

## J E Lloyd and the intellectual foundations of Welsh history <sup>1</sup>

*J E Lloyd's 'A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest' first published in 1911, has been of central importance to the development of Welsh historiography. This article seeks to assess the validity of the model of Welsh history developed by Lloyd. Initially, his nurturing within the Oxford school of Germanist historians, a school of thought which placed great weight on the importance of race, is considered. Lloyd is then identified as seeking to establish a complementary Welsh school of Brythonic historians. In developing his historical model he not only misinterpreted the archaeological and written records, but also suppressed evidence of the extent to which 'Wales' had been assimilated into the Roman Empire. He was able to sustain his model in both the first (1911) and second (1912) editions of his 'History of Wales', but by the time the third edition was published in 1939 that was no longer possible. Advances in the understanding of the archaeological record and the discrediting of race as a basis for historical analysis meant that the earlier foundations to his work were too contentious. As a consequence, in 1939 Lloyd abandoned that earlier theoretical framework, and sought to establish a new basis for his work. Whether he replaced those foundations with an appropriate alternative is an issue which has never been satisfactorily addressed by Welsh historians. It is suggested that consideration of that issue could prove advantageous to Welsh History in the contemporary context.*

In the introduction to his *History of Wales*, J E Lloyd <sup>2</sup> presented the following account of his approach to the writing of Welsh history:

... (I)t has been my endeavour to bring together and to weave into a continuous narrative what may be fairly regarded as the ascertained facts of the history of Wales up to the fall of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd in 1282. In a field where so much is matter of conjecture, it has not been possible altogether to avoid speculation and hypothesis, but I can honestly say that I have not written in support of any special theory or to urge any preconceived opinion upon the reader. My purpose has been to map out, in this difficult region of study, what is already known and established, and thus to define more clearly the limits of that "terra incognita" which still awaits discovery.<sup>3</sup>

Lloyd, quite understandably depicted his approach as being resolutely empiricist, thereby avoiding the need to address the major theoretical assumptions underpinning the composition of his *History of Wales*. As a consequence, it is important to give further consideration to that aspect of his work.

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Dr D Stephenson, R van Kemenade and R Suggett for their comments on this article. The responsibility for the views expressed and for any errors is entirely mine.

<sup>2</sup> Lloyd J E, *A History of Wales from the Earliest Times to the Edwardian Conquest* (Longman, Green & Co, London, 1911)

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid* p. v.

### Lloyd's intellectual biography

Two institutions played a key role in J E Lloyd's education. From October 1877 to October 1881 he studied at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. Subsequently he entered Lincoln College, Oxford, and there continued his studies until summer 1885.<sup>4</sup> While at Oxford, Lloyd was introduced to an account of English history that accorded a central role to the concept of race. During his undergraduate years at Oxford, it is apparent that he was greatly influenced by that outlook. Understanding that racial approach is of crucial importance to a comprehension of Lloyd's portrayal of Welsh history.

In his biography of Lloyd, Huw Pryce refers to Lloyd's employment of the 'germ theory',<sup>5</sup> an outlook which Pryce believed he had borrowed from his reading of the work of Bishop William Stubbs. Stubbs was a constitutional historian who, until May 1884, served as Regius Professor of Modern History and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.<sup>6</sup> In the nineteenth century the concept of the 'germ' was widely used as an adjective to add meaning to other concepts. The difficulty was that Stubbs employed the concept in relation to race, but that was not necessarily the case with other authors.

F Max Müller in his lectures on '*The Science of Language*' delivered at the Royal Institute in London in 1861 argued that the original Aryan language contained the 'dialectal germs' of all the Aryan languages,<sup>7</sup> but he was explicit in seeing language and race as separate.<sup>8</sup> Matthew Arnold could similarly refer to the Church of England as having 'the germ of Christianity' thus harnessing the concept to illustrate an aspect of culture.<sup>9</sup> By contrast Sharon Turner in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons of 1799-1805* harnessed the concept in a very different way. He saw the original Anglo-Saxon migrants to Britain as bearing

... the germ of those amiable qualities which have become the national character of their descendants.<sup>10</sup>

In the work of Stubbs the concept of 'germs' was attached to the concept of race, the Saxon race. Accordingly, the theory both Stubbs and Lloyd employed was not, the germ theory but rather the race theory, and it is the significance of race that needs to be explored.

---

<sup>4</sup> Pryce H, *J E Lloyd and the creation of Welsh History* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 2011).. See chapter 2, pp. 27-45.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid p. 130.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid p. 38. See also Stubbs W, *The constitutional history of England* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1883) p.i.

<sup>7</sup> Max Müller F, *Lectures on the science of language* (Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green, London 1864) ) 3 vols. See vol 1 p. 220.

<sup>8</sup> Max Müller F, *Chips from a German workshop* (Longman, Green, and co, London 1898) vol 1 p. ix.

<sup>9</sup> See Arnold M, 'Irish Catholicism and British Liberalism', in Arnold M, *Mixed essays Irish essays* (Macmillan, New York 1883) pp. 73-106. See in particular p. 99.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted in MacDougall H A, *Racial myth in English history* (Harvest House, Montreal / University Press of New England, London 1982) p. 93.

That theory of the merits of the Saxon race lay at the core of a discourse which, by the late nineteenth century, had developed its own approach to the evaluation of historical evidence and constructing national histories. In the opening chapter to his *Constitutional History of England*, William Stubbs provided a succinct summary of that theory. Regarding the origins of the English people, Stubbs argued:

The English are not aboriginal, that is, they are not identical with the race that occupied their home at the dawn of history. They are a people of German descent in the main constitution of blood, character, and language, but most especially, in connexion with our subject, in the possession of the element of primitive German civilisation and the common germs of German institutions. This descent is not a matter of inference. It is a recorded fact of history, which these characteristics bear out to the fullest degree of certainty. ... These show the unbroken possession of the land thus occupied, and the growth of the language and institutions thus introduced, either in purity and unmolested integrity, or, where it has been modified by antagonism and by the admixture of alien forms, ultimately vindicating itself by eliminating the new and more strongly developing the genius of the old.

The four great states of Western Christendom – England, France, Spain, and Germany – owe the leading principles which are worked out in their constitutional history to the same source. In the regions which had been thoroughly incorporated with the Roman Empire, every vestige of primitive indigenous cultivation had been crushed out of existence. Roman civilisation in its turn fell before the German races: in Britain it had perished slowly in the midst of a perishing people, who were able neither to maintain it nor to substitute for it anything of their own.<sup>11</sup>

In that statement, Stubbs provided an overview of the English experience from their migration as a Germanic people to Roman Britannia. He further claimed that the subsequent development of England was in keeping with the original common Germanic racial characteristics and institutions. For Stubbs, throughout much of Western Europe it was those common germs of Germanic institutions which had enabled a social regeneration to occur, a transformation which he regarded the indigenous post-Imperial societies as having being incapable of creating.

The views of William Stubbs not only defined the sweep of English history - but from Lloyd's perspective - would also have interpreted the Welsh experience. For Stubbs the old Celtic civilisation had been crushed by the Romans, and following the fall of the Western Roman Empire, the population of Britannia had failed either to sustain or renew that civilisation. As a consequence they could be defined as a 'perishing people'. Such views were entirely in keeping with the earlier work of J M Kemble, an intellectual

---

<sup>11</sup> Op cit Stubbs W 1883, pp. 2-3.

whom Stubbs greatly admired.<sup>12</sup> Kemble had regarded the peoples subdued by the Germanic tribes as ‘degenerate races’.<sup>13</sup>

In the Oxford of the 1880s, as Matthew Arnold in particular sought to secure an accommodation between the dominant English and the subordinate Celtic nations of Britain, such forthright views were being restrained. Arnold’s efforts to achieve a new balance were institutionalised through the establishment of the Chair of Celtic at Oxford University<sup>14</sup>, with John Rhys being appointed to that post in 1877.<sup>15</sup>

The above constituted the background to Lloyd’s period at Oxford, and it is from such a perspective that Lloyd’s evident admiration for Stubbs and his work must be interpreted.<sup>16</sup> Never the less, Lloyd’s *History of Wales* can be seen, at least in part, as a very deliberate attempt to refute the definitions of Welshness found in the work of authors such as Kemble and Stubbs and as an attempt to construct an alternative positive model of Welsh history. As such, it can be seen as a further chapter in the Welsh Nonconformist attempt to counter negative definitions of Welshness as evidenced earlier by the *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the State of Education in Wales* of 1847.<sup>17</sup> The key issue concerns the manner in which Lloyd sought to construct that new positive concept.

In seeking to develop an account of Welsh nationality which was meaningful to Nonconformists, it is reasonably clear that Lloyd adopted the racial model espoused by Stubbs and others in relation to English identity. As a consequence, in order to understand the rationale of Lloyd’s work, it is of crucial importance to identify the dominant concept of nationality sustained by Oxford historians during Lloyd’s term as an undergraduate at Lincoln College.

### **The English identification with the Saxon past**

William Stubbs was not an isolated intellectual, for he belonged to what is referred to as the Oxford school of Germanist historians. That school of thought, in turn, was part of a far broader intellectual movement whose origins lay in the Protestant Reformation.

The English identification with the Saxon past was a development having long historical roots. Its origins lay at that turning point in English history constituted by the Reformation. The religious reforms implemented by Henry VIII triggered a search for legitimacy, with the historical records being scrutinised for evidence of an earlier, pre-Reformation, non-Roman church. That endeavour initially had an important Welsh dimension as revealed in the work of Richard Davies, Bishop of St. David’s. He prefaced the translation of the New Testament into Welsh with an ‘Address to the Welsh Nation’

---

<sup>12</sup> Op cit MacDougall H A 1982, p. 102.

<sup>13</sup> Kemble J M, *The Saxons in England* (Bernard Quaritch, London 1876) 2nd ed Vol 1, p. 232.

<sup>14</sup> Young R J C, *The idea of English ethnicity* (Blackwell, Oxford 2008) See pp. 140-52.

<sup>15</sup> Lloyd J E, Jenkins R T, Davies W L I, (eds), *The dictionary of Welsh national biography, down to 1940* (Cymmrodorion, London 1959) **Rhys J.**

<sup>16</sup> See Lloyd J E, ‘The teaching of history’, *University College of Wales, Magazine*, Vol x, No 3 1888, pp. 99-108.

<sup>17</sup> Op cit MacDougall H A 1982, p. 102.

in which the Welsh Protestant view of the development of the Christian church in Britain was outlined.<sup>18</sup> In considering the development of the Saxonist paradigm, it is important to recognise that the search for legitimacy which in England led to an interest in the Saxon past, initially had parallels in the Welsh context.

In England, that Protestant search for legitimacy ultimately advanced beyond the British context to an interest in the Germanic origins of English identity. Such a path offered rich possibilities, for the Germanic past had since the late fifteenth century been of growing interest to German intellectuals. That interest had focused on the work of the Roman author, Tacitus, who had composed his *Germania*<sup>19</sup> in 98 A.D. On the continent that interest, first revealed in Renaissance humanism, was subsequently taken up in the Reformation, with Martin Luther emerging as a leading defender of German identity. From those movements there emerged a concept of the Germanic people as having a uniquely rich language and culture which had evolved independently of other peoples.<sup>20</sup>

In England, interest in the Germanic inheritance was initially taken up by William Camden (1551-1623) who was the first intellectual to focus on the Anglo-Saxon origins of the English. Richard Verstegen, a Roman Catholic, also identified with that outlook, and in 1605 produced a work which praised the German nation and saw the English as being of Germanic descent. By 1673, Verstegen's *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* had run to five editions. He has been described as the first author to produce a comprehensive account in English of the belief in the superiority of the Germanic people as a race.<sup>21</sup>

During the seventeenth century, interest in the Germanic origins of English identity secured a new focus. In the context of increasing conflict between crown and parliament, an interest which had initially been triggered by the religious crisis of the Reformation was increasingly harnessed to secular ends.<sup>22</sup> As those who sought to limit the power of the Crown stressed the antiquity of parliament, it became meaningful to seek the origins of parliament in the Germanic past. In turn there developed a project which sought to document the broader antiquity and continuity of English customs and institutions, with the work of Tacitus again being harnessed as a source.<sup>23</sup> That entailed a number of difficulties, for continuity had to be established between the contemporary English experience and the rural origins of the Saxons in the lands to the north of the Rhine as described by Tacitus.<sup>24</sup>

The process of delineating the historical journey of the Saxon nation to greatness, in turn created a model of national development which J E Lloyd sought to replicate when creating a complementary path of development for the Welsh nation.

---

<sup>18</sup> Williams G, 'Some Protestant views of early British church history', in Williams G, *Welsh Reformation essays* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff 1967) pp. 207-19. See in particular pp. 212-3.

<sup>19</sup> Anderson J G.C (ed) *Corneli Taciti. De origine et situ Germanorum* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1938) / Mattingly H (trs), *Tacitus. The Agricola and the Germania* (Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1986).

<sup>20</sup> Op cit MacDougall H A, 1982 pp. 42-4.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid pp. 45-9. See in particular p. 49.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid pp. 49 -50.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid pp. 56-7 & op cit Young R J C, 2008. See pp. 18-23.

<sup>24</sup> Op cit Anderson J G C (ed), 1938 & op cit Mattingly H (trs), 1986.

### **The evolution of the Saxonist model.**

The Saxonist model conceived of the foundations of English political success as being inherent in the initial racial qualities of the Anglo-Saxon population who had migrated to Britain in the fifth century. As noted earlier, Stubbs could refer to that inheritance in terms of ‘blood, character, and language’, and also in terms of ‘the elements of primitive German civilisation and the common germs of German institutions’.<sup>25</sup>

In order to sustain the coherence of that outlook, its exponents needed to establish how such characteristics had been sustained from the context of the original Germanic migration into eastern Britannia, for in that context the land had been inhabited by a Welsh and Roman population. Over time a number of different explanations were advanced. In his famous *History of England* (1754-62), David Hume,<sup>26</sup> writing from the perspective of the Scottish Enlightenment, saw the previous British population of England as having either been exterminated or driven west. As a consequence, from the Saxonist perspective, it could be believed that in the post Roman context a purely Anglo-Saxon nation had emerged in England.<sup>27</sup> The purity of the Saxon race had been sustained.

The Norman conquest posed a greater obstacle, for how could a people conquered by the Normans have sustained the essence of their existence? That difficulty was overcome by arguing that following the Norman conquest, the Anglo-Saxon population of England had succeeded in assimilating its Norman conquerors.<sup>28</sup> On the basis of such arguments a model of social continuity was constructed, with that stability being seen as having been maintained from the time of Tacitus in the first century A. D. to the contemporary context.

