

Antiquity

VOL. XLIV No. 174

JUNE 1970

Editorial

PLATES XIII-XV

We have often expressed our disapproval of the *Festschrift* and described it as a politically unhappy device (it is only too easy to make quite a long list of very distinguished archaeologists and ancient historians over fifty-nine who have never been so honoured), and a cemetery for articles which ought to have been published elsewhere in more accessible form, or not at all. Yet, from time to time, a *Festschrift* appears which justifies the effort involved in producing it. Such a one was the Autumn 1969 number of *Iraq*, which was consecrated 'in honour of the seventy-fifth birthday of Professor C. J. Gadd'. There are papers by R. D. Barnett about musical instruments from Ur, by D. J. Wiseman on a Lipsur Litany from Nimrud, by Joan Oates giving a preliminary report on Choga Mami 1967-8 (a most fascinating account of this exciting site), Leo Oppenheim on 'New Fragments of the Assyrian Dream-Book', and Lenzen on Eanna in Uruk (but why was this contribution published in German with no English summary?). Gadd just lived long enough to be presented with this *Festschrift* (*Iraq*, xxxi, part 2; 50s.).

Fortunately Dr Iorweth Peate was and is in happier health than Gadd and can look at the attractively produced volume of essays in his honour published a few months ago (*Studies in Folk Life*, edited by Geraint Jenkins. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969. 344 pp., 24 pls., 84s.). This is a very handsome volume with contributions by Frank Price Jones on 'The Gwerin of Wales', Dag Stromback on 'The

Institute for Dialect and Folklore Research in Uppsala', G. B. Thompson on 'The Welsh Contribution to the Development of the Ulster Folk Museum', Estyn Evans on 'Sod and Turf Houses in Ireland', and George Ewart Evans on 'Folk Life Studies in East Anglia', to name only a few. It also contains a bibliography of books and papers by Dr Peate and reminds us of his contributions to *ANTIQUITY* from 1931 onwards. In 1930 Peate had edited *Studies in Regional Consciousness and Environment* as a *Festschrift* for H. J. Fleure, and it is a delightful thought that the first contribution in *Studies in Folk Life* is an introduction by Fleure, the last thing he wrote before his death last year at the age of ninety-two. Fleure, in his preface, describes how Peate was one of the earliest students entering the newly founded Honours School of Geography and Anthropology at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, graduating in 1921 and in so doing, says Fleure, winning 'the lasting friendship of the external examiner, Sir John Myres, as well as of the writer of these notes'. Fleure describes how Peate's great opportunity came when the estate of St Fagans was given to the Welsh nation and he was able to create and develop Amgueddfa Werin Cymru, the Welsh Folk Museum.

Dr Peate writes himself, in a letter to the Editor, 'We began here in 1948 with a staff of about a dozen persons. The staff now totals over one hundred, and I regard the establishment of our Department of Oral Traditions and Dialects as one of our principal achievements

ANTIQUITY

I spent three summers (1922–5) with the late Professor Alf Sommerfelt of Oslo studying Welsh dialects and became convinced then that a full survey of the speech of Wales should be undertaken. It took over thirty years to get this initiated. The work now being done is magnificent—in folk song, folk beliefs, the folk tale as well as systematic studies of local dialects.’

The work of the Department of Oral Traditions and Dialects, while important, is not so obvious to the visitor as the collections of material objects and the various buildings—houses, a chapel, a woollen factory and many another—that have been transported to the park at St Fagans in furtherance of the splendid tradition created by the Scandinavian students of folk life and culture. On a recent visit we saw for the first time the toll-house from Aberystwyth, built in 1771, which was transferred to St Fagans in 1962 as a gift from the Ministry of Transport when they were widening the cross-roads at Penparcau. This elegant building has on it a fascinating list of tolls and we reproduce this here (PL. XIII).

We turn from the Welsh Folk Museum, one of the most attractive and successful museums in Britain, to the sad story of the Pitt-Rivers Museum, Farnham, which has now been closed for some time. Nicholas Moore, Honorary Secretary of Group 12 (Wessex) of the Council for British Archaeology, writes:

The Group has become increasingly worried about the future of the Museum and the present lack of care being taken of the collections. This was high-lighted earlier this year when hooligans removed and damaged the statue of Augustus outside the Museum. As far as we can learn Captain Pitt-Rivers’s wish that the Museum should become an educational charity never materialized because of his death, and now no one appears to have any interest in the Museum. . . It would seem that even bona fide research students cannot gain admission to the Museum. As a Group we would much like to see the Museum reinstated, particularly as a Museum of local archaeology. It has been suggested that it would form a very good Field Studies Centre.

