

ESSAYS AND STUDIES

by

STUDENTS OF SIMMONS COLLEGE

VOL. XXXIV No. 1

November, 1975

THE ARTHURIAN TRADITION ON SITE: 1974

by ANNE CONNELLY—*History 122*

The identity of the fifth century British leader to whom the world today refers as King Arthur has long been obscured behind a maze of legend and literature which has grown up around him through the centuries. The most favored opinion now concerning the historicity of the man to whom so much has been attributed in legend is that he led the British against the Saxons in the late fifth and early sixth centuries and was successful in forestalling the Saxon invasion for several years. His end is unknown, as are the details of his life, although it is believed by some that he died in a civil war in the north of England. He probably was a Christian: both the *Easter Annals* and the *Historia Brittonum* of Nennius, two very early sources, say that he carried Christian symbols into battle with him. As always, when two unrelated sources contain related information, the credibility of each is strengthened, and the inference to be made in this case is that he "was an overtly Christian ruler."¹

The earliest mentions of Arthur are in Welsh sources: poems, certain historical lists, and lives of Welsh saints. There cannot be absolute certainty as to whether or not some of the various mentions are from the original sources, because only later copies of the manuscripts exist, copies made after the Arthurian legends had already begun to weave their spell among the peoples of Great Britain. "The difficulties of distinguishing between authentic and interpolated material form one of the major cruxes of Arthurian scholarship."²

When Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote his *History of the Kings of Britain* around the year 1140, he "changed the whole literary and historical standing of the Arthurian legend almost overnight."³ The title *History* misled many of the time to believe that Geoffrey's account was factual; in addition to the title, Geoffrey claimed that he had based much of his work on a "very ancient book written in the British language,"⁴ which was supposedly presented to him by Walter, archdeacon of Oxford. Un-

fortunately, not a trace of this work has ever been found, so we have only Geoffrey's word on the subject. But whether or not the work existed is not a matter of concern with respect to the effect of the *History* on the development of the Arthurian legend. Looking back, one can view the work as a brilliantly imaginative fantasy, supported at odd junctures by known facts. But at the time of its writing, it's very probable that one of Geoffrey's motives was to construct a "history" which would "paint a picture of a British race and nation able to boast of an origin not a whit less ancient and noble than that of the Greeks or Romans."⁵ Geoffrey described Arthur as "of outstanding courage and generosity, [with] inborn goodness [which] gave him such grace that he was loved by almost all the people."⁶ Arthur's career was the climax of the work, as Geoffrey didn't dare to let his writing reach into the time when written records were kept and his *History* could be discredited. Relying on his claim that it was largely a translation of a British source, Geoffrey cleverly created a defense for himself before any accusations of total fabrication were levelled at him.

The effect of *The History of the Kings of Britain* was to bring the story of Arthur, greatly enlarged upon, out of the corners of Wales and Cornwall where the legends had been handed down for generations, to the attention of a large part of the British population.

With the furnishing of the raw material for the Matter of Britain, a literature was begun which has continued into the 20th century, to T. H. White's brilliantly comic and tragic rendition, *The Once and Future King*. But the step immediately following Geoffrey of Monmouth's twelfth century work was the export of the basic Arthurian legend to France, where it was greatly embellished in the French twelfth and thirteenth century romances, especially those written by Chrétien de Troyes in the latter part of the twelfth century. Chrétien used Arthur's court as a rich and splendid backdrop for his tales about knights in shining armor: *Lancelot* or *Le Chevalier de*

la Charrette; Yvain or Le Chevalier au Lion; and Perceval or Le Conte du Graal. In this last work, King Arthur is first associated with the Holy Grail, the search for which becomes, in later versions, one of the primary objectives of King Arthur's Court.

The set of Arthurian manuscripts written by several unknown authors in France between the years 1210 and 1230, and known collectively as the Vulgate Cycle, dealt with all the characters connected with "Arthur's Court" as it had evolved to that time. In this work also, the themes of courtly love, adultery, celibacy and spirituality, which were to recur in later Arthurian works, are first fully included as elements of the legend.⁷

Thomas Malory, a fifteenth century English writer whose exact identity is unknown—there were at least two men named Thomas Malory who conceivably could have created the work—wrote *Le Morte D'Arthur* around the year 1470. In it, he drew heavily from the material contained in the Vulgate Cycle, and put the entire story of Arthur in a coherent form, "retaining the main features of the story, while rejecting those unsuitable or overlengthy for the English taste."⁸ In addition to the theme of courtly love derived from the French romances, *Le Morte D'Arthur* exhibits a fully developed medieval code of chivalry.

