

Introduction

pp. 1-34

Lhuyd, Edward, 1660-1709., (2009) Archæologia Britannica : texts & translations , null Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies, National Library of Wales

Atgoffir staff a myfyrwyr Prifysgol Cymru Y Drindod Dewi Sant bod hawlfraint ar y darn hwn ac ar y gwaith y cafodd ei gymryd ohono. Gwnaed y Copi Digidol hwn o dan delerau trwydded CLA sy'n caniatáu i chi:

- fynd at gopi a'i lwytho i lawr;
- argraffu copi;

Sylwch bod y deunydd hwn yn UNIG at ddefnydd myfyrwyr sydd wedi cofrestru ar y cwrs astudio fel y nodir yn yr adran isod. Caniateir i holl staff a myfyrwyr eraill ddarllen y deunydd yn unig ac ni ddylent ei lwytho i lawr ac/neu argraffu copi

Mae'r Copi Digidol hwn ac unrhyw gopi digidol neu brintiedig a ddarparwyd i chi, neu a wnaed gennych, o dan delerau'r Drwydded hon, i'w ddefnyddio gyda'r Cwrs Astudio hwn. Gellwch gadw copïau o'r fath ar ôl i'r cwrs ddod i ben, ond at eich defnydd personol eich hun yn unig. Bydd pob copi (yn cynnwys copïau electronig) yn cynnwys y Rhybudd Hawlfraint hwn a bydd yn rhaid eu dinistrio ac/neu eu dileu pan fydd Prifysgol Cymru Y Drindod Dewi Sant yn galw am hynny.

Ac eithrio'r hyn a ganiateir gan gyfraith hawlfraint, ni chaniateir copïo, cadw neu ddosbarthu pellach (yn cynnwys drwy e-bost) heb ganiatâd deiliad yr hawlfraint.

Mae gan yr awdur (ac mae'r term hwnnw'n cynnwys arlunwyr a chreuwyr gweledol eraill) hawliau moesol dros y gwaith ac ni all staff na myfyrwyr achosi, na chaniatáu, i'r gwaith gael ei aflunio, ei lurgunio neu ei addasu mewn unrhyw ffordd arall, neu ei drin yn ddiraddiol mewn unrhyw ffordd, a fyddai'n niweidiol i anrhydedd neu enw da'r awdur.

Mae hon yn fersiwn ddigidol o ddeunydd hawlfraint a wnaed dan drwydded gan ddeiliad yr hawl, ac ni ellir sicrhau ei chywirdeb. Cyfeiriwch at yr argraffiad cyhoeddedig gwreiddiol os gwelwch yn dda.

Trwyddedwyd i'w ddefnyddio ar gyfer y cwrs HPCS4002 - An Introduction to the Celtic Languages

Teitl: Archæologia Britannica : texts & translations

Enw'r Awdur: Lhuyd, Edward, 1660-1709.

Enw'r Cyhoeddwr: Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies, National Library of Wales

Staff and students of the University of Wales, Trinity Saint David are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA licence which allows you to:

- access and download a copy;
- print out a copy;

Please note that this material is for use ONLY by students registered on the course of study as stated in the section below. All other staff and students are only entitled to browse the material and should not download and/or print out a copy.

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this Course of Study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by University of Wales, Trinity Saint David.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author. This is a digital version of copyright material made under licence from the rightsholder, and its accuracy cannot be guaranteed. Please refer to the original published edition.

Course of Study: HPCS4002 - An Introduction to the Celtic Languages

Title: Archæologia Britannica : texts & translations

Name of Author: Lhuyd, Edward, 1660-1709.

Name of Publisher: Centre for Advanced Welsh and Celtic Studies, National Library of Wales

INTRODUCTION

THE series of volumes to be entitled *Archæologia Britannica* together with its accompanying studies which was announced in a *Design* (Proposal) published in November 1695¹ was an ambitious, but not unrealistic, personal project undertaken by Edward Lhwyd² (c. 1660–1709), Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, with a team of assistants. During an extended tour of the Celtic-speaking countries they collected a mass of material relating to the natural history, geology and flora of these lands and to the antiquities, languages, folklore and customs, history and literatures of their peoples which Lhwyd, on his return to Oxford, began to set in order and to analyse in greater depth than he had been able to during his travels. The only part that he succeeded in completing of the *Archæologia* series, however, was the first volume, *Glossography*, which was printed at the University Press and published in May 1707, a mere two years before his untimely death at the age of 49. The book is a remarkable achievement, not only on account of the range of its linguistic content but even more especially because of its innovative and structured methodology for establishing the affinities of languages. *Glossography*,³ the first truly comparative compendium of Celtic languages, is a significant milestone in the history of European comparative linguistics, a pioneering study which would not be matched until the advent of the new philology of the nineteenth century.

Edward Lhwyd was born, probably in 1660, the illegitimate son of Edward Lloyd of Llanforda, Oswestry, and Bridget Pryse of Gogerddan, north Cardiganshire. Both were old established gentry families, the former in decline while the latter was on the rise. Edward was brought up by his father at Llanforda in precarious financial circumstances but in the favourable environment of scientific experiments and modern horticulture, in which his father was involved, and of field botany under the tutelage of Edward Morgan, 'a skilful botanist' who had been gardener in Westminster. After his father's death Lhwyd entered Jesus College Oxford in 1682 to read law but he was soon drawn to the

¹ See below pages [35–9]. Lhwyd's handwritten version, together with a printed copy, is in Oxford, Bodley MS Ashmole 1820a, f. 228, 230.

² For the varying forms of the surname and Lhwyd's preferred choice see Brynley F. Roberts, 'Lloyd – Lhuyd – Lhwyd', *Y Traethodydd*, 151 (1996), 180–3.

³ 'Glossography' had a general meaning of 'compiling a glossary' and more narrowly, as derived from gloss, of 'an expounding of strange words' (1623); see *OED*, 'glossography'. Lhwyd had in mind as the basis of his work the comparison of the lexicon of Celtic languages as a guide to their affinities, but inevitably, as part of the wider *Archæologia*, the comparison broadened and became of more general application. 'Archæologia', 'archaeology', was the study and description of antiquities, both physical and literary; see *OED*, 'archaeology'.

new Ashmolean Museum and to meetings of the Oxford Philosophical Society under the guidance of Robert Plot, the professor of chemistry and Keeper of the Museum. Lhwyd was to spend the rest of his life in Oxford, as Under-keeper (1689) and then Keeper (1691) of the Ashmolean Museum, where he died, in his room on the ground floor, on 30 June 1709. He was buried the following day in the Welsh aisle, St. Michael's church, Oxford. The university had conferred an honorary M.A. upon him in 1701 and he had been elected senior Divinity Bedel in 1709. He was made a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1708.

Though Edward Lhwyd—he adopted the Welsh form of the family name about 1688—had begun to make a name for himself as an accomplished field botanist and palaeontologist following his appointment as Under-keeper at the Ashmolean Museum and in spite of his commitment to publish an eagerly awaited classified catalogue of British fossils,⁴ he was already being attracted to the study of antiquities and, as a consequence, to the languages of Britain. These interests were further stimulated by the queries on Welsh matters that were being put to him by English and other antiquaries,⁵ but they were given a sharper focus when, now Keeper of the Museum, he was invited by Edmund Gibson in April 1693 to become one of the contributors to his new English-language edition of William Camden's *Britannia* and to write the additions to the accounts of the north Wales counties. Lhwyd agreed first 'to doe something for two or three counties' but eventually he undertook the revision of all the Welsh entries. His familiarity with recently-published descriptions ('Natural Histories') of English counties and his close association with Robert Plot, himself a major figure in the development of regional studies and in the use of questionnaires as a means of collecting data, ensured that Lhwyd had clear views on what was required. In 1693 he undertook brief tours of south Wales (an area less familiar to him than the north and the Marches) and then, using his own observations in the field and information given to him by a number of correspondents, produced descriptions of all the Welsh counties. Their comprehensive detail and accuracy, allied with his judicious comments on the origin and significance of many of the monuments and phenomena that he observed, made them by common

4 This was published in London in 1699 as *Lithophylacii Britannici Ichnographia sive Lapidum aliorumque Fossilium Britannicorum ... Distributio Classica*.

5 He had been copying inscriptions in north Wales in the 1680s and he had begun to learn Irish by 1694. R. T. Gunther, *Life and letters of Edward Lhwyd*, Early Science in Oxford, vol. XIV, Oxford, 1945 (henceforth G), 249.

consent the most notable of all the revisions in the book.⁶ For his part, Lhwyd was taken with the ambition to write a 'Natural History of Wales'⁷ and he was in no doubt where his primary interest would henceforth lie. In a letter to John Aubrey in November 1693 he referred enthusiastically to his study of 'British antiquities; wherein haveing now got some small relish I think (how vain so ever my endeavours may prove) I shall never quite forsake ym'.⁸ This may have been a long-standing ambition, for in March 1692 he had written to John Lloyd, one of his closest friends, expressing his 'strong fancy ... (if it please God I may live 7 years longer)' to seek encouragement towards writing 'some part of the *History of Wales*',⁹ and no doubt he had shared his hopes with others, among them the Principal and Fellows of Jesus College. In May 1692 Robert Plot, who still regarded Lhwyd as his pupil, suggests that the support of the Principal was assured when he wrote to him:

I cannot blame the Principal and Fellowes of Jesus for wishing for a *Nat. Hist.* of their own Country, finding it now a sort of learning universally approved, and most desired of any, especially since they have too a countreyman of their own so well able to performe it as you are. There are perhaps some particulars relating to that affair, wherein you are not so well skilld as is necessary, but if I had you with me but one summer, I should not doubt but to render you as able for such an

-
- 6 Thomas Hearne's view in April 1706 was that 'excepting what ye Learned Mr Llhuyd ... did', there was 'nothing of any great moment' in the book. See *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, Oxford Historical Society, 1885-1921, (henceforth *Hearne*), I, 217, and later, in May 1713: 'Llhuyd's part about Wales excellent and as good as anything of Camden's own. This a necc. Supplement because of Camden's want of skill both in Irish and British tongues & his not having travelled in Wales', *Hearne*, IV, 169. Modern scholars have remarked on the quality of his work, e.g. 'The one outstanding success', *Antiquity*, 45 (1971), 167, and cf. Graham Parry, *The trophies of time: English antiquarians of the seventeenth century*, Oxford, 1995, 347-53.
- 7 'Natural history' was used in its primary meaning as a description of physical and natural features but it also had a more general use as a wide-ranging survey of both the natural environment and the antiquities and folklore of an area. Lhwyd uses the phrase in both senses.
- 8 G 206. In 1695 he 'could very willingly spend the remainder of [his] days in that employment', G 270. All the more strange, therefore, that he could say to John Morton in February 1696, 'not that I delight in ye study [of antiquities] so much as in nat. History', London, BL MS Sloane 4062, f. 263.
- 9 G 161; cf. G 193. Plot had proposed a Natural History of England in 1673 and had prepared a detailed analysis of what he hoped to achieve. This eventually bore fruit as descriptions of Oxfordshire (1677, 1705) and of Staffordshire (1679, 1686) and in notes on Kent. A volume on Middlesex was also being planned in 1695, G 296.

