Queen and \textit{Edling}’, particularly pp. 47–55.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Pryce, ‘Eglwys’, p. 7 and above, p. 142, n. 44.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Owen, ‘Royal Propaganda’, p. 246. This is not to say that there were no challenges to the law from within the Welsh polities. See Pryce, ‘Prologues’, pp. 176–8, and above, p. 135, n. 16.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
made to the papacy elsewhere in the law texts, this respect did not extend to changing Welsh traditions.

**Rome and the papacy in Welsh Poetry**

Poets had a particularly high standing in Welsh society. The rights and dues of two poetic offices, the *Bardd Teulu* and *Pencerdd*, are recorded in the Welsh law texts.\(^{53}\) We also know that poets were well educated, in some cases associated with the legal profession, with certain families of poets integrated into the bureaucracy of Gwynedd in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.\(^{54}\) Andrews summarises the poets’ status as being “… a professional, learned and highly respected class whose status and privileges were protected by law, the poets were at the very centre of government.”\(^{55}\) The poets also took advantage of the public spectacle of performing their poetry to advise the rulers whom they addressed.\(^{56}\) The corpus demonstrates their familiarity with popular devotion and some current theological concepts.\(^{57}\) Although known as the ‘Poets of the Princes’, it is evident that the poets were in frequent contact with the most prominent aristocratic families throughout the Welsh polities.\(^{58}\) Their function as

---


57 *WCP*, pp. xix–xxx. See also T. M. Charles-Edwards, and N. A. Jones, ‘Breintiau Gwyr Powys: The Liberties of the Men of Powys’, in T. M. Charles-Edwards, M. E. Owen, P. Russell, eds., *The Welsh King and his Court* (Cardiff, 2000), 191–223. In addition to being called the poets of the princes, the poets are also frequently referred to by the Welsh *Gogynfeirdd* (literally “quite early poets”). For the background to this term see Williams, *Poets*, pp. 1–2.
public entertainers and propagandists also makes them a valuable source of information for Welsh aristocratic courts.\(^{59}\)

A total of 236 poems, being the work of 40 poets, survives from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.\(^{60}\) In this corpus, there are eleven certain references to Rome, with a possible, metaphorical, twelfth reference and two further possible references to the office of the Pope. They generally fall into two categories. The first category acknowledges Rome as a place of authority or power, whilst in the second, the distance to Rome is used to aggrandise the poem’s subject.\(^{61}\)

Into the first category falls the earliest mention of Rome in the corpus in a poem mourning Gruffudd ap Cynan of Gwynedd (d. 1137).\(^{62}\) The poet, Meilyr Brydydd (fl. 1137–45), appeals for intercession on his patron’s behalf:

“Ry gated Ruuein rec aduwynda6d,
Ny vynnei gamhwr garu neba6d.”\(^{63}\)

\(^{59}\) “…the primary function of court poetry in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Wales was that of ritual entertainment. Ornate and highly formulaic, archaic and elevated diction, it undoubtedly benefited the ceremonial aspects of court life.” P. I. Lynch, ‘Court poetry, power and politics’ in T. M. Charles-Edwards, M. E. Owen, P. Russell, eds., The Welsh King and his Court (Cardiff, 2000), 167–90, p. 167. On the poets as propagandists see WCP, pp. xxviii–xvix.

\(^{60}\) WCP, p. xxxii.


\(^{62}\) Gruffudd is the only secular ruler for whom a medieval biography survives from Wales. For this see P. Russell, ed. and trans., Vita Griffini Filii Conani (Cardiff, 2005), D. S. Evans, ed., Historia Gruffud vab Kenan (Cardiff, 1977) and D. S. Evans, ed. and trans., A Medieval Prince of Wales: The Life of Gruffudd ap Cynan (Felinfach, 1990). See also K. L. Maund, ed., Gruffudd ap Cynan: A Collaborative Biography, Studies in Celtic History 16 (Woodbridge, 1996).

Meilyr, as a guardian of Gruffudd ap Cynan’s posthumous reputation, portrays Gruffudd as a manly warrior who asked nobody, not even God, for mercy. More important to our purpose is the association of Rome with mercy and as a centre from which power derived. A further reference in this category derives from the work of Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr (fl.1155–95). In one of three Arwyrain poems he sang to Owain Gwynedd, Cynddelw lists the many martial feats and encounters of his subject. A passage referring to the conflict of 1157 between Owain Gwynedd and Henry II of England (1154–1189) is of particular interest. In describing the conflict Cynddelw tells us “Kyfarfu ddrigieig, rieu Ruuein”. Cynddelw makes Owain Henry’s equal by implying that the authority of both rulers derives from Rome.

Cynddelw again utilises the image of Rome as a centre of authority in a poem to Owain Cyfeiliog (d.1197). The poet tells us that Owain Cyfeiliog was:

---

64 WCP, p. xxxiii. For Cynddelw’s life and works see Gwaith Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr I, Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion 3, eds. N. A. Jones and A. P. Owen (Cardiff, 1991), pp. xxv–xlvi.
67 For Owain Cyfeiliog’s life see Gwaith Llywelyn Farudd I ac eraill o feirdd y ddeuddegfed ganrif, Cyfres Beirdd y Tywysogion 2, eds. K. A. Bramley, N. A. Jones, M. E. Owen, C. McKenna, G. A. Williams, and J. E. C. Williams (Cardiff, 1994), pp. 193–8, C. McKenna, ‘Performing Penance and Poetic Performance in the Medieval Welsh Court’, Speculum 82 (2007), 82–96, at pp. 87–9 and for Owain’s period of ascent and rule in Powys, see Stephenson, Powys, pp. 58–74. See also Gruffydd A. Williams, ‘Welsh Raiding in the Twelfth-Century Shropshire/Cheshire March: The Case of Owain Cyfeiliog’, SC 40 (2006), 89–115. Along with Hywel ab Owain Gwynedd, Owain Cyfeiliog is most famous for being one of the ‘prince poets’, with two compositions attributed to him surviving. For these poems see CBT 2, 15 and 16. For a translation of ‘Hirlas Owain’ see Clancy, Medieval Welsh Poems, pp. 130–3. See also C. A. McKenna, ed. and trans., The Medieval Welsh Religious Lyric (Belmont, 1991), p. 55. For Hywel’s poems see CBT 2, 6–13 and translations Clancy, Medieval Welsh Poems, pp. 134–8. Doubt has been cast over the attribution of these poems to the two princes, with arguments being advanced that all the poems should be attributed to Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr. See Gruffydd A. Williams, ‘Owain Cyfeiliog: Bardd-dywysog?’, in B. F. Roberts and M. E. Owen, eds., Beirdd a Thywysogion
“Gelyn tra6s ryuel tros Ruuein – yd wys, Tros y llys yn Llundein.”

Cynddelw uses hyperbole to praise Owain’s “authority” here. The choice of these two cities is significant as they clearly symbolised power for Cynddelw. These examples are comparable with contemporary synonyms in Welsh for rulers of a particular area. In the section on the King’s sarhaed (insult, or more specifically the payment due for insult or personal injury) in law texts, for instance, we find both brenhyn Aberfrav (King of Aberffraw) and arglwyd Denewr (Lord of Dinefwr). The former was synonymous with the ruler of Gwynedd and the later with the rulership of Deheubarth.

The second category of reference utilises the distance to Rome to aggrandize the poem’s subject. Rome is used in conjunction with the praising of resources in two of our examples. Einion ap Gwgon (fl. c. 1215) informs us that Llywelyn ap Iorwerth had the ability to fight as far away as Rome, whilst Owain ap Gruffudd ap Gwenwynwyn (d. 1293) is complimented for his great wealth by Llywelyn Fardd III (fl. c. 1284). Rome is used in conjunction with

---

68 CBT 3, 16.155–6. “A powerful enemy in war whose authority is recognised unto Rome / [And] over the court in London” (my own translation). The Middle Welsh *tros* is rather difficult to express in this case, as it is usually translated as “over” or “beyond”. The editor makes comparison with the work of Llywelyn Fardd I (for which see below, n. 71), suggesting that “unto” would be an acceptable translation, and I follow her suggestion here. In any case, Cynddelw aggrandises the object of his praise.