Malory dressed the Arthurian legend in medieval finery, and his is the most well known form of the legend of Arthur which was passed on to later generations. Tennyson, in the nineteenth century, composed a group of poems inspired by Malory's work, known as *Idylls of the King*. And in the twentieth century, T. H. White created a tale with a fallible hero in *The Once and Future King*, which derives indirectly from Malory's treatment of Lancelot and his failure to achieve success in the quest for the Holy Grail.⁹

For over one thousand years, interest in Arthur and his life has been continually renewed by the cycle of literature which is rooted in history. In many of these works, different places, both fictional and real, have been connected with Arthur. Especially in the twentieth century, with a resurgence of interest focusing on the fact and fantasy surrounding the Arthurian tradition, archaeologists and historians have been attempting to assess the different local claims to an Arthurian connection, and to determine which have any validity. Where archaeological finds support the legends, progress can be made in determining Arthur's status and whereabouts. Strong arguments can be made on both the side of the believer and that of the nonbeliever, but I've found

in my readings that the more skeptical critics writing in recent times, tend to overlook not only newly unearthed archaeological evidence, but the strong possibility of the discovery of more such evidence in the future. The excavators of the hillfort in Somerset county reputed to have been Arthur's stronghold, would disagree with Richard Barber's statement that "We have already seen how slight the possible archaeological links between Arthur and Cadbury Camp are."¹⁰

Glastonbury, the ruined abbey at the foot of a large, lone, conical hill in the county of Somerset, and Cadbury Castle, a sizable earthwork hillfort, also in Somerset, have long claimed a relation to the illustrious King Arthur. Visitors interested in the legends still flock to the sites, to obtain a first-hand impression. The following pages are an attempt from my own first-hand impression to determine the status of the Arthurian tradition today, with respect to the above two places.

Cadbury Castle/Camelot

"At the very south ende of the church of South-Cadbyri standith Camallate, sum tyme a famose toun or castelle, apon a very torre or hille, wunderfully enstrengtheid of nature. In the upper part of the coppe of the hille be 4 diches or trenches, and a balky waulle of yerth betwixt every one of them. . . . Much gold, sylver and coper of the Romaine coynes hath be found ther yn plouing . . . the people can telle nothing ther but that they have hard say that Arture much resortid to Camalat."¹¹

As one approaches South Cadbury in Somerset from the lowlands to the west, the ancient earthwork hillfort dominates the landscape, rising two hundred and fifty feet above the surrounding area. Much of the slope of the hillfort is wooded, and not useful to the present owners of the land, but the eighteen acre plateau at the top of the hill is now used mostly as a cow pasture. In the village, a small sign announces to visitors the main path leading to the site: "Cadbury/Camelot; Private Property." For the more persevering student of King Arthur who is willing to walk through mud and cow manure to the summit, while being bellowed at menacingly by a herd of chestnut-colored cows, the reward is a breathtaking view of all the surrounding lowlands and hills, one which would have afforded any ancient occupier of the fort an immediate advantage over enemies attempting to approach. To the northwest the pyramidal hill of Glastonbury Tor can be seen, about twelve miles away.

According to Leslie Alcock, who recently

conducted five seasons of excavations on the site, from 1966 to 1970, "Cadbury Castle has few equals among British hillforts for the number, complexity, and above all, the towering steepness of its defences."¹²

There is little evidence left to suggest that extensive archaeological digging took place there; grass has overgrown all that was laid bare to reveal the history of the ancient hillfort. A group of cows placidly grazing display no awareness that their pasture is reputed in local legend to overlie a hollow hill, one on the list of legendary burial sites of King Arthur. At one point during the excavations, an old man approached the archaeologists anxiously to inquire whether or not they intended to dig up the king!¹³ But local Arthurian lore, always strong in the area, seems to have found substantial support in the archaeological evidence dug up on site.