Undertaking as any man in England.¹⁰

Encouragement came from two directions. One of Lhwyd's Glamorganshire correspondents, John Williams of Swansea, a shrewd palaeontologist and antiquary, praising his contributions to *Britannia* in December 1694, nevertheless 'often secretly' wished that Lhwyd

had leisure and encouragement to your own wishes to frame y^e naturall History of Wales; and the Civil alsoe as far as it may be retrieved and purifi'd from y^e fabulous traditions of our own countryman, or the dry partial accounts of the English writers.¹¹

In April the following year he pursued his suggestion and sought to convince Lhwyd that the difficulties that he foresaw 'might be surmounted if y^e Welsh gentry were warmly solicited to a standing & Generous contribution to encourage & support such a work,' as English gentry had supported Robert Plot in his *Natural history of Stafford-shire*.¹² Williams proved to be an active and energetic ally who succeeded in attracting the support of a number of Glamorgan gentry with whom he was associated by kin or marriage whom he served as chaplain, and it may have been his good offices that led to an invitation to Lhwyd in 1695 from 'some gentlemen in Glamorganshire to undertake a *Natural History of Wales*', together with the promise of financial support over a period of seven years, thus allowing Lhwyd to plan a wide-ranging History which would include antiquities and anything else 'as far as may be consistent with my capacity'.¹³ The Glamorganshire gentry proved to be the most supportive of all the subscribers and *Glossography* was dedicated to Sir Thomas Mansel of Margam, who had been 'so constantly active in procuring subscriptions and payments, and so much the author of the undertaking from the beginning' that Lhwyd could not contemplate dedicating the

10 See R. T. Gunther, *Dr. Plot and the Oxford Philosophical Society*, Early Science in Oxford, vol. XII, Oxford, 1939, 390-1.

11 Bodley MS Ashmole 1817b, f. 301.

12 Bodley MS Ashmole 1817b, f. 303.

13 G 269-70. Lhwyd sets out his plans and timetable in the same letter. F.V. Emery, 'Edward Lhwyd and some of his Glamorgan correspondents', *THSC*, session 1965, 59-114, describes in detail the role of Ven. John Williams, rector of Cheriton, archdeacon of Brecon and of Cardigan, and analyses the list of subscribers in the *Archæologia Britannica*. For the antiquarian interests of Glamorganshire gentry see Philip Jenkins, *The making of a ruling class: the Glamorganshire gentry, 1640-1790*, Cambridge, 1983, 234-8.

book to anyone other than to him.¹⁴ Williams, too, may have been instrumental in ensuring the practical interest of the Principal of Jesus College in the project. Lhwyd wrote to Martin Lister in October 1694:

The Principal of Jesus Coll. talks much of a *History of Wales*, & offers his interest to dispose ye gentry, to give me ye like encouragement yt Dr Plot met with in Staffordshire.¹⁵

Principal Jonathan Edwards was as good as his word and encouraged other gentry to subscribe to the 'design', perhaps most importantly Sir Roger Mostyn of Mostyn Hall whose son, Richard Mostyn of Penbedw, Flintshire, himself an active antiquary, had already contributed material to Lhwyd's additions to *Britannia*.¹⁶

Britannia, as its title suggests, was largely based on Roman (and medieval) Britain. Lhwyd's vision was equally historically-based but he aimed to push the horizon back beyond the Roman period. A study of pre-Roman Britain and of the 'First Planters', mainly by interpreting field monuments, inscriptions, place-names, personal names and literary remains, could not be achieved by county surveys, nor even by a survey of Wales alone; his field of study would have to be the 'Celtic' entity as evidenced by the contemporary Celtic-speaking peoples of Britain, Ireland and Brittany who represented the 'First Inhabitants', the 'ancient Britains'.

The 1695 *Design* which described his planned tour and invited subscriptions to support his journeys, was distributed mainly in Wales, and in London among persons of influence in the Royal Society, Houses of Parliament and elsewhere (a few went to Cornwall), and it was followed a year later by a detailed set of 31 Parochial Queries, sixteen 'in order to the Geography and Antiquities of the Country', followed by a further fifteen 'Queries towards the Natural History', all based on the *Design*. Three copies were to be sent to every parish in Wales to be completed by the local incumbent, schoolmaster or gentry, and the responses would provide a comprehensive collection of data to serve as the basis of the study.¹⁷ His 'Proposal' had made it clear to potential

¹⁴ G 531.

¹⁵ G 249.

¹⁶ G 293.

¹⁷ Lhwyd's handwritten version of the Queries is in Bodley MS Ashmole 1820a, f. 74. The Queries (which are significantly more comprehensive than any of those produced by other contemporary researchers) and most of the responses, together with some of Lhwyd's notes, were edited by Rupert Morris and published as Supplements to *Archaeologia Cambrensis* in 1909, 1910, 1911 under the title *Parochialia*. See also studies by F.V. Emery in *THSC* 1958, 41-53,

contributors that the project would take several years to complete, so much so that in setting out his timetable Lhwyd did not venture to suggest when the Natural History might appear. His most committed supporters in Wales, among them Dr Humphrey Foulkes, rector of St George, Denbighshire, John Lloyd of Rhuthun school, and Richard Mostyn of Penbedw, Flintshire, and leading English scholars like John Ray, Martin Lister, Edmund Gibson and William Nicolson were impressed by what was intended. J. Byrom, in a warm letter to Thomas Tanner following a visit from Lhwyd, could barely contain his enthusiasm, which he expressed memorably:

I am willing to think yt he will meet wth an encouragement wch such a work deserves, it being in my opinion ye most useful service, yt can be done to our antiquitys. We shall then, I hope see our 1st planters as naked as they went, without ye imaginary dresse of mere art or fancy: then we shal see old citys & villages rise up from their ruines, wth their ancient names & the etymologies of 'em. I can hardly forbear saying more but I must consider yt I am writting a letter.¹⁸

The initial response of subscribers was also encouraging¹⁹ but as might have been expected, many failed to maintain their promised subscriptions throughout the period of the tour, and others expressed misgivings about the time-scale. The lack of financial support was to remain one of Lhwyd's constant concerns. He was fortunate that in Walter Thomas of Bernard's Inn he found an honest and effective agent.²⁰

After a brief period of field work in Wales during April–October 1696 and after making the necessary administrative arrangements for collecting and recording subscriptions, Lhwyd and his three assistants, David Parry, William Jones and Robert Wynne, set out in May 1697, returning to Oxford in March 1701 (Jones and Wynne had returned some weeks previously).

Lhwyd's project was a comprehensive one. He envisaged a number of volumes, perhaps from four to six: *An Historical & Geographical Dictionary* (an onomasticon of

ibid. 1965, 59–114, *Cylchgrawn Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru / National Library of Wales Journal*, 10 (1958), 395–402, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 124 (1975), 102–10. The Queries were adapted and used by Lhwyd and his assistants during the tour as *aides-memoire* in note-taking and in interviews.

18 G 286–7.

19 G 292–5, 296, 297, 298.

20 For the financial details of subscriptions to the tour, see G 264, Brynley F. Roberts, 'Cyhoeddiadau Edward Lhwyd', *Y Llyfr yng Nghymru / Welsh Book Studies*, 1 (1998), 21–58, (40–1).

antiquities, personal and place-names of historical significance); *Archæologia Britannica* in four parts (not necessarily four volumes), (i) the languages of Britain and their affinities, (ii) customs and traditions, (iii) pre-Roman monuments, (iv) Roman and Welsh monuments and inscriptions; and the *Natural History of Wales*. As he began his work on the material that he had gathered on his return to Oxford, Lhwyd almost immediately changed his publication plans and decided to get the *Archæologia* out before the *Dictionary*, 'as thinking it may meet with more buyers, & having a tolerable apparatus for it'.²¹ Foulkes greeted Lhwyd on his return to Oxford and pressed him, 'I suppose by this time you have recovered yr breath and can readily tell us when yr Geographical & Historical Dictionary which most people now impatiently expect to hear something of, may be ready for ye press.' He continued to impress on Lhwyd the urgency of publishing his work, criticising his 'over cautious policy of keeping the world in ignorance' and he suggested a taster in the form of a 'short account by way of an Essay in a sixpenny pamphlet of all yr novells', adding 'I am sure it would appease the subscribers'.²² Although the University Press was to undertake the printing of the *Archæologia*, the costs of printing and publishing were Lhwyd's personal responsibility²³ and he had made it clear that his patrons and benefactors were supporting only the costs of his tour, though he later proposed presenting a copy of the book to those who had contributed 20/- or more *per annum*.

By 1703, acutely aware how slowly the printing was progressing (the book was in the press from September 1703 to May 1707) and under increasing pressure to publish even though he had been unable to gain acceptable terms from London booksellers, he had no option but to invite subscriptions for the *Archæologia*.²⁴ This notice was issued 10 July 1703²⁵ and though William Nicolson, bishop of Carlisle,²⁶ actively promoted subscrip-

21 G 461. He had originally intended printing the volumes in the order in which they appeared in the *Design*. *Natural History* had long given way to 'the antiquities of Wales &c. as [his] main aime and designe', letter to John Lloyd, 22 September 1695, G 285. In October 1703 Lhwyd told Josiah Babington that his next volume would 'take in' archaeological remains like the gold rings that he had sent him, G 490.

22 29 May 1701, Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 37, 8 October 1701, Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 39.

23 One of Lhwyd's contracts with the printers survives in Bodley MS Ashmole 1820a, f. 231; for the financial burden of publishing this first volume see Brynley F. Roberts, 'Edward Lhuyd's debts', *BBCS*, 26 (1975), 353-9.

24 His unhappy experience with the publishers of the 1695 *Britannia* was to make Lhwyd a bitter critic of booksellers and publishers throughout his career.