69 See *Llyfr Iorwerth* 3.3 (p. 2), Jenkins, *The Law*, pp. 5–6, *Pomffred*, 11 (pp.70–6), *Pomffred*, 11 (pp.70–6, 11 (pp.70–1) and the legal triads concerned with these centres of power in S. E. Roberts, ed. and trans., *The Legal Triads of Medieval Wales* (Cardiff, 2007), Q243 (pp. 232–3). See also *AoC*, p. 217 and p. 253.


71 “Rifir y de6rll6r6, ryuel darllein– gled, / Reuued nyt ryued hyd yn Ruuein” CBT 6, 8.32. “Praise is given to his heroic progress, [his] sword declares war, / Wealth that is not strange unto Rome” (my own translation). For Owain ap Gruffudd ap Gwenwynwyn see CBT 6, pp. 114–5 and Stephenson, *Powys*, pp. 169–77. This poem was attributed in the CBT edition to Llywelyn Fardd II, however more recent research has shown that the poem
reputation in other examples. Owain Fychan (d. 1187) was known in Rome according to Llywelyn Fardd I (fl. c. 1147–c. 1176). Gwalchmai ap Meilyr (fl. 1132–80) described Rhodri ab Owain Gwynedd (d. 1195) as being feared by everybody between Gwynedd and Rome whilst in the work of Seisyll Bryffrwch (fl. c. 1170), Iorwerth ab Owain (d. c. 1174) was mourned all the way to Rome. As observed by McKenna, the collective impression of these lines is that the distance to Rome was considered an especially great one. In each case, this great distance is used to emphasise the quality being praised by the poet—Llywelyn ap Iorwerth and Rhodri ab Owain’s martial qualities, the wealth of Owain ap Gruffudd ap Gwenwynwyn and the good names of Owain Fychan and Iorwerth ab Owain.

Thus far we have seen the poets viewing Rome as a centre of authority which was particularly far away. Aside from the appeal for Gruffudd ap Cynan’s soul, Rome appears as a strictly temporal centre of power, lacking any sacred dimension. We might conclude then that the Rome of which the poets were thinking was mainly the ancient world’s Rome rather than that of the papacy. There are however four further possible references to Rome in a spiritual context, and all are linked to pilgrimage. Given the surviving corpus, it is little wonder that one example appears in the work of Cynddelw Brydydd Mawr, when he sings

---

72 “Ny hepkoraf y r6yf, hyt Ruuein – y g6ys” CBT 2, 3.5. “I have not given a lord the best, he is known as far away as Rome.” (my own translation). On the death of Madog ap Maredudd of Powys in 1160, Owain Fychan, along with his cousin Owain Cyfeiliog, was one of the five co-heirs of Powys. For more on Owain Fychan’s career see CBT 2, p. 45 and CBT 3, p. 154, and for the situation in Powys see Stephenson, Powys, pp. 58–60 and J. B. Smith ‘Dynastic Succession in Medieval Wales’, BBCS 33 (1986), 199–232, pp. 210–12. I again follow Jones’s revised dates for the poet’s life. See above, p. 147, n. 71.


74 “Ar ol erbylu cyrdd, nid coelfrai – ei ddwyn / Oddyman hyd Rufain / Can ys marw ior cor cywrail.” CBT 2 23.9–11. “After poets separate, it is not good news to bring this/ from here to Rome / For the lord of a skilful force is dead” (my own translation). Iorwerth ab Owain was the father of Llywelyn ap Iorwerth. For Seisyll Byrffrwch see CBT 2, pp. 371–4.

75 CBT 6, p. 123.
the praises of St. Tysilio and the church associated with him at Meifod, Montgomeryshire. The poem is thought to have been composed in the period 1155–60 and certainly no later than 1170 by Owen. Owen and McKenna speculate that Cynddelw composed this poem in response to Meifod’s hospitality to him and at the abbot’s commission. One should also consider the suggestion of Jones and Owen, supported by Stephenson, that part of Cynddelw’s motivation for composing the poem was as a response to the dynastic struggle within Powys during the 1160s and the need for the now dominant Owain Gwynedd to protect Meifod. The site was closely associated with the ruling dynasty of Powys at the time of the poem’s composition. Madog ap Maredudd rebuilt the church at Meifod in the 1150s, rededicating it to the Virgin Mary in 1156, and was buried in Meifod in 1160 according to all versions of Brut y Tywysogyon. It is worth quoting Cynddelw’s poem at length to appreciate his rhetorical flourish:

“Berth Veiuot, ovirein loga6t
Lloc ua6reith am uedueith uедra6t
Tremynt tec y’м trewyn beida6t
A weles ny welir hyt ura6t
Caer Rufein, ryued olyga6t
Caer uchel, uchaf y defa6t
Kaer ehang, ehofyn y chi6tawt
Ny chyfret y phobyl a phecha6t

77 CBT 3, pp. 16–17 and MWRL, p. 31.
79 Brut (RBH) 1156 (pp. 132–5), Brut (Pen. 20), (p. 102, 1156 (p. 59), BS 1156 (pp. 158–9), Brut (RBH) 1160 (pp. 140–1), Brut (Pen. 20), (p. 107, 1160 (p. 61), BS 1160 (pp. 162–3), Stephenson, Medieval Powys, p. 54 and Owen, ‘Canu’, p. 94.
Caer arheul, kaer didreul didra6t
Kaer bellglaer o bellglot ada6t
Kaer barchus barhaus bara6t
A berit y bererinda6t”

Cynddelw’s poem demonstrates his high regard for Meifod, a place with a reputation for high standards. It is famous for its welcome and it was purpose-built for pilgrims. Owen links the comparison to Rome with an incident in a seventeenth-century Breton life of St. Suliau by Albert le Grand whose source material is believed to have been based on a medieval Welsh life of St. Tysilio. Le Grand describes how Tysilio wished to spare Gwyddfarch, the elderly Abbot of Meifod, an arduous pilgrimage to Rome. Tysilio prayed to God and the following day Gwyddfarch was granted a vision of Rome’s wonders in the fields surrounding Meifod.

As Cynddelw draws heavily on what was a well-known story, Owen’s suggestion of Cynddelw’s passage being inspired by this incident has some merit. His purpose, after all, was to retell the story of Tysilio and to praise Meifod. The recent suggestion by Thurlby and Stephenson that the vision of Rome in Cynddelw’s poetry was included in order to demonstrate Meifod’s lack of need for Anglo-Norman driven reform seems unnecessary; it is surely better understood as a direct comparison between two high status ecclesiastical sites.

For Cynddelw, Meifod is a second Rome.

---

80 CBT 3, 3.159–170. “Beautiful Meifod, extremely splendid monastery / A great and ample church upon the graveyard of noblemen / A fair scene for my adventurous, ardent man / The which he saw will not be seen until Judgement Day / Fort of Rome, a marvellous scene, / Exalted fort, of the highest [standard] are its rites / Expansive fort, dauntless are its inhabitants / Its people do not pursue sin / Bright fort, solid, steadfast fort / Fort of widespread fame, a fort shining from afar / An honourable fort, constantly ready [in welcome] / Which was created for pilgrimage.” (My own translation). The repetition of the phrase kaer at the beginning of each line is an example of a device known as cymeriad. For this technique, see A. P. Owen, ‘Cymeriad yn awdlau Beirdd y Tywysogion’, Dwned 4 (1998), 33–58, and MWRL, pp. 9–10, pp. 68–9 and pp. 82–3.

81 Owen, ‘Canu’, p. 88 and p. 89.

A second example occurs in a devotional poem to St. David by Gwynfardd Brycheiniog (fl. c. 1170–9). The poet tells the story of David’s life, discussing his achievements and missionary work. We are told:

“Ef kymerth yr Duw dioteifyeint - yn dec
Ar don a charrec, a chad6 y vreint
A chyrchu Ru6ein, rann gyreifyeint
A gwest yn Efrei, g6st diamreint.”