The name "Camelot" was probably first invented by a twelfth century French romancer; its origin may exist in the mention of Colchester, the Roman Camulodunum in Pliny's *Natural History*.¹⁴ The first recorded mention of Camelot with reference to Cadbury seems to be in the introductory passage by John Leland, written in 1542. Aside from a strong oral tradition which existed in the area, the fact that the River Cam flows nearby and a village once called Camel, now Queen Camel, is located nearby may have suggested the identification to Leland. But Cadbury Castle was not the elegant medieval court ruled by chivalry which the legends describe as King Arthur's Court, nor did its towers house knights in shining armor. Rather it was the stronghold of a wealthy and powerful sixth century military leader, possibly holding the title "Duke of Britain," but in all probability, not a king.

The series of excavations conducted on site revealed several different periods of occupation, among them the pre-Roman Iron Age, the Roman, the Dark Age and the Saxon. The occupation connected with Arthur occurred during that period called the British Dark Age, owing to the lack of information about those years, although reasonably accurate inferences have been made in more recent times as a result of archaeological finds.

Examination of the earthworks protecting Cadbury Castle revealed extensive refortification during the interlude between the Roman withdrawal and the Saxon takeover. While scraps of rubbish definitely dating from after the Roman occupation were found in the fortified wall known as the "stony bank," its structure is of a pre-Roman Celtic design, a clue as to the fortifier's origins.

Another hint as to the status of the leader at

Cadbury can be inferred from the sherds of imported pottery found on the site, known as Tintagel pottery and datable to the fifth and sixth centuries. Only a person of considerable wealth could have afforded to import such ware from the Eastern Mediterranean region.

Arthur would seem a likely choice to fit the role of the leader at the Cadbury hillfort, on the basis of the portrait furnished by the above evidence, and on the strength of local lore. But the excavations conducted by Mr. Alcock furnished supplemental information which strongly supports the theory of Arthur, the military leader. Aside from the defensive earthwork excavated, remnants of a gate-lookout tower from the Arthurian period were uncovered on the South-West rampart, the only one known of from that era.¹⁵ One of the major accomplishments of the archaeologists was the disclosure of postholes, leading to the discovery of the position and type of the principal building of the Arthurian stronghold. The thirty by sixty foot timber structure is one of the three known to have existed at the time, and to some extent its discovery is a measure of the success of the digs, for chances of locating such a hall had been two hundred to one!¹⁶

The number and widespread location of the finds dating from the Arthurian period substantially reduces the likelihood of special luck on the part of the archaeologists and establishes even more firmly the theory that a leader, presumably Arthur, with abundant resources refortified and occupied Cadbury Castle during the British Dark Age.

Even if one accepts the archaeological facts, and the premises for believing that a wealthy military leader lived there, it's still possible to ask whether he was necessarily named Arthur. Nothing can be definitely proven, without the discovery of some contemporaneous object, such as a coin, with the name Arthur on it. And the chances of such luck would appear almost nonexistent.

"But the question of the name is hardly more than a quibble. The lord of Cadbury was a person as much like Arthur as makes no matter: a person living on a site traditionally picked out as his home, in the traditional period, with resources on the traditional scale, playing at least a part of the traditional role; a person big enough for the legends to have gathered around him. Nowhere else but at Cadbury does Britain supply any archaeological trace of such a person."¹⁷

Cadbury Castle still houses secrets which may some day shed additional light on "King Arthur's Court." During the last season of excavation, outside the South-West gate, was found "a major focus of Arthurian-period activity

which we omitted to excavate."¹⁸ Knowing of such an area, why did the archaeologists neglect to examine it carefully for new data? The answer lies simply in the limits set by the expense of five seasons of excavations, by the fact that the workers on the site were volunteers, and by the patience of the tiny village of South Cadbury, the inhabitants of which tolerated thousands of visitors during the five years. Additional discoveries at Cadbury Castle must be left to a future generation. In the meantime, the villagers are still good-naturedly tolerant toward the tourists, and toward seekers of Camelot who turn up at the site even now, four years after the excavations. The village has not cashed in on its potential commercial value with the hawkers and vendors who remain a jolting reminder of the contrast between the present and the past at many of England's historical sites, such as Stonehenge and the Roman remains at Bath.

