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Abstract

Visions and Revisions: Gerald of Wales, Authorship, and the Construction of Political, Religious, and Legal Geographies in Twelfth and Thirteenth Century Britain

by

Amelia Lynn Borrego Sargent

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Frank Bezner, Chair

Gerald of Wales revised his *Topographia Hibernica* and *Itinerarium Cambriae* multiple times over the course of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Each revision reshapes the text, adding nuance and contours that affect the understanding of the work’s meaning, its function, and its depiction of the underlying geographic space. This dissertation is a case study at the intersection of three foundational questions: what motivates textual revision, how can revision of depictions of landscapes in geographic texts affect the physical concept of space, and what was the conception of history and the text, such that they could affect the outcome of future events. By carefully parsing the versions of the *Topographia* and *Itinerarium*, and identifying and analyzing the differences between them, we can begin to understand how textual revision was deployed both to respond to changed circumstances and to affect future action. The resulting picture counters the idea that texts, history, or geography were static in the Middle Ages, and studying the dynamic relationship between them has implications for our understanding of medieval historiography, politics, religion, and authorship.
Illo quoque Ciceronis exemplo retardari non potui:
   “Ea,” inquit, “re poemata non scribo,
   quia qualia volo non possum, qualia possum, nolo.”

Mihi enimvero ea mens est, et in hanc partem tam vehemens . . .
   Si qualia volo non possum, qualia possum, volo.

    ~ Giraldi Cambrensis Opera V, 5

I am not deterred by that example of Cicero, who said
   “I do not write poetry on that subject
   because I cannot write such verses as well as I would like,
   and I am unwilling to write those that I am capable of.”

   For I am of such a mind, and very vehement on this:
   If I cannot write as well as I would, I will at least write as well as I can.

To Matt, to my family, to my mentors, and to my inspirations,
   thank you.
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INTRODUCTION

HOW TEXTUAL REVISION CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

How can textual revision change the world? By this I mean three related questions. First is the question of revision itself. Why revise a text? That is, when thinking about why an author might revise a text, can we look beyond mere mundane reasons (such as error correction or updating facts) and locate a desire to revise based on an author’s perception of what the text is supposed to mean? If a text resonates with a certain meaning at a certain time and in a certain context – including current events, anticipated readers, and projections about future history – when that context changes over time, the text’s meaning loses its legibility. For an author deeply involved in the creation, dissemination, and proper understanding of his works, these changed circumstances would compel him to revise, to locate meaningful resonance in new passages, and to re-envision the scope of his histories in such a way to encompass new anticipated contexts.

Second, when a historical text focuses on a particular landscape, how does revising that text affect those landscapes, and what does this say about the concept of geographical reality in the Middle Ages? In a world of symbolic locations, of places that connect this world to the next, of places where the creases of history are visible on the very landscape – a world of Roman ruins and enta geweorc, churches made of spolia, places that commemorate miracles or display natural marvels – what is writing about geography? And how can revising that geography, literally, change the way the world looks?

Finally, how can revision of historical texts affect or alter the outcome of current or future events? That is, can we also locate a desire to revise based on an author’s perception of what a text is supposed to do? Historical texts have functions, both post hoc and ante hoc. Histories recount prior deeds and events, memorialize people and stories, and describe journeys taken and places seen. But they can also persuade and compel readers to action, counsel against tactics that have failed in the past, and encourage readers to cast and articulate their contemporary struggles in terms of historical models. In the Middle Ages in particular, one function was found in the relationship between text and prophecy. This relationship is most immediately illustrated by the sortes Virgilianae or sortes biblicae, that game of divination-by-reading played by the genre’s most famous player Augustine, after hearing the command tolle lege (“take and read”). It is also seen in parallel in the typological method of textual interpretation, where Old Testament passages are considered to prefigure New Testament events. Other medieval genres too, such as historiography and hagiography, attempted to change and were changed by new contexts and circumstances. For an author steeped in these methods of reading and understanding texts – and not just texts, but the world around him – why wouldn’t he be convinced that his own works could have the same transformative power?
These three questions form the foundation of this study of the writings of Gerald of Wales, also known as Giraldus de Barri or Giraldus Cambrensis, who wrote the twelfth and thirteenth century works *Topographia Hibernica* (*The Topography of Ireland*), and *Itinerarium Kambriae* (*The Journey Through Wales*). Gerald revised each of these works multiple times; each revision, in turn, reshapes the text, adding nuance and contours that affect the understanding of the work’s meaning, its function, and its depiction of the underlying geographic space. The resulting picture counters the idea that texts, history, or geography were static in the Middle Ages, and studying the dynamic relationship between them has implications for our understanding of medieval historiography, politics, religion, and authorship. This dissertation is a case study at the intersection of these three foundational questions; by carefully parsing the versions of the *Topographia* and *Itinerarium*, and identifying and analyzing the differences between them, we can begin to understand how textual revision truly can change the world.

**Authors and Authorial Revision**

In more conventional “travel” texts, the relationship between geography and text is mediated by the author. And in the *Topographia* and the *Itinerarium*, Gerald of Wales plays the lead role. In these two “historical” works (and their two companion pieces, *Expugnatio Hibernica* and *Descriptio Kambriae*, which are referred to but not thoroughly examined in this dissertation), Gerald deliberately inserts himself into his subject matter. In the *Topographia*’s prologue, he describes his role in acquiring and ordering the material and presenting it to his patron, and frequently breaks into the first person throughout the text to address the reader directly. In the *Itinerarium*, his role is doubled, first as an author-narrator, but second as “the archdeacon” – Gerald – a character in the story narrated in the third person, who travels through Wales with Archbishop Baldwin.

In the triangulation between landscape and text, then, this author in particular plays a very pronounced role. Unlike the norm for medieval authors – no biography, maybe not even a name, just hints snatched from localizing details in the text – Gerald of Wales has bequeathed to us an enormous autobiographical trove. His autobiography, *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, is supplemented by letter collections and excerpts of his favorite writings (*Symbolum Electorum*), an account of his case before the papal curia regarding the see of St. David’s (*De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*), a formal complaint berating his nephew (*Speculum Duorum* or *De Invectionibus*), saints’ lives, moral lessons for preachers (*Gemma Ecclesiastica*), and a moralized mirror for princes and thinly veiled invective on Henry II (*De Principis Instructione*).1

I take advantage of this wealth of information in my analysis of the revisions. Rather than isolate the author’s voice from his material, as has been frequent in past scholarship, by embracing Gerald’s insistent voice, my study of the relationship between revision and landscape yields a study of Gerald’s own authorial project. What results is a picture – a series of still frames – of the writing process. Each textual version is a snapshot of Gerald’s personal

---

1 For full bibliographical data on these please see the Bibliography.
experience of the political, religious, and historical context of the time. Comparing the revisions across time reveals how Gerald’s experience changed, and what changed in his texts, and in the landscape, as a result.

First, however, it is worthwhile to step back and consider how this project is positioned within broader scholarship. The idea of authors and authorial revision has fallen in and out of fashion over the past decades. Medieval literary criticism was not immune to the “death of the author,” and since then waves of reactions and reassessments have fruitfully informed scholarship on medieval texts. French literary studies in particular have inherited the legacy of Barthes and Foucault, where scholars face an array of scribally interpolated texts, particularly texts from an oral performance context, which claim to be written by generically named poets (Marie “from” France, “the Christian from Troyes”). The notion of examining authorial intention, as well as taking a “biographical approach” to textual interpretation, is thus often rejected. English medievalists have perhaps been more circumspect at giving up their named authors so easily: a surplus of biographical and contextual information about the fourteenth century authors Chaucer, Gower, and (though less so) Langland invites new historicist textual interpretation. But Derek Pearsall still located resistance to the idea of the author in the early 1990s, when he wryly summed up his view of why Middle English textual criticism avoided the idea of authorial revision:

The concept of authorial revision is closely tied up, it is evident, with the concept of the author and of authorial intention. Since intention is a fallacy, and the author is dead, the hypothesis of authorial revision must be resisted so that the text can be reconstituted qua text. For the modern critic, to acknowledge that the author had the capacity to change his mind would be to admit that he had, once, made it up. Such an admission could have dangerous consequences.

Perhaps medieval Latin studies of the author have been the least affected by deconstructionist ideas, as the logic of written Latin culture was less prone to the variance of other genres and languages. Instead, modern scholarly discourse has been shaped largely by Alastair Minnis’s imposing Medieval Theory of Authorship, which argues for the use of medieval rather than

---


3 See, for example, Sarah Kay, “Who was Chrétien de Troyes?,” Arthurian Literature 15 (1997): 2, and Greene, 220: “Kay . . . refuses to view twelfth-century authors as distinct persons whose intentions and agendas could be uncovered by careful reading of their works (and particularly their prologues and epilogues).” Though Keith Busby and Howard Bloch have reexamined the case of Marie de France in particular, Greene, 221.

modern theories of authorship, gleaned from prologues discussing the concept of the “auctor.”\footnote{Alastair Minnis, \textit{Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010) [1984].} Voluminous works like A. G. Rigg’s \textit{History of Anglo-Latin Literature} have been less concerned with engaging in theoretical debates about the author than at simply attempting to provide a corrective to modern studies of medieval literature focused primarily on vernacular traditions.\footnote{A. G. Rigg, \textit{A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 1066-1422} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).}

Studies of manuscript creation and scribal practice have also added to the discourse on medieval authorship. Indeed, my dissertation’s fundamental questions, outlined above, are not only the province of authorial revision; scribal revision and the medieval reading practice of glossing also served to bring a text up-to-date and situate it within a certain context, making it legible for later audiences. Such texts could also be deployed in certain situations to have certain effects. These types of practices have been fruitfully addressed by scholars such as John Dagenais, whose study of the \textit{Libro del Buen Amor} manuscripts locates meaning in the interaction between text and reader-glossator.\footnote{John Dagenais, \textit{The Ethics of Reading in Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro del Buen Amor} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).}

Bearing in mind the contours of these discourses, we can see that an in-depth study of Gerald of Wales offers a unique and exciting opportunity. We know enough about his historical personality, thanks to his own works and to the occasional exterior reference, to consider biographical and historical information in contextual interpretations of the texts.\footnote{As will be evident, Gerald’s biography and autobiography permeates each text in its own deliberate way; exterior reference to Gerald include material associated with the St. David’s controversy.} And we know enough about the texts, thanks to the exhaustive codicological study of Catherine Rooney and the critical editions of the Rolls Series, to map the variance between the manuscripts into a series of versions.\footnote{Catherine Rooney, “The Manuscripts of the Works of Gerald of Wales,” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2005); \textit{Giraldi Cambrensis Opera}, vols. I-VIII, eds. J. S. Brewer, James F. Dimock, and George F. Warner (London: Longmans [Rolls Series], 1861-1891). Subsequent references to the Rolls Series texts will take the form of GCO (for \textit{Giraldi Cambrensis Opera}) followed by the volume number, then page number.} Through whatever accident of history, one hundred manuscripts of the works of Gerald of Wales survive, and all of them are in some way about himself.\footnote{See Rooney’s “List of Manuscripts,” vi-xix.} At the intersection of these enormous amounts of data, the project of this dissertation is to write, essentially, a biography of the text. In tracing the changes from version to version, this study examines why they were written, how they changed over the years, and what ultimately, they can tell us about the practice of authorship in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.

The practice of authorship is different from the theory of authorship, though they are related concepts. In the practice of authorship, we can include practicalities such as a writer’s impetus to write, subject matter, cultural milieu, and patronage circle. We might consider how he or she gathered information, if that can be known, and how he or she decided to order and present it. We might consider the mechanics of writing itself: whether the author was also a
scribe, employed a scribe, or had access to a scriptorium. We might question whether the author wrote with a stylus and wax tablets, how the text was then transformed onto parchment with ink, or if the text was revised, and how (for example, through marginal notations, or sewn-in parchment strips, such as exhibited in a manuscript of Gerald’s De Inventionibus\(^{11}\)). We might consider the decisions with which an author was faced when choosing subject matter or presentation style. Finally, we might consider whether and how the author portrays him or herself in the text: whether simply as a name, or with hints of biography, or in a way that indicates a larger project of self-fashioning. In other words, how an author presents his practice of authorship, and how, in turn, that interacts with the theory of authorship.

Deliberate engagement with the theoretical understanding of authorship was, in fact, quite common in medieval works. A medieval auctor, as Minnis points out, “denoted someone who was at once a writer and an authority, someone not merely to be read but also to be respected and believed.” The writings of an auctor contained or possessed auctoritas; this in turn implied two criteria, “intrinsic worth” – that is, Christian truth – and “authenticity” – that is, the genuine production of a named auctor.\(^{12}\) Auctoritas was also an attribute specific to very ancient works. Minnis reasons, “No ‘modern’ [that is, medieval] writer could decently be called an auctor in a period in which men saw themselves as dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants, i.e. the ‘ancients’.\(^{13}\) Thus for example, Walter Map’s Dissuasio Valerii ad Rufinum was attributed to the first century historian Valerius Maximus, because his contemporaries and later commentators doubted he could have written it.

But this is also an example where practice meets theory of authorship. As Minnis explains about this example, Walter Map deliberately titled his work with “the names of dead men because this gives pleasure and, more importantly, because if he has not done so the work would have been rejected.” Map speculated that after his death, “every defect in it it will be remedied . . . and in the most remote future its antiquity will cause the authenticity to be credited to me, because, then as now, old copper will be preferred to new gold.”\(^{14}\) Walter Map made a conscious decision of authorial practice to position his work as by an ancient “Valerius” to attempt to engage with and mitigate the theoretical strictures that denied auctoritas to new authors. Though his plan backfired, his positioning was deliberate vis à vis the hermeneutical idea of the medieval auctor. This example is illuminating not only because Walter Map was a close associate of Gerald’s, and because the Dissuasio appears in a number of early manuscripts that also contain the Topographia Hibernica.\(^{15}\) But also, as discussed below, Gerald’s texts


\(^{12}\) Minnis, 10-11.

\(^{13}\) Minnis, 12.

\(^{14}\) Minnis, 12, quoting Walter Map, De nugis curialium, dist. iv, cap. 5, ed. M. R. James, Anecdota Oxoniensis, xvi (Oxford, 1914).

\(^{15}\) Gerald states that Walter Map heard a reading of the Topographia at Oxford and enjoyed it very much; he includes in other passages discussions they have had about the relative popularity of their works. These passages
embody the struggle between the practice and theory of authorship as Gerald deliberately tries to get around its strictures and obtain his own version of auctoritas. This struggle is particularly visible across the versions of his texts.

Authorial versions and revisions, in fact, are imperative to consider in constructing the practice of authorship. It begins with the manuscripts, when the variance between manuscripts is attributable to authorial versions of the text that are related to one another in a distinguishable progression. This is no small order, and yet a number of medieval texts fall into this category: historical texts such as Gerald’s, of course, as well as Henry of Huntington’s Historia Anglorum and William of Malmsbury’s Gesta Regum Anglorum, literary texts such as William Langland’s Piers Plowman, parts of Gower’s Confessio Amantis and Vox Clamantis, the prologue to Chaucer’s Legend of Good Women as well as the Canterbury Tales generally, and even saints’ lives and mystical texts such as Julian of Norwich’s Revelations and Nicholas Love’s Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ.

Given a series of revisions, one must then assume some kind of authorial intention behind the changes. Assuming not only that an author exists, but that he or she had a self-conscious project, studying revisions can tell us something important and coherent about what an author was trying to do with his or her text. Considering the revisions themselves along two axes, both within a single version and across multiple versions, it is often possible to identify certain patterns or isolate certain themes with which the author was grappling at the time. These, in turn, read in historical context, can illuminate the pressures and motivations that drove an author to revisit and revise a text in the Middle Ages. The result is a map of a text over time, one that charts an authorial project as it evolved to changed circumstances.

The Versions of Gerald of Wales

Gerald of Wales issued his Topographia Hibernica in five versions (that we know of), and his Itinerarium Kambriae in three. These versions are attested by multiple manuscripts that, within the version, vary little from each other. Nearly every version is attested by an early manuscript that can be dated to Gerald’s lifetime. The order of the versions is fixed, thanks to Gerald’s general tendency only to add material, rather than delete or rewrite passages. The chronology too, thanks to the wealth of historical detail within the text, and recent work on manuscripts, is fairly certain. Changes from version to version can thus fairly indicate some deliberate action on Gerald’s part to revise his text.

Methodologically, to break out and compare the text from version to version presents a challenge, as only the latest (fullest) version has been edited – and that only in the nineteenth-century Rolls Series. Crucially, however, the critical apparatus of that edition catalogues

---

are discussed in greater detail below. Manuscripts such as London, British Library Arundel 14 contain Version III of the Topographia as well as the Dissuasio – in fact, the incipit to that work can be seen in Plate 1, of the map of Ireland that follows the Topographia’s text.

16 See GCO V and VI, Prefaces, and Chapter 1 for the dates of the versions of the Topographia.

17 Version I of the Topographia has been edited by John J. O’Meara, though that edition is not widely used.
textual variants by version, by indicating the groups of manuscripts in which a certain text is or is not found. As the editor himself notes, the versions are represented by consistent groups of manuscripts, and Gerald’s revisions, for the most part, consist of discrete passages of added material. It is therefore fairly straightforward to determine when particular passages were added based on the critical notes. For example, in Ch. II.XXIII of the *Topographia Hibernica*, Gerald added four lines to a verse. The critical edition itself is Version V, thus the lines are included in the main text. A footnote from those lines reads, “*Vis genitiva, &c.*] These four last lines not in M. Bb. In margin of C. In text of A. R., &c.”18 This means that the lines are not in manuscript M, a Version I text, or manuscript Bb, a Version II text. It is found in the margins of manuscript C, which has both Version II and III readings. Manuscript A is a Version III text, and R is a Version III text with Version IV readings in the margins. The passage, therefore, was added in Version III.19

For every significant addition in the *Topographia* and the *Itinerarium*, I have catalogued the version into which it was added, its content, and its location within the text. I define “significant” addition as those changes of two words or more, or in a very few instances additions of one word which dramatically alter the meaning or tone of the text. I did not include spelling variations or other variants that might be attributed to copyist error. The full catalogue of Gerald’s additions in the *Topographia* and *Itinerarium*, as well as less detailed catalogues of his *Expugnatio Hibernica* and *Descriptio Kambriae*, are included as Appendices A-D at the end of this dissertation. Reading the chart down presents summarized text of material within a particular version, while reading across illustrates the evolution of a particular chapter across the versions. So, in our example above, in Appendix A, for chapter II.XXIII, the row reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.XXIII [II.56]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+*[Vis genitiva, etc.] pg. 110n3. Gerald adds another verse. (the crime makes itself known in creating a prodigy)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– <em>De hircus ad mulierem accedente</em></td>
<td>On a goat belonging to Roderic, king of Connaught, which was seduced by a woman. Exclamations on bestiality. GW includes a verse of his on the subject. 1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The left-hand column contains the chapter number (both Rolls Series and Penguin translation numbers are given for the *Topographia*) and the title. The subsequent columns represent the five versions. A “+” sign indicates that the chapter is present in the version. The Version I column contains a short summary of the text. The Version III column indicates the added lines by reference to the critical edition’s page number and note, and also indicates the nature and content of the added material. A number followed by an asterisk, here 1*, indicates the positioning of

---

18 GCO V, 110 n. 3.
19 According to Dimock’s notation, MSS M, H, and P contain Version I; MSS C, Bb, and W contain Version II; MSS A, Bc, R, B, and the marginal additions in C contain Version III; MSS F and the marginal additions in R comprise Version IV, and MSS Ba, Cl, Hb, and Rb contain Version V. Full manuscript lists for each version are provided below; the best study is Rooney, “Manuscripts.”
the new text, that is, that Gerald added the lines at the end of the chapter. Versions IV and V contain the chapter with the added Version III material, reflecting Gerald’s habit of never deleting material. The occasional deletions are conspicuously marked as such.

Having created a map of Gerald’s revisions, I then tracked thematic patterns both across versions and within a single version. I looked at what Gerald changed, and kept changing, and what types of changes he made during a particular time period. By analyzing the revisions in this way, a fairly clear picture emerged of the author moving his text through time, adapting and changing certain passages in certain ways. If one considers these changes against the wealth of historical and biographical data Gerald includes in his other works, they reveal Gerald’s authorial project for his texts and how it changed over time.

The results form the rest of this dissertation. Chapter 1, “Dating the Versions of the Topographia Hibernica,” provides dates for the five versions of that text based on new manuscript information and internal analysis of the text. This chapter progresses version by version, describing each one’s contents, listing the manuscripts which contain it, and then providing dates and that version’s likely audience. The results drastically reconfigure the timeline and context for Gerald’s works, and upend the assumptions of previous scholarship that Gerald revised this text intermittently until the end of his life. Instead, the versions are placed within concrete contexts as both reactive to specific events and received by specific audiences: Versions I (and, to a certain extent, II) can be located in the Angevin court prior to the death of Henry II, while Versions II, III, and IV are directed at a clerical audience. A letter accompanying many Version III texts shows that that text was directed at William de Vere, Bishop of Hereford, while a new discovery of textual extracts from the Topographia in William de Montibus’s Similitudinarium illustrates the link between Version IV with both William de Montibus and Lincoln during Gerald’s first “retirement” there. Version V was again directed at the Angevin court, this time to King John around 1209, to urge renewed action in Ireland. This new timeline forms the basis for the analysis of Chapter 2.

In Chapter 2, “From Political Geography to Authorial Fashioning: Prospective History in the Topographia Hibernica,” I identify and discuss examples of “prospective history” in the evolution of the Topographia. Gerald of Wales built into his texts episodes that anticipated and hoped to prefigure events and actions that had not yet occurred. These occur both in his authorial posture and the descriptions of marvels and portents found on the Irish landscape. In Version I, Gerald seeks quaestum aliquem quaestum – some profit or conquest – from the Angevin court, which I interpret as securing patronage, on the one hand, and influencing the conquest of Ireland and, by proxy, crusade in the Holy Land. He creates a “signifying landscape” for Ireland, which models conquerable, inviolable, and portentous space that mirrors the physical, spiritual, and moral methods of reading. By positioning himself as an omniscient scrutator of the landscape, he presents himself as the ideal mediator between Ireland and the Angevin court. The acquisition and successful outcome of either patronage or conquest would, in their own way, “finish” or fulfill the text, and vindicate Gerald’s own position.
When these fail, Gerald revises and redirects his text to a new end. In Versions II, III, and IV, Gerald seeks to trade on the symbolic capital generated by his text to gain credibility as a medieval auctor from a new, clerical audience. He engages in discussions of novitas and auctoritas and expands his discussion of the signifying landscape to convince his new readers of the worthiness of his work. The success of this endeavor is modulated by the interruption of the St. David’s litigation, which erupted in 1199 when Gerald, acting as Bishop of St. David’s, sought a separate, Welsh diocese at the papal curia, as well as his own episcopal confirmation. That failure ruptured the Topographia’s evolution, as well as Gerald’s own auctoritas, and Gerald abandoned the text.

But with Gerald, unfinished, unfulfilled texts are never complete. After the litigation, Gerald turned the Topographia again to political ends, bringing the material on Ireland up-to-date to seek to reactivate its rhetoric on conquest for King John. Drawing on the language of prophecy in the Topographia’s final chapters, Gerald attempts again to both anticipate and incite his Angevin reader to action. John’s subsequent successful Irish campaign is perhaps an unsatisfactory conclusion for so ambitious a text, but provides a tentative, proximate end.

A similar narrative runs through Chapter 3, “From Wales to Jerusalem: Inscribing the Journey of Gerald in the Itinerarium Kambriae.” On the surface, the Itinerarium traces Gerald’s journey through Wales as part of a delegation preaching to recruit for the Third Crusade. It thus, like the Topographia, looks toward exterior events for fulfill or complete the text – looks to crusade as the successful conclusion of the preaching circuit. Gerald fashions the Welsh landscape deliberately to invoke shades of the Holy Land, to paint the two as analogous landscapes and the delegation itself as a type of pilgrimage or crusade. He does this by invoking Welsh nota et notabilia to build up layers of narrative below the surface journey that make up the contours of the landscape. Thus, just as the Holy Land is characterized by famous places which give witness to past historical events – and specifically textual historical events – so Gerald creates Wales by reference to its famous places and the textual past underlying their foundation. The resulting landscape resonates with the story of Arthur and a Celtic past, rather than with the story of biblical history, but it resonates nonetheless, and points structurally to Jerusalem, the preaching circuit and Third Crusade’s goal.

By the time Gerald issued Version I, however, the Third Crusade had already failed, stripping that text of much of its contextual resonance. Version II is characterized by passages that illustrate this ambivalence and struggle with the crisis of meaning arising out of crusading failure. Gerald adds passages that address and question the idea of prophecy and its origins, as well as passages that grapple with violent political realities among Welsh and English. Finally, he makes several key changes to the material dealing with St. David’s, and particularly Archbishop Baldwin’s authority as head of the preaching delegation within Wales. Thus, while struggling to synthesize the crusade’s failure with the success of the preaching delegation, Gerald is already redirecting his text toward a new prospective goal: litigating the independence of a Welsh archdiocese at the papal curia.
When that too fails, Gerald again refocuses the text. The additions in Version III draw focus back to the delegation, and specifically to Gerald himself. He focuses on reestablishing his own damaged credibility and auctoritas after the St. David’s litigation as well as on his own character within the text. He retitles the work the “Odoporion Giraldi,” using a term that strongly evokes pilgrimage, to cast the journey as one of memorialization of the self rather than the attainment of an exterior goal. In this mold he casts himself a pilgrim and portent on the landscape, still searching for his Jerusalem.

Chapter 4, “Historical Truths and Legal Fictions: Evidence and Prophecy at the Papal Curia, 1199-1203,” takes matter of the St. David’s litigation head on. After outlining the case, I discuss Gerald’s evidentiary strategies in his quest to convince the Pope of the antiquity and authenticity of his claim. Gerald’s own appeals to history are only marginally effective, but Gerald’s navigation of both oral and written sources of evidence, as well as confrontation with accusations of forgery and false testimony, reveal a strong current of anxiety running throughout the litigation and court. Here again all of Gerald’s texts, and a cache of visions to boot, projected success, but he was defeated. In writing the history of the case he memorializes the heroism of his own role while recording key arguments and documents for potential future claimants.

Finally, the Conclusion, “History in the Typological Mode,” simply makes explicit the theme running through all of Gerald’s works. Gerald does not only believe that history informs the future, he believes it can predict it. In all of his works, he sets up a typological relationship between past history and future, projected events. What is so surprising about this conception of history is not, perhaps, that he believed it in the first place, but that he believed that he himself could be the author of that relationship, that a poet and not a Prophet – that is, a medieval historiographer outside the biblical context – could create typological meaning. It is with our eye fixed on Gerald that we end our story, a failed author, but paradoxically triumphant in preserving his own story.
CHAPTER 1

DATING THE VERSIONS OF THE TOPOGRAPHIA HIBERNICA

Introduction

In 1185, Gerald of Wales, courtier, cleric, and scholar, accompanied the then Prince John on a journey to Ireland as part of an effort to reaffirm the power of the English crown over some potentially rebellious Anglo-Normans who had established themselves there. Though this journey was a political failure, it provided source material for Gerald to compose two works. The Topographia Hibernica (c. 1188) is a collection of discursive snippets grouped into three sections, or distinctiones. The Prima Distinctio describes Ireland’s physical geography and unique birds and animals, the Secunda Distinctio consists of natural marvels and of miracles, and the Tertia Distinctio is a quasi-ethnographic study of the Irish people, mostly focused on their “barbaric,” non-Anglo-Norman ways. The Expugnatio Hibernica (c. 1189) is a historical account of the Irish conquest, interspersed with character sketches, speeches, Irish prophecies, and culminating with a description of John’s efforts there.

Gerald released both the Expugnatio and the Topographia in multiple versions, revising and adding to the text as he went. The two versions of the Expugnatio have been described and dated by editors A. B. Scott and F. X. Martin. The first version (which they label α) dates from 1189, based on a preface dedicating the work to a not-yet-crowned King Richard, a designation he enjoyed between Henry II’s death in July 1189 and his coronation that September. The second version (designated β) reflects Gerald’s additions and deletions beginning in 1190, with a more-or-less fixed form sent to King John with a letter in 1209.

The Topographia, by contrast, exists in at least five authorial versions witnessed by an impressive forty-five manuscripts, a great many of which date from Gerald’s lifetime. Each of the versions is longer and has less to do with Ireland, its purported subject matter, than the last. Through extensive marginal notations and revisions, Gerald and his scribes built on and expanded the Topographia from version to version. As the marginal notations were incorporated

---


22 Scott and Martin, lxxi-lxxiii.

into the body of the text, a new version was born.\textsuperscript{24} As Diana Greenway says of the versions of Henry of Huntingdon’s \textit{Historia Anglorum}, the numerous versions make it “possible to trace the evolution” of the text, and allow “a partial and imperfect view” of the “complex process of continuing composition and revision by the author.”\textsuperscript{25}

The study of Gerald’s continuing composition and revision has been hindered by scholarly bias and a lack of a dating framework for the \textit{Topographia}’s versions, likely resulting from the lack of a modern critical edition. Bias against Gerald’s additions has been inherited since his first editor and translator, John J. O’Meara, who states:

During twenty to thirty years, from the period . . . when [Gerald] retired temporarily to Lincoln in 1194 to his death in 1223, he continued to add to his original text, going through at least four recensions, until in the end the final version was more than twice as long as [the first].\textsuperscript{26}

Cutting down the text to its “first version,” he continues, “It will be seen that the merits of the original work are considerable. The whole story gains immensely in vigour and interest by the omission of extraneous matter which to a modern reader can only be tedious.”\textsuperscript{27} Such an attitude has resulted in a serious lack of detailed scholarly attention to the later versions. More recent scholars accept both O’Meara’s dates (or rather, the lack of dates) and the bias, assuming that Gerald – that “inveterate fiddler” – continued his revisions until the end of his life.\textsuperscript{28} This claim is bolstered in part by a letter written to the Hereford Cathedral chapter in about 1218 in which Gerald promises to send an updated copy of the \textit{Topographia}, which is presumed to be the latest extant version of the text, Version V.\textsuperscript{29}

Modern views of the later versions are also colored by the assumption that the additions are late-life musings of a drifting scholar. Robert Bartlett notes that the additions to the text are largely spiritual, consisting of didactic, discursive, or allegorical passages building on the previous material. He suggests this “drift” in Gerald’s emphasis “from topography and history to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Manuscripts Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 400 and London, British Library, Royal 13.B.viii illustrate this process.
\item \textsuperscript{26} \textit{The History and Topography of Ireland}, trans. John J. O’Meara (New York: Penguin Classics, 1982) 15-16.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{29} “Giraldus Cambrensis, Epistola ad capitulum Herefordense de libris a se scriptis,” GCO I, 409-419. It is certainly possible that Gerald continued to revise the \textit{Topographia} until the end of his life. The five versions we have, however, date earlier, as will be discussed below.
\end{itemize}
hagiography” is in part due to his disappointment in the Angevin court, from which he retired c. 1195, a disappointment which had been “exacerbated by the wearying litigation of the St. David’s case.” Gerald brought this case before Pope Innocent III in 1199 as an attempt to create a Welsh archdiocese separate from the powerful archdiocese of Canterbury, with St. David’s as the seat of the archbishop. After four years, three journeys back and forth to Rome, and prolonged arguments, he failed.

In fact, Gerald’s shift was both more subtle and more pronounced than a simple “drift” to hagiography. This chapter suggests that Gerald did not continue to “fiddle” with the text of the Topographia, inserting occasional changes until an unknown endpoint near his death in 1223. Rather, his revisions broke continuously and swiftly, with the majority of textual changes occurring in the second and third versions, well before the St. David’s case began in 1199. The fifth and final version of the Topographia dates from only six years after the case ended, c. 1209, and is contemporaneous with the β-version of the Expugnatio. This is proven by Catherine Rooney’s discovery that manuscript Dublin, National Library of Ireland, MS. 700, studied and dated by A.B. Scott and F.X. Martin for its hybrid β-version of the Expugnatio, also contains the fifth version of the Topographia. Based on new work done on Gerald’s manuscripts and new textual analysis, the present article proposes dates for each of the five versions of the Topographia that drastically modify the timeline of Gerald’s work.

This timeline will, in turn, allow better analysis of each distinct version. Tracing the threads of revisions through the text reveals that Gerald deliberately directed the early versions of the Topographia to first a courtly, and then a clerical audience. This trend continued after his retirement from the Angevin court. As shall be shown below, the date offered for Version IV, based on new textual evidence linking the Topographia directly with William de Montibus’s Similitudinarium, places it squarely among the pastoral care movement at Lincoln. Finally, the changes to Version V show Gerald again addressing a royal audience: King John in about 1209. Following Gerald’s texts in this way provides new, concrete contexts for understanding his work and influence, as well as dramatically adding to the richness of what we know of these times and communities. This in turn will allow better integration of Gerald’s works into future analyses.

The Versions of the Topographia Hibernica

This chapter takes the first step toward a comprehensive analysis by proposing dates for each of the five versions of the Topographia. I also provide a brief list of the manuscripts and

30 Bartlett, 121. (Page number refers to the 2006 version.)
31 Dublin, National Library of Ireland, MS. 700. Scott and Martin date N.L.I. 700 to c. 1200. Catherine Rooney dates it to the beginning of the 13th century. It is unclear why Scott and Martin did not mention the fifth version text of the Topographia in their description of this manuscript, which they call “I,” in their study. They certainly noticed the presence of the text, as they refer to its illustrations as well as those in the Expugnatio. Scott and Martin, xxxvii, xvi-xlvi. Thomas O’Loughlin suggests that a map found in N.L.I. 700 was drawn while Gerald was at Lincoln after his European travels, after 1207. Thomas O’Loughlin, “An Early Thirteenth Century Map in Dublin: A Window into the World of Giraldus Cambrensis.” Imago Mundi 51 (1999) 24-39.
describe the contents of each version. I close each section by suggesting an interpretation of Gerald’s motives and authorial project based on trends in the revisions and the version’s likely audience. Taken together, it is possible to map the Topographia’s trajectory over time, as Gerald adapted and directed his text to different audiences and different situations at different times in his life.

**Version I**

There is general agreement on the date of Version I. Gerald accompanied Prince John to Ireland in 1185, and returned from his journey between Easter and Pentecost in 1186. He began writing while still in Ireland. As is well known, in the spring of 1188, Gerald accompanied Archbishop Baldwin on a circuit through Wales to preach the Third Crusade. As he tells us in the Itinerarium Cambriae, when they arrived at Gerald’s archdeaconry of Brecon, Gerald presented Baldwin with a copy of his new book on Ireland. It was therefore completed before March 1188, and probably dates from 1187, as a dedication copy was likely presented to the court of Henry II soon after Gerald’s return from Ireland.

This version is contained in full in eight manuscripts: Cambridge, University Library, Mm.5.30 [2435] (s. xii e) [M]; London, British Library, Harley 3724 (s. xiii/xiv) [H]; Cambridge, Peterhouse Library 177 (olim 181) (s. xv) [P]; Cambridge, St. Catherine’s College 3 (s. xiii med.); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 11111 (s. xiii e); London, College of Arms Vincent 418 (s. xv); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 2 [9822] (s. xvi i); and Dublin, Trinity College Library 574 [E.3.31] (s. xvi/xvii). Three of these (M, H, and P) were known to James Dimock when he edited the text for the Rolls Series. Richard Sharpe identified one more, and Catherine Rooney found the four others, along with a fragmentary and abbreviated version. John J. O’Meara has edited the first version separately from the subsequent versions, and his popular translation, now published by Penguin Classics, is only of this first version.  

---

32 De Rebus a Se Gestis, GCO I, 72; see, for example, the account in J. Conway Davies, “Giraldus Cambrensis, 1146-1946,” Archeologica Cambrensis 99 (1946-47) 85-108 and 256-280, at 102.
33 De Rebus a Se Gestis, GCO I, 65 and Itinerarium Cambriae, Ch. 1.2.
34 Lewis Thorpe estimates the exact date of their arrival at Brecon as March 8, 1188 in his “Gerald of Wales: A Public Reading at Oxford in 1188 or 1189,” Neophilologus 62.3 (1978): 455-458, 455. I am assuming Henry II would have received a copy based on certain changes to Version II, discussed below.
35 The manuscripts used in the Rolls Series edition are M, H, and P. Richard Sharpe includes Cambridge, St. Catherine’s College 3, and, erroneously, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 4126, which Catherine Rooney has reclassified. Rooney also added Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 11111, London, College of Arms Vincent 418, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 2 [9822], and Dublin, Trinity College Library 574. For reference, see GCO V, xi-xxviii; Richard Sharpe, A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540 (Belgium: Brepols, 1997) 134-137; and for the most complete discussion, Rooney, 30-65. She also includes information on fragments, extracts, and translations.
Forester translated the fifth and fullest version for Thomas Wright’s 1892 edition of Gerald’s works, though it is not widely used.\footnote{37}{“The Topography of Ireland,” trans. Thomas Forester, \textit{The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis} (London: George Bell & Sons, 1892).}

Version I is the most succinct of all the versions and is comprised of three \textit{distinctiones}. It begins with a preface dedicating the work to Henry II, which briefly recounts how Gerald accompanied John on the mission to Ireland, where Gerald noted and recorded many never-before seen marvels of Nature. (This is the “Second Preface” in the Rolls Series edition.) The \textit{Prima Distinctio} contains information on the geography of Ireland, locating it first among other countries and then describing its interior topography, weather, fertility, and lakes and rivers. Gerald then turns to fauna, describing in turn fish, birds, wild animals, and finally reptiles. Many of the birds are accompanied by short moralizations based on their particular characteristics. At the very end of the \textit{distinctio}, Gerald compares Ireland’s general salutary climate with that of the rich but often poisonous East.

The \textit{Secunda Distinctio} is divided into natural marvels, marvels “of our time” (\textit{nostris temporibus}), miracles, and miracles “of our time.” The natural marvels include seas, tides, holy lakes, and marvelous wells, fountains, and islands, while the marvels “of our time” include hybrid births, two episodes of bestiality, and other types of animal behavior “against nature” (\textit{contra naturam}). Ireland’s miracles involve tales of ancient local saints, such as St. Kevin and St. Brigid, and other miracles associated with Kildare. The miracles “of our time” include accounts of saints vengefully protecting their holy sites from wrongful encroachment by the English.

The \textit{Tertia Distinctio} describes the nature of the Irish people. It has an “envelope” structure, beginning with the ancient history of attempted invasion and colonization of Ireland, and ending with contemporary accounts of invasion and colonization by the Vikings (\textit{Norwagienses} and \textit{Ostmanni}) and finally the English. In the center of these stories of attempts at conquest are descriptions of the Irish people themselves, with an account of their nature and customs (\textit{natura et mores}). Gerald focuses mainly on their vices and bad qualities (which fuels anti-Irish rhetoric for centuries\footnote{38}{For a succinct introduction to the legacy of Gerald’s ethnographic ‘observations’ in the early modern period and beyond, see John Barry, “A Wild Goose Chase,” in \textit{The Role of Latin in Early Modern Europe: Texts and Contexts}, ed. Gerhard Petersmann and Veronika Oberparleiter (Salzburg: Horn, 2005).}), though he also offers some positive descriptions, telling of their skill in music and the history and state of Christianity in Ireland. The work ends with a discussion of kingship and an account of the victories and titles of Henry II.

This version had both a courtly and a clerical audience, which substantially overlapped. It was dedicated to Henry II, at whose court it would have been read aloud. Henry II’s court included both clerical and lay courtiers, poets, scholars, and theologians.\footnote{39}{A good overview of the court of Henry II is Egbert Türk’s \textit{Nugae Curialium: Le règne d’Henri II Plantagenet (1145-1189) et l’éthique politique} (Geneva: Librarie Droz, 1977).} Many of the notable late twelfth-century English and French literary figures had some connection with Henry II: John of Salisbury and Peter of Blois, but also Chretien de Troyes, Marie de France, perhaps
Walter of Châtillon, Wace, and Benoit de Sainte-Maure. Peter Dronke notes the variety and depth of literary activity at Henry II’s court, saying that, in addition to a huge range of vernacular verse chronicles and romances, “In his thirty-five years on the English throne, Henry received mirrors of princes, chronicles, political, economic and legal writings, treatises on geography, falconry, even on shorthand, not to mention a series of panegyrics, collections of moral maxims, and edifying hagiographic works.”

The court of Henry II represented a flowering of the “twelfth century renaissance.” It is easy to place Gerald in such company, as the Topographia actively takes part in ongoing courtly dialogues on, for example, Henry II’s geographical expansion, the signification of the natural world, and the question of how one ought to approach, read, and interpret diverse texts. Henry’s courtiers, including Gerald, offered advice and attempted to affect policy through consideration of these types of topics.

The first version of the Topographia was also presented to Archbishop Baldwin in 1188, as mentioned above. Gerald describes giving the book to Baldwin in the Itinerarium Kambriae (c. 1191); in the third version of that text (c. 1214), he adds the detail, Quod ipse [archiepiscopus] gratanter accipiens, singulisque diebus obiter inde vel legens vel audiens attente, tandem in Angliam reversus, lectionem una cum legatione complevit. (“The Archbishop received it graciously, and every day read a small portion or had it read to him with close attention, and turning back toward England, completed the reading together with the mission.”) Every member of Baldwin’s delegation heard at least some of the Topographia read. This delegation included, at various times, Ranulph de Glanville, the Chief Justiciar; Alexander, Archdeacon of Bangor, who acted as an interpreter during most of the trip; Peter de Leia, Bishop of St. David’s; William de Salso Marisco, Bishop of Llandaff; John, Abbot of Whitland; and Seisyll, Abbot of Strata Florida, in addition to a number of unnamed attendants.

---

42 Compare John of Salisbury’s opinions in the Polycraticus, 2.15-16, where he declaims the ability for dreams or general things to have significance beyond their surface, with the opinions of Hugh of St. Victor in the Descriptis et scriptoris sacris praeotatiunculae, Ch. 14 (PL 175.20), in which he notes that a diligens scrutator can see and understand spiritual lessons in natural things through seven modes: vox, res, persona, numerus, locus, tempus, and gestum. Gerald comments on the role of the diligens scrutator in the “First Preface” to the Topographia, added in Version II.
43 For example, the different registers of assertion distinguished in the Preface to Abelard’s Sic et Non, a distinction also employed by Gerald in Version II to respond to his critics. See below.
44 GCO VI, 20.
45 Lewis Thorpe has, “The Archbishop received it graciously and read a portion of it with close attention each day during the journey, or else had it read to him. When he returned to England he read the remainder of the book in the presence of his retainers.” Gerald of Wales: The Journey Through Wales and The Description of Wales, trans. Lewis Thorpe (New York: Penguin Classics, 1978) 80-81. Future unspecified translations are my own.
46 See Thorpe, Journey, 24-29.
By Gerald’s account in his autobiography, *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, Baldwin enjoyed the *Topographia* very much.\(^{47}\)

**Version II**

The second version contains Gerald’s most extensive additions and revisions to the text, including twenty-three entirely new chapters as well as long extensions and digressions within existing chapters. This version is easily twice as long as the first. It dates from only a year or two after Version I, and prior to Henry II’s death on July 6, 1189, as it contains many laudatory passages indicating that he was alive and well.\(^{48}\)

This version is contained in seven manuscripts: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 400, Part B (s. xii/xiii) [C], Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B.483 [11830] (s. xiii\(^{in}\)) [Bb], London, Westminster Abbey 23 (s. xii\(^{xx}\)) [W], London, British Library, Additional 34762 (s. xiii\(^{in}\)), London, British Library, Additional 44922 (s. xiii\(^{in}\)) (incomplete, missing final six chapters), Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, B.P.L. 13 (s. xiv), and London, British Library, Cotton Faustina C.iv (s. xvi\(^{xx}\)).\(^{49}\) Three of these (C, Bb, and W) were known to Dimock, two additional ones were catalogued by Sharpe, and Rooney supplied the remaining. MS C contains extensive marginal additions which, along with four other manuscripts, constitute Version III, demonstrating Gerald’s method of adding marginal comments (or having his scribes do so) which were then incorporated in the body of text of subsequent versions.

The additions to the text of Version II illustrate that Gerald was responding to his readers and critics from Version I. Broadly speaking, Version II’s changes involve 1) a preoccupation with a defense of Gerald’s authorial project in the prefaces (both the fact that he was writing about Ireland at all as well as the fact that what he was saying was true), 2) an expansion of the bird allegories in the *Prima Distinctio*, 3) additional examples of marvels and miracles and chapters on refuge in the *Secunda Distinctio*, 4) four new chapters on music in the *Tertia Distinctio*, and 5) five new chapters on Henry II’s sons closing the work, with a sixth promising a history of his daughters. Many of these themes illustrate the idea that Gerald was actively in dialogue with his readers, responding directly to both clerical and royal reactions to Version I.

First, Gerald defends his authorial project against critics and potential critics. In a new preface, he defends his choice of Ireland as a topic, claiming that rhetoric and language will render it worthy of discussion despite its geographic and cultural remoteness. He expands the preface to the *Secunda Distinctio*, reasserting the authenticity of the things he witnessed firsthand, but acknowledging that *quae vero tantum demissa per aures, quia segnius irritant, horum non assertor sed recitator existo* (“what has only reached my ear through others, which I am slower to believe, . . . I do not affirm, but only relate”).\(^{50}\) Regardless of this, Gerald advises

---

\(^{47}\) See for example *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, GCO I, 80.

\(^{48}\) GCO V, li-lii.

\(^{49}\) GCO V, xi-xxviii; Sharpe, 134-137; and Rooney, 30-65. Note that Rooney calls another manuscript by the letter W: Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 3074D. This is a Version V text.

