

Appendix 13

Tabulated analysis of focal zone elements

This appendix sets out the method and results of the parish-based tabulation which was used initially to assess focal zone evidence. As chapter 3 and 6 note, this approach was problematic for a number of reasons (see below), and density mapping of cantref-wide datasets was found to be more useful.

Parish-based tabulation of evidence: data is assessed by parish at two levels, cantref and case study level, using the following list of focal zones which is introduced in Chapter 2:

Table 1 - Focal zone key elements:

- 1 - Assembly site (1A – feasting sites; 1B – seasonal festival; 1C– monumental stones)
- 2 - Sacral site – pagan or Christian
- 3 - Aristocratic/ royal residence
- 4 - Other high status homes, e.g. warriors/ cult leader/ craft specialist/ ruling kin-group
- 5 - Market
- 6 - Craft production
- 7 - Rich material culture
- 8 - Significant function (cult/ juridical/ political/ administrative)
- 9 - Important cemetery
- 10 - Strategic location - communication
- 11 - Strategic location – landscape zones/ topography
- 12 - Mills
- 13 - Hunting
- 14 - Complex ditches (possibly around large area)
- 15 - Dependent agricultural settlements

Tables 3 and 4 show, on a parish-by-parish basis, the distribution of focal zone elements (the evidence for these focal zone elements is given in Appendix 4, and comprises a multidisciplinary dataset that includes place-names and patterns of *longue durée* activities.).

Tabulation was done in two ways. Table 3 shows the first approach, with presence/ absence of focal zone indicators identified for all the cantref's parishes through analysis of readily-available datasets. The focal zone indicators to be examined were selected for cantref-wide coverage. Data derives from HER and RCAHMW records; Charles 1992's place-name survey; George Owen's 16th century records; the Welsh Annals; Graham Jones' online list of saints dedications (amended in the light of local knowledge); and historical sources discussed in chapters 2 and 4. References are given in Appendix 4.

Table 4 shows the second approach, which focussed on the parishes of the case study areas, and involved a more detailed interrogation of local records. This case study overview covered all focal zone elements in Case Study areas 1, 2, 3 and was expanded to include, for comparison, additional study areas 4, 5, 6 and 7. Area 4 has been studied previously by the author (Comeau 2010; 2016), but areas 5, 6 and 7 were not part of current or previous detailed case studies and neither their tithe schedules nor their fourteenth to sixteenth century records were analysed, the latter being, in these areas, generally exiguous.

Evidence draws on the full range of place-name, archaeological and historical data, supplemented in the case study areas and area 4 by fourteenth to sixteenth century manorial records, nineteenth century tithe schedules, a re-assessment of place-name evidence, and ground-truthing. The assessment process can be viewed best in the overview for Bayvil, undertaken as part of a preparative study and therefore particularly detailed (Appendix 14).

Most categories of evidence can be clearly identified and assessed, though some are not present. There is currently no evidence for craft manufacture or feasting, though this is to be expected given preservational conditions and lack of excavation, and the only evidence for rich material culture is provided by the area's freestanding crosses, cross slabs and

pillars (Appendix 4). There is also no evidence for mills in the early medieval period, though medieval and 16th century records of these are noted in Appendix 4 for reference. Assessment of strategic location requires an analysis of topography, geomorphology and communication networks that this approach is not suited to.

Scores of the incidence of focal zone indicators in each parish were then calculated. The cantref and case study overviews (Tables 2 and 3) produces different scores for the same parishes because the case study overview uses a wider range of more detailed datasets. Nonetheless, similar variations in score are exhibited by the same parishes in each overview, potentially indicating focal zones. Both assessments show high scores for two parishes, Bayvil and Morvil, where almost the whole suite of focal zone characteristics is present. In no other parish are they evident to the same degree, though there are also high concentrations in adjacent parishes. The highest-scoring parishes, grouped by adjacency, are as follows:

Table 2

Parish	Cantref-wide analysis	Case-study analysis
Group 1		
Bayvil	16/29	16/18
Crugie quarter (Nevern parish)	5/29	11/18
Group 2		
Morvil	11/29	14/16
Puncheston	3/29	9/16
Little Newcastle	7/29	8/16
Group 3		
Maenclochog	8/29	10/18
Llandeilo Llwydarth	4/29	9/18
Llangolman	4/29	10/18
Group 4		
Llanfair nantgwyn	8/29	11/18

Assessing the significance of these variations is, however, complicated by differences in parish size. There are also issues arising from differential availability of data: the finely grained case study overviews are potentially misleading because of variable survival of written records, particularly between northern and southern Cernais, which is reflected in sharply differing numbers of pre-1700 place-names. There is also great variability in nineteenth century tithe records of field names, which are not recorded at all in some areas, and when present are often only functional designators. Achieving confidence in a cantref-wide projection of an analysis based on the detailed case studies is therefore problematic. Density mapping of cantref-wide datasets was found to be more useful (chapter 6).