The development of German philology provided a further basis for elaborating that politico-historical genre. It led to an interest in language and literature and to the study of English literature as a discipline. In keeping with that broader outlook, in order to emphasise continuity, Anglo-Saxon literature was included within the concept of English literature and was identified as ‘Old English’ literature.<sup>29</sup> Revealingly, that attempt at imposing linguistic continuity did not pass without comment, for an American linguist argued that there was a case for regarding Anglo-Saxon as a distinct language as compared to English.<sup>30</sup> That however, would have conflicted with the historical model being promoted by the Saxonists.

The development of philology also facilitated an identification of the English language as a core dimension to being English. It enabled the concept of Englishness to move more explicitly beyond a biological concept of race and blood to a concept of Englishness

---

<sup>25</sup> Op cit Stubbs W 1883, p. 2. Lloyd himself referred to neolithic culture as possibly having arisen ‘out of palæolithic germs’. See op cit Lloyd J E, 1911 vol 1 p. 5.

<sup>26</sup> Hume D, *The history of England* (George Bell, London 1854). See vol 1 pp. 16-7 & op cit R J C Young 2008, pp. 18-9.

<sup>27</sup> Op cit MacDougall H A 1982, pp. 81-2.

<sup>28</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008, pp. 18-21.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid pp. 24.

<sup>30</sup> March F A, ‘Is there an Anglo-Saxon language?’, in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* Vol 3, 1872, pp. 97-110.

which could be learnt, rather than being biologically inherited. That transition was already inherent in the manner in which the problem of the Norman Conquest had been addressed, but was rendered more explicit by the accommodation of language into the model.

The Saxonist discourse which had its origins in religious and political conflict, was also from the seventeenth century to take root within the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, with Oxford in due course establishing its pre-eminence over Cambridge. That intellectual input ensured that English identity evolved through an interplay between its intellectual and political aspects.<sup>31</sup> Whilst some developments tended towards the amelioration of the racial model, from the late eighteenth century there also emerged influences which tended towards its accentuation. The development of the eugenics movement was one such aspect, but social conflict also contributed to the process. Since its inception Saxonism had been identified with Protestantism and had been antagonistic to the Catholic French, who could be viewed as Celtic. The Napoleonic Wars deepened that hostility, with the situation being further exacerbated as a consequence of the Act of Union of Britain and Ireland of 1801, a departure which introduced an Irish dimension to the core of English politics.<sup>32</sup>

From 1842, *The Times* campaigned aggressively against the leaders of the Irish on a racist platform of conflict between English Saxons and Celts, with the Irish, Welsh and Scots Highlanders being grouped in the latter category. In that context, *The Times* adopted the view that the racial inferiority of the Celt constituted the cause of the Irish famine. It was in that general context that the 1847 *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the State of Education in Wales* was produced.<sup>33</sup>

1848 was to be the year of revolutions on mainland Europe, an event which triggered a conservative innovation of the Saxonist discourse. In that situation John Mitchell Kemble emerged to the fore, with his work being seen as establishing the Anglo-Saxon provenance of English culture.<sup>34</sup> He was the leading Anglo-Saxon academic of the first half of the nineteenth century. In contrast to the views of historians such as Hume, referred to earlier, he believed that much Celtic blood had survived in England.<sup>35</sup> He also saw national character as a force which contributed to the shaping of national institutions.<sup>36</sup> Following the fall of the Western Roman Empire, he conceived of the Germanic commitment to the family as having played a key role in the process of regenerating the Western European social system. He stated that:

...The idea of the family is at once the earliest and strongest of human ties; in its development it is also the most ennobling to the individual and salutary to the state ... Where it does not exist, man becomes an instrument in the hands of

---

<sup>31</sup> Op cit MacDougall H A 1982 pp. 68-9.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid p.21.

<sup>33</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008. See pp.51-2, 94-5 & 100-1.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid p. 35.

<sup>35</sup> Op cit Kemble J M 1876, 2nd. ed. vol 1 p. 21.

<sup>36</sup> Mandler P, *The English national character* (Yale University Press, New Haven and London 2006), p. 45.

others, or the blind tool of systems. ... Throughout the latter day of ethnic civilization, when the idea of the *state* had almost ceased to have power, and the idea of the *family* did not exist, there was a complete destruction both of public and private morality; and the world, grown to be a sink of filth and vice, was tottering to the fall which Providence in mercy had decreed for its purification. The irruption of the Germanic tribes breathed into the dead bones of heathen cultivation the breath of a new life; and the individual dignity of a man as a member of a family, - the deep-seated feeling of all those nations, - while it prepared them to become the founders of Christian states which should endure, ... an example to be held up to the degenerate races whom they had subdued....<sup>37</sup>

For Kemble, the fact that the Anglo-Saxons had never been integrated into the Roman Empire was an aspect of importance to their history. He could conceive of them as having sustained a pure pre-urban life uncorrupted by the decadent urban civilisation of Rome. That had enabled them to build new states on the remains of the collapsed Roman system. Kemble argued further that the existence of social institutions grounded in the Anglo-Saxon origins of British society, and granting equality to all before the law, had been of vital importance in sustaining stability in 1848, the year of revolution in Europe.<sup>38</sup>

Kemble's work was to be a key influence on members of what is referred to as the Oxford school of Germanist historians. The key figures in that movement were men such as Bishop Stubbs, J R Green and E A Freeman.<sup>39</sup> They were precisely the intellectuals whose work Lloyd studied and one of whom he met whilst a student at Oxford.<sup>40</sup>

The concept of the Germanic tribes as having been in a position to regenerate a decadent Roman system was deeply embedded in that school of thought. It was evident in the work of Kemble and transmitted in an amended form, for example, to the work of J R Green. He described the causes of the collapse of the Western Roman Empire in the following terms.

The mines, if worked by forced labour, must have been a source of endless oppression. Town and country were alike crushed by heavy taxation, while industry was fettered by laws that turned every trade into an hereditary caste. Above all, the purely despotic system of Roman Government, by crushing all local independence, crushed all local vigour. Men forgot how to fight for their country when they forgot how to govern it.<sup>41</sup>

That outlook highlights an important dimension to the historical perspective of the Oxford school. For them, the Roman Empire was associated with social collapse but the non-Romanised populations of Western Europe were associated with the process of post-Roman social regeneration. That aspect lay at the core of the model of national

---

<sup>37</sup> Op cit Kemble J M 1876, 2nd ed Vol 1 See pp. 231-2.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid Vol 1 See preface p. v.

<sup>39</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008. See pp. 35.

<sup>40</sup> Op cit Pryce H 2011, p. 40.

<sup>41</sup> Green J R, *Short history of the English people* (Macmillan, London 1902), p. 9.



development espoused by the Oxford school of Germanist historians. As a consequence, given that Lloyd had been imbued with the outlook of that school, in 1884 it is unlikely that he could have contemplated a model of Welsh history which depicted Wales as having been thoroughly integrated into the Roman Empire.<sup>42</sup>

In order to rescue the Welsh people from being defined as members of Kemble's 'degenerate races',<sup>43</sup> or Stubbs's 'perishing people',<sup>44</sup> Lloyd would have recognised the need to locate at the core of his history a tribal group which had avoided assimilation into the Roman Empire. He would have recognised the need to create a model of Welsh history that corresponded with the Saxonist model. The alternative could not be contemplated, even if the evidence pointed to an alternative interpretation. For Lloyd the writing of a history of 'Wales' in which its tribes were fully assimilated into the Roman system was not an option. The reasons for such reluctance can be considered further in relation to the work of E. A. Freeman.

Freeman was the leading member of the Oxford school of Germanist historians of the 1880s.<sup>45</sup> He was a great admirer of Switzerland and its form of government, and had visited the country in order to view its ancient institutions. From his perspective as a supporter of the Liberal Party and admirer of W E Gladstone, his broader view of history is worthy of note. Whilst viewing the city states of Greece and Rome as part of the story of human freedom, he regarded that social model as having failed. He regarded the English nation's historical path to modernity, from village community and tribe to modern nation state without experiencing a civic phase, as a privileged route.<sup>46</sup> Constructing a national history which acknowledged assimilation into the Roman Empire, accordingly, was an approach which was contrary to one of the central tenets of the Oxford school of Germanist historians. If Lloyd was to rescue the Welsh people from the status accorded them by figures such as Kemble and Stubbs, and to construct a national political ideology for Welsh Liberal Nonconformity, he needed to construct a path to national development which was acknowledged by the Oxford intellectual establishment as being appropriate.

---

<sup>42</sup> It is worthy of note that in 1901 F J Haverfield did hint at a different historical model, for he directly challenged Green's interpretation of the fall of Roman Britannia. Quoting Green, he stated. '... we are told ... men "forgot how to fight for their country when they forgot how to govern it." The truth, in the view of the present writer, is almost the reverse. The Romans, ... accorded much local autonomy to provincials, and it was largely owing to them that the Britons so long resisted the English. Their task was doubtless lightened by the fewness of the English, but this is not all. The Celt with Roman aid did what the Celt alone could never have done.' Haverfield F, 'The Roman army in Britain', in Traill H D & Man J S (eds) *Social England*, Vol 1, (Cassell, London 1901) Illustrated edition pp. 76-106. See in particular pp. 105-6. Haverfield's grasp of the nature of those times, and 'the fewness of the English' is worthy of note, for in his work we are surely dealing with a very formidable Romanist and a person from whom Lloyd could have learnt far more.

<sup>43</sup> Op cit Kemble J M 1876, 2nd ed Vol 1 p. 232.

<sup>44</sup> Op cit Stubbs W 1883, pp. 2-3.

<sup>45</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008. See pp. 35.

<sup>46</sup> Burrow J W, *A Liberal descent* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1981) pp. 165, 168-9 & 181-2. Lloyd also visited Switzerland on a number of occasions. See op cit H Pryce 2011 pp. 54 & 66.

The form that historical path should assume can be gauged from Freeman's broader work. He had drawn on the earlier work of the French historian Amédée Thierry to develop a methodology which saw national histories as based on a struggle between different races and in which the objective was to assimilate and achieve a new stability.<sup>47</sup> He explained his position as follows:

The history of Britain ..., and specially the history of England, has been largely a history of elements absorbed and assimilated from without. But each of those elements has done somewhat to modify the mass into which it was absorbed.<sup>48</sup>

As will become evident, Lloyd's methodology was in keeping with that of Freeman's. For Freeman, England had emerged as a consequence of the success of the Anglo-Saxons in assimilating their Norman conquerors. For Lloyd, Wales emerged as a consequence of the success of the Brythonic tribes in assimilating the Iberian and Goidelic tribes.<sup>49</sup> The parallels between Lloyd's work and that of the Oxford school of Germanist historians was not confined to Freeman, for it is evident that the work of two other authors had created an historical niche which he could occupy. The authors in question were William Boyd Dawkins and J R Green, both of whom belonged to an earlier generation than Lloyd.

### **William Boyd Dawkins.**

Dawkins had been born in 1837 at the vicarage at Buttington near Welshpool, and from his subsequent work it appears that he regarded himself as being Welsh.<sup>50</sup> In 1854 he entered Jesus College, Oxford, to study geology. There, as an undergraduate, he met the future historian J R Green. Due to their mutual interest in history they agreed a pact whereby Green would focus on the history of Britain as revealed in the written records, whilst Dawkins undertook to research the prehistory of Britain as revealed in archaeology and geology. With Green in 1874 having published his four volume *Short history of the English people*, Dawkins in 1880 published a companion volume titled *Early man in Britain and his place in the Tertiary Period*.<sup>51</sup> In that work Dawkins not only harnessed geology and archaeology to develop a picture of the history of early man in Britain, but also drew on linguistics.<sup>52</sup> By 1889 he was drawing upon the work of John Rhys.<sup>53</sup> In order to locate J E Lloyd's work, the nature of the analysis developed by Dawkins needs to be considered. Both the scale and the nature of the intellectual project he undertook must to be noted.

Dawkins defined the task confronting him in the following terms.

---

<sup>47</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008 p.36.

<sup>48</sup> Freeman E A, *William the Conqueror* (Macmillan, London 1894) pp. 1-2.

<sup>49</sup> See e.g. Lloyd J E, 'History of Wales', in *Transactions of the Royal National Eisteddfod of Wales*, Liverpool 1884, pp. 341-408. See in particular pp. 376-80.

<sup>50</sup> Dawkins W B, 'The ancient ethnology of Wales', *Y Cymmrodor* vol 5, 1882 pp. 209-23. See p. 209.

<sup>51</sup> Matthew H C G & Harrison B (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004), vol 15 pp. 540-42. See also J R Green 1902 & W B Dawkins, *Early man in Britain and his place in the Tertiary Period* (Macmillan, London 1880).

<sup>52</sup> Op cit Dawkins W B 1880, pp. 331-2.

<sup>53</sup> W B Dawkins, *The place of the Welsh in the history of Britain* (Simpkin, Marshall, London 1889) p. 29.

... We have to chronicle in the Prehistoric period the changes wrought in Europe by the invasion of new peoples, and the appearance of new civilisations. ... Man appears in the Neolithic stage of culture ... along with the stocks of the more important of the domestic animals, and many of the cultivated seeds and fruits. Subsequently in the long course of ages bronze became known, and then iron, each causing a great change in the arts and the social condition of the people. Polished stone, bronze, and iron, it must be remarked, are merely the outer signs or symbols of three phases of culture, each of which was higher and better than that which went before. ...<sup>54</sup>

Dawkins was presenting a multi dimensional analysis. In addition to the human dimension he considered aspects such as the changing sea level, climate and the wildlife. He was constructing a complex model of social change based on very divers categories of evidence. Moreover, in focusing on the British context, he recognised that his analysis needed to encompass the European stage. As a consequence, in the above volume he could not give detailed consideration to the Welsh context. None the less, it is evident that there was a Welsh audience which was interested in his work, for in 1882 he addressed a meeting of the Cymmrodorion, on the issue of *The ancient ethnology of Wales*.<sup>55</sup>

The primary conclusion of Dawkins's presentation was that Britain had developed on the basis of three population groups. The initial Iberian population were identified as a Neolithic people who were subsequently challenged by invasion by a Celtic, Bronze Age people, who in turn were challenged by the Belgae, a people belonging to the Iron Age. Each invasion was interpreted as driving the previous populations westwards, until the Roman conquest introduced a new stability. In turn, following the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, all three established tribal peoples were again seen as having been driven west by the new Anglo Saxon invaders.<sup>56</sup> Such an analysis was largely in keeping with the outlook of the Oxford school of Germanist historians.

Through the above, W Boyd Dawkins had by 1882 already developed a model of early British social development which included a Welsh dimension. In that context Green's work had remained confined to England. As a consequence, in relation to Wales, the work of the Oxford school of Germanist historians contained a void which Lloyd could, from his undergraduate days, seek to occupy. As he sought to fill that void, it appears that Lloyd's career at Oxford led him to have at least a limited personal acquaintance with one of the leading figures identified with the Oxford school.