Gwynfardd praises his subject’s virtues. David was loyal to God and suffered for it. That David is said to have travelled to Rome and the Holy Land is exceptional and worth mentioning. It is also worth noting the description of Rome as a *rann gyreifyeint*, a place of absolution, for the poet. This gives us an inkling of the way in which Rome was considered important by Gwynfardd. Catherine McKenna draws attention to the large number of churches associated with David throughout Wales that are noted in the poem. She links mentioning these churches with the argument advanced by Gerald of Wales for the independence of St Davids from Canterbury’s jurisdiction. Her argument rests on the poem being likely to have been composed c. 1175, and she claims that is at the same time as Gerald began pursuing his cause. In this she errs as Gerald appears to have paid little heed to the argument in favour of St Davids’ independence from Canterbury until the time of his attempt to have his election as Bishop of St Davids recognised almost a quarter of a century after the

---

83 Gwynfardd Brycheiniog is unique in the surviving corpus as he is the only poet known to originate from south-east Wales. See CBT 2, pp. 417–22.
85 CBT 2, 26.19–24. “He received, for God, suffering - faithfully/ On wave and rock. and kept his privilege/ And travelling to Rome, a place of absolution/ And dwelling in Canaan, a great effort”. (My own translation).
86 MWRL, p. 30.
poem’s composition. The poem does, however, point to a popular tradition of David’s popularity as being Wales-wide.

A further reference to Rome occurs in a poem recorded in the Black Book of Carmarthen, a manuscript dating from the mid-thirteenth century and almost certainly the earliest extant manuscript of Welsh poetry to survive. Huws describes the manuscript’s contents as being an “original retrospective of Welsh poetry”, with the manuscript containing poems on religious themes, secular panegyric, poems associated with the Myrddin legend and other mythological material. The religious poems in the manuscript appear to be the work of a monastic author. Our poem takes the form of a lorica, a charm poem. It opens with an early morning appeal to the Cross of Christ for protection and over several stanzas it becomes obvious that the speaker is about to embark on a journey to Rome:

87 See Chapter 1, pp. 20–47.
90 MWRL, pp. 74–6 and pp. 77–8.
“Drcheuid bran y hadein.
arowun myned ruvein.
etil butic bytaud kein.”

After further appeals to God, Christ, Peter and St. Bridget, the poet expresses hope for attaining atonement through pilgrimage. The expiation of sins was emphasised by Henry, who also draws attention to the poem’s ability to bring the pilgrim experience to life. This is an important piece of evidence for the idea of penitential pilgrimage in Wales. There are only a further three possible references to pilgrimage in the poetic corpus. The first is an ode praising God by Gwalchmai ap Meilyr in which the poet expresses his willingness to go on pilgrimage to reduce the burden of his sins. The second reference occurs in a poem in praise of God by Einion ap Gwlachmai (fl. 1176–1223), the aforementioned poet’s son. Einion expresses a wish to withstand the pain of crossing the Alps so that he may visit the Holy Land. The final reference occurs in an anonymous, incomplete poem, in which the poet gives the impression of having visited several sites in the Holy Land. Andrews has argued convincingly that this poem is likely to be the work of Einion ap Gwalchmai. If she is correct, it seems possible that Einion’s wish was granted. The evidence with which we may compare the Black Book of Carmarthen’s poem is very limited. Rome is again portrayed as a

92“A raven raises its wing / desiring to go to Rome. / A beneficial purpose; all will be fine.” Rowland, Saga Poetry, p. 453 and p. 500. The raven in the poem may represent a cleric or monk. See Rowland, Saga Poetry, p. 227 and Haycock, Blodeugerdd, p. 273.
95 On pilgrimage see Chapter 1, p. 48, n. 245 and Chapter 3, pp. 103–4 and pp. 109–11.
98 Rh. M. Andrews, ‘Ar Drywydd Pererin: Gwaith Dafydd Benfras, Cerdd 36’, Lîên Cymru 32 (2009), 1–32, where the poem is edited at pp. 28–30 and the notes accompanying the edition in CBT 6, 36 (some of which are superseded by Andrews’s article).
place where absolution might be achieved but, in this instance, it is explicitly stated that this is to be achieved through penitential pilgrimage.

The final possible reference to Rome occurs in *Marwysgafn Meilyr Brydydd*.99 Throughout the poem Meilyr demonstrates what Hughes termed “a recognition of the Petrine powers.”100 His emphasis is on forgiveness of his sins in preparation for his resurrection. In addition to Peter, Meilyr invokes Mary and expresses his wish to be buried on Bardsey Island, the reputed burial place of twenty thousand Saints.101 Meilyr describes himself in the poem as *beryrein y Bedyr*, a pilgrim to Peter.102 One might legitimately interpret this as a reference to Meilyr having travelled to Rome, or desiring to travel to Rome, but this interpretation fails to take account of the poem’s genre. It is a *marwysgafn*, a poem associated with death and the Last Things, so it is perhaps more readily understood as Meilyr describing himself as a pilgrim on the way to the afterlife to meet St. Peter as the keeper of the keys to the kingdom of Heaven.103 This interpretation of Meilyr’s words fits well with other references to St. Peter in the corpus, which either ask Peter for intercession or associate him with being the gatekeeper of heaven.104 The latter grouping is intriguing, as it allows Peter to be interpreted

---

100 K. Hughes, ‘The Celtic Church and the Papacy’ in C. H. Lawrence, ed., *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, (Stroud, 1999), pp. 1–28 at p. 28.
102 CBT 1, 4.25.
103 WCP, p. 141. It has been usual to translate this term as meaning a “deathbed poem”, but recent work has cast doubt on the validity of this usage. See Jones, ‘*Marwysgafyn*’, pp. 21–2 and pp. 32–6 and MWRL, pp. 61–6.
by the poets in terms of the Welsh royal household’s *Drysor* (Doorkeeper).\(^{105}\) No poetic reference links Peter directly with Rome.

There are two other possible references to the office of the Pope in the corpus. The earliest occurs in a poem in praise of God by Meilyr ap Gwalchmai.\(^{106}\) In a section listing the characteristics of God, the poet refers to God as *Ef 6w’r Pap pennaf*;\(^{107}\) The second occurs in a poem on the birth of Christ by the Franciscan friar Madog ap Gwallter (fl. c. 1250).\(^{108}\) The poem concludes with the following lines:

> “Bendegedic y6’r Nadolic, deil6g wledeu,
> Pan anet Mab, Arglwyd pob pab, pobeth biev
> O argl6ydes a wna yn lles a’n llud poeneu,
> Ac a’n g6na lle yn tecca bre, yg gobr6yeu”\(^{109}\)

The key word in both examples is *pap or pab*. *Pab* is the Welsh for Pope, so it is reasonable to translate these examples as “He is the chief Pope” and “Lord of every Pope.”\(^{110}\) This might lead us to conclude that both poets thought that Popes should remember their place in the

\(^{105}\) *MWRL*, pp. 126–7.

\(^{106}\) For the life and work of Meilyr ap Gwalchmai, see CBT 1, pp. 507–9 and *WCP*, p. xxxvi. Doubt has been cast on the accuracy of attributing any work to a poet of this name. See N. A. Jones, ‘Meilyr ap Gwalchmai-Rhithfardd!’, *Duned* 9 (2003), 23–36.

\(^{107}\) CBT 1, 32.20. “He is the Highest Father.” Costigan, *Defining*, 14.20.


\(^{109}\) CBT 7, 32.61–4. “A blessed time is the Nativity, Fit time for feasts, / When the son was born, Lord of every priest, of all things Master, / Born of a lady who will do us good And Prevent our pains, / And make room for us on the fairest height as our reward.” Clancy, *Medieval Welsh Poems*, p. 168.

\(^{110}\) McKenna prefers this interpretation in the case of Madog ap Gwallter’s poem. *MWRL*, p. 48.
hierarchy but contemporaneous usage of *pab* suggests that it is translated more simply as “father” or “priest”. Each contemporaneous reference to *Pab* meaning Pope recorded by *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru* is associated with Rome in some way. These are the interpretations of the word used by the poems’ most recent editors and although not quite as interesting, they are very probably more accurate.

An examination of twelfth- and thirteenth-century poetry does not provide much illumination of the attitudes of Welsh poets to Rome. There are so few references that one cannot trace any development of attitude amongst the poets over time. Perhaps this should not surprise us as the Welsh poets were preoccupied with the domestic politics of their time and are far more likely to have asked a saint for intercession on their behalf rather than appealing to the Pope. The subject matter of their poetry, praising God or praising or mourning a secular nobleman, also limits the opportunities to mention Rome. One might further consider that there are exceptionally few references to places beyond the British Isles, and that other than Rome, only two other “overseas” places are mentioned in the corpus. Bethlehem and Jerusalem are mentioned in passing by Madog ap Gwallter in his poem on the birth of Christ, whilst the shock felt by Elidir Sais (fl. 1246) at the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin is mentioned only to express the poet’s greater shock at the imprisonment of Dafydd ab Owain Gwynedd by his nephew Llywelyn ap Iorwerth. This said, it is possible to venture a few tentative conclusions. The collective impression from the corpus is that the poets knew Rome was a long way from the polities in which they performed and knew that it was a centre of great power and a place suitable for pilgrimage.