Table 3 - Focal zone assessment – selected indicators and ALL parishes

15	TOTAL SCORE	Bond or ex-bond township recorded	✓	16	1
15	Bond township place-name				
4, 8 & 15	Maerdref place-names, pre-1700				
4 & 15	Meredith place-names, pre-1700				
14	Large prehistoric enclosure with complex ditches	✓			
13	Medieval forests recorded in 10c				
13	Hunting place-names				
12	Medieval mills				
10	Cross roads (5)	✓			
9	EM *special* graves	✓			
9	Barrow cemeteries	✓	✓		
8	Cantref/ regional place-names	✓			
*	Court place-names, pre-1700				
3 & 8	Llys place-names, pre-1700				
3 & 8	Prince (etc) place-names, pre-1700	✓			
2 & 8	Brynach dedications	✓	5		
2 & 8	David & associated saints dedications				
1 & 7	Ogham/ Latin inscribed stones, 5c-6c	✓	1		
5	Medieval markets	✓			
3	Multivallate enclosure	✓			
2	Pre-Comag eccl site – written evidence	✓			
2	Multiperiod ritual complexes	✓	7		
*	Beacon place-names	✓	4		
*	Battle place-names				
*	Battle site, recorded				
*	Twynpath place-names				
1B	Pre-1600 Cnapan (hurling) game				
1B	Documented medieval fair	✓			
1	Assembly site place-names, pre-1700	✓			
Focal zone element	Parishes	Bayvil	Castlebythe		

* - Included for comparison: most of these can be identified as medieval manorial centres

Table 4 – Evidence for all focal zone elements in selected parishes

The evidence of the parishes in the case study areas, assessed against criteria derived from comparative analysis of early medieval focal zones elsewhere in north-west Europe (see page ... in Chapter 2/3). For further details of the evidence see relevant Appendices and the demesne area analysis in Chapter 4. ‘Parishes’ = ecclesiastical, post-Reformation parishes

Evidence type: A = archaeology; C = church dedication; D = documentary evidence; P = place name; G = geomorphological/ topographical; M = medieval manorial centre OR pre-Conquest maenor; Mp = historic map evidence.

Case study area 1: ‘Bayvil and Moylgrove’, comprising the parishes of Bayvil, Moylgrove, and Crugie quarter of the parish of Nevern. [A detailed analysis of the Bayvil focal area elements is provided in Appendix 14]. 13th-16th century evidence (Chapter 4, App X - Extent) indicates that Bayvil and Crugie together constituted the medieval manor/ fee of Bayvil.

Case study area 2: ‘Redwalls’, comprising the parishes of Morvil, Puncheston, Castlebythe and Little Newcastle. 13th-15th century evidence (Chapter 4) indicates that Morvil and Puncheston together constituted a medieval manor known variously as the manor of Redwalls/ Carn Deifo/ Puncheston; both the lord of Cemais and an Anglo-Norman knight (de Vale, 13c) held lands here. The 19th century field patterns of Morvil and Puncheston (Chapter 4) indicate a common open field.

Case study area 3: ‘Llanfeugan’, comprising principally the parishes of Llanfair Nantgwyn, Whitechurch and Meline (separate medieval fees)

Additional areas, with 5-7 not the subject of detailed studies:

- Area 4: parish of Dinas (medieval fee; previously studied – Comeau 2009, 2014, 2017)
- Area 5: ‘Maenclochog/ Llandeilo Llwydarth’, comprising the parishes of Maenclochog, Llandeilo and Llangolman, which together constituted the medieval manor/ fee of Maenclochog
- Area 6: parish of Henry’s Moat (medieval manor/ fee)
- Area 7: parish of Llanfyrnach (medieval fee)

Notes on Table 6.4:

1: possible hunting activity identified through festival date.

2: Crugiau Cemais round barrow cemetery is shared between parishes of Bayvil, Crugie quarter and Moylgrove.

3: Mabinogion references to adjacent area.

4: early medieval inscribed stone, either Latin/ ogham stone (Group I) or elaborated cross (Group III).

5: Bayvil mill is in Crugie quarter of Nevern parish, so is also listed under Crugie

6: medieval forest status, implying hunting activity

7: see Chapter 4 & 5 on medieval demesne areas and pre-Conquest bond settlements

*: Under criterion 2, medieval churches and chapels are noted as ‘D’; multiperiod archaeological complexes are noted as ‘A’. Barrow cemeteries are noted under criterion 9 (=‘important cemetery’). Cist cemeteries are not automatically noted under criterion 9 – inclusion depends on the presence of distinctive factors, whether indicated by records, place-name, location, or the presence of ‘special’ (rectilinear embanked) burials.

