From December 2007 to March 2014, the National Museum of Wales in Cardiff hosted an exhibition on Wales’s origins. Covering a period from the dawn of the ‘homo’ genus to the Middle Ages, the exhibition defined those living within modern political boundaries as Welsh. There was no attempt to construct a monolithic narrative of Welshness, but rather the exhibition linked cultural discontinuities within physical space and common humanity, reflecting a modern multicultural construction of Wales. This was particularly interesting given the exhibition’s physical contexts. It was hosted by Wales’s oldest national museum which was established in 1907, at a time when several Welsh national institutions were created. Adjacent and roughly contemporaneous to the museum is Cardiff City Hall, which has housed a Pantheon of National Heroes in its Marble Hall since 1916. Among this statuary appear heroes of the primitive Welsh church (St. David), nonconformity (William Williams, Pantycelyn), poetry (Dafydd ap Gwilym), lost independence (Llywelyn Olaf) and indomitable spirit (Owain Glyndŵr). Across from the museum stands a stone circle, constructed in 1899 for a ceremony of the Gorsedd of the Bards in connection with the National Eisteddfod, a revived medieval cultural festival. The Gorsedd, a venerable institution complete with druids, bards and ovates, had originated a century earlier as a late-eighteenth-century cultural invention.

Each of these displays signifiers of Welsh nationhood tied to ideas of Wales’s origins; origins which very much depended on the perspective from which the Welsh past was viewed, within contemporary values and identities. This process of redefining origins in accordance with changing culture and society can be seen occurring across the long eighteenth century, in a period when Wales underwent a concerted process of reconceptualisation arising from a renewed cultural awareness and new understandings of history and ethnicity.

Anthony D. Smith has discussed the importance of national ‘myths’, either of descent from a notable ancestor or of a ‘golden age’ which exhibits the values of the people, in constructing and maintaining national identity. He further notes that ‘The content of the myths may gradually change, … yet the myths themselves endure and acquire new elements and are subject to
continuous elaboration. By the eighteenth century, the medieval account of Wales’s origins was not guaranteed survival, as changing scholarly views and the alteration of Wales’s cultural and social landscape rendered many of its elements unpalatable or untenable. Still, the idea of a noble and ancient past remained important to ideas of Welshness: as Prys Morgan has noted, “To a people with little present, and no future, the discovery of the distant past was electrifying.” By stressing an idiosyncratic history, the Welsh legitimised their claim to nationhood, whilst the links between their own history and those of other nations placed them within wider narratives of European history and civilisation. Elements of both the ‘ideological’ and ‘genealogical’ myths can be seen in the changing conceptualisations of Welsh origins. While the idea of a noble progenitor of Wales remained a salient feature, the construction and presentation of Wales’s origin reacted and altered in accordance with changing ideological values, including the idea of Celticism, the influence of Christianity, the rise of antiquarianism, and the process of romantic forgery and invention.

The Fall of Wales’s Trojan Origins

Noting the cultural shifts within which a heightened interest in Welsh history and culture led to the construction of new identities, Prys Morgan has referred to this period as the ‘eighteenth-century renaissance’. In London, several groups of patriotic Welshmen emerged, notably the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion from 1751, and the Gwyneddigion Society from 1770. Providing an expatriate Welsh community, these societies helped to forge a sense of Welshness by emphasising Welsh language, literature, music, popular antiquities and history, often patronising works on these subjects and creating a space for their discussion. The medieval bardic competition, the eisteddfod, was also revived, particularly by the Gwyneddigion Society from 1789. These interests were also reflected by writers within Wales as interest in local studies blossomed. Much of this antiquarian interest, particularly the rediscovery of Celts and Druids, had a bearing on the idea of Welsh origins.

The reconceptualisation of Welshness was necessitated by the discounting of Welsh history, or else its appropriation under wider Britishness, throughout the early modern period. Henry Tudor had utilised Welsh history to legitimate his kingship. Tracing his descent from Cadwaladr, the last king of Britain, Henry unfurled the Red Dragon of Cadwaladr at Bosworth and incorporated it into the Tudor royal seal. This was a conscious nod to
Wales’s origin myth, as related in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s twelfth-century *Historia Regum Britanniae*, was also challenged – largely discredited by the sixteenth-century Italian-English historian Polydore Vergil. According to Geoffrey, the Welsh were the aboriginal inhabitants of Britain, led there by the exiled Trojan Brutus, the great-grandson of Aeneas. Brutus discovered a group of enslaved Trojans in Greece and led them in an uprising, freeing them and defeating the Greek king. Sailing around Europe he gathered more exiled Trojans, before reaching Britain to which he gave his name. The legend also provided onomastic rationales for Britain’s four nations: Cornwall was named for Cornelius, the leader of a band of Trojans who had joined Brutus, while England (*Lloegr*), Scotland (*yr Alban*) and Wales (*Cymru*) were the lands ruled by Brutus’s sons, Locrinus, Albanactus and Kamber.