---


Rome and the papacy in Welsh Hagiography

The primary purpose of any saint’s life is “to promote and augment the cult” of that particular saint.\textsuperscript{113} They are in essence advertisements for the cult’s mother church and the benefits that saints might bring to devotees and benefactors.\textsuperscript{114} In addition to their devotional purposes, lives might be used to protect the “rights, immunities, privileges and estates” claimed by a church.\textsuperscript{115} In other words, they are far more likely to reflect the concerns and needs of their high medieval authors than they are to give a genuine account of an early medieval saint.\textsuperscript{116} It is of primary importance to keep this in mind when considering references to Rome and the papacy in the Welsh saints’ lives. The texts under consideration are the saints’ lives found in British Library MS Cotton Vespasian A. xiv, the life of St. Gwenffrewi from British Library, Cotton Claudius A. v, the Middle Welsh Life of Beuno from Oxford, Jesus College MS. 119 and the saints’ lives contained in the Book of Llandaff.\textsuperscript{117} All of the saints’ lives in these manuscripts either date from before the end of the thirteenth century or are very likely to be derived from texts dating to this period.

\textsuperscript{114} On the idea of saints as patrons, see the superb summary of scholarship in B. Lewis, ed. and trans., \textit{Medieval Welsh Poems to Saints and Shrines}, Medieval and Modern Welsh Series (Dublin, 2015), pp. 2–3. On the economic importance of saints’ cults to ecclesiastical establishments see ibid., p. 7.
There is some evidence to suggest that hagiography may have been composed in Wales in the
ninth century, but there is no complete life from before the end of the eleventh century. The most prominent collection of Welsh saints’ lives is to be found in British Library MS Cotton Vespasian A. xiv. In an important study of the manuscript, Kathleen Hughes agreed with Robin Flower in declaring that the manuscript was written c. 1200 and discerned evidence suggesting that the saints’ lives were composed earlier than the manuscript itself, during the twelfth century. She also discusses evidence linking the manuscript’s compilation to St. Peter’s Abbey Gloucester, as opposed to Flower’s suggestion that it was a product of Brecon Abbey. Also highlighted are the links between St. Peter’s Abbey and both Llandaff and the church of Llanbadarn Fawr. She concludes by suggesting that the final production stages were in an anglicised scriptorium open to Welsh influence, concurring with Harris that the monks of Monmouth seem likely candidates. These conclusions about the manuscript have been endorsed by Lewis’s recent reconsideration. The motivation for compiling the manuscript may have been to record the deeds of Welsh saints so that they could be introduced to a non-Welsh audience.

---


119 For a description of the manuscript by Robin Flower, see *VSBG*, pp. x–xiii.


122 Following Hughes and concentrating primarily on the *Vitae S. Carantoci*, Jankulak argues that the “West Wales” group of saints’ lives in the manuscript were composed in Llanbadarn. K. Jankulak, ‘Carantoc alias Cairmech?: British saints, Irish saints, and the Irish in Wales’ in K. Jankulak and J. M. Wooding, eds., *Ireland and Wales in the Middle Ages* (Dublin, 2007), pp. 116–48, at pp. 135–6.


124 B. J. Lewis, ‘A Possible Provenance for the Old Cornish Vocabulary’, *CMCS* 73 (Summer, 2017), 1–17, pp. 3–7

The dating of three other texts deserves attention: Rhygyfarch’s *Life* of St. David, the *Vita S. Wenfrede* and the Middle Welsh *Life* of Beuno. Davies building on Sharpe’s study of the different manuscript versions of the text and using the “chronological indicators” of the apparent lament for Bishop Sulien, the linking of David with the dynasty of Ceredigion and that the text shows no sign of the “anti-Norman sentiments” of Rhygyfarch’s *Planctus*, convincingly suggests a date of 1091x1093 for the text’s original composition.126 Wade-Evans included the text of *Vita S. Wenfrede* from British Library, Cotton Claudius A. v in his edition.127 The manuscript may have been compiled at Worcester in the early thirteenth century, but the text is thought to have arrived at Worcester from North Wales.128 The Middle Welsh Life of Beuno’s manuscript dates from 1346, but is thought to be based on an earlier Latin life. The lost Life must have been extant in the twelfth century, as Robert of Shrewsbury appears to have used it as a source for his *Vita et translatio S. Wenfrede*.129

The lives in the Book of Llandaff formed part of Bishop Urban’s campaign to extend the boundaries of his diocese.130 They were included in his dossier of evidence either to show that Llandaff had a claim over the lands of a particular church or that it laid claim to the relics

---


127 See the description by Flower in VSBG, pp. xviii–xix.

128 F. Winward, ‘The Lives of St Wenefred (BHL 8841–8851)’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 117 (1999), 89–132, at pp. 90–1. Winward is sceptical of Welsh authorship of this text, preferring to attribute its genesis to an extraction of part of a lost Latin Life of St. Beuno, in which Gwenffrewi was a subsidiary character, by the monks of Basingwerk Abbey which she, quoting David Williams, describes as “in Wales, but not “of it””. See ibid., pp. 118–25. Gwenffrewi is the sole Welsh female saint to have had a *vita* written about her. The next early life of a Welsh female saint is that of Melangell, which seems likely to date from the fifteenth century, though based on some earlier material. For the life of Melangell see H. Pryce, ‘A new edition of the *Historia Divae Monacellae*, *Montgomeryshire Collections* 82 (1994), 23–40.


130 An overview of the lives is given in Davies, Book, pp. 109–10. Davies elsewhere explains the importance of promoting the cults of three of these saints to Llandaff: “the shrine of Dyfrig provided a powerful connexon to the founding patriarch of the British episcopate; the relics of Teilo secured Llandaff within the episcopal heritage of the southern Welsh; the teeth of Ælfgar, the Hermit of Bardsey, tied the new cathedral into what must have been a popular contemporary cult”. Id., ‘Cathedrals and the Cult of Saints in Eleventh- and Twelfth-century Wales’ in P. Dalton, C. Insley, and L. J. Wilkinson, eds., *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict in the Anglo-Norman World*, Studies in the History of Medieval Religion (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 99–115, at p. 108.
of an individual saint. The authors of these saints’ lives show familiarity with some material contained in the Vespasian manuscript and seem to derive from a common source.

Given the likely date of compilation for the manuscript, as established by John Reuben Davies, all the texts in the manuscript must date from the early twelfth century and from no later than 1134.

Most of the saints’ lives follow a similar structure. Studying the Welsh saints’ lives from a folklorist’s point of view, E. R. Henken declared that “the saints of Welsh tradition led patterned lives”. Comparing the saints’ lives with some native Welsh tales, she declares that each saint is portrayed as a “Christianized folk hero.” She identifies a general pattern which occurs in the lives, noting that the major stages of a saint’s life appear to be 1. Conception and birth, 2. Childhood, 3. Performing a miracle which indicates maturity 4. Going out into the world, 5. Conflict with secular powers, 6. Ruling a territory and 7. Death.