25 See pages [49-51] below.

26 William Nicolson (1655-1727), bishop of Carlisle and of Derry, was a leading antiquary and virtuoso whose scholarly interests matched those of Lhwyd with whom he maintained a long

tions (with some success), he voiced what may have been general concerns about its price and especially its timetable, given the notorious delays of the Oxford Press: 'God knowes (say they) when 'twill be finish'd'.²⁷ The notice is more defensive than the documents of 1695, an indication of Lhwyd's increasing frustration with the attitudes of some in the academic community and beyond. He had, however, promised to print a list of subscribers to his journeys and of those who had provided other support in the volume and this was duly done. (A few names which had been 'accidentally omitted' were printed on a separate sheet and inserted into about half the printing; the complete list was intended to appear in the second volume).²⁸

In spite of Lhwyd's dissatisfaction with his printers and his complaints that progress was slow, it has to be acknowledged that *Glossography* was a difficult undertaking for the compositors. It is a book of 464 pages, most of which are in three columns; it has prefaces in three languages other than English; it uses special fonts and symbols, and contains lists of individual words and some texts in a variety of languages. The Irish-English Dictionary, part 10, the final section of the book, was the first to be printed (which is why it has no page numbers) but it soon became apparent that the press lacked sufficient letters to continue. By August 1704 they had reached S, 22 sheets, but the font that Lhwyd required for much of his book was already being used by the same compositor who was also working on George Hickes's *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus*. Neither author was happy but priority was given to Hickes whose final volume appeared in 1705. The delay had one advantage in that it allowed Lhwyd to print and to send the page proofs of the Irish Dictionary to Jeremiah Pepyat, the Dublin bookseller, and three copies to enable a few Irish scholars to make corrections and to attract potential purchasers; others copies were sent to three Scottish scholars and also to Bishop William Nicolson and Henry Rowlands. In fact, Lhwyd received only two responses, one each from Ireland and Scotland. He continued to write and to send sections of *Glossography* to the press and the book was therefore printed piecemeal with the final order of its component parts (and indeed their content) not decided until late

and mutually fruitful correspondence. See Francis Godwin James, *North Country Bishop: a biography of William Nicolson*, Yale University Press, 1956; Joseph M. Levine, 'Nicolson as a Virtuoso' in Clyve Jones and Geoffrey Holmes, eds, *The London Diaries of William Nicolson Bishop of Carlisle 1702-1718*, Oxford, 1985, 11-17.

27 Letter to Lhwyd, 2 August 1703, Bodley MS Ashmole 1816, f. 532.

28 G 538. Remarkably, some copies of the book do not have the dedication to Sir Thomas Mansel.

in the day.²⁹

By December 1704 Lhwyd could report that about a third of the book had been completed; by July 1705 sections 1 and 2, the Comparative Etymology and Comparative Vocabulary, 48 sheets, were finished, and 90 sheets were ready by 1706. The book was eventually made up of 116 sheets. The print run seems to have been about 600 copies, sold for 16/- unbound, and 18/6 bound. A few 'large-paper', de-luxe copies were also produced for patrons like Sir George Harkham, Sir Roger Mostyn, Richard Mostyn and the Earl of Carbury (who refused to honour his intended subscription and whose copy was sold to a bookseller for two guineas).³⁰ When *Glossography*, volume 1 of the *Archæologia Britannica*, finally appeared in May 1707 it was warmly welcomed by those who understood what it was about and who shared in its aims, e.g. George Hickes, Edmund Gibson, William Baxter,³¹ Roderic O'Flaherty and other Irish and Scottish scholars, and by 'Linguists and Antiquaries in these parts' (London)³² as well as others in Wales who had always been supportive. Not all, however, shared their enthusiasm. Some had a 'mean opinion' of the book even before its publication³³ and that Lhwyd was well aware of hostility to his work, and presumably to himself, is clear from comments in his correspondence and in the Prefaces to the *Archæologia*:

29 In October 1706 Lhwyd told Bishop Humphrey Humphreys that the delays in the printing had allowed him to expand some 'tracts' and the Irish Dictionary 'twice as large as I design'd; And inserted also an Armoric Grammar and Vocabulary with some other Things I had no thoughts of at the Beginning of Printing', *BBCS*, 17 (1957), 114. The consequence was that some sections, including the Cornish dictionary, had to be held over until the following volume. It appears that sections 1 and 2 were among the last to be printed, probably because Lhwyd continued to work on these crucial sections throughout the printing period, see G 505, 28 July 1705. Anne and William O'Sullivan trace the printing history and analyse the evidence of Lhwyd's drafts of sections of the *Glossography* in his papers at Trinity College Dublin in the Introduction to the facsimile edition, *Archæologia Britannica*, [henceforth O'Sullivan] Shannon, Irish University Press, 1971, vi-xi. See also Brynley F. Roberts, 'Cyhoeddiadau Edward Lhwyd', *Y Llyfr yng Nghymru / Welsh Book Studies*, 1 (1998), 21-58, (44-8).

30 G 535, 538.

31 Baxter sent a warm commendation to the *Philosophical Transactions*, 331, 1707, 2438-44, which was later printed as a separate sheet (with additions by Lhwyd) and which is sometimes bound in with copies of the *Archæologia*. See John R. Kenyon, 'William Baxter and Edward Lhwyd's *Archæologia Britannica*', *BBCS*, 34 (1987), 118-20. For a copy of the commendation see below pages [233-6].

32 G 532.

33 William Beveridge, bishop of St Asaph, had 'but an indifferent opinion of your undertaking but for reasons best known to himself', Humphrey Foulkes to Lhwyd, 10 January [1707], Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 48.

Some leading men of our own nation were pleas'd to take private occasions of talking slightly of it, whilst 'twas in the press, which has done it no small prejudice; and I have been told since the publishing that the same mean notion of it is stil retain'd.³⁴

He was more concerned about the effect such attitudes might have on the reception and sales of the book and he was able to dismiss his critics as being those who 'have yet given the world no proof of their talent in such studies'.³⁵ Granted that some of the hostility was personal, there was, nevertheless, a more general disparagement of aspects of the work of antiquarian-philologists like Lhwyd, as expressed bluntly by Maurice Jones, a long-standing friend and collaborator who complained that he had found it difficult to attract purchasers:

the Book (tho' there is a vast deal of learning & industry in it) is generally judg'd to be but too useless in that it gives light into those old languages, y^t are in this age of little use & obsolete because that little Commerce or Trade is had in them wth any other nations; tho' none can deny or disown the high character you deserve & learning you shewed in the light you gave into them.³⁶

Lhwyd responded to this attitude in one of his prefaces:

I am very sensible that Etymological Observations, have been look'd upon but as a Trifling and Groundless Disquisition; and the Preservation of Antiquated Languages, thought a Service of no use to Letters. But as the Learned *Vossius* and Father *Besnier* have satisfi'd the Ingenious, as to the Usefulness of the one; So I dare presume that upon the Publishing the *Thesaurus Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium*,

34 Letter to Richard Mostyn, 2 November 1707, G 534.

35 G 534. Cf. Lhwyd's spirited comments in the Preface, pages [63–64] below, and the Welsh Preface, pages [140–41] below. Thomas Hearne (*Hearne*, I, 24, 2 July 1707), reported Oxford gossip as to the identity of a 'certain Gentleman who had run down ye work as no great use' in the Preface. Years later, 26 September 1719, Hearne noted the view that the *Archæologia* should have been in Latin, '& yt it was despised at Paris & elsewhere, partly because 'twas not in yt Language' (*Hearne*, VII, 50).

36 Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 285, Maurice Jones to Lhwyd, 24 January 1708; this after Jones had thanked Lhwyd for a copy of the *Archæologia* 'wch is soe learned, & expresses soe indefatigable an industry as well as parts in the Compiler, that J could heartily wish J were Capable of understanding it, but am fare from it', a comment hardly designed to encourage the author.

now almost Printed, the World will be abundantly convinc'd of the Necessity of the other.³⁷

By associating his work with that of Dean George Hickes and other Oxford scholars who were promoting Old English studies Lhwyd was able to claim a broader context for his work than the specifically British-Irish one and to make it more generally acceptable to those who sought 'a Clearer Notion than we have had hitherto of the most Ancient Languages, and Consequently of the Origin of the First Colonies of these Kingdoms', especially if it were used in conjunction with the 'late Exquisite Performance of Dr Hicks',³⁸ a point made to Lhwyd by Nicolson in a letter 18 June 1705:

Now that Dr Hickes's Saxon Thesaurus is gotten abroad, had we your Welsh and Irish Mines also discover'd, what advances should we make in the true (Genuine) Antiquities of this Island? ³⁹

It is striking that a common thread running through many of the commendatory verses printed in *Glossography* is that Lhwyd has revived and restored the ancient and neglected languages of Wales, Scotland and Ireland.

Nevertheless, the uncompromising nature of the discussion of 'the languages of Britain and their affinities' in the first volume of *Archæologia Britannica* may have startled some readers who had expected a more historical approach or at least a more generally popular work. Thomas Smith remarked to Hearne that 'the generality of subscribers are dissatisfied with it' and the ever loyal and sage Humphrey Foulkes, whose ear was always close to the ground, suggested to Lhwyd in April 1706 that 'your 2^d vol. of Customs would have been much more acceptable to y^e Gentry', and he added, 'to be sure you'll promise that pleasant entertaining vol. shall follow very suddenly this dry & jejune one'.⁴⁰ By now, however, Lhwyd was even more committed to documentary history—he and his assistants were actively seeking out charters and grants of religious houses throughout Wales and in major libraries⁴¹—and to examining the role of historical linguistics and etymology for the historian. The key to interpreting much of the evidence that Lhwyd intended presenting in the complete *Archæologia*, be it literary, epigraphic or

37 p. [145] below.

38 p. [54] below.

39 Bodley MS Ashmole 1816, f. 540.

40 Hearne, II, 58, 4 October 1707; Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 47.

41 See G 536–7, *Cylchgrawn Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru / National Library of Wales Journal*, 10 (1958), 422–3; Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 39.

onomastic, was the ability to use the native languages of Britain and Ireland effectively, and as language affinities were a sign of the historical relationships of the speakers of languages it was essential to be able to distinguish between borrowings and cognates; etymology was one of the historian's essential tools.

Glossography, which was a collection of grammars, dictionaries and comparative vocabularies and which, more importantly, attempted to 'methodise' the correspondence of languages one with another, was a logical choice as the first volume of *Archæologia Britannica* to be published; as Lhwyd himself pointed out in his Preface, 'the Reason for publishing this Volume first will be I presume Obvious to every one'.