\(^{50}\) GCO V, 75; Forester, 57.
his readers not to be surprised at the contents of the distinctio, since no marvel or miracle is impossible for (or with) God.\textsuperscript{51} He also expands the Tertia Distinctio’s preface with a passage defending his writing project, “weak and feeble though it is” (longe licet inferiore lyra calamoque fragili), as a useful and purposeful addition “to the stores of knowledge handed down to posterity” (nostra quoque diligentia posteriorum studiis aliquid adjiciatur).\textsuperscript{52}

Other changes also respond to potential criticism about the Topographia’s truth. Gerald tries to bolster the credibility of particular passages throughout Version II by adding quotations from the authorities Bede, Isidore, and Solinus,\textsuperscript{53} and by adding additional examples of marvels and miracles, including approximately thirteen additional marvelous wells, fountains, and rivers, and one marvelous forest – all save one located outside of Ireland.\textsuperscript{54} In this same vein, he adds an entire catalogue of saints from all over Europe whose lives are similar to his account of that of St. Kevin.\textsuperscript{55} Finally, he qualifies his language for two of his more unbelievable marvels: adding a possible natural cause to explain the portentous frog in the Prima Distinctio\textsuperscript{56}; and adding ut fertur (“it was said”) to the account of the fish with three gold teeth in the Secunda Distinctio.\textsuperscript{57}

Second, the expansion of bird allegories in the Prima Distinctio directly responds to Archbishop Baldwin’s feedback for Gerald as they were leaving Wales following the preaching circuit. In his autobiography, Gerald recounts how the members of the delegation were discussing their imminent departure for the Third Crusade. During this conversation, Baldwin told Gerald that he meant for him to record the Crusade in prose, while his nephew, Joseph of Exeter, would record it in verse. Gerald reports that Baldwin had a high opinion of his work from reading the Topographia, and recounts with pride:

Quaesiverat etiam archiepiscopus ab ipso, utrum evidentiam aliquam ab agiographis et expositibus nostris habuisset, super allegoriis circa avium naturas assignatis in prima Topographiae Distinctione. Et cum responderet quod nullam, subjecit archiepiscopus, quia revera spiritu eodem quo et illi scripserunt scripta sunt ista.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{52} GCO V, 138; Forester, 112.
\textsuperscript{53} For example in Chs. I.III (Solinus, Polyhistor, 25; Orosius, Historiae adversum paganos, I.2; Isidore, Etymologies, 14.6; Bede, Ecclesiastical History, i.1), I.VI (same sources), I.XXXI (Bede, ibid.), II.XI (Orosius, ibid., and Isidore, ibid.), II.XIV (oblique reference to the “philosophers”), II.XVII (Solinus, ibid.; Isidore, ibid.; Orosius, ibid.), and III.XII-XV (drawn both directly and indirectly from Isidore, Etymologiae, De Musica, 3.15-15). The first roman numeral refers to the distinctio, the second to the chapter number as printed in the critical edition in the Rolls Series.
\textsuperscript{54} Ch. II.VII.
\textsuperscript{55} Ch. II.XXXVIII (St. Apollinaris in Ravenna, St. Vincent in Lisbon, St. Firmin in Auch (France), and St. Clement in Constantinople.)
\textsuperscript{56} Ch. I.XXXII
\textsuperscript{57} Ch. II.X.
The Archbishop had asked him whether he had used any material from the hagiographers and commentators concerning the allegories assigned to the natures of the birds in the first distinction of the Topographia. And when he had responded that he hadn’t, the archbishop exclaimed that they certainly were inspired by the same spirit that those who had written those things were.\textsuperscript{58}

In Version I, several descriptions of birds described had no moralizations, but in Version II, every bird, and indeed every separate attribute, has been assigned an allegory. Gerald expands the both the chapter on hawks and sparrowhawks and the chapter on cranes, assigning to each bird’s attribute a moralization.\textsuperscript{59} He entirely rewrites the chapter on eagles, and includes an additional discussion on the theme of intellectual and religious pride.\textsuperscript{60} He adds a new chapter on cicadas (included with birds, perhaps, because they also fly) and who, like Christian martyrs, sing more sweetly in death than in life.\textsuperscript{61} As we shall see in our discussion of Versions III and IV, Gerald’s moralizations were popular not only with Baldwin, but also with William de Montibus.

Third, many of the additions in Version II are directed to the royal audience of the work. These, consistent with Gerald’s style, take both a laudatory and admonitory tones. The titles and triumphs of Henry II are expanded, nearly doubled in length.\textsuperscript{62} Five new chapters relate the history of Henry II’s sons, Henry III, Richard, Geoffrey, and John, and how they rebelled against their father.\textsuperscript{63} A final chapter promises a fuller history of Henry II’s daughters, who were married to the rulers of Saxony, Spain, and Sicily, though this was never added.\textsuperscript{64} In the Tertia Distinctio Gerald changes the chapter entitled De duplici novo jure to De triplici novo jure, adding a third reason the English should rule Ireland by right: because the Irish originate from Biscay in Gascony, which by virtue of Henry II’s marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine fell under British rule. The other two claims, voluntary fealty and papal confirmation, are strengthened by the placement of this additional detail, which had originally been located in the previous chapter.\textsuperscript{65} Other additions, however, reveal some ambivalence about the ruling house: in the Secunda Distinctio, Gerald adds a miracle “of our time” implicating Henry II’s troops in the

\textsuperscript{58} GCO I, 80. Gerald recites this bit of praise elsewhere: in his letter to William de Montibus, found in Giraldbus Cambrensis: Speculum Duorum or A Mirror of Two Men, ed. Yves Lefèvre and R. B. C. Huygens (Cardiff 1974) 170-173, in the De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae, GCO III, 334-335, and in the letter to the canons of Hereford concerning his books, in GCO I, 410.

\textsuperscript{59} Ch. I.XII; I.XIV.

\textsuperscript{60} Ch. I.XIII. This is further expanded in Version III.

\textsuperscript{61} Ch. I.XXI.

\textsuperscript{62} Ch. III.XLVIII.

\textsuperscript{63} Chs. III.XLIX-LIII.

\textsuperscript{64} Ch. III.LIV.

\textsuperscript{65} Ch. III.IX. This was originally titled De duplici novo jure, and becomes De triplici novo jure.
destruction of a holy orchard, which thus accounts for their military loss at Finglas. This culminates a list of miracles admonishing soldiers of Anglo-Norman invaders for violating Irish holy places, but it is the first one to implicate the Angevin house.

It was this version that Gerald of Wales read aloud at Oxford in either late 1188 or early 1189, and in fact Version II’s new preface is entitled Introitus in Recitationem. Gerald describes the reading at Oxford in his De Rebus a Se Gestis, where he describes it as taking place opere completo et correcto, with the work having been completed and corrected. The fact that Gerald made such extensive changes to the Topographia so soon after issuing the first version strongly indicates that Gerald considered Version II’s additions integral to a larger project. This is consistent with the view that Version II was considered textually “complete” compared with Version I. Indeed, Versions III and IV contain only minor textual emendations, mostly words or phrases. Gerald’s readers Walter Map, archdeacon of Oxford, and Robert de Beaufey (Bello Fago), canon of Salisbury, encountered Version II during the reading at Oxford.

Version II likely had a royal audience as well. First, Henry II may have seen a version of it before his death. But second, in 1189, Richard likely received a presentation copy of the Expugnatio Hibernica, as indicated by that work’s preface dedicating the work to him. The Topographia very often circulated with the Expugnatio, and it is therefore likely Richard received this text as well. Internal evidence supports this, as Gerald refers to the Topographia throughout the Expugnatio. For example, when describing Henry II meeting the princes of Northern Ireland, Gerald notes in the Expugnatio: Ea tempestate sagittarii apud Fineglas in arbores sanctum manibus per cemiterium olim plantatas enormiter desevientes, singulari peste consumpti sunt, sicut in Topographia declaratur. (“At that time, some archers at Finglas, who were lawlessly wreaking havoc upon hand-planted trees in the holy cemetery, were all carried off by an extraordinary disease, as is related in the Topography.”) This miracle makes its first appearance in Version II, as mentioned above, indicating that Richard had some access to this version.

**Version III**

---

66 Ch. II.LIV. This chapter is in the margins of MS C, which would normally constitute part of Version III. However, it also exists in MS Bb, a Version II manuscript. Where additions located in the margins of C are also in another Version II manuscript (W or Bb), I have considered them a Version II addition.

67 Version I’s miracles implicate the forces of Strongbow and Hugh de Lacy; the Finglas miracle affects troops directly under Henry II’s control.

68 Scholars differ as to whether the first or second version was the one read aloud at Oxford. At stake is the primacy of the shorter first version over the “cumbersome” additions in the subsequent texts. J. Conway Davies, John J. O’Meara, and Robert Bartlett state the first recension was read; Lewis Thorpe, Yoko Wada, James Dimock, and I think the second. See Dimock, GCO V, li and n. 3; Wada, 229-230; Thorpe, “Public Reading,” 455.

69 Thorpe, “Public Reading,” 455.

70 The two works often accompany each other in manuscripts, see Rooney, v-xix.

71 Scott and Martin, Expugnatio Hibernica, 96-97.
The third version of the *Topographia* is contained in nine manuscripts: London, British Library, Arundel 14 (s. xii\textsuperscript{ex}); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 511 [2179] (A.D. 1513); Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B.188 [11549] (s. xii/xiii) [B]; London, British Library, Royal 13.B.viii [R]; London, British Library, Additional 33991 (s. xii/xiii); Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 887 (s. xii/xiii); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 4846 (s. xii/xiii); Cambridge, Emmanuel College 1.1.3 (A.D. 1481); and London, British Library, Harley 359 (s. xvi\textsuperscript{ex}). In addition, the marginal additions of MS [C] (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 400) are considered a third-version update to the second-version main text. Of these ten manuscripts, seven contain a letter from Gerald to William de Vere (bishop of Hereford, 1186-1199), recommending the chapters he might enjoy the most.\textsuperscript{72} As Catherine Rooney has pointed out, this suggests Gerald completed the third version before the Bishop’s death in 1199.\textsuperscript{73}

It is likely, however, that he completed it even earlier. James Dimock proposed that the third version might have appeared “within two or three years after the first” because of evidence provided by two early manuscripts: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B.188 [B] and London, British Library, Royal 13.B.viii [R].\textsuperscript{74} Both of these manuscripts also contain two of Gerald’s other works: an α-version of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* and the first version of the *Itinerarium Cambriae*. In their introduction to edition of the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, Scott and Martin have shown that R is a copy made from B, and that both were produced in Gerald’s circle.\textsuperscript{75} Their dating of the α-version of the *Expugnatio* to mid-1189, after the death of Henry II but before Richard’s coronation, shows that Version III of the *Topographia* was produced after 1189. The fact that the texts are grouped with the first version of the *Itinerarium* (c. 1191), however, proves more useful: Assuming that Gerald would include the most up-to-date versions of his works in his manuscripts, the textual grouping may indicate that the second version of the *Itinerarium*, c. 1197, was not yet completed when these manuscripts were composed.\textsuperscript{76} This in turn implies that the third version of the *Topographia* dates prior to 1197.


\textsuperscript{73} Rooney, 48.

\textsuperscript{74} GCO VI, x. For descriptions of MS B see: Dimock’s Preface in GCO V, xxi; Scott and Martin, “Introduction,” *Expugnatio Hibernica*, xxxiv-xxxv; and Macray, *Catalogi Codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae* 5.1 (1862) 524. For descriptions of MS R see: Dimock’s Preface in GCO V, xx-xxi; Scott and Martin, “Introduction,” *Expugnatio Hibernica*, xxxv; and George F. Warner and Julius Gilson, *Catalogue of Royal and King’s MSS. in the British Museum*, vol. ii (London 1921) 94. Interestingly, MS R also contains Henry of Saltrey’s St. Patrick’s Purgatory and excerpts from the Chronicles of Eusebius. Alain de Lille’s *Anticlaudianus* is a separate gathering from the thirteenth century (Warner and Gilson).

\textsuperscript{75} Scott and Martin, xliii and xlv. See also Rooney, 114-115.

\textsuperscript{76} The date of the *Itinerarium Cambriae* is discussed by Dimock, GCO VI, xxxvii. Version II dates after 1194, as it contains information about the defeat of Rhys and the expulsion of David, and is dedicated to Hugh of Lincoln, likely after Gerald arrived there in 1196. Dimock believes it was finished and presented to him not long after his arrival.
There is some evidence to narrow Version III’s window of composition further still. Since MSS B and R were produced close to Gerald (possibly by his own scriptorium) and only contain his two Irish works and the Itinerarium, Rooney speculates that the Descriptio Kambriae (c. 1193/4) might not have been written yet. Rooney’s suggestion that the grouping in these manuscripts occurred before the Descriptio was written would bring Version III’s terminus ante quem to 1193/4. In the footnote to this suggestion, however, Rooney lists 1188 as the date for the Topographia, which does not take into account that the manuscripts in question contain Version III of the Topographia and not Version I. Despite this apparent error, the possibility of pinpointing the date of the third version of the Topographia more exactly merits further exploration.

An earlier window of 1189-1193/4 for the date of the third version of the Topographia would be consistent with two pieces of evidence. First, Gerald had strong ties with Hereford in the early 1190s. It makes sense that Gerald would send Bishop William de Vere the Topographia with the accompanying introductory letter earlier in William’s tenure as bishop rather than later, as Gerald often sought patronage from powerful men on the ascent. Gerald considered William a friend and generous host as early as 1186, when he was present at a meeting at the bishop’s house between Rhys ap Gruffydd, Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury, and Ranulph Glanvill, Justiciar of England. Gerald became a canon of Hereford and possibly stayed there in the mid-1190s, perhaps writing the Vita Ethelberti at William’s request during this period. In 1195, he recommended the young Robert Grosseteste to the bishop’s service, and c. 1195-1197, Simon de Freine tried to convince Gerald to take up residence at Hereford rather than at Lincoln by writing him a letter in verse. Simon’s poem, included with a number of poems in two manuscripts and edited in the Rolls Series, seeks to promote Hereford as a center

---

77 Rooney, 24 and 119. Rooney speculates that, once the Descriptio was completed, it circulated with the Itinerarium separately from the Irish works. Dimock describes the Descriptio at GCO VI, xxxix. The Descriptio is dedicated to Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury, who was promoted in 1193. It also refers to David ap Owain as prince of North Wales; he was expelled in 1194 by his nephew Llywelyn.

78 Rooney, 24 n. 122.

79 See, for example, Jason Harris, “Giraldus as Natural Historian: Transformations and Reception,” in Kathy Cawsey and Jason Harris, eds., Transmission and Transformation in the Middle Ages: Texts and Contexts (Dublin, Ireland: Four Courts Press, 2007), who suggests that Gerald’s revisions in the Topographia are to secure patronage.

80 De Rebus a Se Gestis, GCO I, 57.


82 The poem is found in London, Lambeth Palace 236, f. 166r and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 400, f. 119. Labeled Carmen Magistri Symonis de Fraxino Herefordensis Canonici, Magistro Giraldo transmissum, it is edited in part in GCO I, 382-384, and is part of a three poem exchange with Gerald. R. W. Hunt edits lines missing from the GCO edition that focus on the wide range of scientific disciplines studied at Hereford, including what is possibly the earliest reference to geomancy in England, in Appendix I to his “English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century.” Hunt, 110 n. 3 and 121-122.
of superior scientific learning; it therefore seems plausible that the community at Hereford was already well aware of Gerald’s naturalist pursuits.

Second, an earlier date for Version III of the *Topographia* would help to explain a textual anomaly in the B manuscript, which includes an unfinished portion of the *Itinerarium*’s dedicatory preface, misplaced at the end of the work, and strangely addressed to the disgraced William Longchamp, bishop of Ely. Dimock suggests that Gerald must have initially dedicated the *Itinerarium* to William and then suppressed the dedication after William’s notorious downfall and flight from England in 1191 after disputes with John during Richard’s absence. Gerald rededicated the work to Hubert Walter after he was made archbishop of Canterbury in 1193. Perhaps, then, Gerald had the original incomplete dedication copied into B despite William’s downfall, and tacked on to the end of the text rather at the beginning, so as not to lose the prefatory text until he found a new dedicatee. This is only speculation, of course, but the inclusion of the partial dedication to William makes better sense generally if the manuscript (and thus the version of the *Topographia* it contains) dates prior to the rededication to Hubert Walter. R (a later, direct copy from B) lacks the mysterious dedicatory preface entirely, as does the other manuscript of the first version of the *Itinerarium*.

The textual additions in Version III are mostly small, consisting of additional phrases, sentences, or quotations which refine information already present. Gerald adds some additional etymological and geographical detail to the initial chapters on geography, topography, and Ireland’s fish. He expands his moralization of the eagle with a number of biblical quotations and amplifies the conclusion on the ineffability of nature. He adds dormice as another example of animals that hibernate, and an additional chapter on a bird called the *croerae*. In the *Secunda Distinctio*, Gerald again defends the idea of the new in the Preface, adding a quotation from Horace. He alters and further qualifies the chapter on the fish with three gold teeth. In one of the most significant textual changes, Gerald tacks on a long, Augustine-inspired discussion of the humanity of monsters to his tale of the wolf speaking with a priest, and continues the discussion again two chapters later. He adds a second verse on the prodigies of nature to his discussion of bestiality in Ch. XXIII. Gerald adds virtually nothing to Version III’s *Tertia Distinctio* except for a few clarifying details and some additional unflattering details on Irish culture in Ch. XXVI.

The most significant additions in Version III are extra-textual. As mentioned above, seven of the ten manuscripts of Version III contain the introductory letter to William de Vere, directing him to the chapters Gerald believed were most profitable and that William would enjoy most. Four of these seven manuscripts also contain a representational map of Britain and Ireland showing the orientation of Ireland to England and the Hebrides, an example of which is included as Plate 1.

**Version IV**

---

83 GCO VI, xxxv-xxxvii.
84 See GCO VI, x and xxiv; Walter and Gilson, 94.
85 Ch. I.XXIII.
86 These are BL Arundel 14; BL Add’l 33991; BNF latin 4846; and Cambridge, CCC 400.
The fourth version of the *Topographia* has never been dated, and I propose it be dated to the time of Gerald’s first “retirement” from the court to Lincoln, c. 1196-1198, for two reasons. First, it is consistent with scholarship on the program of marginal illustrations that is added to the two manuscripts of Version IV: MS R, mentioned above as a Version III text, but whose marginal additions bring the *Topographia* from the third version to the fourth, and MS F, Cambridge, University Library, Ff.1.27 [1160] (s.xiii/xiv), thought to be a copy of R that incorporates the marginal additions into the main text. Second, I have discovered new textual evidence that links Version IV of Gerald’s *Topographia* to the pastoral care movement centered at Lincoln at that time: portions of the *Topographia* that are copied into William de Montibus’s *Similitudinarius*.  

Nigel Morgan in *Early Gothic Manuscripts* first suggests Lincoln as a possible provenance for MS R when he describes the illustrations as having an affinity for other manuscripts produced in the region:

> The lively drawings have colour washes in brown, green and yellow with occasional use of blue and red. Very possibly the original versions of the subjects were sketches by Giraldus himself in his no longer extant autograph copy. Perhaps an illustrated version was made when he was at Lincoln (1192-8) as there are elements in the drawing style having affinities with work in the Leningrad Bestiary (no. 11) produced in the Lincoln region at that time.

Michelle Brown goes even further, suggesting that Gerald may have even been responsible for the drawings themselves. She notes:

> Lincoln and works produced in its orbit [such as the Cambridge University Library Bestiary and the Guthlac Roll] could well have provided the necessary stylistic background, especially for the London volume [MS R]. … [Gerald’s] sojourn at Lincoln from 1196-8 may well have witnessed the formulation of an illustrative programme by Gerald or under his supervision, or such may already have existed and have been introduced there by him.

Brown argues that what she calls the London manuscript (MS R) is a later elaboration on the earlier “Dublin” volume, which she believes is “closest to the core of [Gerald’s] programme.”

---

87 GCO V, xxii-xxiv. (Illustrations are also found in two fifth-version manuscripts: Oxford, Bodleian Laud Misc. 720 and Dublin, National Library of Ireland 700.)
88 William de Montibus’s *Similitudinarius* is edited in part in Joseph Goering, *William de Montibus (c. 1140-1213): The Schools and the Literature of Pastoral Care* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1992). I thank Professor Goering for sending me his own diplomatic transcription of the passages in question.
90 Brown, 46-47.
91 Brown, 47.
In fact, the “Dublin” volume, Dublin, National Library of Ireland 700, is a Version V text dating from c. 1209 (see below), which Brown has erroneously identified as containing “an early recension.” It is therefore later than MS R – indeed, Brown calls it “stylistically later,” though she misidentifies its text.

Regardless, Brown believes the illustrations in MS R were “elaborated” in Gerald’s presence while he was at Lincoln, but she is unsure whether to date the illustrations in MS R to Gerald’s first tenure at Lincoln or his second. She notes that MS R contains a particular illustration which seems to locate it very clearly in Lincoln: an image of a deer with gold teeth, captured in Dunholm. Brown notes that Dunholm “is likely to be the wood that lies a mere six miles from Lincoln, where Gerald was a resident from 1196-8 and after 1207/1208.”

Placing MS R and therefore Version IV at Lincoln is useful because Gerald was there for specifically defined dates. But consistent with the diligent work of these art historians is a new discovery of textual evidence that I believe places MS R’s fourth version of the text at Lincoln during Gerald’s first tenure there, 1196-98. Gerald went to Lincoln in 1196 to study under the theologian William de Montibus, one of the primary figures in the pastoral care movement. This movement, known as *cura pastoralis*, was a reform of the Church promulgated to increase opportunities for lay literacy and education, and which focused on the social and spiritual needs of the public. It was supported implicitly by the Third Lateran Council in 1179, and explicitly by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. One of its main goals was to improve preaching; thus the literature that flowed from this movement included *florilegia*, sermon handbooks, and bestiaries and other handbooks from which to draw moral lessons.

Previous studies associate Gerald with William de Montibus only in the context of a rather nasty letter included in the later *Speculum Duorum* (c. 1208-1216), in which Gerald defends the *Topographia* from William’s criticism. In this letter, Gerald expresses astonishment that William would criticize the *Topographia* and *Expugnatio*, particularly considering that William “used to praise them highly” (*quos antea plurimum commendare consuevit*). Most scholars attribute this line to Gerald’s active imagination. However, new evidence reveals not only that William used to praise the *Topographia*, but that he copied extracts from it verbatim into his own *Similitudinarium*. And significantly, these extracts include a textual variant only introduced in the fourth version.

---

92 Some bestiary scholars have raised doubts that Lincoln was a center for luxury illuminated manuscript production (see Ron Baxter, *Bestiaries and their Users in the Middle Ages* (London: Sutton Publishing, 1998) 18-22). Brown herself notes likewise. This, however, does not preclude the possibility that Gerald still managed to produce illustrations there. Francis Hill cites a “Henry the illuminator” recorded living in the Lincoln suburb of Butwerk in *Medieval Lincoln* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 161.

93 Brown, 45. This image, and a short description of the deer, is added to the passage about the fish with three gold teeth, yet again altering and qualifying that chapter.


The scope of the extracts is similar to those passages of Gerald found in Alexander Neckham’s *De Natura Rerum*. William de Montibus’s *Similitudinarium* contains moralized entries of hunting birds under the heading *Aves Rapaces*, and of hybrid birds under the heading *Aves biformis nature*. An examination of the texts of those entries (a diplomatic transcription graciously provided to me by the text’s editor Joseph Goering) reveals the striking similarities between the two, though the morals attached to them are quite different. The order of William’s birds is: *Aves Rapaces*: *Falcones*, *Girofalcones*, *Accipitres*, *Nisi*, *Milui*, *Aquile*, *Alietos*, *Ciconie*, *Cicadie*, *Fenix*. The order of these birds in the *Topographia* is nearly identical: *Falcones*, *Gyrofalcones*, *Nisi*, *Accipitres*, *Aquile*, and then (skipping Gerald’s description of the crane and barnacle goose), *Aurifrisii* (renamed *Halieti* in Version IV), eventually followed by *Cygnie et Ciconie*, and *Cicadie*, whose chapter ends with details about the silkworm and, significantly, the phoenix.

William’s natural descriptions are much more concise than Gerald’s own, but conserve Gerald’s order and many of his word choices and wordplay. A comparison of the texts is included below:

**Chart 1: Comparison of William de Montibus and Gerald of Wales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>William de Montibus Extracts</th>
<th>Gerald of Wales Extracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falcons a falcando, quia in falcis modum circumeundo perlustrant. . .</td>
<td>Falcons itigrur a falcando, quia in falcis modum circumeundo perlustrant; gyrofalcones a gyro-faciendo, <em>vel in gyrum falcando</em>; nisi a nisu, accipitres ab accipiendo, nomen acceperunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girofalcones in girum falcando, . .</td>
<td><em>italics</em> indicate a Version III addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accipitres . .</td>
<td>De avibus biformis, earumque naturis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisi diaboli sunt, qui toto nisu plebeios dampnificant.</td>
<td>Aves quoque biformis naturae, <em>quas haliaetos</em> vocant, sunt hic multae; aquila quidem minores, accipitre majores. Quibus alterum pedem unguibus armatum, apertum et rapacem, alterum vero clausum et pacificum, solique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aves biformis nature sunt quas alietos uocant. Aquila quidem minores, accipiter maiores, alterum pedem habent unguibus armatum, apertum et rapacem. alterum uero clausum et pacificum solique natatui idoneum. . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

97 The diplomatic transcription is from Lincoln, Public Record Office, MS Ancaster 16/1, fols. 53rb-54va.
It is likely that William took the natural descriptions and order of birds from Gerald rather than the other way around for two reasons: First, Gerald’s naturalistic descriptions of birds are thought to come from firsthand observation.\textsuperscript{98} Second, the sections of the \textit{Topographia} found in William’s \textit{Similitudinarium} are taken from multiple versions. In other words, some of the extracts are found in Version I, some in Version II (for example, the entire chapter on grasshoppers), some from additions in Version III (the second etymological explanation \textit{vel in gyrum falcando}), and one from Version IV (\textit{haliaetos} for \textit{aurifrisios}). Other explanations are of course possible: perhaps Gerald returned to, for example, notes from his time with William in Paris from the 1160s each time he decided to revise the \textit{Topographia}. It seems more likely, however, that William had access to a Version IV \textit{Topographia} when he wrote the \textit{Similitudinarium}, which Joseph Goering dates to after his return to England in the 1180s.

\textsuperscript{98} For example, see Urban T. Holmes, “Gerald the Naturalist,” \textit{Speculum} 11 (1936) 110-121.
I would contend that William culled these extracts from a Version IV text of the *Topographia* to which he was introduced as Gerald worked on the text during his first stay there in 1196-98, as all the extracts in the *Similitudinarium*, including the *halietos* variant, are found in Version IV of the text. A copy of the *Topographia* is listed in Lincoln’s twelfth-century book catalogue (though there is no way to verify what version), and Gerald refers to the gift of a copy of the *Topographia* in his letter to William de Montibus from the *Speculum Duorum*. William de Montibus died in 1213 in Scotland, where he had gone while England was under papal interdict (1208-1214). It thus seems very likely that this exchange dates from Gerald’s first visit rather than his second. Gerald’s audience for the Version IV text at Lincoln c. 1196-98 would thus have included both William de Montibus, who was chancellor from at least 1194, and Bishop Hugh of Lincoln (d. 1200).

Placing the *Topographia* at Lincoln at this time – and indeed, in William de Montibus’s hands – has important implications both for the interpretation of Version IV within the context of the pastoral care movement, as well as interpreting the beginnings of the pastoral care movement in terms of the *Topographia*’s naturalistic moralizations, *distinctio* format, and its series of illustrations. Both of these merit further study, though some perfunctory analysis can be offered here. As with earlier versions, we see Gerald specifically recasting the work for a new audience and into a new context, the nascent pastoral care movement. The addition of the program of illustrations in Version IV was perhaps an attempt to enhance the work’s pedagogical value. The pastoral care context can also provide one explanation for Gerald’s continued project of revision as a whole, and answer why Gerald continued to add so many things to his text that have little to do with Ireland. The morals, biblical quotation and exposition, classical references, and examples of natural phenomena that abound in the later versions suggest that Gerald was not seeking to perfect a topography of Ireland, but a compendium of information, loosely gathered around Irish themes, to assist other clerics in teaching and preaching. Seen in this light, the scope of Gerald’s additions make perfect sense.

Aside from the program of illustrations, Version IV has very few additions to the text. These come mostly in the form of additional quotations, parallel examples, expansions of lists, and qualifications. Additions to the *Prima Distinctio* include a biblical quotation, an anecdote that hawks keep warm by seizing a bat to put in their nests, the names of two animals to various lists, and Bede’s opinion on whether poison can survive on Irish soil. In the *Secunda Distinctio* Gerald adds information on the effect of the tides on the brain and attributes his information on

---


100 Specifically, he requests that if William de Montibus cannot stop criticizing it, would he please return the book: Aut itaque libellos prescriptor rodere de cetero et verb is minus discretis dilacerare cessetis, aut ipsos auctori suo quam cicius resignare curetis (speaking of both the *Topographia* and the *Expugnatio*). Lefèvre, *Speculum Duorum*, 174-175.

101 Joseph Goering discusses the literary techniques of the pastoral care movement, including similitudes and *distinctiones*, in his Chapter 3, “The Literature of Pastoral Care.”
the Isle of the Living to Peter Comestor’s *Scholastic History*. He adds five marvelous wells to the list in *De mirandis fontium naturis*, and two parallel examples to the marvelous flooding lake and the fish with gold teeth. Significantly, Gerald continues to add details to the tale of a wolf speaking with a priest, which passage he changed and added to in nearly every version. Two additional natural details are added in the subsequent chapters and multiple biblical quotations are added to the final miracle of the holy orchard at Finglas. Gerald adds a total of six phrases to the *Tertia Distinctio* consisting of qualifications and refinements to his history in Chs. II and IX, the addition of a passage on the harp (from Cassiodorus) to the musical chapter, an acknowledgement that an oath-making custom comes from the rites of heathens, and a detail that women sit astride horses like men.

**Version V**

In addition to the program of illustrations and the textual extracts in William de Montibus, a third reason exists to date Version IV of the *Topographia* to a relatively earlier date: The fifth version does not date from some undefined final years of Gerald’s life, but rather the rather distinct date window of c. 1207-1209, and was largely directed at King John.

Version V is contained in full in eight manuscripts: Dublin, National Library of Ireland, 700 (s. xiii) [1]; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 720 [1062] (s.xiii²); London, British Library, Cotton Cleopatra D.v (s. xiv); London, British Library, Harley 4003 (s.xiv); London, British Library, Royal 13.A.xiv (s. xiii³ex.) [Rb]; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 4126 (s. xiv); Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 3074D [Mostyn 246] (s.xiv); and London, Lambeth Palace 622 (s.xv).

Catherine Rooney’s classification of N.L.I. 700, discussed briefly above as the “Dublin” manuscript, as a fifth-version text is highly significant. First, it provides evidence that Version V is indeed an authentic version written by Gerald, about which there has been some controversy. Rooney notes, “The presence of fifth-edition variants in this manuscript proves that the fifth edition existed in Gerald’s lifetime and that therefore he was probably responsible for it, a probability increased by the fact that N.L.I. 700 is thought to have originated close to Gerald and spent some time with him.” Second, this manuscript has already generated a great deal of scholarship because it contains both versions of the *Expugnatio*, and has already been dated.

N.L.I. 700 is unique in that it shows two of Gerald’s works in the process of revision. Rooney has determined that the main text contains readings from both the fourth and fifth versions of the *Topographia*, with further fifth version additions in the margins. The manuscript also includes an α-version of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* that has been actively changed to the β-version, with passages scored out for deletion, alterations over erasures, and

---

102 Four of these were identified by Dimock, and four by Rooney. Three others are listed by Sharpe, but have been misclassified. Two additional manuscripts contain extracts of the fifth version: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 290/682 (s. xvi^med/ex.) and Oxford, Corpus Christi College 263 (s.xvi/xvii).

103 Rooney, 56-57.

marginal notes. Scott and Martin identified three hands at work, but Rooney’s very detailed paleographic analysis has led her to believe the entire manuscript is the work of one scribe. Scott and Martin date the manuscript to c. 1200 and the finished β-version of the Expugnatio to c. 1209, as it was probably sent with a letter to King John before his expedition to Ireland in 1210. Based on the codicological evidence, we must date the fifth version of the Topographia to the same time period.

This date is reinforced by additional evidence. N.L.I. 700 contains a detailed map of Europe, Plate 2, and a series of illustrations similar to those found in MS R. Based on his analysis of the shifting orientations of the cities on the map, Thomas O’Loughlin suggests that the map reflects the route taken by Gerald on his many trips to Rome between 1199-1203 and 1206-1207. As Lincoln is the only northern city pictured on the map besides York, O’Loughlin hypothesizes that the map dates to Gerald’s probable second retirement to Lincoln after returning from his pilgrimage. Michelle Brown believed that the “Dublin” manuscript’s illustrations were closer to a “core programme” of Gerald’s, and pre-dated MS R’s, but regardless, still identified Lincoln as their probable provenance. If the program of illustrations did indeed originate at Lincoln, then the illustrations in N.L.I. 700 could date from Gerald’s second residence at Lincoln, along with the map.

Finally, Version V’s additions provide internal evidence bolstering these dates. First, there is an extensive reworking of the chapter discussing the attributes of John, making it clear that he is alive and king (r. 1199-1216). Second, a small addition in the Tertia Distinctio may indicate some problems with the province of Gascony, which was claimed by Alfonso VIII of Castile after the death of Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1204. In the chapter De triplici novo jure, discussed above as expanded in Version II, Gerald adds the phrase praeter id, downplaying the added detail which assigned a claim to Ireland based on the origin of the Irish from Biscay, part of the duchy of Aquitaine. It reads instead: Duplici quoque [praeter id] novo jure Britanniae reges ad hoc funguntur. (“Besides that one, the kings of Britain have also new claims of two sorts in this respect.”) This subtle change may indicate Gerald’s awareness of John’s difficulty retaining his continental holdings, implying that even if Aquitaine was lost, two other good claims to Ireland still existed. Third, there are several additional naturalistic details about Ireland, which may be attributed to new material gathered during another trip to Ireland that
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111 For fifth-version changes to the text see GCO V, 200-201 (concerning John) and 149 n.4 (concerning Gascony). Gascony was promised to Alfonso VIII of Castile as a dowry for Eleanor, daughter of Henry II, but he could only claim it after Eleanor of Aquitaine’s death. See John Gillingham, Richard Coeur de Lion: Kingship, Chivalry and War in the Twelfth Century (London: The Hambledon Press, 1994) 31 and 70-71.
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Gerald made after his defeat at Rome and before his later pilgrimage there, which is mentioned in the *De Invectionibus*.\textsuperscript{113} This trip may have furnished him with both the new material and the desire to update the *Topographia* and the *Expugnatio*.

The textual emendations to Version V, aside from those previously discussed, are not particularly extensive. In the *Prima Distinctio*, Gerald adds details to his descriptions of salmon and the weasel, with the moral that the strong are conquered by the lesser.\textsuperscript{114} He changes the title of the chapter *De avibus, earumque defectibus* (Of birds, and those that are missing), adding after it *et tam naturis quam allegoris* (and their nature as well as allegory), highlighting the placement and importance of the bird moralizations.\textsuperscript{115} He adds a quotation from Orosius about Ireland, and a local saying and an opinion of the Irish concerning St. Patrick and poison.\textsuperscript{116} He adds a long example about a snake entering the belly of a boy who was cured by going to Ireland.\textsuperscript{117} He also rewrites the final chapter to connect the ages of man’s life to the times of day.

In the *Secunda Distinctio*, Gerald adds two biblical quotations on how peoples are punished for defying God to the wolf-priest episode, and a few clarifying words or phrases to three other chapters.\textsuperscript{118} Gerald also adds a marvel of a half-bearded hermaphrodite from Connaught to the account of the bearded woman.\textsuperscript{119}

Gerald also makes several changes in the *Tertia Distinctio*. He adds a list of four indigenous trees and a note that yew trees were planted by holy men to a previous line explaining Ireland’s lack of orchards.\textsuperscript{120} He adds a verse to the quotation from Virgil in Ch. XXI, and Jerome’s opinion on the connection between *vinum* and Venus to his discussion of the drunkenness of Irish clerics in Ch. XXVII. A rhetorical flourish notes that many things esteemed among men are abhorred by God and vice versa.\textsuperscript{121} Finally, Gerald repeats a line in his description of Henry II, asking “who, indeed, shall relate” Henry II’s triumphs – which makes the tone of the passage sound highly critical\textsuperscript{122} – and he adds five phrases to the chapter on Geoffrey and John, who would have been king at the time.

With a date of 1207-1209, and considering the textual changes, it is very likely that Version V was once again intended for a royal audience. King John probably received this up-to-date version along with the *Expugnatio*. Other religious notables at Lincoln and the surrounding area who perhaps had not encountered it before may have included Robert Grossteste, Alexander Neckham, and Stephen Langton, to whom Gerald dedicated the *Itinerarium Kambriae* in 1214.

\textsuperscript{113} J. Conway Davies, 270.
\textsuperscript{114} Ch. I.IX and I.XXVII
\textsuperscript{115} Ch. I.XI.
\textsuperscript{116} Chs. I.XXIII, I.XXVIII, and I.XXIX, respectively.
\textsuperscript{117} Ch. I.XXXI.
\textsuperscript{118} Chs. II.VI, II.VII, II.XV.
\textsuperscript{119} Ch. II.XX.
\textsuperscript{120} Ch. III.X
\textsuperscript{121} Ch. III.XXXI.
\textsuperscript{122} This is in Ch. III.XLVIII.
**Resulting Topographia Timeline**

The resulting timeline is as follows. Gerald began Version I while in Ireland with Prince John in 1185-1186, and gave a completed version to Archbishop Baldwin in March 1188. He completed Version II prior to Henry II’s death on July 6, 1189, and probably read it aloud at Oxford in late 1188 or early 1189. Manuscript evidence places Version III prior to the second version of the *Itinerarium Kambriae* in 1197 and possibly prior to the *Descriptio*, 1193/4. Version IV can be placed at Lincoln during Gerald’s time there in 1196-1198 and was probably completed (or rather interrupted) by his involvement in the St. David’s controversy in 1199. N.L.I. 700 shows the process of revision as Gerald continued to update the text to Version V, possibly sporadically, throughout the controversy and afterward. I would date it after his trip to Ireland and pilgrimage to Rome, and contemporary with the β-version of the *Expugnatio*, which was sent to King John around 1209.

The assumption that Gerald continued updating the *Topographia* intermittently until the end of his life has resulted in scholars privileging the first version of the text, which is not supported by any sort of manuscript evidence or reasoning other than the outdated sentiment that the subsequent additions to the text “have about as much to do with Ireland or its people as with the moon and the man in it.”

By contrast, considering the nearly continuous, wave-like act of revision of the *Topographia* offers a vivid example of the connection between reading and writing in manuscript culture. Studying textual revision in this way suggests a model of authorship in the Middle Ages that considers reconfiguration of texts and authorial projects over time. Authors, as well as scribes, rewrote texts for various reasons and redirected them to new audiences. This is most visible when comparing versions and interpreting them through their likely contexts. It therefore becomes possible to paint a more complete picture of the process of authorship – a process that recognizes texts as fluid and able to be manipulated and used for social, political, or religious ends.

In Gerald’s case, analyzing the additions to the *Topographia* against the background of his biography and likely context allows us to trace its trajectory as well as speculate about Gerald’s own authorial project. Ultimately, considering the “still more symbolisms, moralizations, theological excursions, quotations from early writers (with comments on them), legendary accounts of other countries, indiscriminate erudition of all kinds, and well-pointed laudations of Henry II and his sons” – the additions so lamented by John J. O’Meara – as vivid traces of deliberate interventions within a text during a process of either reading or writing, the breaking out of the versions suddenly becomes a rather exciting road map of one author’s process of composing “history” in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.
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123 GCO V, xiv. Quote cited and sentiment agreed with by O’Meara, *Topography*, 15, and Scott and Martin, xl (“The additions in the *Expugnatio* are nothing like so substantial as those with which he has lumbered the *Topographia*, and from which it has been rescued, thanks to the efforts of Professor O’Meara.”).
CHAPTER TWO

FROM POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY TO AUTHORIAL FASHIONING:
PROSPECTIVE HISTORY IN THE TOPOGRAPHIA HIBERNICA

COMPOSING THE “LANDSCAPE OF IRELAND”

During his trip to Ireland with Prince John in 1185-86, Gerald of Wales looked around an unfamiliar landscape and asked questions. He writes in the preface to the first version of the Topographia Hibernica:

ubi cum multa viderem aliis regionibus aliena nimis et prorsus incognita, suique novitate valde miranda; coepi diligens scrutator eruere, quis terrae situs, quae natura, quae gentis origo, qui mores; quoties, a quibus, et qualiter subacta sit et expugnata; quae nova, quaeve secreta, contra solitum sui cursum, in occiduis et extremis terrarum finibus natura reposuit.

And there, when I had seen many things not found in other countries and entirely unknown, and at the same time worthy of some wonder because of their novelty, I began diligently as an investigator to dig up: what the position of the country was, what was its nature, what was the origin of the race, what were its customs; how often, and by whom, and how, it was conquered and subjugated; what new things, and what secret things not in accordance with her usual course had nature hidden away in the farthest western lands.\(^\text{124}\)

Gerald, positioned as a diligent investigator, is faced with a string of question words: quis, quae, qui, quoties, a quibus, qualiter. These questions range from those about the land itself, to those about its people, and finally end with those about its “new” and “secret” things, marvels – marvels found in the farthest, most western boundaries of the world, beyond which, Gerald continues, there is only that great, empty, unknown ocean: Quos ultra fines nec terra subsistit, nec hominum vel ferarum habitatio est ulla; sed trans omnem horizontem in infinitum per investigabilis et occultas vias solus oceanus circumfertur et evagatur. (“For beyond those limits there is no land, nor is there any habitation either of men or beasts – but beyond the whole

\(^{124}\) GCO V, 20; Translation from John J. O’Meara, Gerald of Wales: The History and Topography of Ireland (London: Penguin Classics, 1951, rpt. 1982) 30-32, modified slightly for sense of interpretation. Future citations to the text will be formatted with the reference to the Rolls Series followed by the translator’s name, separated by a semi-colon. In many cases it has been necessary to modify the translations to make them closer to the Latin; this has been noted. Where no translator is listed, the translation is my own.
horizon only the ocean flows and is borne on in boundless space through its unsearchable and hidden ways.”)\textsuperscript{125}

Gerald portrays Ireland as the ultimate boundary of the world, surrounded only by the inscrutable ocean. Ireland’s secrets, however, unlike those of the ocean, are bright and visible. Gerald sees these marvelous, unknown things, and they are tangible, for they are physically placed in Ireland and “not found in any other country.” Moreover, they are potentially knowable: Gerald positions himself as a \textit{diligens scrutator}, and poses and examines these questions with the eye of his mind. Gerald minimizes the differences between his marvels in the West and the wonders of the East – for Gerald, the category of the marvelous is extended to all the new things he encounters (\textit{suique notivate valde miranda}), and he uses the vocabulary of the visible to describe the analogy: \textit{Sicut enim orientales plagae propriis quibusdam et sibi innatis praeeminent et praeceellunt ostentis, sic et occidentales circumferentiae suis naturae miraculis illustrantur.} (“Just as the countries of the East are remarkable and distinguished for certain prodigies peculiar and native to themselves, so the boundaries of the West are also made remarkable by their own wonders of nature.”)\textsuperscript{126} The prodigies of the East literally display themselves (\textit{ostentis}) and the Western boundaries are literally illuminated (\textit{illustrantur}) by the miracles of nature.

This rhetoric of visibility is important because Gerald introduces his project as collecting the answers, as though they were gemstones glittering on the outermost shore of the world, and stringing them together as a worthy gift for a king: \textit{Collectis igitur et electis elegantioribus cunctis, ea quae memoria digna videbantur non inutile duxi in unum congerere, et industriae vestrae, quam nulla fere latet historia, propalare.} (“Having collected everything, therefore, and chosen out the more elegant, I have put together those things which seemed worthy of memory and propose to your diligence, which scarcely any part of history escapes.”)\textsuperscript{127} This collection of answers, Gerald concludes, is to be preferred to any physical treasures of the island such as gold, falcons, or hawks because the answers are both instructive and indestructible, a parallel that Gerald makes explicit in the rhyming infinitives of the final line of the preface: \textit{ea potius curavi celsitudini vestri mitti, quae non possunt amitti; illis posteritatem per vos instruere, quae nulla valeat aetas destruire.} (“Rather I took care to send to your highness those things which cannot be lost, to instruct posterity through you with those things, which no age can destroy.”)\textsuperscript{128}

Of course, Gerald’s gift to Henry II is contained in a thing: a manuscript. But Gerald’s rhetoric emphasizes that it is the knowledge conveyed, and not the manuscript itself, that is valuable. He does not describe taking pen to parchment (or stylus to tablet) and composing at a desk: rather, he describes how he gathered his source material, diligently surveying and asking questions of the unknown landscape, and then choosing out the information worthy to be written

\textsuperscript{125} GCO V, 20; O’Meara, 31.
\textsuperscript{126} GCO V, 20; O’Meara, 31.
\textsuperscript{127} GCO V, 21.
\textsuperscript{128} GCO V, 21.
Gerald’s process of writing the *Topographia* was thus first a process of reading the landscape, collecting material, and then choosing the significant details, a process made explicit in Gerald’s choice of words: *collectis igitur et electis elegantioribus cunctis* (“having collected everything, and chosen out the more elegant”).

This idea of “reading the landscape” is reinforced by Gerald’s description of reading ancient Irish chronicles. In the *Introitus in Recitationem*, a new preface added to Version II of the *Topographia*, Gerald describes culling source material for the *Tertia Distinctio*:

> In tertia [distinctio] sola, de habitatoribus insulae, et gentium origine, aliquam ex eorum chronicis contraxi notitiam. Verumtamen ea quae ab ipsis diffuse nimis et inordinate, magnaque ex parte superflue satis et frivole, rudi quoque et agresti stilo congesta fuerant, non absque labore plurimo, tanquam marinas inter areanas gemmas eligens et excipiens, elegantiora quaeque presenti volumine quanto compendiosius potui lucidiusque digressi.

It is only in the third part, which treats of the inhabitants of the island and the origin of the various races, that I obtained some information from their own chronicles. But these having been heaped together by the native writers in a loose and disorderly manner, with much that is superfluous or absurd, and being composed in a rude and barbarous style, I have digested them, with much labour, as clearly and compendiously as I could, like one seeking and picking up precious stones among the sands on the sea-shore, and have inserted whatever was of most value into the present volume.¹³⁰

Like the Irish landscape, Gerald finds that the Irish chronicles have no inherent order or method. But the pages of the rough Irish chronicles are just like that landscape of Ireland that glitters with marvelous answers, and both are read in the same way. *Lectio* leads to *electio*, reading to collection, and finally to composition.