The texts under discussion abound in examples of the stages Henken describes. St. Illtud’s ancestors, for instance, are described as *illustri genere*, whilst St. Beuno and St. Samson of Dol are born to noble parents who have had trouble conceiving. St. David has one of the more remarkable births. It is prophesied by an angel to his father, God commands St. Patrick

---

133 J. R. Davies, ‘*Liber Landavensis*: Its Date and the Identity of its Editor’, *CMCS* 35 (Summer, 1998), 1–12.
135 Ibid., p. 1.
136 Ibid., *Welsh Saints*, p. 2.
to move away from the future site of David’s monastery and Gildas cannot preach because of the presence of the pregnant Non (David’s mother) in the room.\textsuperscript{138} The childhood and education each Saint receives performs a similar function. St. Tatheus is portrayed as a model student and both St. Gwenffrewi (St. Wenefred) and St. Teilo are noted for their devotion to God from an early age. \textsuperscript{139} These events are used to establish their “peculiar and special position in society” and denote their future greatness. \textsuperscript{140}

To denote a Saint’s maturity, a miracle might take place. In Lifris’s Life of St. Cadog, the saint performs a quite spectacular miracle. \textsuperscript{141} A servant had refused to give Cadog assistance in lighting a fire, unless Cadog could carry the burning coals in his cloak. Not only does Cadog perform this task without damaging his cloak, the servant is found to have been burned alive. \textsuperscript{142} Meuthius, Cadog’s teacher, interprets this as a sign that he cannot teach

\begin{footnotes}
\item[138] ‘Rhygyfarch’s Life of St. David’, § 2 (pp.108–11), § 3 (pp.110–13) and § 5 (pp.112–15).
\item[142] This incident is one of many that appear to justify Gerald of Wales’s remark in his Itinerarium Kambriæ that: “both the Irish and the Welsh are more prone to anger and revenge in this life than other nations, and similarly their Saints in the next world seem much more vindictive.” See Gerald of Wales Itinerarium Cambriæ, II.7 (Gerald of Wales (Giraldi Cambrensis), Opera, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. F. Dimock and G. F. Warner, 8 vols., Rolls Series 21 (London, 1861–91), vi.130, L. Thorpe, trans., Gerald of Wales: The Journey through Wales and The Description of Wales (Harmondsworth, 1978), p. 189). For further biblical parallels in this incident see L. M. Guimarães aus Salvador, The Uses of Secular Rulers and Characters in the Welsh Saints’ Lives in the Vespasian Legendary (MS. Cotton Vespasian A. XIV.) (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg, PhD Thesis, 2009), pp. 97–9.
\end{footnotes}
Cadog anything further, and allows him to go forth in the world.\textsuperscript{143} A similar pattern is found in the \textit{Life} of Illtud, who rather than causing a miracle to occur, miraculously survives. A hunting party led by Illtud demanded food from St. Cadog. The request for food being improper, the earth swallows the hunting party. Illtud is the only survivor, and in thanks he leaves the service of King Poulentus to become an ecclesiastic.\textsuperscript{144}

After the miracle of maturity, the saint goes out in the world to found new churches, undertake pilgrimages and partake in other ‘holy’ activities. This section of Henken’s pattern shall be discussed in more detail later as it is often in this section of the lives that saints visit Rome. However, to give one example, Cadog travels widely, visiting Ireland, Cornwall, Jerusalem and St Andrews before ending his days in Benevento, Italy.\textsuperscript{145} Travelling and founding monasteries are often associated with gaining greater power.\textsuperscript{146} It is undoubtedly an opportunity to show a saint at their best.

Often a saint comes into contact with a powerful secular opponent.\textsuperscript{147} Padarn is threatened by King Maelgwn and his horde, and defeats Maelgwn’s messengers by demonstrating his sanctity.\textsuperscript{148} Maelgwn is blinded, seemingly fatally weakened until Padarn forgives him. The

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{143}‘Vita Sancti Cadoci’, §7 (VSBG, pp. 36–41).
\item \textsuperscript{144}‘Vita Sancti Ilutti’, §3 (VSBG, pp.196–99). See also Guimarães aus Salvador, \textit{Uses}, p. 94 and pp. 130–1. For further examples see Henken, ‘Saint as Folk Hero’, p. 66.
\item \textsuperscript{146}Henken links this to secular heroes gaining ‘magic powers. Henken, \textit{Welsh Saints}, p. 4.
\item \textsuperscript{148}‘Vita Sancti Paterni’, §15–18 (VSBG, pp.256–9). See also Guimarães aus Salvador, \textit{Uses}, pp. 198–200. An alternative edition and translation of the \textit{Vita Sancti Paterni} is found in A. C. Thomas and D. R. Howlett, ‘Vita Sancti Paterni: The Life of Saint Padarn and the Original ‘Miniu’, \textit{Trivium} 33 (2003), at pp. 15–27 and pp. 31–45 respectively. Thomas and Howlett argue that the author of the \textit{Vita Sancti Paterni} was Ieuan ap Sulien, the brother of Rhygyfarch, the author of the \textit{Life} of St. David. They base their case on the vocabulary used by the
King thanks Padarn by giving him control over an area near to modern Llanbadarn; a, none too subtle, claim by the church of Llanbadarn to land.\textsuperscript{149} Brynach displays his prowess in more martial fashion, by defeating a beast which had killed many people and animals.\textsuperscript{150} St. Elgar’s conflict with a secular authority was of a different nature. He had been taken into captivity by pirates as a child, sold as a slave and later forced to serve as the executioner of Ruaidrí Ua Conchobhair (King of Connacht, 1076–92).\textsuperscript{151} He does this against his will, and survives a shipwreck close to Bardsey Island after his release from servitude because he had completed a suitable penance.

Having established him or herself through miracles, founding new churches and displays of power, the saint is then left to rule over a territory and prepare for death. The latter two stages are exemplified by the \textit{passio} of Clydog from the Book of Llandaff.\textsuperscript{152} Clydog was a king who led a devout life. A beautiful woman wanted to marry no one but him, and Clydog was consequently murdered by one of her jealous suitors. We see Clydog already ruling over a territory, but in death he is responsible for many miracles.

Having given a flavour of the saints’ lives, let us turn to the concerns expressed in them. An important concern for any church during the medieval period was its prestige. This might be reflected through the patronage a church received, through the number of other churches

\textsuperscript{149} ‘Vita Sancti Paterni’, §19 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 258–9) and cf. a similar tale about Cadog in ‘Vita Sancti Cadoci’, §69 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 136–41).

\textsuperscript{150} ‘Uita Sancti Bernachii’, §2 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 2–3). For further examples see Henken, ‘The Saint as Folk Hero’, pp. 69–70.

\textsuperscript{151} The events described here all occur in \textit{Vita S. Elgari} §1 (p. 39 and p. 43). See also ‘The Life of St. Elgar of Ynys Enlli’, pp. 22–3 and Davies, \textit{Book}, pp. 124–5.

under its control or the lands it owned.\(^{153}\) This is the background against which we must consider two important incidents, the pilgrimage by St. David and others to Jerusalem and the Synod of Llanddewi Brefi.

According to Rhygyfarch’s *Life*, after receiving a message from an angel, St. David travelled first to Rome and then to Jerusalem, accompanied by St. Teilo and St. Padarn.\(^{154}\) At the beginning of the journey, they are described as “equal” with each other, yet this was soon to change as, after they arrive in Jerusalem, the Patriarch promotes David to be an archbishop. After preaching for a time they decide to return home, but not before the Patriarch gives David four gifts, which are sent separately from the travelling party, to the individual monasteries of those involved. This story aims to establish St. David as superior to his fellow pilgrims, through receiving gifts directly from the Patriarch and elevation to a higher status. This was resisted by the author of *Vita Sancti Paterni*, who states that all three pilgrims were ordained bishops, and that all three received individual gifts.\(^{155}\) Indeed, in what could be interpreted as an attempt to claim superiority, the author goes so far as to declare that Padarn received two gifts from the Patriarch.\(^{156}\) Padarn is said to have received both a tunic and a staff from the Patriarch. What is quite possibly the only Welsh language poem to have survived from the eleventh century is a quatrains concerning the powers of Padarn’s staff, although it should be noted that “Cirguen”, the poem’s subject, is nowhere said to be the patriach’s gift.\(^{157}\) A third version of the story appears in the *Vita S. Teliaui* of the Book of Llandaff.\(^{158}\)

---

153 See above, p. 157.
154 ‘Rhygyfarch’s *Life* of St. David’, §44–§48 (pp.138–41).
155 The author later defines each bishopric in ‘Vita Sancti Paterni’, §30 (VSBG, pp. 266–7). These are described as “deliberate archaisms” in Thomas and Howlett, ‘Life of Saint Padarn’, p. 115.
158 On this story see Davies, *Book*, pp. 115–16. A version of *Vita S. Teliaui* also appears in the Vespasian manuscript. For comparisons between this version and the version in the Book of Llandaff see ibid., pp. 118–19.
is given the greatest honour by being designated a successor to St. Peter, whilst David must make do with being named successor to St. James. The gifts assigned to each saint are the same as in *Vita Sancti Paterni*. If one were to interpret the individual saints as representing the ecclesiastical establishments to which they had ties (Padarn with Llanbadarn Fawr and Teilo with Llandeilo Fawr), then the story takes on a greater significance. Rhygyfarch, whose family was closely associated with the schools of Llanbadarn Fawr and whose father Sulien was twice Bishop of St Davids (1073–78 and 1080–85), is an unlikely person to have launched an attack on Llanbadarn Fawr. He may perhaps have been demonstrating the ‘ancient links’ between Llanbadarn and St Davids. His inclusion of Teilo in the triumvirate is another matter entirely. Teilo is a saint who is closely associated with the church of Llandaff, which was in constant competition with the church of St Davids for primacy in Wales. This attack on Llandaff is made all the clearer when considering the description of the Synod of Llanddewi Brefi.