These are excellent ideas and we hope that something may come of them.



Pharos, a quarterly which, founded in 1934, is the official organ of the Cremation Movement at home and abroad (namely The Cremation Society and The International Cremation Federation), may not be regularly read by students of archaeology. We recommend the issue for May 1969 (vol. xxxv, no. 2) which has an admirable article on ‘Ninety Five Years of Cremation in Great Britain (1874–1969)’. 1874 was the year in which Sir Henry Thompson published in *The Contemporary Review* his paper on ‘The Treatment of the Body after Death’, and in which the famous declaration was signed at 35 Wimpole Street on 13 January. The *Pharos* article deals fully and clearly with the well-known events that followed the cremation of the horse in 1879 with the assistance of Professor Gorini of Lodi, the cremation of Captain Hanham’s wife and mother in his own crematorium on his private estate in Dorset in 1882, and the celebrated affair of Dr William Price on Llantrisant Mountain in 1884.

By permission of the Welsh Folk Museum we print pictures of Dr Price, and of his own cremation (PLS. XIV, XV). Price is described in the *Dictionary of Welsh Biography* as ‘eccentric’, and how correctly! His dates are 1800 to 1893. Born in Monmouthshire, he was the son of the Reverend William Price (1760–1841) who was for a short while—perhaps fortunately short—a Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Price *père* took up a living in South Wales; he was insane at thirty and seems to have spent his time, stark naked, rushing around the countryside armed with a saw, with which he cut down trees and bushes in public woods, and, to the natural annoyance of many, in their private gardens. It is perhaps surprising that his son grew up to be no more than an eccentric. William *filis* was a student of the great Dr John Abernethy in London and then practised medicine in Glamorgan except for a short time when, involved in the Chartist march on Newport in 1839, he escaped for a year to France, disguised as a woman. From 1840 until his death at the age of 93 he practised medicine in South Wales and was described as ‘a blunt and forthright doctor whom patients were wont to consult

EDITORIAL

when others more orthodox considered their cases as hopeless'.

He was a vegetarian, declaring that 'the eating of animal flesh has a tendency to revive in man the worst passions of the brute'; he himself practised free love, constantly advocated cremation, and opposed vivisection and vaccination—the latter described by him as 'a method established by law for the express purpose of slaughtering infants'. He believed it injurious to the health to wear socks or stockings: 'They prevent', he said, 'the proper exhalation of the feet, which, in consequence, are kept damp.' He always visited his patients at night—they were always worse then, he said. He was several times tried for manslaughter and always acquitted. A colourful, fascinating person whose biography has not yet been published; the materials for it exist in Dr John Hedley Cule's MD dissertation in Cambridge to which these paragraphs are much indebted. (Dr William Price (1800–93) of Llantrisant: A Study of an Eccentric (Cambridge MD 680).)

Cule calls Price 'a disintegrating, intelligent, schizophrenic'. His interest to archaeologists is that he, more than any other person, was responsible for the legalization of cremation in this country. On Sunday evening, 13 January 1884, as people were coming home from their evening chapel services, excited by passionate hymn singing and bored by a long sermon, they saw smoke coming from the 500-ft Caerlan Hill at Llantrisant, and, hurrying to the site, found Dr Price, clad in a white robe, burning the body of his son with the aid of a ten-gallon tank of petrol. The child had been born five months before—Price was then 83—to his housekeeper, Miss Gwenllian Llewellyn. To the annoyance of many people, he had this child christened Iesu Grist—Jesus Christ—and later, Miss Llewellyn became the mother of two other children, Jesus Christ the Second, and Penelopan, who lived on to discuss her unusual father with colleagues of ours.