The product of this reading, collection, and composition is the *Topographia Hibernica*. The *Topographia* is highly ordered, first into *distinctiones*, then named chapters. It includes a table of contents as well as *notulae* in the margins to aid the reader. The term *distinctio*, though sometimes used simply to indicate “the proper division of a whole work into its components – parts, books, chapters, *distinctiones*, *quaestiones*, and the like,”¹³¹ was a technical innovation of the Parisian schools used to expound spiritual meanings. Gerald, who studied in the schools at

---

¹²⁹ *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, GCO, I, 65.
Paris c. 1165-1174, and again c. 1174-1176, would have been familiar with its potential as a formal ordering device. In choosing such a form for the Topographia, he adapts the distinctio to his purposes, ordering the results of his reading within a structure that allowed him near-infinite possibilities to expand with new material, simply by splitting branches into smaller and smaller parts. This structure, moreover, commonly used to convey spiritual meanings, assisted Gerald in his project of setting up a projected history of Ireland that expected extra-textual fulfillment. As I will show below, Gerald wrote his Topographia intending some action to be taken by the audience who received it; the text sets up an expectation for some form of completion provided not by Gerald, but by the reader.

The distinctio was an organizational method used to order and schematize the multiple literal or spiritual meanings of a particular term. In its ‘simplest form’ it was “a table of meanings for each word, according to three or four senses,” with each one illustrated by a text. As Beryl Smalley notes, “This ‘skeleton’ distinctio could be elaborated by listing the properties of qualities of the thing designated by the word and the interpretations which they suggested. It was a convenient way of grouping together the lore of natural history and the legends of the bestiary . . . .” In his study of the Distinctiones Abel, Stephen Barney identifies a notion of “numerousness” which is a prerequisite for the act of distinguishing between multiplicity (the act of division in ethical reading), and is encouraged by the formal mode of the distinctio. Often these distinctiones were drawn out graphically, with the token word written to the left, and connected with lines to a column of parallel meanings on the right.

In the Introitus in Recitationem, Gerald includes a description of the Topographia’s contents, a road map for the work to come. Importantly, he begins by describing the Topographia’s structure in visual terms: Est itaque trimembris operis hujus partitio. (“There is a three-fold division of this work.”) This verbal diagram recalls the visual cues of a formal distinctio. Though he does not draw one out, a visual schematization of Gerald’s work based on the passage above would appear as follows:
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*Note: Chapter numbers are according to the critical edition and are not found in the manuscripts. The chapters are numbered according to the final (fifth) version of the text.

** Divisions in the third distinction are approximate. The final nine chapters are on Henry and his sons. An argument could be made to split them out into their own section.

** Chart 2: Distinctiones Hiberniae **

This chart illustrates an ordered internal logic of the text. The Prima Distinctio describes first the geographical positioning of Ireland, then its land, then the fish and birds, and finally the animals and reptiles. The Secunda Distinctio describes marvels and miracles, which are essentially split into further subcategories of “past” and “present.” The Tertia Distinctio employs an envelope structure, beginning and ending with lists of Ireland’s conquerors (first ancient, then modern), and literally enveloping his description of the Irish people in the middle. As Gerald adds more material in subsequent versions, he places it within its proper category.

Gerald’s decision to employ the distinctio form for the Topographia Hibernica was an innovation. The technique itself was just coming into widespread use, and was used primarily for the organization of spiritual exposition, not historical and natural information gathered (mostly) by personal observation and inquiry.\(^{137}\) Gerald’s application of it to an entire physical
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country, then, is something of an experiment. In adopting the *distinctio* format, he ordered the content gathered and collected through his own observations, with the goal of conveying that material in a particular way to achieve a particular end.

He does this by translating an actual landscape into a literary one. The primary mode of reading a *distinctio* is horizontal; in Barney’s words, “a token on the left (the title) is ‘rewritten’ on the right in an expanded ‘realization’ of the token.” In the *Topographia*, then, “Ireland” is the token on the left, and it is explained and “rewritten” and “realized” through Gerald’s chapters on the right. Each of the chapters expounds and explains some facet of “Ireland,” some hidden meaning of that term that Gerald is presenting to his reader. In this way, Gerald sought to convey meaning to his readers, as the teachers of theology used this method to illustrate spiritual points to their students. In his own words, this material was meant to be understood and to be used *vel mundo majori ad ornatum, vel minori ad usum*, both “for the enlightenment of the better class and the use of the lower orders.”

The revisions to the *Topographia* are the key to the discovery that Gerald was trying to achieve a particular goal. Gerald’s rewriting of Ireland in the *distinctio* format is presented anew by each revision of that *distinctio*. Over time, Gerald’s impulse to revise implies a textual incompleteness, the idea that Gerald was not getting something from his audience, by way of reception or reaction, that he intended to get. The *distinctio* format suggests a completion or figural end for Gerald’s text that is not resolved within the text alone. Gerald had an expectation for his *Topographia*, a project for the work that was intended to elicit or effect some kind of response. Failure to achieve that response provides Gerald the motivation to revise his text.

In the following sections I will explore how the revisions show Gerald in dialogue with both a courtly and a clerical audience, and illustrate Gerald’s intention to direct and redirect his text over time. Gerald’s tells us that he initially expected his texts to win him *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* – some kind of reward or conquest – from King Henry II. The revisions to the text show first engagement with the court in Version II, but then detachment and disillusionment in Versions IV and V. Version II’s other revisions show Gerald already redirecting his text from a royal audience to a clerical one, seeking *auctoritas* and literary influence rather than political influence, and positing types of reading appropriate to his intention. But his late revisions reveal Gerald struggling with the ambivalent reception of his portentous landscape. Gerald begins
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(London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974) especially pages 245-246. Gerald’s decision to employ the *distinctio* is interesting for a number of reasons. Gerald studied in the schools at Paris c. 1165-1174, and again c. 1174-1176, when the *distinctio* would have been a brand-new and exciting form – almost in its infancy. The earliest collections in the *distinctio* format date from the last quarter of the twelfth century and are related directly to the Paris schools. Rouse and Rouse (see note 131 above) place five major distinction collections to within the decade of 1189/90-1200. Gerald uses the term to describe his *Topographia Hibernica* as early as 1187. Considering Gerald’s use of the term as a deliberate organizational principle, rather than as a mere synonym for “chapter,” would mean that Gerald was at the forefront of this movement, and that his works were more in dialogue with his contemporaries than has been previously acknowledged.

138 Barney, 94.
139 GCO V, 7.
incorporating more and more material that was originally not part of the text, and adding additional notes, maps, letters, and illustrations in an attempt to control the reader’s experience of the text. As Gerald places more and more emphasis on the monstrosity of the landscape, the Topographia becomes a monstrous history in two senses: it is a catalogue of monstra on the Irish landscape, that is also itself barely contained in a disfigured distinctio, a text that has outgrown the confines of its original organizing principle, and can no longer be satisfactorily finished or contained. Unable to “finish” the text, Gerald sets it aside, with the exception of a final version from c. 1209, whose revisions direct the text back to John and again seek political conquaestum: a “proximate,” unsatisfactory ending for a now-monstrous history.

Throughout the Topographia, Gerald models a type of reading that expects something from his readers. This trajectory from a courtly to clerical audience, outlined by tracing the revisions across time, suggests first what Gerald was expecting his texts to do as they were read and received, but it also suggests more broadly that the revisions themselves, the collocations of “nova et notabilia” that grow through the textual versions, are absolutely central to understanding both the works themselves and how Gerald viewed his authorial project. Gerald wrote the Topographia with the expectation of some kind of extra-textual completion, which could be gleaned from careful reading of his text. His model was figural: a history that projected a certain trajectory for future action which would realize and complete the initial event. When that failed to materialize, Gerald turned to other, proximate endings, rewriting his texts to connect them with a revised future.

**THE ANGEVIN AUDIENCE: *QUAESTUM ALIQUEM VEL CONQUAES'TUM***

In 1186, Prince John, son of Henry II and the recently crowned “Lord of Ireland,” traveled to Ireland in an attempt to quell rebellious Anglo-Norman nobles and Irish kings and reassert the power of the English crown that had been partly established by Henry in 1171-72.\(^{140}\) Gerald of Wales accompanied John on this journey to act as a guide and liaison, as many of the noblemen involved were Gerald’s kinsmen. Unfortunately, Gerald tells us, John’s mission was a failure, neither strengthening Angevin political power, nor uplifting and furthering the Irish Church. In his later autobiography, *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, Gerald describes his composition of both the Topographia and the Expugnatio in the context of this failure:

Videns ergo quod comes ibi nil proficeret, sed de die in diem deteriorem per ejus adventum terra statum haberet; considerans etiam multa ibidem nova et notabilia, alii aliae regnis et prorsus incognita; ut vel ipse quaestum aliquem vel conquaes'tum suo saltem labore faceret: primum Topographiae suae, deinde
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Expugnationis Hibernicae materiam ibi colligere studio grandi et diligentius inquisitione curavit.

Seeing then that the Earl [John] made no advance toward that end, but that the state of Ireland was every day the worse for his coming, and considering the many strange and notable things that he observed in that country, things found nowhere else and utterly unknown, he set himself with great zeal and diligent inquiry to collect materials first for his Topography and then for his Conquest of Ireland, that he might at least by his own labour win some profit or conquest thereby.¹⁴¹

This passage encapsulates a number of themes of this dissertation. Gerald positions the act of writing within the framework of the failure of the mission. John has offered Gerald two poor bishoprics in Ireland, but seeing that John had no intention of providing real assistance to the Church, Gerald declines. Gerald can see that John’s own attempts to win quaeestum aliquem vel conquaestum – some kind of profit or conquest – from his excursion into Ireland were unsuccessful. Neither help for the Irish Church – Gerald’s concern here – nor political conquest, as explained in the Expugnatio, will be achieved by his mission. Rather than abandon the mission and return home, however, Gerald turns the political and military excursion into a literary one, and redirects his energies and his own labor (suo labore) toward winning his own quaeestum aliquem vel conquaestum. Gerald’s new mission is to write his works, which he begins by collecting material from the “new and notable things” (nova et notabilia) he sees around him.

Gerald goes on to relate how this new mission has effectively superseded the old one:

Cum itaque comes per aestatem totam et hyamis partem mora in Hibernia inutili facta, remenso pelago in Walliam et Angliam remearet; Giraldus cum senescallo Hiberniae Betranno de Verdun socius et rerum gerendarum testis relictus, ut studio praedicto plenius indulgeret, non solum conquerendo sed etiam dirigendo usque ad pascha sequens moram in insula fecit.

So when the Earl, after spending the whole summer and part of the winter in Ireland all to no purpose, recrossed the sea and returned to Wales and England, Giraldus was left with Bertram of Verdun, the Seneschal of Ireland, to be his comrade and the witness of his deeds, and remained in Ireland until the following Easter, that he might pursue his studies more fully, not merely gathering the materials, but setting them in order.¹⁴²

¹⁴¹ GCO I, 65; Butler, 90.
¹⁴² GCO I, 65; Butler, 90-91.
John’s fruitless political mission is overtaken textually and temporally by Gerald’s authorial one. Gerald’s phrasing directly opposes John’s futile mission with his own, echoing John’s *mora in Hibernia inutili facta* (“useless time spent in Ireland”) with his own (*moram in insula fecit*, “he [Giraldus] spent time in the island”), repeating the same words and structure. But while the former was spent *inutili*, but Gerald spent the later busily, *non solum congerendo set etiam dirigendo* (“not only collecting but also ordering”) the material for his books.

Gerald’s retrospective account of how he came to write the *Topographia* in the *De Rebus*, dating from c. 1208-1216, shows in microcosm the model we shall see played out by the revisions. An initial goal is thwarted, so Gerald writes, or rewrites, his text toward a new one. The pressure built up from the failure of his mission with John is directed into a project of composition and of recrafting his own image as an author. Gerald’s expectation of winning *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* (“some kind of profit or conquest”) with his Irish works is a literal revision of John’s failed political mission. As we shall see, the eventual frustration of Gerald’s goal for *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* inspires further revision, leading the text far beyond its original expectations and confines.

This twin goal of *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* is directed not at the young prince, but at his father Henry II. Seeing that John’s mission will be unsuccessful, Gerald directs his efforts toward compiling histories that he dedicates to Henry, writing treatises with the expectation of a future successful outcome of, I would argue, patronage or political influence at court. Though *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* could have many meanings (such as, for example, a successful campaign for St. David’s independence from Canterbury), I will be mapping these terms on to the idea of patronage (*quaestum*), and political influence regarding the imperial strategies of the King toward Ireland (*conquaestum*). This is only to use Gerald’s own words in describing the dual strategies at work in the *Topographia* vis-à-vis the Angevin audience. This dual desire for both literary achievement and political relevance motivates Gerald’s project.

**Conquaestum**

The most prominent strategy deployed in Gerald’s *Topographia Hibernica* is that of conquest over an Irish Other. This section will begin with a consideration of the *Topographia* as it invokes a colonial discourse in its stance toward Ireland and the Irish for the purpose of promoting Henry II’s earlier conquest, and with the hope of informing future action. Employing the idea of the “legible landscape,” Gerald “reads” certain amazing events or marvels on the Irish landscape as omens or portents of the future, in order to justify the Anglo-Norman incursions. The landscape, however, has its limits: strict boundaries exist around Ireland’s holy spaces, and violation of that space incurs the wrath of local saints. The holy and marvelous landscape which
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143 The terms could also be used to map out the two audiences for the *Topographia*: seeking *quaestum* from a clerical audience, and *conquaestum* from a royal one. For a fuller discussion of the St. David’s litigation, see Michael Richter, *Giraldis Cambrensis: The Growth of the Welsh Nation* (Aberystwyth: The National Library of Wales, 1976).
Gerald describes, populated with hybrids and depictions of Irish Otherness, recalls the theme of crusade in the Holy Land. This theme informs the imperial subtext and provides a model for the conquest of Ireland.

The colonial project of the *Topographia* has been explored by several scholars.144 This section will go further, however, by then examining how the versions of the *Topographia* continue to engage in dialogue with the Angevin house over time. The tension between the permeable and impermeable boundaries of Ireland results in literary space that allows Gerald room to gloss his text. That is, by mapping these different types of spaces, Gerald is able to present himself as an authority on the landscape, the one who can articulate the different types as well as explicate their meaning. As we shall see, as *conquaeastum* recedes further from Gerald’s grasp, his stance toward Henry II and toward the colonial project of the *Topographia* is revised and ultimately rewritten into a new direction, which is itself visible on the landscape.

The rhetoric of imperialism or colonialism that Gerald employs to encourage conquest has been examined by John Gillingham, who traces the discourse of English superiority to the Irish (as well as the Welsh and Scottish) back to William of Malmesbury. William’s classicizing historiography resulted in a “rediscovery” and reappplication of the “classical conception of the barbarian” to the Celtic peoples of his own day.145 These categories include the idea of “barbarity” in agricultural practices, war, and sex.

Gerald adopts William’s category of barbarous sex particularly vividly in the *Secunda Distinctio*, where, in the section *De mirabilibus nostri temporis* he introduces a half-man, half-ox, presumably the product of a bestial relationship, and the example of a goat belonging to the Irish King Roderic having sex with a woman. Interestingly, the French are then implicated in this practice as well; the next chapter takes us to Paris for a similar case involving a lion.146

Irish “barbarity” is also a main theme of the *Tertia Distinctio*, in chapter entitled *De gentis istius natura, moribus, et cultu*. Gerald highlights the Irish traditional dress, methods of riding, and battle practices as barbarous, and cites the reliance on shepherding coupled with a lack of tilled fields or planted orchards or any industrial practices as examples of Irish primitiveness. Several chapters later Gerald picks up this ethnically charged discourse once more to remark on Irish ignorance of Christianity, their treachery, barbarous practices in oathmaking, and unnatural family structure. Gerald’s description of the barbarity of the Irish


145 Gillingham, 10.

146 GCO V, Ch. II.XXI, XXIII and XXIV.
culminates in a tale of a ceremony in which a king has intercourse with a white mare, which is then killed and made into a broth that the king bathes in and drinks.

But Gerald’s depiction of the Irish is not totally consistent. Andrew Murphy parses Gerald’s construction of the Irish “Other” in chapter two of his But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us, and examines how Gerald’s rhetorical moves throughout the narrative constantly destabilize the notion of Irish Otherness. Instead, according to Murphy, Gerald introduces an idea of “proximate” Otherness, arguing, “in writing about the Irish of this period, Gerald had not only to strive to evoke a sense of Irish Otherness, but also needed to engage with and account for the fact that, within that Otherness, there resided a certain profound and enduring element of proximate alignment.” In a period rife with colonial enterprise eastward, where pagan Slav and Baltic peoples still occupied territory in Eastern Europe, and Crusaders battled the Muslim “Saracens” for control of the Holy Land, Irish Christians (and Celtic Christians generally) stood in closer alignment with their English neighbors than Gerald’s rhetoric may at first indicate.

The marvels and miracles in the Secunda Distinctio manifest the inherent tensions within this notion of “proximate” Otherness. Murphy contends that the effect of these “marvels of the West” is “to deny that any kind of mediate position is sustainable – indeed to suggest that the breaching of boundaries separating dichotomous realms is morally repugnant and is therefore subject to divine retribution.” This emphasis on boundaries and the “reinvocation of strict dichotomies” is the common theme that runs through the anecdotes of the islands with prohibitive spaces where transgression means death, the morally outrageous examples of bestiality, and the wrongful invasion of holy refuges protected by the Irish saints. Murphy’s ultimate conclusion is that Gerald attempts “to engage with and to disengage Ireland’s relationship of proximity with Britain and with the greater European Christian realm,” but also that “Irish proximity eluded such efforts to contain and circumvent it.”

It is possible, however, that this “anxiety of proximity” that Murphy detects is itself a deliberate strategy on Gerald’s part. For to Gerald’s primary audience, Henry II and his court, the unsustainable positioning of Ireland comes with a hope and a warning: Gerald encourages Angevin intervention in Ireland through the portents of the land, but at the same time exposes the limits of invasion through a series of contemporaneous miracles. The resulting “topography of Ireland” is divided into different types of space: those natural and political borders that may be safely breached and occupied by the invading forces, those holy boundaries which should never be crossed out of reverence for God, and those bodily transgressions which should not be crossed out of moral repugnance. In mapping out these types of space, any one of which (reading...
horizontally on the distinctio illustrated in Chart 2) may represent Ireland, Gerald is mapping a strategy for future successful conquest.

Two marvels in particular imply that Angevin invasion and occupation of Ireland are inevitable. The first of these occurs in the Prima Distinctio, when Gerald describes how Ireland is free from reptiles. Despite this natural condition of the island, a frog is found, and its presence is so unusual that it is taken before an assembly of English and Irish. There it is interpreted by Duvenaldus, king of Ossory, who,

cum grandi capitis concussione, gravique cordis dolore, verbum hoc eructavit;
“Pessimos in Hiberniam rumores vermis iste portavit.” Utensque tanquam
prognostico vero, certissimum hoc signum esse dicebat adventus Anglorum,
imminentisque conquisitionis et expugnationis gentis suae.

with a great shaking of his head and deep sorrow in his heart, vomited these words: “That reptile brings very bad news into Ireland.” And using it as a true prognostic, he said that this was a most certain sign of the coming of the English, and the imminent conquest and defeat of his people.¹⁵³

Gerald goes on to explain, using a line of Ovid, that the frog was in no way born there because Ireland’s land lacked the “seeds” from which the frogs spawned. Rather, he suggests that the frog arrived by ship: Vel potius rana portu propinquo forte fortuitu nave devecta, et in terram
projecta, quia vermis venenosa non est, aliquamdiu subsistere et vivere praevaluit. (“But rather the frog was brought over by accident from a nearby port, and thrown onto the land, was able to subsist and live for some time because it is not poisonous.”)¹⁵⁴ Like the English whose advent it portends, the frog comes by ship from a nearby port, and permeates those boundaries to where by nature it does not belong.

But this seems to contradict a story from two chapters earlier, where Gerald tells in no uncertain terms that poisonous reptiles die as soon as they land on the soil, including frogs that arrive on ships:

Scrutatores tamen oceani mercatores asserentes audivimus, quod cum naves in
portu Hibernico aliquoties exonerassent, bufones casu illatos in fundo navium
invenerunt; quos dum vivos in terram projecissent, statim verso ventre, videntibus
et admirantibus multis, medii crepuerunt et interierunt.

Indeed we have heard merchant-explorers of the ocean say that when they unload their ships in an Irish port sometimes they find toads in the bottom of the hold;

¹⁵³ GCO V, 65-66.
¹⁵⁴ GCO V, 66.
and when throw them alive onto the land, the toads immediately turned on their backs, and, with many watching and marveling, burst their bellies and expired.\textsuperscript{155}

The land of Ireland is normally impenetrable to such invaders by ship; it does not let such reptiles cross its borders. By the time the frog is found and brought before Duvenaldus in 1179, however, these boundaries have become permeable. Gerald explains it is because the frog (\textit{rana}) is not poisonous, unlike the toad (\textit{bufo}). But though the frog is not itself poisonous, the news it portends is: Duvenaldus “vomits forth” the words (\textit{verbum hoc eructavit}) in place of the frog’s absent venom. The frog’s displaced venom is what allows it to permeate the boundaries of Ireland in the first place, and portends future invaders.

The theme of displaced venom is brought up at the end of the \textit{Prima Distinctio}, and again serves to encourage future conquest. Ireland’s healthful climate and poison-neutralizing soil is diametrically opposed to the East’s pestiferous elements, where \textit{mors imminet} (“death is always present”) in the land, water, air, sun, and food.\textsuperscript{156} Indeed, Gerald declares the East the origin of all poisons in the aptly named chapter, \textit{Quod fons venenorum in oriente}.\textsuperscript{157} The naturally poisonous East is only neutralized by physical distance: \textit{Quantoque remotius ab origine derivatur, tanto naturalis efficaciae vim minorem exercet}. (“The farther it is taken from its source, so does it exert less strength of its natural power.”)\textsuperscript{158}

Ironically, however, though Gerald places Ireland on a spectrum – the farthest and healthiest Western point contrasted with the poisonous East – in doing so he perhaps justifies even more openly the idea of conquest. The East may have riches, gems, and silks, but Gerald believes that the salubrious West has its own compensations: \textit{Habeat igitur oriens venenosas, habeat toxicatas opulantias suas. Nos, cum aurea rerum mediocritate, quae et usui decenter suppetat, et naturae sufficiat, omnes orientales pompas sola aeris nostri clementia compensamus}. (“Let the East, then, have its riches – tainted and poisoned as they are. The mildness of our climate alone makes up to us for all the wealth of the East, in as much as we possess the golden mean in all things, giving us enough for our uses and what is demanded by nature.”)\textsuperscript{159}

Gerald has already slipped into the position of the beneficiary of Irish territory, using his usual first-person plural “we” to project a future successful outcome of completed conquest. In this sense, Gerald even may justify Irish invasion \textit{instead of} invasion of the East; suggesting that successful conquest is more beneficial than Crusade to the poisonous East. Irish conquest thus becomes a proxy for Eastern crusade. This covert suggestion would be quite a welcome one to Henry II, who had refused the patriarch of Jerusalem’s personal request that he or one of his sons

\textsuperscript{155} GCO V, 63.
\textsuperscript{156} GCO V, 68. Gerald repeats this phrase three times.
\textsuperscript{157} GCO V, 72, Ch. I.XXXIX.
\textsuperscript{158} GCO V, 72.
\textsuperscript{159} GCO V, 70; O’Meara, 55.
(particularly John) come to rule over Jerusalem in 1185. Henry sent John to Ireland instead. The fact that the landscape contains no poison, and is easily reached by ship from a nearby port, makes Ireland a better target than the toxic East.

A second natural marvel confirms the portent of the frog in the *Secunda Distinctio*, which in the Version I text reads:

> Biennio elapso ante adventum Anglorum in insulam tempore, in Ultonia apud Karlenefordiam, inventus est piscis tam qualitatis quam quantitatis inusitatae: inter alia sui prodigia, tres dentes aureos habens quinquaginta unciarum pondus continentes; aurea, ut videtur, imminentis et proximo futurae conquisitionis tempora praesagiens.

Two years before the coming of the English to the island, there was found at Carlingford in Ulster a fish of unusual size and quality. Among its other prodigies, it had three teeth containing fifty ounces of gold: prefiguring it seems the golden times of the impending future conquest close at hand. 

According to Gerald, this recently discovered fish with three gold teeth (possibly taken from episode in Irish traditions where a whale with three gold teeth was cast to shore in Ulster in the year 743) portends a “golden age” of Ireland under English rule. Unlike the displaced venom that arouses bilious words from the Irish King Duvenaldus, who regarded the frog as an evil omen, Gerald views the future conquest as the beginning of a golden age for Ireland. Again, the rhetoric of riches is displaced: gold will not be found in Ireland, but golden times. The fish with gold teeth is a departure from nature (*prodigium*), like the frog in Ireland, and therefore a visible sign of a future event.

> These *prodigia* or *prognostica* are remarkable because they run contrary to the general course of nature. They are therefore not only visible on the landscape because of that abnormality, but also legible and interpretable – they mean something. As Gerald said in Version I’s Preface: *Sicut enim orientales plagae propriis quibusdam et sibi innatis praeeminent et praecedunt ostentis, sic et occidentales circumferentiae suis naturae miraculis illustrantur.* (“Just as the countries of the East are remarkable and distinguished for certain prodigies peculiar and native to themselves, so the boundaries of the West are also made remarkable by their own wonders of nature.”) In this way, Gerald draws on the trope of the “Marvels of the East,” a popular work describing the Plinian Races, to create his own “Marvels of the West.”

---

160 See Gerald’s own account of this in the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, eds. A.B. Scott and F. X. Martin, (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1978) at II.27, ll. 19-27 (pgs. 200-201), and my discussion below.
161 GCO V, 93.
162 GCO V, 93 n. 2.
163 GCO V 20; O’Meara, 31.
164 The Marvels or Wonders of the East is a collection of monster descriptions, many of which are the so-called Plinian Races, human monsters described in Pliny’s *Natural History*. An Old English version of this text is
What is interesting about these western marvels, however, is that they are temporally placed. The Marvels of the East are static and locational – literally found, as on a mappa mundi, at the farthest boundary of the world and essentially unreachable. Their significance is not necessarily tied to any particular future event. The Irish frog and whale, however, are placed exactly in Duvenaldus’s court (c. 1179 according to the Expugnatio, where the marvel is cross-referenced) and “two years before the coming of the English.” Gerald is thus able to read them retrospectively to portend the coming of the English, which happens soon after, and prospectively to portend the eventual English success that he anticipates.

The crucial point is that the border of the West, normally impenetrable to reptiles and poison, has become permeable at a particular point in time. Evidence of that is visible in the frog found on the island. And this permeability thus opens up the West for its eventual conquerors. Normally, frogs are not able to live on the island for some unknown natural cause; now, the island has betrayed its nature and is unable to repel the invaders any longer. The exact temporal placement of these marvels indicate that the “legible landscape” of Ireland is actively opening up, loosening its boundaries, unable to resist the portentous creatures which wash up on its shores: frogs, fish, and the English. As we shall see below, the meaning of both of these portents is revised in later versions of the Topographia when the colonial “golden age” fails to materialize. In Version I, however, these portents justify incursion onto the natural and physical topography of Ireland. Its borders are open and its landscape is expecting the invasion.

And yet Gerald makes it abundantly clear that invasion has definite limits. Holy spaces protected by local saints are surrounded by strict boundaries which, when breached, result in horrible punishment. When Gerald describes marvels and miracles in the Secunda Distinctio, he describes several incidents reestablishing hard-and-fast, impenetrable boundaries around holy places. There are a series of marvelous holy islands, including St. Patrick’s Purgatory. There are also miraculous places associated with local saints, involving either the protection or found in the Beowulf manuscript, and both the Old English and Latin versions have been edited and translated in Andy Orchard, Pride and Prodigies: Studies in the Monsters of the Beowulf-Manuscript (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1995) 173-203. The starting point for any discussion on medieval monsters must be John Block Friedman, The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000), as well as the work of Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, particularly Of Giants: Sex, Monsters, and the Middle Ages (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999). Asa Simon Mittman has discussed Gerald’s adoption of the Marvels of the East motif more directly, in his “The Other Close at Hand: Gerald of Wales and the ‘Marvels of the West,’” in The Monstrous Middle Ages, eds. Robert Mills and Bettina Bildhauer (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003), 97-112.


166 Though, as will be discussed below, the Marvels of the East on the tympanum at Vezelay provided a significant backdrop for Bernard of Clairvaux’s call to the Second Crusade. Friedman, The Monstrous Races, 77.

167 See David Rollo for a more explicit analysis of the invading English/Anglo-Normans as frogs: David Rollo, “Gerald of Wales: Writing for the Crowned Ass of England,” in Glamorous Sorcery: Magic and Literacy in the High Middle Ages (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), at 143-144.

168 GCO V, Chs. II.IV-VI. Note that London, British Library, Royal 13.B.viii [R], which contains a Version III text of the Topographia and was produced close to Gerald, also contains a copy of Henry of Saltrey’s Tractatus de Purgatorio Sancti Patricii (c. 1180-84).
expulsion of certain animals: teals protected by St. Colman, fleas expelled by St. Nannan, rats expelled by a bishop. The clearest example of protected holy space, however, is that of St. Brigid, whose fire is surrounded by a hedge which no man may cross: *Virgeo quodam et orbiculi sepe ignis iste circuitur, intra quem mas non intrat. Et si forte intrare praesumpserit, quod a temerariis quibusdam nonnunquam est attentatum, divinam ultionem non evadit.* (“This fire is surrounded by a hedge, made of stakes and brushwood, and forming a circle, within which no male can enter; and if anyone should presume to enter, which has been sometimes attempted by rash men, he will not escape the divine vengeance.”)\(^{169}\) Each holy space was actively established by the living saint in the past, and yet the space continues to manifest present, spiritual, impermeable power.\(^{170}\) The teals of St. Colman or St. Brigid’s fire provide a direct link to a past saint whose holiness is still attached to and active in a certain location.

The borders of these locations were tested by the Angevin invasion of 1171-72. Eight of the ten *miracula nostri temporis* involve the holy landscape of Ireland reacting to invasion by English forces. In most of the miracles, invaders in the English army have “penetrated” too far – not just into Irish territory, but into Irish *holy* territory, and are subsequently punished for their impiety. The punishment ranges from a cross throwing back a penny from an archer who had plundered the bishop’s residence (Ch. II.XLVI) to the infection and death of an archer who raped a girl in St. Fechin’s mill (Ch. II.LII). St. Brigid again provides a very memorable miracle: yet another archer jumps over the hedge to blow on her fire. Gerald describes:

> Qui statim resiliens, dementire coepit; et cuicunque obviabat, insufflans in os ejus dicebat, “Viden? Sic ignem Brigidae sufflavi.” Sic quoque per domos totius villae discurrens, ubicunque ignem invent eadem verba ingeminans, eum exsufflavit.

On leaping back over the hedge, he began to lose his senses, and blew into every one’s mouth he met, exclaiming, “See how I blew St. Brigid’s fire.” In the same way, running from house to house, though the city, wherever he found a fire, he began to blow it, using the same words.\(^{171}\)

The man eventually bursts in his comrades’ arms from drinking too much water to quench an insatiable thirst. The punishment of these archers illustrates the dire consequences that the English invaders will face should they disregard Irish holy space.

\(^{169}\) GCO V, 121; Forester, 97.


\(^{171}\) GCO V, 131; Forester, 106.

\(^{172}\) Archery was marked as a specifically Welsh skill, and Welsh archers were frequently employed in campaigns against the Irish. This comment, therefore, implicates not only the English, but also the Welsh mercenaries employed by Henry II and the other English nobles. In the *Itinerarium*, GCO VI, 147, Gerald remarks that the Welsh were particularly skilled in archery and fighting with lances.
Gerald articulates a third kind of space delineated by boundaries which must also be inviolate: a moral space corresponding with the limits of the body. As discussed briefly above, the *Secunda Distinctio* contains a series of prodigious human hybrids. In the section *De mirabilibus nostri temporis*, there is a wolf-human hybrid, a bearded and crested woman, a man with ox-like extremities and a man-calf born from a cow (presumably from an act of bestiality). Gerald also reports two cases of women engaging in sexual relations with a goat (in Ireland) and a lion (in Paris). Caroline Walker Bynum suggests that the twelfth-century focus on hybrids, and Gerald’s werewolf instance in particular, articulate an anxiety and fascination about the idea of bodily transformation and metamorphosis, which she connects with the idea of transubstantiation.\textsuperscript{173} This anxiety is also meant to signify moral prohibition against certain types of sexual activity. It may also articulate a deeper anxiety with the concept of racial miscegenation – Gerald himself was a “hybrid” Welsh and Anglo-Norman – but such an anxiety was also frequently articulated in the context of crusade. Worries of “going native” in the East or of “passing” between the supposedly set boundary of Christian and Saracen abound in crusading romances and histories.\textsuperscript{174}

By articulating categories of physical, spiritual, and moral space, and by populating each of those spaces with signifying marvels and miracles, Gerald provides a road map for invasion. On the one hand, Ireland’s island borders are permeable – there is territory which may be conquered, and which has essentially marked itself as such though the prefigural appearance of fish with gold teeth and frogs. On the other hand, the landscape is dotted with holy spaces that are defined by certain injunctions against penetration, whose boundaries are to be observed and respected. Ireland’s natural and political boundaries have become permeable, but spiritual boundaries must not be crossed.

This dichotomy between the political and religious functions of space traces the tension between Church and State that often played out in England (and Europe) in the twelfth century, most recently for Gerald in Henry II’s “crossing” of Thomas Becket. For the future conquest of Ireland to be successful, the Irish Church must not be violated, as it was during 1171-72. Rather, the Church must be reformed and supported, as Gerald makes clear in the later chapters dealing with the Irish ignorance of Christianity and the vices of the clergy in the *Tertia Distinctio*.\textsuperscript{175} One reason for the failure of John’s mission in 1186 was his lack of reform and support for the Irish Church. Ireland’s holy boundaries, then, must be negotiated differently from those political or natural ones. In creating and contrasting these two categories of Irish landscape, Gerald explicitly evokes and presents the nuances of the question of English invasion. Gerald thus deliberately invokes an “anxiety of proximity” to Ireland as a political strategy, offering a


\textsuperscript{174} See, for example, the *King of Tars*, found in the Auchinleck Manuscript at http://auchinleck.nls.uk/mss/tars.html, and *Bevis of Hampton*, Ronald B. Herzman, Graham Dranke, and Eve Salisbury, eds., *Four Romances of England: King Horn, Havelok the Dane, Bevis of Hampton, Athelstan* (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Medieval Institute Publications, 1999).

\textsuperscript{175} See Chs. III.XXXVII-XXXII.
justification for invasion of Ireland as well as a warning against physically attacking her religious territory. Gerald makes it clear (particularly in the Tertia Distinctio) that the Church of Ireland is in need of reform, but that its holy spaces ought to be immune from violence.

Though the territory of Ireland may be occupied, however, its people are not to be commingled with. The “proximity” of the Irish seems to end where their bodies begin, creating a third type of space – “moral” space – where a series of hybrid monsters (monstra) both demonstrate (demonstrare) and warn (monere) against miscegenation. The anxiety of mixing nationalities was a real concern for Gerald, and for the crusades in the East. Indeed, Gerald’s use of hybrid bodies to stimulate conquest is similar to Bernard of Clairvaux’s call to the Second Crusade in front of Vézelay, under a tympanum depicting Christ delivering the Commission to the Apostles and bordered by the hybrid Plinian Races believed to reside in the East.\textsuperscript{176} The Irish hybrids are Gerald’s own call to conquest, inhabiting a middle space within the natural and holy territories of Ireland.

The physical, spiritual, and moral “spaces” found in Ireland mirror the literal, spiritual, and moral types of allegorical reading, and create a landscape highly charged with meaning. That is, the physical space of Ireland, for the most part, is apprehendable – open to conquest, open to understanding. The religious spaces, however, are inviolable and in some ways ineffable – they may not be questioned or transgressed. Finally, from moral space – from Ireland’s hybrid bodies – lessons may be learned, in particular about sex, but also, as with Ireland’s birds, about general theological or pastoral principles. These different types of space can stand in for Ireland as a whole – the token on the left side of our distinctio – both separately and together. Taken separately, the tension between them allows Gerald literary space to construct his role as an authority. Built up together, they create a landscape that resonates with meaning. Like the Holy Land, on which, in Mary Campell’s words, pilgrims “read in the stones and fountains and caves of Palestine the narrative that had lured them there, the story of the Jewish people,”\textsuperscript{177} the legible landscape of Ireland offers a kind of narrative. This narrative, however, is incomplete: it must be fulfilled by a successful English conquest. Only a successful conquest, informed by the topographical map outlined by Gerald’s Irish distinctio, will provide the conclusion to the open-ended marvels and miracles populating the landscape of Ireland.

This reading of the Topographia as a desire for conquest is underscored by Gerald’s preface to its companion volume, the Expugnatio Hibernica. The Expugnatio is a chronological, historical narrative detailing the English invasion of Ireland, starting with the exiled Darmait Mac Murchada’s request for Henry II’s assistance in reclaiming his kingdom of Leinster in the winter of 1166-67. In the preface, Gerald links the two books, saying: Retroacti siquidem temporis gesta locaque Topographia descript; presencia vero presens hystoria comprehedit. (“My Topographia describes the events and scenes of time past. But the present history

\textsuperscript{176} Friedman, 77.

\textsuperscript{177} Mary Campell, The Witness and the Other World: Exotic European Travel Writing, 400-1600 (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988) 17.
describes contemporary events.”) The Expugnatio, written in a plano facilique stilo (“plain and easy style”) presents and looks forward to that which the Topographia presents in the scolasitici stili eligancie (“elegance of the scholastic style”): a road map for conquest. The second book ends with an account of the reasons, according to Gerald, that John’s mission was a failure, with straightforward advice on Qualiter gens Hibernica sit expugnanda (“How the Irish are to be conquered”) and Quo moderamine eadem expugnata sit gubernanda (“With what kind of rule they are to be governed once they have been conquered”).

Both the Topographia and the Expugnatio look for completion of their texts in outside events. Throughout the α-version of the Expugnatio, the events of the Irish conquest are described as fulfilling a number of prophecies. In Book I, Chapter 16, for example, Richard’s arrival and the fall of Wexford and Dublin fulfill two prophecies, one of Merlin Celidon and one of Moling of Ireland, beginning, Tunc impletum est illud Celidonii . . . (“then the prophecy of Merlin Celidon was fulfilled”). Similar prophecies, usually beginning with the phrase Tunc impletum, are found in Book I, Chs. 20, 30, 33, 45, and in Book II, Chs. 17, 31, and 32. And Gerald promises in a third book a full translation of Merlin Celidon’s prophecies, though he refuses to publish it at the time for fear of offending those in power. This unfinished prophecy requires completion – not only from Gerald, who has yet to translate it, but also from those in power, who must fulfill it.

This model of figural history set up prophetically in the Expugnatio and figurally in the Topographia is a deliberate attempt by Gerald to get something from his royal reader, Henry II. And the versions show that there is evidence this motivation was acknowledged. On the one hand, the legible landscape of Ireland reveals a roadmap for future conquaestum, which I have interpreted as political conquest. Complementary to this, Gerald also sought a literary reward, quaestum, or for Henry to fulfill his other role as literary patron.

Quaestum

In order to understand better Henry II’s role as literary patron, we must imagine the atmosphere in which Gerald first introduced his Topographia Hibernica to Henry II. It is important to recall that Henry II’s court was inhabited by courtiers who included both clerics and laypersons. Men like John of Salisbury, Peter of Blois, and, earlier, Thomas Becket, lived at court and produced collections of letters on theological arguments. Henry II was considered

178 Scott and Martin, Preface, 2-4, ll. 12-43.
179 Scott and Martin, 18-19.
180 Scott and Martin, 64-65, ll. 9-13.
181 The prophecies are charted in Appendix B.
182 Scott and Martin, 252-257.
literatus by his contemporaries, and was very involved in legal judgments brought before his court. M. T. Clanchy notes, “Peter of Blois was probably not exaggerating when he states that among Henry’s commonest forms of relaxation were private reading and working with a group of clerici to unravel some knotty question; at his court there was ‘school every day’. By ‘school’ Peter did not mean an elementary school, but a circle of learned schoolmen discussing quaestiones as they did at Paris or Oxford.” The distinctio format and the three modes of reading would thus have been highly legible and recognizable, not just to Paris masters and clerici, but also to Henry II and his court.

David Rollo disagrees. In his chapter “Gerald of Wales: Writing for the Crowned Ass of England” in Glamorous Sorcery: Magic and Literacy in the High Middle Ages, Rollo asserts that Gerald engages in “an exercise in deliberate misrepresentation” of the Irish people – an example of highly stylistic and fictional “unnatural writing” in the vein of Alain de Lille’s De Planctu Naturae – that the Angevin kings Henry II, Richard I, and John would not have understood. Starting with Gerald’s angry rhetoric toward the Angevin house in the prefaces to the De Principis Instructione (final form c. 1217), Rollo reads back into the Topographia the metaphor of the “asinus coronatus,” from the maxim rex illiteratus quasi asinus coronatus (“An illiterate king is like a crowned ass”). Rollo identifies the crowned ass in a reference to Apuleius’s Golden Ass that appears in Gerald’s discussion of werewolves in the Secunda Distinctio (Ch. II.XIX). He thus concludes that the Topographia is a “receptive challenge, issued by a belligerent litteratus and negotiable only to those displaying a litteratura comparable to his own.” Rollo contends that Gerald does this strictly for political reasons: in order to humiliate the Angevin rulers, revealing them to be nothing but proverbial “crowned asses,” and thus “sanction the prior territorial rights” of Gerald’s “Cambro-Norman brethren, who had first intervened in Irish affairs in the late 1160s . . . .”

Rollo’s conclusion seems highly unlikely to me, and an examination of his analysis reveals multiple gaps where his evidence falls short. Essentially, the problem with Rollo’s thesis stems from an elision between authorial intentionality and authorial consistency. His work suffers from the opposite problem of most other scholars: rather than using only the first version of the Topographia, he has used the fifth. Though there are arguable advantages for this, Rollo’s discussion still suffers from the same disregard for the changes and evolutions of the text(s) over time. Rollo’s analysis of the werewolf of Ulster passage, for example, draws on passages only present in Version III and later, and one detail only present in Version IV and V. His analysis

184 Clanchy, 186.
185 Rollo, “Crowned Ass,” 132.
186 This is found in William of Malsmsbury, as explained by Rollo, but also in John of Salisbury’s Policraticus. John was a member of Henry II’s court.
187 Rollo, “Crowned Ass,” 123.
188 Rollo, “Crowned Ass,” 132.
therefore cannot hold for Versions I and II of the text – the only ones, incidentally, that Henry II would have seen.\textsuperscript{190}

Moreover, much of Rollo’s argument is based on the retrospective application of Gerald’s later writings to his earlier ones, particularly in terms of his negative attitude toward the Angevin kings. Rollo considers it unlikely that Gerald’s opinions about the court could have actually evolved over a twenty year period, and instead adopts the position that Gerald’s authorship of the \textit{Topographia Hibernica} was an act of writing falsehoods (“deliberate misrepresentation”) with the purpose of taunting the Angevin monarchy with distorted images of the Irish. Considering the overwhelming colonial undertone to the work, it seems equally unlikely that the \textit{Topographia} would in any way sanction prior territorial rights of Gerald’s relatives as against the Angevin claims.

But David Rollo’s main mistake is that he relies too heavily on a modern concept of “fiction” in the construction of his argument. He assumes, for example, that because the ephemera of literary criticism critiquing the \textit{Topographia} have not survived, they never existed. They “can only be assessed as written figments in their own right.”\textsuperscript{191} As such, they are part of a complex fictive stance in order to “furnish a pretext” of critique that will uphold Rollo’s own assessment that Gerald wrote the \textit{Topographia} in order to be deliberately misunderstood by his “asinine” readers. His claim that the “otherwise unattested and demonstrably predictable voices of censure” are fictional \textit{because} they are unattested is circular logic. No one can know this for certain, and it disregards a basic tenet of medieval manuscript tradition: its high loss rate.

Of course, the most egregious example of Rollo’s “fictive stance” is his assumption that, because Gerald describes Irish marvels in ways which do not seem to correspond to empirical modern reality, Gerald is making them up out of whole cloth, stating unequivocally: “the prodigies at issue are unquestionably delirious.”\textsuperscript{192} The problem here is that Rollo is deploying a rigid definition of fiction whose parameters are strictly truth and falsehood rather than a strategic, self-aware textuality. Monica Otter, also writing on twelfth-century historiography, employs a notion of fiction in Latin historiography that encompasses “the textuality, the self-conscious voicing, the self-reference, the playfulness, the “parodic” quality” that is usually considered in reference to vernacular romance.\textsuperscript{193} “Our authors,” notes Otter, “while being mostly “engaged,” can also temporarily, or partially, “disengage” themselves – with the result that, at least for a short time, referentiality is called into question, truth claims are suspended, and fictionality becomes a possibility.”\textsuperscript{194} Where Otter advocates a light touch, Rollo’s contention

\begin{footnotes}
\item[190] See my discussion in Chapter 1 for the evolution of the text from Version I to Version V.
\item[191] Rollo, “Crowned Ass,” 134.
\item[192] Rollo, “Crowned Ass,” 137.
\item[194] Otter, 12.
\end{footnotes}
about Gerald’s work relies on a heavy-handed application of a true-false binary which is
unsupported and unsupportable by the text.\footnote{Additionally, there are plenty of modern, scientific explanations for the deformities of Gerald’s “delirious” prodigies. See, for example, James D. Cain’s sidebar discussion of ectodermal dysplasia in his “Unnatural History: Gender and Genealogy in Gerald of Wales’s Topographia Hibernica,” Essays in Medieval Studies 19 (2002): 29-43. The point, however, is that modern true/false binaries and stark categories of fictionality cannot be applied strictly to medieval texts.}

When one considers the “final” version of the Topographia along with Gerald’s remaining canon, his end-of-life Retractiones (c. 1217) and his De principis instructione, his “retrospective testimony” on Henry II, Rollo’s reading is certainly interesting, and not impossible. To be sure, Gerald said a number of highly unflattering things about Henry II in later versions of the Topographia and other works. However, the likelihood of a medieval reader – any medieval reader – coming to Rollo’s conclusion that the Topographia is an elaborate fictive hoax is highly doubtful. Rollo posits three readers who understood Gerald’s work according to his formulation: Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury; Robert de Beaufey, canon of Salisbury; and Walter Map, archdeacon of Oxford.\footnote{Rollo, “Crowned Ass,” 138.} Unfortunately, Baldwin’s departure on crusade and death at the siege of Acre in 1190 precluded him from reading any version of the text but the earliest, which contains none of the Version III material drawn on by Rollo in his argument: no discussion of Augustine, no reference to Balaam’s Ass – and of course no supporting “retrospective testimony” on Henry II. Meanwhile, Robert and Walter’s actual opinions are totally unknown, though Gerald says c. 1218 in his letter to Hereford that both Walter and Robert heard the Topographia during the reading at Oxford, and therefore would have heard the second version, not the third.\footnote{Thorpe “Public Reading,” 457.} This highlights the importance of accounting for textual revision in analysis of medieval texts.