Cadbury, partly because it is not readily accessible, doesn't seem to be in any imminent danger of being marred by careless tourists. One who would take the trouble to climb the muddy path to its summit must appreciate and want to preserve its natural magnificence.

After our descent, a casually rustic farmer in blue jean overalls leaned on the stone wall outside his thatched stone cottage, at the foot of the path. In answer to our questions, he said that there are still plenty of tourists in the summer. "The weather's beautiful in the summer," he remarked, as if to imply that the excursion then would be worthwhile, just for a glimpse of the beauty of Somerset. But it was obvious, as he grinningly watched our vain attempts to wipe the mud and manure off our shoes, that on a cold rainy day late in October, he thought this group of tourists terribly foolish to go through all that trouble only to see a cow pasture!

Glastonbury/Avalon

William of Malmesbury, a highly respected twelfth century historian, was convinced, after examining the materials in the library and archives at Glastonbury, that Glastonbury, "was the first church in the kingdom of Britain and the source and fountain of all religion in our land."¹⁹

Today the magnificent remains of the abbey stand at the foot of Glastonbury Tor, vestiges of their splendor and dignity remaining, despite their reduction to ruins by men who stole the stones for building after the Abbey was dissolved in 1539. Atop Glastonbury Tor stands a church tower, the only part remaining of a church dedicated to St. Michael, the body of it having been thrown down in 1275 by an earthquake.

Approaching the old English village of Glastonbury from the south, the Abbey can be seen through a black iron fence and the pumps of a petrol station, one of the many examples of the incongruity of a modern England built upon and beside ancient foundations. The remains are those of structures built after a fire destroyed the Abbey in 1184. The most prominent ruins are those of the Lady Chapel built on the site of the original chapel, and those of the nave of the Great Church. In one corner of the grounds stands the Abbot's Kitchen, which has survived largely intact to this day. And inside the grounds, a stone border and a neat sign mark the site where the remains of Arthur and a woman, presumably his wife Gwenevere, were interred, after being dug up on the south side of the Lady Chapel.

The legend of Glastonbury as it has evolved to this day is a complex composition, the result of Celtic, Christian and political influences from different periods of British history. By examining the different facets of the legend, we can determine many of these influences, thus allowing historians to come close to the truths underlying the traditions.

In ancient times, the lowlands above which Glastonbury Tor rises five hundred feet were marshes and lagoons, often sufficiently flooded to make Glastonbury a virtual island, reachable only by boats and causeways. Excavations in the area have revealed that two "lake villages" (built on platforms) flourished in the area in the third century B.C.; these were inhabited by local Celts, proven by archaeological evidence to have been excellent craftsmen. By Christian times, these villages had been largely destroyed by other invading Celtic tribes. It is probable, although not yet proved, that Ynys-Witrin, as Glastonbury was called at that time, was the burial ground for the lake villagers, the drier ground being more suitable for burial. In Celtic legend, Avalon was the name given to the place where the dead passed over into another life.²⁰ Thus an early Celtic connection between Avalon and the Isle of Glass (Ynys-Witrin) is possible.

"... From our old books I know
That Joseph came of old to Glastonbury,
And there the heathen prince, Arviragus,
Gave him an isle of marsh whereon to build;
And there he built with wattles from the marsh
A little lonely church in days of yore."²¹

Unconfirmed tradition has it that not long after the Resurrection of Christ, the disciple Philip made his way to Gaul, to convert the people to Christianity, accompanied by a large following. Among them was Joseph of Arimathea, the wealthy Jewish merchant who took

and buried the body of Jesus after its removal from the cross. Glastonbury tradition continues to say that in the year 63 A.D., Philip sent Joseph along with a group of twelve from Gaul to Britain. There, they were courteously greeted after landing in Wales, by King Arviragus, who offered them Ynys-Witrin to settle upon, for it was unpopulated at the time.

Further legends say that Joseph brought with him two small cruets, one filled with Christ's blood and the other with His sweat, obtained at His burial. These he buried upon his arrival at Glastonbury, to prevent any future desecration. In this legend, one can see the seed of the story which grew to include one of the main themes in Arthurian literature, that of the quest for the Holy Grail.