Given the shifting views and values of the eighteenth century, it is interesting that new origin myths reflected many of the elements and themes of earlier conceptualisations of Welsh identity, including the Brutus story. The Welsh language remained an important signifier of Welsh idiosyncrasy, and was even imbued with new meanings and perceptions. Wales’s special relationship with Christianity not only endured, but was expanded and lengthened. The idea of the Welsh as aboriginal Britons remained paramount, as it differentiated them from later invaders. Some myths reflected contemporary scholarly theory, and as the period was marked by improved communication networks and an increasingly interconnected world, Welsh origins became more inter- and transnational.

**Celts and Druids: The Welsh as the Descendants of Gomer**

Even at the beginning of this period, external influence combined with local thought, connecting Welsh origins with Celticism. In 1703, the Breton scholar Paul Pezron published his *Antiquité de la Nation* (English translation, 1706), followed soon after by the Oxford-based Welsh scholar Edward Lhuyd’s *Archæologia Britannica* (1707). The scholarship of the two works
was worlds apart, but both identified Welsh as a Celtic language, with Lhuyd noting the relation between Welsh, Breton, Cornish, Gaelic and Gaulish. Lhuyd was a meticulous and sceptical scholar, characterised by his insistence on first-hand observation, careful recording of information, and aversion to theorisation without extensive evidence. Only the first volume of his *Archæologia Britannica* ever appeared, but it did much to establish the Celticism of the Welsh language. Mainly consisting of lists of words and etymological comparisons interspersed with essays, Lhuyd’s work proved obtuse to many later scholars, but its overarching message contributed markedly to later conceptualisations of Welsh origins. Pezron, while similarly utilising etymology, was prone to speculation. Citing mythology and scripture, he claimed the Celtic people were descended from Gomer, son of Japhet and grandson of Noah, who migrated into Europe after the fall of Babel. This was not a new idea, as seventeenth-century Welsh writers like John Davies of Mallwyd and Charles Edwards had espoused similar theories, but here the Celtic element gave it new legitimacy. Pezron claimed that these Gomarians were men of great stature and importance in Antiquity, and travelling from Asia through Greece and Italy they entered Classical mythology as Titans. Pezron not only connected Celtic, within which he included Welsh, with Scripture but also with the Classical world, much as Geoffrey had:

A strange Thing, that so ancient a Language should now be spoken by the *Americam Britons* in France, and by the Ancien [sic] Britons in Wales: These are the People who have the Honour to preserve the Language of the Posterity of Gomer, Japhet’s Eldest Son, and the Nephew of Shem, the Language of those Princes called Saturn and Jupiter, who passed for great Deities among the Ancients.

Finally, by linking the Welsh with Celtic, and thus with Gaul, and the migrations of the descendants of Gomer after the flood, they became not just the aboriginal inhabitants of Britain, but most of western Europe. It is little surprise that these bold pronouncements had a greater impact over the succeeding century than Lhuyd’s etymological tables. Many of these ideas entered into Welsh popular consciousness just a decade later. In 1716 Theophilus Evans published his *Drych y Prif Oesoedd*, the most popular Welsh-language history for over a century. Beginning his history with Genesis, Evans situated Welsh origins after the fall of Babel with the language: ‘And who do you suppose spoke Welsh in that time but Gomer, Japhet’s eldest son’. Derived from the name Gomer, his progeny
became Gomeri or Cymru, and following roughly the path described by Pezron, settled in France, Britain and Ireland. Moreover, it should be noted that Evans was not only a passionate Welsh patriot, but also a stark Anglican, and the myth of Gomer situated the Welsh within his Christian, Protestant narrative of history. Evans also reflected Lhuyd’s arguments about the relationship between Welsh and Irish Gaelic, arguing that the arrival of the Trojan Brutus, after whom the island had been named, had imported Greek words while the Romans had brought Latin, causing the difference between the languages of Britain and Ireland. Throughout his work, Evans also returned to Geoffrey’s history, along with other early Welsh and Classical sources, offering a defence against English critics and connecting Welsh antiquity with the Classical world. By combining the myths of Gomer and Brutus, Evans united contemporary theory and traditional historiography, and he appropriated the values and meanings embedded in both stories.