### **J E Lloyd and the Oxford school of Germanist historians.**

The University College of Wales Magazine of June 1884 contained a contribution from J. E. Lloyd which related current academic changes at his seat of learning.

---

<sup>54</sup> Op cit Dawkins W B 1880 pp. 247-8.

<sup>55</sup> Op cit Dawkins W B in *Y Cymmrodor*, vol 5, 1882 pp. 209-23.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid. See in particular pp. 216-21.

...There has been one important change in the professorial phalanx: Dr. Stubbs, the learned and genial Regius Professor of Modern History, has left us to become Bishop of Chester, and Dr. Freeman, of even wider renown, though scarcely of profounder learning or more sagacious judgement has been appointed to the vacant chair. Dr. Stubbs's farewell lecture was, I have been told, one of the best things of the term, for the new Bishop has a rich vein of humour that is not to be suspected by readers of his Constitutional History. ...<sup>57</sup>

This above provides an insight into the manner in which Lloyd viewed key members of the Oxford school of Germanist historians. Subsequently Lloyd became actively involved in the Stubbs Society, previously known as the Oxford Historical Seminar. It was chaired by E. A. Freeman, the newly appointed Regius Professor of Modern History. On second March 1885, Lloyd read a paper to the Stubbs Society on *Wales and the Marches in the reign of Stephen*. According to O. M. Edwards the paper was well received by Freeman, a man who was otherwise perceived as bearing an antipathy towards Celts.<sup>58</sup>

Lloyd, as an undergraduate, had not only been educated in the milieu of the Oxford school of Germanist historians but also had a high regard for its leaders. Lloyd's achievement during subsequent decades was to produce for Wales a history which was broadly in keeping with the outlook of that school of thought. He was engaged in a project aimed at constructing an equivalent Brythonic concept of Welsh history. It is evident that Lloyd fashioned the outlines of that history prior to his graduation at Oxford. The nature of his earliest concept of Welsh history will now be considered.

### **J E Lloyd - fashioning a national concept of Welsh history.**

In 1884, J E Lloyd was in his formative phase as a historian. Whilst he had command of the primary sources, those sources were still malleable and capable of being moulded to reflect his concept of history. His skills were amply revealed in an initial article published in 1884 in which he focused on Taliesin.<sup>59</sup> That was the year in which Lloyd also produced his prize-winning handbook on the history of Wales for the use of Day Schools, a work which he submitted to the National Eisteddfod at Liverpool. It was described by John Rhys, one of the adjudicators, in glowing terms:

He stands alone in the competition, being head and shoulders taller than the others .... He consults all the modern writings which have any bearing on the subject. ... In brief I may say that altogether this work ... is the best historical production ever sent me by the Eisteddfod for adjudication. ...<sup>60</sup>

The reason for such praise can be gleaned from the fact that Lloyd had produced a concept of Welsh history which not only moved far beyond the work of the amateur

---

<sup>57</sup> Lloyd J E, 'Oxford Letter', in *The University College of Wales Magazine*, 1884 pp 269-72. See in particular pp. 270-1.

<sup>58</sup> Op cit Pryce H 2011, pp. 38 & 43.

<sup>59</sup> Lloyd J E, 'Taliesin ben beirdd', in *Y Geninen*, vol 3 1885 pp. 65-9. The above article displays his skills, but his analysis of Taliesin contained major shortcomings.

<sup>60</sup> 'Adjudication of Professor John Rhys, M. A.', in *Transactions of the Royal National Eisteddfod of Wales, Liverpool 1884*, pp. 338-9.

historians who had previously dominated the field, but also advanced further than a work that Rhys himself had first published in 1882.

John Rhys by then had secured the new Chair of Celtic at Jesus College, Oxford. In 1884, the second edition of his *Celtic Britain* was published.<sup>61</sup> As a linguist it is not surprising that Rhys largely proceeded on the basis of written records, initially focusing on Julius Caesar's invasion of Britain. Never the less, in a concluding chapter he did draw upon the new discipline of ethnology and in the volume as a whole cited the work of William Boyd Dawkins on a number of occasions.<sup>62</sup>

Lloyd the historian of 1884, was in a far stronger position to harness the work of Dawkins, than Rhys the linguist, and his account of the Brythonic advance in southern Britain had far more vibrancy than that offered by his older compatriot.<sup>63</sup> Such differences should alert us to the process of headlong advance which was occurring within the field as a whole, an aspect which can be illustrated by reference to the work of Rhys himself.

In his *Lectures on Welsh Philology* (1877), he had found it necessary to address the issue of the Goidels having inhabited Wales prior to the Brythonic Celts. At that time he was by no means convinced of the validity of that argument.<sup>64</sup> By the time his *Celtic Britain* was published, he expressed a somewhat different view. Whilst stressing that the argument was still in flux, he accepted that at least some Goidels were the first Celtic inhabitants of Britain but that others were probably immigrants from Ireland. He viewed the original Goidels as being followed from the continent by the Brythonic Celts. His work even contained a map showing the location of the Iberian, Goidelic and Brythonic populations of Britain during the Roman era.<sup>65</sup>

From the above, it is apparent that the broad intellectual framework which we find in Lloyd's work had, prior to 1884, already been at least tentatively mapped out by Dawkins and Rhys. Their work afforded Lloyd ample opportunity to advance further by inserting the empirical details into a national framework. That was accomplished in two of Lloyd's earliest historical publications, the first his prize-winning essay of 1884 and the second a contribution to *Y Geninen* in 1886.

Lloyd's strategy in constructing his concept of Welsh history is reasonably clear. In proceeding from the outlook of the Oxford school of Germanist historians he needed to construct a view which accorded the Brythonic tribes a similar role in the history of Wales to that fulfilled by the Anglo-Saxons in the history of England. They were to carry the germ of success which the Anglo-Saxons race had borne in England. In order to fashion that concept, Lloyd needed to ensure that the Brythons followed an historical path

---

<sup>61</sup> Rhys J, *Celtic Britain* (Society for promoting Christian knowledge, London, 1884) 2nd ed

<sup>62</sup> Ibid. See chapter I pp. 1-31 & chapter vi pp. 202-76.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid pp. 216-222 & 358—65.

<sup>64</sup> Rhys J, *Lectures on Welsh philology* (Trübner & Co, London 1877) pp. 186-9.

<sup>65</sup> Op cit Rhys J, *Celtic Britain* (Society for promoting Christian knowledge, London 1882) 1st ed pp. 3-4, & pp. 245-9 See also map at front of volume.

which enabled them to avoid being subsumed and corrupted by the urban life of the Roman Empire.

In 1884, Lloyd proceeded on the tentative assumptions of the period, namely that the Neolithic population could be identified as Iberian, the Bronze Age population could be identified as Goedelic, and the Iron Age population as Brythonic.<sup>66</sup> Regarding the validity of his analysis, one initial aspect should immediately put us on our guard. In seeking to trace the progression from the Neolithic era to the Bronze Age and the Iron Age, Lloyd was unable to distinguish adequately between those historical epochs. He was of the view that:

... it is in neolithic times that we first meet with traces of a social organisation, of men seeking the society of each other, and living, working, and fighting in concert. This organisation was, of course tribal : it was the tribe that acted together, living in hut villages, and resorting in time of need to mountain fortresses ; for they were a warlike people, and like all tribal communities were constantly encroaching upon each other... The age of these fortresses is exceedingly difficult to fix; it is however believed that the most elaborate are the oldest, and no doubt a large proportion are neolithic. ...<sup>67</sup>

The analysis was based on drawing a distinction between the neolithic age, the bronze age and the iron age, yet those seeking to present an account of the period had no adequate means of distinguishing between those periods. According to subsequent archaeological analysis, in referring to the most elaborate of the hill forts as neolithic, Lloyd, was mistaken, for the more elaborate hillforts are nowadays dated at the earliest to the middle Iron Age and at the latest to the late Iron Age. Their construction spanned a period extending from around 400 B.C. down to the period of the Roman conquest<sup>68</sup> rather than a far earlier period as implied by Lloyd. From the outset, a major flaw thus lay at the heart of his analysis.

It is also apparent that the above misinterpretation was not confined to Lloyd, for in his paper to the *Cymmrodorion* in 1882, W. Boyd Dawkins had similarly identified hill forts with the Neolithic civilisation.<sup>69</sup> Whatever the source of that analytical failure, it is apparent that Lloyd had placed his analysis on the wrong path. Given that he had identified Neolithic society as a tribal society, having multivalent hill forts, his analysis pointed to his ultimate quite invalid definition of Wales as an underdeveloped society. His initial misinterpretation was of necessity carried forward to his subsequent analysis.

On the basis of a passing assessment by Julius Caesar,<sup>70</sup> he came to a conclusion that constituted a further key step in his construction of Welsh history. By the time of the

---

<sup>66</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884, pp. 341-408. See pp. 347, 351 & note 1 and p. 352.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid p. 345-6.

<sup>68</sup> F Lynch, S Aldhouse-Green & J L Davies (eds) *Prehistoric Wales* (Sutton, Stroud, 2000) pp. 154-7.

<sup>69</sup> Op cit W B Dawkins in *Y Cymmrodor* 5, 1882 pp. 209-23. See in particular pp. 212-3.

<sup>70</sup> Pontet R du , (ed) *C Iuli Caesaris commentariorum* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1900-08). Bk v, par 14 / Wiseman A & Wiseman P, (trns) *Julius Caesar. The battle for Gaul* (Book Club Associates, London 1980) See Bk. V, par. 14 pp. 94.

earliest Roman involvement, Lloyd believed that Britain had evolved into two distinct societies which he described in the following terms.

... When we reach the times of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, the men of the Stone, the Bronze, and the Iron Age have become merged into two broad divisions, the maritime and the inland tribes of Cæsar. Between these two there is a wide separation; the men of the interior are in the pastoral stage of civilisation, sowing no corn to speak of, but depending for food on their cattle and their sheep; the tribes of the coast are agricultural, with houses, fields, gardens, and a thriving settled population.<sup>71</sup>

Once more, in terms of modern scholarship Lloyd's analysis was misconceived. Whilst modern archaeology recognises a distinction between the Belgic territories of southern Britain and the more northerly tribal peoples, that distinction recognised all those peoples as belonging to the Iron Age.<sup>72</sup>

Lloyd had identified the above social division on the evidence provided by Julius Caesar on a brief visit to the south coast of Britain in 54 B.C. He then proceeded to a more fundamental evaluation of the qualities of the populations of those two regions. The assessment he offered at that point fully betrayed his intellectual grounding within the Oxford school.

... It is not to be supposed that any of the Brythonic tribes, inheriting an Aryan civilisation, and comfortably settled as farmers on the Kentish coast more than three hundred years before Christ, afterwards relapsed into a condition of semi-barbarism, and therefore we may class together as pre-Brythonic all those people who are described as living in a primitive, not to say savage fashion. On the other hand, the great inaptitude for civilisation which the older races exhibited in their after history makes it fairly certain that none of *them* need be included in the industrious farming population which occupied the south-east angle of the island  
...<sup>73</sup>

Such an assessment raises fundamental issues regarding the assumptions Lloyd brought to bear on his study of Welsh history. Clearly the Brythonic population were regarded as bearing a superior civilisation to their Goidelic and Iberian predecessors, and were regarded as being less capable of sustaining a higher civilisation. Why should they be so regarded?

Given the absence of an adequate acknowledgment of sources in Lloyd's early work, it is difficult to trace the source of his ideas. His reference to a 'great inaptitude for civilisation' does suggest that Lloyd may at some point have absorbed aspects of the anti-

---

<sup>71</sup> Op cit J E Lloyd 1884, pp. 341-408. See p. 359.

<sup>72</sup> Cunliffe B, *Iron Age Communities in Britain* (Routledge, London 1991) See p. 130 and chapters 7-9.

<sup>73</sup> Op cit J E Lloyd 1884, p. 359.

Irish racism characteristic of the campaigns waged by *The Times* from the 1840s, and also exemplified in the work of authors such as Thomas Carlyle and Robert Knox.<sup>74</sup>

The positive evaluation of the Brythonic tribes may point to an awareness of some earlier views regarding the purported racial merits of the Belgæ. Given that both Goidelic and Brythonic are usually regarded as Celtic peoples, from the perspective of what can at best be described as the distorted racially-tinged thinking of those times, it is difficult to identify the rationale of such a view. Never the less, it is worthy of note that W. Boyd Dawkins in his paper to the *Cymmrodorion* in 1882 highlighted a disagreement amongst ethnologists as to the ethnic identity of the Belgæ, for some believed them to have been Celts whilst others saw them as being of Germanic origin.<sup>75</sup> Some decades earlier Sir Francis Palgrave had argued that the Belgic Celts were Germanic. On such a basis, it would have been possible for Lloyd to regard the Brythonic population as being racially on a par with the Anglo-Saxons and as being superior to the Goidelic Celts.<sup>76</sup> What specific ideas he may have drawn from such continental sources is difficult to gauge.

Through such an analysis, Lloyd in 1884 appears to have been led to a definition of the Brythonic population as a culturally superior or possibly racially superior stock, who were capable of defeating the inferior population of Iberians and Goidels and establishing what he regarded as the foundations of the Welsh nation. His evaluative subtext was but thinly concealed in his description of those peoples.

... In manners the pre-Brythonic tribes were probably much alike, that is they had advanced but little beyond the civilisation which has been portrayed in our earliest chapters. Diodorus Siculus tells us of their mean huts, their subterranean granaries, their neglect of straw from which they reaped their little harvest of corn: Strabo speaks of their ignorance of cheese or garden fruit; and Cæsar is no doubt referring to them when he mentions the barbarous and repulsive form of polygamy which was to be found in Britain. We cannot doubt that they were a rude, uncivilised race, not far removed from running wild in the woods, yet their later history shows them capable of much that was admirable, and classical romancers are probably responsible for many of the enormities with which they have been credited ...<sup>77</sup>

The negative evaluation of the Iberian and Goedelic tribes continued through Lloyd's assessment of their religion.

... The Goidelic religion was Druidism. No Brythonic people in Britain seem ever to have professed it: as far as we are able to judge, the Brythons, like the Aryans

---

<sup>74</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008. See pp. 27-32 & 71-107.

<sup>75</sup> Op cit Dawkins W B in *Y Cymmrodor*, vol 5, 1882 pp. 219. The issue had also been addressed by William Stubbs and dismissed as being misconceived. See op cit Stubbs W 1883, pp. 67-8.

<sup>76</sup> It is also worthy of note that Lloyd in his final two years of study at Oxford had followed a course in foreign history. He decided to study aspects of late medieval French history. See op cit Pryce H 2011, pp. 40.