When they arrived at a hill a half mile from Glastonbury Tor, known today as Weary-All hill, supposedly because of the weary condition of Joseph and his disciples when they reached it, Joseph sought a sign of encouragement from God. He planted his staff in the ground and prayed, and the staff was changed into the Glastonbury thorn tree, which has flowered bi-annually at Christmas and in the spring since then. (The original thorn no longer exists, but there is a tree rooted from a slip of the original.) At the Isle of Glass, they built a small wattle church and dedicated it to the Virgin Mary, the first Christian establishment in Britain. This church was "commonly called by the Saxons 'the Old Church' on account of its antiquity. It was at first formed of wattles and from the beginning breathed and was redolent of a mysterious divine sanctity, which spread throughout the country,"²² wrote William of Malmesbury in 1125.

The connection of Joseph of Arimathea with Glastonbury appeared first around 1140, in a copy of William's work which had been written over and improved upon by the monks, and is too late to be considered very plausible. But it's possible that while the naming of a specific founder was a fabrication, the story contains elements of an ancient memory: a wealthy early Christian merchant who came to settle in Britain, not as a missionary, but who set up a small structure to worship privately. The thorn tree is also a late invention; a tree fitting the description does indeed exist today, but it is known now to be a well known, if uncommon, "botanical freak."²³

The problem of dating the origin of Glastonbury's religious community with respect to the Arthurian legend is an important one to consider if one is to decide whether or not the Glastonbury claims to an Arthurian connection are valid. If the Abbey was the important and influential Christian center, of which its reputa-

tion boasts, and well established by Arthur's time, some relation between it and Britain's Christian leader would not only have been possible, but highly probable, especially considering the close proximity of the Abbey to his headquarters at Cadbury. William of Malmesbury, in his *De Gestis Regum Angliae* said, "There are documents of no meagre credit which have been found in certain places saying thus: 'No other hands than those of the disciples of Christ erected the church of Glastonbury.' Nor is this totally irreconcilable with truth, for if the Apostle Philip did preach to the Gauls (as Freulfus says in the fourth chapter of his second book) then it is possible to believe that he broadcast the seed of the Word across the sea also."²⁴

R. F. Treharne, one of the more skeptical writers on the Glastonbury legends, admits that by the time the Saxons occupied the area in the year 568 A.D., they found an old and distinguished Celtic Monastery already established.²⁵

It is generally accepted that the Christian Glastonbury community was established early in the history of Christianity, and very well may have been the site of the first Christian church in Britain. Post holes from a wattle-type structure have been unearthed where the old church was said to be,²⁶ pointing to its existence, but not to a specific date.

"Clouds and darkness
Closed upon Camelot
Arthur had vanish'd
I knew not whither . . ." ²⁷

The early lore of Arthur specifies that his ultimate end was unknown. In the *Annales Cambriae*, a tenth century list of important dates in Welsh history, the date 539 A.D. is given as the year of the "battle of Camlaun in which Arthur and Medraut were slain."²⁸ Geoffrey of Monmouth says that the battle took place on the banks of the River Camblam, where "Arthur himself, our renowned king, was mortally wounded, and was carried off to the Isle of Avalon, so that his wounds might be attended to . . . This was in the year 542 . . ."²⁹ But among Welsh legends, his final fate was unknown, and the prophecy existed that one day he would return to lead his people to supremacy.

In 1191, a grave was dug up on the Abbey grounds, which the monks claimed to be that of Arthur and his queen Gwenevere. The details of the exhumation said that seven feet down were found a slab of stone and a lead cross bearing the inscription: "HIC IACET SEPULTUS INCLYTUS REX ARTURIUS IN INSULA AVALONIA." ("Here lies buried the renowned King Arthur in the Isle of Avalon.") Nine feet below that, a huge hollow oak coffin was uncov-

ered between two stone pyramids, and it contained two skeletons. One was that of a very tall man, with multiple skull wounds from which it appeared he had died; the other was a group of smaller bones along with a scrap of yellow hair, reputedly Gwenevere's remains. The bones were removed from the dugout coffin, sealed in caskets, and placed with the treasures of the Abbey until its dissolution in 1539, when along with the other riches of the Abbey, they disappeared.