This synod, it is related, was called in response to the reviving Pelagian heresy. The multitudes gathered, but there were so many people, that no preacher could be heard. St. David was summoned and, after reviving a dead boy on the way, caused a hill to rise so that all could hear him preach. David was then confirmed as archbishop by the synod and a subsequent synod, and continued in his role until his death aged 147. The identities of the two messengers sent to David are important here, as they are named as Deiniol and Dyfrig.

159 ‘Vita S. Teliaui’, *Book of Llan Dâv*, p. 103 and p. 106.
160 Ibid., p. 106.
163 ‘Rhygyfarch’s *Life* of St. David’, §49–§58 (pp. 142–9). On the multiple times David is promoted to be an archbishop in Rhygyfarch’s text, see Chadwick, Op. Cit., pp. 143–4.
164 Ibid., § 50 (pp. 142–3).
Here, Deiniol represents the church of Bangor, whilst Dyfrig represents Llandaff. Davies thus suggests that Deiniol represents north-west Wales, whilst Dyfrig represents the south-east. Again, we see David being served by two other saints. If we accept Davies’s suggestion about the symbolism behind the naming of these particular saints, we see a claim for an even wider jurisdiction for the church of St Davids.

The promotion of David at the synod drew a response in the *Life of St. Cadog*. In what Emanuel suggested are two interpolated passages into Lifris’ original text, Cadog’s absence from the synod is explained. When an angel is sent to St. David urging him to call a synod, David protests that Cadog is more worthy than he to lead it. Furthermore, Cadog is away on pilgrimage in Jerusalem at the time of the synod, so he could not possibly have attended. When Cadog returns, after his disciples summon the courage to tell him about the synod, only an angel can placate his anger. As a reward for forgiving David for the ‘affront’ of not inviting Cadog, the Angel tells him of the innumerable souls which will be saved on judgment day because of Cadog’s actions. These passages portray St. David as having played a dirty trick, given Cadog was away on pilgrimage in the holiest of places. The final passage indicates that Cadog’s success will be eternal, whilst David’s is temporal.

---


170 Ibid., §14 (pp. 54–7).

171 Ibid., §17 (pp. 60–3).

172 David’s status as bishop or archbishop is never mentioned in the text.
There was a clear, political purpose for writing these lives. The rivalry between St Davids and Llandaff is abundantly clear in the passages cited. This political dimension must be borne in mind when considering the saints’ journeys to Rome. Let us now return to the travel section of Henken’s model for Welsh saints’ lives.

The saints travel a great deal in the texts. One of their motivations is education. St. Beuno journeyed from the kingdom of Powys to Caerwent, Monmouthshire, to be educated by St. Tangusius.\(^{173}\) St. Cadog journeyed to Ireland to deepen his knowledge, and on his return to Wales arranged to study in Brycheiniog with the rhetorician Bachan, who had himself recently returned from studying on the continent.\(^ {174}\) In the same spirit as Bachan, St. Brynach is said to have travelled to Rome to live and study, and is the only Welsh saint to do so.\(^ {175}\) This might be an indication that Rome was considered a centre of learning, but the number of saints who studied closer to home indicates that receiving an education was in and of itself remarkable enough. The desire for self-improvement shows them in a positive light, firstly by establishing that the knowledge each saint possessed was learned from a reliable source and secondly that each was willing to go to some length to secure an excellent education. The teaching of each of these saints could therefore be relied upon. This served to enhance their reputation.

Travel could also be used to emphasise how well connected the saints were. St. Beuno visits a very prominent Welsh saint, St Tysilio, at his centre in Meifod, whilst St. Illtud’s connections to the monastery of Dol in Brittany are emphasised in his life.\(^ {176}\) St. Euddogwy travelled to

\(^{173}\) ‘Hystoria o Uuched Beuno’, §3 (VSBG, p. 16 and p. 337).  
\(^{174}\) ‘Vita Sancti Cadoci’, §10 and §11 (VSBG, pp. 46–9).  
\(^{175}\) ‘Uita Sancti Bernachii’, §1–§2 (VSBG, pp. 2–5).  
Rome to be consecrated bishop.\textsuperscript{177} This emphasised both his orthodoxy and his connection to the papacy.\textsuperscript{178}

The sheer number of other Saints’ travels serves to emphasise their virtues; St. Cadog and St. Cybi in particular travel widely.\textsuperscript{179} Another way of demonstrating a saint’s wide-reaching associations was to show them doing good deeds on their travels. St. Padarn, for instance, is shown bringing peace to Ireland.\textsuperscript{180} Cadog and Brynach, travelling respectively in Scotland and the Roman countryside, defeat monsters.\textsuperscript{181} These features serve to demonstrate a Saint’s influence: the more wide-ranging, the better for the cult.

Pilgrimage, and through pilgrimage demonstrating a saint’s piety, is another reason for saints’ travel.\textsuperscript{182} There are some examples of local pilgrimage- St Cybi visits St Davids for instance- but there are more numerous examples of longer distance travel.\textsuperscript{183} These are to the two most important destinations of all Christendom, Rome and Jerusalem. As Webb noted, “Pilgrimages to the very greatest shrines… tended to be associated with the quest for a special devotional experience.”\textsuperscript{184} This was certainly the case for St Cybi and St Gwenffrewi. Cybi travels to Jerusalem specifically to worship at Christ’s sepulchre.\textsuperscript{185} Gwenffrewi, a

\textsuperscript{177} ‘Vita S. Oudocei’, \textit{Book of Llan Dâv}, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{178} The life sought to emphasise that Euddogwy was consecrated in the tradition of Dyfrig and Teilo, the senior saints associated with Llandaff: On the development of Euddogwy’s cult see Davies, ‘Saints of South Wales’, pp. 390–1.
\textsuperscript{179} For some of Cadog’s travels see above, p. 161, n. 145 and for the journeys of Cybi see ‘Vita Sancti Kebii’, §2–16 (VSBG, pp. 234–45). A detailed, though dated, account of St. Cybi’s travelled is found in G. H. Doble, with C. G. Henderson, \textit{S. Cuby (Cybi), A Celtic Saint}, Cornish Saints Series 22 (Shipston-on-Stour, 1929), pp. 12–30.
\textsuperscript{180} ‘Vita Sancti Paterni’, §9–10 (VSBG, pp. 254–7).
\textsuperscript{181} ‘Vita Sancti Cadoci’, §26 (VSBG, pp. 82–5) and ‘Uita Sancti Bernachii’, §2 (VSBG, pp. 2–3).
\textsuperscript{182} On the importance of pilgrimage see Lewis, \textit{Medieval Welsh Poems}, p. 5 and W. Davies, \textit{Wales in the Early Middle Ages} (Leicester, 1982), pp. 182–3.
\textsuperscript{183} ‘Vita Sancti Kebii’, §8 (VSBG, pp. 238–9).
\textsuperscript{184} D. Webb, \textit{Medieval European Pilgrimage} (Basingstoke, 2002), p. xiii.
\textsuperscript{185} ‘Vita Sancti Kebii’, §3 (VSBG, pp. 234–5).
The piety of Cybi and Gwenffrewi is obvious in these instances, and piety is certainly one aspect of the pilgrimages undertaken by David and Cadog. The piety of each is emphasised in a different manner. St. David was directed to undertake pilgrimage to Jerusalem by an Angel.\(^{187}\) St Cadog is claimed to have visited Jerusalem three times and Rome seven times.\(^{188}\) On one journey Cadog travelled first to Rome, then Jerusalem before finally visiting the river Jordan to gather water for a well he had previously created in Cornwall.\(^{189}\) Rhygyfarch’s \textit{Life}, further mentions St. Bairre staying with David on his return from Rome, having visited the shrines of St. Peter and St. Paul.\(^{190}\) Ó Riain explains the importance of this incident by highlighting Bairre’s first deed after visiting Rome. In other words “not only could the choice of St David’s as Bairre’s destination among the churches of Wales be taken as recognition of its primatial position, the Cork saint’s prior communion with Rome could also be regarded as proof of contacts enjoyed by the clergy of St David’s with the papacy since time immemorial.”\(^{191}\) A similar event is recorded in the Life of St. Samson of Dol from the Book of Llandaff, where learned pilgrims returning from Rome arrive at Samson’s monastery.