The volume contains two types of linguistic material: formal grammars of Irish, Breton and Cornish with vocabularies, and discussions and examples of etymologies. Lhwyd had realised from the first that his *History of Wales* would have a strong linguistic base. Even before 1694, when he had begun learning Irish so that he might be a better critic in British in case he should ever be concerned in the History of Wales, there are signs of an organised response to questions of language. His insistence (circa 1689) on writing *q* rather than *qu* in Latin (*quatuor*, *quo* etc. appear as *qatuor*, *qô*), is interesting because comments made by Robert Plot⁴² suggest that his reasons are strictly phonetic: *qu* represents a single voiceless labialized velar plosive [k^w], not a voiceless velar plosive followed by [w], and this phoneme should logically be denoted by a single grapheme *q* without the superfluous *u*. More significant as an indication of the way in which Lhwyd's thinking and methodology were developing at this time is a comparative glossary of Irish and Welsh words agreeing in 'sense and sound' (*sensum et sonum*), together with their Latin equivalents, which he prepared for John Aubrey in 1689.⁴³ Some of the Welsh words have notes on their morphology, and other comments on local usage and sources reveal how far Lhwyd had progressed in his structured linguistic work. The glossary is prefaced by a guide to Welsh spelling and pronunciation and closes with a complaint that the lack of an Irish dictionary was a hindrance to a fuller comparison, a difficulty that he attempted to overcome in *Archæologia Britannica* some fifteen years later. A different topic but addressed equally methodically appears in a letter which Lhwyd, using the pseudonym Mredydh Owen, sent to Robert Plot in May 1690. This begins as a series of answers to queries about 'curiosities' in Nant Ffrancon but soon turns to discuss Dr. Bernard's contention⁴⁴ that, judging from John Davies's Welsh-Latin Dictionary (1632), half of the Welsh lexicon derived from Latin, a quarter from English, leaving a

42 G 134.

43 Bodley MS Aubrey 5, f. 6-7v.

44 In his Epistle in George Hickes's *Institutiones grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae et Moeso-Gothicae*, 1689.

mere quarter of Welsh origin. Lhwyd's analysis produced quite different results (one sixth, 1500 words, are Latin and one fortieth, 200 words, are English), but he also presented a methodology for determining which had been borrowed from Latin and which were 'cooriginale'. Thus Welsh words 'agreeing in sound and signification' with Latin or English could be shown to be cognates, not borrowings, if they were also to be found in languages whose speakers historically had not been in contact, as the Irish and the Romans, or the Bretons and the English. He used the same analytical approach later that year when John Ray asked him to give his views on some north-country English words which might be related to Welsh, bearing 'affinity ... both in sound and signification.'⁴⁵ The problem was how to distinguish the similarities which were due to language contact from those which were evidence for the affinity of the old British with the languages of Germany and Denmark. Logically, he claimed, the words could not be borrowings from English into Welsh, as, among other reasons, some were found in Breton. Some years later Humphrey Foulkes was to carry out a similar exercise with the list of French and Welsh words agreeing in sound and signification which Camden had published. Latin, French and Welsh, with Irish as an outside control, would reveal elements of the vocabulary of Gaulish, as French words having no affinity with Latin must be of Celtic origin. Lhwyd's method is almost chemical in its search for isolating agents. He needs good collections of data and he is not prepared simply to compare sets of words similar in sound from two languages. As he remarked in 1692 when John Aubrey mentioned a young Cornishman who had noted 'many British words amongst the natives' of Catalonia, 'tis possible this gentleman having pickd out five or six parallel words (which is easily done out of any language in these parts of Europe) took it for granted, from their guttural pronunciation, that there might be many more'.⁴⁶

Lhwyd at this stage in his studies, circa 1690, is concerned with the broad question of the origins and inter-relationships of languages. He is dealing with individual words, attempting to deduce evidence, which can be used together with written sources, for the movements of peoples. Etymologizing was a common tool in such historico-linguistic studies and Lhwyd is the inheritor of a great deal of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writing on these matters in western Europe. His emphasis on borrowings and cognates as explanations of similarities between languages, and his attempts to devise a rational methodology to distinguish between them place him in the mainstream of seventeenth-century developments and make him a significant contributor to contemporary linguistic thought. His early methodology served to state the relationships of single words within

45 G 110, See page [21] below.

46 G 157.

an accepted pattern, based on historical evidence, of related languages. The real need was to establish these relationships on linguistic grounds. By the time he came to write the *Archæologia* he had turned his attention to a detailed consideration of linguistic correspondences, most especially of the rules governing phonetic change.⁴⁷ Two of the ten sections of the *Archæologia* are devoted to etymology (a third, section II, is A Comparative Vocabulary of the Celtic languages which also notes cognate forms), and both of these, viz. I Comparative Etymology or Remarks on the alteration of languages, and VIII An Essay towards a British Etymologicon, contain discussions of the criteria which Lhwyd used to determine correspondences between compared words. Real or assumed similarity of sound and sense had led to an unregulated 'correspondence of letters' by which orthographical forms might be altered according to a semantic theory of word composition instead of that a methodical analysis of phonetic correspondences that should decide what in fact was comparable. Johannes de Laet drew attention to the danger in 1643:

If you are willing to change letters, to transpose syllables, to add and subtract, you will nowhere find something that cannot be forced into this or that similarity; but to consider this as evidence for the origin of peoples—this is truly not proved as far as I am concerned.⁴⁸

Lhwyd's guidelines for etymology are well-formulated: e.g. agreement or analogy of signification is always required; declensions and conjugations are proper to individual languages; old or obsolete words may be found not only in ancient texts but in living modern dialects; the words to be compared are the oldest and most simple, or the obvious and necessary, a formula which clearly echoes Rudbeckius's emphasis on words *ad designandas res in vita communi maxime necessarias et obvias*.⁴⁹ When George J. Metcalf remarks that:

There seems to be (in the seventeenth century) growing need for more explicit statements of the *rationes* which could be applied in phonetic correspondence, and

47 See below, pages [213–15], for Lhwyd's earlier comments in his notes on a Scottish Gaelic glossary and cf. the glossary that he prepared for Aubrey, above p. [12].

48 Quoted from George J. Metcalf, 'The Indo-European hypothesis in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Studies in the history of linguistics*, ed. Dell Hymes, Bloomington, 1974, 233–57 (247).

49 Art. cit. 250.

also for rules to decide *what* could legitimately be compared⁵⁰

he has stated the context of Lhwyd's chapters on etymology, for nothing marks his friends William Baxter and Henry Rowlands as men of the old school so clearly as their free way with words compared to his methodical analysis.⁵¹

Lhwyd accepted the seventeenth-century form of the Indo-European hypothesis, of lost common ancestors for European languages, and he agreed that a 'mother tongue' developed dialects which over a period of time became mutually unintelligible and hence individual languages. He aimed to reduce the arbitrary element in etymology by formulating a set of rules of phonetic change which recognized principles of *cognatio* or *permutatio litterarum* based on phonetic groups, and he insisted that inflectional endings were what the 'Nature or Property of each Language required' and thus were irrelevant in etymology. None of these ideas was new for they can be found in the writings of such scholars as Abraham Mylius (1612), Schottelius (1663), Johannes de Laet (1643), Olaf Rudbeckius (1675), or George Stiernhielm (1671). By 1700 Lhwyd's views were not exceptional but his formulated and specific guidelines for identifying phonetic correspondences were innovative and mark him as a linguist (as in his other areas of study), less interested, perhaps, in hypotheses than in evidence. The *Archæologia* is a milestone in the history of Celtic linguistics, but it fits neatly into place in the context of seventeenth-century comparative linguistics. Just as his proposed volume on natural history is a Welsh reflex of contemporary regional surveys, so does the *Glossography* find its context in the work which scholars like Vossius, Hickes, Skinner, Bernard, Ménage, Besnier were doing in Latin, English, French and Italian, between about 1662 and 1694.⁵²

Lhwyd's six principles of the 'Origin of Dialects' which became in time 'distinct Languages,' viz. 1. Change in the sense of words, 2. 'Accidental Transposition of Letters or Syllables', 3. 'Addition or Subtraction' of Letters or Syllables, 4. Change in composition, 5. Mispronunciation, 6. Borrowings, (his Section I), can all be found in the

⁵⁰ Ibid. 244.

⁵¹ For a discussion of seventeenth-century etymology see David Cram, 'On wild etymology and descriptive profligacy: a contrastive case study', Bernadette Smelik, *et al.*, eds, *A Companion in linguistics*, Nijmegen, 2004, 219–30.

⁵² Though these cannot represent the sum of his reading in linguistics Lhwyd refers specifically to Picardus, *de prisca Celtopædia*; Vulcanius, *de historia et lingua Getarum*; J.J. Scaliger, *Diatriba de Europæorum linguis*; Trabouet, *Tractatus de Re et lingua Francica*; G. Stiernhielm, *de linguarum origine Praefatio* (in his Gothic Bible); Vossius, *Etymologicon linguae Latinae*; Besnier, *Discours sur la science des etymologies*, in Ménage, *Dictionnaire etymologique*; Boxhornius, *Originum Gallicarum Liber*; Pezron, *Antiquité de la langue et de la Nation des celtes*.

works of his immediate predecessors (as he himself implies). His great analytical gifts, perhaps his training as a zoologist and botanist concerned with contemporary problems of the typological classification of species and genera, allied to a phonetician's ear, led to the detailed working out of a host of examples of these six principles under twenty four observations which list correspondences between the Celtic languages, Latin, French, Spanish, Italian, English (and English dialects) and sometimes German. These are then summarized under ten headings—semantic change, items lost in some languages retained in others, borrowings (recognized only on semantic, not formal or phonetic, grounds), and seven classes of phonetic change. The most interesting of these is 'Permutation or Change of Letters', which he categorises as *Classical*, alternation within the same phonetic group, *Idiomatal*, alternation from one group to another established as regular by at least five examples, and *Accidental*, or anomalous, but justified by the semantics. These 'permutations' are truly phonetic. They are brought about 'by the ear of the multitude not from writing', and they are gradual ('by degrees') over a period of time. The change from Celtic and Latin, K to H in Teutonic languages is analogous to the change from northern Welsh initial C pronounced 'very gutterally' (actually he is referring to *chw-*) to southern Welsh H as in *chware* – *hware*. The pattern of initial mutations in the Celtic languages ('always regular; and constantly betwixt Letters of the same Organ of Pronunciation,' *Archæologia* p. 19, col. 3) suggested to him a source of phonetic change in the development of other European languages. These phonetic changes, especially in the *Idiomatal*, he regarded as the best guidelines for tracing language relationships and he lists those which he regarded as being the most significant. Lhwyd, more than any other etymologist, attempted a thoroughly reasoned analysis of *permutatio litterarum*, and these *rationes* are a major contribution to the comparative method, though it must be added that his analysis is not without its weaknesses.⁵³

Lhwyd saw that a common origin could be postulated for 'our neighbouring tongues'—Celtic, Greek, Latin, and in typical fashion he was not prepared to be dogmatic about other European languages since he had insufficient knowledge of them. He does not attempt any reconstruction of the hypothetical parent language; he neither identifies it with any existing language nor does he offer a name for it. He saw that Celtic must include Gaulish, Irish and British, and he notes the affinity of Breton and Cornish with southern Welsh. But he does not seem to have had a clear view of the relationships of these languages and on the basis of the C/Q – P equation which he had discovered he

53 See David Cram, 'Edward Lhuyd and the Doctrine of the Permutation of the Letters', *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, eds Gerda Hassler & Peter Schmitter, Münster, 1999, 317–35.

placed Irish with Latin and British with Greek. Nowhere does he set out a genealogical tree for the Celtic languages like that proposed for the Romance languages or the one which Hickes suggested for the Germanic group. Lhwyd was aware of language development, and many of the phonetic variations (or deviations from an original) which he noted are interesting and often still valid, e. g. Latin, Greek, Celtic, C/K – Teutonic H; Latin, Greek, P – Teutonic F; initial Gw (Welsh) – F (Irish) – V (Latin) – W (Teutonic); Welsh -g, h-, ch(w)-, p-, Irish -ch, s-, s-, c-: Welsh s, t, m – Cornish z, s/z, b. He recognizes late developments in spoken and written Cornish, e.g. the change from *b* to *bm*, *n* to *dn*, *t* to *s/z*, *s* to *ds* (*dzh*).