The scenes following the unsuccessful cremation at Llantrisant were extraordinary. The partly burnt body was reclaimed by the father and spent a week under his own bed. On 12 February 1884 William Price came to

trial in the Town Hall at Cardiff before a most percipient and wise judge, Mr Justice Stephen. For a full account of the remarkable trial *Regina v. Price* we suggest you consult the *British Medical Journal* for 1884 (624 ff.). Mr Justice Stephen was brilliant, and explained patiently to the rather stupid jury that the trial should never have happened: there was nothing in English law, he said—and he was right—that prevented cremation. The jury did not like this and brought in a verdict other than what they had been asked to do. 'This is no verdict at all,' said the judge. 'Go back and do what I asked you to do.' They came back, and to their own surprise and that of the Welsh and English public, had to say that William Price was not guilty. From that moment it could not be maintained, even by the most obscurantist occupants of the Home Office, that cremation was illegal. But its legalization took a long while: Sir Charles Cameron's Bill 'to provide for the regulation of cremation and other means of disposal of the dead' of April 1884 was opposed and defeated. It was not until 1902 that an Act of Parliament was passed 'For the Regulation of burning of human remains, and to establish burial authorities to establish crematoria': years after crematoria had been set up at Woking, Glasgow, Manchester, Liverpool and Darlington, and were in use.

The Home Office have kindly supplied us with the figures of cremations since their records commenced. There were 3 cremations in 1885, 10 in 1886, and 13 in 1887. The thousand mark was passed in 1912, the ten thousand mark in 1936, the hundred thousand in 1953. In 1968 the number of cremations in Britain was 302,130 and this was 52.4 per cent of the number of registered deaths in that year—this was the first time since records were kept that more than half the people who died in Britain were cremated. In just over eighty years the habits of the British people with regard to the disposal of the dead have been changed—without any change in the population: no invasions, no cultural influences.

We should remember the eccentric William Price of Llantrisant as one of those who by his strange behaviour changed British habits. He

ANTIQUITY

himself died in 1893, and of course insisted on being cremated: 'Peidiwch a'm rhoi i yn y ddaer' he said. His own cremation was public and spectacular (PL. XIVb). This very strange man, a classic paraphrenic, according to Dr Cule, is interesting to students of antiquity not only because he was a pioneer of modern cremation, but because his ideas were heavily Druidic. He thought—like several other people in modern times—that he was an Arch-Druid: he always wore a red waistcoat with green-bound scalloped revers and rows of brass buttons embossed with goats, over this a green coat and green trousers, and on his head a fox-skin hat like Davy Crockett's (PL. XV). He was a latter-day and extravagant Stukeley.



The first six months of 1970 have produced two very remarkable events: first, the discovery by Emery of the Serapaeum at Saqqara, and secondly the exhibition in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts of a golden hoard of ancient Near Eastern artifacts of uncertain provenance. Professor Emery's discovery, described by many as the most sensational find in Egyptian archaeology since the discovery of Tutankhamen's tomb, comes after years of painstaking excavation. It is not the tomb of Imhotep but it does suggest that Emery is really on the track of Imhotep: we wish him all luck.

In January the Boston Museum put on exhibition 137 pieces of 18-carat jewellery weighing 22 lb including a large six-strand necklace of twisted spirals, and a diadem with ten looped chains and hanging pendants. One of the most remarkable items in this collection is a gold Egyptian cylinder seal said to have belonged to an official at the courts of two fifth-dynasty Pharaohs who ruled between 2497 and 2450 BC. The Boston hoard was presented to the Museum by the Boston broker Landon T. Clay who bought it, allegedly from dealers in Switzerland—although this is not certain—for a figure said to be well in excess of a hundred thousand dollars. Neither Mr Clay, nor the Boston Museum, nor the Zurich firm who were alleged to have been trying to sell the hoard in

Berlin, Switzerland and the United States of America for some while, will say—if indeed they know—where this remarkable material came from. Most people think it came from Turkey, and the rumour is Cilicia, the region around Mersin on the south-east coast of Turkey. Dr Temizer, Director of the Archaeological Museum of Ankara, said he was sure it was from Turkey. Professor Akurgal does not agree. But is it a genuine hoard? Professor Emily Vermeule thinks so. Professor Spyridon Marinatos describes it as 'a grotesque forgery'. Professor Vermeule's husband, Cornelius Vermeule, Curator of Classical Art at the Boston Museum, says, 'I have a great admiration for Professor Marinatos . . . when he has had an opportunity to examine the find . . . he will concur that whatever the origins of the jewellery, wherever it was found, it is not a forgery.'