Having received permission from Bishop Dyfrig to journey with them to their own lands, Samson performs miracles there before returning to his monastery. Ó Riain’s views seem apt


\(^{187}\) See above, p. 164, n. 154.

\(^{188}\) The assertion regarding the number of visits is made twice in the text in ‘\textit{Vita Sancti Cadoci}’, §26 and §27 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 80–1 and pp. 86–7) The journeys to Rome are ibid., §32 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 94–5) when a visit to the river Jordan is preceded by a visit to Rome, and in ibid. §35 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 96–9), when Cadog builds a church in Armorica.

\(^{189}\) ‘\textit{Vita Sancti Cadoci}’, §32 (\textit{VSBG}, pp. 94–5).


for the learned pilgrims’ visit as well.\textsuperscript{192} These references reinforce the idea that Rome was considered a suitable destination for saints’ pilgrimages.

It is interesting to note in this context a description of Bardsey Island in the \textit{Vita S. Elgari}, repeated in the \textit{Vita S. Dubrici} and again with some variety in Benedict of Gloucester’s \textit{Vita Sancti Dubricii}. The island is described as the “Rome of Britain” because of the arduous nature and length of the journey to the island and because it holds the bodies of 20,000 saints.\textsuperscript{193} Jankulak and Wooding see this as an attempt by the church of Llandaff to counter a grant by Calixtus II to St Davids that two pilgrimages to south-west Wales were the spiritual equivalent of two pilgrimages to Rome.\textsuperscript{194} They state: “The \textit{Vita} implies that one visit to Enlli is implicitly worth two to St Davids.”\textsuperscript{195} This seems an unnecessary interpretation as the work of combating the claims of St Davids takes place in the interview between Caradog and St. Elgar in this work. It seems preferable to understand the comparison with Rome firstly as a compliment to Bardsey and secondly as an explanation of the attractions of both pilgrimage destinations. Though the journey to either place was arduous, it was worthwhile to be in the company of the relics of holy men and women.

The final references to Rome in the saints’ lives are aimed at enhancing the status of the subject by association with Rome. In the \textit{Vita S. Oudocei} we are told that the church of

\textsuperscript{192} ‘Vita S. Samsonis’, \textit{Book of Llan Dâv}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{194} See Chapter 2, p. 65, n. 86.
\textsuperscript{195} ‘The Life of St Elgar of Enlli’, p. 32.
Llandaff is the Rome of southern Wales as it exceeds all other churches in dignity.\textsuperscript{196} The deeds of St. Carannog are read in Ireland as are the acts of St. Peter in Rome.\textsuperscript{197} This comparison with the chief apostle is clearly aimed at boosting St. Carannog’s reputation. The same might be said of an incident in the \textit{Life} of St. Cadog. Gildas, travelling to Rome with an Irish hand bell for the Pope, stays in Cadog’s monastery overnight. Having heard the bell’s melodic sound, Cadog greatly desired the bell but Gildas refused to sell it to him. When Gildas presents the bell to the Pope, named as Alexander, the bell refuses to chime. Upon hearing a little of the history of the bell, the Pope praised Cadog, blesses the bell and commands Gildas to return it to Llancarfan.\textsuperscript{198} Cadog is thus shown to be superior to Gildas, receives the Pope’s praise personally and an item blessed by him.\textsuperscript{199} As with St. Carannog, the prestige of Cadog is enhanced.

We have now examined all the references to Rome in saints’ lives, but one curious question remains: why does Rhygyfarch show David journeying to Jerusalem rather than to Rome to be consecrated? If Rome’s “ultimate authority over the Church in Wales was recognized” in the eleventh century, why does David not travel to the Holy See to become an archbishop?\textsuperscript{200} Two possible explanations present themselves.

\textsuperscript{198} ‘Vita Sancti Cadoci’, §27 (VSBG, pp. 84–7).
\textsuperscript{199} Rhygyfarch also shows David to be superior to Gildas by having him unable to preach when David’s pregnant mother is in the same room as him. See above, p. 161, n. 138. For the rivalry between Gildas and David see D. N. Dumville, \textit{Saint David of Wales}, Kathleen Hughes Memorial Lectures on Mediaeval Welsh History 1 (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 11–22 and pp. 40–1.
\textsuperscript{200} \textit{AoC}, p. 191.
The first is that Rhygyfarch was reporting a tradition which sought to link St Davids to the place of Christ’s death rather than the burial place of St. Peter and St. Paul.\textsuperscript{201} He attempted to link his subject matter to a higher spiritual power. The second argument is a similar one, and was first advanced by G. H. Doble. He argued that Rhygyfarch included the tale to demonstrate St Davids independence from Canterbury, further linking the idea of journey to Jerusalem with the First Crusade.\textsuperscript{202} The revised date of composition for Rhygyfarch’s text makes a link between the text and the First Crusade impossible, although Doble’s first suggestion still has some currency. It was a central part of J. W. James’ argument for the composition of Rhygyfarch’s text in 1093x1095, suggesting that it was in response to Anselm of Canterbury’s demand for professions of obedience from Welsh bishops.\textsuperscript{203} Both arguments have some validity, but neither can be proved beyond reasonable doubt.

What one can say is that this tale caused much embarrassment to the church of St Davids during its struggle for recognition of its metropolitan status. In its appeals to the papacy during the twelfth century, it does not mention the tale at all.\textsuperscript{204} Although, he included the tale in his \textit{Life} of St David, Gerald of Wales did not include this text in the selection of works he presented to Innocent III in 1199.\textsuperscript{205} Gerald did not wish to prejudice his case by appearing in any way unorthodox.\textsuperscript{206} In this context, perhaps the consecration of Euddogwy in Rome should be understood as a direct challenge to St Davids, contrasting the orthodoxy of

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\item I thank Dr. Alex Woolf for suggesting this to me.
\item J. W. James, ed. and trans., \textit{Rhigyfarch’s Life of St. David} (Cardiff, 1967), p. xi.
\item We might compare Gerald’s decision not to take his Life with him to his decision to exclude Rhygyfarch’s description of David’s monastic order from his text. See R. Bartlett, ‘Rewriting Saints’ Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales’, \textit{Speculum} 58 (1983), 598–613, at p. 604.
\end{thebibliography}
Llandaff’s saints and bishops with the oddity of David’s consecration in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{207} By the time Rhygyfarch’s text was translated into Middle Welsh, David is made an archbishop in Rome.\textsuperscript{208} As Chadwick says, in the years after Rhygyfarch, the tendency “is to stress the Roman and Catholic elements in the history of the church of St Davids, and in the career of the saint himself.”\textsuperscript{209}

This last point is in itself instructive. In later years, there was a growing knowledge of the Church of Rome’s importance which was not reflected in the earlier saints’ lives. In these it is clear that Rome was a suitable pilgrimage destination, but not the only one. Association with the city was a way of demonstrating piety but it was not the only way. Rome clearly held symbolic significance but the relatively few references to the city and the little information presented about it demonstrates a lack of knowledge amongst the hagiographers.

\textsuperscript{207} See above, p. 164, n. 154.

\textsuperscript{208} The text is edited in D. S. Evans, ed., \textit{The Welsh Life of St David} (Cardiff, 1988). The earliest manuscript copy of it is Jesus College Oxford MS 119, more commonly known as ‘The Book of the Anchorite of Llanddewi Brefi’, a manuscript dated to 1346. It is almost certainly based on Rhygyfarch’s \textit{Life} and is likely to have been translated prior to the date contained on the manuscript, and possibly before the end of the thirteenth century. See Evans, \textit{Welsh Life}, pp. liii–liv and pp. lvi–lvii. See also Chadwick, ‘Intellectual Life’, pp. 146–7. David is made Archbishop at Evans, \textit{Welsh Life}, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{209} Chadwick, ‘Intellectual Life’, p. 152.
CONCLUSION

We have seen through consideration of the evidence presented by the works of Gerald of Wales, documents produced in the papacy’s name and a variety of Welsh sources that the assessment of the changes in the relationship between Wales and the papacy by R. R. Davies and Glanmor Williams is largely accurate. Welsh chronicles support their assessment of Rome as a distant pilgrimage site before the twelfth century. Equally, beyond the changing of the date of Easter to the Roman practice and the possible visit of the legate Theophylact during the time of Offa, there is no hint of papal authority “impinging” in any way on Wales. Although the Welsh Church had maintained some links with the continent, some of its practices were outmoded by contemporary standards. The self-governing collegiate *clas* churches had become secularised by the end of the eleventh century, and many churches had fallen under hereditary control, perhaps most famously those of Sulien at Llanbadarn Fawr and Herewald at Llancarfan.\(^1\) Attitudes began to change under Norman influence. The Normans saw control of the Church as a corollary to political conquest, but also felt a moral obligation to reform the Welsh Church to contemporary standards.\(^2\) Parishes, developing from the *parochiae of clas* churches, became formal, administrative territorial units as did, eventually, the four Welsh dioceses.\(^3\) The latter process brought the Welsh Church into far closer contact with the papacy.