Following Clanchy, Dronke, and Türk’s characterizations, then, I will assume that Henry’s court was made up of highly literary clerics and advisers, and was able to understand Gerald’s use of the distinctio and his suggestions about conquest. And in fact, Gerald’s desire for quaeestum aliquem vel conquaestum was not limited to political influence at court. Just as the maxim rex illiteratus quasi asinus coronatus implicates the direct link between a good reader and a good ruler, so too did Gerald seek from Henry II not only a literal conquest of Ireland, but also a literary one, offering a written landscape of Ireland as a proxy for the physical one.

**Quaestum as Literary Conquest**

When Gerald dedicates the Topographia to Henry II, as discussed above, he employs metaphors of visibility and tangibility to describe the questions and answers he finds. Having read, selected, and ordered all of the most elegant things (collectis igitur et electis elegantioribus cunctis and in unum congerere), he presents them to Henry. He ends the preface (in Version I) with a comparison between his gift to Henry and the gifts of others:
Poteram quidem, ut alii, aurea forte munuscula, falcones, et accipitres, quibus abundat insula, vestrae sublimitati destinasse. Sed quia magnanimo principi parvi pendenda putavi, quae de facili praeterire possunt et perire; ea potius curavi celsitudini vestrae mitti, quae non possunt amitte; illis posteritatem per vos instruere, quae nulla valeat aetas destruere.

Indeed I could have done as others, and presented to your highness some little offering of gold, or falcons or hawks, with which the island abounds. But because I thought it little to offer to so great a prince those things which may be easily gotten and easily perish, I thought rather to send those things to your highness those things which cannot be lost, and, through you, to instruct posterity with those things that no time may destroy.¹⁹⁸

Gerald offers Henry II knowledge: knowledge of those many new and marvelous things (multa . . . aliena [et] . . . incognita, suique novitate valde miranda), and the answers to the string of questions he posed as a scrutator of the nation. What he also offers, of course, is a manuscript, a physical book that contains the knowledge for posterity.¹⁹⁹ Gerald’s gift is the “landscape of Ireland” both textually (the book) and intellectually (understanding the subject matter). Possession and comprehension of the book stand in for possession of the physical territory; Gerald will present Henry II with the textual Topographia Hibernica, if John cannot present it to him politically. In this way, then, Gerald gives Henry an alternate route to grasp the nation of Ireland: intellectual comprehension. The Topographia therefore facilitates conquaestum of Ireland, by providing what Gerald views as a roadmap for successful future conquest, but also stands in itself for that country as a proxy and offers Henry a way to comprehend Ireland simply by reading (or hearing) the book.

The idea that the book stands in for the country itself is reinforced by Version I’s final two chapters, where Gerald addresses Henry II directly again. After a list of short-lived kings and conquerors of Ireland, Gerald turns to Henry, who is positioned as the final conqueror of Ireland. The final two chapters of Version I celebrate Henry II’s victories, titles, and triumphs as a capstone to the Topographia. They also function as a request for more work. Gerald outlines Henry’s triumphs through a series of parallel rhetorical questions, but then, perhaps surprisingly, he offers to answer them. The first two of these questions highlight the connection between the political and intellectual conquest of Ireland: Qualiter igitur titulis et triumphis vestris Hibernicus orbis accesserit:/Quanta et quam laudabili virtute, oceani secreta, et occulta naturae deposita transpenerat.(“How then has the Irish world been added to your titles and

¹⁹⁸ GCO V, 21.
¹⁹⁹ Gerald probably transmits the knowledge to Henry orally – by reading portions of the Topographia aloud at court.
triumphs? By what great and glorious inspiration were you able to penetrate into the secrets of the ocean, and nature’s hidden recesses?”

The “secrets of the ocean” and “hidden recesses of nature” recall exactly the language which opens the Preface, where Gerald asks quae nova, quaeve secreta, contra solitum sui currsum, in occiduis et extremis terrarum finibus natura reposit (“what new things, and what secret things not in accordance with her usual course had nature hidden away in the farthest western lands”). Here, however, Gerald is explicitly referring to Henry’s project of conquest, and not to his own. Gerald deliberately blurs the difference between an intellectual and a military conquest for the purposes of adding to Henry’s praises, substituting an intellectual “penetration” or understanding of Ireland’s secrets for a military one. This sleight of hand allows Gerald to replace Ireland with his own text, for it is through Gerald’s work that Henry is able to “penetrate into the secrets of the ocean and nature’s hidden recesses.” Gerald has laid his treasure – a literary landscape of Ireland – before the feet of the king, as a proxy for the literal landscape of Ireland, which has yet to be fully subdued through physical conquest. Henry’s act of reading is therefore a colonialist act, but metaphorically colonialist: an intellectual grasping of Ireland rather than a political one. In the first of a long list of praises and exclamations about Henry’s reign, Gerald appears to be congratulating Henry for finishing his book.

And yet the interrogatory words beginning each clause beg for an answer. Like the questions Gerald lists in the preface (quis terrae situs, quae natura, quae gentis origo, qui mores; quoties, a quibus, et qualiter subacta sit et expugnata; quae nova, quaeve secreta), Gerald writes:

Qualiter igitur titulis et triumphis vestris Hibernicus orbis accesserit:
Quanta et quam laudabili virtute, oceani secreta, et occulta naturae deposita transpenetraveris;
Quam praemature et intempestive, quam celerrime et scelerosissime, intestina conspiratione ab ausu nobili revocatus fueris: . . .
Qualiter fulguranti adventus vestri lumine attoniti, occidentales reguli, tanquam ad lucubram aviculae, ad vestrum statim imperium convolaverint:
Quam innaturaliter et illaudabiliter conjurata in ventrem viscera tam orientales Asiae quam Hispaniae victorias vestras, quas et occidentalibus continuae, et fidem Christi egregie dilatare, animo excelso jam conceperas, tam pravo et iniquo consilio, totique fidelium orbi damnosissimo distulerint:

---

200 GCO V, 190.
201 GCO V, 20; see above.
202 O’Meara’s translation in the Penguin edition does not interpret the initial words as interrogatives, thus removing the suspension of question/answer. Instead, he prefaces the list with, “If then you bid me, I shall attempt to describe . . . ,” which does not appear in the Latin text.
Quantam misericordiam, et quam laudabilem in principe et capitaliter offenso rege clementiam, perpetuaque memoria et exemplo dignissimam, et hostibus ubique triumphatis, in reges et principes victos rex et victor exerueris.

How then has the Irish world been added to your titles and triumphs? By what great and glorious inspiration were you able to penetrate into the secrets of the ocean, and nature’s hidden recesses? How prematurely and unreasonably, how quickly and evilly, were you recalled from this noble duty by an internal conspiracy . . . ?

When your lightenings flashed, how did the petty kings of the West fly to your feet, dazzled at the light of your presence here, like moths to a candle? How unnaturally and scandalously has the conspiracy hatched in the bowels of your land, with such wicked and perfidious designs, much to the detriment of all Christendom, interrupted your victories both in the East, in Asia, and in Spain; which your noble mind proposed to extend to the West, and thereby notably enlarge the fold of Christ?

What mercy and what laudable clemency, worthy of imitation and of everlasting remembrance, did you, a prince and mortally offended king, exercise toward your foes over whom you everywhere triumphed, you, a conqueror and king?203

The reader (or listener) might assume that these are all rhetorical questions until Gerald reveals at very end of the work that he actually means to answer them. He states:

Tantae siquidem et tam arduae materiae, longeque sublimiori ingenio non indebitae, cursim hic et sub compendio delibatae, veram et amplam historiam si praeeeperis ut stilo perstringam, opus aggregiar. Nec a tanta majestate fuerit injunctum.

I shall endeavour to compile a full and true history of this important and difficult matter, which is worthy of the pen of a far higher genius, if I have your commands to employ mine on the subject. For nothing can or ought to be thought a heavy task which is enjoined by so high a Majesty.204

At the end of Version I, then, Gerald highlights both the unfinished state of the text as well as his own intention to continue adding to it. The passage seems to be merely a straightforward request for more work and continued employment in the court, but it also casts subtle doubt on the questions that precede it. They are not merely rhetorical questions, but also real ones that as of

203 GCO V, 190; Forester, with modifications for a Version I reading.
204 GCO V, 202; Forester 164, modified for Version I reading.
yet have inconclusive answers. Gerald’s concluding revelation that the text is not complete, but fragmentary, leaves the “titles and triumphs” of Henry literally in question, and sets up a requirement for Angevin response in order to “complete” the text.

The Angevin response Gerald is expecting, of course, is that of a patron and princeps literatus. A literate prince in this sense implies not just a prince who can read Latin (they all could, to an extent\(^{205}\)), but one who supports the poets and writers of his court through a system of patronage. Gerald, a cleric, was certainly hoping to be appointed to a higher position than his archdeaconry of Brecon – St. David’s in Wales, or at least a wealthy bishopric in England – which Henry II had the power to do. And as an author, Gerald also hoped that further work would be commissioned – indeed, the last two chapters of the Topographia are essentially an offer to become the official historian of the Angevin house. Henry II therefore had two remunerative ways of “completing” the unfinished text of Version I: to reward Gerald with a position, and to commission further work.

**Revising Quaestum aliquem vel Conquaestum**

Did Gerald receive *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* for his Topographia? By examining the revisions to the text that appear in Version II, it is possible to trace Gerald’s dual motives for his work and to hypothesize what Gerald thought of how his work was received. Version II, completed only two years after Version I and read aloud at Oxford in 1189, includes several additions which continue to flatter Henry II and uphold his Irish claims. At the same time, however, many of the portentous marvels and miracles that write the English invasion into the landscape have been qualified. Finally, the few late-version revisions dealing with Henry II reveal Gerald utterly disillusioned with the court and directly critical of the now-deceased king, illustrating that Gerald’s failed goals of patronage and conquest have been utterly abandoned. Instead, as we shall see in the next section, the vast majority of the additions to Version II steer the text away from a royal audience, drowning the underlying goals of *quaestum vel conquaestum* with additions that focus on spiritual and moralized meanings.

**Princeps Literatus**

Initially, however, Gerald got his *quaestum*. Though a bishopric was not forthcoming, and indeed, never would be, Henry commissioned Gerald to write the *Expugnatio*. As Gerald said later in a letter to John c. 1209, Henry was pleased with the Topographia and asked Gerald to finish the story: *Cui quoniam labor hic placuit utpote principi – quod nostris rarus est diebus – litterarum erudicie conspicuo, ad ipsius postmodum instanciam super expugnacione regni eiusdem hac ultima per ipsos et suos facta . . . librum emisi*. (“Since that work was pleasing to such a prince conspicuous in erudition of letters – which is rare these days – at his insistence

---

afterward I put out a book on the conquest of that same kingdom having recently been completed by him and his sons.”)

In Version II the *Topographia*, moreover, Gerald’s offer to become the official historian of the Angevin house appears to have been accepted. A *notula* is added between Chapters III.XLVI and XLVII to separate Henry’s victories from the history of Irish conquest which reads, *Hactenus historia. Ab hinc autem de titulis regis, regiaeque prolis.* (“History up to this point. From here on, the titles of the king, and the royal offspring.”) Rather than part of the historical arc of the work, then, Henry’s victories, titles and triumphs are set off to give them greater prominence. This separation between the history of Ireland and history of Henry is also underscored by an addition to the Preface (which, due to the addition of an *Introitus in Recitationem*, is now the “Second Preface”): a new paragraph proclaims that, in addition to giving Henry knowledge about the island which no time can destroy, Gerald will also give him an exposition of his victories and those of his sons: *Dignas quoque tam vestras, quam inclitae prolis vestrae virtutes, et victoriarum titulos summatim evolvere, stiloque perstringere, non indignum reputavi; ut tanta temporis nostri gloria transitorie non pertranseat, verum enimvero literarum beneficio firmum perpetuitatis robur obtineat.* (“I esteemed it also a worthy undertaking to give a short account in writing of the virtues and victorious honor of yourself and your illustrious sons, that the great glory they have conferred on our age may not be merely transitory, but, by the aid of letters, be firmly planted in the memory of posterity.”)

In accordance with this new focus, Gerald continues the flattering list of questions in the section *De titulis et triumphis* (Chapter III.XLVIII) until it is doubled in length. The list of Henry’s qualities, beginning with the intellectual discovery of Ireland and continuing through his fortitude through adversity and mercy in victory, is extended in Version II to include his youthful study, punctuated with proverbs and quotations from Jerome, David, Solomon, and Horace:

Quanto studio, quantaque et quam laudabili regio in sanguine diligentia, a prima aetate annisque pueritate studia literarum amplexus fueris . . .
Qualiter istorum et consimilium exemplo, literatus princeps effectus, et in ethicis disciplinis decenter eruditus, inter universos mundi principes tanquam lucida gemma praefulseris . . .
Quanta et quam incomparabili in terris gratia, desuper tamen et divinitus collata, discordantia regna propria virtute, aliena consilio et auctoritate, pacis amator et auctor pacificaveris;
Qualiter eximiae strenuitatis vestrae . . .
Quam in longinquos et advenas . . .

---

206 The letter is edited by Scott and Martin in their edition of the *Expugnatio* as an appendix found at pages 261-265. This passage will be discussed again later; in context it illustrates how Gerald had in fact not received payment for the two texts.

207 GCO V, 189. The critical edition unfortunately does not indicate when this notula was added. The fact that it is not included in O’Meara’s translation, whereas others are, implies it was not present in Version I.

208 GCO V, 21; Forester, 10, with “son” changed to “sons,” as *proles* is better translated as “offspring.”
Et quoniam “Vitiis sine nemo nascitur, optimus ille est qui minimis urgetur,” quanto discrimine nitidissimae famae vestrae candorem maculae quaedam obfuscant; . . .
Qualiter enim ab ineunte actate quasi vias vestras dirigens . . .

With what study, and with how much and what praiseworthy diligence for one of royal blood did you embrace the study of letters in the first years of your youth . . .
How, following such examples as these, you became a learned prince, and being tolerably versed in profane literature, you shone like a brilliant gem among all the princes of the world . . .
How much and what grace, unparalleled on earth, conferred on you from above, did you, lover and author of peace, restore to your discordant kingdom by your power, and to foreign lands by your counsel and authority;
How has the opinion and fame of your exceptional valor . . .
How for foreigners and strangers . . .
And since no one is born without fault, and he is best who has the least, however much spots which darken your fair fame are to be regarded with indulgence . . .
For how much from your earliest years, as if leading your paths . . .

These additions strenuously emphasize Henry II’s dual virtues of study and effective kingship, announcing him as the inverse of the rex illiteratus. The literatus princeps, called away from study by earthly concerns, is a successful king, committed to Christian peace.

Additionally, the sentence in which Gerald offers to “answer” the questions presented in Version I is removed, and in Version II is located at the end of the work after six new chapters describing Henry II’s sons: the young Henry III, Richard, Geoffrey, and John. This new placement allows the list of questions to be read unequivocally and in all their rhetorical force, removing any doubt that they need to be answered. Instead, the final chapter introduces Henry’s daughters, who have been married to the kings of Saxony, Spain, and Sicily. It is here that the offer to complete the story is placed, recast as an offer to continue the history of the Angevin dynasty.

Such exuberant history writing seems to be a response to Gerald receiving some kind of encouragement from Henry II. He was, as he tells us, asked to write the Expugnatio, and to continue the history of Henry’s titles and triumphs. These additions seem to imply that Gerald still had every expectation of receiving quaestum vel conquaestum for his work.

Revising Conquaestum

209 GCO V, 192-93.
Despite his outward and overt enthusiasm for Henry II’s patronage, however, other additions in Version II show that Gerald was becoming skeptical of his potential for political influence regarding the Irish conquest. He was also beginning to wonder how effectively the court would be able to fulfill figurally the projected history his texts set up. Notably, these additions occur in the same passages we have already examined in the context of Gerald’s creation of a roadmap to facilitate Irish conquest. First, Gerald adds to both the frog and the whale marvels in a way that casts doubt on their ability to signify conquest. Second, Gerald adds details that, taken together, criticize Henry’s policy in Ireland. Later versions expand these revisions further, culminating in Version V with a revision of Henry’s status as a princeps literatus.

In the chapter De rana in Hibernia nuper inventa (I.XXXII), Gerald reports that a frog is found near Waterford and taken before the court. King Duvenaldus interprets it as a certain sign (certissimum signum) of the coming of the English and of the conquest of his people. Gerald, reciting a line from Ovid, continues the passage by noting that frogs are absent from Ireland because the soil lacks the “seeds” to generate them, and then, in Version I, suggests that the frog came by boat. This reminds the reader how, two chapters previously, toads found in merchants’ ships normally die on contact with the soil. The ability of the frog to survive is thus a sign of the increasing penetrability of Ireland’s natural borders.

In Version II, however, Gerald adds a natural detail that questions whether the frog was able to penetrate Ireland’s borders at all, and therefore whether it, as a certissimum signum, still holds. After the line from Ovid, Gerald displaces the linking detail about the frog coming by ship from a nearby port, and inserts the line:

Sed forte liquidi et limosi seminis particulam, aethereo calore in nubes attractam, et vi ventorum huc impulsam; vel etiam vermiculum ipsum jam formatum, nubeculae descendantis concavitate sursum elevatum, et huc casu advectum, terra inhospita et inimica suscepit.

It may have happened that some particle of the germ, hid in the moist soil, had been exhaled into the clouds by the heat of the atmosphere, and wafted hither by the force of the winds; or, perhaps, that the embryo reptile had been swept into the hollow of a descending cloud, and, being by chance deposited here, was lodged in an inhospitable and ungenial soil.\(^{210}\)

These two additional natural explanations for how the frog ended up in Ireland dilute the power of the connection between the frogs and the English coming by ship. Moreover, the frog is not itself an invader (or perhaps, “invasive species”) if it was, as Gerald suggests, actually born in Ireland. Though the detail about the ship still follows, and begins “Vel potius,” implying that it

\(^{210}\) GCO V, 65; Forester, 51.
is the preferred interpretation, the addition dilutes the initial power of the marvel as it appeared in Version I.

A similar move occurs in the passage about the fish. In De pisce, tres dentes aureos habente (II.X), which so clearly connected the future “golden age” of Ireland with the golden teeth of the fish in Version I, is thrown into doubt by the addition of “so it is said” in Version II: inter alia sui prodigia, tres dentes, ut fertur, aureos habens. Gerald, now uncertain of the veracity of this tale, casts it as reported speech rather than as the speech of a first-person scrutator of Ireland.

Indeed, Gerald further qualifies the marvel in subsequent versions. In Version III, which I date to 1189-1193/4, Gerald deletes the detail of the teeth weighing fifty ounces, and adds another detail to the line fulfilling the prophesied conquest, which then reads: Quos aureos quidem exteriore quadam similitudine, aurique nitore potius quam natura, crediderim; assumpti colores fuco aurea forte imminentis et proximo futurae conquisitionis tempora praesagientes. (“I believe that this ‘gold’ had the outward appearance and the brightness of gold, but not its true nature; and that the colour they assumed was a presage of the golden times of the future conquest immediately impending.”)211 By Version III, after the death of Henry II and with Richard’s attentions on the Third Crusade, the fish has only normal-sized teeth and gold veneers, and the “presage of the golden times” has become an assumption rather than a reality. The prognostic power of the marvel receives its death knell in Version IV, after Gerald’s retirement from court, when he adds that a deer was found with gold teeth not far from Dunholm.212 The deer underscores the possibility of a fish existing with three gold teeth, but Gerald does not provide it with any significance. This open-endedness raises the possibility that animals with gold teeth do not necessarily signify anything at all.

In addition to discounting the marvels that portend English conquest, Gerald’s tone shifts in Version II in a way that indicates that he has been put on the defensive by some kind of criticism. He thus begins to subtly critique Henry’s policies. Gerald’s first addition to the now-“Second” Preface indicates that some question had arisen as to Gerald’s exact capacity in Ireland. In Version I, Henry II saw fit to send Gerald to Ireland where, seeing many new and unknown things, he began to make note of them. In Version II Gerald adds the detail that he journeyed to Ireland non tanquam trans fugae, sed exploratoris officio fungens (“not, therefore, as a fugitive, but acting in the official capacity of an explorer”). This detail reiterates the idea that Gerald’s exploration of Ireland and his writing of the Topographia were part of his job description as a clerk of the court receiving patronage from the King. The Second Preface addressed to Henry reads as a reminder of services rendered for which compensation is expected, as well as a possible rebuke of the Angevin house for dragging its feet.

A second rebuke is placed at the end of the Secunda Distinctio. As discussed above, the “miracles of our time” illustrate the anger of Irish saints when English troops have penetrated too far into the holy spaces of Ireland. In Version I, the perpetrators of various atrocities are

211 GCO V, 93; Forester, 72.
212 GCO V, 93; Forester, 72.
attached to Henry II only at a remove. The first invader, Strongbow, was later considered as acting against Henry II’s wishes. Other miracles are directed against unnamed “archers” and soldiers, or troops of Hugh de Lacy. In Version II, however, a final miracle is inserted which implicates Henry directly. In Chapter LIV, Gerald recalls an account of archers at Finglas who burned holy trees that had been planted in a cemetery and subsequently sickened and died; those who tried to flee were shipwrecked. These archers were under Henry II’s command. Gerald has extremely harsh words for the soldiers’ actions:

Cum enim silva propinqua fuisset, non insolita populi pravi malitia, et hominum officii illius intemperantia, praedictas arbores, quasdam frondibus mutilatas, alias vero stirpitis avulsas, omnes fere in brevi igne consumpserunt. Et vere officium illud et ab officiendo non per antiphrasin sed proprie dictum. Talibus enim ascripti officiis, officiosissime semper potius officere parati sunt quam proficere.

For there being no woods near at hand, they fell on these trees with the not-unusual insolence of a depraved people and the intemperance of men of duty, and lopping off the boughs of some of them, and tearing up others by the roots, speedily consumed nearly the whole in their fires. And truly, I say “that duty” and “to the detriment of” not by antiphrasis, but rightly. For having been enlisted into such duties, they are always much more obligingly ready to do harm rather than good.

The episode of the archers and the holy orchard at Finglas highlights the tension between authorized conquest and inviolable holy spaces first introduced in Version I, and directs this tension into a critique levied at Henry II himself. This critique is somewhat veiled, as Henry is not named, through it is clearly directed at him. The punishment of these soldiers, moreover, comes not from irate local saints, but God Himself. Gerald notes that they were punished “by divine indignation (seu verius dignatione) … in the same court wherein they had offended” – falling ill and dying in the very same town. Those who tried to flee were shipwrecked; thus, as Gerald notes at the end of the chapter in a highly classicized rhetorical flourish, Neptune vindicated the rest of God’s fury: Sic igitur summi verique Tonantis iram, quam pravitas in terris provocavit, Neptunus in undis vindicavit. (“Thus we find that the wrath of the only true and mighty Thunderer, which had been provoked by wickedness on the earth, was vindicated by Neptune on the waves.”)

---


214 GCO V, 135.

215 GCO V, 136; Forester, 110.
The officium of these archers stands in stark contrast to Gerald’s exploratoris officium in the Second Preface. In this passage, Gerald insists that his play on words between officium, service or duty, and officere, to be detrimental to, is not irony, but truth: that the duty of these soldiers is foremost to do more harm than good. Both Gerald and the soldiers are performing a duty to Henry II, and are authorized to enter into Ireland. But only Gerald’s officium, as an explorer rather than a soldier, is authorized by something larger, litera, and is in that sense worthy – a theme that also surfaces in the Introitus in Recitationem. Both the explorer and the soldier are, in a sense, conquerors – one literal, the other literary. Gerald’s critique of Henry’s soldiers illustrates the superiority of his own project, but also suggests that he is quickly realizing that his quaestum vel conquaestum will not be forthcoming, as Henry seems to prefer his soldiers’ officium over Gerald’s.

By Version IV, which dates to Gerald’s retirement from the court at Lincoln (c. 1196-98), Gerald is under no illusions. The story of the destruction of the holy orchard at Finglas is amplified to nearly twice its original length. Well after Henry’s death in 1189, and after Gerald left the court of Richard, Gerald finally implicates Henry by name in this atrocity against God, and unleashes a blistering round of biblical quotations on divine fury and vengeance. He begins by inserting Henry directly into the first sentence (the added section is underlined): Contigit quoque temporibus nostris, Jove praeter solitum in Hibernia tonante, et rege Henrico ibidem fulminante, plurimas sagittariorum turmas . . . (“It happened in our time, with Jove thundering more than usual in Ireland, and King Henry flashing like lightning in that same place, many troops of archers . . .”).216 The grammatical parallel places equal destructive power on Jove’s thunder and Henry’s lightning, equating the violence of the thunderstorm with that of Henry’s expedition.217

Gerald then rounds out this chapter with the invective not of a courtier, but a religious sermonizer. Not content with the classicizing reference to Jupiter and Neptune, Gerald adds quotes from five different biblical and religious texts, all on attempts to flee the hand of God, and exhorts the reader to listen: Audi namque prophetam Amos, he begins, Non erit fuga eis, et qui fugerit ex eis non salvabitur . . . (“For hear the prophet Amos: Not one of them shall flee away, not one of them shall escape.”). Gerald continues, Audi et Abdiam . . . (“Listen also to Obadiah . . .”), and then picks up speed into Item et super Jonam . . . Ieronimum audi . . . (“Hear also Jonah . . . and hear Jerome . . .”). Finally Gerald ends with, Audi et psalmistam: Si ascendero in coelum, tu illic es: si descendero ad infernum, ades. Si sumpsero pennas meas diluculo, et habitavero in extremis maris, etenim [illuc] manus tua deducet me, et tenebit me dextera tua. (“Hear also the words of the Psalmist: If I ascend up to heaven, thou art there; if I go down to hell thou art there also. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the

216 GCO V, 135.
217 This grammatical parallel is also repeated in Version IV of the chapter on the three-fold oath: “In occiduis enim oceani finibus Jove tonante, et Henrico rege Anglorum secundo ibidem expeditionem agentem, occidentalis reguli, tonitruius ejus attoniti, pacis adeptae beneficio fulminis ictum praeveenerunt.” GCO V, 149. See Appendix A, entry for Chapter III.IX.
sea, even there also thy hand shall lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.”)\(^{218}\) If Gerald had had exclamation points, he would have used them here. The direct invocation to the reader “Hear!” is repeated four times, ordering us to learn from this lesson that no man may flee God, not to the highest heights nor the furthest seas – a lesson which here, Gerald feels Henry II so obviously did not heed.

**Who Shall Relate?**

For, in fact, Henry did not heed Gerald’s quoted admonitions. Henry II may not have ever seen the additions meant for him in Version II, since he died soon after in Chinon in 1189. And by the time Version IV was written, Gerald was already beginning work on his *De Principis Instructione*,\(^{219}\) in which he instructs young princes (eventually the young Prince Louis) through Henry’s posthumous negative example. Robert Bartlett describes it in its final form (c. 1217) as “not a political critique or programme. It is a personal drama – the rise and fall of a tyrant.”\(^ {220}\) Gerald casts Henry’s failure to go on crusade as the fulcrum in a dynamic swing from fortune to disgrace, culminating in his ignominious death.\(^ {221}\)

```
. . . [H]aec ingeminando imo multiplicando verba, quae de reliquiis
cognitionum vehementia tam morbi quam doloris pariter et indignationis extorsit,
quoniam ex abundantia cordis os loqui solet, “Proh pudor de rege victo!  Proh
pudor!” in extremis laboravit. Et sic demum inter aerumnosas hujusmodi voces,
propiae praeco confusionis, exspiravit, obrutusque magis et oppressus quam
naturali morte finitus occubuit.
```

He laboured in his death throes, repeatedly groaning these words, which the vehemence of the disease, and of his sorrow and indignation too, extorted from the rest of his thoughts, since ‘the mouth speaks from an abundant heart’: ‘Shame, shame, on a conquered king!’ At last, among words of this kind, full of suffering, the herald of his own confusion, he breathed his last and died, overwhelmed and crushed rather than dying a natural death.\(^ {222}\)

A small glimmer of this invective to come shines through in a final gloss on the chapter *De titulis et triumphis* in the final fifth version of the *Topographia*, dated to 1207-09. To rewrite

---

\(^{218}\) GCO V, 136-137; Forester, 110. Biblical and patristic quotations are Amos, ix. 1-4; Obadiah, v. 4; Jonah, i. 9; *Hieron. in Jonah* i. 3; and Psalm 139. 9.


\(^{220}\) Bartlett, 62.

\(^{221}\) *De Principis*, GCO VIII, 295-298 (Ch. III.26); Bartlett, 67.

\(^{222}\) GCO VIII, 296-297; translation from Bartlett 77.
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the long list of triumphant rhetorical questions would take valuable time and energy, and perhaps do too much violence to the text as he saw it. But Gerald makes a small addition in Version V which recasts the entire passage not as rhetoric, but as sarcasm, ending the passage once and for all with an innocent-looking question (italicized):

Qualiter etiam ab ineunde aetate quasi vias vestras dirigens, et aspera quaeque complanans, in regni detentores pacisque vestrae turbares graviter animadvertens, regi pacifico, totique fidelium populo tam futuro proficuo, ut ad votum cuncta successerint, divinus favor semper arriserit; haec, inquam, ad plenum singula quis explicabit?

How much then, from your earliest years, you have made your paths straight, and trodden down rough places, laying a heavy hand on those who withheld your crown, and disturbed your peace, how all things have prospered, and the divine favour has attended so pacific a king, and one so serviceable to all Christian people; all this, I say, who shall fully relate?²²³

How great his virtues, how strong his might, how merciful, with what zeal, how incomparable his grace, his fame, and his prosperity; who, Gerald asks, will explain all these things? The answer is a resounding “no one” – and not only because Gerald shuns the task, but because there is no virtue, no might, no mercy, and no prosperity to describe. Henry II is a despised king, and Gerald’s biting wit makes the entire passage shift negative in one phrase.

Princeps Illiteratus

Anyone familiar with the Topographia, however, will know that Gerald began to indicate his discontent with the ruling house far earlier, and in a very public way. In the Introitus in Recitationem, added to Version II of the Topographia (often called the “First Preface”), Gerald makes it clear that his intended royal audience was not adequately appreciative of his literary efforts. This version was read aloud at Oxford over three days at some time between July 1188 and February 1189 to a primarily clerical, university audience. This new introduction was added specifically for the occasion.

In the Introitus, Gerald sets out the two primary motivations for writing: first, the promise of memoria and fama after the writers are long dead, and second, the promise of patronage by a lettered prince. Thus he sets out an ideal model for writing based on the classical Golden Age, quoting lines from Statius, Ovid, Juvenal, and Horace. He then compares this to more modern days, in which, in his mind, poetry and the art of letters has all but ceased. Gerald makes clear that the fall of literature was not the fault of writers, but of princes:

²²³ GCO V, 193; Forester, 157, modified to preserve the rhetorical force of the addition.
Non enim desunt literae, sed principes literati; non desunt artes, sed artium honores. Nec hodie destitissent scriptores optimi, si non desiissent imperatores electi. Da igitur Pirrum; dabis Homerum. Da Pompeium; dabis et Tullium. Da Gaium, et Augustum; Virgilium quoque dabis et Flaccum.

Letters were not wanting, but lettered princes. The liberal arts had not disappeared, but the honours which ought to attend them were withheld. There would be no lack of eminent writers at the present day, if there were no lack of enlightened rulers. Give but a Pyrrhus, and you will have a Homer; a Pompey, and you will have a Cicero; a Caius and Augustus, and a Virgil and Horace will follow in course.  

This lament leads directly into a discussion of Gerald’s own authorial motivation, and a jab at the Angevin house: Ceterum, quamvis defectu principum cesset in nobis causa secunda, scribere nos tamen prior illa praemonet et potissima. (“While, then, in our case, the second motive for writing fails for want of patrons, the first and most powerful of those I have mentioned urges me on.”)

To his learned audience, Gerald’s criticism would have immediately recalled the axiom of William of Malmesbury and John of Salisbury: rex illiteratus quasi asinus coronatus. And here is where Rollo’s argument gains some traction: In the later versions of the Topographia, Gerald certainly meant to imply that Henry II was a bad king. Rollo’s argument, however, does not take into account the development of the versions over time. This implication that Henry was a bad king was not encoded in a fictive stance that Henry was unable to understand, especially as Rollo’s examples were written into versions of the Topographia that Henry never saw. Rather, Henry II was a bad king because he was a bad literary patron. And he was a bad patron because he had not completed Gerald’s work with quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum.

This sentiment is expressed in a letter to the then-King John in c. 1209, which forms the preface to the β-version of the Expugnatio. A portion of this letter is discussed above, in which Gerald exhorts John not to forget unfinished business in Ireland, and reminds him of some other unfinished business regarding the composition of the Expugnatio. Recalling many other passages in which he describes the process of writing the Topographia, Gerald complains to John that he has yet to be rewarded for either work:

Placuit olim excellenti et magnanimo regi Henrico patri vestro me in Hiberniam a latere suo vobiscum transmittere. Ubi, cum multa notarem, nova quidem et

---

224 GCO V, 4; Forrester, 4. Translation modified a bit for sense. Note that for Caius Gerald is referring to Gaius Cilnius Maecenas, patron of Virgil and Horace.  
225 Ibid.  
226 See Scott and Martin, “Introduction,” lxxi. So dated because it refers to John’s legitimate sons, the second of whom was born that year. The advice to go in to Ireland would have become obsolete after John’s visit there in 1210.
Some time ago it pleased your excellent and magnanimous father King Henry to send me with you from his side into Ireland. There, when I had seen many new and notable things, not found in other kingdoms and totally unknown, collecting and putting together that material with diligence, afterward in England I published a book, the Topography of Ireland, on the marvels of Ireland and the circumstances of that same place, and spread the praise of your father in three years of work. And since that work was so pleasing to a prince so conspicuous in erudition of letters – which is rare these days – afterward at his insistence I put out a book on the conquest of that same kingdom having recently been done by him and his sons, indeed, renewing and indeed, continuing that work – but because “honesty is praised but left to starve,” neither the renewed nor the continual labor has been paid for.  

Henry II is *literarum erudicione conspicuus*, but neither of the two versions of the *Expugnatio* has been paid for. The implication of this oversight would be clear to John, who was an avid reader himself. Henry – and here, John – is learned enough to read and understand the books Gerald produces, but still has not fulfilled Gerald’s expectations of reward in his role as patron, as a *princeps literatus*.

Not being a proper patron, of course, means that even if Henry II read the work, thereby penetrating into and understanding the *nova* and *notabilia incognita* of Ireland as promised both here and in the *Topographia*’s Preface, his “literary” conquest of the topography of Ireland is still a failure. Version I’s strong colonialist discourse and its dedication to Henry II reinforce the idea that Gerald’s project regarding Henry was to encourage a literary conquest of Ireland as a proxy for the failed physical one, with the hope of remuneration from the court. In the *De Rebus*, Gerald frames the writing of the *Topographia* as an effort for *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* (“some kind of profit or conquest”) in the context of John’s failure to categorically win either during their journey to Ireland in 1188. Were Henry to remunerate Gerald with *quaestum . . . vel conquaestum*, Henry’s “literary” conquest of Ireland, at least, would be a success. Winning neither, however, leaves Gerald’s prospective history without a satisfactory conclusion.

227 Letter, at Scott and Martin, 261-265.
This failure spurs Gerald to redirect his text to the *Topographia*’s secondary audience. Winning neither *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* from a royal audience, Gerald will try to gain literary *auctoritas* from a scholarly one. In the next section, we shall see how Gerald’s additions in Version II and beyond address themselves to a clerical audience.

**THE CLERICAL AUDIENCE: CREATING AUTHORITY**

While Gerald was angling for *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* from Henry II with the first version of the *Topographia*, he also had in mind a secondary audience: clerics and learned men, both in that court, or in a specifically scholarly space. As his text progressed, Gerald added a number of revisions that speak directly to this audience, with themes focused less on imperial conquest, and more on authority and authorship. In Version I, Gerald constructs his authoritative position as a first-person *scrutator* of the landscape, bestowing authority on his observations by virtue of his proximity to the landscape. Such authority is appealing and very effective for readers like Archbishop Baldwin, himself an avid traveler who was also active in the court. But when Gerald seeks authority from the larger, scholarly audience at Oxford, he constructs a different theory of authorship, importing and adapting the tradition of classical and Christian “*auctoritas*” and based on the writings of poets and historiographers. These dual conceptions of authorship show how Gerald was directing his text based on what he felt his audience would respond to. Further additions show Gerald in dialogue with both classical conceptions of *novitas* and *auctoritas*, as well as engaging contemporary scholastic hermeneutics.

**Cultivating Natural and Spiritual Authority: Scrutator**

Version I of the *Topographia* laid the groundwork for Gerald’s overtures to a clerical audience. Henry II’s court was populated with clerics, many of whom, as discussed above, would have readily understood the *distinctio* format and Gerald’s desire for *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum*. Gerald’s delineation of space within the *Topographia* – space which is conquerable, space which is inviolate or holy, and space which is hybrid – would have been legible, if not familiar, to this audience. In this way, he constructed his text to appeal not only to Henry II, his primary audience, but also to a clerical audience, either those in service to Henry II or other scholarly clerics.

Another aspect of the *Topographia* that would have been particularly legible to this audience is the number of moralizations based on the birds in the *Prima Distinctio*. These simple analogies that liken physical or natural attributes of animals to spiritual or moral models of behavior were often used to unlock the allegorical meaning of difficult scriptural or theological passages. Gerald’s moralizations of the birds followed a long tradition of Christian exegetical practice. As Lorraine Daston and Katharine Park note in their *Wonders and the Orders of Nature*, “A basic appreciation of the marvelousness of creation sufficed for ordinary believers, but for preachers, teachers, and exegetes, whose responsibility it was to interpret the
Bible for others, required more specialized knowledge of the properties of natural things.\textsuperscript{228}

According to Augustine in the \textit{De Doctrina Christiana}:

An ignorance of things makes figurative expressions obscure when we are ignorant of the natures of animals, or stones, or plants, or other things which are often used in the Scriptures for purposes of constructing similitudes. The well-known fact that a serpent exposes its whole body in order to protect its head from those attacking it illustrates the sense of the Lord’s admonition that we be wise like serpents . . . . The same thing is true of stones, or of herbs or of other things that take root. For a knowledge of the carbuncle which shines in the darkness also illuminates many obscure places in books where it is used for similitudes, and an ignorance of beryl or of diamonds frequently closes the doors of understanding.\textsuperscript{229}

The “marvelousness of creation” referred to by Daston and Park is not here, or not only, comprised of the hybrid “Marvels of the West” in the \textit{Secunda Distinctio}. For Gerald – and for all theologians, especially in the pastoral care movement – the ordinary birds of Ireland had marvelous properties and behaviors that could explain and model Christian morals. Gerald understood quite well how ignorance of natural things could give rise to scriptural misinterpretation,\textsuperscript{230} and he is careful to describe thoroughly any particular natural attribute before following it with its specific moralization.

Gerald consistently uses the language of wonder in describing the natural attributes of the birds, and then semantically connects that wonder directly with the moralization. The swan is a good example:

\begin{quote}
In boreali Hiberniae parte cygni abundant. Ciconiae vero per totam insulam rarissimae sunt; et illae nigrae.

Mirum de cygnis quod mortis discrimina doceant non dolenda; et imminente letali articulo, tanquam de necessitate virtutem facientes, funebriae fata canendo contemnunt.

Sic viri virtutum meritis candidate, ab aerumnis hujus secoli laeti discedunt; solumque Deum fontem vivum sitentes, a corpore mortis hujus liberari dissolvique cupiunt, et esse cum Christo.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{230} See the opposite effect, where a natural explanation is given to a Latin misinterpretation, in Michael Evans, “An Emended Joke in Gerald of Wales,” \textit{Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes} 61 (1998): 253-254.
Swans are very plentiful in the northern part of Ireland. Storks are very seldom seen anywhere in Ireland, and when they are, they are black.

There is a remarkable thing about swans. They teach us that the troubles of death should not grieve us; for in the very moment of dying they make a virtue of necessity and despise their sad fate in singing.

So men, clothed in the white garments of virtue, depart joyfully from the hardships of this world. They thirst only for God, the living fountain, and desire to be freed and liberated from the body of this death and to be with Christ.\(^{231}\)

In the dying swan’s song, Gerald extrapolates two lessons: first, generally, that death is no time for grief, and second, that holy men, like swans, die joyfully. The natural attribute, the swans’ song, is introduced with an adjective of wonder: \textit{mirum}. This is connected with the lessons by the word \textit{sic}: the remarkable thing is described, and thus, the lesson is taught. This pattern is repeated throughout the bird moralizations. The barnacle geese is described as \textit{quas mirum in modum, contra naturam, natura producit} (“which is marvelous in manner, because its nature shows against nature itself”).\(^{232}\) Gerald’s description of the hunting habits of the osprey begins, \textit{Mirum in avibus istis} (“the remarkable things about these birds are . . .”). His moralization, which likens the osprey’s grip on its prey to the devil’s grip on souls, begins, \textit{Sic nos hostis antiquus} (“Thus our ancient enemy . . . ”).\(^{233}\)

Indeed, Gerald reinforces the explicit connection between the “wonder” and the moralization with a repeated pattern: an introductory phrase indicating wonder (\textit{mirum} or \textit{mirandum}) followed by \textit{sic}, linking the wonder to his moralization. This pattern occurs six times in Version I, and a seventh in an additional chapter added in Version III.\(^{234}\) Variations on the pattern, lacking the explicit use of the word \textit{mirum}, but using \textit{item}, \textit{et}, or \textit{etiam} to connect additional phrases occur numerous other times.\(^{235}\) This strict organization again brings to mind the \textit{distinctio}, which was uniquely suited to organizing moralizations and illustrating both the “link” between the word and meaning and the “gap” or mental “leap” required to move from one to the other. Though Gerald’s moralizations are not visual, with each iteration, he emphasizes the close connection between the wonders of nature and those of God, reinforcing the allegorical stratum which lies just below the legible landscape of Ireland.

This also, of course, reinforces his role as author of and authority on those moralizations. As Antonia Gransden and Urban Holmes have noted, much of the naturalistic content and detail in the \textit{Topographia} can be attributed to Gerald’s own observations.\(^{236}\) Gerald makes this no

\(^{231}\) GCO V, 52, I.XIX; O’Meara, 45.
\(^{232}\) GCO V, 47.
\(^{233}\) GCO V, 50.
\(^{234}\) GCO V, 34 (hawks); GCO V, 50 (osprey); GCO V, 51 (kingfisher) (arguably twice, because of the use of the word “et” to include a second attribute and second moralization); GCO V, 52 (storks and swans), GCO V, 52 (hibernating birds) (with the use of “similis” rather than “sic”); GCO V, 55 (hooded crows); GCO V, 56 (croerae).
\(^{235}\) See, for example, the chapters on hawks, eagles, and cranes.
\(^{236}\) Gransden, “Realistic Observation,” and Holmes, “Gerald the Naturalist,” see above, note 137.
Describing the barnacle goose’s marvelous generation from wood, he says: *Vidi multoties oculis meis plusquam mille minuta hujusmodi avium corpuscula, in litore maris ab uno ligno dependentia, testis inclusa, et jam formata.* (“I myself have seen many times and with my own eyes more than a thousand of these small bird-like creatures hanging from a single log upon the sea-shore.”) 

And about the osprey’s unique method of hunting fish, he says: *Mirum de avibus istis, quod et oculis plerumque conspexi . . .* (“The wondrous thing about these birds, which I have witnessed often and with my own eyes . . .”) 

Gerald’s insertion of himself in these passages serves as a reminder of his role, defined in the Second Preface, as a *scrutator*, an examiner, whose role it is to collect diligently the answers to the visible questions of the landscape, and transmit this information to the reader. Indeed, Gerald’s own observations on the barnacle goose, osprey, and kingfisher are later incorporated into a variant of the Bestiary tradition; Gerald is the only known source for this material.

Gerald is not only an authority on the natural information, but also on the spiritual moralizations. As Joseph Parry notes in his article, “Giraldus Cambrensis and the ‘Place’ of Authority,” Gerald’s “repeated emphasis on his own proximity to the world he creates” is crucial to Gerald’s position as an authority. This proximity to the physical reality of Ireland is at the same time a proximity to that landscape’s spiritual signification: “For Gerald – whether he reads a manuscript or a landscape – God is in the details, and Gerald is careful to posit his own proximity to the details, therefore to God.” Parry notes that Gerald’s intention to demonstrate this authority, which he ultimately carries over into the *Itinerarium Kambriae*, “relies on his demonstrating the ability to read the phenomenal world in authorized, moralized ways.”

These moralized readings were uniquely Gerald’s, and his spiritual authority was recognized explicitly by Archbishop Baldwin. In 1188, while accompanying Baldwin on a preaching circuit through Wales to recruit for the Third Crusade, Gerald presented him with Version I of the *Topographia*. As Gerald reports in his *De Rebus*, Baldwin was particularly impressed with the moralizations:

> Quaesiverat etiam archiepiscopus ab ipso, utrum evidentiam aliquam ab agiographis et expositoribus nostris habuisset, super allegoriis circa avium naturas

---

237 GCO V, 48; O’Meara, 41.
238 GCO V, 50; O’Meara, 43.
239 See GCO V, 20.
242 Parry, 10.
243 Parry, 11.
assignatis in prima *Topographiae* Distinctione. Et cum responderet quod nullam, subjecit archiepiscopus, quia revera spiritu eodem quo et illi scripserunt scripta sunt ista.

The Archbishop had asked him [Gerald], whether he had used any material from the hagiographers and commentators concerning the allegories assigned to the natures of the birds in the first distinction of the *Topographia*. And when he had responded that he hadn’t, the archbishop exclaimed that they certainly were inspired by the same spirit those who had written those things were.\(^{244}\)

In this passage, Baldwin recognizes that Gerald’s ability to create moralizations is based on his own observations of the natural world, and that those moralizations are inspired by the same spirit (*spiritu eodem*) as those of the hagiographers and commentators. This recognition is truly high praise, and though it comes by way of Gerald’s own narration, it illustrates how Gerald viewed his project as producing symbolic capital – a project of creating and cultivating spiritual and symbolic interpretive authority concerning a landscape over which he, as a privileged *scrutator*, has total authorial control.