But in general, he does not appear to have considered phonetic change as continuing after the formation of 'new' languages from dialectal variation. Thus, though he understood Old Welsh orthography, he related the value of the symbols to contemporary pronunciation rather than seeing it as evidence of phonetic change within the historical period of Welsh. The difference between forms such as Cassivelaunus and Caswallawn lay in the addition of a syllable by the Romans not its loss during the development of Welsh. Phonology is central to Lhwyd's analysis but it is not historical and correspondences once noted may be applied equally to any languages and at different stages in their development. That Lhwyd's main interest lay in etymology tended to restrict him to analysis based on individual lexical items. He made comments on word composition and on the morphology of the personal endings of the verb, but he has little on inflexion or grammar. His grammars of Irish and Breton are translations and his original description is his Cornish grammar, which awaits critical examination. Nevertheless, it is true to say that Lhwyd's work was the first serious attempt to apply scholarly principles of etymology to the Celtic languages, and it is his success here that gives him claim to the title, *le fondateur de la philologie celtique comparée*.⁵⁴

The most significant of the Idiomatic Alternations for Celticists is the correspondence which Lhwyd noted in 1703 between British P and Irish C:

for you must know I am troubled with an hypothesis of C Britons and P Britons, the C B B would begin no word with a P, and therefore for *pen* a head they said *cian* or *kean* ... insomuch that I cannot find the Irish have a word (purely their own) that begins with a P, and yet have almost all ours, which they constantly begin with a C.⁵⁵

54 V. Tourneur, *Esquisse d'une histoire des études celtiques*, Liège, 1905, 207.

55 Letter 14 October 1703, G 491.

Lhwyd's aim in this first volume of the *Archæologia* was to trace the 'Original Language' of the British Isles. The affinity of Welsh, Cornish and Breton was in no doubt, though the phonetic bases of the relationship had not been established before Lhwyd's work, nor had the degree of similarity between them been noted:

[I] found that the Armorican and Cornish differ'd less than the present English of the vulgar in the North from those of the West of England; but in respect of us the difference is greater ... Their language (viz. of the Cornish texts) comes nearest that dialect of the British, call'd in Dr Davies Gwen Nwyseg, or the Language of Monmouth and Glamorgan.⁵⁶

But though, as Lhwyd himself noted, George Buchanan, Boxhornius and Camden had argued for the affinity of British and Gaulish (or Celtic), Irish had not been fully integrated into this scheme. Lhwyd extended the bounds of the British-Gaulish comparison, quantitatively by using new sources, and qualitatively by searching Ménage's *Dictionnaire* for words of unknown (non-Latin) derivation which were comparable to Welsh and Cornish (but not to Breton where similarity might be due to borrowing from French), and also by comparing personal and place-names in Britain and Gaul. The initial basis for Lhwyd's guess that Irish and Gaulish might be related was, in fact, ill-founded. In the Welsh Preface to the *Archæologia* (pages [131-2] below) he claims:

Vergobretus, saith Cæsar, signified a Chief Magistrate in the Language of the Ædui. ... Now *Fear go breath* signifies *A Judge*: Verbatim, *The Man that judges*. And 'twas by taking Notice of this Word, that I first suspected the *Gwydhelians* to be Ancient *Gauls*; a thing I see at present no reason at all to doubt of.

His other personal name parallels are also incorrect (Vercingetorix, Ir. *Fear cean go turus*, Vergasillaunus, Ir. *Fear go Saelan*), but others in his list of words showing affinity are correct and his thesis is established. But he also discovered when he began to compose a list of Irish words which agreed with the British languages that Irish bore a closer affinity with them than with Gaulish, a view which his etymological rules confirmed. Irish and Welsh were the first and original languages of the British Isles and preserved *radices* better than most others, and both were linked to Gaulish (or Celtic). What Lhwyd began in 1698 to call the Celtic languages⁵⁷ had a common origin with Greek and

56 G 441. The correspondence of Breton and Welsh had been noted by Joseph Scaliger and by Edward Brerewood in his English version of the latter's work.

57 G 400.

Latin.⁵⁸

The matter of British origins was at the root of his linguistic work as his 1695 *Design* reveals. Edmund Wyld had guided these early interests: he had introduced him to the work of Boxhornius, *Originum Gallicarum Liber*, and had spoken to him of Pezron in 1691. Lhwyd's research and methodical analysis of data over the next ten years led him to a view of the inter-relationship of the Celtic languages. In the Welsh Preface to the *Archæologia*, and in his correspondence and conversations with a few friends, he set out a theory of Celtic migrations to Britain, which had been developing since about 1700, though he was not prepared to discuss the more distant theme of the ultimate mother language.

The C Britons (or Irish Britons) were a Gaulish colony in Britain, whose priority in time is shown by the existence of place-names containing the element *isca*, *ex* etc. cognate, so he claimed, with Irish *uisge* but not found in British. A second wave of Gaulish settlers, P Britons, subsequently forced them northwards to the Highlands and North of England where they became mixed with Scots and English, and to Ireland. The place-names of the Lowlands, he noted, were more akin to Welsh than those of the Highlands. The C Britons comprised a distinct nation in Ireland, Gwyddelians (*Gwyddelod*) whose language was akin to Welsh. But another nation in Ireland were the Scots (some of whom migrated to the Scottish Highlands), in Welsh *Skuidied*, in Irish *Kinskuit*, whom learned Irish traditional history, Nennius and others had described as Scythians coming out of Spain.⁵⁹ This tradition, too, was confirmed when Lhwyd claimed to have found an affinity between part of the Irish lexicon (but not the British) with 'Old Spanish' ('Cantabrian' or Basque). A Germanic element in Irish he ascribed to Belgic influence (reflected in the stories about the Fir Bolg). There are many strands in this theory that did not gain currency as it remained hidden in the Welsh Preface and in the conversation of a limited circle of friends. But Lhwyd was proud of the 'novelties' of his argument and what is significant is that acknowledging that he had no written authority for his views, he was prepared to justify them on strictly linguistic grounds: 'All the arguments us'd is the agreement of languages'.⁶⁰

The achievement of *Archæologia Britannica* — *Glossography* is twofold. Lhwyd gave

58 Cf. the 1695 *Design* (pages [35–39]) where he intends 'a comparison of the Modern Welsh with other European Languages; more especially with the *Greek, Latin, Irish, Cornish & Armorican*'.

59 Cf. the poems by Colin Campbell (number 5) and John Maclean (number 10) below.

60 G 511, a letter, May [1701], which presents his views succinctly, and cf. G 482, letter in February 1703. Cf. Colin Campbell's poem and following notes.

etymology a rational basis in the conceptual framework of seventeenth-century scientific thought and thereby set the comparative method on firmer ground.⁶¹ One consequence was that Lhwyd justified the use of the term 'the Celtic languages' as a meaningful one.

A particular aspect of etymology which was an important part of the evidence of British 'origins' remained the interpretation of personal and especially of place-names. William Camden's *Britannia* (1586 and a number of subsequent editions throughout the seventeenth century) seems to have had its genesis as a *Topographical Survey* which would help to elucidate references made by Roman historians to places and itineraries. Place-names had always had a part in the descriptions of previous antiquaries, but interpreting the place-names of Roman Britain and their contemporary forms was central to Camden's pattern of work.⁶² For the antiquaries who followed him in the seventeenth century place-names became the linguistic equivalents of field monuments—visible survivals of antiquity the correct interpretation of which could shed light on those who had first created them. Some names could be related to specific archaeological remains, notwithstanding the need in some cases to evaluate carefully their traditional and folkloric associations, but in broader historical terms, place-names viewed as a linguistic stratum would reveal the language and, it was believed, the ethnic identity of inhabitants and settlers. Regional and county surveys normally included some discussion of place-names, but John Aubrey's *An Interpretation of Villare Anglicanum* (unpublished but the Preface is dated 1687) was probably the most ambitious onomastic undertaking of all: an elucidation of the English place-names in Henry Spelman's gazetteer, *Villare Anglicanum* (1656). Aubrey's aim, as he described it himself, was 'to pick-out the small Remnant of British words, that have escaped the Deluge of the Saxon Conquest' and to map the British (or Welsh) elements in place-names from the Orkneys to the Pyrenees.⁶³ Lhwyd would not have needed any encouragement to collect and to study place-names but repeated requests and appeals for assistance from Aubrey early in the 1690s would have obliged him to consider the etymology of specific examples. Lhwyd was conscious that onomastics was as unregulated as any other area of contemporary etymology⁶⁴ and in William Nicolson Lhwyd found a scholar whose attitudes and aims were more like his

61 See Alf Sommerfelt, 'Edward Lhuyd and the comparative method in linguistics', *Lochlann*, XVI (1952), 370–4, David Cram, 'Lhuyd, Edward', *Lexicon Grammaticorum: Who's Who in the history of world linguistics*, ed. Harro Stammerjohann, Tübingen, 1996, 571–2. For a discussion of the development of Lhwyd's linguistic thinking see Caryl Davies, *Adfeilion Babel: agweddau ar syniadaeth ieithyddol y ddeunawfed ganrif*, Caerdydd, 2000, chap. 3.

62 See Stuart Piggott, *Ruins in a Landscape*, Edinburgh, 1976, 42–3.

63 Michael Hunter, *John Aubrey and the world of learning*, London, 1975, 169.

64 See above pages [13–15].

own.

Their extant correspondence began in 1692 when Nicolson was working on his history of Northumbria. Both men shared the wide range of interests typical of scholars of the time and exchanged information on their collections in botany and palaeontology, but Nicolson, who had been a major contributor to Moses Pitt's ambitious *English Atlas* (1680–82), appears to have approached Lhwyd initially as a result of his work on his projected history. Lhwyd, recognised as the leading Welsh scholar of his day, had already been brought into the discussion of the possible 'British' aspects of the history of northern England when John Ray, preparing a new edition of his *Collection of English words not generally used* (1691), sought his opinion on some dialect words which seemed to bear 'affinity with the Welsh',⁶⁵ and now Nicolson asked for his assistance:

A great many of our Towns (as Carlisle, Penrith, Penruddock, Caerdornac, &c.) with most of the names of our Rivers and Mountains are Brittish. I shall send you a large Vocabulary of 'em, since you allow me the confidence to hope that you will readily explain them for me.⁶⁶

Nicolson's only guide to the derivations of Welsh names was Dr John Davies's *Dictionarium Duplex* (1632) and he was very conscious of his own deficiencies, but by October 1692 he was able to thank Lhwyd for 'the excellent Rules . . . for y^e derivation of y^e Brittish names of our Rivers' and to request, in March 1693, a similar set of rules for names of towns and mountains.⁶⁷ Their mutual interest in onomastics, and especially the Welsh elements in northern place-names, continued throughout their friendship and Nicolson sent Lhwyd a long letter on Northumbrian/'Welsh' place-names in 1703.⁶⁸ Though Lhwyd was to collect place-names (from published lists and elsewhere) and to interpret them throughout his career (often in response to queries put to him),⁶⁹ his primary concern (as in all he did) was to establish a firm methodology (what Nicolson called *ratio nominis*) so that one could analyse the composition of place-names and recognise their elements⁷⁰ in order to make valid interpretations from which to draw

65 G 110.

66 31 March 1692, Bodley MS Ashmole 1816, f. 454.