<sup>77</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884, pp. 341-408. See p. 363.



in general, worshipped a variety of deities which had originally represented the powers of Nature ...<sup>78</sup>

On the basis of Lloyd's analysis, the negative evaluation of the Druidic religion was not allowed to taint the Brythonic tribes, a population whom it should be noted he regarded as members of the Aryan race. Rather, any opprobrium regarding Druidism was to be safely channelled to the Goedelic tribes. In the above, Lloyd largely echoed the more nuanced assessment of John Rhys who saw religious observance within Britain as falling into three categories, but recognised that there was a lack of evidence in relation to the whole subject.<sup>79</sup>

Lloyd proceeded further by describing the purported conflict between the social forces of pre-Roman Britain. He depicted a context in which the Goidels and Iberians were confronted by the more advanced Brythonic population and charted the demise of the former.

... The latter ... were at some date ... compelled to retreat even further to the west and north before the onrushing tide of Brythonic conquest. The Parisi drove them from the shores of the Humber, the Dobunni and the Cornavii from the banks of the Severn, the Ordovices from Powys ... and Cæsar's men of the interior became almost everywhere the fierce, wild denizens of a western coast. ...<sup>80</sup>

With the Brythonic advance being conceived of as being in full flow, Lloyd saw that process being halted by the Roman conquest of southern Britain. In that context he quite correctly saw the pre-Roman tribes of 'Wales' being defeated by their new Roman enemy with 'Wales' becoming an integral part of the Roman province of Britannia.<sup>81</sup> Regarding the nature of the Roman victory, Lloyd came to one further conclusion which proved to be of major importance to his analysis. In the work of Tacitus he discovered what he regarded as evidence that some of the defeated Brythonic tribes had been assimilated into the Roman system, whilst others had sustained their former way of life. Again Lloyd did not cite his source, but it seems clear that his comments related to the concluding two sentences of chapter 11 of *De vita Agricola*.

Nam Gallos quoque in bellis floruisse accepimus; mox segnitia cum otio intravit, amissa virtute pariter ac libertate. Quod Britannorum olim victis evenit: ceteri manent quales Galli fuerunt.<sup>82</sup>

We have gathered that the Gauls once won renown in war; but then peace and quiet brought decadence, valour was lost along with liberty. This has befallen those of the Britons who were conquered: the rest are as the Gauls once were.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid p. 363.

<sup>79</sup> Op cit Rhys J 1884, pp. 69-70.

<sup>80</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884, pp. 341-408. See p.362.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid p. 369.

<sup>82</sup> Furneaux H (ed), *Cornelii Tacitus, de vita Agricola* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1898) ch 11 p. 94.

<sup>83</sup> Translated by D Stephenson.

In that comment it appears that Lloyd detected evidence that the attempt by Agricola to assimilate the leadership of the conquered tribes of western Britain into the Roman system had failed. He explained that,

... Tacitus gives us a hint that the plan was not everywhere a success: some of the tribes, he says, are passive like the Gauls, but others are not so apt and manageable; and their past and subsequent history makes it extremely probable that the Welsh tribes were among the latter. They probably lived an underground kind of life, following their oldfashioned ways in such places as were abandoned to them by the Roman soldiery, cheerfully paying tribute, ... but resolutely refusing to become the drudges and slaves of their conquerors.<sup>84</sup>

The supposed evidence on which Lloyd based the above conclusion is worthy of further scrutiny.

Tacitus had accompanied his father-in-law Julius Agricola to Britannia whilst the latter served as governor from 78-84 A.D. Tacitus completed Agricola's biography in 98 A.D., twenty years after the beginning of his visit to Britannia,<sup>85</sup> and twenty years after Agricola had defeated the Ordovices.<sup>86</sup> By the end of Agricola's term as governor, the tribes of southern Britannia had already been subjected to a process of assimilation for around forty years, whilst those conquered by Agricola had been subjected to that process for only a few years. Others in northern Britain remained unconquered.

In chapter 11 of *De vita Agricola*, Tacitus was discussing the whole of Britain, and the distinction he drew was between those tribes within southern Britain who had been conquered, and those within northern Britain who had not been conquered. As the tribes of 'Wales' had been conquered, Tacitus was stating that they, like the tribes of Gaul, were becoming decadent and had lost their valour. It was the unconquered tribes of northern Britain whom Tacitus saw as retaining their martial qualities.

In seeing the tribes of 'Wales' as resisting assimilation into the Roman system, Lloyd was drawing an invalid conclusion from the work of Tacitus, yet that conclusion was of fundamental importance to his concept of Welsh history. Whereas Lloyd concluded that the tribes of 'Wales' had remained on the margins of the Roman system, Tacitus was implying that they had been assimilated. For Tacitus it was not the tribes of 'Wales' who had retained their valour, but rather those who lived beyond the northern border of the Roman province of Britannia.

Never the less, it is worthy of note that J R Green, in his *Short history of the English people*, had earlier constructed an historical framework which Lloyd could have consciously adopted. In considering the causes of the decline of the Roman province of Britannia, Green conceived of the Roman conquest as having been but partial:

---

<sup>84</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884, pp. 370.

<sup>85</sup> Op cit Mattingly H (trs) 1986. See Introduction pp. 9-13.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid ch. 18 pp. 68-70.

The island was weakened by a disunion within, which arose from the partial character of its civilization. It was only in the towns that the conquered Britons became entirely Romanised. Over large tracts of country the rural Britons seem to have remained apart, speaking their own tongue, owning some traditional allegiance to their native chiefs, and even retaining their native laws.<sup>87</sup>

Green did not cite the primary sources on which his interpretation was based. Whatever those sources were, it seems clear that his interpretation was mistaken. In his early writings, Lloyd's acknowledgement of his sources is similarly lacking, but it would not be in the least surprising had he based his analysis on the earlier work of Green.

Having come to the above conclusions, Lloyd then proceeded to describe the nature of the social context that existed in that Roman 'Wales':

... Speaking generally, ... the Roman occupation brought little change for the Welsh tribesmen, except a narrow range and a compulsory peace: each year they brought their little dues of corn to the Roman officer at Segontium or Moridunium, and often they saw in the distance the flashing train of legionaries move along the great Sarn or military road, but they themselves went through the same monotonous existence, simple barbarians in the midst of imperial pomp and luxury.<sup>88</sup>

Given that he was working from within the assumptions of the Oxford school of Germanist historians, what was significant was that Lloyd had succeeded in depicting an historical context in which the tribes of Wales had remained separate from the corrupting influences of Roman urban society. As a consequence, in the context that emerged after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, those tribes, uncorrupted by Roman civilisation, were at hand to build the new Welsh nation. By such means Lloyd had succeeded in ensuring that the pieces fell into place in accordance with the outlook of his intellectual mentors. How then did Lloyd conceive of the survival of Roman Britannia following its separation from the Empire in 409?<sup>89</sup>

Initially, it should be noted that the manner in which Lloyd resolved that issue was absolutely crucial to his attempt to construct a Welsh nationalism which extended back to that immediate post-Imperial context. In pursuing that objective he would have recognised that he needed to counter the accounts current within English history, which conceived of the collapse of post-Roman Britannia as being the consequence of failure of 'Welsh' leadership. One of the most important of those accounts had been produced by Sharon Turner in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons* published in successive parts between

---

<sup>87</sup> Op cit Green J R 1902, p. 9. The views of William Stubbs were not fundamentally dissimilar. See op cit Stubbs W 1883, p. 65.

<sup>88</sup> Op cit J E Lloyd 1884, pp. 370.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid. See pp. 375-6.

1799 and 1805. Lloyd was familiar with Turner's work, for in 1884, in discussing the poetry of Taliesin, Lloyd referred in passing to Turner's analysis of Taliesin's poetry.<sup>90</sup>

In his *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Turner was of the view that Roman Britannia had contained 33 *civitates*, but that following the collapse of formal Imperial rule, the *civitates* had started fighting amongst themselves. He saw that as being the consequence of the

'...degenerated civilisation, bad financial system, and oppressive government...'<sup>91</sup>

which the Romans had left in Britannia. Turner then drew on the work of Gildas and Nennius to illustrate those themes,<sup>92</sup> before proceeding to consider the role of Gwrtheyrn and Ambrosius Aurelianus. From Turner's perspective, that constituted the destructive background to the advent of Hengist and Horsa in the mid-fifth century.<sup>93</sup> Lloyd would have recognised that he needed to counter that historical account in order to construct his new Welsh national history. How then did he pursue that task?

Firstly, Lloyd conceived of post 409 Britannia as a newly founded state which sought to sustain its former structure. He recognised that there were potentially four officers who could have taken the lead. According to Lloyd, these were on the civil side, the Vicar of Britannia: he was matched on the military side by the supreme commander, the Count of Britain and two subordinates, namely the Count of the Saxon Shore on the eastern and southern coast and the Duke of the Britains primarily on the northern frontier.<sup>94</sup>

In considering how the situation evolved, Lloyd initially took a major step into the unknown by assuming that the first two posts were largely ornamental, leaving the real responsibility for defending Britannia in the hands of the *Comes litoris Saxonici* and the *Dux Britanniarum*. Assuming that the Roman system had collapsed, he envisaged a situation in which successors to the *Comes litoris Saxonici* and the *Dux Britanniarum* were recruited from the resident population, with Britannia as a consequence splitting into two distinct territories. The theoretical implications of that approach should be noted.

By dividing the Britannia of post 409 into two distinct regions, Lloyd was in a position to deposit all the historical evidence he did not wish to harness to his analysis, into the south-eastern region, whilst reserving all the evidence he wished to employ, to his favoured north-western region. As a consequence, despite the fact that Sharon Turner and J E Lloyd focused on the same period in the history of Britannia, there is little overlap in the characters who participate in their relevant accounts. For Turner the key characters were Gildas, Maelgwn, Gwrtheyrn, Ambrosius Aurelianus and Arthur, with Cunedda

---

<sup>90</sup> Lloyd J E, 'Taliesin ben beirdd', in *Y Geninen* vol 2, 1884, pp. 145-8. See in particular p. 146.

<sup>91</sup> Turner S, *The history of the Anglo-Saxons* (Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans 1852) 7<sup>th</sup> ed vol 1 p. 167.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid* pp. 165-75.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid* pp. 216-9.

<sup>94</sup> *Op cit* Lloyd J E 1884 p. 376.

being a notable absentee.<sup>95</sup> By contrast, J E Lloyd constructed an account which focused on Cunedda and his dynasty and as a consequence was able to compose a version of history which side-stepped the issues raised by Turner.<sup>96</sup> The problem with such national histories is not that they were not empirically based, but rather that the evidence was selected on a political basis in order to construct a favourable national narrative. The evidence was not considered on the basis of appropriate academic criteria. How then did Lloyd further develop his account of that period?

He saw the lands from the Humber to the Severn as rapidly falling into the hands of the English. By contrast, in the west, he saw the Roman military command responsible for the defence of the Antonine Wall and the territory down to the Bristol Channel being assumed by a native Brythonic leader known as Cunedda Wledig. When he was ejected from his northern base by the Picts, he was depicted moving south and establishing the ruling dynasty of Gwynedd. That provided the context for the completion of the Brythonic conquest of Wales. For Lloyd, the Ordovices of mid-Wales had during the period of Imperial rule continued to conquer territory from their Goidelic neighbours. In the new post Imperial context he conceived of the process of conquest and modernisation being completed by the Cunedda dynasty, with the Welsh nation emerging as a consequence of that process.

The union of the north-western half of the province under a single native ruler had one effect which could scarcely have been expected: the different tribes, Brythonic, Goidelic, and Ivernian, who owed obedience to his commands, began to know themselves under a common national name. No doubt it is to this time we must refer the rise of the now familiar name of Cymry. ... (T)he first Cymry called themselves so as being fellow countrymen, not indeed of the same kindred and race, but under the rule of the same Gwledig.<sup>97</sup>

It was in that post-Imperial context, under the leadership of the Cunedda dynasty that Lloyd conceived of the Welsh nation being formed. His concept of national formation conformed to that advanced by William Stubbs in his *Constitutional History of England* where he described the development of the English Constitution in the following terms.

The growth of the English Constitution, ... is the result of three forces, whose reciprocal influences are constant, subtle, and intricate. These are the national character, the external history, and the institutions of the people. ... (I)t is not until a nation has arrived at a consciousness of its own identity that it can be said to have any constitutional existence, and long before that moment the three forces have become involved inextricably ...<sup>98</sup>

In the broader context of the conflict for control of north-western Britannia, Lloyd conceived of the Welsh nation as arriving 'at a consciousness of its own identity' through

---

<sup>95</sup> Op cit Turner S 1852, 7<sup>th</sup> ed vol 1 pp. 168-175 & 217-8.

<sup>96</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884 pp. 376-8.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid, p. 376.

<sup>98</sup> Op cit Stubbs W 1883, p. 1.

that supposed process of being united behind and under the leadership of the dynasty that entrenched itself in power in Gwynedd.<sup>99</sup> That concept was also expressed in Lloyd's article on Taliesin, where, with reference to the events of the sixth century he stated.

...(C)yfnod mawr yn hanes y Cymry oedd y chweched ganrif; adeg pan y daeth y genedl, am y tro cyntaf erioed, i deimlo ei hundeb, a'r nerth sydd yn codi o undeb, dan bwysau creulawn yr ymdrech derfynol â'r Seison ...<sup>100</sup>

... In the history of the Cymry the sixth century was a momentous period: a period when the nation, under the cruel pressure of the final conflict with the English, for the first time ever, experienced its unity, and the strength that arises from unity, ...

That post Roman context was for Lloyd the one in which the Welsh nation was formed. Regarding that departure he concluded:

... The Brythonic Conquest of Gwynedd and the South had many important results. So thoroughly did he root out the Goidelic tongue that in a few centuries the very memory of it was forgotten, and it is now difficult to realise that at one time a large part of Wales was as Irish as Munster or Connaught itself. ...<sup>101</sup>

For the Lloyd of 1884, following the methodology of Freeman, the success of the Brythonic tribes in assimilating the Iberian and Goidelic tribes not only laid the foundations of the Welsh nation but also modified Brythonic culture, for he conceived of some of the stories of the Mabinogion as vestiges of the Goidelic presence in Wales. In the same way that Freeman acknowledged that the English nation had been modified by the absorption of the Danes, Normans, Flemings and other peoples,<sup>102</sup> Lloyd saw the Brythonic inheritance of Wales being modified by the absorption of the Goidels.