Building upon the biblically-based account of Gomer, an important contribution was made by Henry Rowlands’s *Mona Antiqua Restaurata* (1723) which identified Rowlands’s native Anglesey as the seat of ancient druidism. The druids received much antiquarian attention in the period, notably in the works of John Toland and William Stukeley. As a symbol of Welshness, a druid appeared as a standard-bearer on the title page of the Cymmrodorion Society’s Constitution in 1755. Providing etymological comparisons between Welsh and Hebrew and historical comparisons between descriptions of druidic and Old Testament practices of worship, Rowlands argued that Welsh druids had received and maintained the antediluvian religion of the patriarchs, bolstering Wales’s religious credentials. Drawing from Pezron, he described the migrations of Gomer’s descendants to Britain. He also utilised the work of Lhuyd, with whom he had corresponded, noting:

“These two now mentioned gentlemen, having by different methods opened a way of resolving diverse tongues in Europe to one mother-language, which language indeed Mr. Lhwyd leaves modestly undecided, but by Monsieur Pezron is determined to be the Celtic; I hoped my pains would not be ill spent, if I endeavoured by the demonstration of this table to mount it one step higher; that is, to resolve that (our first distinguished Gomerian) into the very original and fountain-head of all, the most ancient patriarchal Hebrew tongue.”

However, like Evans, he also took note of Brutus. Citing the unreliability of ancient texts, Rowlands denied Brutus’s claim to aboriginal status whilst
allowing that it was ‘very probable’ that he led a group of Greeks to the island and gave it his name.\textsuperscript{33}

Despite Rowlands’s doubts, wider British and European developments soon lent new legitimacy to ancient texts. From 1760, James Macpherson’s Ossianic poetry had a profound effect on European literatures, and Wales was no exception.\textsuperscript{34} In 1764 Evan Evans published his \textit{Some Specimens of the Poetry of the Ancient Welsh Bards}:

When I saw that one of the \textit{wild Scottish Highlanders}, and also a learned Englishman, had translated the work of their old bards to English, I thought that it was not fitting that we, the \textit{Welsh}, who have some authentic ancient poetry of our own, are utterly unconcerned in this case: because, as far as I know, that it is the only masterpiece of art which our ancestors have left us, without being lost.\textsuperscript{35}

Catherine McKenna has noted that this work cannot be seen exclusively in the context of Ossian, as Evans’s collection built upon earlier eighteenth-century publications such as Lewis Morris’s \textit{Tlysau yr Hen Oesoedd} (1735).\textsuperscript{36} Still, while claiming that he meant ‘not to set the following poems in competition’ with Macpherson’s works, and that his book was ‘first thought of ... some years before the name of Ossian was known in England’,\textsuperscript{37} persistent references to the literature of the Scottish highlands and comments on the antiquity of Welsh literature place Evans’s work within this discourse.\textsuperscript{38} He was also critical, noting, ‘I fear, after all, that the \textit{highlander} is throwing a cloak over men’s eyes, and that they are not as old as he asserts they are’.\textsuperscript{39} Despite a lack of direct comment on origins, this paradigmatic shift had ramifications for the perception of Wales’s ancient history. By looking to the vernacular literature of the nation, hitherto unknown information not contained in Latin or English texts could be excavated.

\textbf{Reinventing Welsh Origins in the Age of Romanticism}

Like the ‘ancient’ literatures of many nations in this period, these sources were largely inaccessible, locked away either in private collections or foreign libraries, such as Oxford. Welsh scholars therefore made concerted efforts to publish this material. The most notable early work was the three-volume \textit{Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales} (1801-07). This was the product of three Welshmen: Owen Jones (Owen Myvyr), who largely financed it; William Owen Pughe, who edited the material; and Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg),
who ‘procured’ the contents. Much of the material in the collection was authentic and the product of extensive research, but some was also invented by Iolo, notably sections of the ‘third series of triads’, which included information on Wales’s origins. Indeed, many of these triads, a genuine Welsh and Irish literary form which grouped information in threes, were authentic, albeit elaborated and embellished with Iolo’s mythology. Only a fraction was fabrication. Materials in the Myvyrian Archaiology were not Iolo’s only inventions: his most enduring creation was the Gorsedd of the Bards of the Isle of Britain, a body which was supposed to have preserved knowledge from antiquity to the present, allowing access to the spirit of Wales’s original forefathers. Indeed, Prys Morgan has noted that, for Iolo, ‘history was archaism, but it was also continuity’. Morgan identified different strains which made up Iolo’s historiography and conceptualisation of Welsh origins. These included the triads, medieval histories, the ‘Protestant myth’ of Welsh history, and antiquarianism, especially Druidism, Celticism and folk traditions. He was also familiar with the works that have been discussed here: he rejected much of Geoffrey, especially the Brutus myth, and was familiar with the works of Lhuyd, Pezron, Theophilus Evans, Rowlands and Evan Evans, among many others. Iolo’s contributions to Wales’s origins and early history were at once historical and contemporary, and his ideas quickly entered into wider discussion. Much of his bardic material found a place in William Owen Pughe’s Heroic Elegies and Other Pieces of Llywarç Hen (1792). Likewise, the triads were taken up almost instantly: in Pughe’s Cambrian Biography (1803), which featured entries for these mythic characters, as well as Edward ‘Celtic’ Davies’s Celtic Researches (1804).