---


The recognition of the papacy’s jurisdiction took place much as Davies described in the case of ecclesiastical institutions, as can be seen from the activities of Bishop Urban of Llandaff and Bishop Bernard of St Davids. Both came from a reformed background: Urban was educated at Worcester and Bernard had been chancellor to Queen Matilda. Their appeals were the first of many for assistance and approval by the papacy from Welsh sees. Gerald of Wales, educated in mainstream contemporary thought, certainly recognised papal authority. He valued the power given to him by papal decree and recognised the papacy as a recourse. These twin tracks of accepting instruction and seeking papal support were hallmarks of the relationship between Welsh ecclesiastics and the papacy throughout the thirteenth century. We see this in appeals for confirmation of possession of lands or the permission granted for two Bishops of Bangor to retire allied with a willingness to conduct investigations or perform tasks on the papacy’s behalf. These instances certainly support the case for the Welsh Church conforming to international standards.

Papal jurisdiction did not make itself felt in secular Wales until the second half of the twelfth century. Beyond recording pilgrimages to Rome by lay rulers, and perhaps the letter from Owain Gwynedd and his brother Cadwaladr in support of Bernard of St Davids’ attempt to raise his see to Metropolitan status, there is no evidence of any contact between secular Welshmen and the papacy. Even then, Owain Gwynedd felt that he could ignore Alexander III’s instructions about his marriage to his first cousin. This attitude had begun to change when the Lord Rhys, or perhaps his officials, recognised the papacy as a source of authority in the Latin phrases employed in Rhys’s charter for Strata Florida. Llywelyn ap Iorwerth and his descendants recognised papal jurisdiction in their appeals. He sought permission for a marriage and later recognition for his inheritance strategy. His son Dafydd attempted to defend his polity by appeals to Innocent IV. Similarly, Llywelyn ap Gruffudd looked to the
papacy to settle the disputes with Edward I which eventually led to the war of 1276–77. We might well consider these events as examples of Welsh rulers becoming increasingly similar to their European neighbours.

At the same time, we see the papacy’s importance recognised in Welsh sources. From the twelfth century onwards, the chronicles, reflecting the monastic setting in which they were composed, take a much more active interest in papal affairs. Charters and agreements use the papacy as a guarantor, thus recognising it as a source of authority. The papacy’s power is likewise recognised by the Welsh lawbooks of the thirteenth century, the praise poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the saints’ lives of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

This is not to say that knowledge of Rome was ubiquitous or detailed. Naturally far more attention is given in the chronicles to affairs at hand. Rome is somewhere far away for the poets, with only Meilyr Brydydd and the anonymous poem from the Black Book of Carmarthen referring to Rome in a devotional context. The city is only one of many pilgrimage destinations for the saints and when they go, only Gwenffrewi visits the tombs of the Apostles and martyrs. There is little evidence beyond Gerald of Wales’s remarks on the number of Welsh pilgrims in Rome testifying to the popular appeal of Rome and the papacy.

It is interesting to consider why the change in Welsh attitudes occurred. Almost all the available evidence derives from the twelfth century onwards and most of it from the thirteenth century. This might mean that evidence for contact from earlier centuries does not survive. The age of the surviving evidence also points to greater papal assertiveness following the reforms of the eleventh century and especially following the expansion of
activity during the pontificate of Innocent III. There was greater opportunity for evidence to survive under these circumstances.

This being said, it is important to note that similar changes in attitude were occurring elsewhere at around the same time. Scottish contacts with the papacy developed at a remarkably similar pace to those in Wales. At the beginning of the twelfth century, direct contact between Scotland and the papacy was rare but by the final decades of the thirteenth century recourse to the papal Curia by Scots, and direction to them from Rome, had become regular occurrences. This change was in part driven by the papacy’s desire to make good their claim to primacy over the western Church, partly by an increasingly efficient bureaucracy at the Curia but also as a response to petitioners and litigants seeking to submit themselves to the papacy’s independent jurisdiction.

The change may in part be due to pressures to conform. Under pressure from Church reformers Welsh ecclesiastics had to conform to be accepted. This was not a dissimilar experience to those of churchmen in Scotland, where reform came about from “a desire to conform with the value and ideals of the western church and to receive the blessing of its head, the papacy.” The same desire to conform also began the process of reform at a local

---

4 This is not to say that the relationship was the same. One may point to the issuing of Cum universi and the existence of a strong Scottish monarchy as significant factors in the difference between the Welsh and Scottish experiences. R. Oram, *Domination and Lordship Scotland 1070–1230*, New Edinburgh History of Scotland 3 (Edinburgh, 2011), pp. 334–45 and P. C. Ferguson, *Medieval Papal Representatives in Scotland: Legates, Nuncios and Judges-Delegate 1125–1286*, Stair Society 45 (Edinburgh, 1997), pp. 191–203.

5 Idem., p. 2.


level in Ireland.\(^8\) Welsh princes were expected to conform to and indeed sought to emulate the standards of England’s nobility. Another explanation might simply be that both ecclesiastical institutions and polities looked to an institution which might be able to assist them. Ecclesiastical institutions could settle their problems with assistance from an impeccable authority. The papacy gave Llywelyn ap Iorwerth the opportunity to fortify himself against charges of impropriety regarding his proposed marriage and allowed him to overcome his subjects’ resistance to changing the law with regards to Dafydd’s succession. In the case of Dafydd ap Llywelyn and Llywelyn ap Gruffudd the papacy was a means of attempting to circumvent the royal government.

With the papacy willing to exert its influence following the reforms of the eleventh century, the dispute between St Davids and Llandaff was an excellent opportunity to become involved in the affairs of two barely known dioceses. The discussion of Welsh affairs from a distance continued throughout the period under consideration (as witnessed by the appeals of Gerald of Wales and the appeals for the release of Eleanor de Montfort from captivity), but the papacy also became directly involved in Welsh affairs through the visits of papal legations. Each legate appointed to England during the thirteenth century had some involvement in Welsh affairs. Four men involved in these legations would become Pope themselves, and two of these, Clement IV and Gregory X, used the knowledge earned whilst undertaking legatine work in their own involvement with Welsh affairs: Clement IV in the terms of address chosen for his successor legate Ottobuono (later Adrian V) and Gregory X in his sensitive responses to Llywelyn ap Gruffudd’s letters.\(^9\) This is not to suggest that the papacy obtained any “institutional memories” through its involvement in Welsh affairs. Defective knowledge was


\(^9\) The other future Pope was Boniface VIII (1294–1303), who served in Ottobuono’s legation.
clearly to the fore in the case of Dafydd ap Llywelyn’s appeal regarding Henry III, and even though Innocent III dealt with both Gerald of Wales and Llywelyn ap Iorwerth, he had to reissue letters of interdict on England as he had omitted any mention of Wales in his first letter. Closer involvement with the papacy was a mark of integration with mainstream Europe for Welsh churchmen and nobility. Welsh affairs were no more than occasional problems for the papacy.

Much work remains to be undertaken to further our understanding of Wales and the papacy before the Edwardian conquest. This work has not for instance described fully the work of papal legates in Wales or given full consideration to the papacy’s financial demands and what they might tell us about the Welsh economy. Further attention might have been paid to the papacy’s development during the period and how this might have affected its dealings with Welsh polities and ecclesiastics, although the study might be of interest to historians of the papacy as a case study. It has hopefully contributed to the understanding of how the Welsh Church developed through contacts outside the British Isles in this period. It might also add to our knowledge of the Welsh princes’ diplomatic activities.
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