The allegorical landscape of physical, spiritual, and moral spaces in Version I, then, not only outlines a roadmap for conquest of the literal or literary space, but also lays the groundwork for Gerald’s authorial self-fashioning: Gerald’s creation of himself as an author and authority on his topic. Gerald’s purpose is to establish his position in the circle of clerical and literary figures active at the time, and in doing so, set himself up for future literary success. In other words, this production of symbolic and spiritual meanings is meant to engender more work. In a certain sense, Gerald can be said to seek *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* from a clerical audience rather than a royal one: not the political conquest of Ireland and royal patronage, but literary *auctoritas* over Ireland’s spiritualized meanings, which will make him the favored *auctor* for future scholarly projects.

This productive project, the idea that interpretative facility breeds authority, which breeds further opportunities for interpretation, is played out in the idealized autobiographical space of Baldwin’s praise of the bird moralizations. Just before he exclaims that Gerald is truly inspired by the Holy Spirit, Baldwin gives Gerald an authorization of a different kind:

> Finita sic igitur legatione laudabili, cum ad Angliam de Walliae finibus tenderet archiepiscopus, quidam de clericis suis pariter iter agentes, et de perigrinatione Jerosolimitana coram ipso loquentes, interrogabant eum quis nobilem historiam illam de terrae Palestinae per principes nostros restauracione, et Saladini ac Saracenorum per eosdem expugnatione digne tractare posset. Quibus ipse

---

\(^{244}\) GCO I, 80. This passage is recited in Gerald’s letter to William de Montibus, found the *Speculum Duorum*, eds. Lefèvre and Huygens, 170-173, in the *De Jure*, GCO III, 334-335, and in the letter to the canons of Hereford concerning his books, in GCO I, 410. See also the discussion in Chapter 1.
respondens ait, se bene providisse ac promtum babere qui historiam illam egregie tractaret. Et cum instarent illi quae re quisnam esset, vertens se ad archidiaconum Giraldum, qui ad iatus ipsius equitabat: “Hic est,” inquit, “qui prosaice tractabit, et nepos meus Joseph metrice, quem et archidiacono adjungam, ut ei serviat et inseparabiliter adhaereat.”

This praiseworthy mission thus accomplished, as the Archbishop was passing from the borders of Wales into England, some of his clerks who were traveling with him and talking in his presence concerning this pilgrimage to Jerusalem, asked him who could worthily cope with the glorious story [nobilem historiam] of the recovery by our princes of the land of Palestine, and the defeat of Saladin and the Saracens at their hands. And the Archbishop replied that he had made good provision for that and had one ready who could handle the story exceedingly well. And when they pressed him further and asked who it was, he turned to Giraldus who was riding at his side, saying, “This is he who shall tell of it in prose, while my nephew Joseph shall record it in verse; and I will attach him to the Archdeacon that he may serve him and be ever at his side.”

Gerald goes on to recount how Baldwin praised the Topographia, in the words quoted above, and exhorted him to continue writing. In this passage, written in a retrospective autobiography ca. 1208-1216 but set in 1188 just after the preaching circuit through Wales, clerks ask the Archbishop who shall write the “history” of the Third Crusade, which had yet to happen – and indeed, never did, as a truce was struck between Richard and Saladin in 1192. The purpose of the passage, then, is to memorialize this moment in which Baldwin – perhaps Gerald’s best reader – fulfilled Gerald’s expectations for his text. The Archbishop recognized the circuit of Gerald’s productive authorship, and commissioned him to narrate the prospective glorious history of the Third Crusade.

Gerald’s response to this commission, if we can assume for the moment it genuinely reflects some moment in 1188, is to focus his interpretive powers onto the most prominent of the additions to Version II: more bird moralizations. In Version I, several birds are are described without moralizations and others only have certain attributes moralized. In Version II, Gerald has remedied this adding six new moralizations, a new chapter on cicadas, and entirely rewriting the chapter on the eagle. The intensive revision of this section results in a highly organized structure. Gerald’s focus on the birds may initially seem dissonant (particularly for those modern Gerald critics who view the moralizations as “detracting” from the work) but in fact makes sense: Gerald’s ability to describe a landscape, imbue it with allegorical significance, and create a symbolic logic that looks forward to prospective conquest is exactly that skill, that project, that Baldwin recognizes in the Topographia and requires for a prose account of his
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journey to Jerusalem on crusade. This proposed narration of Baldwin’s journey, like the
Topographia, would be figural, written in expectation of the extra-textual completion of
successful conquest. A diligens scrutator, capable of both describing natural phenomena and
drawing out their symbolic meanings, is precisely the type of author Baldwin requires for his
history.

An Abundance of Eloquence: Auctor

Gerald was in an enviable position at the time he was revising his Topographia in late
1188 and early 1189. He had turned a disastrous mission to Ireland into a literary gold mine,
using the trip as an opportunity to gather material for a book that he dedicated to Henry II, for
which he expected some kind of reward. Moreover, he had a fan and the promise of future
patronage from the most important cleric in England, Archbishop Baldwin. He was Baldwin’s
companion on his journey through Wales, and he was to accompany him to the Holy Land as
Baldwin’s official historiographer on crusade. Two audiences for the Topographia had signaled
their approval. (Henry had at least given positive enough signs to account for the “titles and
victories” of Version II.) Gerald decided to try for the approbation of a third audience: the
scholarly community at Oxford, Britain’s nascent university. Many of the revisions in Version II
of the Topographia specifically appeal to this audience.

Gerald describes the reading at Oxford in his autobiography:

Processu vero temporis opere completo et correcto, lucernam accensam non sub
modio ponere, sed super candelabrum ut luceret erigere cupiens, apud Oxoniam,
ubi clericus in Anglia magis vigebat et clericatu praecellebat, opus suum in tanta
audientia recitare disposit. Et quoniam tres erant in libro suo distinctiones
qualibet recitata die tribus diebus continuos recitatio duravit; primoque die
pauperes omnes oppidi totius ad hoc convocatos hospitio suscepit et exhibuit. In
crastino vero doctores diversarum facultatum omnes et discipulos famae majoris
et notitiae. Tertio die reliquos scolares cum militibus oppidanis et burgensibus
multis. Sumptuosa quidem res et nobilis, quia renovata sunt quodammodo
authentica et antiqua in hoc facto poetarum tempora; nec rem similem in Anglia
factam vel praesens aetas vel ulla recolit antiquitas.

And when in the process of time the work was finished and corrected, not wishing
to place the candle which he had lit under a bushel, but to lift it aloft on a
candlestick that it might shine, he determined to read it before a great audience at
Oxford, where of all places in England the clergy were most strong and pre-
eminent in learning. And since his book was divided into three parts, he gave
three consecutive days to the reading, a part being read each day. On the first day
he hospitably entertained the poor of the whole town whom he gathered together
for the purpose; on the morrow he entertained all the doctors of the diverse
Faculties and those of their scholars who were best known and best spoken of; and on the third day he entertained the remainder of the scholars together with the knights of the town and a number of the citizens. It was a magnificent and costly achievement, since thereby the ancient and authentic times of the poets were in some manner revived, nor has the present age seen nor does any past age bear record of the like [in England].

It is significant that Gerald describes his reading at Oxford as *opere completo et correcto*, with the work having been completed and corrected. Version II’s additions show Gerald’s preoccupation with documenting the abundance of the wonders of nature, filling out his landscape with both additional marvels and revised ("corrected") marvels. As discussed in Chapter 1, Gerald adds twenty-three entirely new chapters to Version II of the *Topographia*, as well as long extended passages within existing chapters. The *distinctio* format allows Gerald to indulge his collective impulse by providing expansive interpretive space within its delineated branches, holding open the tantalizing, and ultimately unattainable, possibility of creating a “completed” text, if Gerald can only fill out all the potential conceptual space. As we shall see, Gerald’s impulse will outgrow the delineated branches in later versions.

In addition to adding a huge amount of substantive material, Gerald also frames Version II with an *Introitus in Recitationem*, where he positions himself within a classical tradition of authorship. He makes this explicit in the description above, where he states that through him, the ancient and authentic times of the poets are renewed (*quia renovata sunt quodammodo authentica et antiqua in hoc facto poetarum tempora*). Gerald positions himself as a fulfillment and restoration of a past literate golden age, one that has never been seen in England (*in Anglia*) but has now, through Gerald’s efforts, been brought to Oxford. In the *Introitus in Recitationem*, Gerald emphasizes this gap in the literary tradition, lamenting the lack of lettered princes to
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subsidize the arts and thus lacking divine poets and men devoted to literature. In a purposefully overblown rhetorical parallel, he implies to his audience that if Henry II was only a Pompey, he himself would be a Cicero.

Lacking a Pompey, however, Gerald will do Cicero one better. For Gerald, writing is essentially a moral imperative, and Gerald’s project is not only to aspire to the greatness of the ancient writers, but, as much as he can, to go beyond them. He alludes to the phrase, attributed to Bernard of Chartes by John of Salisbury,\(^{249}\) that he is standing on the shoulders of giants: *Hoc etiam animositatis tam scintillam adjicere, quam et innatum ignem inflammare postest; quod tantis auctoribus et tot innitentes, eorumque tanquam humeris insidentes, multiplicatae majestatis beneficio magni fieri possumus, si magnanimi.* (“For nothing can better tend to kindle the sparks of mental vigour, and fan the innate fire into a flame, than that, supported by so many and such great authorities, and borne, as it were, upon their shoulders, we may rise to eminence by the aid of their manifold grandeur, if only we have confidence in ourselves.”)\(^{250}\) He contrasts this with otherwise praiseworthy, learned men who, despairing of success (*ex desperatione consequendi*), grow old without gaining honors, and “perish like beasts” (*veluti pecora pereunt*).

Richard Southern interpreted the phrase *nanos gigantum humeris insidentes* as an “abasement before the shrine of antiquity,”\(^{251}\) while more recently Alaistair Minnis has pointed to it as an example of how the medieval theory of authorship assigned *auctoritas* only sparingly, saying, “No ‘modern’ writer could decently be called an *auctor* in a period in which men saw themselves as dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants, i.e. the ‘ancients’.”\(^{252}\) Gerald’s allusion, however, has no mention of giants, and certainly does not imply that he is a dwarf. He appropriates the phrase in a way that leaves behind the abasement of the ‘modern’ [that is, medieval] author, while focusing instead on the achievement of eminence and fame. This, of course, turns the theory of *auctoritas* on its head: Gerald believes that the light of intellectual illumination of *any* kind can raise mankind to majesty, and that he can join a landscape of *auctores* populated by classical and Christian authors alike. Gerald enacts this intellectual theory in his own project, by “lift[ing his candle] aloft on a candlestick that it might shine” at Oxford.\(^{253}\)

In presenting the *Topographia* at Oxford, Gerald makes a point of stating not only that his project renews the ancient classical traditions, but that, because he does it without royal patronage, he exceeds it. He wholeheartedly rejects the example of Cicero’s reluctance to write because of the possibility of failure:

Illo quoque Ciceronis exemplo retardari non potui: “Ea,” inquit, “re poemata non scribo, quia qualia volo non possum, qualia possum, nolo.” Mihi enimvero ea

\(^{250}\) GCO V, 5; Forester, 5.
\(^{253}\) GCO I, 72-73; Butler, 97. Gerald is quoting Mark 4:21.
mens est, et in hanc partem tam vehemens: . . . Si qualia volo non possum, qualia possum, volo.

I am not deterred by that example of Cicero, who said, “I do not write poetry on that subject because I cannot write such verses as well as I would like, and I am unwilling to write those that I am capable of.” But I am of such a mind, and very vehement on this: . . . If I cannot write as well as I would, I will at least write as well as I can.\(^{254}\)

In the next line, Gerald acknowledges that his fate may be to endure \textit{invidiam in vita} ("envy in life"), but the chance, he posits, for \textit{gloriam forte post fata} ("perhaps some glory afterward") is enough motivation. In this way, Gerald’s project is hopeful, contrasted with the earlier \textit{desperatio} of men who do not exercise their talent, and is presented as both a fulfillment and rejection of earlier classical models of authorship. Gerald’s practice of authorship is in a way very Christian: dependent on a rejection of earthly and contemporary fame and riches, in the hope of glory after death. But it also struggles with the theoretical categories of authorship in place at the time.

Gerald’s careful placement of himself against the ancient authors, but also as their fulfilment, is significant because his topic of Ireland is far beyond the classical purview. Gerald describes in the \textit{Introitus} that he chose Ireland because of its remoteness:

\begin{quote}
Talia siquidem mihi dudum proponenti, diuque in animo anxie volventi, vix tandem angulus unus, quasi ab aliis relictus, terrarum scilicet finis Hibernicus orbis occurrit; nec ille omnino intactus; nullius tamen hactenus stilo absolute comprehensus.
\end{quote}

After long musing on this subject, and after anxiously revolving it in my mind, at last it occurred to me that there was one corner of the earth, Ireland, which, from its position on the furthest borders of the globe, had been neglected by others. Not that it had been left altogether untouched, but no writer had hitherto comprehensively treated of it.\(^{255}\)

Gerald’s description of Ireland’s geographical position on the farthest borders of the world renders it a literary frontier, ripe for his literary ambitions. In this way, he seriously revises his earlier account of collecting naturalistic \textit{notabilia} about Ireland while part of John’s royal retinue in the dedication preface. Instead, Gerald positions himself almost as the scholar in his study, musing and turning over in his mind the question of what to write about, having already made the decision to write, no matter what the outcome – as he says earlier, \textit{qualia possum volo} ("I

\(^{254}\) GCO V, 5.
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will at least write as well as I can”). And rather than visualizing the glittering questions around him that beg for answers – _quae nova, quaeve secreta_ – Gerald meets the Ireland in the _Introitus_ with a rather dour biblical prognosis (one that must have been very funny, incidentally, to his English audience): _Sed ab Hibernia potestne aliquid boni esse? Numquid montes illi stillabunt dulcedinem, et valles fluent mel et lac?_ (“But has anything good ever come from Ireland? Will its mountains ever drop sweetness, and its valleys flow with milk and honey?”) If not for literal or literary _conquaestum_, what makes Ireland worth writing about at all?

The answer has nothing to do with Ireland, but everything to do with Gerald’s project as an author. Eloquence makes Ireland worth writing about, and Ireland, as if left behind by all others ( _quasi ab alis relictus_ ) and on the farthest edges of the globe ( _terrarum scilicet finis Hibernicus orbis_ ) is chosen not because of Gerald’s courtly duty there, but because it presents the greatest literary challenge. Gerald is seeking nothing less than poetic immortality, and he will win it, he proposes, through serious literary effort: setting the soaring oratory of the schools – as he described it in the _Expugnatio_, the _scolasitici stili eligancie_ (“elegance of the scholastic style”) – against that rough and barbarous land of Ireland. Quoting Cicero again, he says: _Nihil tam incredible, quod non dicendo probabile fiat; nihil tam horridum et tam incultum, quod non splendescat oratione; et tanquam excolatur (“Nothing is so incredible, that it cannot be made probable by the manner of putting it; nothing so rude and barbarous, that oration cannot embellish, and even refine it”). Gerald proposes to narrate Ireland, and thereby, to civilize it, revealing to his readers an Ireland polished with eloquence and order, as if, he says, in a clear mirror ( _quasi speculo quodam dilucido_ ).

There is only one difficulty, and Gerald knows it: _auctoritatem nova non habent_ (“new things have no authority”). Gerald deploys this truism of the medieval theory of authorship in order to overcome it. And throughout Version II, Gerald builds on the themes of the _Introitus_ to bolster his claims of authority – through his proximity to the landscape as eyewitness of nature, as discussed above, and through added references to classical and early Christian authorities and additional examples of similar marvels.

To reinforce his claim of standing on the shoulders of authorities, Gerald peppers the first several chapters of the _Prima Distinctio_ with copious material from Solinus, Orosius, Isidore, and Bede. He adds an entire new chapter dedicated to them: _De caris Solini, Horosii, et Ysidorii, sententiis, quibusdam veris, quibusdam erroniis_ (“Concerning the opinions of Solinus, Orosius, and Isidore, some of which are true, some false”) (I.III), in which Gerald analyzes and attempts to synthesize the varying opinions of the ancients regarding Ireland’s size and shape. A few chapters later, he splits a discussion of the weather off from the chapter on fertility and creates a new chapter, _De ventositate, et pluvositate; earumque causis_ (“Concerning the wind
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and rain, and their causes”) (I.VI). In addition to adding a discussion of the rain and mists of Ireland, no doubt witnessed firsthand, he criticizes and corrects Bede’s and Solinus’s opinions about whether Ireland contains bees and vineyards. Perhaps realizing the delicate problem of criticizing one’s authorities, Gerald adds a pardon:

Still, these writers are entitled to their due share of praise for their careful and general correct investigation of subjects placed by distance so far beyond their observation. And, since nothing human is altogether perfect, and universal knowledge and freedom from error is the attribute of divinity, and not of mortals, any mistakes must be considered pardonable, as arising both from human imperfection and the remoteness of the country of which they treat. This indulgence we ask for ourselves, while we grant it to others, thinking nothing that concerns the human race is foreign to us.

This pardon reinforces Gerald’s authoritative stance in the Introitus. The mistakes of Isidore and Solinus are due in part to the human condition and in part to Ireland’s remoteness. While Gerald shares in their “human imperfection,” however, he can see farther than they – literally. His authority is greater because he has gone beyond their experiences in a very real way and actually traveled to Ireland. At the same time, he employs a truism, popularly attributed to Socrates, that “nothing that concerns the human race is foreign to us” (nihil unquam humanum a nobis alienum esse putantes). Nothing humanum to Gerald is foreign – alienum – because of the shared nature of humanity. Gerald is our proximate traveler to Ireland, but Ireland is not alienum because it is still humanum. This dichotomy opens up the space for Gerald to become an authority on humanum matters far beyond Ireland by virtue of shared experience, a proximity, in a sense, to all borderlands.

This outward-looking view draws on classical concepts and models while at the same time privileging Gerald’s personal experience in Ireland over the authority of books. This expansive view toward all things humanum, in a book that ostensibly treats only the “topography of Ireland,” begins to creep in through other additions in Version II that are there to bolster Gerald’s credibility through added examples that he has encountered. The list of wells with marvelous natural properties in the Secunda Distinctio (II.VII) is greatly expanded (and begins to cover marvelous woods), and a list of saints with similar miracles to that of St. Kevin is added in II.XXVIII. Interestingly, only one of the fourteen wells or woods of the added examples are located in Ireland: Gerald is providing these examples to bolster the credibility of his Irish claims, to situate Ireland’s marvels in like ones around Europe. These moments of transition
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between Ireland to Europe serve to highlight Ireland’s proximity rather than its Otherness, bringing Ireland closer to the center, rather than emphasizing its borderland status. At the same time, the paratactic additions read like a whirlwind tour of Europe, dizzyingly taking the reader from Ireland to Britain, France, Normandy, Norway, Hungary, Cornwall, back to France, and back to Ireland. This catalogue reminds the reader of the marvelous in everyday nature (not just Irish-Other nature), and of Gerald’s authorizing claim that he considers “nothing that concerns the human race foreign to our object.”

In Version I and the \textit{Introitus}, and played out through many of the additions in Version II, Gerald attempts to establish himself as a true authority on his topic by using and adapting classical and scholastic rhetorical moves. Whether reading the landscape as a diligent \textit{scrutator}, or standing on the pillars and traditions of classical texts, Gerald’s act of narrating Ireland is equally an act of narrating his own authority. However, it is clear that not all of Gerald’s listeners were convinced, either of the veracity of his material, or by his authorial self-positioning. In the next section, we shall consider how Gerald addresses his critics, which can be observed in the Preface to the \textit{Secunda Distinctio}, which was expanded in Version II and Version III.

\textbf{Good Readers, Bad Readers}

Part of establishing oneself as an authority involves addressing one’s critics. In the course of constructing his authority, Gerald draws on both his eyewitness \textit{scrutator} status and the \textit{auctoritas} of classical writers to make his case, reinforcing the idea that he is both a good reader of the landscape and of classical texts. When addressing his critics by adding sections that defend his own status, Gerald implies that it is the critic who is a bad reader, subtly shifting the dialogue from a question of “truth” to a question of “newness,” and offering his own model of reading to his audience.

In the \textit{Introitus}, Gerald acknowledges the relative audacity of his project, rhetorically asking the audience, \textit{Praesumptuosus itaque dicar, an providus?} (“Will it be said that I was presumptuous or provident?”), and referring obliquely to his critics by mentioning only \textit{invidiam in vita} (“envy in life”) compared with \textit{gloriam forte post fata} (“glory after death”).\footnote{GCO V, 5-6.} These defensive echoes are magnified in the internal prefaces to the work, signaling those particular sections in the \textit{distinctiones} that met with skepticism or critique.

This is particularly noticeable in the preface to the \textit{Secunda Distinctio}. Here, Gerald deletes the final lines of his original preface and adds three new paragraphs that are longer and more strongly worded. In Version I he asserts:

\begin{quote}
Scio tamen et certus sum, me nonnulla scripturum quae lectori vel impossibilia prorsus, vel etiam ridiculosa videbuntur. Sed ita me Dii amabilem praestent, ut nihil in libello apposuerim, cujus veritatem vel oculata fide, vel probatissimorum
\end{quote}
et authenticorum commprovincialium virorum testimonio, cum summa diligentia non elicuerim.

But I am aware that I shall describe some things that will seem to the reader to be either impossible or ridiculous. But I protest solemnly that I have put down nothing in this book the truth of which I have not found out either by the testimony of my own eyes, or that of reliable men found worthy of credence and coming from the districts in which the events took place.\textsuperscript{265}

In this passage, Gerald emphasizes that the truth (\textit{veritatem}) of all of the seemingly impossible things has been verified either by his own eyes (\textit{oculata fide}) or by the testimony of very honest and authentic men from those districts (\textit{probatissimorum et authenticorum commprovincialium virorum testimonio}). The emphasis is on Gerald’s own placement within the landscape he is narrating; he either sees these things himself, or gathers testimony from the very people populating his written landscape. The authenticity of his informants is a proxy for a chain of authenticity: authenticity of the informants, and thereby of the testimony, and thereby of the \textit{Topographia}, and thereby of Gerald, as proper judge and reader of the informants.

In Version II, Gerald inserts immediately after that passage a continued defense, but subtly recalibrating the relative veracity of the things he has seen and heard:

\begin{quote}
Nec mihi calumniae nubilia livor obducat. Quae nam oculis subjecta fidelibus ipse conspexi, firmiter et indubitanter haec assero; quae vero tantum demissa per aures, quia segnius irritant, horum non assertor sed recitator existo.
\end{quote}

Let me not, however, be involved in a cloud of malicious slander. What I have witnessed with my own eyes, that I assert firmly and without any hesitation. But what has only reached my ear through others, which I am slower to believe, that I do not affirm, but only relate.\textsuperscript{266}

Gerald’s distinction between “asserting” what he has seen and simply “reciting” what he has been told by others is a rather sophisticated comeback at the critics who have found the \textit{Topographia}’s marvels incredible. Here he echoes a position maintained by Abelard in the Prologue to his \textit{Sic et Non}, whose ethics of reading authority starts, as Gerald’s discourse, with a reflection on authorial presumption: in his attempt to remove only apparent contradictions between authoritative texts and identify “real” ones, Abelard develops the crucial distinction between an author’s own ideas and mere recitation of the statements of others:

\begin{quote}
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\end{quote}
We must also give equal consideration to the possibility that such statements may be among those made by the Fathers, but which have either been retracted by them elsewhere, when they have subsequently come to know the truth, as St. Augustine did in many instances, or alternatively they may have reported the opinions of others rather than stating their own conclusions.\(^\text{267}\)

Abelard goes on to describe Jerome’s position who, finding his work under scrutiny by Augustine, pleads that Augustine had failed to remember his preface, where Jerome says he was following the commentary of Origen. Abelard recites Jerome’s chastizing Augustine for not properly questioning whether the opinions expressed were his own or those of others, noting that it is up to the reader to be smart enough to distinguish between the two: “all the more so because I freely confessed in my preface that I had followed the commentary of Origen and had dictated views which were indifferently my own or other men’s, so that I might leave it to the reader’s discretion whether they should be approved or rejected.”\(^\text{268}\) In a similar way, by making the same distinction Gerald subtly shifts the onus onto the reader, placing less emphasis on his own proximity to the landscape and his questionable subject matter, and instead positioning himself as a literal Jerome in his study, taking into account the opinions of others, but not necessarily asserting them himself.

By appropriating this stance explicitly in Version II, Gerald causes the last lines of the preface to read differently. Where in Version I they seemed only to acknowledge expected differing opinions about Gerald’s work, in Version II they serve to highlight the requirement that the reader weigh and judge what is written:

Hoc etiam diligens lector advertat, quia historia veritati non parcit, potiusque vera quam verisimilia sectatur. Habeat hic igitur et praesens tempus quod laceret, et posteritas quod laudet; habeat hoc quod laedet, illa quod legat; habeat hoc quod damnnet, illa quod amat; habeat hoc quod reprobet, illa quod probet.

Let the diligent reader also remark that history must not be sparing of the truth, and that it rather chooses what is certain than what is probable. Let there be found here both what the present age may blame, and posterity applaud; what the one may rail at, the other read; what the one may condemn, the other love; what the one may reprove, the other approve.\(^\text{269}\)

In Version II, the role of the *diligens lector* includes distinguishing between what Gerald “asserts” and what he only “recites.” The antithetical pairings ending the preface thus scan in a


\(^{\text{268}}\) Ibid., 91.
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way that opposes a good reader and a bad one: whether a reader is one or the other is attributable to his own ability to judge what he is reading, and not to the actual veracity of Gerald’s content. Gerald thus introduces the idea of a bad or careless reader (a negligent lector), a subtext he will make more explicit in subsequent defenses of his work.

Another set of additions in Versions II and III echo his sentiment in the Introitus that auctoritatem nova non habent: new things have no authority. Whereas modern scholars often focus on the fictionality of Gerald’s prodigies, and theorize about the presentation of falsehoods as true things, Gerald’s discussion of his marvels frame them not in terms of a true/false binary, but a new/old spectrum – old things, as he says in the Introitus, having by nature authority because of their history. Quoting Pliny, Gerald says, Ardua res est vetustis novitatem dare, novis auctoritatem . . . (“The difficulty is giving old things novelty, and new things authority”). In one of the added paragraphs to Version II’s Preface to the Secunda Distinctio, Gerald reminds the reader that it is in the nova, the new things, that nature teaches and makes things known:

Semper enim, et quasi ex industria, seria sui negotia novis quibusdam natura depingit; ut sic manifeste doceat et declaret, quod licet humanis utcunque ingeniis usualia ejusdem opera valeant attendi, potentialis tamen effectus nequaeat comprehendi.

For nature always, and purposefully as it were, embroiders the course of her works with new things, so that she may openly teach and declare, that although her usual operations may be comprehended by the human understanding, her mighty power cannot be understood.

In Version III, Gerald adds a section which makes it clear that these new things are new only with respect to the reader or discoverer, and refutes the idea that nature’s new prodigies are incomprehensible. For as time passes, new things eventually become old, thus gaining authority by virtue of the passage of time:

Si quid ergo novum hic et inauditum emerserit, non statim lividi vel contemnant, vel demordeant; sed nunc ignoscendo, nunc approbando, studia procedere sinant.
Nam, ut ait poeta,
   Si patribus nostris novitas invisa fuisset,
   Ut nobis, quid nunc esset vetus, aut quid haberet
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If, therefore, anything should escape me which is new and unheard of, let it not be condemned and struck out even by the malicious, but sometimes pardonning, sometimes approving, let my task proceed. For as the poet sings: --

If our forefathers had hated anything new
As much as we do, what would now be ancient, or what would
The crowd have to read and peruse?

Let no one, therefore, condemn anything because it is new, which, as time passes on, while it is accused of novelty, ceases to be new.273

By inserting this passage into the *Secunda Distinctio*’s prologue, Gerald attempts to elide the question of truth or falsehood. He focuses instead on the idea of newness, implying that criticism against him is only based on the fact that his readers have never encountered the new marvels of the West in Ireland. Gerald contrasts his contemporary critics with their forefathers, complaining through Horace that if they had treated *novitas* with the same contempt, no literature would exist in his day. Gerald therefore enjoins his reader from premature critique, based only on the idea that it is “new.”

In the *Topographia*, Gerald emphasizes both his role as first-person *scrutator* and as a classicizing *auctor* when addressing his critics. In doing so, he attempts to reinforce the idea that above all, he is a good reader, both of the landscape of Ireland and of the canon of previous literature. Indeed, he encourages his readers to emulate him in “pardoning” any misleading information and indulging the writer in his small errors. Gerald thus attempts to model in his rejoinders a type of sympathetic reading that finds wonder and delight in the new, rather than focusing on the question of true accuracy.

This model of sympathetic, wondrous reading has appeared twice before in the *Topographia*. The first is in the “Second” Preface, when Gerald, as a *diligens scrutator*, “reads” the landscape of Ireland.274 The second is when Gerald reads the miraculous Book at Kildare.275 Gerald’s famous description of this ancient book, located at Kildare, brings to mind the Book of Kells (ca. 800), a lavishly decorated Insular manuscript of the Gospels. Both are characterized by intricate knotted designs, illuminated carpet pages, and symbolic depictions of the Evangelists. In this passage, Gerald breaks out of his first- or third-person narration and

---

273 GCO V, 76; Forester 58 with some modifications. The quotation (altered somewhat by Gerald) is from *Horace Epistulæ* II.90-93. The original is:

*Quodsi tam Graecis novitas invisa fuisset*

*quam nobis, quid nunc esset vetus? Aut quid haberet*

*quod legeret tereretque viritim publicus usus?*

274 See above, “Composing the Landscape of Ireland.”

275 Ch. II.XXXVIII.
addresses the reader with second-person urgency. He directs the readers’ eyes along the imagined page:

_Hic Majestatis vultum videas divinitus impressum; hinc mysticas Evangelistarum formas, nunc senas, nunc quaternas, nunc binas alas habentes; hinc aquilam, inde vitulum, hinc hominis faciem, inde leonis; aliasque figuras fere infinitas. Quas si superficialiter et usuali more minus acute conspexeris, litura potius videbitur quam ligatura; nec ullam prorsus attendes subtilitatem, ubi nihil tamen praeter subtilitatem. Sin autem ad perspicacius intuendum oculorum aciem invitaveris, et longe penitus ad artis arcana transpenetraveris, tam delicatas et subtiles, tam arctas et artitas, tam nodosas et vinculatim colligatas, tamque recentibus adhuc coloribus illustratas notare poteris intricaturas, ut vere haec omnia potius angelica quam humana diligentia jam asseververis esse composita._

This book contains the harmony of the Four Evangelists according to Jerome, where for almost every page there are different designs, distinguished by varied colours. Here you may see the face of majesty, divinely drawn, here the mystic symbols of the Evangelists, each with wings, now six, now four, now two; here the eagle, there the calf, here the man and there the lion, and other forms almost infinite. Look at them superficially with the ordinary glance, and you would think it is an erasure, and not tracery. Fine craftsmanship is all about you, but you might not notice it. Look more keenly at it and you will penetrate to the very shrine of art. You will make out intricacies, so delicate and so subtle, so full of knots and links, with colours so fresh and vivid, that you might say that all this were the work of an angel, and not of a man.\textsuperscript{276}

As if reinforcing the merits of this type of reading, Gerald adds to this description in Version II, _Haec equidem quanto frequentius et diligentius intueor, semper quasi novis obstupeo, semper magis ac magis admiranda conspicio._ ("For my part, the oftener I see the book, and the more carefully I study it, the more I am lost in ever fresh amazement, and I see more and more wonders in the book.")\textsuperscript{277}

By employing the second-person through vivid description or rhetorical _enargia_, Gerald recreates the Book of Kildare through his own words, and narrates the page while the reader stands in the place of the viewer, which creates, for that moment, a model reader. Through a series of juxtapositions, Gerald leads the reader on an imagined trip through the pages of an

\textsuperscript{276} GCO V, 123. The vivid translation of this passage comes E. H. Alton, _Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Cenannensis_ (Berne, 1950-1) 15, quoted in Françoise Henry, *The Book of Kells: Reproductions from the Manuscript in Trinity College, Dublin* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1977) 165. Gerald’s text has been associated with the Book of Kells throughout 20\textsuperscript{th} and 21\textsuperscript{st} century scholarship.

\textsuperscript{277} GCO V, 124; Henry [Alton], 165.
illuminated manuscript, going *hinc* to *inde* as the eye “penetrates into the secrets of the artistry” (*ad artis arcana transpenetraveris*). This should immediately remind the reader of the secrets of the ocean and hidden recesses of nature that Henry penetrates in his literary conquest of Ireland: *oceani secreta, et occulta naturae deposita transpenetraveris.* The parallelism is, I contend, no accident: Gerald imagines his reader reading the *Topographia* in just the same way that he himself read both the book of Kildare and the landscape of Ireland, and just as Henry II was to have both literally and literarily conquered the text.

In this passage, then, there are no “true” or “false” things, only good and bad readers. A careless reader (*superficialiter*) will only see *litura* rather than *ligatura*, only manuscript erasures rather than the intricate knotted tracery within the drawing. But a good reader will be rewarded with new discoveries as the eye ranges across the page; he will feel, as Gerald does, an ever increasing admiration, *semper magis ac magis admiranda* (“always more and more things to be admired”). Through the example of viewing an illuminated page, Gerald gives each of his readers a tutorial on reading his text. The *Topographia* is designed exactly for this kind of roving, non-linear reading. The *distinctio* format does not allow the building up of meaning through narrative logic, but the dispersal of meaning throughout discrete *distinctiones* and *capitula*. Taken as a whole, they create the *Topographia Hibernica*. But like the miraculous Book of Kildare, the wonder is in the details: in the wonderful natural attributes of the moralized birds, the salmon’s leap, the local miracles, and in each separate and glittering answer to Gerald’s questions. For Gerald, wonder is the pleasurable emotion that comes from understanding that there is a gap between what you see, and what you can *come to see* through diligent and further inquiry. In the *Topographia* Gerald advocates a model of continued looking, first ranging along the open ground (*hinc, inde*), then stopping at a point and “penetrating through” (*transpenetrare*) the surface to the deeper meaning. Through the eventual building up of discrete wonders, the character of the landscape of Ireland takes shape.

This type of reading that advocates both taking in the whole, but then reaching in and penetrating the deeper meaning of discrete detail is exactly the method that Gerald advises William de Vere to follow in a letter that accompanies seven of the ten manuscripts of Version III of the *Topographia*. In this letter, Gerald presents a new type of reading especially suited to experience of the individual reader, which combines the disparate categories of “directed” or “determined” reading and varied reading. This combination deliberately turns some advice of Seneca on its head, again showing how Gerald appropriates classical models for his own uses. The letter begins:

*Guillelmo Herefordensi episcopo:*

*Lectio certa prodest, varia delectat. Si ergo legendo proficere quaeris, primo continetiam operis cum diligentia seriatim transcurras, quatinus et materiae*

---

278 GCO V, 190.  
tenor, et tractandi modus, et rerum cohaerentia cuncta patescant. Quoties vero, transcurso volumine, delectari volueris, circa titulos istos verseris.

To William, Bishop of Hereford:
Determined reading is useful; varied reading is pleasurable. If therefore you seek to profit by reading, first you should diligently go through the contents of the work in order, where the tenor of the material, the way of treating it, and the coherence of the items are all laid open. But when you want to be delighted, after you’ve run through the book, you should turn to these chapter titles.  

He then lists the chapters he believes William will most enjoy.

The first line of Gerald’s letter comes from one of Seneca’s letters to Lucilius:

Librorum istic inopiam esse quereris. Non refert quam multos sed quam bonos habeas: lectio certa prodest, varia delectat. Qui quo destinavit pervenire vult unam sequatur viam, non per multas vagetur: non ire istuc sed errare est.

You have complained that there [in Syracuse] there are few books. But what matters is that you have good books, not many: determined reading is useful; varied reading is only pleasurable. He who wishes to arrive at a destination must follow one road, not wander through many ways: that is not to advance, but to go astray.

Seneca instructs Lucilius that there is one way (unam viam) through the text, and that to take many paths is not to go forward (ire) but to err (errare). Gerald appropriates Seneca’s line to direct William de Vere in the exact opposite type of reading. Thanks to the textual map provided by the manuscript’s table of contents and chapter headings, varied reading now is directed reading, and pleasure can result from making one’s own way through the most interesting chapters. Once William has gone through the book to understand the coherence and scope of the material, Gerald encourages his ranging eye to go particularly and deeply into those individual chapters he lists as being the most pleasurable, which he includes, arranged by distinctio.

By authorizing this kind of pleasurable reading, and by including this letter with the majority of the Version III manuscripts, Gerald instructs William and his readers at large in a type of reading that dips in and out of the text, choosing certain chapters and skipping over others. This type of reading is facilitated by the distinctio format. On the one hand, the strict structural logic of the distinctio renders the full scope and coherence of the text fairly quickly grasped by the reader; Gerald can describe the entire contents of the work in one paragraph in the

280 GCO V, 203.
281 Seneca, Epistulae morales ad Lucilium, Liber V, Ep. XLV.
On the other hand, unconstrained by a linear narrative, a reader is free to range back and forth along the *distinctio*’s horizontal branches, considering single chapters, and delighting in seeking the *ligatura* within. This encourages the reader to contemplate the possible moral and allegorical significances of the subject matter beyond the text: the very open-endedness of the *distinctio* expecting and allowing for the readers’ own prospective contributions.

Gerald’s choices for chapters that would provide delight through wonder are telling. In the *Prima Distinctio*, he recommends the section on bird moralizations, and the comparison between East and West, which emphasizes the connection between the two signifying landscapes, and the ability for the West to stand in for the East. In the *Tertia Distinctio*, and at the end of the letter, Gerald recommends his new chapters on music (added in Version II), which tell how music survived the Flood by being written down on stone pillars, and then renewed by King David. And in *Secunda Distinctio*, he recommends the chapters on hybrids, as well as, significantly, the chapter on the miraculous book of Kildare. All of these chapters emphasize Gerald’s role as author and reader of the landscape, modeling a useful legibility of the sensible world.

But the sensible world cannot be read in a vacuum; it must be accompanied by the appropriate textual index. Interestingly, the chapters on hybrids that Gerald recommends are exactly those chapters that seem to have given the most fodder to Gerald’s critics. Shortly after Version II of the *Topographia*, Gerald gives voice to his critics in the preface to the *Expugnatio Hibernica* (α-version c. 1190s). The critics, whom Gerald personifies as Livor, envy, attack the hybrids in the second book. Gerald responds by suggesting that Envy is a bad reader, and ought to brush up on its reading:


---

282 GCO V, 7-8, beginning *Est itaque trimembris operis hujus partitio.*

283 Stephen Nichols considers the chapters on music and King David as providing authorial models for Gerald in the *Itinerarium Kambriae* in his “Fission and Fusion: Meditations of Power in Medieval History and Literature,” *Yale French Studies* 70 (1986): 21-41. The authorizing functions of the bird moralizations and the miraculous book of Kildare were discussed above.
It makes its accusation as follows: ‘He brings into his book a wolf talking with a priest; he describes a human body with the extremities of an ox, a bearded woman, and a goat copulating with a woman.’ But the reader who finds such accounts so offensive should read in the book of Numbers the account of Balaam’s ass talking and rebuking the prophet. He should read the Lives of the Fathers, and read there the faun talking with St. Anthony. He should read about the crow which was the means of refreshing Paul’s hunger with bread, and how that kindly gift was doubled because he had a guest. He should read many of St. Jerome’s other books. He should read Gregory’s Dialogue[s]. He should read Augustine, On the City of God. He should be particularly careful not to omit books sixteen and twenty-one, which are full of prodigies. He should read too the eleventh book of the Etymologies of Isidore concerning portents, also the twelfth concerning animals, and the sixteenth, which deals with precious stones and their powers. In all of these things he will find many stories which he may then carp at with envy’s tooth. I repeat, let him read these, and let him condemn in toto the words of noble writers because of certain prodigies included in them.

In this passage, Envy is a bad reader, complaining and condemning Gerald’s work based on a few passages that contain prodigies which, Gerald rightly points out, are very similar to those contained in other authoritative works. Gerald is suggesting the place where his work fits in, as if inserting the Topographia on a library shelf. The main difference between Gerald’s Topographia and Isidore’s Etymologies is authority: because Gerald’s prodigies are new, they are said to lack credibility.

Gerald attempts to overcome this criticism by suggesting the literary canon within which his book should be read, and trying to suggest and control the audience’s reading experience through examples. He attempts to show his mastery and skill at creating signifying landscapes comparable to the far-off portentous borderlands described in, for example, Isidore’s Etymologies. He accuses those readers who criticize his works of simply being bad readers, either ill-versed in classical literature, or reading his text only superficially, and missing the meaning found within the knotted ligatura. As he directs his text away from a royal audience to a clerical one, Gerald makes these elements of good and bad readership more and more prominent, seeking to ensure his own literary influence beyond the court. While fashioning his authoritative voice, Gerald takes pains to assure his reader that he himself is a diligens scrutator.

---

284 Scott and Martin, Expugnatio Hibernica, 4-5; ll. 50-65. Scott and Martin translate prodigia as “miracles,” which is misleading in this type of study, so the translation has been amended to “prodigies.”

of the landscape, and a good judge of *viorum authenticorum*. At the same time, he challenges his readers’ ability to read his text properly, requiring them to discriminate between what he is “asserting” and what he is only “relating,” to be familiar with the proper textual canon in which the *Topographia*’s marvels are best understood, and most of all, to approach his text with the appropriate sense of sympathetic wonder and delight in nature’s marvels.

**Crisis of the Signifying Landscape**

In constantly reinforcing his own authoritative voice, however, and making such demands on his readers, Gerald doth protest too much. While some critics no doubt unfairly maligned the *Topographia* for its newfangled subject matter, by Versions III and IV, the revisions to the work displayed a real crisis of authorial confidence. After the failure of the Third Crusade, much of the symbolic capital of the *Topographia*’s subtext of *conquaestum* was lost. With the text unmoored from a colonialist discourse, Gerald’s position as an authorizing, figural reader of the landscape was severely called into question. In later readings of the *Topographia*, Gerald’s proximity to Ireland seems to become a liability, as he himself is marginalized, becoming a hybrid figure on his own written landscape.

The revised timeline of the versions of the *Topographia* shed important new light on Version III and Version IV’s additions. Robert Bartlett, as noted above, felt that the largely discursive and theological additions represented a “drift . . . from topography and history to hagiography” due to both his disappointment in the royal court (from which he retired c. 1196

286), and the “wearying litigation of the St. David’s case.”

287 In fact, Gerald’s shift was due to one, but not the other: as discussed in Chapter 1, Gerald did not embark on the St. David’s case until after Version IV was completed. Instead, his shift to theologically informed discourse (which is really only borne out in the bird moralizations, particularly the chapter on the eagle, I.XIII) was due to his recasting of the *Topographia* for a specifically clerical audience. This had started as early as Version II in 1189, with the reading at Oxford, and increased in substantive focus (if not in quantity of additions) in Versions III and IV. Gerald’s increased efforts to engage in a theological discourse were all the more urgent considering his loss of stature at court after his retirement due to lack of advancement.

Gerald’s loss of a courtly audience, however, had a more critical consequence. Through Version II, Gerald’s text looked forward to prospective completion by his (particularly courtly) readers: *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum*. The subtext of conquest gave Gerald’s landscape of Ireland its significance. The frog portending the coming of the English and the fish with three gold teeth were supposed to have been evidence of successful conquest. Gerald’s ability to recognize and authorize these portents was supposed to build up symbolic capital in his efforts to influence political and religious policy regarding both the Irish and the Crusades. Henry II was

---

286 Henry II died in 1189 and Richard was crowned shortly thereafter. Gerald retired from Richard’s court c. 1196.

287 Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales*, 121. Please note the page number references the 2006 version.
supposed to have subdued Ireland as a proxy or preparation for crusade in the East. Gerald was supposed to have accompanied Baldwin on a triumphant, God-inspired, history-making crusade to liberate Jerusalem.

By 1192, however, everything had changed. Henry II was dead, having never made good on his promise to go to Jerusalem. Baldwin had died at the Siege of Acre in 1191. Richard had not liberated Jerusalem, but had concluded a truce with Saladin to allow Christian pilgrims to visit the city. Richard himself had refused to look upon it, and he had been captured and held ransom on the continent until 1194. In the space of one year, 1191-92, Gerald experienced an authorial crisis: the loss of his best reader and patron Archbishop Baldwin, and the loss of the crusading subtext significance for the *Topographia*. The *Topographia*’s call for conquest would never be answered.

These failures cause a crisis of significance for the *Topographia*. If the *Topographia* is best understood, as so many scholars interpret it, within the context of Irish conquest and crusade, what becomes of the text in 1192, when that context no longer has meaning? Against a backdrop of failure, the *Topographia*’s call for *conquastum* would seem naive and anachronistic. Gerald’s authoritative stance as a *diligens scrutator* and *lector* of the landscape is severely impaired. More and more critical eyes are turned on Gerald’s landscape, and, by extension, on Gerald himself.

Gerald addresses this interpretive crisis by attempting to strengthen the work’s structural and contextual scaffolding. Gerald’s careful directions to his readers and the emphasis he places on his own authority can be interpreted as a reaction to a crisis of meaning. Previously, the reception of Gerald’s text had been well under his control: it was read (probably aloud) while he was at court, read aloud while he accompanied Baldwin through Wales, and read aloud in lecture format at Oxford. Once the manuscript began circulating without its author (probably Version II, the *opus completus et correctus*), Gerald had less and less control over its reception and interpretation by critics.

Lacking the solid cultural context of crusade, in Version III and IV Gerald adds literary context: extra-textual material that was marginal to main text, but provided an interpretive framework that traveled with the text. This extra-textual material focuses on mapping and visualization. Seven of the ten manuscripts of Version III include the letter to William de Vere suggesting how to read the work profitably and enjoyably. The letter also draws attention to the manuscripts’ tables of contents, chapter headings, and other visual cues. In particular, Gerald

---

288 Gerald’s interpretation of the Conquest of Ireland is as a proxy or preparation for Crusade, not knowing whether Henry would actually go. Henry had originally vowed to go on Crusade as part of his penance for the murder of Thomas Becket, and sent a steady stream of money there, allegedly in preparation for his eventual departure. In the *Expugnatio*, Gerald describes how the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Hereclius, begged Henry II to take the keys to the kingdom just before it fell to Saladin, and then, when Henry refused, requested that he send one of his sons. Scott and Martin, *Expugnatio*, Book II Ch. 27, 200-201, ll. 19-27. Instead, Henry sent John to Ireland. Hans Meyer discusses Henry’s methods in “Henry II and the Holy Land.” *English Historical Review* 97.385 (1982): 721-739, noting that, had John gone to Jerusalem, Henry’s swelling bank account would have been able to be opened. See also the discussion below, text associated with note 324.
remarks on his notulae, saying, “Also I have placed little notes opposite passages with the most notable sentences as well as words; in order to direct the eyes of the reader more easily, having been signaled by a note.” Four of the manuscripts that contain the letter to William also contain a map showing the orientation of Ireland to England, the Hebrides, and the Orkneys (Plate 1), providing a visualization of the landscape of Ireland to complement the textual one. The map of Ireland concretizes the literary landscape of Ireland, providing the illusion of solid ground upon which Gerald has built his now-seismically uncertain text.