Several mythic figures appeared prominently in Iolo’s triads, notably Hu Gadarn, Prydain ap Aedd Mawr, and Dyfnwal Moelmud. These characters were not without historical basis. Hu Gadarn was mentioned by the fourteenth-century bard Iolo Goch, whilst Geoffrey of Monmouth had discussed ‘Dunvallo Molmutius who established among the Britons the so-called Molmutian Laws which are still famous today among the English’. All three featured in a triad on the ‘Three Pillars of National Compact’:

First HU THE MIGHTY, who first conducted the Nation of the CYMMRY to the Island of Britain, and they came from the SUMMER COUNTRY otherwise called DEFFROBANI, where now Constantinople is, and they came over the HAZY SEA into the Island of Britain and to LLYDAW (where they remained). The second was PRYDAIN SON OF AEDD THE GREAT who first instituted Government and social compact in the Island of Britain, before which time there was no regular order, excepting what
might take place of free Courtesy nor any Law but that of Superior force. The third was DYVNWAL MOELMUD who first reduced to order the Laws and Injunctions and Rights and Immunities of the Nation and Country. 46

These were not the only accomplishments of Iolo’s heroes. Hu Gadarn was credited with bringing ploughing, cultivation and the practice of using verse for the purposes of memory and preservation to the Welsh, and drawing the Avanc (a water monster) out of the lake Llyn Llion, preventing the floods which it caused. 47 He was also considered to be a god, if not the primary god, of the ancient Welsh. 48 In addition to dealing with individuals, the triads also discussed the various peoples who had settled the island. The first to arrive were the ‘Three Pacific Tribes’, the Cymry, the Lloegrwys and the Brython. All three ‘were of the original stock of the Cymmyr’, but the Cymry came first even among the original settlers. 49 These peoples were contrasted with later settlers and invaders. In particular, the peaceful settlement of the Cymry was distinguished from later conquests accomplished by treachery, deceit and violence. 50 Indeed, much of Iolo’s material and interpretations mirrored his politics and vision of Wales, which favoured liberty, equality and peace. His founders of Wales reflected these values, settling Britain peacefully and ruling through social compact.

These characters echoed and, to a certain extent, were conflated with both the myths of Brutus and Gomer, both by Iolo and other contemporary writers. Pughe’s Cambrian Biography referred to Brutus as a misidentification of Prydain ap Aedd Mawr. Consequently, he rejected Brutus’s Trojan origins, noting that the early chroniclers who recorded the Brutus myth ‘may well be pardoned for not having been able to discriminate the true meaning of the ancient allegory of Troy, as the same error was adopted by the Romans’. 51 Hu Gadarn was more comparable to Gomer. The triad, ‘the three arduous Achievements’, featured the ship of Nefydd Naf Neifion, which held the male and female of every animal when Llyn Llion flooded the world, and the drawing of the Afanc from that lake by Hu Gadarn’s hunched oxen (Ychain Banog), preventing further floods. 52 This connection with the Flood, along with Hu’s role in leading the Welsh to western Europe, furthered this similarity to Gomer, and situated him within Welsh history rather than wider Christian tradition.