Let us suppose, for the moment, that the Vermeules are right, and that we are not dealing with another affair like the Tiara of Saitaphernes which, like Piltdown, fooled almost all the experts for almost all of the time. Let us suppose Landon T. Clay has not spent his money on period jewellery made by a latter-day Rousso-mousky. How and why did an authentic Turkish hoard of this richness find its way to Boston? Was it stolen and smuggled out of the country, as many believe that the Dorak Treasure was smuggled out of Turkey and now reposes in the private vaults of a Texan millionaire? Peter Warren of the Department of Classics in the University of Durham wrote, outspokenly, in *The Times* of 7 February:

What are we to make of the museum's action? I feel they must be condemned *in toto*. It will be argued that the treasure can now readily be admired and studied, and it will surely receive exemplary publication. But this by no means offsets the loss of knowledge of its exact provenance and find circumstances, which would have provided primary evidence for the history of the area, particularly of its metallurgy. The museum may say that by buying it from the antique market which it had already reached they have saved it for students and visitors. Certainly museums in general are much less guilty in these respects than the vast private market. But by the very fact of having a large sum of money

EDITORIAL

available for it Boston is deliberately and explicitly encouraging robbery of this kind, of material which properly belongs to the country where it was found and which would have been at least as important for the evidence of its find context as for its beauty.

We asked Professor George Bass to comment on the affair of the Boston treasure: this is what he says:

The Boston hoard seems to offer additional evidence for the higher date of Early Bronze Age jewellery that I propose in my forthcoming publication of the University Museum's collection of Trojan jewellery. What stands out in that article (to appear in *AJA*) is that *none* of the evidence for this dating—two gold sauceboats, trinket moulds from Turkey, the University Museum hoard, the Dorak Treasure—was obtained through archaeological excavation. If we, as archaeologists, are truly interested in artifacts as evidence for ancient history, rather than as possessions to be selfishly prized because of their rarity, it is time to take a firm stand. The clandestine excavator and antiquities smuggler are criminals to be abhorred; museums and private collectors who encourage their illegal work, however, are held in high esteem by society. Today we may rationalize our purchases by the thought that it is better for museums and serious collectors to obtain antiquities for public display and scholarly examination than for them to disappear into private, unknown hands. But is it not time that all dealing in antiquities in all countries be made illegal, except as approved by the governments in question? To prevent economic hardship to dealers who today operate within the law, the final date of closure could be set well in the future; new dealerships, in the meantime, would be discouraged. For their part, the lands in which the only remnants of our most ancient past are to be found should take a realistic attitude toward sharing duplicate objects, offering frequent loan exhibits, and making vast basement stores readily available to scholars of all countries. Antiquities smuggling in many countries has reached such immense and lucrative proportions that it will soon be controlled by international organized crime in much the same way as illegal narcotics traffic, if this has not already happened in some cases. To believe otherwise is to be incredibly naive. It is no longer a case of simple peasants selling their chance finds; elaborate and complex operations utilizing helicopters and

speedboats require enormous financial backing. Today the purchase of any valuable antiquity can only encourage further theft, smuggling, and murder. It is time that it is stopped.

There have been only three other comparable treasures: that discovered by Schliemann in 1873 (for long on view in the Berlin Museum, taken away by the Russians in the last war, and whereabouts not now known), that purchased by the University of Pennsylvania and described by Professor Bass himself, and the Dorak Treasure (whereabouts now unknown) described by James Mellaart, who saw it in Izmir in 1958. The Dorak Treasure affair remains one of the great mysteries of 20th-century archaeology: Alfred Friendly in the *International Herald-Tribune* for 10 February describes Mellaart as 'the victim of a frame-up'. Mellaart himself writes of the Boston hoard that 'none of the objects illustrated is stylistically of undoubted Anatolian origin: nor are all the objects of undoubtedly the same date' (*The Times*, 7 February) and takes the opportunity to draw our attention to the statement published in the Twenty-First Annual Report (for 1969) of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara.

As many of our readers remain puzzled by the Dorak affair, and as Mr Mellaart has for long been the victim of a whispering campaign, and has been barred from continuing his work in Turkey, we are happy to publish this statement which reads:

In 1968 the council set up a committee to investigate what has come to be known as the Dorak Affair: Mr J. Mellaart's account of his visit in 1958 to a resident of Izmir who showed him a rich collection of antiquities alleged to have been excavated around 1922 during the Greek occupation at a site called Dorak near Lake Apollyont. As is well known, in 1959 an article on the collection was published by the Institute in *The Illustrated London News* under Mr Mellaart's name and with his full agreement. Having read the committee's report and studied Mr Mellaart's material, including a signed statement which is now in the Institute's archives, the council reached the conclusion that his drawings, which had been shown to the Director in 1958, were beyond doubt genuine records of a

ANTIQUITY

collection which had existed at that time, and that any suggestion that he had been engaged in illegal activities was completely without foundation. A letter to this effect was delivered to the Department of Antiquities in Ankara on 8 May 1969.