Detailed accounts of the discovery of the grave exist today, and the site of the newer grave is marked at Glastonbury. Giraldus Cambrensis, a reputable Welsh scholar, visited Glastonbury and wrote in *De Instructione Principis* in 1193 of his findings there, apparently accepting the monks' claims. Why, then, is there so much doubt as to the validity of Glastonbury's claim that Arthur was buried there?

There doesn't seem to be a question as to whether or not two bodies were dug up, but rather whether or not one of them truly belonged to Arthur. R. F. Treharne put forth the arguments of the disbelievers in *The Glastonbury Legends*.

In 1184, a fire destroyed most of the Abbey, including the Old Church, which had been encased with lead and wood to preserve it, in 633, by Paulinus, Bishop of York and Rochester. Henry II, sovereign of England at the time, contributed generously to the construction of a new Abbey, but died in 1189, before its completion. His successor, Richard, did not continue the support, leaving the monks with a need for revenue in order to proceed with the reconstruction. During his travels, Henry II had heard from a Welsh bard that Arthur was buried at Glastonbury, and during his lifetime, he had suggested that the monks conduct a search for the grave. Treharne maintains that the exhumation was a fraudulent ploy on the part of the monks to obtain money when they were in great need—a medieval publicity stunt. The hollow oak coffin wouldn't seem to indicate a Christian burial, and the cross which was found, if not an outright forgery, was certainly not datable to the sixth century, according to the style of lettering in Camden's seventeenth century reproduction, "but a twelfth century improvisation, or . . . going back no further than the point in the development of the Arthurian legend at which Arthur came to be thought of as a king."³⁰

But Geoffrey Ashe, a respected Arthurian scholar who has worked closely with the archaeologists at other Arthurian sites, has another explanation. The Welshman, Geoffrey of Monmouth, says in his *History* that Arthur was taken to Avalon, but doesn't identify it geographically.

Henry II was told by a Welsh bard that Arthur was buried at Glastonbury, and he in turn told the monks. When the grave was discovered, while a certain monk was being buried at that spot, the information given to the monks by Henry II was confirmed. If not previously made, the equation of Glastonbury with Avalon was made at that point. Mr. Ashe's argument against a fraudulent identification is "that the monks' announcement of the Glastonbury-Avalon identification was never disputed. Despite the fact that Glastonbury was not even in Wales; despite Avalon's colossal publicity value; despite the exploitation of the discovery by English kings—no Celt or Celtic enthusiast spoke up in protest, no rival Avalon arose."³¹ Ashe further suggests that when the bard passed the information to Henry II, he was revealing an authentic tradition, well enough known among the Welsh, that Glastonbury's claim to be Arthur's burial place stood.

But why was such a tradition kept hidden for so long? Arthur's death may have come at a time when its disclosure would have given renewed encouragement to the enemy while destroying the morale of the natives trying desperately to defend what land remained in their possession. So the death was concealed and the supernatural story with its echoes of ancient Celtic beliefs was concocted, that Arthur's end was unknown, but that he would one day return after his wounds had been healed at Avalon.

A few other theories lend credibility to the above hypothesis. The River Cam, near Cadbury Castle, has been suggested as one of the possible sites of the battle of Camlann, in which Arthur reportedly was slain. Its proximity to the renowned Christian center would have made Glastonbury a likely choice for the burial of a Christian leader. Even if the battle didn't take place nearby, Arthur may have wished to be buried near his home base at Cadbury. It's possible that he was personally acquainted with the monks. The first recorded connection of Arthur with Cadbury suggests this. It occurs in *The Life of St. Gildas*, written by Caradoc of Llancarfan in 1150. The incident related states that Melwas, king of Somerset, kidnapped Gwenevere, and Arthur came to fight Melwas, but that the clergy at Glastonbury interfered, and made peace between the two men.

Glastonbury, with its fascinating history, still draws pilgrims each year, people who are influenced by the same sacred and mystical aura which made it, in its time, the most powerful Christian community in the British Isles. Each June, the Anglican church organizes a pilgrimage in which thousands of English people participate, testimony to the strength of the belief in

Glastonbury's holiness as the place of origin of the Christian faith in Britain.