... The conquest of the Goidels, then did much to enrich and beautify Brythonic literature: but the Brythons had one valuable gift in return, namely the Christian religion. The organisation of the Welsh Church, as we find it in mediæval times, dates without a doubt from the time of the Brythonic advance: the Welsh saints are nearly all connected with Cunedda or his contemporaries Brychan of Brycheiniog and Caw of Prydyn or Pritland in the North. ...<sup>103</sup>

Lloyd's understanding of those supposed vestiges of the Goidels carried echoes of Matthew Arnold's views on Celtic literature, and should perhaps be seen as a riposte to his views. Whereas Arnold envisaged a situation in which Celtic literature would be accommodated and absorbed into English culture, Lloyd conceived of Brythonic culture

---

<sup>99</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884. See pp. 377-8

<sup>100</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E in *Y Geninen*, vol 2 1884 pp. 145-8. See in particular p. 147.

<sup>101</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884. See pp. 378.

<sup>102</sup> Op cit Freeman E A 1894, pp. 1-2.

<sup>103</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1884, p. 379.

as having already been enriched by Goedelic culture<sup>104</sup>. It was something of lasting value in itself, rather than a means of enhancing English culture.

The task of founding the Welsh nation was seen by Lloyd as having been initiated by the Ordovices of mid-Wales and completed by the northern Brythonic leadership of Cunedda Wledig supported by Urien Rheged. That union of north western Britannia was viewed as resulting in the emergence of a people united by a new identity and religion, that of the Christian Cymry. Lloyd had delivered a model of the Brythonic tribesmen establishing a Christian Welsh nation in much the same context as J M Kemble envisaged the Anglo-Saxons tribesmen founding their Christian states of the post Roman era.<sup>105</sup>

Whether Lloyd had produced a correct interpretation of Welsh history is entirely another matter. There is however one further aspect which at this juncture is worthy of consideration. The perspective of the Oxford school of Germanist historians had its origins in the social conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but had eventually secured academic expression. By contrast J E Lloyd's view of Welsh history was a product of academia but already by the mid 1880s was seeking a political audience.

In the essay submitted to the National Eisteddfod at Liverpool in 1884 the manner in which Lloyd's national dimension related to contemporary politics had of necessity to be constrained. In an article published in *Y Geninen* in 1886, that aspect could be expressed far more explicitly. That work is worthy of consideration, for it enables us to locate Lloyd within the Liberal politics of the 1880s.

### **The emergence of a new Welsh dimension to politics.**

As a consequence of the Acts of Union of 1536 and 1542-43<sup>106</sup> Wales as an officially recognised political entity had largely ceased to exist. Whilst the Tory and Whig ascendancy in Wales survived, that situation persisted. On the basis of a severely restricted franchise, the Welsh dimension was largely submerged but as the franchise broadened and as radical Liberalism secured ascendancy in Wales, the Welsh dimension re-emerged into British politics. The new reality crystallised as a consequence of the General Election of 1880 at which 29 Liberal representatives, as compared to 4 Conservatives were returned. That inaugurated an era of Liberal domination of Welsh politics which extended for almost forty years, to the post First World War context.<sup>107</sup>

Having been born in 1861, it is evident that Lloyd's formative years were spent in that context in which Wales emerged from the political shadows and in which new political aspirations were being forged and articulated. As a committed Liberal and Nonconformist<sup>108</sup> one aspect which needs to be addressed concerns the relationship between Lloyd's political and religious convictions and his articulation of Welsh history.

---

<sup>104</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008, pp. 145-6.

<sup>105</sup> Op cit Kemble J M 1876, 2nd ed vol 1. See pp. 231-2.

<sup>106</sup> Bowen I (ed), *The Statutes of Wales* (Unwin, London 1908) pp. 75-94 & 101-133.

<sup>107</sup> James A J & Thomas J E, *Wales at Westminster* (Gomer Press, Llandysul 1981). See pp. 76-130.

<sup>108</sup> Op cit Pryce H 2011 see pp. 16-7, 54. 63. Lloyd was an active member of the Congregationalist denomination and until 1917 served as a lay preacher. Whilst living at Bangor, he also regularly joined Bangor Liberal Club.

To that end the process whereby the new Welsh politics evolved must be briefly considered.

The process of accommodating the new Welsh dimension into the politics of the Liberal Party extended over a number of decades. In that process the formal recognition of Wales as a political entity was to be long delayed.<sup>109</sup> As late as March 1880, Gladstone in his address to the Midlothian constituency had conceived of the United Kingdom as constituted of three nationalities, namely England, Scotland and Ireland. Wales was not mentioned. By 1886 a new context had emerged for the existence of Wales was acknowledged by the leadership of the Liberal Party. It was with a sense of discovery that Gladstone in a pamphlet on *The Irish Question* declared,

... The fact that Wales has been from the first under an incorporating union has blinded us to the fact that there are within the United Kingdom, no less than four nationalities ...<sup>110</sup>

That departure coincided with major organisational developments within the Liberal Party. Already in 1877 the National Liberal Federation had been established in Birmingham. During the subsequent ten years the organisational structure of the Federation was extended and elaborated to cover the whole of England, Wales and Scotland. That development also facilitated the establishment of a specific organisational structure for Welsh Liberalism. In December 1886 the North Wales Liberal Federation was established, followed in January 1887 by the South Wales Liberal Federation. In October 1887 that framework was completed through the establishment of the Welsh National Liberal Council, consisting of the Executives of the two Federations.

As a consequence, not only had Wales re-emerged as an acknowledged entity on the Westminster stage, but moreover the political party which dominated Wales had evolved a specific Wales based organisational structure. In that context there existed a need to develop a new political vision which offered a sense of direction for Welsh Liberalism. In 1886 Lloyd recognised the possibilities of that situation and secured the publication of an article 'Ffurfiad y genedl Gymreig'<sup>111</sup> or 'Formation of the Welsh nation', in the Welsh-language journal *Y Geninen*.

In that article Lloyd welcomed the new national consciousness and the fact that the Parliamentary system was having to legislate specifically for Wales. He also saw that new awareness as an opportunity to turn back to consider the historical origins of the Welsh nation.

... Y genedl sydd yn ymddeffroi, yn bwrw ymaith lyffetheiriau cwsg a difrawdwr, yn ymarfogi erbyn cyfnod newydd o weithgarwch. Nis gall unrhyw adeg, felly,

---

<sup>109</sup> The foregoing analysis of Liberal politics is based on pp. 54-62 of Williams E W, *The politics of Welsh home rule 1886-1929; a sociological analysis* Ph D Aberystwyth 1986. See also Morgan K O, *Wales in British politics 1868-1922* (University of Wales Press, Cardiff 1980) chapters 2 & 3.

<sup>110</sup> Gladstone W E, *The Irish Question* (John Murray, London 1886) p. 33.

<sup>111</sup> Lloyd J E, 'Ffurfiad y genedl Gymreig', *Y Geninen* vol 4 1886 pp.264-70.



fod yn fwy amserol at droi golwg yn ol ar ddechreuad y genedl, y Cymry cyntaf a ddygent yr enw, eu ffawd a'u hanffawd, y ddisgyblaeth lem yr aethant drwyddi, a'r modd y daethant o'r diwedd yn genedl unol, nas gallai na llaw gorthrwm na threigliad amser ddofi ei hysbryd annibynol. ...<sup>112</sup>

... The nation is awakening, is casting off the shackles of sleep and indifference, and is arming itself for a new period of activity. No time can thus be more timely to turn our attention back to the beginning of the nation, the first Cymry who took that name, their fortune and misfortune, the severe discipline they experienced, and the means by which they became at last a united nation, which neither the hand of oppression nor the passing of time could tame their independent spirit. ...

That was a somewhat different J E Lloyd to the one on display in his earlier contribution to the National Eisteddfod at Liverpool. He recognised that he was presenting his audience with a new vision of Welsh history.

Earlier accounts tended not only to deprecate the Roman conquest but also to recognise the economic progress that had resulted from it. Jane Williams noted that the Romans had not only harnessed native labour to build roads but had also introduced a long list of new plants, animals and sports into Roman Britannia.<sup>113</sup> Gweirydd ap Rhys in his *Hanes y Brytaniaid a'r Cymry*<sup>114</sup> published in two volumes between 1872 and 1874 also produced a very interesting summary of the implications of the Roman conquest.<sup>115</sup> Whilst being critical of the destructive wars waged by the Romans, he praised their legal system and their commitment to develop the territories they conquered. He noted that a number of Roman towns had been established in Wales and referred to both *Venta Silurum* and *Maridunum*. He also noted that the Romans had introduced new livestock and new culinary practises.<sup>116</sup>

In presenting his account of the formation of the Welsh nation, Lloyd recognised that he was challenging the current orthodoxy. Initially he went along with past perceptions, depicting the Roman ascendancy as extending throughout southern Britain up to the Highlands of Scotland, and describing it as entailing general military domination and commercial success. Having outlined that perspective he then changed his pitch. He introduced a new note.

... Ond arafwn: pa beth sydd wedi dyfod o'r hen hiliogaeth Frytanaidd, cynfrodorion y wlad, fu'n ymladd mor wrol yn erbyn Cesar a Paulinus? A ddifodwyd hwynt? naddo, medd bodolaeth y genedl Gymreig. A lyncwyd hwynt i fyny gan y gwareiddiad newydd oedd wedi ei ddwyn i'r Ynys? Naddo, medd bodolaeth yr iaith Gymraeg. ...<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Ibid p. 264.

<sup>113</sup> J Williams, *A history of Wales* (London 1869), p. 47.

<sup>114</sup> Pryse R (Gweirydd ap Rhys), *Hanes y Brytaniaid a'r Cymry* (Mackenzie, London 1872-4). 2 vols. See vol 1 pp. 171-6.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid. See chapter xvi pp. 155-9.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid pp.156 & 172-4.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid p. 265.

... But let us pause: what has become of the old Britannic race, the former natives of the country, who fought so bravely against Caesar and Paulinus? Have they been annihilated? No, replies the existence of the Welsh nation. Were they swallowed up in the new civilisation which was brought to the Island? no, replies the existence of the Welsh language ...

Having described a Roman ascendancy, he invited his audience to consider a different perspective which conceived of the possibility that the old Brythonic race had survived the Roman conquest. He saw the existence of the Welsh nation and the existence of the Welsh language as evidence that they had not been assimilated into the new Roman civilisation. He then proceeded to outline his alternative interpretation of Welsh history.

... Gadewch i ni graffu, ynte, yn fwy gofalus ar yr olygfa sydd ger ein bron, i weled ai nid oes arwyddion yn rhywle fod yr hen Frytaniaid eto mewn bod, ac yn dilyn eu dull cyntefig o fyw. Ni raid craffu yn fanwl iawn i weled mai bywyd y trefydd a'r prif-ffyrdd, bywyd y dyffrynoedd breision a'r gwastadeddau ffrwythlon, oedd y bywyd prysur, egniol, a ddarluniwyd genym: ac fod y mynyddoedd anial, y cymoedd neillduedig, y coedydd anhygyrch, yn drigle dosbarth gwahanol iawn o ddynion – llwythau cyntefig yr Ynys, heb golli eu harferion syml a gwladaidd, - yn talu teyrnged, efallai, i'w meistriaid Rhufeinaidd, ond yn cael eu gadael, gyda hyny, i fyw fel y gwelent hwy yn dda.

...<sup>118</sup>

... Let us then, focus more carefully on the scene which is before us, to see whether there are signs somewhere that the ancient Britons are still in existence, and following their primitive way of life. There is no need to focus unduly carefully to see that the busy energetic life described by us, was the life of the towns and main-roads, the life of the broad valleys and the productive plains and that the desolate mountains, the secluded valleys, the inaccessible forests were the abode of a very different category of men – the primitive tribes of the Island, who had not lost their simple rural customs, - paying tribute, perhaps, to their Roman masters, but being left, with that, to live their lives as they saw fit ...

On the basis of his earlier analysis, Lloyd was offering his audience a new concept of Welsh history. He was acknowledging that 'Wales' had experienced a degree of Romanisation but was of the view that within that broader context the tribal society had survived without being assimilated into the Roman system. He was inviting his audience to identify with that Brythonic past. The manner in which he envisaged that situation evolving through to the collapse of the Western Roman Empire has already been considered and does not require further elaboration, but the way in which he visualised the situation evolving in the post Imperial context is of interest, for it casts further light on Lloyd's political outlook.

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid p. 265.

After 409, he conceived of the still tribal west as breaking up into territories under the control of tyrants and petty-princes. He then expressed his own political perspective, stating

... yr oedd eu hawdurdod yn rhwystr mawr ar ffordd undeb; nid oedd obaith am genedl Frytanaidd neu Gymreig, yng ngwir ystyr y gair cenedl, tra y caniateid i'r mân-dywysogion rwydd hynt i ddarnio y wlad rhyngddynt. ... (R)haid fod y Brytaniaid wedi rhestri eu hunain dan ryw gadflaenor, yn ben am y tro ar yr holl fan-dywysogion.<sup>119</sup>

... their authority was a great obstacle to unity; there was no hope for a Britannic or Welsh nation, in the true meaning of the word nation, whilst the minor princes were allowed to fragment the country amongst themselves. ... The Britons must have enlisted behind some military leader, a chief for a while over all the minor princes.

Though not having any specific evidence on which to base his views, he speculated that the Britons had enrolled under the leadership of one military leader, an individual who was associated with the old Roman military structure. Earlier he had conceived of Cunedda Wledig, the military commander of the northern and western region of Britannia as eventually losing control of his northern territories, before transferring to Gwynedd and imposing a degree of unity on post Roman Wales.<sup>120</sup> Unity was established not by a figure from amongst the petty chiefs which had emerged after 409, but rather by the people uniting behind an authority figure associated with the old Roman military structure. For the Lloyd of 1886, it was in that context that Wales secured its Bismarck who established the foundations of the Welsh nation.

In the era of what was seen by C W Dilke as unsurpassed English or Saxon Imperialism,<sup>121</sup> an attempt was being made to establish Welsh history on similar Imperialist and racial foundations. The racial aspect to that history is worthy of further consideration, for with regard to Cunedda Wledig, Lloyd stated,

... ac nid oes amheuaeth nad oedd ef a'i dylwyth yn Frythoniaid o waed coch cyfan.<sup>122</sup>

... and there is no doubt that he and his clan were pure, redblooded Britons.

The emphasis on Cunedda Wledig's supposedly full Brythonic blood leaves little doubt that Lloyd visualised the Brythonic racial germ as being central to the emergence of his Welsh nation. It appears that he was attempting to ensure that the core of Welsh Liberalism considered themselves to be the inheritors of a political leadership derived ultimately from the Brythonic leadership which he saw as having been at the heart of the

---

<sup>119</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, in *Y Geninen* vol 4 1886 pp. 268-9.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid pp. 269-70.

<sup>121</sup> Op cit Young R J C 2008. See chapter 7 pp. 196-230 and in particular p. 200.