While stressing the solidity of his own authoritative stance, Gerald simultaneously backpedals on some of his previous interpretations. As previously discussed, in response to disillusionment with the court and failure of Irish conquest, Gerald severely qualifies the two most potent marvels indicating conquaestum: the frog portending conquest, and the fish with three gold teeth. These changes show that Gerald no longer believed the Angevin house, so disappointing in both quaestum and conquaestum, would ever fulfill his text. But they also indicate Gerald’s own failure – failure as an author to properly read the landscape – and Gerald scrambled to qualify them in the face of his critics. In fact, no other marvel in the Topographia is qualified and altered through the versions as much as the fish with three gold teeth, where in Version III Gerald takes the rare and drastic step of deleting and rewriting his description. It reads through the versions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I (M)</th>
<th>Version II (W)</th>
<th>Version III (Cmarg, A, R)</th>
<th>Version IV (Rmarg, F, Ba)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bienno elapso ante adventum Anglorum in insulam tempore, in Ultonia apud Karlenefordiam, inventus est piscis tam qualitatis quam quantitatis inusitatae: inter alia sui prodigia, tres dentes aureos habens quinquaginta unciarum pondus continent, aurea, ut videtur, imminentis et</td>
<td>Non multm ante adventum Anglorum in insulam tempore, in Ultonia apud Karlenefordiam, inventus est piscis tam quantitatis immensae, quam qualitatis inusitatae: inter alia sui prodigia, tres dentes, ut fertur, aureos habens quinquaginta unciarum pondus</td>
<td>Non multo ante adventum Anglorum in insulam tempore, in Ultonia apud Karlenefordiam, inventus est piscis tam quantitatis immensae, quam qualitatis inusitatae: inter alia sui prodigia, tres dentes, ut fertur, aureos habens. Quos aureos quidem exteriore quadam</td>
<td>Non multo ante adventum Anglorum in insulam tempore, in Ultonia apud Karlenefordiam, inventus est piscis tam quantitatis immensae, quam qualitatis inusitatae: inter alia sui prodigia, tres dentes, ut fertur, aureos habens. Quos aureos quidem exteriore quadam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

289 Readings based on GCO V, 93. Manuscript C is a good example of the continuous flow of revisions here: its main body text contains the line Quos aureos quidem exteriore quadam similitudine, but has the continuing thought aurique nitore potius quam natura, crediderim in the margins (indicated “Cmarg”). Manuscript R likewise contains the detail of the deer with gold teeth in its margins, its body text otherwise representing Version III (indicated “Rmarg”).
proximo futurae conquisitionis tempora praesagientes.

continentes, aurea forte imminentes et proximo futurae conquisitionis tempora praesagientes.

similitudine, aurique nitore potius quam natura, crediderim; assumpti coloris fuco aurea forte imminens et proximo futurae conquisitionis tempora praesagientes.

similitudine, aurique nitore potius quam natura, crediderim; assumpti coloris fuco aurea forte imminens et proximo futurae conquisitionis tempora praesagientes.

Nostris quoque diebus, in Britannia majori, foresta scilicet Dunholmensi, inventa et capta est cerva, omnes in ore dentes aurei coloris habens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 3: Version Comparison of the Fish with Three Gold Teeth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Version I is both the most concrete and “marvelous” version: the marvel is placed precisely two years before the coming of the English, it is marvelous in both size and quality, it has three gold teeth weighing fifty ounces, and the gold, it seems, presages future conquest. In Version II, the marvel begins to lose some of its concrete outline: Two years has been changed to “not long before.” The fish is as large in size as it is marvelous in quality, tam quantitatis immensae, quam qualitatis inusitatae. “It is said” (ut fertur) that the three teeth are gold and weigh fifty ounces, and the gold “perhaps” presages future conquest. In Version III, the teeth no longer weigh fifty ounces, suggesting that the fish is not as large as reported in the previous versions, and they are no longer made of gold, but have only the appearance of gold. Gerald inserts the rare first-person editorial aside, “I believe that this ‘gold’ had the outward appearance and the brightness of gold, but not its true nature.” In Version IV, Gerald adds that a deer with “gold-colored teeth” had been discovered. The discovery of this creature supports the possibility of the fish’s existence in nature, but does not support its signifying power. The accompanying illustration, added in Version IV’s illustrative program,290 depicts the deer, but not the fish. Without the expectation of conquaestum, this marvel’s existence in the Topographia is problematic for Gerald. What should have figured a successful English conquest now announces not only Angevin failure to subdue Ireland, but Gerald’s failure to appropriately read and interpret the landscape. Gerald’s revisions are hesitant and reluctant, taking place across all four versions. His trajectory of qualification illustrates Gerald’s continual process of negotiation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

290 See discussion in Chapter 1, “Version IV.”
among his readers, his text, and his landscape. The fish is ultimately reduced to a mere suggested marvel on the landscape, like the deer, and Gerald’s own stance vis-à-vis the fish is called into question. Gerald’s hesitation to discredit his own narrated marvel exposes his authoritative stance to criticism. This qualification questions not only the propriety of Angevin conquaestum, but also Gerald’s own ability as scrutator to interpret the landscape. This was one marvel that he misread.

In addition, the most significant textual change to Version III shows Gerald turning to formal scholastic techniques to attempt to interpret his landscape in a fashion more recognizable to his clerical audience. In the Secunda Distinctio, Gerald adds an extended discussion on monsters to the chapter De lupo cum sacerdote loquente, “of a wolf speaking with a priest” (II.XIX). In this encounter, a wolf convinces a priest to administer the Eucharist to his dying she-wolf companion by pulling down her wolf skin and demonstrating that she is human within. This done, as Gerald says, more duly rather than rightly (rite potius quam recte), the priest later confesses to the bishop, who asked Gerald’s opinion on the matter. Gerald recommends that the priest be sent to the pope with sealed letters to receive advice.

In Version III, Gerald tacks onto this passage a long scholastic quaestio, beginning, Sed animal hujusmodi brutum an homo dicetur? (“Was this creature a man or brute?”) After reframing the question in several ways, he concedes, Sed miracula divina sunt admiranda, non in rationem humanae disputationis trahenda. (“But divine miracles must be admired, not subjected to the reason of human disputation.”) Despite this, Gerald continues doing exactly that, and considers the question from the perspective of St. Augustine, and Gerald’s own observations, for seven additional paragraphs. Quoting directly from Augustine’s City of God, Gerald cites two instances where Augustine considers the humanity of monsters, and comes to the conclusion that they are, in fact, human. First, Augustine concludes that the Plinian races are human; he distinguishes between the monstrous body and the human mind, and concludes that “whatever answers to the definition of man, as a rational and mortal animal, whatever be its form, is to be considered a man” (quicquid hominis definitionem, animal scilicet rationale mortale, sub quacunque forma recipit, illud hominem esse vera ratione testatur). Second, Augustine concedes that the Arcadians, who transform into wolves when they cross a certain lake, were also still human: nec tamen in eis mentem fieri bestiale, sed rationele humanamque servari (“nevertheless their minds did not become bestial, but remained human and rational”).

Gerald then adds his own local examples within the framework of the quaestio. Gerald’s examples, however, are more troubling, and not easily reconciled with Augustine’s. He describes those who magicis artibus (“with magical arts”) can change men into pigs, or how witches (vetulas) in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland could transform themselves into hares in order

---

291 GCO V, 105.
292 GCO V, 105.
293 GCO V, 105; De Civ. Dei, xvi, 8.
294 GCO V, 105; De Civ. Dei, xviii, 18.
steal milk from others’ cows.\textsuperscript{295} Including these marvels results in something of an epistemological quandary: they are only changed in outward form, and not in substance. Gerald is at pains to synthesize these folkloric tales with Christian theology while at the same time distinguishing between their relative powers, saying:

Daemones igitur seu malos homines sicut nec creare ita nec naturas veraciter mutare posse, simul cum Augustino sentimus. Sed speciemenus, quae a vero Deo creata sunt, ipso permittente, commutant; ut scilicet videantur esse quod non sunt; sensibus ominum mira illusione captis et sopitis, quatinus res non videant sicut se habent, sed ad falsas quasdam et fictitias videndum formas, vi phantasmatis seu magicae incantationis, mirabiliter abstrahantur.

We agree then, with Augustine, that neither demons nor wicked men can either create or really change their natures; but those whom God has created can, to outward appearance, by his permission, become transformed, so that they appear to be what they are not; the senses of men being deceived and laid asleep by a strange illusion, so that things are not seen as they actually exist, but are strangely drawn by the power of some phantom or magical incantation to rest their eyes on unreal and fictitious forms.\textsuperscript{296}

The fictitious forms here should give us pause. Up to this point, Gerald has unequivocally crafted his position as a \textit{diligens scrutator} of the landscape, promising to portray Ireland as in a “clear mirror” (\textit{quasi speculo dilucido}). He has taken testimony \textit{virorum authenticorum} (“from authentic men”) and seen things \textit{oculis [su]is} (“with his own eyes”). His has recommended careful, diligent models of reading that delight in seeing miraculous forms materialize in the Book of Kildare. He has interpreted the natural attributes of the birds of Ireland as if inspired by the same spirit (\textit{eodem spiritu}) as those authorities and hagiographers of old. The suggestion that men’s eyes may be deceived by outward appearances, that these outward appearances may be changed by men (with the permission of God, no less!) seems to directly counter Gerald’s entire firsthand interpretive stance. These \textit{falsas et fictitias formas}, I contend, are not an interpretive challenge to which Gerald holds the answer – not, as Rollo argues, a derisive mockery of the Angevin house. Rather, they function as an acknowledgement by Gerald of the limits of firsthand, eye-witness testimony – of the limits of authorial knowledge when faced with empirical reality.

Gerald extends this acknowledgment of the limits of human understanding to biblical miracles. Continuing his \textit{quaestio}, Gerald contrasts the magical ability to change outward appearances with God’s ability to change forms entirely, such as by turning Lot’s wife into a
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pillar of salt, or water into wine. Gerald ends the chapter by broaching the nature of transubstantiation, which, being ineffable, he refuses to consider:

De illa vero speciali panis in corpus Christi mutatione, nec speciali tamen, immo verius substantiali, quia specie tota manente substantia sola mutatur, hic praetereundum tutius existimavi. Quoniam supra humanam longe intelligentiam alta nimis et ardua est ejus complexio.

Of course that apparent change of the bread into the body of Christ (which I ought not to call apparent only, but with more truth transubstantial, because, while the outward appearance remains the same, the substance only is changed), I have thought it safest not to treat; its comprehension being far beyond the powers of the human intellect.297

Gerald has abruptly run into the utter limit of human understanding. The mystery of the Eucharist is a change in inward substance, not outward appearance, but it still relies on the incantations of men during Mass. This rather troublingly aligns it more closely with the magical incantations of wicked men than with the straightforward, visually apparent changes of Lot’s wife or water to wine. Gerald’s foray into theologically informed discourse on the substance of things has resulted in uncertainty about the hybrid Body of Christ as both bread and body, a subject that will be treated at length during the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Gerald displays a discomfort with the limits of his human senses, an inability to distinguish deceptive appearances from true transubstantial changes. Gerald no doubt thought that, in including this discussion, he could bolster the theological strength of his Topographia, and in doing so change its nature from a text seeking conquaestum to one seeking to engage with a sophisticated, theological audience. Instead, Gerald has introduced textual evidence of the real crisis facing his Topographia: unmoored by the lack of a colonial subtext, Gerald’s own interpretive abilities are questioned. Gerald is realizing the possibility that he, like the men tricked by falsas formas, has misread the landscape of Ireland.

But by bringing this question to the forefront within a scholastic quaestio, Gerald is able to control the extent of the interpretive doubt presented, as well as to reframe his presentation of the hybrids in the Secunda Distinctio. Version I and II of the De lupo passage leave the reader focused on Gerald’s own role in advising the bishop. If the reader trusts Gerald as an author, his appearance within the narrative provides strong evidence of his privileged, eyewitness stance. When Gerald’s initial interpretation – that the hybrids provide justification for conquest – proves false, however, this proximity to his monstrous subject matter casts Gerald as less reliable, a character on his marvel-ridden landscape rather than an author in control of his material. Version III’s scholastic quaestio redirects the discourse on hybrids from conquest to taxonomy within an Augustinian framework. This shows Gerald actively redirecting his text for a clerical
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audience, as well as putting much-needed narrative distance between him and his subject-matter through formal, scholastic interpretive techniques. Finally, the *quaestio* allows Gerald to systematically critique his own monsters without diminishing his authorial stance.

Gerald critiques other hybrids in Version III as well, adding sections to the episodes of the half-ox man (II.XXI) and the goat having intercourse with a woman (II.XXIII) that again question the general nature and humanity of the hybrids using a scholastic approach. This preempts the reader from questioning the veracity of the monsters’ existence by steering the ends of the chapters to balanced, rational discourse. And most tellingly, Gerald adopts a new emotional stance toward the marvels – that of fear – which further distances him from his topic. Gerald adds to the end of the chapter on the half-ox man (*a homo prodigiosus*), *Sed excursus hujusmodi sunt excusandi: potiusque timenda est naturae vindicta, quam disputatione dicutienda;* “but nature’s eccentricities of this kind are to be excused, rather her judgments are more to be dreaded than made the subject of disputation.”298 This echoes Gerald’s insistence in the *De lupo* chapter that miracles were to be admired rather than treated in discussion (*Sed miracula divina sunt admiranda, non in rationem humanae disputationis trahenda*), but its tone is much more ominous. Here, Gerald distinguishes clearly between natural marvels and divine miracles, a distinction which he had always made structurally, but never enforced substantively. Until Version III, Gerald never suggested that natural marvels should be feared, *timenda*, while miracles admired, *admiranda*. Rather, he had consistently employed the language of wonder throughout both natural marvels and miracles – and certainly never suggested that one ought to refuse to inquire into a natural marvel because of *fear*.

What is Gerald afraid of? On the one hand, his addition two chapters later to the episode of the goat having intercourse with a woman would suggest that Gerald is fearful that the excesses of nature are actually the transgressions of man: bestiality. He had already provided a verse, in the style of Alain de Lille, condemning inversion of sexuality “without nature”:

Omnia jam novitate juvant; nova grata voluptas,
Et naturalis inveterata Venus.
Arte minus natura placet; consumitur usus
In reprobos ratio, jam ratione carens.

It is only in their novelty that things are now held to be pleasant. New delights are enjoyed, and the natural Venus is now obsolete. Nature pleases less than art. Reason, now lacking reason, is consumed in loathsome acts.299

There is of course some irony here: Gerald encourages his readers to take pleasure in the newness of his subject matter, which he adamantly defends elsewhere in the *Topographia*. But
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reading and writing about the *nova et notabilia* of Ireland is quite different than engaging in the *nova voluptas* of bestial sex: one takes pleasure in the wonders of nature while the other engages in *arte minus natura*, a false, unnatural Venus, lacking reason. In Version III, Gerald adds a second verse, diluting some of the focus on newness, and instead closing the loop on what he had previously left unsaid:

*Vis genitiva gemit, violata cupidinis arte;*
*Et violans vindex publicat ira scelus.*
*Pandit enim natura nefas; proditque pudorem*
*Criminis infandi, prodigiosa creans.*

The genitive force whimpers, violated by the art of lust. By her anger, the violating avenger proclaims his crime. For Nature attests infamy, and revealing the shame of an unspeakable crime, she creates prodigies.  

In this verse, Gerald explicitly announces that the hybrid bodies described in the *Secunda Distinctio* are announcing the *pudorem criminis infandi*, bestiality. Earlier versions contained a strong condemnation of the sections dealing overtly with bestial sex (II.XXIII and II.XXIV), but contained ambiguous and vaguely sympathetic words for, for example, the *semibovus vir* at Maurice’s court, who “did not merit” his death at the hands of youths who suspected he was born of a cow.  

With the addition of this verse, however, Gerald casts suspicion on all the hybrid marvels, and he invokes the orthodox discourse, popularized through Alain de Lille’s work *De planctu Naturae*, that unnatural sex (*contra naturam*) of any kind was to be demonized, and that Nature herself would announce the shame in these acts through prodigies.

This is very different from the playful and fascinating Nature of Version I, where Gerald states in the Preface that she, *tanquam seriis et veris fatigata negotiis, paululum secedit et excedit, remotis in partibus, quasi verecundis et occultis natura ludit excessibus* (“as if tired of serious affairs and realities, Nature withdraws and retires a little, and seems to play with secret and hidden excesses in the remote places of the world”). In that Version, Gerald delights in gathering the marvels of natures like gems, placing them in order, and presenting them to his audience. In Version III, however, Nature’s excesses are unambiguous signs of unnatural crimes, and are to be feared, rather than admired. Gerald’s fear of Nature’s excesses may be attributable to his new setting of Lincoln, home of the eminent theologian William de Montibus, whose school Gerald had retired to after leaving Richard’s court in 1196.

While William also looked to nature to provide analogies and morals – and even incorporated several of Gerald’s

---
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own bird descriptions in his *Similitudinarium* – his approach was not to wonder at Nature for nature’s sake, but explicitly to reveal the theological kernel within the nut. Gerald’s condemnation of his own “delight in the new,” coming so late in the versions, would seem to be due to his attempt to align himself with theological orthodoxy after losing his position at court.

But his fear of Nature’s marvels in Version III also, I believe, stems from his own authorial crisis. Gerald’s initial reading of the marvels was wrong: there was no *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum*. Admiring Nature’s marvels has resulted in an enormous amount of criticism. And his suggestions that his critics are merely bad readers, not taking pleasure in the new marvels contained there, are wearing thin as his own interpretive stance is questioned. The troubling alignments of Gerald’s marvels, once *admiranda* (to be marveled at), now *timenda* (to be feared), parallel a shift in Gerald’s own: once a *diligens scrutator* of the landscape, now, having lost his subtext of *conquaestum*, suspiciously close to his subject matter. Gerald’s “proximate” stance toward his subject matter is unique because of his chosen genre in which to write: history. Having chosen to narrate the landscape of Ireland, and writing about his own new discoveries during his travels, Gerald has implicated himself throughout the text. After all, it is Gerald who looks upon the Book of Kildare, and Gerald who advises the bishop about the priest who administered Communion to the wolf. Inasmuch as Gerald the *scrutator* is a narrator of the landscape, he is also a figure on that landscape, representing a bridge between the two worlds of English hegemony and Irish opposition, Catholic Church and Irish church.

Throughout the text, Gerald simultaneously attempts both to demonstrate his proximity to Ireland, from where he draws his authoritative voice, and to distance himself from it and align himself with royal and ecclesiastical England. With both Henry II and Baldwin gone, however, Gerald’s English ties are weakened, and he is in danger of appearing too proximate, too close to Ireland. Already maligned for being too Welsh, which is discussed further in Chapter 4, Gerald is dangerously close to slipping into his text entirely, becoming his own marvel on the landscape of Ireland. In Version III, he attempts to mitigate this slippage with formal, scholastic techniques, which provide critical distance in the most problematic passages, but which are unable to fully remove Gerald from the taint of his subject.

Gerald’s response to this danger, eventually, is to abandon the text. Version IV, which I have dated to his retirement at Lincoln, contains very few textual additions. A lively series of marginal illustrations highlight the naturalistic attributes of his subject matter, but downplays signifying power or theological interpretation. He adds more information to the catalogue of wells, to his discussion about the wolf and the priest, and adds the passages that criticize Henry II’s actions at Fineglas. But the *distinctio* appears to be at capacity, and even beyond it: in Version III he adds to the *Introitus*’s description of the *trimembris operis hujus partitio* (“tri-fold division of this work”), noting that the *Secunda Distinctio* will contain information *nec tantum in hac regione reperta, sed et alia quaelibet, dum tamen his fuerint undecunque concordia* (“not only those which are found in this country, but others also, of whatever kind and wherever they may be, which are of the same description”). While this supports Gerald’s declaration that

---
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“nothing that concerns the human race is foreign to us” (nihil unquam humanum a nobis alienum esse putantes), it is not supported by the distinctio format, where each section ought to in its own way stand in for the “topographia” Hibernica (the literary landscape of Ireland), comprehending the entire landscape within each scene, as if in, as Gerald protests, a clear mirror. Gerald’s text has instead overgrown its boundaries and organizing principles: a text about Ireland that is not about Ireland, a headless distinctio that no longer catalogues spiritual or figural meaning, its limbs reaching far beyond its purported trunk, requiring marginal scaffolding (introductory letters, maps, marginal illustrations) to keep it from toppling over. Gerald’s constant revisions, his approximations in the face of failure to receive the proper figural ends of quaestum or conquaestum for his work, result in a failure of his figural history, a disfigured distinctio, a monstrous text.

So he put it down. After Version IV, Gerald turns his attentions to other texts. He had been working on the Itinerarium at the same time, but also saints’ lives, and in 1197 while at Lincoln he began the Gemma Ecclesiastica, where he collected the jewels of the Church rather than the glittering questions of Ireland. In 1199, he was called for the second time to become Bishop of St. David’s in Wales, and the next chapter of his life begins. One of his later letters will categorize the Topographia as a book specifically belonging to his inexperienced youth, bracketing it off from his theological writings and thus attempting to insulate it from unfair criticism.

PROXIMATE ENDINGS

Of course, with Gerald, nothing is ever finished. One final version of the Topographia Hibernica exists: Version V. Completed after his unsuccessful battle for an archbishopric at St. David’s, it represents the final form of the text as we have it. Many scholars believe it dates from the end of Gerald’s life, based on a reference to an “updated text” in a letter to Hereford c. 1218. As discussed above, however, it does not: it dates from c. 1209, just before John’s 1210 campaign in Ireland that drove out Hugh de Lacy (Earl of Ulster) and William de Braose, and set up a relatively stable system of government that sustained until John’s death in 1216.

This date is based on the fact that manuscript N.L. I. 700, which Scott and Martin have dated to c. 1200, contains a Version IV/V hybrid text of the Topographia, with supplementary Version V additions in the margins. N.L. I. 700 also has a new map, reproduced at Plate 2. This
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map has Rome placed at the top and England and Ireland aligned underneath it, embraced by two arms of Europe on either side. In contrast to the map contained in Arundel 14 and other Version III *Topographia* manuscripts, which only show Britain and immediate islands, this map encompasses all of Western Christendom. This eurocentric depiction suggests that it was illustrated after Gerald’s many trips to Rome. It also reinforces the outward-looking nature of the additions, which stretch beyond the borders of Ireland to liken, for example, Irish wells to those in Cappadocia, Switzerland, or Poitou, underscored by Gerald’s sentiment *nihil unquam humanum a nobis alienum esse* (nothing human being alien to us).\(^{309}\) The map illustrates concisely how far Gerald has traveled from his original, Irish-centered text; Version IV and V’s ambitious scope encompasses the Western world.

Version V’s additions, however, relate primarily to Ireland. The majority of the changes to the text come in two places: the *Prima Distinctio*, dealing with the natural qualities of Ireland and clustered around the section concerning reptiles, and in the chapter *De Britone, et Hibernico*, concerning Henry II’s sons Geoffrey, Duke of Brittany, and John, Lord of Ireland. Some additional changes come in the *Secunda Distinctio*: additional wells, and the story of a hermaphrodite in Connaught. The new naturalistic details may have been inspired by an additional trip to Ireland that Gerald made before his final pilgrimage to Rome in 1207-1208.

This purposeful focus back on Ireland is more directly a focus back to a royal audience: John. In 1209, Gerald delivered to John a revised version (the β-version) of his *Expugnatio Hibernica*, along with a letter, whose contents we have already discussed in part, and which will be examined more below. The revisions of the β-version consisted largely of the excision of the prophecies of Merlin Celidon, including deleting the α-version’s unfinished Book III, which had promised a full translation of Merlin’s text. Scott and Martin suggest possible motivations for this revision, but only insofar as it is relevant to the question of whether the β-version is authentically Gerald’s.\(^{310}\) They contend that Gerald may have lost faith in the prophecies, or that his source for the prophecies was lost.\(^{311}\) I suggest that Gerald had indeed lost faith in the prophecies, and that he systematically deleted them as part of a wide-ranging reconception of the project. Gerald needed to revise his own expectations of a successful Irish conquest. The revision is visible in a literal sense in N.L.I. 700, whose text of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* shows the progress from the α- to β-text: large passages of prophecy and interpretation are scored out, while other changes are visible in the margins.\(^{312}\) As we shall see, the letter which accompanies the *Expugnatio* makes Gerald’s revisionist motivations clear: he hopes to spur John to return to Ireland and finish what he started in 1186.

Numerous additions to Version V of the *Topographia* indicate that it was probably also included in the volume delivered to John, as many of the revisions are directed toward John himself. Gerald updates the chapter *De Britone, et Hibernico*, explicitly calling John to action.

\(^{309}\) See the additions to II.VII. See discussion above.
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\(^{312}\) See Appendix B for an idea of the changes to the *Expugnatio*.
regarding the conquest of Ireland. This chapter, which had been added in Version II in 1189, initially described John as, *Ratione siquidem aetatis, mollitiis hactenus magis addictus quam miliitis, deliciis quam duritiis, Veneri quam virtuti.* (“Hitherto, because of his age, he is addicted more to pleasures than to arms, to dalliance rather than endurance, and to Venus rather than virtue.”)\(^{313}\) In Version V, Gerald updates this line to read: *Ratione siquidem aetatis, mollitiis hactenus magis addictus quam miliitis, deliciis quam duritiis, juvenili quippe magis adhuc levitati, quam virili quo nondum attigit maturitati.* (“Hitherto, because of his age, he is addicted more to pleasures than to arms, to dalliance rather than endurance, indeed more as yet to juvenile levity than to manly maturity, which he has not yet attained.”)\(^{314}\) Gerald redirects his critique to focus less on John’s youthful sexual exploits, deleting the reference to Venus, and focuses it more on a distinction between what he believes John should have accomplished (*virili maturitati*) over what he displays (*juvenili levitati*). Because John is now King (and, indeed, forty-three years old), Gerald has greater expectations for him in 1209 than in 1189, and criticizes his apparent lack of devotion to duty. The passage of time and Gerald’s revisions give new, forceful meaning to the remainder of the paragraph, in which Gerald expresses, interspersed with the words of Horace, that *juvenilis excusabilis est levitas, cum laudabilis fuerit ipsa maturitas* (“juvenile levity is excusable if the mature age is laudable”).\(^{315}\)

Gerald’s final set of additions at the end of the paragraph make Version V’s call to action explicit, drawing on a prophecy previously mentioned in the *Expugnatio*. In Version II, the chapter ended with the adulation: *Ultimus hic fratrum, et utinam futurus virtute non ultimus, utrique parente fere semper obtemperens longaevus in terris esse promeruit.* (“May this last of the three brothers not be the last in virtue; but being always dutiful to both his parents, may he be long-lived on earth!”)\(^{316}\) In Version V, Gerald adds to that wish (addition underlined), saying, *longaevus in terris esse et felix esse promeruit* (“may he be long-lived and happy on earth”), and continues,

Cujus etiam descriptioni vulgatum illud Merlini Abrosii vaticinium, de illo qui Hiberniae moenia subvertet dictum, utinam sic vere consonet sicut et verisimiliter consonare videtur: “Principium,” inquit, “ejus vago affectui succumbet, et finis ad superos convolabit.”

May he truly conform to the description given by Merlinus Ambrosius, in a prophecy much noised abroad, of the man before whom the walls of Ireland shall fall, as he appears to answer to it. “His beginning,” it says, “shall be abandoned to loose living, but his end shall waft him to heaven.”\(^{317}\)

\(^{313}\) GCO V, 200.
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Gerald’s use of the prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius here is striking, for it appears in the α-version of the Expugnatio. When he describes the preparations for John’s journey to Ireland in the Expugnatio, Gerald recounts how Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, arrived to request Henry II’s assistance in protecting the Holy Land from the Saracens, offering him the keys to the city.318 Gerald attributes the ignominy of Henry II’s final years to the dire consequences of his refusal to come to Jerusalem’s aid. As Gerald recounts the history of the subsequent Third Crusade, he alludes to the greater glory that could be won by achieving Jerusalem’s full restoration, rather than simply shoring up a declining city. He ends the chapter with Merlin Ambrosius’s prophecy:

Igitur ad tanti lapsus reparationem, prae aliis cunctis Anglorum, ut creditur, rege reservato, si victoriosum vitae labentis cursum cum hac quoque tanta victoria felici fine compleverit, de ipso procul dubio famosum illud Merlini Ambrosiio vaticinium constat esse complendum: “Principium,” inquit, “ejus vago affectui succumbet; et finis ad superos convolabit.”

As is generally believed, the English king, above all others, has been reserved to make good this great calamity. So if he successfully crowns the triumphant course of his declining years with a victory on such a scale as this, then there can be no doubt that the famous prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius is destined to be fulfilled in his person. His words are: “His beginning will give way to his unruly passions, and his end will fly aloft to heaven.”319

In Gerald’s original interpretation, Henry II, winning the victory of the restoration of Jerusalem in his declining years, seems to be this rex Anglorum in Merlin Ambrosius’s prophecy. Henry’s death in 1189 precluded this, and the task fell to Richard, whose strenuous efforts would nevertheless fail to liberate Jerusalem in 1192.

Interestingly, Gerald preserves this prophecy in the β-version, while wiping out almost all the other prophecies. In the updated version, Gerald deletes sixteen prophecies by Molig of Ireland and Merlin Celidon (Sylvester), and qualifies those of Columba the Irishman.320 The Third Book, an introductory placeholder for the eventual translation of Merlin Celidon’s prophecies, is deleted as well. The fact that this prophecy remains, though in a qualified form, then, is highly significant. And the fact that Gerald translates it into a new context in Version V of the Topographia at the same time reinforces the notion of proximity between Ireland and the Holy Land, with John, rather than Henry II, as the central figure.

In this way, Gerald revives his earlier goals of quaestum vel conquaestum, but modifies them to emphasize the possibility of John’s successful completion of the conquest of Ireland. In
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Version I and II, Gerald cast his own authorial project as beginning from John’s political failure, and urged Henry II to action to complete his own text through successful conquest. Gerald set up Ireland as a rhetorical Western proxy for Jerusalem, and suggested that conquest of the one could stand in for conquest of the other. By the end of Henry’s life, however, the fact that neither conquest bore fruit led Gerald to condemn Henry II’s inaction in the Holy Land, and turn his text to a clerical audience. Gerald sought authority from spiritual rather than political significance, relying on his status as a *diligens scrutator* and the prospective success of the Third Crusade to pervade the *Topographia* with meaning. When this failed, he eventually put aside the *Topographia*, and turned his attention to other, more immediate concerns: the fight for the bishopric of St. David’s. In 1209, however, Gerald revised both the *Expugnatio* and the *Topographia* in a way that again set up a typological model of conquest, ready for fulfillment by a perhaps unlikely figure. In this new scenario, John is presented as the possible fulfillment of Merlin Ambrosius’s prophecy, potentially atoning for John’s youthful shortcomings and his earlier failure in Ireland.

Gerald does this by conflating two previously separate prophecies. In the *Topographia*, Gerald applies the *Expugnatio*’s *rex Anglorum* prophecy to conquest in Ireland rather than the Holy Land, conflating it with a second prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius from elsewhere in the *Expugnatio* which reads, *Quinque porciones in unum redigentur et sextus Hibernie menia subvertet.* (“The five parts will be reduced to one, and the sixth will overthrow the walls of Ireland.”)\(^321\) This second prophecy is revised in the β-version of the *Expugnatio*: Gerald deletes the other prophecies in this chapter, and breaks this one into two, replacing it with, *Tunc impetum videtur usitatum illud et vulgatum, quia de veritate nihil assevero, Merlini Ambrosii vaticinum, ‘Sextus Hibernie menia subvertet’, et illud eiusdem, ‘Quinque porciones in unum redigentur.’* (“Thus would seem to be fulfilled the commonly quoted prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius, because I assert nothing of its truthfulness, ‘The sixth shall overthrow the walls of Ireland,’ and again in that same place, ‘the five parts will be reduced into one.’”)\(^322\) In Version V of the *Topographia*, Gerald imports this second prophecy by reference, calling John *qui Hiberniae moenia subvertet*, he who will overthrow the walls of Ireland. In this way Gerald again substitutes Ireland for the Holy Land, retextualizing the prophecy of Merlin to apply to Irish conquest rather than the retaking of Jerusalem.

Directed at John, Gerald’s approximation of Irish conquest to Crusade in the Holy Land activates another, otherwise dormant detail in the *Expugnatio*: John’s eagerness to take the keys of Jerusalem from Heraclius. In a detail only reported in the *Expugnatio*,\(^323\) Gerald describes how Heraclius changed tactics when he realized Henry would not accept his offer to rule Jerusalem:

---
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Sed quoniam nullum aliud a rege responsum patriarcha elicere puit, ad aliud se
denique convertit, rogans ut vel unum filiorum suorum, et si non alium, saltem
natu minorem Iohannem eis in subsidium principem daret, ut regium semen de
Andegavensium stirpe descendens possit eis vel ex hoc surculo redivivo germine
suscitari. Ipse vero Iohannes, quamquam in Hiberniam ei a patre datam jam tunc
cum grandi expedicione mittendus foret, patrios a pedes se provolvens et ut
Ierosolimam potius mitteretur laudabiler ut fertur efflagitans, non impetravit.

But since the patriarch was not able to extract any other response from the king,
he finally tried a different approach, and asked him at least to help them by giving
them one of his sons as their prince, even John, the youngest, if he was unwilling
to give any of the others. In this way their royal family, which was descended
from Angevin stock, might be revitalized, and its bud renewed even from the
scion grafted on to it. John was at that time just on the point of being sent with a
large force to Ireland, which his father had lately granted him. But he himself fell
at his father’s feet and, so men say, begged to be sent to Jerusalem instead, with
an insistence which did him credit. However he did not get his way.  

Hans Mayer notes that John’s trip to Jerusalem would have unfrozen an Eastern account into
which Henry had been depositing money in place of actually traveling to Jerusalem. Gerald
alludes to this when he recounts how Heraclius admonished the king, saying, *Principem enim
quarere venimus, non pecuniam.* (“We came here seeking a prince, not money.”) In this
passage, John’s eagerness to go in Henry’s stead is a relatively minor detail, but one that, as
Gerald emphasizes, does him credit. This detail takes on particular significance in Book II,
Chapter 38 of the *Expugnatio*, when Gerald describes the reasons for John’s failure in Ireland.
Before addressing historical reasons, such as John’s rebuff of the native lords who had come to
meet him, Gerald describes the “first and foremost” reason for John’s lack of success:

Primam itaque causarum omnium dixerim et precipuam quod, cum rex pater ad
tantam vocacionem per patriarcham ut dictum est iam factam, in propra statim
persona profectus fuisse, vel saltem aliquem filiorum pro se in Christi obsequium
prompta devocione misisse debuisse, eodem tante citacionis tempore, et in ipsa
quoque tanti legati tantique preconis presencia, hunc filium suum non in orientem
sed in occidentem, non in Saracenos sed in Christianos, que sua sunt querentem
non que Iesu Christi, sumptuosa magis quam utili expedicione transmisit.

---

739, 733.
I would say that the first and most important reason was that, whereas his father the king should have responded to the powerful summons issued by the patriarch at this time, as related above, by immediately embarking on the crusade in person, or at any rate by the prompt dispatch of one of his sons to serve Christ in his place, at the very time when he received this summons, and in the very presence of the distinguished emissary who had come to proclaim this important message, he sent his son not to the East, but to the West, not against Saracens, but against Christians, to pursue his own interests rather than Christ’s interests, and on an expedition that was lavish but did not serve any useful purpose.  

This description is in striking contrast to the Topographia’s rhetoric in the final chapters of the Prima Distinctio and the preface to the Secunda Distinctio, where Gerald emphasizes the affinities between the “marvels of the West” and those of the East, and, employing a colonialist discourse, suggests that successful Irish conquest can stand in for successful Eastern conquest. Indeed, it is the lack of success altogether that causes Gerald to rethink his framing, and instead in the α-version Expugnatio blame John’s failure on the decisions of a recently deceased Henry II, whose promise of being Merlin’s rex Anglorum to liberate Jerusalem is now irrevocably past. Gerald’s translation of Merlin’s prophecy from the Expugnatio’s “King of the English who liberates Jerusalem” to “he who will subvert the walls of Ireland” [qui Hiberniae moenia subvertet] in Version V of the Topographia displaces or overlays the Holy Land with Ireland, replacing the unattained goal of crusade with a proximate goal of Irish conquest. John’s successful subjugation of Ireland would, in a sense, recuperate both failures: fulfilling the geographically relocated prophecy of Merlin as a proxy for his frustrated attempt to answer the summons of Heraclius. What is important for Gerald is that successful conquest ensue, fulfilling this final prophecy, and girding the Topographia’s crusading discourse with meaning.

That Gerald is trying to spur John to successful action in a restive Ireland is no secret: his letter accompanying the Expugnatio (which presumably also contained the updated Topographia) explicitly states that he wants to awaken John’s “sleepy memory” [sopita memoria] of Ireland with a new, more correct and fuller edition of that book (ad eam excitandam librum eundem, iam correctius quidem et plenius editum, vestre sublimitati destinare curavi). Indeed, according to Gerald, the book, as a clear mirror image of the past, ought to direct John’s future actions: Sic itaque tamquam in speculo dilucido considerari, longeque certius et plenius veritate historica perpendi poterit, quibus gloria conquestus huius amplior et maior digne attribui debeat. (“Thus accordingly as if reflected in a clear mirror, one can judge in the future more certainly and entirely with historical truth to whom additional and greater glory of that conquest must be attributed.”) What is important here is not just that Gerald is trying to influence John’s foreign policy. He gives John several good reasons to return to Ireland and

327 Scott and Martin, Expugnatio, 236-237.
329 Ibid. ll. 32-34.
impose order on what has obviously been a tumultuous transition of power between the original Anglo-Norman settlers (Gerald’s kinsmen, to whom he assigns no blame), and newcomers (*labores absque labore*) (“laborers without labor”) who have caused unrest. Gerald hints that these newcomers threaten to usurp English rule entirely.\(^330\) It is even more significant that Gerald seeks to do this with *history*, and specifically his own written history of the failed conquest of Ireland. With the *Expugnatio*, Gerald makes explicit what we have been discussing implicitly with the *Topographia*: that Gerald expected some kind of extra-textual completion for his texts. The Angevin rulers are supposed to *do* something.

Gerald reinforces this theme elsewhere in the letter by discussing two diplomatic texts. One of the strongest reasons Gerald urges John return to Ireland is to restore the Church, and thus fulfill Pope Adrian IV’s grant of Ireland to Henry II in the papal bull *Laudabiliter*. This bull (c. 1155-56) gave Henry II permission to invade Ireland “in order to expand the boundaries of the Church, and to declare the truth of the Christian faith to un instructed and primitive peoples and to uproot the weeds of vice from the field of the Lord.”\(^331\) Though this bull was, Gerald says, prudently and circumspectly acquired and deposited at the archives in Winchester (*privilegii eiusdem pape super hoc a patre vestro prudenter et circumspecte perquisiti et in archivis Guintonie fideliter repositi*), subsequent history “manifestly declares” that Henry had not fulfilled its requirements (*inferius historia manifeste declarat*). John, Gerald insists, must ensure the restoration of the Church *ad exonerandam tam patris vestri, qui hec promiserat, animam – quoniam, ut ait Salomon in Parabolis, nihil minus principem decet quam labium mendax* (“for the exoneration of the soul of your father, who promised this – since, as Solomon says in Proverbs, nothing befits a prince less than lying lips”).\(^332\) By fulfilling *Laudabiliter*’s charge, John will vindicate his father and “liberate” himself and his sons (*ad vestram quoque et vestrorum liberandam*) from Henry’s ill-fated history. Gerald assures him: *Quatenus, si de hoc conquestu, sicut decet et debet, Deus honoratur, et prosperitas in terris vobis ac vestris augeatur et perpetua denique felicitas, que superat omnia, subsequatur* (“However much, if by this conquest, as is proper and ought to be done, God is honored, both prosperity in you and your lands will be increased and perpetual happiness, which is above all things, will follow”). The *felicitas* that Gerald promises here recalls the addition in Version V of the *Topographia* that John be *felix*, just before Gerald recites the prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius. Happiness follows from the successful completion or fulfillment of written texts with real-life action.

This textually-oriented understanding of historical action comes up again when Gerald insists that John impose taxes on Ireland. After discussing the despoliation of the churches by the local lords, Gerald adds “with the same impatience” (*eadem impaciencia*) that Ireland ought to send a yearly tribute of gold or hunting birds, so that as the memory of the Irish conquest

\(^{330}\) *Ibid.* II. 63-76.  
\(^{331}\) Scott and Martin, *Expugnatio*, 144.  
fades, quasi perpetuo chirographo et indissolubili vinculo, regnum Hibernicum Anglicae corone subjectum omni palam tempore fiat (“as if with a chirograph and unbreakable chain, the Irish kingdom may be openly subject to the English throne for all time”).

A chirograph was a type of charter originating in Anglo-Saxon England, where the terms of agreement were copied on the upper and lower parts of the parchment with the word CHIROGRAPHUM written in large letters through the middle. This was then cut in two, often with a wavy line, so that the authenticity of a document could be verified by matching the two pieces together again. Some chirographs were made in triplicate, with that third copy being deposited in an archive; in 1195, Hubert Walter began implementing this for the royal feet of fines, documenting the conveyance of property.

Gerald’s suggestion that John’s taxes (a sign of successful conquest) can act quasi perpetuo chirographo et indissolubili vinculo, illustrates the concept that it is the text that has the authority, and the action here, the collection of taxes, can be like a text in openly showing, as if written in a page of parchment, that Ireland was subject to the English crown.

What is unique about Gerald is that, while the concept of an authoritative text gained ground generally in the twelfth century regarding records and diplomatic documents, Gerald firmly believes that his texts, too, ought to wield this power. Such an attitude toward the genre of history permeates Gerald’s corpus of works. It explains why Gerald referred to the Expugnatio Hibernica as the Vaticinalis Historia, the “Prophetic History,” even after he deleted the “third book” of prophecies. It explains the whirlwind-like pressure building up within the Topographia as Gerald makes revision upon revision in the text, always attempting both to anticipate and dictate a prospective outcome. Gerald’s success as an author, his authority, depends on his works doing something. Texts were not to be locked up and forgotten in an archive, like the papal bull Laudabiliter which gave Henry II authority over Ireland; rather, they must be acted upon, and when they are completed, the archive, a technical innovation of the twelfth century, becomes a repository of and testament to that action. Gerald’s attitude is emblematic of the rise in documentary culture. Texts were now no longer mere records of events transpired: they could cause events and require action to be taken. But Gerald is unique in his attribution of this potential transformative power to history, a conception that a written narrative could prefigure future events.

This also explains Gerald’s rather sudden transition from discussing chirographs and taxes to lamenting the perceived lack of influence of his own book. Gerald attempts to appropriate the authority of documents with political power and import that authority into his historical works. Emphasizing the effectiveness, or lack thereof, of his written texts compared with Walter Map’s oral quips, he puts pressure on John to act in Ireland, thereby confirming the authority of Gerald’s texts:

333 Ibid. ll. 144-147.
335 Clanchy, 88.
336 See, for example, his letter to Hereford, Epistula ad Capitulum Herefordense de Libris a Se Scriptis, GCO I, 409, where it is referred to as the Vaticinalem Hybernicae expugnationis Historiam.
Verumtamen. quoniam res gesta per interpretam non adeo sapit aut animo sedet, sicut proprio et idiomate noto prolata, alci, si placet, lingua simul et litteris erudito, ad transferendam in Gallicum ocius non ociosus liber hic noster committatur. Qui forte fructum laboris sui, quoniam intelligi poterit, assequetur, quem nos quidem, minus intellecti, quia principes minus litterati, hactenus obtinere non valuit. Unde et vir ille eloquio clarus W. Mapus, Oxoniensis archidiaconus, cuius anime propicietur Deus, solita verborum faciecia et urbanitate precipua dicere pluries, et nos in hunc modum convenire solebat: ‘Multa. magister Giralde, scripsistis, et multum adhuc scribitis: et nos multa diximus. Vos scripta dedistis, et nos verba. Et quamquam scripta vestra longe laudabiliora sint et longeviora quam dicta nostra, quia tamen hec aperta, communi quippe idiomate prolata, illa vero, quia Latina, paucioribus evidencia, nos de dictis nostris fructum aliquem reportavimus, vos autem de scriptis egregiis, principibus litteratis nimirum et largis obsoletis olim et ab orbe sublatis, dignam minime retribucionem consequi potuistis.’

Nevertheless, since a written record explained by an interpreter has neither the same taste nor the same hold on the memory as it was related to listeners in their own familiar idiom, this not insignificant book of mine ought to be committed to someone skilled in both language and letters for it to be quickly translated into French. Perhaps the fruits of his labor will be rewarded, since he is able to be understood; since so far, we have obtained nothing, barely understood by barely literate princes. Whence that brightly eloquent man Walter Map, archdeacon of Oxford (God rest his soul!), known for his witty sayings and especially his frequent urbanities, used to say to us: ‘Master Gerald, you have written many things and will write many things; and I have said many things. You have devoted yourself to writings, and I to words. And however more laudable your written things may be, and longer lasting than my words, I have received some reward for what I have said because I have made myself clear using the idiom of the people. But your writing is in Latin, and accessible to far fewer. And so, because genuinely literate and generous princes have for some time now been a dead breed, banished from the face of the earth, the reward you have managed to gain is far below the merits of your outstanding writing.’

David Rollo cites this passage as prime evidence of his theory that Gerald is castigating the Angevin house, and that a royal audience would have been unable to read or understand Gerald’s

---

As we have shown above, however, this deliberately ignores the context of the passage (in a letter to John) and the thrust of Gerald’s argument.