While some of its legends can be disproved today by objectively examining the influences which nurtured them, there is yet the possibility of proving that truth is contained in them. Future archaeological excavations may provide the evidence required. If remnants of a Roman villa were to be found in the area, the story of Joseph of Arimathea or some wealthy merchant of that period would be substantiated. Likewise, if an ancient Celtic graveyard were uncovered, there would be reason to believe that the Avalon/Ynys-Witrin connection was drawn much earlier than the thirteenth century. Old, as yet unseen, manuscripts, that were dispersed and lost, but not destroyed at the time of the Dissolution, may be discovered, and could document any one of the legends.

Until such time, however, Glastonbury's ruins will remain an austere, impressive reminder of its mysteries.

Arthur today has been to some extent separated from the legends. While many people think of the Broadway show, "Camelot," when they hear his name, the historical figure, slowly being more accurately identified, is at the same time becoming better known. There is widespread curiosity about the man who preserved an invaluable part of the British heritage, by saving the Celts of post-Roman Britain from complete defeat and obliteration by a barbaric Saxon tribe.

FOOTNOTES

1. Leslie Alcock, *Arthur's Britain* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1974), p. 71.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
3. R. F. Treharne, *The Glastonbury Legends* (London, 1967), p. 44.
4. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *History of the Kings of Britain* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1966), p. 51.
5. R. F. Treharne, *The Glastonbury Legends*, p. 49.
6. Geoffrey of Monmouth, p. 212.
7. Roger Sherman Loomis, *The Development of the Arthurian Romance* (London, 1963), p. 92.
8. Richard Barber, *King Arthur in Legend and History* (London, 1973), p. 121.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 131.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
11. John Leland, 1542—quoted by Leslie Alcock, "By

- South Cadbury Is That Camelot*" (Great Britain, 1972), p. 11.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Geoffrey Ashe, *King Arthur's Avalon* (Great Britain, 1973), p. 13.
14. Richard Barber, *King Arthur in Legend and History*, p. 24.
15. Leslie Alcock, "By South Cadbury Is That Camelot," p. 212.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Geoffrey Ashe, ed., *The Quest for Arthur's Britain* (New York, 1968), p. 187-88.
18. Leslie Alcock, "By South Cadbury," p. 205.
19. R. F. Treharne, *The Glastonbury Legends*, p. 28.
20. Geoffrey Ashe, *King Arthur's Avalon*, p. 18.
21. Alfred Lord Tennyson, "The Holy Grail," *The Poetical Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson* (London, 1911), p. 419.
22. *Glastonbury: The Isle of Avalon*. Illustrated guide for the Abbey Bookstall. (Bristol, n.d.), p. 3.
23. Treharne, p. 122.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
26. Beram Saklatvala, *Arthur: Roman Britain's Last Champion* (New York, 1967), p. 30.
27. Alfred Lord Tennyson, "Merlin and the Gleam," *The Poetical Works*, p. 605.
28. Geoffrey Ashe, *King Arthur's Avalon*, p. 75.
29. Geoffrey of Monmouth, p. 261.
30. Treharne, p. 104.
31. Ashe, *King Arthur's Avalon*, p. 95.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcock, Leslie. *Arthur's Britain*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1974.
- Alcock, Leslie. "By South Cadbury Is That Camelot," Great Britain, 1972.
- Ashe, Geoffrey, *King Arthur's Avalon*, Great Britain, 1973.
- Ashe, Geoffrey, ed. *The Quest For Arthur's Britain*, New York, 1968.
- Barber, Richard. *King Arthur in Legend and History*, London, 1973.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth. *History of the Kings of Britain*, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, 1966.
- . *Glastonbury: The Isle of Avalon*, Illustrated Guide for the Abbey Bookstall, Bristol, n.d.
- Loomis, Roger Sherman. *The Development of the Arthurian Romance*, London, 1963.
- Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte D'Arthur*, translated by Keith Baines, New York, 1962.
- Pearce, Susan M. "The Cornish Elements in the Arthurian Tradition," *Folklore*, Vol. 85, Autumn, 1974.
- Saklatvala, Beram. *Arthur: Roman Britain's Last Champion*, New York, 1967.
- Tennyson, Alfred Lord. *The Poetical Works of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, London, 1911.
- Treharne, R. F. *The Glastonbury Legends*, London, 1967.
- White, T. H. *The Once and Future King*, New York, 1969.