<sup>122</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, in *Y Geninen* vol 4 1886 p. 269.

founding of the Welsh nation. He was attempting to promote a national ideology for the Liberal Nonconformist leadership of Welsh Liberalism, a vision which had at its core a concept of race.

If Lloyd's article in *Y Geninen* is seen as indicating an aspiration on his behalf to secure a role in the Liberal politics of his times, then it must be concluded that he failed abysmally, for essentially he was unable to articulate a vision which appealed to the radical wing which actually led the party. It is likely that the appeal of his article would have been confined to conservative elements having an interest in Cunedda as a figure of authority. The extent to which Lloyd's concept was misplaced is evident from the fact that twenty years later, Lloyd George was to sustain the political credibility of radical Welsh Liberalism through such issues as his commitment to National Insurance, and through his support for Church Disestablishment,<sup>123</sup> not by referring to Cunedda and his supposed racial characteristics.

In 1886, whilst J E Lloyd identified with the new radical politics, it seems clear that he was not in tune with those politics. It is surely worthy of note that his *History of Wales* was not published for a further quarter of a century, when the domination of Welsh radical Liberalism was about to be eclipsed. In the mean time he composed a series of booklets for schools.<sup>124</sup>

#### **Lloyd's view of Welsh history.**

Having considered Lloyd's early writings, it is appropriate at this point to try and identify and summarise the key aspects which are crucial to understanding his approach to writing the history of Wales.

From his period as an undergraduate at Oxford, Lloyd had developed a thesis of the nature of Welsh history which was based on two basic assumptions. Firstly, he appears to have assumed that the model of a national history developed by the Oxford school of Germanist historians in relation to England could be replicated in relation to Wales. That model viewed Romanisation as a corrupting influence, which the Saxon tribes had been fortunate enough to avoid. In keeping with that assumption, Lloyd also assumed that Roman history had contributed very little to the long term development of Wales and could accordingly be disregarded. He set out that aspect in his article on the formation of the Welsh nation published in 1886.

Wrth dremio fel hyn ar agwedd ein gwlad yn y bummed ganrif, yr ydym o fwriad wedi gadael allan un elfen yn y darlun oedd ar y pryd o gryn bwysigrwydd. Cyfeirio yr ydym at y sefydliadau Rhufeinig: oherwydd hyd yn nod yng Nghymru anial yr oedd dinasoedd Rhufeinig i'w cael, a ffyrdd Rhufeinig yn eu cydio at eu gilydd ... Yn y rhai hyn y mae'n sicr fod arferion Rhufeinig yn ffynnu, a chyfraith Rhufain yn cael ei gweinyddu. ... Gallasai y dinasoedd hyn fod wedi effeithio yn

---

<sup>123</sup> Op cit Morgan K O 1980, ch 6, pp. 222-74.

<sup>124</sup> Lloyd J E, *Llyfr Cyntaf Hanes* (Welsh National Press, Caernarvon 1893) ; Lloyd J E, *Ail Llyfr Hanes* (Welsh National Press, Caernarvon 1896) ; Lloyd J E, *Trydydd Llyfr Hanes* (Welsh National Press, Caernarvon 1900)

ddwfn iawn ar hanes ein gwlad, pe na buasai eu bri wedi cilio yn llwyr yn y cyfnod ar ol ymadawiad y Rhufeiniaid. Gadawn hwynt allan o'r cyfrif, am iddynt hwy a'u dylanwad ddiiflanu o'n mysg, fel y diflana y llythrenau a gerfir ar y traeth o flaen ymchwydd diddarfod y dôn.<sup>125</sup>

In thus observing our country in the fifth century, we have deliberately left out one element in the picture which was at that time of considerable importance. We are referring to the Roman institutions: for even in desolate Wales, Roman cities existed, and Roman roads connecting them together. ... In these it is certain that Roman practices were flourishing, and Roman law being administered. ... These cities could have had a profound effect on the history of our country, had their fortune not experienced a complete demise following the departure of the Romans. Let us leave them out of our account, for they and their influence disappeared from our midst, as the letters carved on the beach disappears before the endless swell of the waves.

Lloyd thus acknowledged that his history only accommodated themes which he judged to be of long term relevance to the development of the Welsh nation. That implied that he felt at liberty to disregard aspects of history which he viewed as having only temporary significance. In 1886 Lloyd viewed the Roman dimension to the life of western Britannia in such terms and as a consequence did not regard it as requiring detailed consideration.

The validity of his account of Welsh history was dependent on two crucial aspects. Firstly, the structure of Welsh history needed to be a mirror image of the history of England as conceived of by the Oxford school of Germanist historians. Secondly he needed to be able intuitively to identify those strands to Welsh history which were of long term significance to the historical development of his Welsh nation, and to disregard aspects which he interpreted as being of no such relevance. Such an approach implied that Lloyd in writing his *History of Wales* was engaged in a highly precarious intellectual project.

In 1884 and 1886 Lloyd had constructed an initial concept of Welsh history which accorded with the historical outlook of the Oxford school of Germanist historians. In his subsequent career, Lloyd continued to identify with that model and sustained the broad structure of that earlier work in the first two editions of his *History of Wales*. Key aspects to the manner in which he achieved that objective will now be considered.

### **J E Lloyd – sustaining a thesis.**

In line with the thesis he had put forward in 1884, J E Lloyd in 1911 was of the view that though the western and northern regions of the Roman province of Britannia had been

---

<sup>125</sup> Op cit J E Lloyd, in *Y Geninen* 4 1886 p. 268. That the above was no passing aspect to Lloyd's methodology is apparent from the views he had expressed in 1884, for he then stated '... henceforward we shall confine ourselves almost entirely to the tribes of Wales, passing rapidly over those political movements which did not in the long run affect their future, and dwelling upon those in which they were actually concerned. The chronicle must of necessity be meagre, but it includes all with which in the present line of enquiry we need acquaint ourselves.' Op cit J E Lloyd 1884, pp. 341-408. See pp. 365.

conquered, they were never fully assimilated into the broader Romanised economy and system of government. As a consequence he believed that after 409, when Britannia drifted from the Western Roman Empire, the tribal peoples of the west and the north were able to revert to their old way of life, with the primacy of their pre-Roman social institutions being reasserted. Apart from their adoption of Christianity, he believed that in those regions, life reverted to the form that had existed prior to the Roman conquest. That perspective was expressed succinctly in the concluding paragraph to his chapter on the Roman period where he stated:

... Roman civilisation ..., while it imported many new influences into the old Celtic society, did not break up its essential structure or sever its connection with the past. It left Wales richer in many respects, its parting gift of a new religion... being the greatest of all it bestowed, but the land remained a home of primitive ways and ideas, the dwelling-place of a people who, taken as a whole, had scarcely attained the level of culture of the Britons of the south-east at the time of the Roman conquest...<sup>126</sup>

That account was dependent on his ability to depict the core of the proto-Wales of his analysis as a distinct underdeveloped region within Roman Britannia. The foundations of such a claim lay in his flawed understanding of the Neolithic and Bronze Ages, for as has already been highlighted, he had quite mistakenly conceived of the most elaborate of the hill forts as being neolithic rather than belonging to the iron age. Lloyd's analysis was also under pinned by the broader contemporary understanding of the tribal structure of pre-Roman 'Wales'. Perceptions of that structure were already in flux prior to his composing his essay of 1884 and were subsequently to undergo further changes, thus posing a significant challenge to his analysis. It is of relevance to trace those changes and their implications for his work.

### **Lloyd and the tribal structure of Wales.**

In the work of Gweirydd ap Rhys, the 'Wales' of the pre-Roman era was regarded as having been inhabited by three tribes. They were the Ordovices who were seen as occupying the lands of 'Wales' from the north coast down to Montgomeryshire as well possibly as Radnorshire and some lands to the east. To the south, the Demetae were viewed as occupying Cardiganshire, Carmarthenshire, Pembrokeshire and Breconshire, as well as the lands of Glamorgan as far as the Gower peninsula. The Silures in turn were seen as occupying the remainder of Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire as well as considerable lands to the east.<sup>127</sup>

When John Rhys's *Celtic Britain* was first published in 1882, that picture had already changed, for Rhys placed the Ordovices in mid Wales with an earlier Goidelic population being located to their north.<sup>128</sup> That amendment appears to have been the result of Rhys's own linguistic analysis, for in *The Welsh People* published in 1900, an explanation was provided for dividing the territory formerly regarded as having belonged

---

<sup>126</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1911 vol 1, p. 89.

<sup>127</sup> Op cit Pryse R 1872-4. 2 vols. See vol 1 pp. 33-4.

<sup>128</sup> Op cit Rhys J 1882, pp. 86-7.

to the Ordovices. That argument was based on the nature of the Welsh dialect spoken in Powys and its adjoining territories.

Rhys believed that the dialect in question was in origin closer to that of Gaul than the other Welsh dialects. The conclusion drawn from that argument was that in the pre-Roman era, an Iron Age tribe had occupied Powys and its adjoining territories.<sup>129</sup> The crucial issue was the identity of that tribe. Given that a Goidelic population was seen as occupying most of Gwynedd and Clwyd, the Ordovices, who were correctly believed to be an Iron Age tribe, could not be assigned a location in north 'Wales'. Accordingly they were placed in mid-Wales and it became necessary to invent a new Iberio-Goidelic tribal group to occupy most of Gwynedd and Clwyd. In 1886, Lloyd created a name for that tribe, referring to them as the Gwyndodiaid,<sup>130</sup> and explained their possible relationship with the Ordovices in the following terms.

Nid ymddengys fod gan y Rhufeiniaid unrhyw enw ar y llwyth yma, ac efallai nad oeddent yn gwahaniaethu rhyngddi a'r Ordovices.<sup>131</sup>

It does not appear that the Romans had any name for this tribe, and perhaps they did not differentiate between it and the Ordovices.

The problem was resolved by assuming that the Classical records were either wrong or inadequate. In 1911, in contrast to the approach he had adopted in 1886, Lloyd refrained from assigning to those people a specific name but again adopted the questionable approach of viewing Ptolemy's description of their location as being inadequate.<sup>132</sup>

From Lloyd's point of view, that concept of a territory broadly corresponding to the territory of modern Wales, being occupied by four tribes was very convenient, for the distinctiveness of modern Wales could be read back to the pre-Roman context. How then should the problem have been resolved?

According to this analysis the Ordovices should have been located in Gwynedd and Clwyd, with the territory of the Cornovii being extended from the west Midlands into latter day Montgomeryshire. Such an account would have been in keeping with the Classical sources. That, however, would have created a major difficulty for Lloyd's analysis, for two Iron Age tribes would then have occupied territories in 'Wales', and the whole of the territory of mid and north 'Wales' would have been occupied by Iron Age tribes. His thesis, that pre-Roman 'Wales' constituted a territory dominated by an Ibero-Goidelic population would have been seriously challenged. Moreover, extending the territory of the Cornovii westwards into latter day Montgomeryshire would have undermined the territorial integrity of his pre Roman 'Wales'.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> Rhys J & Brynmor-Jones D, *The Welsh People* (Unwin, London 1900) pp. 19-20.

<sup>130</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, in *Y Geninen* vol 4 1886 pp. 264-70. See p. 267.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid p. 267.

<sup>132</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1911 pp. 39-40.

<sup>133</sup> It is worthy of note that the map contained in Francis Haverfield's, *Roman occupation of Britain* located the Ordovices in north-west 'Wales', and hinted at the territory of the Cornovii extending west. See

From the turn of the century, Lloyd's analysis was also confronted by a further challenge, for the work of John Rhys and Brynmor-Jones suggested one further innovation to the tribal structure of 'Wales'. On the basis of linguistic evidence, they were of the view that an Iron Age tribe known as the Dobunni had at some point influenced the Welsh dialect spoken within the territory of the Silures. Their influence was seen as extending from the southern reaches of the river Severn over to the Neath valley. Given that the territory of the Demetae was seen as extending possibly as far as Gower, that did not leave much of the territory of the Silures occupied by Lloyd's Ibero-Goidelic inhabitants.<sup>134</sup> The map of tribal Britain of the 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D. contained in *The Welsh People*, accordingly contained a subtle amendment as compared to the map contained in Rhys's earlier *Celtic Britain*, for the territory of the Dobunni was depicted as extending to the lowlands between the Severn and the Wye.<sup>135</sup> That cartographic presentation however fell way short of the rationale of argument put forward by Rhys in the text.

Lloyd would have been aware of the views of Rhys and Brynmor-Jones as their *Welsh People* is listed in his bibliography.<sup>136</sup> The manner in which Lloyd in 1911 set out his views regarding the Silures is worthy of note, for he did not acknowledge the existence of the challenge posed to his analysis by the work of Rhys and Brynmor-Jones. Never the less, the way he presented his own interpretation suggests that he was not only well aware of their alternative perspective but was also aware of the threat that it posed to his own work. Without explicitly engaging with the interpretation offered by Rhys and Brynmor-Jones he simply stated his own views regarding the extent of Silurian territory. He did not address the argument advanced in *The Welsh People* regarding the possible influence of the Dobunni in the territory over to the Neath valley.<sup>137</sup> That in itself suggests that when confronted by a challenge which he could not effectively counter, Lloyd simply ignored the alternative analysis and reasserted his own position. It appears that he adopted such an approach in relation to a number of other key issues.

By 1911 Lloyd was confronted by a growing body of opinion that viewed the Irish population of western Britannia as a new population based on migration from Ireland, rather than a people having a prior presence in Britain. As noted earlier, John Rhys in his *Celtic Britain*<sup>138</sup> first published in 1882 was to a degree uncertain as to the origins of the Irish population of western Britain but hardened his stance by the turn of the century when *The Welsh People* was published. He then viewed the Goidelic population of Britain as native.<sup>139</sup> Others disputed that view.

In a paper read to the *Cymmrodorion* in May 1896, Kuno Meyer launched a forthright and scholarly attack on John Rhys and his theory of their being an original Goidelic

---

Haverfield F, *The Roman occupation of Britain* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1924) See map at back of volume and text p. 103.

<sup>134</sup> Op cit Rhys J & Brynmor-Jones D, 1900 pp. 21-2.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid. See map between pp. 74-5.

<sup>136</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1911. See p. xxiii.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid pp. 37-8.

<sup>138</sup> Op cit Rhys J 1882 pp. 3-4, & pp. 245-9.