67 6 October 1692, Bodley MS Ashmole 1817, f. 459, 1 March 1693, Bodley MS Ashmole 1817, f. 461; cf G 192.

68 13 September 1703, NLW MS 309E, ff.149–55.

69 See, e.g. G 211–2, 490, 491, 442.

70 He pointed out in *Archæologia Britannica*, p. 8, that cognate elements might appear in transposed order in compounds in different languages.

historical conclusions. His correspondence with Nicolson inspired him to begin similar work in Wales and no doubt formulating rules for the English antiquary concentrated his thoughts and cleared his own mind. He wrote to his friend John Lloyd, 16 May 1693:

To begin therefore, I desire you would send me a catalogue, in your next, of all ye ancient towns, castles, & forts, yt you can reckon in Meiriondydh-shire & Denbigh-shire; with what account you can give, of ye names of such as may be interpreted. . . . I would also gladly have a catalogue (I doe not mean a compleat one, but *talem qualem*), of the mountains and lakes of Meiriondydshire, with yr brother David's interpretation & glosses on them: for I believe he's able to give some acct of divers of them. My design in this, is partly to observe ye method our ancestors used in nameing places; and partly to gratify a very ingenious gentleman who is writing ye History of ye Kingdome of Northumberland.⁷¹

The importance of river and mountain names was that these were the 'oldest and most deeply rooted' place-names but one needed to be aware of how later settlers might misunderstand native names, adapt them (as the Romans often did) or replace them. There are glimpses of Lhwyd's thinking about place-name elements and suffixes in his contributions to the 1695 *Britannia*⁷² but the fruits of his more sustained thinking naturally appear later, for instance with reference to lowland Scotland, Cornwall and Brittany, e.g. G 428, 490–1, 474. The accepted hypothesis that place-names often represented a linguistic survival—'For one may observe from the names of places that another people once possess'd that country'⁷³—was applied by Lhwyd to his 'British' evidence and became an important element in his theory of the coming of the 'Celts' and of the priority of 'Irish' settlements in Britain (and of Armorican colonies in Cornwall).

Personal names were part of the same evidence but they were difficult to interpret.⁷⁴ The more transparent nature of place-names, however, together with his extensive corpus of materials would allow him 'to draw a scheme of the method of naming places', he believed.⁷⁵ About this time, too, Lhwyd began a correspondence with William Baxter

⁷¹ G 191–2.

⁷² See, for instance, his observations (now conveniently available in the volume *Camden's Wales*), on the significance of some suffixes in river-names, e.g. 24, 28, and on Romano-British names, 48; other elements that he notes are *cader*, 30, *llan*, 31, *Gwyddel*, 80, *bala*, 72. Cf. his remarks G 493.

⁷³ G 442.

⁷⁴ For Lhwyd's comments on personal names and their appearance in place-names see, e.g. G 474.

⁷⁵ Letter to Humphrey Foulkes, 28 July 1705, G 506.

(1649–1723), a schoolmaster in London, well-known for his editions of Horace and of Anacreon but recognised also as a philologist and etymologist conversant with a number of languages in addition to Latin, Greek and Hebrew.⁷⁶ Baxter was attracted to the study and interpretation of British place-names and he seems to have gone some way towards compiling his lists of names by 1694 when he showed his notes to John Aubrey, who called Lhwyd's attention to them when he was seeking assistance in his own work.⁷⁷ Baxter began to shower Lhwyd from 1702 onwards with lengthy epistles full of philological speculations about language relationships and etymologies. For his part, Lhwyd respected Baxter's linguistic skills and knowledge but he was doubtful, as were others, of his judgement. Probably conscious of Thomas Hearne's propensity for gossip and sharp comments, he described Baxter to him as 'a scholar and a good antiquary', but the view that he expressed to Humphrey Foulkes more closely reflected his misgivings, 'a person of learning and integrity, thô, I fear me, too apt to indulge in fancy'.⁷⁸ Baxter's dictionary of British place-names was probably more or less complete by 1705 and Lhwyd, notwithstanding his doubts, not only sent him his 'Comparative Etymologicon' for 'his perusal'⁷⁹ but was prepared to include Baxter's work as part of his own projected Historical and Geographical Dictionary. Fortunately this was not done but as was already noted above, Lhwyd was grateful to Baxter for his commendation of *Glossography* to the Royal Society. Baxter's 'dictionary' appeared in 1719 (second edition in 1733) as *Glossarium Antiquitatum Britannicarum* and included as an appendix some of Lhwyd's *Adversaria* on place-names.⁸⁰ The book was transcribed and seen through the press by Moses Williams, one of Lhwyd's former assistants and himself a contributor to *Glossography*. Onomastics occupied Lhwyd's thoughts increasingly while *Glossography* was at the press, so that in November 1707, while he was considering what aspect of his studies he would tackle after publishing that volume, he told Richard Mostyn that he was prepared to devote time to place-name and personal-name studies:

As for the remainder I know not well what ist to set upon; but I am sure I have

-
- 76 On Baxter see Arthur Percival, 'William Baxter (1649–1723)', *THSC* Session 1957 (1958), 58–86; *ODNB*. A native of Llanllugan, Montgomeryshire, he claimed he spoke only Welsh until he went to Harrow, aged 18.
- 77 See G 235. At this time Lhwyd expressed the view that Baxter's ability to use Welsh 'surpasses my skil in yt language'.
- 78 Hearne, I, 296; G 476.
- 79 G 506, letter to Humphrey Foulkes. 28 July 1705. On receiving Baxter's approbation Lhwyd remarked drily, 'but we must in such cases make large allowances for complement'.
- 80 See below pages [216–31].

materials for three or four volumes. Dr Aldridge has been talking some years about publishing a *Cæsar's Commentaries*; and has expected some notes on the names of persons and places from the Bishop of Hereford. If he would goe on with it, I should be willing to add to it an *Onomologia Britannica* (or *Celto-Britannica*), or a dissertation on the method of nameing persons and places, us'd amongst the Gauls and Britans. There has been nothing of that kind, that I know of, as yet attempted: and perhaps the learned part of my subscribers would think that part of my time as well bestowd as any.⁸¹

Nothing came of this but the following year Lhwyd was able to assert that 'The first thing I design to publish will be only an 8vo. in Latin, containing an account of the method observ'd by the ancient Gauls and Britons, in the naming of persons and places'.⁸² Apparently, this was to be a small handbook, not the Dictionary originally intended as the first volume of the whole project and which Lhwyd had mentioned to Baxter in 1705. In his preface, p. [62], Lhwyd says that the next volume would contain linguistic materials that he had been unable to include in *Glossography* because of lack of space; among these would be 'An Account of *British* and *Celtic* Proper Names'. At the end of the Welsh preface he refers to his intention of publishing a second volume, 'containing partly a Dictionary of the Histories of the Kings, Princes, Ancient Nobility; the Towns, Castles, Churches and Saints, and all other very remarkable Men and Places of the *British* Nations, mentioned in ancient Records' (p. [143] below). Lhwyd's intentions may have been common knowledge, for after Lhwyd's death Tancred Robinson could say, 'I remember Mr. Lhwyd told me he had perfected for the press an *Onomasticon Populorum, Urbium et oppidorum Antiq. Britan.*, very much augmented'.⁸³ There are, in fact, indications that the Dictionary, which was in active preparation while *Glossography* was at the press, was itself nearing completion and was

81 G 535.

82 G 547. In the Seabright Sale catalogue of Lhwyd's papers in 1807, no. 1124 (now BL 15053) is *Nomina Virorum et Foeminarum Propria, e Camdena, Verstegan, aliisque auctoribus haud paucis*; and a list of Lhwyd's manuscripts at the Seabright home, Beechwood, (Bodley MS Carte 108) has, no. 129, 'Alphabetical names of men and women'. There is, perhaps, a foretaste of the Dictionary in Lhwyd's discussion of personal and place-names in the poetry associated with Llywarch Hen in *Glossography*, 259–61.

83 Quoted in G 47 from Bodley MS Lister 37, f. 157. The second edition of the *Lithophylacium* was prepared and published by William Huddersford in 1760. Comments and rumours such as these are probably at the root of a claim in 1794 that fifteen copies of the second volume had been printed, one of which was in the possession of the 'Rev'd Mr Tinsley of Llandinam', letter from William Jones to William Owen Pughe, *Llên Cymru*, 1 (1951), 180.

being prepared for the press when Lhwyd died.

As has already been noted above (p. [11]), Lhwyd's assistants were copying charters and other records soon after their return from the great tour. In particular, William Jones and Hugh Griffiths spent much time in London and Cambridge copying and abstracting material, personal names especially, from monastic charters, exchequer rolls and genealogies in the Tower, the Cottonian Library, the College of Arms and Gresham College, and comparing the material with that already published in, e.g. Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Both young men were capable and intelligent amanuenses, and they sent regular progress reports to Lhwyd. When relations between William Jones and Lhwyd became strained in June 1702, Griffiths continued in London while at the same time endeavouring to complete his exercises for his degree and while he sought ordination and a curacy (or school). He continued his labours even after leaving Oxford and London. In June 1705 (Ashmole MS 1815, f. 139) he speaks of writing 'the Dictionary', and in September of that year he could report, 'I thank God that I have at last after a sort finished what I undertook for you'. His two letters in September 1705 (13th, 18th, Ashmole MS 1815, f. 139, 141) describe the principles that he follows in abstracting names and events, his abbreviations and annotations, and he explains how the work is being set out in sheets for the press. Unfortunately, Lhwyd's letters and instructions are not extant, but in Hugh Griffiths he had discovered yet another able, intelligent assistant who could undertake original research on his own. The Dictionary was planned and directed by Lhwyd who would presumably have written a Preface drawing out the significance that he attached to the data; no doubt, too, that he would have revised and corrected Griffiths's sheets. Nevertheless, it appears that much of the Dictionary as an organised collection of historical personal- and place-names was the work of Hugh Griffiths who had been called upon to make a number of critical judgements in the selection and copying of the material and whose contribution Lhwyd would doubtless have acknowledged as he had those of Moses Williams and David Parry in *Glossography*. The Dictionary, however, was not yet complete or ready to be sent to the press, and on 25 June 1707 (Ashmole MS 1815, f. 153) Griffiths offered his help to Lhwyd to transcribe material as he thought of the 'infinite trouble & pains you must be at to publish ye 2^d volume'.