** : ‘A/ P’ here represents a ‘Twmpath’ site

Areas/ post-medieval parishes	TOTAL SCORE															16 if treated as one unit			
	15: Dependent agricultural settlements	14: Complex ditches around large area	13: hunting	12: mills	11: strategic location – landscape zones/ topography	10: strategic location - communication	9: important cemetery	8: significant functions [cult/ juridical/ political/ admin]	7: rich material culture	6: craft production	5: market	4: other high status homes	3: aristocratic/ royal residence	2: Sacral site – pagan or Christian *	1C: monumental stones at assembly site		1B: assembly - seasonal festival	1A: assembly feasting	1: Assembly site
Area 1 (case study): parish of Bayvil (= Anglo-Norman demesne manor of Welsh-law bondsmen)	D P	A D P	(1)	D/ P (5)	G	G	A P	D M P	(4)	–	D P	D	P	A D P	A D P	C D P	-	D P (2)	16
Area 1 (case study): Crugie quarter of parish of Nevern (NB – this is part of Anglo-Norman manor of Bayvil)	D P	A D P	-	D/ P (5)	G	G	A P	-	-	-	A D P	A D P	A P	D	-	P	-	D P (2)	11
Area 1 (case study): parish of Moylgrove (= Anglo-Norman demesne manor)	A D P	-	(6)	D P	-	-	-	(4)	-	-	A D P	-	-	D	-	-	-	D P (2)	7
Area 2 (case study): parish of Morvil (alias ‘Redwalls’, linked with Puncheston and Castlebythe in Anglo-Norman manorial records)	A D P	A	(1) (3)	D P	G	G	A	M	(4)	-	D	D		D	-	C D	-	A D	14
Area 2 (case study): parish of Puncheston (linked with Morvil/ Redwalls and Castlebythe in Anglo-Norman manorial records)	A D Mp P	-	-	D	G	?	-	M	(4)	-	P	A	P	D	-	-	-	-	9
Area 2 (case study): parish of Castlebythe (linked with Morvil/ Redwalls and Puncheston in Anglo-Norman manorial records)	D Mp	-	-	?	-	?	A	P	-	-	A P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Area 2 (case study): parish of Little Newcastle (Anglo-Norman demesne manor)	A D P Mp	–	–	D P	G	?	-	M	-	-	A	A	-	A D	-	C D	-	D P	8
Area 3 (case study): parish of Llanfair Nantgwyn (Medieval Welsh freeholder ‘fee’)	Mp	-	(1) (3)	D	G	G	-	M	-	-	A D	A D	P	D P	-	C D	-	D	11
Area 3 (case study): parish of Whitechurch (Medieval Welsh freeholder ‘fee’)	A P	A	(3)	D P	G	G	A P	M	-	-	A D	-	-	A D P	-	A	-	A	12
Area 3 (case study): parish of Meline (Medieval Welsh freeholder ‘fee’)	A D P	-	(3)	A D P	G	G	A P	M	(4)	-	A D	-	-	D	-	P	-	P	12
Cf Area 4 - parish of Dinas (medieval Welsh ‘fee’; previous study Comeau 2009, 2012, 2017)	D P	-	-	D P	G	G	-	-	-	-	A D	-	-	D	-	P	-	D	8
Area 5 (not subject to detailed study): parish of Maenclochog (Anglo-Norman manor)	D	A	-	D	G	G	A	M	(4)	-	-	A	-	A D	-	-	-	-	10

Area 5 (not subject to detailed study): parish of Llandeilo Llwydarth (part of manor of Maenclochog)	-	-	C	-	A D	D	-	-	-	(4)	D M	A	G	G	?	(3) (6)	-	-	9	
Area 5 (not subject to detailed study): parish of Llangolman (part of manor of Maenclochog)	-	-	C	-	A D	P	A	-	-	-	-	A	G	G	D/ P	P	-	P	10	
Cf Area 6 (not subject to detailed study) – Henry's Moat (Anglo-Norman manor)	A/P **	-	-	-	A D	-	A	-	-	-	M	-	G	G	?	-	-	A Mp P	7	
Cf Area 7 (not subject to detailed study) – Llanfyrnach (mixed area: Anglo-Norman manor and Welsh freemen)	-	-	-	-	A D	-	A D	-	-	(4)	M P	A	G	G	D P	-	A?	P	10	

References

Barrow, J. (ed.) 1998: *St Davids Episcopal Acta 1085-1280*, Cardiff: South Wales Record Society.

Comeau, R. 2010: Cytir and Crosses: the archaeological landscape of the Parish of Dinas. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 158 (2009), 225-25.

Comeau, R. 2016: Feeding the body and claiming the spirit(s): early Christian landscapes in West Wales. In: Ó Carragáin, T. & Turner, S. (eds.) *Making Christian Landscapes in Atlantic Europe. Conversion and Consolidation in the Early Middle Ages*. Cork: Cork University Press

Edwards, N. 2007: *A Corpus of Early Medieval Inscribed Stones and Stone Sculpture in Wales*, Cardiff, University of Wales Press.

Pryce, H. 2007: The dynasty of Deheubarth and the church of St Davids. In: Wyn Evans, J. & Wooding, J. (eds.) *St David of Wales : cult, church and nation*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.305-316

Rhys, J. 1874: On Some of Our British Inscriptions. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, Series 5, 17-21.

Westwood, I. O. 1884: Description of the Vitalinus Ogham Stone. *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5(1), 50-52.