Edward Davies’s Celtic Researches contained a lengthy discussion of the dispersal of peoples following the Flood and the fall of Babel. Discussing the universal belief in Giants (or Titans), he did not consider them the ancestors of the Celts, as Pezron had, but rather those people who had been dispersed from Babel. 53 He did, however, consider Gomer to be the
progenitor of the Celts.\textsuperscript{54} He also did not believe Celtic and Hebrew to be related, but asserted that Hebrew's claim to be the Ur-language was impossible owing to changes which all languages undergo over time, questioning whether any language could be considered more sacred than another.\textsuperscript{55} Still, he noted that the druids had preserved ‘many of the vital and essential principles’ of the primitive religion,\textsuperscript{56} and echoed Rowlands's assertion that their seat was on Anglesea.\textsuperscript{57} Davies saw the world’s religions as a monomyth arising from memory of the Deluge and used Iolo’s triads extensively to support his vision of the Gomerian myth by comparing Noah to Hu, the ‘figurative conductor’ of the Welsh to Britain.\textsuperscript{58} He continued these arguments in his \textit{Rites and Mythology of the British Druids} (1809), in which he devoted almost a hundred pages to illustrating this comparison and Hu’s importance.\textsuperscript{59}

Nevertheless, Davies was critical of Iolo’s material in this later work, particularly Bardism:\textsuperscript{60} ‘A slight inquiry into the credentials of this society itself, will discover some marks of gross misrepresentation, if not absolute forgery.’\textsuperscript{61} He took further umbrage with the political biases he detected in Iolo’s conclusions, remarking that the pacifist, liberal, radical sentiments displayed in Bardism could not be an ancient feature.\textsuperscript{62} Still, Davies was willing to put the (forged) manuscript material provided by Iolo in the \textit{Myvyrian Archaiology} and elsewhere to good use, especially Iolo’s invented Bardic Alphabet (\textit{Coelbren y Beirdd}), as it fit well into his own theories concerning Welsh origins and history.\textsuperscript{63} He embedded both authentic and forged primary sources within contemporary scholarly discourses concerning history, mythology and Celticism. Escewing Iolo’s interpretation, Davies discussed Hu Gadarn in the context of theories by contemporary scholars like Sharon Turner, George Stanley Faber, Jacob Bryant, Charles Vallancey and Paul Henri Mallet. Thus these sources passed from the romantic forger Iolo into the developing scholarly fields of mythology and ethnic history, not only illustrating Welsh origins, but wider theories on the origins of religion.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Iolo’s vision of history remained popular with Welsh romantic scholars, particularly from the mid-nineteenth century. As Marion Löffler has noted, ‘The counterfeit material Iolo had added to the sources of Welsh history came to the aid of Welsh scholars in their search for a core historical narrative in a century during which Romanticism and nationalism jointly created
a sustained demand for a historicist view of nationhood. Material by Iolo appeared in print throughout this period. His son, Taliesin Williams (ab Iolo), published his father’s major work on Bardism, *Cyfrinach Beirdd Ynys Prydain* (1829), and began editing the *Iolo Manuscripts* (1848) at the behest of the Welsh Manuscript Society, although the work was completed by Thomas Price (Carnhuanawc) and John Williams (ab Ithel). This society, established in 1837, was responsible for publishing much Ioloic material, including Ab Ithel’s *Barddas* (1862). In 1853, Lady Augusta Hall of Llanover purchased the Iolo Manuscripts, making them available to scholars at Llanover Hall. In the same year, Ab Ithel established the *Cambrian Journal* which published many articles on Iolo and his materials. Still, even as Iolo’s accounts enjoyed popularity with romanticist scholars, they faced new controversy and critique, notably from Thomas Stephens, the first modern Welsh scholar.

Arising from his extensive reading of and correspondence with European scholars, Stephens’s revolutionary critical treatment of medieval Welsh literature disproved the historical legitimacy of much of Iolo’s work, including characters like Hu Gadarn, Prydain ap Aedd Mawr and Dyfnwal Moelmud. This approach to the Welsh past reflected the new views and values of Welsh identity and scholarship, just as the evolving myths of Welsh origins had throughout the eighteenth century. As Löffler has stated, ‘Even the comprehensive critique of Iolo’s legacy … was part of the process of national legitimation since it allowed professional Welsh scholars to correct their historical narrative along scientific lines.’ Indeed, in defending his controversial 1858 eisteddfod essay disproving the discovery of America by the twelfth-century Welshman Madoc ap Owain Gwynedd, Stephens stated that ‘he would still continue to urge strongly and persistently every merit honestly pertaining to the history or national character of the Kymry … but he thought it lowered them as a people, to be arguing claims which they could not prove’. Further developments in nineteenth-century Welsh historiography continued to reflect changing ideas of Welshness and the origins of the nation. Just as earlier ideas of Welsh origins like the myths of Brutus and Gomer had an indelible place in eighteenth-century reimaginings, many of the ideas of this period continued to have a powerful influence on Welsh identity and self-perception. The values which constitute the Welsh nation are still reflected in modern representations tied to ideas of its genesis, like the Gorsedd of the Bards, a hall of heroic statuary, national institutions, and even a twenty-first-century exhibition on Wales’s origins.
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