We remain unhappy about Dorak and about the Boston 'treasure'. It was an excitement to see the Boston treasure recently through the glass windows of the splendid exhibition 'Art Treasures for Tomorrow' mounted as part of the Centennial Celebrations of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and whether these objects be original or period jewellery, they are beautiful to look at. Who is right in these matters? Marinatos and Friendly, or the Vermeules? Cornelius Vermeule III and his wife Emily, recently appointed to the Zemurray Chair at Harvard, have written a very fair and clear account in *The Illustrated London News* for 21 March 1970. We quote their penultimate words: 'A couple of journalists in London have tried to create "a scandal" over the acquisition of this group. . . It would have been far more scandalous for it to continue its peregrinations, with a prominent American museum bidding for the cylinder seal alone because the rest was "non-Egyptian". . . The loss of archaeological context with which the group came equipped, was guaranteed by the greed of whoever dug it up and peddled it abroad . . . One can only hope that the site, with its new regional style, will be discovered and responsibly excavated in the near future . . .' These sentiments are admirable but surely those who offered the treasure on the international art market in Switzerland, Germany and England before it reached New York, and the New York dealer who sold it to Landon T. Clay, know more about its provenance than has hitherto been revealed: if, not, how is it known that this collection, allegedly homogeneous stylistically, is in fact part of one authentic find?

Meanwhile, as we go to press, we learn that the curatorial faculty of the University Museum

of the University of Pennsylvania reached, on 1 April, the unanimous conclusion that they would purchase no more art objects or antiquities unless the objects were accompanied by a pedigree. We will publish the full text of their decision in the next number of ANTIQUITY, and we have invited the Vermeules to give us their comments upon it.



This is the fiftieth editorial we have written for ANTIQUITY and we feel old and decayed, but enlivened by a letter from a Professor in California who writes: 'I always read ANTIQUITY because it is the only archaeological journal that has a gossip column.' We are not sure that Crawford would have liked that, but we do. Looking back on the last fifty issues, what are immediate reflexions? Growing impatience with contributors who still send in single-spaced manuscripts, diagrams and photographs that cannot be reproduced. And much more than impatience with people who take more than a year to produce a review they have agreed to do, especially when—as happens very rarely—they have, quite properly, suggested themselves as suitable reviewers. Admiration for those who produce their reviews without reminder, and their material for articles and notes in perfect form—double spaced with Harvard bibliography and illustrations ready to be sent to the printer. And a deep and abiding and appreciative affection for all those who make the punctual quarterly appearance of ANTIQUITY possible: our secretaries, our proof and production advisers, Mr Collieson and Mr Trevitt, our blockmakers and our printers and publishers whose co-operation and friendship are more than one could normally expect from heavily charged and busy firms; and for our Production Editor, without whose skilled and devoted care ANTIQUITY—and for that matter the Editor himself—might not exist.

ABERYSTWITH SOUTH GATES (CLEAR) ABERYSTWITH NORTH GATES.

Rate of Toll to be taken at this Gate,
 For every Horse or other Beast drawing any Coach, Chariot, £ s d
 Berlin, Landau, Landaulet, Barouche, Chaise, Phaeton.
 Vis-a-Vis, Calash, Curricle, Car, Chair, Gig, Hearse, Caravan
 Litter, or any such like Carriage — — — — — 0-0-6
 For every Horse or other Beast, except Asses drawing
 any Waggon, Wain, Cart, or other such like Carriage — — — — — 0-0-4
 For every Ass drawing any Cart, Carriage, or other Vehicle — — — — — 0-0-2
 For every Horse or Mule, laden or unladen, and not drawing — — — — — 0-0-1½
 For every Ass, laden or unladen and not drawing — — — — — 0-0-½
 For every Horse or other Animal employed in carrying, drawing,
 or conveying any lime to be used for the purpose of manure — — — — — 0-0-2
 For every drove of Oxen, Cows, or Neat Cattle, the sum of Ten Pence
 per Score, and so in proportion for any greater or less number
 For every drove of Calves, Hogs, Sheeps, or Lambs, the sum of Five
 Pence per Score, and so in proportion for any greater or less number:

EXEMPTION FROM TOLLS

Horses or Carriages attending her Majesty, or any of the Royal Family, or returning therefrom; Horses or Carriages employed for the repairs of any Turnpike Roads, Highways, or Bridges; Horses or Carriages employed in carrying Manure (save Lime) for improving Lands, or Ploughs, or implements of Husbandry; Horses employed in Husbandry, going to or returning from Plough, or to or from Pasture, or Watering place, or going to be or returning from being Shod, and Horses not going or returning on those occasions more than two miles on the Turnpike Road, on which the exemption is claimed; Persons going to, or returning from, their proper parochial Church or Chapel, Persons going to or returning from, their usual place of religious worship tolerated by Law, on Sundays, or on any day on which Devine Service is ordered to be Celebrated; Inhabitants of any Parish or Township going to, or returning from attending the Funeral of any Person who shall die or be buried in the Parish, Township, or Hamlet, in which any Turnpike Road shall lie, any Rector, Vicar, or Curate, on his parochial duty within his Parish; Horses, Carts, or Waggon, conveying Vagrants sent by passes, or any Prisoner sent by legal warrant; Horses or Carriages conveying the Mails; Horses of any Officer or Soldier on march or duty; Horses or Carriages conveying the Arms or Baggage of any such Soldiers or Officers, or returning therefrom or any Sick, Wounded, or disabled Officers, or Soldiers, or any Ordnance, or other public Stores; Horses and Carriages used by Corps of Yeomanry or Volunteers; Horses or Carriages carrying or conveying any person to and from County Elections; any Horse carrying any Agricultural produce which shall have grown on Land in the occupation of or cultivated, used, or enjoyed by the Owner of such produce, and which shall not have been sold; Sheep going to be washed; Horses drawing or not drawing, which shall not pass more than three hundred yards along the Turnpike Road.

PLATE XIII: EDITORIAL. *Notice board from the Aberystwyth Toll-house*



a

b

PLATE XIV: EDITORIAL (*this page*)

(a) Dr William Price of Llantrisant in one of his costumes, 'suit of scarlet merino wool with green silk lettering'. This formed the frontispiece of Price's 'Gwyllllis yn Nayd' (*The Will of My Father*), 1871. In his left hand is a staff with crescentic head—the new moon of Druidic significance; in his right an egg—symbol of fertility. Behind is the figure of a lion standing on a staff with a bull's head

(b) Cremation of Dr William Price at Caerlan, Llantrisant, 21 January 1893

PLATE XV: EDITORIAL (*opposite*)

Dr William Price in another of his costumes. The stamp shows a red goat in a green serpent. The translation of the two poems is in Islwyn ap Nicholas's "Ap Idanfryn", *Dr Price of Llantrisant*, ch. 13 (no date)

See pp. 85–90]

[Photos: National Museum of Wales, Welsh Folk Museum





"A wehidy Dominus Fortis--
 Iatogan dafn Dossanus?
 Bulyant Uffern?
 Hic memoz i per program?
 Ef a dilhyngys ei thwerf--
 Dominus Virtutum?
 Kaeth nawt kyn hullwys, estis, loc--est,
 (list) a clym, buawen, a- im sel.
 Rwyf derwin, y Daw ddaen!
 A chyn nyuawyf derlyn cren,
 A chyn del, ewyn frw, ar ryggonen,
 A chyn vrg kyf alle, ar y lathen puen,
 Post ym heneit yd a kyfaden.
 Alread, om dyuait, llythyr llyfren,
 Kysuaf dygyn, gwely, gwely agben,
 Ar sawl a gigles vy mardh Lyfren.
 Ry byn lwynt wlat Nef, adaf gonen,
 Ky prynhwyt wlat Nef, adaf gonen."

"Myn iydh Dhewin,
 A Fheifardh cyffredin,
 Mi adwen pob corsia
 Ynagof gorthewin,
 My a eplhaf Elyhin,
 O fel Tior meinin,
 Mi a fynegaf ich Brenia.
 Ar yr bobl gyffredin.
 Edhaw pryf ryfeth,
 O Forfa riciamedd!
 I ddiad exwiredh.
 Ar Faelgw Gwynedd!
 Ai flew, ai zhanneit,
 Ai llygaid, ym corodd!
 A hwn a wna dhwedd
 Ar Faelgwyn Gwynedd!"

Gor ych Lohu Au Mauw d'Hyntau W. J.!

PLATE XV