The comparison to Walter Map brings to light two notable differences. First, a linguistic one: Gerald’s texts are in Latin while Walter’s sayings are, presumably, in French, which is why Gerald introduces his book with a pretextual request to have it translated into French. But the second difference is perhaps the more important: Gerald’s texts are written, and therefore supposed, in Gerald’s mind, to possess some kind of authority, whereas Walter’s sayings are oral. Gerald is back to requesting *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum*, challenging John to prove himself a literate prince by taking action based on Gerald’s written texts, by being the king Gerald has already described him to be: fulfilling the prophecy, finishing the text.

And finish it, he did. Whether or not he explicitly followed Gerald’s advice, or simply acted of his own will, in 1210 John won a decisive victory in Ireland, quelling the local lords and instituting a time of relative peace and stability. Notably, no further versions of the *Topographia* or the *Expugnatio* exist, though Gerald alludes to an updated version c. 1218 in a letter to Hereford. It is tempting to wonder if the additions to such a version would have addressed the events of 1216, the Barons’ War against King John and the granting of the crown to the French king Louis VIII, whose arrival Gerald strongly endorsed. Unfortunately, no such text exists. As far as the *Topographia* is concerned, Version V represents the final version, and John fulfilled it, at least politically, with his decisive actions in 1210.

Such an ending, on purely political terms, seems somewhat inadequate for a text that had become as ambitious as the final version of the *Topographia*. Gerald ends the letter by rather disingenuously insisting he no longer has any desire for or expectation of earthly remuneration, particularly because of his old age and, as he claims, imminent death (though he lived for another fourteen years). Rather, he continues,

*Solum hoc etenim amodo desideramus, et desiderare debemus, ut divinum in primis et precipuis favorem nobis per opera bona, eius cooperante gratia, immo totum efficiene, qui gratis omnia prestat, comparemus; et humanum per opuscula nostra gratiam, si litterarum decus quandoque resurgat et in statum redeat, saltem in posterum, ‘Cum suus ex merito quemque tuebitur honor,’ assequamur.*

We desire and ought to desire only this one thing, that we might receive first and foremost divine favor for our good works, thanks to the cooperation of him, namely the doer of all, who outshines all in grace; and that we may be assigned human reknown for our little writings, if the riches of literature ever resurge and

---

339 Ian Short too analyzes this passage less in terms of what it says about the status of French, and more in terms of Gerald’s attitude toward the declining Latinity of his own age. Ian Short, “*Verbatim et literatim*: Oral and Written French in 12th-century Britain,” *Vox Romanica* 68 (2009): 156-68, 157.
340 *Epistula ad Capitulum Herefordense de Libris a Se Scriptis*, GCO I, 409.
Gerald’s quotation is from Ovid’s *Amores*, I.15.39: *pascitur in vivis livor; post fata quiescit,/cum suus ex merito quemque tuetur honos.* (“Envy feasts on the living; after death it is silent,/When each man’s fame protects him as he deserves.”) As in the Preface to the *Expugnatio* when Gerald defends the *Topographia*, Envy, *Livor*, is the reason Gerald believes his works are maligned during his life and misunderstood by his contemporaries. His hope now is for the kind of immortality ascribed to poets provided by the archive left behind – the author preserved in his corpus of works. The fulfillment of *quaestum aliquem vel conquaestum* is no longer sufficient for the *Topographia*, nor for Gerald, whose eyes are cast on the longer thread of history and authorship, stretching from the ancients down to his own day.

But Gerald had already come to this conclusion long before directing Version V of the *Topographia* to John. He quotes these same lines from Ovid in the Preface to the *Itinerarium Kambriae*, added to Version II of that text (c. 1197), as he layers quotation upon classical quotation complaining of the lack of earthly rewards to be gained by the study of letters. One year after his retirement from court, as he ended his work on Version IV of the *Topographia*, Gerald abandoned that text to focus on his hopes for the bishopric of St. David’s. Gerald dedicates the *Itinerarium Kambriae* to Bishop Hugh of Lincoln, and has this to say about the legacy of his Irish works:

> Sed quia principibus parum literatis et multum occupatis, *Hibernicam Anglorum regi Henrico secundo Topographiam, ejusdem filio, et utinam vitiorum non succedaneo, Pictavensium comiti Ricardo Vaticinalem Historiam, vacuo quondam quoad accessorium illud et infructuoso labore peregi; tibi, vir inclite, Hugo Lincolniensis episcopo, quem religio pariter et literatura commendant, laborem nostrum per horridos Kambriae fines non illaudabilem . . . destinare curavi.  

I completely wasted my time when I wrote my *Topography of Ireland* for Henry II, King of the English, and the companion volume, my *Vaticinal History*, for Richard of Poitou, his son and successor in vice, although I would prefer not to have to say it. Both these princes had little or no interest in literature, and both were much preoccupied with other matters. It is to you, [Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln], a man of great renown, equally at home in the pursuit of letters and the
practice of religion, that I have dedicated this far from negligible work about Wild Wales . . . \footnote{344 Translation from Thorpe, \textit{The Journey through Wales}, 67-68. Note that Thorpe’s translation is a quite dramatic rendering.}

By parsing the \textit{Topographia}’s additions, Gerald’s process of composition, disillusionment, and revision is visibly apparent. In examining the versions, we can see how Gerald’s biography is embedded in his text, and how he retextualizes the \textit{Topographia} in order to respond to the pressure of changed circumstance. Dissatisfied by the reception of his work at court, Gerald eventually redirected his \textit{Topographia} almost entirely at a solely clerical audience, struggling with the allegorical and theological implications of the marvels and monstrosities of Ireland. But as Ireland’s political situation worsened, he sought to reassert the text’s demand for conquaestum, redirecting the work to the very Angevin prince whose journey originated the entire project. Ostensibly exactly what Gerald was seeking and explicitly requested in his letter, John’s political action is only a proximate solution, and does not satisfy Gerald’s ultimate ambition for his corpus of works: solidifying his own position within a legacy of authors stretching back to the classical poets, and reaching forward to a reflowering of letters and future vindication.

This ambition is apparent even in the very early versions of the \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae}, in which Gerald leaves position as a diligens scrutator of Ireland for closer shores, fixing his eye on Wales, his own home. In Chapter Three of this dissertation, our focus also shifts from Ireland to Wales, as we examine the progression of the three versions of the \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} and watch Gerald revise his text as he modifies his expectations for the projection of history.
CHAPTER THREE
FROM CRUSADE TO PILGRIM: INSCRIBING THE JOURNEY OF GERALD IN THE ITINERARIUM KAMBRIAE

INTRODUCTION

The Itinerarium Kambriae, like the Topographia Hibernica, was inspired by a journey. In 1188, Gerald of Wales accompanied Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, on a preaching circuit through Wales to recruit for the Third Crusade. Between the years 1189 and 1215, Gerald wrote three versions of the Itinerarium Kambriae, narrating that journey, and two versions of the Descriptio Kambriae, describing the geography of Wales and Welsh nature, manner, and customs.\textsuperscript{345}

As with the Topographia, Gerald built on and expanded each version of the Itinerarium through extensive marginal notations and revisions. Very little of the added material deals with the Archbishop’s journey through Wales, but rather it consists largely of Gerald’s own observations of local miracles, omens, folklore, natural phenomena, and his own political commentary. And as with the Topographia, the additional material adds substantially to the already marvel- and miracle-laden text, to the consternation of scholars who lament, like the text’s translator, that there are “no fewer than 129 of these digressions from the real matter at hand,” and that “however fascinating they may be, there are too many of these ‘notabilia’ and they detract from the artistic unity of [Gerald’s] book.”\textsuperscript{346}

But what is the real matter at hand? The first twenty-five of the Itinerarium Kambriae’s twenty-seven chapters are titled by the geographic location being traveled through, followed by the phrase \textit{cum notabilibus suis} (“with its notable things”). Like the \textit{nova et notabilia} of the Topographia Hibernica, Gerald incorporates such details as he deems worth recording into the very structure of the work. If Gerald only adds more notabilia to the subsequent versions, then the description of the preaching circuit must be only one component of a larger authorial project.

By changing perspective to focus the process of revision, this chapter reveals the dynamic and fitful nature of that project. By tracing the notabilia throughout the versions, Gerald’s project for the Itinerarium becomes clear: Gerald attempts to create a specific, localized, signifying landscape for Wales, building up meaning by layering snatches of narrative – the notabilia – underneath a defined, geographic space. In doing so, he creates an underlying narrative for Wales, writing a landscape pervasive with meaning while simultaneously narrating

\textsuperscript{345} These are edited in James F. Dimock, ed. \textit{Giraldi Cambrensis Opera: Itinerarium Kambriae et Descriptio Kambriae} (Vol. VI) (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer [Rolls Series], 1868) [hereinafter GCO VI].

his own journey through it. The figurative relationship between the landscape and journey recalls the genre of pilgrimage texts, and creates an analogous relationship between Wales and the Holy Land. The *Itinerarium*’s quasi-typological history, figured through the Welsh landscape, looks forward to the projected successful outcome of the Third Crusade. But as time passes and the versions progress, Gerald’s additions revise and rewrite that outcome as his crusading expectations are frustrated and he questions the very idea of prophetic history. At the center of this frustration is Gerald’s failed attempt to become archbishop of a separate Welsh archbishopric centered at St. David’s Cathedral (also called Menevia). As we shall see, Gerald ultimately retextualizes the *Itinerarium*, superseding Baldwin’s journey with a memorialized account of the journey he deems most important: his own.

In addition to elucidating Gerald’s model of figural history, as enacted by his revisions to his texts, I hope this analysis will also serve as a corrective to modern scholars’ interpretations of the *Itinerarium* based on only one version. Whereas scholars privilege Version I of the *Topographia*, the *Itinerarium* is usually studied only in its final Version III form. And as with the *Topographia*, this has more to do with the accident of the text’s modern availability (only in the Rolls Series edition and the Penguin Classics translation by Lewis Thorpe) than for any reason based in a literary or historical foundation.

**The Versions of the *Itinerarium Kambriae*: Dates and Manuscripts**

Unlike the *Topographia Hibernica*, the versions of the *Itinerarium Kambriae* have been dated fairly precisely. Version I dates to 1191, after the death of Baldwin on November 19, 1190 at the Siege of Acre, but before the downfall of William de Longchamp in October 1191. Version I was initially dedicated to William de Longchamp, and a portion of that dedication is found at the end of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B.188 [11549] [B]. James Dimock suggests that Gerald must have initially dedicated the *Itinerarium* to William and then suppressed the dedication after William’s notorious downfall and flight from England in 1191 after disputes with John during Richard’s absence. In 1193, Gerald rededicated the work to

---

347 Though most scholars acknowledge the *Itinerarium* was issued in three versions, I have seen only one who analyzes the textual differences among the versions: Caroline Walker Bynum, “Metamorphosis, or Gerald and the Werewolf,” in *Metamorphosis and Identity* (New York: Zone Books, 2005). Two very notable scholars who only discuss the text in its final version are Monika Otter, *Inventiones*, and Stephen Nichols, “Fission and Fusion,” *Yale French Studies* 70 (1986): 21-41. Nichols, for example, rests the bulk of his Bakhtinian analysis of dialogic registers in the work’s first chapter on sentences that were added approximately 23 years apart. As with Monika Otter, this makes his analysis no less compelling for Version III of the work, but it raises new and very different questions: by 1214 (when Version III was completed), both the Third and the Fourth Crusades had failed, and England was rife with royal and baronial turmoil. While Version III still performs in an idealized Crusade-era time and space, such a performance can only be retrospective and tinged with loss. This is discussed in detail below.

348 GCO VI, xxxvi. “We may conclude, I think, pretty safely, that this first edition was issued somewhere about the middle of the year 1191, with a dedication to William de Longchamp; that after Longchamp’s downfall Giralduis did all he could to suppress the dedication, and instead of sounding the great man’s praises, now vomited out, from the blackest region of his bile, bitter disgusting abuse of the man who seemed utterly fallen; and that hence
Hubert Walter, who was made archbishop of Canterbury at that time.\textsuperscript{349} This is based on Gerald’s comment in the Preface to the \textit{Descriptio Kambriae}, which he dedicated to Hubert Walter in 1194, where Gerald indicates that he had earlier addressed the \textit{Itinerarium} to him as well.\textsuperscript{350}

Version I, describing the circuit through Wales in spring of 1188, is found in three manuscripts: London, British Library, Royal 13.B.viii [R], Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B.188 [11549] [B], and Cambridge, University Library, Ff.1.27 [F]. Two of these manuscripts, R and B, contain Version III of the \textit{Topographia Hibernica}, and MS F contains Version IV. All three of these manuscripts were known to James Dimock, who also edited the \textit{Itinerarium} for the Rolls Series. Catherine Rooney dates both B and R to Gerald’s lifetime, and includes them in her study of Gerald’s scriptorium.\textsuperscript{351}

Version I of the \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} is the shortest of the versions, but the same structure is retained as Gerald adds to the work. It consists of two books. Book I contains thirteen chapters, and follows the journey from its commencement in Hereford westward through the south of Wales, until the arrival at St. David’s. Book II, consisting of fourteen chapters, begins with a discussion of the history of St. David’s, and then follows the continuation of the journey north and east from there back to Hereford. It ends with a description of Archbishop Baldwin. Each chapter follows the course of the journey, covering the particular location through which Gerald travels. The majority of chapters begin with an initial paragraph (sometimes only a few lines) describing the journey to that point. From there, Gerald jumps to the \textit{notabilia}, describing vestiges of prior miracles and tales of natural marvels, many of which are visibly apparent on the landscape. This structure will be discussed in greater detail below.

Version II of the \textit{Itinerarium} dates to c. 1197, and was dedicated to Bishop Hugh of Lincoln (d. 1200). Allusions in the text to several events indicate that Gerald wrote it after 1194, and, because of the dedication, during his tenure at Lincoln in 1196-1199 after retiring from Richard’s court.\textsuperscript{352} Version II exists in full in three manuscripts. Dimock was aware of only one, and that one very late: London, British Library, Harley 359 (s. xvi) [Hc].\textsuperscript{353} Richard Sharpe identified one more, significantly, dating from Gerald’s lifetime: London, British Library, Additional 34762.\textsuperscript{354} Rooney’s study added one other complete manuscript, London, British Library, Additional 43706, and two manuscripts that contain extracts.\textsuperscript{355}

\textsuperscript{349} GCO VI, xxxvii.
\textsuperscript{350} Ibid. And see GCO VI, 161: \ldots a te, vir optime, cui presens opusculum transmitti deproperat, \ldots sicut et priora vobis exarata \ldots
\textsuperscript{351} Catherine Rooney, “The Manuscripts of the Works of Gerald of Wales,” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2005) 150-161. She also identified some manuscripts that contain extracts, see pg. 76.
\textsuperscript{352} GCO VI, xxxvii.
\textsuperscript{353} GCO VI, xi.
\textsuperscript{354} Richard Sharpe, \textit{A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540} (Belgium: Brepols, 1997) 134-137.
\textsuperscript{355} Rooney, 79-80. The two that contain extracts are Oxford Bodl. Rawl. B.471; Dubl. Trin. Coll. 574.
A number of interesting additions characterize Version II. As with the *Topographia*, Gerald adds a new and very long preface, rededicating his work to Hugh of Lincoln, and emphasizing his hope that his work will be appreciated. He also adds sentences which revise or qualify one of the political purposes of Baldwin’s mission: celebrating mass in all four major Welsh cathedrals, and thereby demonstrating the primacy of Canterbury. As will be discussed below, these changes may indicate that Gerald was already preparing to undertake his case for creating a Welsh archdiocese.\textsuperscript{356} Then he adds a number of passages alluding to politically-motivated violence in Wales, passages I call “silence clauses,” as Gerald raises the issue of violence while simultaneously protesting that he will not describe them.\textsuperscript{357}

Though he declines to discuss the political present, many of Gerald’s additions deal with the future. Gerald adds descriptions of a number of colorful figures who can in some way tell the future, two of whom are explicitly demonic: the Welshman Meilyr, who was driven mad after having intercourse with a succubus,\textsuperscript{358} and the red-haired Simon, who was the offspring of an incubus and a peasant-girl.\textsuperscript{359} Gerald describes an episode that occurred in Cardiff, where a white-clothed, barefoot man hailed Henry II in English, *qui et regem in haec verba quasi Teutonice convenit, “God holde þe, cuning” (“who spoke to the King in these words, in English: God hold thee, King”), and then reminded him to keep the Sabbath holy. Henry II spurned him and rode on, but then remorseful, turns back to find that he has disappeared.\textsuperscript{360} Finally, Gerald adds a number of portents that foretold the deaths of various kings, as well as discusses a form of prognostication that was popular in Wales, the reading of the shoulder blades of rams.

Version III dates to c. 1214, and was dedicated to Stephen Langton. It is found in full in three manuscripts: London, British Library, Cotton Domitian A.i (s. xiii\textsuperscript{2/4}) [D], London, British Library, Royal 13.B.xii (s. xvi) [Rd], and Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 3024C. The first two of these are described by Dimock,\textsuperscript{361} while the third was identified by Sharpe.\textsuperscript{362} Rooney identified three additional manuscripts that contain abbreviated or extracted Version III texts.\textsuperscript{363} Dimock dates Version III to c. 1214 based on the fact that Stephen Langton was in exile and had not acceded to his archbishopric until July 1213.\textsuperscript{364} Additionally, Geoffrey of Llanthony (d. 1214) is mentioned in the text as the most recent Bishop of St. David’s, but no mention is made of his successor Gervase (Iorwerth), who was consecrated on June 12, 1215.\textsuperscript{365} Lewis

\textsuperscript{356} See Appendix C for I.1, II.1.
\textsuperscript{357} Silences clauses are added to I.1, I.2, I.4, I.5, I.10, and II.8.
\textsuperscript{358} I.5.
\textsuperscript{359} I.12.
\textsuperscript{360} I.6.
\textsuperscript{361} GCO VI, xv-xix. Note that MS Rd actually contains two copies of the Itinerarium.
\textsuperscript{362} Sharpe, 134-137.
\textsuperscript{363} Rooney, 84-85. These are Aberystwyth, NLW Peniarth 383D; BL Lansdowne 229; and BL Harley 912.
\textsuperscript{364} GCO VI, xxxviii.
\textsuperscript{365} *Ibid.* See II.1.
Thorpe suggests Gerald may have presented a copy personally to Stephen Langton when they met in Guildford in the autumn of 1215.\footnote{Thorpe, Journey, 39 n.121.}

The textual changes to Version III include additional details about Gerald’s own role during the journey, more description of St. David’s, and a recharacterization of Baldwin in the final chapter. Gerald also adds miracles to I.2 (containing the most miracles already) and characterizations of the monastic orders in I.3. He adds the amusing detail that, while the Gospel of John would drive devils away, placing Geoffrey of Monmouth’s \textit{Historia Regum Britanniae} on Meilyr’s lap caused him to be swarmed by them. Additional cases of demon possession are added in I.12.

Though this chapter will not address the \textit{Descriptio} separately, it is worth noting the dates of its various versions for chronological comprehensiveness. Version I of the \textit{Descriptio} dates from c. 1194, as was discussed briefly in Chapter 1, and was dedicated to Hubert Walter. Version II dates to c. 1215, and was dedicated to Stephen Langton. All of the manuscripts of Version I are defective, missing a section from the middle of I.8 to the middle of I.17.

**COMPOSING THE LANDSCAPE OF WALES -- VERSION I (1191)**

The \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} was written in crisis. In early 1189, everything had been looking up for Gerald. He had presented Version II of the \textit{Topographia Hibernica} at Oxford, winning, as he said, renown (as well as some criticism) from his scholarly audience.\footnote{See Lewis Thorpe, “A Public Reading in Oxford in 1188 or 1189,” \textit{Neophilologus} 62.3 (1978): 455-458.} Though he had yet to receive any particular reward from Henry II, there were indications that such a reward might yet be forthcoming, and Gerald went overboard with praise for Henry in the final chapters of that work.\footnote{See the discussion above, Ch. 2.} Gerald had accompanied the most powerful cleric in England, Archbishop Baldwin of Canterbury, on a highly successful preaching circuit through Wales the year before in 1188. This preaching circuit gave Gerald enough material for a set of works on Wales, and had given him the idea to write an entire series – the \textit{Topographia Britanniae} – which would cover Scotland and presumably England as well.\footnote{Gerald alludes to the \textit{Topographia Britanniae} in Version II of the \textit{Topographia Hibernica}, in III.XVI, when he notes that the sons of Muredus colonized Scotland after being driven out from Ireland. Additionally, the title to Version I of the \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} reads as if Gerald was planning a much longer work: \textit{Incipit Itinerarium Giraldi Kambrensis; et tam Kambriae quam Britanniae descriptio} (“Here begins the Itinerary of Gerald of Wales, and a description of Wales as well as Britain”). This is modified in Version II to cover only the journey itself. See Appendices A and C. This work was never written – Gerald does not mention it in his Catalogue of works.} During the journey through Wales, he had presented Baldwin with Version I of the \textit{Topographia}, which Baldwin praised so highly that he suggested Gerald be the official prose historian of the Third Crusade. Joseph of Exeter, Baldwin’s nephew and author of \textit{De Bello Troiano}, was to narrate the crusade in poetry, and to be attached to Gerald during the trip.\footnote{See \textit{De Rebus}, and above.}

\footnote{366 Thorpe, Journey, 39 n.121.} \footnote{367 See Lewis Thorpe, “A Public Reading in Oxford in 1188 or 1189,” \textit{Neophilologus} 62.3 (1978): 455-458.} \footnote{368 See the discussion above, Ch. 2.} \footnote{369 Gerald alludes to the \textit{Topographia Britanniae} in Version II of the \textit{Topographia Hibernica}, in III.XVI, when he notes that the sons of Muredus colonized Scotland after being driven out from Ireland. Additionally, the title to Version I of the \textit{Itinerarium Kambriae} reads as if Gerald was planning a much longer work: \textit{Incipit Itinerarium Giraldi Kambrensis; et tam Kambriae quam Britanniae descriptio} (“Here begins the Itinerary of Gerald of Wales, and a description of Wales as well as Britain”). This is modified in Version II to cover only the journey itself. See Appendices A and C. This work was never written – Gerald does not mention it in his Catalogue of works.} \footnote{370 See \textit{De Rebus}, and above.}
In the spring of 1189, Gerald, Archbishop Baldwin, and the Justiciar Ranulph de Glanville crossed the English Channel into France to begin making their way to the Holy Land. They remained with the English court in France in April and May. But on July 6, Henry II died at Chinon. Richard, fearing a Welsh uprising, sent Gerald back to England, where he was absolved of his crusading vow by the Cardinal Legate John of Anagni at Dover. Archbishop Baldwin continued to the Holy Land, and ultimately to his death at the Siege of Acre on November 19, 1190. King Richard, in England barely long enough to be crowned at Westminster, went immediately on crusade, but was unable to liberate Jerusalem, finally winning only a truce from Saladin in 1192. During his absence, John and his supporters fomented political unrest, causing, among other things, the downfall of William de Longchamp in 1191, to whom Gerald initially sought to dedicate Version I of the *Itinerarium*.

Version I of the *Itinerarium Kambriae* is thus a text on the precipice. Gerald released Version I with his own situation uncertain, having lost a powerful literary patron in Baldwin, and unsure of his political allegiances and loyalties under Richard’s new political reign. This uncertain position is mirrored in Version I of the *Itinerarium*. Gerald describes the journey’s progression from the point of view of a traveler, and presents the journey as looking forward to successful crusade and even a crusading pilgrimage in its own right. But at the end of the work, Gerald undercuts that vision, with information about Baldwin’s death and the Third Crusade’s failure. This retrospective frame imbues the narrative with a resonance of loss, frustrating the text’s own internal expectations.

### From Diligens Scrutator to Scrupulosus Investigator

The Welsh signifying landscape in the *Itinerarium* looks different from the Irish one in the *Topographia*. As laid out in the previous chapter, the signifying landscape in the *Topographia* resonated with colonialist tones, offering Henry II a catalogue of the “Marvels of the West,” analogous to the popular monster books portraying the “Marvels of the East.” The portentous Irish landscape indicated a loosening of Irish political boundaries, allowing for English incursion. At the same time, religious miracles marked inviolable holy space, mapping the limits of conquest. Gerald’s ability to properly read this landscape, combined with his official status in John’s retinue, contributed to the establishment of his authorial stance and authority over his material as a *diligens scrutator*. His interpretation and presentation of the landscape back to Henry II, at least initially, engaged with and operated in authorized and authoritative channels.

Gerald describes the Welsh landscape from a very different perspective. As he explains in the Preface to Version I of the *Itinerarium* (later, the Second Preface):

Loca igitur invia per quae transivimus, et tam fontium quam torrentum flumina nominatim expressa, verba faceta, viaeque labores et casus varios, notabiles

---

371 See *De Rebus*, II.21-22. Peter de Leia, Bishop of St. David’s, was also absolved at this time.
Therefore I have set down the pathless places we trod, named each mountain torrent and each purling stream, recorded the witty things we said, set down the hazards of our journey and our various travails, included an account of such noteworthy events as occurred in those parts, some in our own times, some long ago, the origin of the people there, with their behaviors and habits; and likewise a description of the countryside and of the father [likely Archbishop Baldwin –ed.], in this work, as if in a clear mirror, which I have presented to posterity. I cannot let all the effort which has been made be forgotten, simply because I am too lazy to set it down, or all the commendation which is due disappear in silence.\footnote{GCO VI, 12-13. Note the Version I reading has been adopted from page 13 n. 1. I have adapted the translation from Thorpe, \textit{Journey Through Wales}, 70, in order to provide a Version I reading and to better reflect the Latin syntax.}

The perspective of the \textit{loca} (places), \textit{flumina} (rivers), \textit{verba} (words), \textit{labores} (hazards), and \textit{eventus} (events) that Gerald plans to describe comes not from an officially sanctioned \textit{scrutator}-explorer, whose roving eye diligently inquired into all the unanswered questions he saw, but is rather that of the traveler, whose own journey dictates what will be included in the work. The Gerald of the \textit{Topographia} is concerned with boundaries and categories, and with cataloguing Ireland’s spaces from a macroscopic, all-encompassing view. In the \textit{Itinerarium}, no boundary keeps Gerald out; he maps the pathless places and names the unnamed streams, but he does so from the perspective of his personal journey, as he travels from place to place. Interestingly, this change in perspective has little to do with an empirical difference between the two journeys. Gerald’s role in Archbishop Baldwin’s delegation was just as potentially authoritative as his role in John’s retinue to Ireland. At the time of both journeys (Ireland in 1185-1186 and Wales in 1188), Gerald was officially attached to the court of Henry II. In both situations he acted as a guide on an official mission through terrain about which he had considerable experiential knowledge and expertise. Indeed, the argument could easily be made that Gerald had even \textit{more} authoritative capital during the trip to Wales. Not only were his relative expertise and connections throughout Wales much greater than Ireland, but critically, Gerald played an active role engaging in recruiting efforts during the mission. He was not “just” a guide; as he tells us, he preached on at least four occasions (Haverfordwest, I.11; St. Dogmael’s, II.2; Lampeter, II.4; Oswestry, II.12) and was integral to the mission. This change in perspective, then, is no accident of differing circumstances, but a deliberate authorial strategy. Gerald’s strategy of limiting and contextualizing his narrative voice within the journey, I argue, serves an important function in his ultimate creation and depiction of the Welsh landscape: by...
characterizing himself as a traveler-pilgrim, he can more easily create Wales as an analogue to the Holy Land.

Gerald’s constriction and localizing of his narrative voice is borne out in the text structurally in two related ways. First, Gerald self-consciously distinguishes between his role as a traveler and his role as author. Though Gerald generally uses the first-person plural (the “we” form) to describe the delegation’s movements, when he describes the past actions of Gerald-the-traveler, he uses the third person. He identifies himself either by his title *archidiaconus Menevensis* (“the archdeacon of St. David’s”) or by a referencing his role as author of the book. For example, Gerald does both while describing his turn preaching at Haverfordwest:

Apud Haverfordiam itaque primo ab archipraesule sermone facto, deinde ab archidiacono Menevensi, cujus nomen praesentis opusculi titulus tenet, verbo Domini gratiosa prolato, turbae allecta est multitudo tam militaris quam plebiae.

At Haverfordwest first the Archbishop himself gave a sermon, and then the word of God was preached with some eloquence by the Archdeacon of St. David’s, the man whose name appears on the title-page of this book . . . . A great crowd of people assembled, some of them soldiers, others civilians.\(^{373}\)

In this passage, Gerald refers to himself both by title, “archdeacon of St. David’s,” and as the person whose name appears at the front of the book. In this way Gerald emphasizes the parallel between himself as “the Archdeacon” and Baldwin as “the Archbishop,” while simultaneously reminding the reader of his special role as author. This second role is frequently emphasized, such as when he describes that *qui scripsit haec* (“he who wrote these [words]”) was the first to stand up in response to Baldwin’s preaching (GCO VI I.1, 14), or when the only packhorse owned by *qui scripsit haec* was nearly lost to quicksand, causing extensive damage to his book collection (GCO VI I.8, 72).

When Gerald-the-author is speaking directly to his audience in his authorial tone, however, he uses the first person. For example, though he is still narrating past events, Gerald will often introduce passages of *notabilia* by saying something like, *Hoc autem mihi notabile videtur* (“This seemed remarkable to me”), as he does when describing the skill of the men of Gwent with a bow.\(^{374}\) In this way, passages of authorial opinions or asides are marked both by a change in Gerald’s personal tense (to first-person singular) and catch phrases that indicate a digression or break from the narrative flow. Occasionally Gerald will end these digressions in a similar, self-conscious manner; after a passage describing Henry II’s love of Pembrokeshire’s falcons, he says, *Sed haec hactenus: ad viam de cetero revertamur* (“But enough of this: now we return to our journey”).\(^{375}\)

---

\(^{373}\) GCO VI, I.9, 82-83. Translation Thorpe, 141.  
\(^{374}\) GCO VI, I.4, 54.  
\(^{375}\) GCO VI, I.12, 99.
This distinction between Gerald-the-narrator and Gerald-the-traveler maps on to the structural division of each chapter, which is the second way Gerald emphasizes the difference in perspective between the *Itinerarium* and the *Topographia*. Rather than a chapter wholly on, for example, *De fluminibus novem principalibus* (“About the nine principle rivers”), which in the *Topographia* catalogues the nine major ancient rivers of Ireland from the perspective of an omniscient, *diligens scrutator*, the chapters of the *Itinerarium* are organized chronologically by location traveled. The progression of the book is literally the progression of the journey. Each chapter is titled by the physical area entered by the delegation, followed by the words *cum notabilibus suis* (“with its notable things”).

Just by reading down the table of contents (which almost all the manuscripts contain), the literal itinerary can be traced from its beginning in Hereford and Radnor (Chapter 1) through Ewias (Chapter 2), and circumnavigating the whole of Wales. St. David’s serves as a literal midpoint, ending Book 1 and beginning Book 2. A description of Baldwin ends the book, which itself ends with an account of Baldwin’s death and the failure of the crusade, serving as an ending – albeit an unsatisfactory one – to the preaching circuit. The division of the book into chapters that correspond with the journey’s own time-space units highlights Gerald’s perspective as traveler.

The chapters themselves usually follow a pattern. The title declares it is about whatever county or diocese is being traversed, with its “notable things” (*cum notabilibus suis*). Anywhere from the first few lines to the first few paragraphs are devoted to describing the journey up to that point, including details like the topographical elements encountered by the delegation, whom the delegation met, what church was visited, and whether a sermon was given. Gerald also frequently explains the etymology of place-names and recounts whether any significant battles took place there. These first few paragraphs are characterized by the use of the “we” form, but with the character of Gerald in the third person.

Following this, there is often an abrupt shift as Gerald-the-author interrupts the journey to describe the *notabilia* associated with that land. These are natural marvels, or miracles that are usually connected to the territory spatially (“not far from here”) or temporally (“nostris diebus”). The *notabilia* are often narrative – not just descriptions, but small stories involving characters, plot, and description that implicate the larger stories of history played out underneath the layers of the current landscape. Once Gerald exhausts his store of knowledge for that particular location, the chapter ends, and the journey continues.

As these snatches of narrative break one after the other on the narrative rocks of the journey, they build up a landscape bit by bit that resonates with the stories beneath it. An analysis of chapter I.8 provides a good example. I.8 is entitled *De Aveninae et Neth fluviis transcursis; de Abertawe quoque, et Goher; cum notabilibus suis* [*How we crossed the Rivers

---

376 GCO V, I.VII.

377 The *Descriptio Kambriae*, which Gerald wrote in 1194 and revised c. 1215, is ordered by topic much like the *Topographia*. That work’s strong political themes and ethnographic focus on Welsh mannerisms make it in many ways more parallel to the *Topographia* than the *Itinerarium*. 122
Avon and Neath, and then Passed through Swansea and Gower, with their notable things”].

Gerald begins the chapter by describing the delegation’s progress to the River Neath, and the area’s quicksands (vivi sabuli). The packhorses on the lower road faced particular danger, and one of them, the only one owned by qui scripsit haec (“he who wrote this”), was sucked down quasi in abyssum (“as if into the abyss”). It was barely saved, non absque sarcinæ detrimento librorumquæ (“not without some damage to my books and baggage”). Eventually, following the advice of their guide to cross the sands slowly, all arrived at the River Neath, which they crossed by boat. Passing the Neath monastery, the delegation crossed out of the diocese of Llandaff and into the diocese of St. David’s.

This boundary crossing provides Gerald the narrative opportunity to recount the chapter’s first res notabilis, an anecdote about David II, Bishop of St. David’s (and Gerald’s uncle), who had crossed the River Neath at the same spot. Gerald marks this transition by beginning, Accidit autem his nostris diebus, Menevensi episcopo David secundo hoc iter agente . . . (“It happened in our own days, when Bishop David II of St. David’s was making this same trip . . .”). Gerald recounts how the Bishop’s guide, a chaplain named Rhydderch the Liar who had recently been suspended, forded the turbulent river on the Bishop’s horse. Instead of returning for the Bishop, he rode off on the horse, leaving Bishop David stranded until he agreed to reinstate him.

These two passages are very tightly aligned. Both take place on the same geographical spot, involving the same journey (hoc iter) across the River Neath. Both involve religious delegations: Archbishop Baldwin, Gerald, and company; and Bishop David, Rhydderch (and presumably others). Both involve danger: in the delegation’s case, the quicksands, and in Bishop David’s case, the ford, which is described as vado recente maris influentis procella turbato (“with the ford whipped by a violent wind from the rising tide”). Both stories involve the instrumental role of a horse: Gerald’s packhorse (clitellarius) falls in the quicksand, while the Bishop’s “large and powerful horse” (equu[s] episcopi grand[is] et fort[is]) successfully navigates the ford and facilitates Rhydderch’s plot to be reinstated. Both involve guides: the delegation’s guide advises them to go slowly, while Rhydderch proves a false guide in finding the ford. Finally, both are resolved fairly satisfactorily with minimal loss. Gerald’s horse is saved, though his books are not. The Bishop’s horse is returned, at the price of reinstating a somewhat sneaky priest.

By following the delegation’s crossing with the anecdote of Bishop David’s, Gerald makes two authorial moves. First, he overlays the original (delegation’s) story with a subsequent narrative layer that frames or recasts the original journey. The delegation’s story is now contextualized: similar things have occurred here before. Both stories’ themes are reinforced: the peril and difficulties of travel, particularly crossing rivers, compounded by horses, unfaithful guides, and unpredictable terrain. This layering, in turn, builds up an archeological depth to the geographic location. Layered with tales and notabilia, the landscape of Wales becomes synonymous with the patchwork narrative beneath it. As we shall see in the analysis of the subsequent versions, Gerald changes the look of that landscape by adding or altering the notabilia that nuance and shape its contours.
Back to Chapter I.8: After finishing his tale about Bishop David, Gerald switches back to describing the delegation’s journey. They enter Gower and stay at Swansea Castle, where Mass is said and many people sign up for the Crusade. Gerald recounts how an elderly man asked Archbishop Baldwin to remit half the penance of the journey for a one-tenth tithe. Gaining the remission, he returned to the Archbishop and cleverly asked him to remit the rest of the journey for another one-tenth.

Gerald then introduces another res notabilis. In Version I, Gerald transitions from the delegation at Swansea to a memorable event that occurred in these parts but “somewhat before our own time” (parum autem ante haec nostra tempora, accidit his in partibus res memoratu non indigna . . .). This rather strange tale concerns the priest Elidyr (Eliodorus), who as a boy was admitted several times to an underground fairyland. Gerald describes this fairyland and its small inhabitants (homunculi . . . quasi pygmaeae) in great detail. When the boy’s mother convinces him to steal and bring her a golden ball, he is cast out of fairyland forever. He returns to his boyhood studies and becomes a priest. Eventually he tells his story to Bishop David II (the same David from the previous res notabilis). Bishop David tells Gerald (his nephew) that Elidyr would burst into tears during the story, and could still remember certain words in fairy language, which Gerald notes are very similar to Greek.

Like the previous res notabilis (and most of the others in the Itinerarium), this story is related to the preceding delegation’s journey specifically through geographic location. The transition to this story requires going back in time (ante haec nostra tempora), and imagining a series of actions previously occurring in the chapter’s delineated geographical space. The tale itself takes place “in these parts” (his in partibus), but in a fairy-otherworld, an underground kingdom where gold is plentiful, inhabited by small folk who never eat meat and never lie. This kingdom is reached through a tunnel on the banks of a river, nearby where the boy Elidyr was hiding after being beaten by his schoolmaster.

This tale quite literally plays out the idea that the delegation is journeying on only the surface of a landscape layered with narratives. Gerald transitions from his description of the present delegation and then, with the notabilia, reveals the narrative below the surface: here, a kingdom which (insofar as fairyland is locatable) literally exists underground. One can imagine what a core sample of the narrative terrain contained in this chapter might look like: on top, the delegation’s present journey across quicksand and the River Neath, followed by a similarly identifiable layer of Bishop David’s crossing somewhat in the past. Underneath that is Bishop David II’s discussion with Elidyr (and then Gerald), and at the bottom, the underground fairyland – full of narrative “gold.” The story’s geographic proximity is paralleled again by thematic similarity. Though not quite as similar as the two ‘crossing’ passages, the fairyland tale reinforces the theme of uncertain terrain. Like the quicksand that swallows Gerald’s books, the

378 In Version II, he first inserts a joke told between two monks in Archbishop Baldwin’s retinue. The first complains that the journey is too hard (dura). The second replies, “Not at all, yesterday we found it far too soft” (Quinimmo, nimis hesterna die mollis inventa est). In case you didn’t get it, Gerald explains this is a reference to the quicksand. GCO VI, 74.
fairyland represents metaphorically a space below the surface, a space from which only linguistic fragments (the Greek-sounding words) remain.

Monika Otter has examined how the loose, self-referential connections between the different episodes in the *Itinerarium* illustrate a notion of self-conscious, authorial play. She counters the common notion, in her view, that Latin texts are predominantly “vertical,” referencing an allegorical or theological meaning, with the idea of “horizontality.” In her analysis, she contends, Gerald’s themes emerge by “cumulative repetition” of associations.\(^\text{379}\) She analyzes both particular juxtapositions of *notabilia* and *notabilia* that are geographically located “outside” the *Itinerarium*’s chapters – though they are paradoxically still somehow “contained” by the chapter’s “borders,” these *notabilia* transport the reader outside it, and even outside Wales, frustrating, she says, the idea that the *notabilia* somehow create that landscape by cumulatively building up “underneath” it.

This horizontal dimension is at its most potent when the reference between world and text is most shaken, leaving only the textuality of the narrative to provide its uncertain guidance. The fairyland episode, she notes, provides a potent gloss for Gerald’s opinion of conquest: it is (to use her term) *gaainable tere* – desirable, appropriable land (it is “a most attractive country, where there were lovely rivers and meadows, and delightful woodlands and plains”) – but Elidyr’s hold on it is only temporary, and now suffused with loss.\(^\text{380}\) She likens this both to the author’s project and the reader’s. Gerald’s hold on his material is never quite fixed, and his ultimate project is not totally successful. Meanwhile, passages such as this suggest that it is during the *reader’s* journey that one must be particularly careful, where going through the *Itinerarium*, like the quicksand, gets particularly ‘soft.’

Otter’s interpretation, however, examines links between episodes that, in nearly all her examples, were added during different periods of the *Itinerarium*’s composition. In her two most prominent extended passages of analysis, I.8 (fairyland) and I.5 (Caerleon, to be discussed below), Otter analyzes juxtapositions of *notabilia* that were added only in Versions II and III to make her point (the quicksand joke in I.8 and Meilyr’s appearance in I.5). This does not, of course, render her argument moot; but it does show how a study of Gerald’s revisions can add greater dimension to her analysis.

Likewise, the *notabilia* that take place “outside” the chapter boundaries are, for the most part, only introduced in the revised Version II and Version III texts. (See Chart 4 below.) In Version I, only one true extra-textual leap occurs: taking the reader of I.11 to Chateauroux in France for another example of a prisoner killing the children of the lord in whose castle he was held.\(^\text{381}\) Version I’s other “leaps” are less dramatic: Fairyland in I.8, insofar as it is the Otherworld, is not technically locatable in Wales, though the tunnel to it is. In II.7 Gerald continues the theme of inherited defects by comparing a story from England. And the final

---


\(^{380}\) Otter, 149.

\(^{381}\) Otter discusses this at 135-136.
chapter ultimately follows Archbishop Baldwin to his demise at the Siege of Acre. It is only in subsequent versions, I would argue, that the accumulation of these geographic leaps begins to break down the *Itinerarium*’s figurative landscaping.

**Chart 4: Locations of the Notabilia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Location of <em>Res notabilis</em></th>
<th>Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1</td>
<td>Elfael</td>
<td>Version II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normandy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2</td>
<td>Bury St. Edmunds</td>
<td>Version III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winchcombe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.5</td>
<td>Strata Florida</td>
<td>Version II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8</td>
<td>Fairyland</td>
<td>Version I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11</td>
<td>Chateauroux</td>
<td>Version I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>Version III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12</td>
<td>Poitou</td>
<td>Version III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.7</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Version I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.9</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Version II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.10</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Version III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Garamantes]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14</td>
<td>Siege of Acre</td>
<td>Version I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Portrait of Baldwin]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Otter’s analysis must thus be qualified, though she is correct that Gerald shifts particular attention onto the readers of the *Itinerarium*. In the final passage of I.8, after engaging in a bit of comparative linguistic analysis among fairy language, Greek, Welsh, and Latin, Gerald ends the chapter with a disclaimer:

Sin autem interpositae relationis de veritate quid sentiam **scrupulosus investigator** inquiras, cum Augustino respondeo, admiranda fore divina miracula, non disputatia discutienda: nec ego negando divinae potentiae terminos pono, nec affirmando eam quae extendi non potest insolenter extendō. Sed illud Ieronymi semper in talibus ad animum revocō: “Multa,” inquit, “incredibilia reperies, nec verisimilia, quae nihilominus tamen vera sunt. Nihil enim contra naturae Dominum praevalet natura.” Haec igitur, et his similia, si quae
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contigerint, juxta Augustini sententiam inter alia locaverim, quae nec affirmanda plurimum, neque neganda decreverim.

But if you, careful reader, should ask me what I think about the truth of this interpolated story, I will only answer with Augustine that divine miracles are to be wondered at, not to be dissected with disputations. I will not place limits on the divine power by denying it, nor by affirming it, extend beyond the bounds of credibility. But I recall what Jerome always said about such matters: “Many things seem incredible and beyond probability, which nevertheless are true. Nature never exceeds the limits of God who created it.” Therefore this story, and those like it, if they should happen, according to the sentiment of Augustine, I would place among those which I believe can neither entirely be affirmed or denied.  

This passage should immediately look familiar: Gerald expressed a very similar sentiment in Version III of the Topographia. There, questioning whether a talking wolf was a man or beast, he conceded, Sed miracula divina sunt admiranda, non in rationem humanae disputationis trahenda. (“But divine miracles must be admired, not subjected to the reason of human disputation.”)  

He continued with a long discourse paralleling Augustine’s City of God, which (as I argue above) served to qualify the Topographia’s troublesome material without entirely undermining his own authority. Likewise, in Version II of the Topographia, Gerald added a subtle reference to Abelard’s Sic et Non in the prologue to the Secunda Distinctio, distinguishing between the marvels he “asserts” and those that he merely “relates.” This addition, also discussed above, allowed Gerald to shift the onus of textual interpretation onto the reader, freeing Gerald somewhat from his authoritative responsibility as a strict diligens scrutator, and instead placing emphasis on the diligens lector, the careful reader, to properly judge what he is reading.  

Gerald added those passages in the later versions of the Topographia to quell the voices of his critics and begin redirecting his prospective history from a purely political trajectory to a spiritual one. As discussed above, Version I of the Itinerarium was composed just as Gerald reached this crisis point: his two powerful patrons had died (Henry II in 1189, Baldwin in 1190), he had been turned back from the Third Crusade to keep an eye on the Welsh, and John was stirring up political unrest in Richard’s absence. This passage’s rhetorical move, then, is consistent with the Topographia’s revisions, but much more explicit. As in Version I of the Topographia, where Gerald protests that his tales come from the testimony of authentic men (probatissimorum et authenticorum . . . virorum testimonio), in this passage, Elidyr’s own
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physical performance of the tale’s authenticity – with tears and examples of the fairy language – provide the proof of its veracity. But here, Gerald directly addresses the *scrupulosus investigator*, the careful reader or investigator, and challenges him to deny the truth of the story, and thus, of God’s potential for miracles.

By circumscribing both of his roles in the *Itinerarium* (that is, as a third-person traveler and first-person narrator), Gerald limits, or at least contextualizes, the reach of his authority. This is a far cry from his stance as a near-omniscient *diligens scrutator* in Version I of the *Topographia*, though consistent with the revisions in Versions II and III. But because Gerald adopts a more localized authoritative stance throughout the *Itinerarium*, his role is much more prominent. Generally, Gerald’s role is personalized: He is always at the forefront of his narration, commenting on it and editorializing it as he presents it. It is thus much more obvious that the reader is receiving a filtered, highly personal and potentially biased account of both the journey and the *notabilia*. Even when Gerald declaims passing judgment on his material, his self-conscious, first-person voice is still a mediating presence within the work.

Additionally, as a third-person character within his own work, Gerald controls the terms by which he appears on and interacts with the Welsh landscape. Rather than slip accidentally into a position of dangerous proximity to the monsters on the Irish landscape (as in the *Topographia*), in the *Itinerarium* Gerald positions himself much more deliberately. Interestingly, his appearances are very often overtly textual in reference – that is, they have to do with books. His character presents a book (the *Topographia*) to Baldwin at Brecon (I.2). He loses books in quicksand (I.8). He finds Merlin Sylvester’s book of prophecies (II.6), though this is qualified in Version III. He preaches four times, partaking in, as Stephen Nichols recognizes, the authorizing discourse of the Word with respect to the journey’s mission.386 As we shall see, Gerald takes advantage of this control to great effect throughout the revisions.