As is well known, Lhwyd's papers were dispersed and many were subsequently lost in two fires,⁸⁴ but catalogues and surviving notebooks do not reveal any such *onomasticon*. Lhwyd had, however, continued to keep William Nicolson informed of developments in

⁸⁴ See Eiluned Rees and Gwyn Walters, 'The dispersion of the manuscripts of Edward Lhuyd', *Cylchgrawn Hanes Cymru / Welsh History Review*, 7 (1974-75), 148-78.

his work and his papers were Baxter's source for both parts of the *Adversaria*, as Moses Williams makes clear in his preface. In his letter to Nicolson Lhwyd has reformulated the 'Rules' that he had written for the bishop in 1692,⁸⁵ but the Latin section probably represents the skeleton of the projected '8^{vo} Latin' handbook on naming structures.⁸⁶

COMMENDATORY VERSES

The praise poems in *Archæologia Britannica*⁸⁷ (pages [66–104] below) were all written by Lhwyd's friends and by antiquaries with whom he had been in personal contact, but they appear not to have been planned as an integral part of the book. Rather, the collection seems to have been prompted by the response of the Irish historian Roderic O'Flaherty to the Irish dictionary, the pages of which Lhwyd had sent to Dublin before the publication of the *Archæologia*, as noted above. In a letter to the Scottish scholar Colin Campbell of Achnaba, a correspondent, perhaps Lachlan Campbell, minister of Campbelltown, writes:

But I am better pleased to understand from some friends in Irland that the Critiques in it, there, are extremely satisfyd wth the performance. Among the rest he tells me in a letter I had lately from him, that Dr Roderick O'flaherty (author of the History of Irland published from Dr Keting & other Irish MSS. in Latine under the title of Ogygia 4to Lond. 1684 which I perused) has signifyd his approbation thereof by a fine Copy of Latine verses ~~he sent him~~ in its commendation he sent him to be prefixed thereto. He tells me also that there will be a page or two vacant that shall be sent him & if any here will favour the work so far as to send him an short Epigram either in Latine but especially in Irish it would be very acceptable.⁸⁸

O'Flaherty's status as an Irish scholar was clearly important, as Lhwyd wrote to Bishop

85 The reference in the section, "Proper Names of Rivers, II TAM", to "Comparative Etymology p. 40, col. 2" reveals that the letter postdates the publication of *Glossography*. See p. [220] below

86 Nicolson's letters to Lhwyd have been preserved but we do not know of a collection of Nicolson's papers which includes his correspondence with Lhwyd.

87 For other poems written in honour of Lhwyd see pages [242–56] below.

88 Edinburgh University Library MS 3097.6. We are extremely grateful to Dr Domhnall Uilleam Stiùbhart for drawing to our attention material from the Colin Campbell collection in Edinburgh University Library and for generously giving us transcripts of relevant documents. On Lachlan Campbell see *ELSH* 10.

Humphreys: 'He is pleased to honour me with some Latin Distichs in Prayse of the Dictionary w^{ch}, thô they are not extraordinary elegant, our Principal advises me to print, on acc^t. of the name he has in that Kingdome'.⁸⁹ The result was a preponderance of poems from Scottish scholars together with the original stimulus from Ireland. Lhwyd was encouraged to turn to Welsh antiquaries to seek their poetic approbation and attracted three commendations. In one sense, however, the collection of commendatory verses was a double-edged sword. Though they are an indication of regard for Lhwyd's work, the writers are not part of the mainstream of English intellectual life, where Lhwyd himself had his base; John Keill is the exception that proves the rule as he is here as a Scottish representative rather than as an Oxford scholar. The scholarly 'great and good' who would immediately command attention are not named here and the difference between the authors of these verses and the scholars such as Edmund Gibson, White Kennet, Edward Thwaites, Christian Worm and William Nicolson, whose testimonials George Hickes was able to quote at the beginning of his *Thesaurus* is striking. The verses are best read not so much as a scholarly *imprimatur* as an appreciation by some of those closest to Lhwyd in his 'Celtic' researches. The Welsh authors are particularly revealing in that they suggest how solitary a scholarly figure Lhwyd was in Wales where he himself had been the inspiration for many young men to take up the study of antiquities and language seriously. Unlike the situation he found in Scotland, Ireland and even in Cornwall, Lhwyd could turn to very few in Wales to discuss matters of language and history and he had very little contact with the literary activity of his day. The only poem in Welsh was written by a popular local poet who was friendly with one of Lhwyd's most able associates, Dr Humphrey Foulkes, and probably with Lhwyd himself. It is not a praise poem designed to be included in the *Archæologia* but rather an appeal to Lhwyd to hasten the volume's publication and it appeared first in a letter to him from Foulkes in April 1706.⁹⁰ Neither of the other two Welsh authors who contributed poems had achieved any eminence at the time of writing, in contrast to the Scottish poets who were well known in the Gaelic community either as poets or as antiquaries.

Almost all the writers of these poems reveal how well they understood the nature of Lhwyd's researches and how personally relevant to them his studies were. Unlike

89 Letter to Humphrey Humphreys 14 January 1705, *BBCS*, 17, 113. For the troubled history of these verses see pages [101-4] below.

90 Bodley MS Ashmole 1815, f. 47. In May 1707 Lhwyd, writing perhaps to Foulkes, explained, 'And having received some Scottish verses out of the High Lands on the *Irish English Dictionary*, which I had sent thither for their correction I have inserted Robin o Ragad's amongst them in the old British, (or as now commonly calld Saxon letter.)', G 511.

Lhwyd's critics in London and Oxford who were not witnessing the disintegration of their ancient culture and its social structures and who had little interest in 'old' languages, these Scottish poets, and to a lesser degree the Welsh writers, saw in *Glossography* and more specifically in the Irish dictionary, a key to the classical language and tradition. Gaelic had lost its role as a high status language and was increasingly becoming alienated from the majority culture and the status community. The decline of learned orders and of their social and economic support, and Anglicization linked to changing norms of education, were aspects of the change which threatened the old order. Bardic poetry, more relaxed in form and language, continued in 'survivals and recreations of the old moods and styles' but there was no mistaking the transition, 'the inexorable revolution in Gaelic poetry',⁹¹ which was underway. A consistent theme in these commendatory verses, themselves survivals of bardic practice, is that Lhwyd not only 'seeks out the origin of words' but that he safeguards, restores and renews a language in decline, a language which had been the vehicle of a culture now vanishing, as John MacLean's poignant ode recalls. This poem is the most representative of bardic culture and more than any of the others reveals something of the power of mythological history and of the meaning of praise poetry in the classical tradition. It is Colin Campbell, on the other hand, who recognises most clearly the scholarly significance of Lhwyd's work, and he even goes as far as versifying one of Lhwyd's most crucial hypotheses on the relationship of Brythonic and Goidelic.

The crisis in the Welsh bardic tradition in the late seventeenth century was not as acute as the Gaelic one and it would be successfully resolved. R. Jones of Carmarthen, nevertheless, shares the same theme as the Scottish poets but strikes an optimistic note. As it transpired, Lhwyd's immediate gift to Welsh identity was not his linguistic scholarship but rather the scholarly validation that he gave to those who took pride in these 'original' British vernaculars and their culture at a time when they were being abandoned by their traditional aristocratic patrons. It was left to the young Edward Wynn in dispassionate hexameters to present the rounded picture of Lhwyd's achievements and of his contributions to English science and to 'Celtic' culture, which was a dichotomy which Lhwyd himself, perhaps, did not share.

91 Derick Thomson, *An Introduction to Gaelic Poetry*, London, 1974, 115.

PREFACES

In addition to the dedication to his main patron, Sir Thomas Mansel [53-4], Lhwyd wrote prefaces to different sections of *Glossography*. A general preface [55-64] and those to the 'Comparative Etymology' [145-8] and the 'British Eymologicon' compiled by David Parry (addressed to Bishop Humphrey Humphreys) [165-73] are in English but others, An address to the Welsh [106-42] and prefaces to the Cornish grammar [150-62] and the Irish dictionary [174-206] are in Welsh, Cornish and Irish respectively. Roderic O'Flaherty took Lhwyd to task for writing in these languages 'rather yⁿ in English common to y^e 3 Nations, whereas one in a hundred can read one of y^e 3 & one in a 1000 (if any) expert in all 3'.⁹² Lhwyd apparently explained his reasons in a letter (now unfortunately lost) to O'Flaherty who was somewhat mollified, if not convinced, but these may have been similar to comments that he made in the prefaces themselves, which were not at that time available in English. With regard to Cornish, though he was not, he said, 'very solicitous about keeping up the language', nevertheless to help to preserve it in printed (i.e. accessible) form was important in order to allow antiquaries to make use of it, and he appeared to encourage a more positive attitude to it among the gentry. In the Irish preface he set out some six reasons to justify publishing his grammars and dictionaries of Irish and other Celtic languages. Most of these are academic and scholarly—that the older languages of Britain may be better understood by students of language and onomastics, but in words that echo the preface to the Welsh Bible of 1588 he stresses the importance of the vernaculars for clergy (and, interestingly, for those 'who have any Office or Place of Trust over the common People') in preference to waiting for all to learn English. Lhwyd had more than scholarly regard for these languages and one cannot fail to be conscious of a sense of personal involvement when he expresses his hope that through these dictionaries it may be possible for 'Men of Learning and other Gentlemen' to learn to read and enjoy their own literatures and thus to realise that 'the old Poetry and Romances, in each of these Languages, were as witty and pleasant, as those of any other Language, that were written at the same time'. One wonders whether Lhwyd's commitment to the British vernaculars had become clear in his conversations with Irish and Scottish scholars and had been shared with his Welsh friends, thus heightening the expectations which are the themes of several of the commendatory verses. The address to the Welsh was the last to be written and Lhwyd was 'obliged', as he put it, to write to his countrymen in his mother tongue, to return home linguistically.

92 22 November 1707, Bodley MS Ashmole 1817a, f. 52.

No doubt the vernacular prefaces had a symbolic value as reflecting the importance of these languages as the oldest British tongues; no doubt too that Lhwyd felt some personal pride in being able to write in all three.⁹³ Nevertheless, these prefaces are not self-indulgent vanities but are, like the English prefaces, integral to *Glossography* and important data for understanding Lhwyd's thinking about languages. Welsh was the only Celtic language that he could use with ease as his natural medium. He was a fluent Welsh speaker and writer and he was genuinely bilingual in that he could switch effortlessly between Welsh and English, in both formal and informal registers; he wrote his personal research notes in both languages.⁹⁴ As has already been noted, he had begun to learn Irish early in his career, but he does not appear to have begun to study Cornish prior to his visit to Cornwall in 1700 on the penultimate stage of his tour. Nevertheless, his grasp of both languages, exemplified most especially by his comprehensive vocabulary of Cornish in NLW MS Llanstephan 84, are remarkable achievements. He was, however, well aware of his limitations in these languages, both of which he learned mainly from grammars and reading rather than orally,⁹⁵ though he pioneered the study of Gaelic dialects and made a point of finding natural speakers of Cornish. Presumably the purpose of bringing a young Gaelic speaker from the Highlands to join him in Oxford as an assistant at the museum was to improve his own fluency in Gaelic, and the sometimes wayward Giliacholum Mac Mullen, always referred to warmly by the other assistants, was to remain with Lhwyd up to his death.⁹⁶ Lhwyd recognised that his Cornish was 'bookish' and he seems consciously to have sought a literary, formal register in these two prefaces, unlike his Welsh which is unforced (but printed in his 'old' Welsh orthography).⁹⁷ The Irish and Cornish

93 Lhwyd also wrote verses in Welsh, Cornish and Breton in collections of Oxford Encaenia poetry; see Brynley F. Roberts, 'Barddoniaeth Edward Lhuyd', *BBCS*, 27 (1976), 31–44.