<sup>139</sup> Op cit Rhys J & Brynmor-Jones D 1900 pp. 11-13.



population in Britain. The paper was subsequently published in the *Transactions* and should have highlighted to Lloyd the precarious nature of a central aspect to his thesis.<sup>140</sup> Subsequently in 1905, the historian J B Bury, in his *Life of St Patrick* concluded emphatically that Britain had no native Goidelic population but noted the well known evidence of the migration of the *Dési* from Ireland to South Wales.<sup>141</sup> In 1901, the leading archaeologist, F J Haverfield, had noted that from the third century, the Roman army was engaged in defending the territory of Britannia against both raids and invasions from Ireland. Subsequently in a paper read to the British Academy in November 1905 he acknowledged the existence of a disagreement amongst philologists concerning the origins of the Irish population of late Roman Britannia, but did not commit himself to either perspective.<sup>142</sup>

Lloyd had begun his work on his *History of Wales* on 26<sup>th</sup> January 1901 and had largely completed the first two chapters by the end of April 1902.<sup>143</sup> As a consequence he would have been in a position to consider a number of the above contributions to the debate prior to his writing the first draft of his book. It appears, however, that the above debate had no impact on his thinking. In discussing the Goidelic aspect, Lloyd cited the works of Rhys but disregarded other contributors to the debate.<sup>144</sup> Having in 1884 established his thesis, he ploughed on regardless. That of course was a very dangerous strategy to pursue and in due course he paid the price for that weakness.

In the new introduction to the third edition of his *History of Wales* published in 1939, Lloyd found it necessary to acknowledge that his earlier view regarding the relationship between the Goidelic and Brythonic populations was no longer tenable.

... Another unsolved problem is the historical relation of Goidelic and Brythonic. It has been natural to treat the former as the older branch and to assume that those whose language it was came to Britain in the first instance, were edged out by the Brythons and thereupon colonised Ireland. With such scanty material as was available, Rhys sought to trace in Wales aboriginal Goidels, who ultimately gave way to Brythonic tribes, including the Ordovices of Mid-Wales. All such views may now be regarded as in the melting pot. ...<sup>145</sup>

Lloyd's assessment of 1939 was misleading for there had never been an academic consensus regarding the Goidelic issue. The problem was that the thesis he had constructed in 1884 had been built on one interpretation and that he had never acknowledged the existence of an alternative perspective. That belated acknowledgement in effect created a vast void at the heart of his work, for not only was that aspect of key

---

<sup>140</sup> Meyer K, 'Early relations between Gael and Brython', in the *Cymmrodor* 1895-6 pp. 55-86.

<sup>141</sup> Bury J B, *The Life of St Patrick* (Macmillan, London 1905). See pp. 12-4.

<sup>142</sup> Haverfield F, 'The Roman army in Britain', in Traill H D & Man J S (eds) *Social England*, vol 1, (Cassell, London 1901) Illustrated edition pp. 76-106. See in particular p. 98. See also Haverfield F J, 'The Romanisation of Roman Britain', in the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol 2 pp. 185-217. See footnotes 1 & 2 p. 212.

<sup>143</sup> Op cit Pryce H 2011, pp. 55 & 60-1.

<sup>144</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E 1911, p. 20.

<sup>145</sup> Lloyd J E, *A history of Wales* (London, 1939) 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. p. xxxviii.

importance to his analysis of the relationship between the tribes of Britain, but it was also of key importance to the manner in which he conceived of the relationship between the tribes and their Roman conquerors.

### **J E Lloyd and the Roman occupation of ‘Wales’.**

By early May 1902 Lloyd was embarking on the third chapter of his *History* focused on the Roman period.<sup>146</sup> The intellectual basis on which he undertook that task is worthy of note, for in introducing his consideration of the subject, Lloyd acknowledged his indebtedness to the work of F J Haverfield. He stated:

In all matters relating to the Roman occupation of Britain, Prof. Haverfield’s authority is paramount, and I have accordingly based much of what I have to say upon his writings.<sup>147</sup>

In particular, Lloyd noted his indebtedness to two articles written by Haverfield.<sup>148</sup> Two issues arise with regard to that acknowledgement. Firstly, whilst recognising that both articles were very impressive intellectual documents, it is surprising that Lloyd found it necessary to base a key section to his work on such limited resources. That aspect leads to the suspicion that Lloyd’s understanding of the Roman period was very limited. Secondly, both of the above articles were published before 1902 and did not take account of the very significant advances in Haverfield’s understanding of the Roman occupation of Britannia which occurred after 1901 but prior to Lloyd’s publication of his *History of Wales* in 1911. That aspect is worthy of detailed consideration.

In his article on *The Roman World* published in 1899, Haverfield produced a masterly overview of the development of the Roman Empire and came to a crucial conclusion regarding the Roman occupation of Britannia. He concluded:

No state in ancient or in modern times has allowed so much local autonomy to its citizens and its subjects as the Roman Empire. ... That system meant an organised municipality, town-council, elected magistrates, citizens who were also citizens of Rome, with a dependent territory round which was often as large as an average English county, though much less populous. ... These towns formed the basis of all local government. In Imperial times, there was no part of Italy, except a few Imperial and private estates, which was not “attributed” to some town. ... Henceforward the system spread through the western provinces: it failed to take root only in Northern Gaul and Britain.<sup>149</sup>

Haverfield had described the normal state of development within the Roman Empire but noted that the system had never been established within Britain. The implications of that system were spelt out by Haverfield.

---

<sup>146</sup> Op cit Pryce H 2011, pp. 60-1.

<sup>147</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1911, 1st ed, p. 59.

<sup>148</sup> Haverfield F, ‘The Roman World’, in Hogarth D G (ed) *Authority and archaeology* (John Murray, London, 1899) pp. 296-331 & op cit Haverfield F, in Traill H D & Man J S (eds) 1901 pp. 76-106

<sup>149</sup> Op cit Haverfield F 1899 pp. 296-331. See pp. 321-3.

The general establishment of municipalities on the Italian model meant much more than the improvement of local administration. It meant also the introduction of uniformity into the inner life of the provinces. It was a result, and doubtless a cause, of what we call the Romanization of the provincials.<sup>150</sup>

Romanisation of the territories conquered by the Roman army was accordingly presented as a process achieved through the establishment of municipalities on the Italian model. Given that such a process was not seen as having taken root within Britannia, at that point there was no need for J E Lloyd to concern himself with evidence of its implementation within 'Wales'. That situation was confirmed by Haverfield's article on the Roman army within Britannia, published in 1901. There he explained that the Roman army had historically been based on the imperial frontiers, and that the location of forces in northern Britannia conformed to that pattern.<sup>151</sup>

The provincial army in Britain was among the most powerful and important of the provincial armies. ... Its importance was emphasised by a circumstance which recurs in few other provinces: the British army was the most important element in the province, and civil life, so prominent elsewhere, is insignificant beside it. This predominance of the army was not unqualified: not everything in Roman Britain was military. ... The Midlands and the South-east of Britain were almost as empty of soldiers as Italy itself. They contained a peaceful population which was not unacquainted with Roman speech and culture. Numerous "villas" were occupied by large landowners, busy with corn-growing or sheep-farming. Small towns were not uncommon : there were even four "colonies," fully-privileged municipalities – in short, there existed in the land east of the Severn and south of the Humber a considerable body of Romanised Britons. But the province, as a whole, was small in area, poor, perhaps thinly populated ; the civil life which developed in it was necessarily also small and poor, and was far inferior to that exhibited by the Romanised provincials of Gaul or Spain, or Africa or Pannonia. It remains true, though with the above qualification, that the military aspect of Roman Britain is its most important aspect.<sup>152</sup>

Such an account complemented and even enhanced the credibility of the model of Welsh history which Lloyd had developed in 1884. As a consequence it is not surprising that the rationale of Haverfield's analysis was incorporated into Lloyd's *History of Wales*. Indeed Lloyd went so far as to quote a section of the above, in his *History*.<sup>153</sup>

The real difficulty for Lloyd was that the historical understanding of the Roman province of Britannia was at that time evolving rapidly. Indeed, either as Lloyd was completing the third chapter of his *History*, or shortly after its completion, a discovery was made at Caerwent that indicated to Haverfield that he needed to significantly amend his

---

<sup>150</sup> Ibid p. 325.

<sup>151</sup> Op cit Haverfield F, in Traill H D & Man J S (eds) 1901 pp. 76-106. See p. 80

<sup>152</sup> Ibid p. 83.

<sup>153</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1911, 1st ed, p. 60.

interpretation of at least some aspects of the history of western Britannia. The development in question was the discovery at Caerwent of a rectangular pedestal bearing an inscription noting that it had been erected in honour of a commander of the Second Legion at Caerleon, by decree of the council of *Civitas Silurum*.<sup>154</sup> In an article published in *The Athenæum* in September 1903, Francis Haverfield proceeded to explain the significance of the new discovery.

A Roman inscription was found at Caerwent six months ago, which has not, I think, received the notice it deserves. ... The monument was erected by the Community of the Silures, in accordance with a decree of the authorities thereof. This latter fact throws a real light on the local administration of Roman Britain.

The unit of Roman as of Greek life was, in respect of space, the town. ... Our new inscription shows that the same system obtained in Britain. This canton of the Silures is just like any Gaulish *civitas*. It has a council of rulers or magistrates (*ordo*), and through the agency of this body it is able to erect in its chief town – Venta Silurum – a monument to a Roman officer who had at some time, perhaps, befriended it.

We possessed indications previous to the discovery of this monument that the cantonal system was used in Roman Britain. We had references to a “*civis Cantius*” a “*civitas Catuvellaunorum*” and the like. But the new inscription has added largely to the certainty and definiteness of our knowledge. It is a discovery of real importance for the history of Roman Britain.<sup>155</sup>

Whereas in 1899, Francis Haverfield had been of the view that the cantonal system had ‘failed to take root’ in Britain, by September 1903 he was of the view that the system had been established, with clear evidence emerging that it had been established amongst the Silures of the west. The new perspective Haverfield had developed as a consequence of the discovery of 1903, was carried forward into a paper he read to a meeting of the British Academy on the 29<sup>th</sup> of November 1905. There he stated.

The bulk of British local government must have been carried on by Roman municipalities, by imperial estates, and still more by tribal *civitates* working on a Romanised constitution. ... Whatever room there may be for survival of native customs or institutions, we have no evidence that they survived within the Romanised area, either in great amount or in any form which contrasted with the general character of the country.<sup>156</sup>

Haverfield then proceeded to trace the chronology of that process of Romanisation from the initial context of the conquest.

---

<sup>154</sup> Collingwood R G & Wright R P (eds), *The Roman inscriptions of Britain*. vol 1, *Inscriptions in stone* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1965) p. 107, **monument 311**.

<sup>155</sup> Haverfield F, ‘A Roman inscription at Caerwent’, in *The Athenæum*, 26 Sept 1903 p. 420.

<sup>156</sup> Haverfield F J, ‘The Romanization of Roman Britain’, in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol 2, 1906 pp. 185-217.

It is fairly certain that the whole lowland area, as far west as Exeter and Shrewsbury, and as far north as the Humber, was conquered before Claudius died, and Romanisation may have commenced at once. Thirty years later Agricola openly encouraged the process. ... Certainly it is just at this period (about 80-85 A.D.) that towns like Silchester, Bath, Caerwent (Venta Silurum), seem to take shape, and civil judges (legati iuridici) were appointed, presumably to administer the justice more frequently required by the advancing civilization.<sup>157</sup>

Whereas Lloyd had earlier interpreted the efforts of Agricola to Romanise western Britannia as having failed, Haverfield in 1905, on the basis of archaeological evidence, was interpreting that process as having succeeded in relation to at least the Silures. The rationale of his argument pointed to the possibility of a far wider Romanisation of the west, though Haverfield himself seems not have pursued the rationale of his own analysis to its logical conclusion. Nevertheless, he did stress the importance of the *civitates* as agents of Romanisation.

So far from wearing a national aspect, this cantonal system merely became one of the influences which aided the romanization of the country. It did not, indeed, involve ... the substitution of an Italian for a native institution. Instead, it permitted the complete remodelling of the native institution by the interpenetration of Italian influences.<sup>158</sup>

The implications of the new discovery at Caerwent were that the Silures had been absorbed into the system which constituted the key agency of Romanisation. Moreover the discovery at Caerwent pointed to the possibility that other tribes who had been conquered by Agricola could also have followed such a path. The evidence pointed to the possibility that none of Lloyd's 'Welsh' tribes had escaped that process.

Despite the above, it is worthy of note that Haverfield himself appears to have been reluctant to follow the rationale of his analysis to its logical conclusion, and appears to have remained wedded to his concept of a military zone as having existed within the west of Roman Britannia. The incoherence of Haverfield's views can be illustrated by reference to his analysis of the Roman presence within the lands of the Demetae presented in his *Military aspects of Roman Wales*, published in 1910, for there he stated:

The archæologist who crosses Loughor bridge [from the east] seems to pass outside the military region, though he remains within the limits of Roman rule and Roman civilisation.<sup>159</sup>

To the east of Loughor Bridge, the archaeologist would have been within *Civitas Silurum* and within what Haverfield himself would have regarded as the civil zone, yet above he regarded it as being part of the military zone. A further question arises as to what

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid p. 24.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid p. 21.

<sup>159</sup> Haverfield F, *Military aspects of Roman Wales* (Cymmrodorion, London 1910) p. 109.

Haverfield regarded as existing to the west of Loughor Bridge. If it was not part of the military zone but yet was an area characterised by Roman civilisation, what was it? Haverfield provided no answer. That difficulty was carried forward to his discussions of the Roman remains at Carmarthen which he assessed as follows:

...(T)hese remains point to a tiny country town, possibly the capital of the Demetae, if capital be not too grand a word.<sup>160</sup>

Today Carmarthen is known to have been a *civitas* capital,<sup>161</sup> but how should Haverfield's description of 1910 be interpreted? Was he at that point also viewing it as a *civitas* capital? His description is too ambiguous to allow a specific view to be formed.

The above highlights the fact that Haverfield never carried his analysis to its logical conclusion and that aspect appears to have been of key importance to the strategy Lloyd pursued in relation to both the discovery at Caerwent, and Haverfield's interpretation of its implications.

#### **Lloyd and the Caerwent inscription.**

Haverfield's article in *The Athenæum* of 26<sup>th</sup> September 1903 should have highlighted to Lloyd that a major issue needed to be addressed. The discovery of the Caerwent inscription in 1903 and the re-interpretation of the history of Roman Britannia that Haverfield was as a consequence pursuing in a limited manner, posed a major challenge to his analysis. Not only did it point to the need for him to substantially amend the third chapter of his book, a chapter which he had in all probability just completed, but it also posed a fundamental challenge to the model of Welsh history he had developed in 1884 and was in the process of embodying in his *History of Wales*.

Whereas the Lloyd model of Welsh history had depicted an underdeveloped 'Wales' which had retained its tribal integrity, the new discovery pointed to a quite different scenario. Already Lloyd had sustained his thesis despite challenges in relation to the origins of the Goidelic population and doubts regarding the Bronze Age identity of a number of the western tribes. How then did Lloyd respond to the new challenge?