94 See Brynley F. Roberts, 'Cymraeg Edward Lhwyd', *Y Traethodydd*, 163 (2003), 211–29.

95 With regard to Cornish, though he used informants in St Just Parish and was helped by others in compiling vocabularies, he wrote that 'I got the best part of my learning from three Manuscript Cornish books', Cornish preface, p. [153] below.

96 On this 'raw Scottish lad', apparently from North Knapdale, Argyll, see *ELSH* xviii, James Maidment, *Analecta Scotica*, 2nd series, Edinburgh, 1837, 360, letter from James Sutherland to Robert Wodrow, 24 December 1702. He was described as 'a deserted infant' in Nicholas Owen, *British Remains*, London, 1777, 137, presumably in the legal sense of a minor, or more generally, youth. He copied some material for Lhwyd in BL Add. MS 15072, 'Giliacholum Mc Mullen his Book Ogust 701'. See again R.F. Ovenell, *The Ashmolean Museum, 1683–1894*, Oxford, 1986, 102–3; Brynley F. Roberts, 'Edward Lhwyd's Protégés', *THSC* Session 2007 (2008), 21–57.

97 The first three pages are extant in Lhwyd's hand with directions for the printer in TCD MS 1392/4 [previously H. 5. 20, book 4].

prefaces were composed in English and then translated by Lhwyd ⁹⁸ who feared that they might not be acceptable or intelligible to Irish and Cornish readers:

I heartily wish the Irish Preface may prove intelligent. I could get none in England to correct it, so I sent some Part of it to a professor of the Language at Dublin, who made it more obscure to me than 'twas; however I have often complied with his correction because I hoped 'twould be the clearer to others.⁹⁹

As have others subsequently, the 'professor' found Lhwyd's Irish difficult and began his own translation,¹⁰⁰ but it did not meet with Lhwyd's approval. Anne and William O'Sullivan refer to Lhwyd's 'leaning towards "learned" Irish', and conclude:

But for Lhwyd its influence, together with a tendency towards the mechanical application of such rules of grammar as he had been able to learn, was to deaden his sensibility towards the natural flow of the language and he was undoubtedly wrong in preferring his own artificial product to the natural, if somewhat ornate, version of the Professor.¹⁰¹

Lhwyd had similar reservation about his Cornish. He wrote to Thomas Tonkin in 1708:

When you favour me with your next letter, I should be glad to know whether old Keigwyn be yet living; and if so, whether either he himself, or your neighbour, can make a shift to understand the preface to the Cornish Grammar. There are some words in it, I own, that I have not read in the Cornish, and were therefore borrowed out of the Welsh, but they are very few; and if they please to send me a catalogue of all that are not understood, I will readily explain them.

He made similar comments about his Cornish verses, referring to their 'Wallicisms' and explaining that he 'aimed at imitating the Book Cornish, rather than the Cornish now spoken; . . . it has been much corrupted this last age or two'.¹⁰² His fears were

⁹⁸ Parts of the Irish preface (some in the original English) are in TCD MS 1392/6 [previously H. 5. 20, book 6] and more extensive versions (in Irish exclusively) in TCD MS 1392/7 [previously H. 5. 20, book 7].

⁹⁹ Lhwyd to Richard Richardson, 27 July 1701, G 529.

¹⁰⁰ It is in his hand in TCD MS 1392/7 [previously H. 5. 20, book 7], ff. 8r-12v.

¹⁰¹ O'Sullivan, ix. This introduction has a full analysis of the material used in compiling the *Glossography* in Lhwyd's notebooks in the TCD manuscripts.

¹⁰² Letters to Tonkin, 22 December 1708, G 548; 8 February 1702, G 484, 16 March 1703, G 484.

well founded, as Tonkin's verdict was that many could not understand the preface 'because it was written in an out of the way Cornish'.¹⁰³

Nevertheless, Tonkin was to prove instrumental in providing a translation. Bodley MS Corn. C.1, entitled 'Archaeologia Cornu-Britannica' and probably written by Henry Usticke of St Just (whose signature is on the title page), contains copies of some of the Cornish material that Lhwyd saw and used, including the Mount Calvary poem and Jordan's 'Creation of the World' together with transcripts of letters from Thomas Tonkin to Lhwyd. The first item in the manuscript, pp. 1-7, is entitled 'Mr Gwavas's and Mr Th. Tonkin's Translation of Mr Lhwyd's Preface to his Cornish Grammar'. Correspondence between the two Cornish scholars reveals that they were discussing the possibility of an English translation of the preface in January 1732 and that they were well aware of the problems posed by Lhwyd's Cornish. As William Gwavas put it to Tonkin:

As the Translation of Mr Lloyd's preface, it is difficult to performe by any one here [i.e. Penzance] without the help of a Learned Welsh Man, being nearer to it, than to the Modern Cornish in use here.

Nevertheless, by June 1735 Tonkin had translated the preface which he sent to Gwavas for his comments and corrections, confessing that he regretted not having been able to take advantage of Lhwyd's offer, noted above, to explain the 'Wallicisms' and 'The very many difficult words', Gwavas retranslated some passages and corrected others in July-August 1735. The translation of the preface found in Bodley MS Corn. C.1 has a few revisions written as marginal notes (including one introduced by the words 'Translate it thus') and these have been incorporated into the printed text. The manuscript appears to be a transcript, with annotations, by Usticke of a volume, comprising in part material left by Lhwyd and compiled by Tonkin which forms the basis of William Pryce's *Archaeologia Cornu-Britannica* (1790) where the translation of Lhwyd's Cornish preface was first published.¹⁰⁴ The translation of the preface arose from Tonkin's attempts to continue Lhwyd's work on Cornish, but it would appear that the published version was a joint

103 Quoted in Derek R. Williams, *Prying into every hole and corner: Edward Lhwyd in Cornwall in 1700*, Dyllansow Truran, Trewirgie, 1993, 27. Lhwyd's Breton verses reveal similar characteristics such as lexical creations and a laboured style.

104 A new translation and study have been published by William Franklin Baxter, *Lhwyd's Cornish Introduction*, [Aberystwyth, 2004].

effort by Tonkin and Gwavas.¹⁰⁵

O'Flaherty returned to the matter of the 'three prefaces' in a letter in April 1707:

I concur wth y^r reasons ab^t y^e 3 prefaces but such as reade 'em not, w^d wish blank paper in y^e^r place. . . . But indeed it were wish'd there were a preface in y^e common language containing y^e contents of y^e 3 as far as what might be feasible for publick view.¹⁰⁶

His desire to read what was hidden from him was shared by many others (including, probably, Welsh readers who found the 'old' orthography irksome). William Nicolson took the initiative. Soon after the publication of *Archæologia Britannica* he requested Lhwyd to translate his Welsh preface into English,¹⁰⁷ and he later arranged for the Irish preface to be 'put into the same Dress, by a Neighbouring Clergyman perfectly well skill'd in the Irish Tongue',¹⁰⁸ whom we now know to have been Anthony Raymond.¹⁰⁹ Nicolson published both in an appendix to his *Irish Historical Library* of 1724, 'for which every discerning Reader will give me Thanks',¹¹⁰ and they were reprinted in his compendium volume *The English, Scotch and Irish historical libraries* in 1736 and 1776.

¹⁰⁵ The Tonkin–Gwavas correspondence is in the 'Cornish manuscript' in the Provincial Library at Bilbao, for which see Henry Jenner, *Journal of the Royal Institute of Cornwall*, 21 (1925) 423–27. We are particularly grateful to Professor Matthew Spriggs for freely sharing with us some of the results of his on-going research on Pryce's *Archæologia* and for giving us transcripts of the correspondence. For William Gwavas (1676–1741/2) see ODNB.

¹⁰⁶ Bodley MS Ashmole 1817a, f. 57.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Nicolson, *English Historical Library*, London, 1714, 30, 'The Author (in his Welsh letter to his Counttymen [sic], whereof he was so kind as to send me a translation) ...'. It is probable that more than one copy was made of the translation. In a letter to Dr Edward Wynn, 30 January 1708, Lhwyd arranges for a copy to be delivered to Nicolson and adds that if the 'servant' (Wynn's secretary, Hugh Hughes) is free, he can make another copy or two (E. Gwynne Jones, 'The Family Papers of Owen and Stanley of Penrhos, Holyhead', *BBCS*, 17 (1958), 99–115, (115)). One of these may have been given to John Anstis; there is a manuscript copy of the English version among his papers in Cardiff Central Library MS 4.1, printed with some omissions in G 513–26. The Scolar Press facsimile of *Archæologia Britannica* (1969) has a facsimile of a manuscript copy of the translation in *Irish Historical Library*.

¹⁰⁸ *Irish Historical Library*, xvii.

¹⁰⁹ On Raymond see ODNB, and Alan Harrison's two volumes, *Ag Cruinniú Meala: Anthony Raymond (1675–1726), ministéir Protastúnach, agus léann na Gaeilge i mBaile Átha Cliath, Baile Átha Cliath*, 1988 (esp. 77, 131) and *The Dean's friend: Anthony Raymond 1675–1726: Jonathan Swift and the Irish language*, Caisleán an Bhúrcaigh, 1999, (esp. 90, 125).

¹¹⁰ Nicolson gives an account of the translating of the two prefaces in the preface to his book, xv–xvii.

A somewhat different Welsh version was published by Hugh Thomas (died 1720), another of Lhwyd's correspondents. We know from his will of 1720 that part of his work was already at the press, but it was not until 1729 that two volumes (partly identical) were finally published. These were *An Introduction to the British History* and *The History of Great-Britain, From the first Inhabitants thereof, 'till the Death of Cadwalader, Last King of the Britains . . .*¹¹¹. Lhwyd's Welsh preface is described as being 'translated into English by the Author himself', but it also contains a long paragraph, absent from Nicolson, which is introduced thus: 'The following Paragraph the Author omitted Translating for fear of giving Offence to Mr. Humphry Wanley and Dr. Hicks, but was since his Death Translated into English.'

The translations of the Welsh given by Thomas and of the Irish given by Nicolson were afterwards published together by the Scotsman David Malcolm(e) in various differently-titled but overlapping volumes which include his *An essay on the antiquities of Great Britain and Ireland . . .* (1738 [longer version]), *A collection of letters, in which the imperfection of learning, even among Christians, and a remedy for it, are hinted. . .* (1739) and *Letters, essays, and other tracts illustrating the antiquities of Great Britain and Ireland. . .* (1744).

The translations which are given here are those found in Thomas and Nicolson respectively. In the case of translations and originals alike we have sought to be faithful to the printed works and have retained typographical errors, adding editorial emendations only very rarely.

111 The volumes are often catalogued under the author of the first part, John Lewis (1548–1616).