We know that Lloyd was aware of Haverfield's article in *The Athenæum*, for it was cited by him in the first edition of his *History of Wales*.<sup>162</sup> Whilst that work contained an acknowledgment of the discovery of a new inscription at Caerwent, he did not consider its content and sustained his analysis as if the inscription was of no consequence. Having produced an initial draft, it appears that Lloyd was prepared to introduce a minor amendment involving an acknowledgment of the discovery at Caerwent, but was not prepared to accept the need for broader changes. Moreover, with *Civitas Silurum* having been discovered to its east, Lloyd did not feel it appropriate to consider the possibility that the remains at Carmarthen may have been the remains of the *civitas* of the

---

<sup>160</sup> Ibid p. 110.

<sup>161</sup> See e.g. Millett M, *The Romanization of Britain* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 2003) p. 106.

<sup>162</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1911, 1st ed, p. 80 footnote 106.

Demetae.<sup>163</sup> In promoting his thesis that ‘Wales’ had not been Romanised, whilst proclaiming his adherence to the work of Francis Haverfield, Lloyd was ignoring evidence that Haverfield had provided that his analysis of the ‘Welsh’ context was flawed.

Had Lloyd recognised the need to consider further the course of events within the lands of the Silures and Demetae, he could have turned to consider the significance of the Llandâf Charters, for they had already been transcribed and published at his own expense by J Gwenogfryn Evans, in 1893<sup>164</sup>. What is remarkable, however, is the limited use made of those documents by Lloyd in the first and second editions of his *History of Wales*.<sup>165</sup>

In disregarding the significance of the discovery of the Roman inscription at Caerwent in 1903 and ignoring Haverfield’s exposition of its significance, Lloyd had in effect both suppressed key evidence and created a framework in which the Llandâf Charters could be of only marginal relevance to his research. He had failed to address an issue which was of key importance to his central thesis, namely that the Celtic tribes of pre Roman Britannia had survived the Roman conquest largely untouched by Roman culture and institutions.

Whilst the significance of the establishment of the *civitates* is an issue beyond the scope of the present article, it is apparent that the above failure by Lloyd was symptomatic of a broader problem. He was attempting to develop a Welsh version of the outlook of the Oxford school of Germanist historians. He was establishing the foundations of a Brythonic school of Welsh historians, for whom the role of the Brythonic race in creating and sustaining the Welsh nation, was to be central. In seeking to locate the emergence of the Welsh nation in the sixth century, a route through the Roman imperial period had to be plotted for the tribes of ‘Wales’ so that they could emerge untainted from the corrupting influences of the Roman Empire to establish a pristine Christian nation in the post-Roman period. The discovery in 1903 of a pedestal bearing evidence of assimilation of the Silures into the Roman system posed a major threat to that project. As a consequence the evidence had to be disregarded, and acknowledgement of its existence minimised.

In his own defence Lloyd would no doubt have argued that evidence of Romanisation could validly be disregarded as it was of only temporary significance. The problem with such an approach was that a judgement was being made on the basis of intuition rather than on the basis of systematic analysis of the evidence. The judgement was thus liable to be invalid.

Whilst Lloyd was able to sustain his position through to the publication of both the first edition of his *History of Wales* in 1911, and the second edition in 1912, the situation had

---

<sup>163</sup> Ibid pp. 74-5.

<sup>164</sup> Evans J G, (ed) *The text of the Book of Llan Dâf* (National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth 1979). See p. iv.

<sup>165</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1912, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, see index p. 798.

changed fundamentally by the time he began to prepare for the third edition published in 1939. By then he realised that many of the foundations of his earlier analysis were no longer tenable and that he needed to take radical steps to salvage the model of Welsh history he had developed, and his own reputation as a historian. The new introduction he composed to the third edition of his *History of Wales* provides an insight to the strategy he pursued.

### **J E Lloyd and his attempt to salvage the Brythonic version of Welsh history.**

The model of Welsh history which Lloyd had initially constructed in 1884 and which was the basis of the first and second editions of his *History of Wales*, constituted a coherent entity. Accordingly, the opening section of his essay of 1884, and the first three chapters of the *History of Wales*, both fulfilled a crucial role in providing an analytical underpinning to his broader account of Welsh history. In 1884, he explained the relevance of that introductory section of his work in the following terms.

We have now watched the growth of the complex mass which forms the foundations of the Welsh people up to the eve of the Roman occupation. It has been necessary to describe the process in considerable detail, because it furnished the key to a great part of Welsh history. In what has been said of the early British tribes we may find the germs of nearly everything that marks mediæval Wales: the Brythons and the Goidels bend their heads to the storm of Roman conquest and reappear with the fall of the empire in all their old simplicity, leading a pastoral, tribal life for century after century under the shadow of the sternest, most rigid feudalism.<sup>166</sup>

For the Lloyd of 1884, as well as the first and second editions of the *History of Wales*, the continuity that he perceived between the pre-Roman and the post Imperial context was of fundamental importance. It was also on the basis of his understanding of that continuity that Lloyd felt justified in disregarding certain aspects of history, particularly the Roman dimension. He judged that such aspects could be disregarded as they were of only short term relevance and did not contribute to the long term development of the Welsh nation.

In preparing for the publication of the third edition of his *History of Wales*, Lloyd concluded that a number of the analytical assumptions underpinning his work were no longer tenable and so decided to abandon the first three chapters of his work. He then proceeded to compose a new introduction for his *History of Wales*. The nature of that introduction is worthy of careful scrutiny, for it not only betrays the nature of the weaknesses which Lloyd by then recognised existed in his work, but also revealed his attempt to insert new foundations to underpin his concept of Welsh history. The scale of that re-modelling of his *History of Wales* will initially be considered.

In the first and second editions, the first three chapters extended to 90 pages, but in the third edition, that material was replaced by an introduction extending to 27 pages. Moreover, Lloyd did not provide detailed references for the new material he had introduced. Rather, he merely noted that he had drawn extensively on four publications as

---

<sup>166</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1884, p. 365.



well as articles published in the *Archaeologia Cambrensis*.<sup>167</sup> He also explained that the original three chapters were being retained in the new edition,

... for the benefit of readers who may wish to consult the authorities mentioned in the footnotes and who may have occasion to refer to the pagination of the original edition.<sup>168</sup>

How did the new introductory chapter differ in content from the original first three chapters of earlier editions? Lloyd's initial analysis had been modelled on that of the Oxford school of Germanist historians, with the purported Brythonic race fulfilling a complementary role in Wales, to that fulfilled by the Saxon race in England. In composing the introduction to the third edition, Lloyd recognised the need to largely abandon his racial theory. Certainly he continued to employ the concept of race, but it no longer constituted a theoretical foundation for his work. For the Lloyd of 1939, the concept of race seemed to equate to little more than a means of referring to social groups.<sup>169</sup>

By then, the foundations of his earlier racially based analysis were being challenged on a number of fronts within the broader academic community. As a consequence he had to acknowledge that his identification of the Bronze Age with a Goidelic population and the Iron Age with a Brythonic population was no longer valid. He also noted the contemporary archaeological trend to regard the migration of a Celtic population to Britain as having occurred a little prior to the Belgic migrations to Britain, that view further undermining his analysis.<sup>170</sup> Furthermore, his model of history was severely damaged by his acknowledgement that Caesar's claim that there existed a simple division between the primitive inland tribes and the more developed tribes of the south east, was not supported by the archaeological evidence.<sup>171</sup>

That in itself removed from his analysis the key dynamic of ethnic and tribal conflict which according to his earlier model of Welsh history had resulted in the emergence of the Welsh nation. Lloyd's attempt to construct an account of Welsh history based on the model of the Oxford school of Germanist historians had effectively collapsed. His claim to be able to disregard certain aspects of history, particularly the Roman aspect, on the basis that he judged some to be merely of short term relevance and as not contributing to the long term development of the Welsh nation, was also patently questionable.

---

<sup>167</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1939, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, pp. xxix-lv & lvi.

<sup>168</sup> Ibid p. v.

<sup>169</sup> In his introduction he employed the concept on a number of occasions. See ibid p. xxx where he refers to 'the Cro-Magnon race' ; p. xxxi where he refers to 'a race of fishermen'. On page xxxiii he posed the question as to who were 'the race' that carried neolithic culture to Wales, and further referred to the 'Alpine race' who carried Bronze Age culture to Britain, subsequently (p. xxxiv) seeing them as having probably 'improved our racial stock'. He also saw a new phase in the Bronze Age, dating to about 1000 B.C., being carried to Britain by 'a new race of invaders'. (p. xxxv)

<sup>170</sup> Ibid, see his discussion of 'The Celtic Question' pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

The implications of Lloyd's abandonment of his own theoretical assumptions had implications for the whole of his work. The extent of those implications are difficult to judge, for that aspect can only be clarified in the light of alternative accounts of Welsh history which overcome the major weaknesses he entrenched in the subject. One aspect is however quite clear, namely that Lloyd's claim that Wales developed a national consciousness in the immediate post Imperial context is highly suspect. Given that his broader historical model had proved invalid, his claim regarding the development of a distinct Welsh national consciousness in the period after 409 is called into question.

From the perspective of the present author, the evidence suggests that a collective Romano Britannic consciousness probably emerged gradually following the Roman conquest, with that consciousness coexisting with the consciousness sustained by the native population who regarded themselves as being *Cymry*. Accordingly, even in the Roman period there appears to have been multiple overlapping identities within Roman Britannia. Discussion of such complexities is, however, beyond the scope of the present article. Rather the focus must remain on J E Lloyd and the implications of the course of action he followed in 1939 in publishing the third edition of his work. In recognising the need to abandon the first three chapters, how did Lloyd attempt to introduce a new theoretical underpinning for his work?

In the 1939 edition, it appears that Lloyd sought to replace the racial determinism of earlier versions with a new geographical determinism. In the opening paragraph to the new introduction he stated:

In the story of this island of Great Britain, it has become customary to distinguish between the Lowland and the Highland Zone. ... More and more has it been realised that this contrast in physical formation is not merely a fact of geography, but has also profoundly influenced the history of the country. ... Nor is this problem one for the historian only, ... since archæology has made it evident that these factors of physical geography – altitude, climate, soil, drainage – worked even more powerfully in those remote ages than in days when it is possible to study their action with the aid of literary sources.<sup>172</sup>

In abandoning his earlier social theory, it was on the basis of Wales as part of the Highland Zone of Britain that Lloyd attempted to sustain his model of an underdeveloped Wales distinct from much of the remainder of Roman Britannia.<sup>173</sup> He also buttressed that approach by noting the possibility that throughout much of the highlands of Wales there was a direct transition from the Bronze Age to the Roman period, without the Iron Age ever having much impact.<sup>174</sup> Such a view contrasts with our contemporary archaeological evidence which dates the transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age as occurring in the period from about 800 B.C. to 550 B.C.<sup>175</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid p. xxix.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid pp. xxix-xxx.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid xxxvi.

<sup>175</sup> Op cit Lynch F, Aldhouse-Green S & Davies J L (eds) 2000, pp. 150-219.

In establishing his new framework, Lloyd also recognised the need to accommodate into Welsh history an aspect of Roman history he had earlier suppressed. In order to achieve that transition he committed a volte-face of major proportions. In his first edition of his *History of Wales* the Silures were depicted as an Iberian people located in an isolated position to the north of the Severn Sea.<sup>176</sup> In the new introduction, Lloyd saw the land of the Silures as being particularly open to foreign influences from across the Bristol Channel and at last he recognised the Silures as an Iron Age people,<sup>177</sup> an aspect which fully accords with the modern archaeological perspective.<sup>178</sup> Lloyd also acknowledged that the Silures had been integrated into the Roman system. Having referred to their hill fort at Llanmelin he saw the process of conquest and assimilation in the following terms.

They remained there, perched upon their limestone rock, until the conquest of the Silurian country about 75 A.D., at last dislodged them. By persuasion or by force, they were then induced to come down to the plain, where in a short space of time the Romano-British town of *Venta Silurum* was established as a new centre for the district.<sup>179</sup>

Such a description should not be seen as accurately reflecting the complex process underpinning the establishment of a Roman *civitas*. Lloyd had, however, acknowledged that process of Romanisation, and having taken that step he proceeded to provide a brief account of discoveries at *Venta Silurum*. That seems to have been a reluctant eleventh hour conversion which led no further, for it is worthy of note that he did not enter on a broader analysis of the existence of *civitates* within western Britannia, and their broader significance to the understanding of early 'Welsh' society. Such an undertaking would have posed a deep threat to the remainder of his work. His primary concern was to defend the core of his earlier analysis of post Imperial society and the process of national formation which formed the foundation of his analysis of that period.

Despite his reluctance to abandon the intellectual straitjacket he had initially donned in 1884, Lloyd's overall assessment of the impact of the Roman conquest on 'Wales' was markedly more restrained in 1939 as compared to his earlier view. In 1939 he merely claimed that,

... (t)here was no such Romanisation of the native inhabitants as was witnessed on the Continent, and Wales, therefore emerges from the Roman occupation as an essentially Celtic country.<sup>180</sup>

By 1939 he no longer claimed that the old Celtic tribal structure had survived the Roman conquest.<sup>181</sup> Implicitly, he recognised that the process of Romanisation had wrought significant changes to the social structure but by 1939 it was too late for him to pursue

---

<sup>176</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1911, 1<sup>st</sup> ed, pp. 37-8.

<sup>177</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1939, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, pp. xxxvi.

<sup>178</sup> For a history of the Silures see Howell R, *Searching for the Silures, an Iron Age tribe in south-east Wales* (Tempus, Stroud 2006)

<sup>179</sup> Op cit Lloyd J E, 1939, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, pp. xxxvi.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. vol 1 p. lv.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid 1<sup>st</sup> ed, p. 89.

the matter. Rather, he cast a shroud over the issue by confining himself to a claim that Wales had survived ‘as an essentially Celtic country’. Such a nebulous claim can be interpreted as an acknowledgement on his behalf that he had failed to get to grips with the impact of the Roman conquest on Wales.

With his attempt at applying the methodology of the Oxford school of Germanist historians to Welsh history having collapsed, and having largely excluded the Roman dimension from consideration, Lloyd’s analysis drew to a close on a note of deep uncertainty. Having abandoned the first three chapters of the first and second editions of his *History of Wales*, the nucleus of his work focused on the emergence of a Welsh national consciousness in the post-Imperial context, with that consciousness continuing through to the fall of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd in 1282.

The difficulty is that in 1939 Lloyd found it necessary to abandon the analytical foundations of that perspective. Whether he was able to replace those foundations with a satisfactory alternative is an issue which has never been satisfactorily addressed by Welsh historians. It is perhaps an issue the consideration of which could prove beneficial to Welsh History as a discipline in the contemporary context.

Emyr W Williams  
30.10.2013