The relative prominence of either of these two roles depends on whether Gerald is describing the journey or the *notabilia*. As we saw above with I.8, Gerald layers or interlaces *notabilia* with the journey as a way to build up the landscape underneath. The resulting landscape resonates with meaning – a meaning Gerald directs to various ends. In building up a landscape deep with meaning, the *Itinerarium* creates a figural or allegorical landscape for Wales, which, with its own (albeit piecemeal) underlying narrative, Gerald is able to successfully direct to or point toward that other resonant landscape, the Holy Land.

**Cum Notabilibus Suis: A Figural Landscape**

The prevalence of the *notabilia*, and the fact that they are only expanded throughout the versions of the *Itinerarium*, indicate that they play a significant role in Gerald’s authorial project. As Gerald narrates the journey through Wales, he deploys these ‘digressions’ to create a particular kind of landscape which contains two distinct narratives: the surface journey and the

“underlying” marvelous narrative. These are connected visually through topographical features – *vestigia* or remnants of the past marvel or miracle – which function as cross-temporal witnesses of the past to the present. By representing the landscape of Wales as one in which a traveler can “read” snatches of narrative which represents an actively sacred past (a past of miracles that actively shaped that landscape), Gerald creates a landscape for Wales that can signify or point beyond itself. This type of signifying landscape has an important and, for Gerald, deliberate analogue: the Holy Land.

**Evoking the Holy Land**

As mentioned in the introduction, twenty-five of the twenty-seven chapters of the *Itinerarium* explicitly mark dual levels on which the narrative operates. The first chapter, for example, is entitled *De transitu per Herefordiam, et Radenouram; cum notabilibus suis* (“Of the journey through Hereford and Radnor, with their notable things”). As discussed above, this duality is played out in the structure of the chapters, which begin with a description of the journey to hand, and then shift to narrative snippets of geographic and marvelous lore which characterize the landscape upon which the journey takes place. Both structurally and substantively, these *notabilia* enact a sacred, signifying geography for Wales analogous to the Holy Land.

In the first chapter of *The Witness and the Other World*, Mary Campbell identifies the salient features of pilgrimage narrative as the emotive structures of wonder and nostalgia. She notes that “the idea of pilgrimage renders the journey important as journey … so deserving of representation.” In travel accounts (as opposed to itineraries or guidebooks), it is the private experience of a self-conscious narrator which is valued. As Campbell notes, the early Christian pilgrim, like Egeria in the *Pelegrinatio*, “read in the stones and fountains and caves of Palestine the narrative that had lured them there, the story of the Jewish people, . . . whose holy places the Christian church was already beginning to appropriate . . . .”

According to Campbell, the Holy Land “lent itself to the development of a heavily allegorical topography” – a phrase she uses to indicate a topography that constantly refers to the text hovering beneath it. A topographical feature was a witness to an earlier, biblical event, just as the pilgrim on foreign soil became a witness during his journey. However, the (as Campbell puts it) “special kind of blindness and vision” of early pilgrims required to maintain this immediate and “allegorical” focus on the landscape did not last. In Bishop Arculf’s highly popular and influential *De locis sanctis*, written from his notes by the abbot Adamnan in the late seventh century, singular concentration on a sacred past gives way to interest in the contemporary. Campbell identifies the emotions which move these accounts: wonder, in that
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Arculf notices not only the holy places, but strange and new flora and fauna, natural wonders, and exotic difference; and nostalgia, in that the passage of time has changed the holy landscape, often leaving ruins rather than monuments – evidence, Campbell says, "not only of the past but of its remoteness."

The total experience of “sacred geography” of the Holy Land, then, as inherited through the legacy of pilgrimage narrative, has multiple parts. First, there is a relationship between a contemporary journey and an underlying, sacred narrative, as enacted through topographic elements. Second, the narrative is imbued with first-person traveler’s own emotions of wonder (at both holy places and at phenomenal or natural strangeness) and nostalgia, a sort of double vision of the lost past and contemporary present.

Gerald employs both of these emotive modes as fundamental to his project.

**Wonder**

In terms of creating a sense of wonder, Gerald focuses on two characteristics of the landscape of Wales. First, he emphasizes the holiness of the landscape through a progression of miracles and localized saints. This creates a sense of sacred space that directly engages with the rhetoric of pilgrimage narratives. Second, he focuses on natural marvels that signify beyond themselves. In this way, Gerald builds on the taxonomy of sacred, hybrid, and political space in the *Topographia Hibernica*, but by strategically deploying those spatial categories within narrative structures, constructs a layered landscape that resonates with meaning.

Sacred space in the *Itinerarium Kambriae* is demarcated, above all, by churches. The preaching delegation travels from church to church as it journeys around the perimeter of Wales. The *notabilia* associated with these churches often involve hermits, relics, martyrs, and saints. Most of these come into play in rather vengeful retaliations of a particular saint, in response to explicit acts of violation of their bodies, accoutrements, or their sacred locations.

In fact, the miracles in the *Itinerarium* are overwhelmingly concerned with holy spaces and localized topographical elements. The episode of St. Caradog can serve as an example. Richard Tancard, a young man who often brought food to the hermit Caradog, found himself caught in a heavy rainstorm. Taking shelter in the hermit’s cell, he attempts to call his dogs in from the rain:

Accidit autem aliquando, praedictum Ricardum ob pluviam inundantem ad domum eremiticam diversitisse. Et cum canes, quos secum ad venantum adduxerat, nec vocatone, nec adulatione, nec etiam cibi oblatione, ad se introducere posset, subridens vir sanctus, et ipsos manu leniter annuens, statim ad se venientes cunctos suscepit (I.11).
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One day it happened that Richard was caught in a downpour of rain and sought shelter in Caradog’s cell. He had brought his hounds with him, for he was on a hunting expedition. No matter how much he shouted at them, or coaxed them, or even tried to entice them with food, these dogs refused absolutely to come in out of the rain. Then the hermit smiled a gentle smile, and made a slight gesture with his hand, and immediately they all trooped in.\footnote{392}

The hounds refuse to violate the sacred space of the hermitage without the express consent of the resident saint, despite the storm, despite the shouts and coaxes of their master, and despite even the offer of food. The dogs recognize the inviolability of the holy space and refuse to enter until the hermit himself allows them in.

This miracle evokes two other episodes in the \textit{Itinerarium}, in which packs of hunting dogs become rabid after being lodged in churches (I.1 and II.7). In one episode, the dogs’ master is blinded, and in the other, he dies within a month. Episodes like these support Otter’s argument for the text’s horizontal thematic mode, but also simply highlight Gerald’s preoccupation with the inviolability of sacred space. This appears in several other miracle accounts: a murder in an abbey is miraculously avenged (I.7), and Henry II himself is punished with defeat of his army for allowing them to despoil the churches and holy places of St. Tyfrydog during his expedition to Anglesey (II.7). The miracle of the hounds indicates a \textit{natural} recognition of sacred or holy space – the dogs can see it, even if man chooses to ignore it.

Miracles also \textit{create} sacred space, as opposed to just demonstrating its existence, and many of the miracles in the \textit{Itinerarium} deal with the land itself responding to the needs of holy men. A hill rises up so St. David may preach over the crowd against the Pelagian heresy (II.4), and streams run with wine or milk at the prayers of bishops (II.1). A field of wheat ripens early for the charitable monks of Abbey Margam (I.7). With these miracles we get the impression that the land itself is somehow actively miraculous and responsive to prayer.

What is important about these topographical and localized miracles is that they – unlike healed pilgrims who return home – are visible, permanent features of the landscape. A miracle associated with the breach of sacred space in one instance is, we are told, still visible:

\begin{verbatim}
Accidit etiam eisdem in partibus, pueri cujusdam, pullos columbinos in ecclesia Sancti David de Lanmays a nido surripere volentis, lapidi supposito manum adhaesisse; miraculosa forte sancti illius vindicta, avium ecclesiae suae indemnitatem procurantis. Cumque diebus tribus et noctibus puer, cum parentibus et amicis, in ipsa ecclesia coram altari, vigiliis, jejuniis, et orationibus institissent, tandem die tertio, vinculo divinitus relaxato, manum a lapide virtus quae ligavit absolvit. Vidimus eundem, apud Niweburiam in Anglia manentem, se Menevensi episcoopo David secundo ibidem praesentantem, et transactis aetatum gradibus jam senem ex puero factum, quoniam in episcopi illius diocesi
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{392 Translation Thorpe, \textit{Journey}, 144.}
It happened in this same neighbourhood that a boy tried to steal some young pigeons from a nest in Saint David’s church in Llanfaes. His hand stuck fast to the stone on which he was leaning, this being no doubt a miraculous punishment inflicted by the Saint, who was protecting the birds of his own church. For three days and nights the boy, accompanied by his parents and his friends, offered vigils, fasts, and prayers at the church altar. On the third day, by God’s intervention, the power which held his hand fast was loosened and he was released from the miraculous force which bound him there to the stone. I myself saw this same boy, then no longer young but become an old man living in Newbury in England, for so the years had passed, when he appeared before David II, Bishop of St. David’s, and confirmed that these events really had occurred, the reason for this being, of course, that they had taken place in that Bishop’s own diocese. The stone is preserved to this day among the relics of the church in question, with the marks (vestigiis) of the boy’s fingers pressed into the flint as though in wax and clearly visible.

The holy stone of the church retains the vestigia – the traces – of the boy’s fingers, as if in wax, and the holy stone is now kept with the other relics as lasting, visible evidence of this miraculous moment. In fact, Gerald is here very concerned with authenticating this miracle himself. We are told that he has seen this young boy – now an old man – swearing before the bishop that this miracle most certainly – certissima relatione – occurred. Gerald’s constant emphasis on the visibility of miraculous events on the landscape, and the visibility of Wales’s holy spaces in general, is highly significant when compared with a tale in Arculf’s De Locis Sanctis:

“Wonderful to relate, to this day there remain in the marble column [where Saint George was flogged] the prints of [a hard-hearted unbeliever’s] ten fingers inserted up to the roots, and into this place the holy Arculf inserted his own ten fingers, they likewise penetrating up to the roots.”

In this way, the traveler through the Holy Land not only sees evidence of the land’s holy past, but can also connect to it in the course of his own journey; a doubting Thomas can reenact the miracle by inserting his own fingers in the indentations left by the miracle.

In addition to a multitude of churches and holy spaces, Gerald narrates a wondrous topography of natural features. Wales’s horridi fines (wild borders) contain marvelous pools, springs, rivers, lakes, hills, mountains, stones, and animals. Gerald tells us of pools which burst their banks and fish that fight with one another at the death of kings (I.1), lakes which change
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color (I.2), and rocks which under different conditions emit noises (I.6) or sweat (II.7) – that stone will return to its spot no matter how far away it is carried. Caves adjust their size depending on who stands in them (II.3) and hills, as noted, rise up according to the needs of saints (II.4). Mount Snowdon contains marvelous lakes with floating islands and springs which run hot at night and cold by day (II.10). Animals with particularly interesting natural behaviors are described in great detail, such as poisonous weasels (I.12), falcons (I.12), tame birds (II.1), salmon (II.3), and – Gerald’s favorite – beavers (II.3).

What is significant about the naturalia Gerald mentions is that a great many of them are portentous. The natural landscape of Wales is one that is pervasive with meaning. The aforementioned pools in the Elfael district which burst their banks did so to signify the death of Henry I. That episode is followed in the next chapter by the lake which turns green:

Ea igitur quae nostris temporibus, his in partibus, notabilia contigere, praetererunda non putavi. Accidit itaque parum ante guerram illam grandem, qua tota fere provincia illa per filios Iestini in exterminium data fuerat, ut lacus ille magnus, qui fluvium Leveni ex se transmittit, simul cum ipso fluvio in Waiae flumen contra Glasbiriam ab ipso descendente, viridissimi coloris inveniretur. Consulti autem super hoc terrae illius seniores quidnam portendere potuisset, responderunt parum ante magnam illum desolationem, per Hoelum filium Moreduci factam, similis coloris aquam inventam fuisse (I.2).396

I thought that it would be useful to include at this point certain important events which have happened in this region during our own lifetime. A short time before in the great war in which the sons of Iestin ap Gwrgant ravaged the whole neighbourhood, the extensive lake from which the River Llynfi flows, pouring its waters into the River Wye opposite Glasbury, was found to be bright green. Certain elderly folk who lived in the area were asked what this signified. They replied that the water had become discoloured in the same way a short while before the devastation caused by Hywel ap Maredudd.397

The lake’s change in color is immediately perceived as having some kind of signification, otherwise the elder members of the community would not have been consulted in the first place. Moreover, the elders are not asked whether this sort of thing has happened before, or if it is normal, but what it means – quidnam portendere potuisset. The lake is interpreted as a portent; as Isidore of Seville notes succinctly in his Etymologiae, Portenta autem et ostenta, monstra atque prodigia ideo nuncupantur, quod portendere atque ostendere, monstrare ac praedicare aliqua futura videntur (“portents and omens, monsters and prodigies are so called because they portend and show, demonstrate and predict future events”) (11.3). The elders recall that the lake
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also changed color just before the devastation of that area by Hywel ap Maredudd around 1136. And indeed, Gerald tells us that this color change happened just before a great war, providing the future event of devastation that it foretold.

It is not only the landscape which can foretell events. Other portents that Gerald mentions include several hybrid animals similar to those found in the *Topographia*. ³⁹⁸ In one episode, a doe found with antlers *contra sexus illius naturam* (“against its natural sex”) is killed on a hunt and its head is sent to Henry II: “Unde et ob tanti prodigii novitatem, Anglorum regi Henrico secundo monstri ejusdem caput et cornua sunt destinata.” ³⁹⁹ We are not told what this portent signifies, but must have been endowed with some kind of marvelous property, as the hunter who shot the doe immediately became blind in one eye and was afflicted by a disease of paralysis. In another episode, which Gerald adds in Version II, he describes a *res prodigiosa* (prodigious event): a man gives birth to a calf. Gerald notes ironically, *novi alicujus et inusitati futuri casus ostentum, aut potius nefandi criminis ultricem declarans indignationem* (“Perhaps it was a portent of some unusual calamity yet to come. It was more probably a punishment exacted for some unnatural act of vice.”) ⁴⁰⁰

Through both miracles and natural marvels, Gerald evokes a sense of wonder at the landscape of Wales that signifies things beyond themselves, whether standing testament to a sacred past or indicating a future event. The topographical wonder evoked in the *Itinerarium Kambriae* creates an active, signifying landscape for Wales. The narrative structure in which these wondrous elements are presented creates a kind of double vision, in which the present journey always refers to yet another narrative event. The recognition of this gap between the contemporary visitor’s experience with the landscape, and the sacred, narrative past to which that landscape refers, is a phenomenon that Mary Campbell terms “nostalgia” – the second key emotive element in pilgrimage narratives, and the second device Gerald uses to create the landscape of Wales.

**Nostalgia**

What makes the landscape of Wales sacred, as opposed to just marvelously strange, is not just that “most of what was strange was also holy,” which is how Campbell renders the title of Arculf’s *De locis sanctis* appropriate despite its wide-ranging topics. ⁴⁰¹ Rather, it depends on Gerald’s ability to invoke a sacred and textual past for Wales analogous to the sacred and textual

³⁹⁸ See for example Asa Simon Mittman, “The Other Close at Hand: Gerald of Wales and the ‘Marvels of the West’” in *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, ed. Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003) and Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, “Hybrids, Monsters, Borderlands: The Bodies of Gerald of Wales,” in *The Postcolonial Middle Ages* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000). Other hybrids include the half-stag, half-horse in I.2, and the deer-cow and monkey-dogs in II.11, which is followed by the account of the deformed woman who can sew with her toes.
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biblical history of the Holy Land. Gerald recognizes the need for a textual past in his prologue, when he states that he plans to describe not only the deeds of Baldwin, but also the notabiles quoque tam moderni temporis quam antiqui partium illarum eventus (“notable events of modern and ancient times in those parts”).\(^{402}\) Gerald’s focus on the past is not accidental, but a significant part of his authorial project. Nostalgia is evoked by the realization of the space between the contemporary and the ancient. In the case of pilgrimage narrative, this occurs between the pilgrim’s present journey through a signifying landscape, and the understanding of what that landscape is acknowledged to represent. In the Itinerarium, Gerald invokes a similar structure for Wales; for the circuit to be complete, Wales needs a sacred past, an underlying historical narrative.

Gerald creates this sacred and textual past out of a combination of two groups of historical sources: the King Arthur legends that had been recently codified by Geoffrey of Monmouth in the Historia Regum Britannieæ, and material relating to St. David’s metropolitan status. And he evokes both of these narratives in extended descriptions of two “ancient and authentic” locations: Caerleon and St. David’s Cathedral.

In his description of the ruins of Caerleon, he evokes both Wales’s Roman and Arthurian past, and its Christian past, combined in the visible ruins of the urbs antiqua et authentica (“ancient and authentic city”):

\[\text{Dicitur autem Kaerleun Legionum urbs. \textit{Kaer} enim Britannice urbs vel castrum dicitur. Solent quippe legiones, a Romanis in insulam missae, ibi hiemare; et inde Urbs Legionum dicta est. Erat autem haec urbs antiqua et authentica, et a Romanis olim coctilibus muris egregiae constructa. Videas hic multa pristinae notabilitatis adhuc vestigia; palatia immensa, aureis olim tectorum fastigiis Romanos fastus imitantia, . . . ; turrim giganteam, thermas insignes, templorum reliquias, et loca theatraelia; egregiiis muris partim adhuc exstantibus omnia clausa.} \]

\[
Caerleon is the modern name of the City of the Legions. In Welsh ‘caer’ means a city or encampment. The legions sent to this island by the Romans had a habit of wintering in this spot, and so it came to be called the City of the Legions. Caerleon is an ancient and authentic city (urbs antiqua et authentica). It was constructed with great care by the Romans, the walls being built of brick. You can still see (videas) many vestiges (vestigia) of its one-time splendor: immense palaces, which, with the gilded gables of their roofs, once rivaled the magnificence of ancient Rome . . . ; a lofty tower, and remarkable hot baths, the remains (reliquias) of temples, and an amphitheatre, all closed within giant walls, which are still standing. [ . . . ]

Two noble men are buried here, and after Abinus and Amphibalus, they are the most famous protomartyrs of Britain, and likewise crowned with martyrdom, namely Julius and Aaron. Each had a church named after him. In ancient times there were three fine churches in this city: one for the martyr Julius . . . another truly named for the blessed Aaron . . . and the third was famed far and wide as the metropolitan church for the whole of Wales. . . . Caerleon is beautifully situated on the bank of the River Usk, navigable by ships when the tide is in, and surrounded with woods and meadows. It was here that the Roman legates came to seek audience at the great Arthur’s famous court. Here too, Archbishop Dyfrig handed over his supreme function to David of Menevia, for the metropolitan see was moved from Caerleon in accordance with the prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius: ‘Menevia shall be dressed in the pall of the City of the Legions,’ and so on. 404

Again, it is through visible vestigia of the past that the history below the surface is revealed to the contemporary traveler. Gerald even adopts the second-person videas, “you can see,” to emphasize the visual aspects of the scene. In fact, Gerald paints a picture of the scene from the top down, beginning with the golden roofs of palaces and the giant tower, down to the theaters and temples at street level, and eventually to describing the foundations, to “constructions dug deep into the earth, conduits for water, underground passages and air-vents.”

Gerald follows his description of physical downward movement with parallel, temporal downward movement. The text continues by descending through the geologic layers of time. First, Gerald describes the protomartyrs of Britain who are literally buried beneath the surface and their three churches which flourished antiquis temporibus, in ancient times. Gerald then pulls the reader into the setting of Caerleon in an idealized, golden past, set in amid woods and meadows where Roman legates would approach King Arthur’s famous court. Beyond that, Gerald points out, Caerleon is the locus of St. David’s metropolitan status, where Archbishop
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Dyfrig consecrated David of Menevia as Archbishop and the see moved from Caerleon to St. David’s.

Layered below Caerleon’s ruined surface, Gerald writes the story of King Arthur’s court and the literal foundation story of the archbishopric of St. David’s as the city’s two historical foundations. Both of these narratives represent a time presently lost to Wales, and both also had carried with them the promise of future renewal. Popular legend at the time held that King Arthur would return to liberate Wales from the English, a tale that Henry II attempted to put to rest by initiating an exhumation of Arthur’s body at Glastonbury Abbey (though it occurred after Henry’s death). Gerald himself provides the only two accounts of the exhumation, in his *De Principis Instructione* and the *Speculum Ecclesiae*. This lends further weight to the idea that Gerald would have been fully aware of the political implications of any mention of King Arthur, and the potential potency that such a figure had in creating the idea of a sacred, lost, and above all, distinctly Welsh past below the landscape. These political implications become more apparent in subsequent revisions to the *Itinerarium*, as Gerald begins to shift the text’s crusading frame to focus more squarely on Welsh political upheaval and his own quest to become bishop (or archbishop) of St. David’s.

And indeed, Gerald establishes St. David’s as the second locus of a lost past in the *Itinerarium*, and one that, as discussed below, became all the more important in the later versions of the work after Gerald took up the restoration of its metropolitan rights in 1197. Gerald was not the first to recognize its lost status: Bishop Bernard, who served St. David’s from 1115-1148, had also raised the claim, but had died before a hearing could be held at the Council of Reims in 1148. In the *Itinerarium*, Gerald reinforces the link between Caerleon and Menevia (St. David’s) when the delegation reaches St. David’s six chapters later at the break between Books I and II – the physical and narrative halfway point of the preaching circuit. At the beginning of Book II, he writes:


Since, then, Menevia (St. David’s) is the capital of Wales, and once upon a time the Metropolitan city, although today having more of the name than of the power, nevertheless I do not abstain as if to weep over the burial rites of our ancient and

---

406 GCO VI, 101.
authentic mother (antiquae tamen et authenticae matris nostrae), and to follow her most mournful funeral, and to lament with tearful sobs her ashes which remain half-buried. I propose to tell you briefly how the archbishop’s pallium came to St. David’s, from where and at what time it was brought, how it was taken away again, how many prelates wore it and how many have been deprived of that honor, giving their names, and bringing the story down to our own time.  

The beginning of the passage paints the church at St. David’s as itself a ruin – a monument only to the greatness that it has lost. Like Caerleon, Gerald describes St. David’s as antiqua et authentica (“ancient and authentic”). Gerald’s focus on antiquity and authenticity shows a deliberate preoccupation with the past but also its veracity: Caerleon and St. David’s are physical, true remnants of an earlier era, remote but potentially renewable. In writing the history of the see of St. David’s in the subsequent chapter, Gerald once again connects Caerleon and Menevia by returning to the scene at Caerleon where Archbishop Dyfrig bestows the pallium on David. Further intertwining the two, Gerald notes that David was King Arthur’s uncle, following the opinion of Geoffrey of Monmouth. Thus a golden religious age is intertwined with a golden political one, and two “ancient and authentic cities,” liked historically and lexically, stand as ruins, witnesses to the present traveler of the past history of Wales. The emotion of nostalgia confers to the reader both this memory of a golden age, and the recognition of its loss.

Both the text’s senses of wonder and of nostalgia are expanded in the subsequent versions. As with the Topographia, nearly all of Gerald’s revisions are additions, and the majority of what Gerald chooses to add, and certainly the longest and most substantial additions, are marvels, prodigies, and portents which augment the wondrous, topographical landscape. And the idea that narration – that writing, or authorship – is the appropriate response to a lost nostalgic past, is shored up by the preface added to Version II, called the First Preface, where

---

407 Translation modified from Thorpe, 159-60.
408 He also uses that phrase in his De Rebus a Se Gestis to describe his Oxford reading of the Topographia Hibernica, which he claims revived in some manner “the ancient and authentic times of the poets” [quia renovata sunt quodammodo authentica et antiqua in hoc facto poetarum tempora]. GCO I, 72-73; Butler, 97; and see Chapter 2.
410 As editorialized by Thorpe: “Thirteen of the additions describe various local prodigies and marvels. Three are nature notes on dogs and beavers. Six are historical anecdotes . . . . Two are historical lists of monarchs reigning in 1188 and of the princes of South and North Wales. One contains quotations from two books in the New Testament. One is a vague and negative remark about the deeds of violence done in the Black Mountains. One consists of three additional sentences on the salubrious air of Llanthony. Three more contain interesting references to historical events which occurred after Version I was finished. . . . This leaves us with eight additions in the revised versions of 1197 and 1214 which really deal with the matter in hand.” Thorpe, Journey, 41. See also Appendix C.
Gerald dedicates the text to Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln. In it he laments the nostalgia of a lost time of Latin authorship, a distinctly textual history:

Sed inter tot hominum species, ubi divini poetae; ubi nobiles morum assertores; ubi linguae Latinae moderatores? Quis hodie scriptis, sive poeticis seu historicis, literatam adornat eloquentiam? Quis, inquam, nostri temporis, vel mores astruit, vel inclite gesta perpetuis literarum vinculis aeternitate ascribit? Adeo literarum honor, in summis olim gradibus constitutus, . . . jam proclivis in ruinam, ad ima devolvi videtur, ut earum addicii studiis non solum hodie non imitabiles, non venerabiles, verum etiam odibiles reperiantur.411

Among so many different sorts and conditions of men, where are the divine poets? Where are the worthy souls who preach morality? Where are the masters of the Latin tongue? Who nowadays in his writings, whether they be poetry or history, can hope to add new luster to the art of letters? Who in our time, I ask, is building up a system of ethics, or, held firm for ever in the works he writes, recording for eternity deeds which are nobly done? In earlier times the man of letters stood on the topmost step in the hall of fame. Now those who devote themselves to study, which is toppled deep in ruin (in ruinam), or so it seems, and stuck in disrepute, are no longer there to be emulated, they earn no respect, on the contrary they are disliked and despised.412

To Gerald, the ruins of a golden age of writing are as visible as those of Caerleon. But they also hold the hope of renewal. Gerald, in the creation of a sacred past and in the writing of a sacred, signifying landscape for Wales, is answering his own call: using the antiquity and authenticity of the subject matter – the cities – to stand in for and subsequently activate the auctoritas of their author. As with his reading at Oxford, Gerald places his role as an author within a view of anticipatory, prospective history. By writing his histories, literally capturing noble deeds in the “chains of letters” (literarum vinculis) and thereby sustaining them for posterity, Gerald hopes to begin a process of renewal and renovation. As in the Topographia, Gerald believes writing this history will do something, that it will have an active effect on the course of events.

Both in the Itinerarium and on the landscape of Wales, Gerald points downward to an underlying, narrative history, one that he creates even as he alleges its discovery. This landscape acts out structurally the mode of “reading” the landscape that Campbell identifies in pilgrimage narrative. Gerald creates an allegorical landscape for Wales analogous to the Holy Land by writing over it with notabilia, building up layers which both point beyond – portentous lakes, hybrid animals – and point below, to an underlying past narrative text which blends Geoffrey of Monmouth, local lore, Arthurian legend, and the story of St. David’s.

411 GCO VI, 4.
412 Thorpe, 64.


**Crusade and Failure**

This figural landscape not only points below to an underlying narrative, but points beyond, constructing a quasi-typological, figurative relationship with Gerald’s prospective historical vision. This vision incorporates a successful outcome of the Third Crusade, resulting in the liberation of Jerusalem. Insofar as the Welsh landscape evokes the Holy Land, Gerald’s journey through Wales can be seen as a kind of stand-in for actual pilgrimage in the East. But further, the purpose of the delegation itself is to recruit for the Third Crusade; it is no accident that the delegation’s journey looks much like a crusade in the Holy Land itself. (Dimock himself refers to Gerald and Baldwin in his introduction as “crusaders.”)

It was Gerald’s intention that the *Itinerarium* be an appropriate prelude to the text he expected to write next: a prose version of the history of the Third Crusade. Archbishop Baldwin commissioned him to write such a work during this very journey: Gerald was supposed to accompany Baldwin to the Holy Land on crusade and write up the history in prose. As Gerald wrote in his autobiography (previously quoted in Chapter 2), Baldwin commissioned the text just after completing the preaching circuit through Wales:

This praiseworthy mission thus accomplished, as the Archbishop was passing from the borders of Wales into England, some of his clerks who were traveling with him and talking in his presence concerning this pilgrimage to Jerusalem, asked him who could worthily cope with the glorious story [*nobilem historiam*] of the recovery by our princes of the land of Palestine, and the defeat of Saladin and the Saracens at their hands. And the Archbishop replied that he had made good provision for that and had one ready who could handle the story exceedingly well. And when they pressed him further and asked who it was, he turned to Giraldus who was riding at his side, saying, “This is he who shall tell of it in prose, while my nephew Joseph shall record it in verse; and I will attach him to the Archdeacon that he may serve him and be ever at his side.”

Gerald’s anticipation of crusading success and future historiographical project suffuses the *Itinerarium*. The Wales is a parallel landscape to the Holy Land, complementing the delegation’s mission of preparing for crusade. When describing the journey on the way to Bangor, Gerald makes this connection explicit, comparing the delegation’s rough going over the terrain to their anticipated journey through Jerusalem:

Venientibus itaque nobis ad vallem via duce, tam in acensu quam in decensu valde praeruptam, cuncti ab equis dilapsi pedites perreximus, ex conducto,

---

413 Dimock, xliv.
414 GCO I, 79; Butler, 104.
Our road led us to a valley, where the going was hard, with many steep climbs up and down. We dismounted from our horses and proceeded on foot, in intention at least rehearsing what we thought we would experience when we went on our pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

In this passage, Gerald analogizes directly the landscape of Wales to the landscape of Jerusalem, making an explicit, figural connection between the two locations. The delegation, proceeding slowly on foot down the Welsh valley, is enacting as a prelude or rehearsal for their eventual crusading pilgrimage. This direct, figural connection is made all the more potent by the symbolic capital built up in the signifying landscape itself. The figural landscape of Wales, resonating with the symbolic narratives beneath it, is textually analogous to the Holy Land, and here, the delegation mimics their pilgrimage to Jerusalem on literal geography of Wales.

The mission in Wales was very successful. Three thousand recruits were signed with the Cross, and Gerald had secured a powerful patron in Archbishop Baldwin. Throughout the text and up until the very end, Gerald recounts the delegation’s diligence and evidence of divine favor: impressive sermons given by both Baldwin and Gerald, numerous miracles worked, people healed in Baldwin’s presence, and divine vengeance wrought on those who refused or were slow to take the cross. But paradoxically, by the time Gerald issued Version I of the *Itinerarium*, the Third Crusade already appeared a failure. Though Richard remained in the Holy Land, where he would ultimately come to truce terms with Saladin in 1192, the Seige of Acre and Philip and Leopold’s departure severely disrupted Gerald’s vision of successful crusade. In the final chapters of Version I, we see Gerald grappling with the actual outcome of the Third Crusade, and his recognition that his expectation had been frustrated. In last two chapters, Gerald again shifts the tone from traveler to author. But instead of writing more notabilia, he discusses the status of the crusading mission, comparing it directly (and unfavorably) with the success of the Welsh delegation that had preceeded it. He says:

In hujus itaque legationis longo laudabilique labore, circiter tria virorum millia crucis signaculo sunt insignita, lanceis et sagittis expeditissima, martiisque negoiis exercitatissima, solam cum hostibus fidei congrediendi moram communiter accusantia; fructuose quidem Christi obsequiis ac feliciter obligata, si

---

415 GCO VI, 124-25.
416 Thorpe, 184.
417 The *Itinerarium* includes such miracles as: the lump of turf on which Baldwin stood while preaching heals a blind woman, a man who swore he would first do vengeance for a death before crusading found his spear miraculously shattered in his hands, a man whose wife persuaded him not to take the cross overlaid her child that night. Gerald’s “miracle” sermon takes place in Version III.
salutiferae crucis expeditio tam expedite fuisset, tantaque maturatione profecta, quanta fuerat tam diligentia quam devotione collecta.

We worked very hard to make a success of our mission. About three thousand men were signed with the Cross, all of them highly skilled in the use of the spear and the arrow, most experienced in military affairs and only too keen to attack the enemies of our faith at the first opportunity. They were all sincerely and warmly committed to Christ’s service. If only the Crusade itself had been prosecuted with an urgency and forethought on a par with the enthusiasm and devotion of these men whom we collected!

Likewise, in the final chapter, a portrait of Archbishop Baldwin, Gerald focuses on the Third Crusade’s failure. He first introduces his portrait of Baldwin by reinforcing the connection between the delegation through Wales and the crusade to Jerusalem: Ejus autem, cujus legationis insignia, et quasi peregrinationis sanctae praeludia, succincta brevitate praelibavimus, tam interioris hominis quam exterioris proprietatem exprimere, praeter rem ne putetur. 419 (“I have given you a brief account of Baldwin’s mission, which was, so to speak, a prelude to his going on the Crusade. You must not think it out of order if I now describe his physical appearance and personality.” 420 The peregrinationis sanctae praeludia (“prelude of the holy pilgrimage”) is this time limited only to Baldwin, as it was a journey Gerald never made. And whereas the prelude mission was successful, Baldwin’s mission to Jerusalem met an untimely end:


This second successor to [St. Thomas], having heard of the insults offered to our Saviour and the holy Cross, lately attacked by Saladin, took the Cross himself.

418 GCO VI, 147; Thorpe, 204.
419 GCO VI, 148.
420 Thorpe, 204.
He obeyed Christ’s call by accepting the task of preaching the Crusade with great vehemence both near and far. Then he set out on his journey, taking ship at Marseilles, crossing the deep sea and landing without mishap in the port of Tyre. He made his way to Acre, where he found our troops. When he joined them, many of our soldiers, and indeed, almost all of them, were in a state of desolation and despair, for they had been deserted by their leaders. They were worn out by waiting so long for supplies, sadly afflicted by hunger and want, and made ill by the inclement climate. He was about to end his own life there in the Holy Land, but he gave them such succour as he could, by gifts and presents, by his words and by the example of his own life, embracing them in Christian charity.\footnote{GCO VI, 151; Thorpe, 208.}

Archbishop Baldwin died at the Siege of Acre on November 19, 1190. Gerald, of course, never went on crusade, but was instead turned back after the death of Henry II in 1189 to quell potentially rebellious Welsh nobles. This account of the death of Baldwin is thus the closest Gerald gets to writing a triumphant history of the Third Crusade. As appended to the \textit{Itinerarium}, it leaves the reader unsettled, and disrupts the vision of successful crusade anticipated by the delegation with a retrospective frame of loss and failure.

As the delegation traveled around Wales, Gerald, Baldwin, and the other members thought constantly about the Holy Land, and their eventual journey there. Gerald evokes this in Version I of the \textit{Itinerarium} by constraining his narrative voice to that of a traveler, focusing on the Welsh \textit{notabilia}, and ultimately, creating a figurative landscape for Wales that, by virtue of its structure and the context of the journey, points to Jerusalem, and projects the expectation of successful crusade. Twice he makes this relationship explicit, by calling the delegation’s mission a \textit{praeludia}, prelude, to the expected crusade pilgrimage. The \textit{Itinerarium} is thus itself a prelude, or a preface, to the expected textual account of the Third Crusade that Baldwin commissioned during the journey.

Unfortunately for this vision, the Third Crusade had stalled even before Gerald had finished the \textit{Itinerarium}. Both Gerald’s failure to actually embark on crusade and the death of Baldwin at the Siege of Acre fundamentally disrupted the figurative resonance of the landscape. Version II of the \textit{Itinerarium}, issued around 1197, reflects this disruption through the added \textit{notabilia}, many of explore the idea of portentous interpretation and prognostication. Additional \textit{notabilia} focus on local Welsh political unrest, reflecting a new perspective for Gerald, who had left the royal court and settled at Lincoln to retire.

\textbf{ON PROPHECY AND POLITICS -- VERSION II (1197)}

In 1196, finding his literary aspirations unfulfilled, Gerald retired from Richard’s court. He first attempted to return to Paris to continue studying at the university there, but found his efforts frustrated by the ongoing war between Richard and King Phillip of France. He decided to...
retire to Lincoln, where the famed magister William de Montibus, a major figure in the pastoral care movement, was teaching. Around 1197, he issued Version II of the *Itinerarium*, which was likely contemporaneous with Version IV of the *Topographia*. In Version II, as with Version II of the *Topographia*, Gerald adds a much longer preface at the very beginning of the work, rededicating it to a new patron (here, Bishop Hugh of Lincoln). Gerald casts Version II of the *Itinerarium* as a clean break with the court, saying in no uncertain terms:

Sed quia principibus parum literatis et multum occupatis, *Hibernicam Anglorum regi Henrico secundo Topographiam*, ejusdem filio, et utinam vitiorum non succedaneo, Pictavensium comiti Ricardo *Vaticinalem Historiam*, vacuo quondam quoad accessorium illud et infructuoso labore peregi; tibi, vir inclite, Hugo Lincolniensis episcopo, quem religio pariter et literatura commendant, laborem nostrum per horridos Kambriae fines non illaudabilem . . . destinare curavi.⁴²²

I completely wasted my time when I wrote my *Topography of Ireland* for Henry II, King of the English, and the companion volume, my *Vaticinal History*, for Richard of Poitou, his son and successor in vice, although I would prefer not to have to say it. Both these princes had little or no interest in literature, and both were much preoccupied with other matters. It is to you, Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, a man of great renown, equally at home in the pursuit of letters and the practice of religion, that I have dedicated this far from negligible work about Wild Wales . . . .⁴²³

In a similar vein as the *Topographia*, Gerald directs his text to an explicitly clerical audience after finding his work unappreciated by a royal one. In this way, he seeks to ensure that in Hugh, he will get the type of reader the *Itinerarium* demands, one attuned to the nuances of the work, but also one who will, importantly, reward Gerald with continued patronage. How fitting to establish that relationship with a work about Baldwin, who would have been Gerald’s patron, and whom Gerald calls Hugh’s *coepiscopus*, when he begs Hugh “to receive, with the same pleasure as if it had been written about you, all that I have set down in this little book about your brother bishop, a venerable man who became Archbishop of Canterbury.”⁴²⁴ As discussed above, Gerald introduces in the preface the idea of nostalgia for a lost, golden age of literature, which now stands in ruins. He weaves that idea in with the notion of Hugh’s patronage, ending the preface by saying:

---

⁴²² GCO VI, 7. In Version III, *Hugo Lincolniensis episcopo* is changed to *Stephane Cantuariensis archiepiscopo*, as Gerald rededicates the text to Stephen Langton in 1214.


⁴²⁴ Thorpe, 68.
Non itaque pileum sustinendo, non pulvillum suponendo, non plumam extrahendo, non pulverem, etsi nullus fuerit, excutiendo, sed inter alios palpones tibi scribendo placere constitui. … Et si forte nec tibi in hunc modum placere praevaleam, tum quia lectionis horam tam oratio suffocat quam occupatio, tum etiam quia literarum olim honor evanuit; saltem, si quandoque resurgat, posteritati. ⁴²⁵

However, it is not by standing cap in hand that I have tried to please you, not by placing a cushion for you to sit on, by pulling a feather out of the said cushion lest it irk you, by flicking off you a particle of dust that was not there anyway. But among all the other flatterers, I decided to please you by writing. . . . But if your prayers and your administrative duties leave you no time to read what I have written, or if perchance I fail to please you by what I have done, then, indeed, the esteem in which literature once was held really has vanished, and my work must be left to posterity, in the hope that one day such honours may return. ⁴²⁶

In this paragraph, amidst extreme alliteration, Gerald opposes his method for gaining patronage against that of “flatterers” – a topical subgroup that Gerald had no doubt had experience with while at the royal court. Gerald contrasts their actions, sustinendo and suponendo, with his, scribendo; it is by writing that Gerald will honor Hugh, and his offering has to do not with a pileum, pulvillum, plumam, or pulverem, but with the verb placere, to please. Gerald’s goal for his literary composition is to please its reader, and if that doesn’t work, then it is better dedicated to posterity.

Gerald’s appeal to Hugh with a reminder of the pleasure of reading is similar to the letter to William, Bishop of Hereford in Version III of the Topographia. As discussed above, for Gerald, the pleasing aspect of literature is associated with the wonder of both diligent investigation and eloquence. In the Itinerarium generally, Gerald uses the wonderful aspect of the landscape to figure or point toward the Holy Land. In Version II’s preface, Gerald contrasts the reader’s present wonder at the landscape of Wales with the idea of future posterity, should the reader fail to appropriately appreciate his work. In that sense, he preemptively mitigates any negative reaction. Knowing already that his goal of writing the Itinerarium as a prelude to a successful crusade has failed, Gerald sets up the text’s project as looking forward to a future time, where it will be read with understanding eyes and win everlasting fame for the author.

Gerald alludes to this fate often in the Preface, but in one passage in particular he does so in a way which focuses on the textuality of his project. After comparing the arma Mariana (“arms of Marius”), which have long since rusted away, with the carmina Maroniana (“songs of

---

⁴²⁵ GCO VI, 3.
⁴²⁶ Thorpe, 69; translation modified slightly.
Maro,” i.e. Virgil\(^{427}\), which still shine brightly, Gerald compares his own texts to another type of writing that, much like the chirograph discussion in the *Topographia* chapter, has effective and transformative authority:

> Inter haec ergo, quae contulimus, hoc distare potest; quod aurum et arma vitam hanc fulcire videntur, post mortem nil valitura; verum e diverso scripta parum in vita propter invidiam prosunt, perpetuum a morte sortita valorem. Sicut igitur testamenti, sic et scripti auctoritas mortis atramento confirmatur . . . .\(^{428}\)

It appears then, from what I have said, that this distinction can be made: wealth and violence seem to sustain us in this life, but after death they avail us nothing; on the contrary, the pursuit of letters brings us little except dislike as long as we live, but once we are dead our fame is immortal. Like a last will and testament *[testamenti]*, what we have written down in black ink is only of importance *[auctoritas]* when we ourselves no longer exist.\(^{429}\)

In the previous chapter, I argued that Gerald’s discussion of a chirograph highlighted his historical outlook: the idea that texts could affect the progression of history by causing or motivating certain events. The *Topographia* was set up to project the success of both Irish conquest and crusade, both of which ultimately failed. In this passage, Gerald compares the *Itinerarium* to a different type of authoritative text, a will. Whereas the binding power of a chirograph is activated, so to speak, when it is created, Gerald points out that the authority of a will is activated only on the death of its author.

This idea of textual authority only vesting at the death of the author engages with the perceived theory of *auctoritas* at the time,\(^{430}\) and is consistent with Gerald’s more contextualized authoritative stance in the *Itinerarium*, evidenced (as discussed above) by his decision in the text to distinguish his limited voice as (third-person) traveler from that of a (first-person) narrator. He also puts more emphasis on the role of the reader in understanding and interpreting the work, as we saw in the passage where he calls on the *scrupulosus investigator*, the careful reader, to judge the truth claims of the fairyland passage. Here in the Preface, Gerald qualifies his authoritative stance even further, seemingly acknowledging the limitations of his own authorial control over his work, while simultaneously anticipating a certain future vindication. The reader – and if not this reader, then *future* readers – will eventually give the *Itinerarium*, and by extension Gerald, their due.

\(^{427}\) In GCO VI, 4 n. 2, Dimock notes that at least one of the Version II manuscripts reads “Virgiliana” rather than Maroniana.

\(^{428}\) GCO VI, 5.

\(^{429}\) Thorpe, 65.

\(^{430}\) Minnis, 9-10.
While Gerald is loathe actually to relinquish any authorial control over his work, the additions in Version II in fact strongly raise this question of interpretive authority. Gerald himself had seen his efforts to anticipate history fail: By 1197, both the Topographia and the Itinerarium stood unfinished, in the sense that the figural relationships Gerald had set up between the text and projected history were unfulfilled by actual events. This raises the question: If a quasi-typological model of history does not work, and the author writing this type of history may have no authority, who does have the appropriate authority to interpret the future? Gerald raises this question with a number of added notabilia in Version II, all dealing with problematic examples of interpreting the future in the form of prophecy.

The first, and most compelling, addition in Version II takes us back to Caerleon. After the description of Caerleon’s ruins and its historical legacy, there is a short description of Goldcliff, a hill that shines gold in the afternoon sun. This leads Gerald to muse about the nature of diligent inquiry, saying, “If someone who was skilled in such work would only dig down into the mineral deposits and penetrate into the very entrails of the earth, he might extract sweet honey from the stone and oil from the rock.” Monika Otter interprets this passage in terms of the project of reading, as a challenge to the reader to “dig deeper” into the text to extract its meaning. In Version II, Gerald more than doubles the length of the chapter by adding a long passage describing a personage named Meilyr. He begins: Notandum autem quod in his Urbis Legionum partibus fuit diebus nostris vir quidam Kambrensis, cui nomen Meilerius, futurorum pariter occultorum scientiam habens . . . (“It is worth relating that in our days there lived in the neighbourhood of this City of the Legions a certain Welshman called Meilyr who could explain the occult and foretell the future.”). Like Gerald, Meilyr is a Kambrensis, a Welshman, a title Gerald uses in the title of the Itinerarium, including in manuscripts dating from his lifetime. As such, and as a character who foretells the future, Otter argues that he stands in as an author figure within the text, problematizing Gerald’s previous suggestion regarding Goldcliff that diligent inquiry will yield interpretive fruit. Otter’s analysis, however, is based on a Version III text; Gerald did not add a key component to her argument, a passage involving Meilyr and Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae (discussed below), until Version III. My argument rests on this idea of Gerald’s qualified and gradual questioning of authorial interpretation, illustrated through the additions of notabilia through the versions.

Meilyr as an author figure casts doubt on the very idea that deeper meaning may be found. First, his interpretive powers stem from a questionable source: a sexual encounter with a succubus, who had taken the form of a beautiful girl. When the succubus revealed her true
nature, Meilyr became insane: *Statim, loco puellae formosae, formam quamdam villosam, hispidam et hirsutam, adeoque enormiter deformem invenit, quod in ipso ejusdem aspectu dementire coeptit et insanire* (“Immediately, in place of the beautiful girl, he found a rough, hairy, and shaggy creature, totally deformed, and looking at her he began to lose his mind and go insane.”)\(^{436}\) Despite being healed at St. David’s church, he was still able to see and converse with unclean spirits, through which he had the power to tell the future and detect lies or falsehoods.

But, second, this interpretive power is far from perfect. Gerald notes that Meilyr’s demonic sight was wrong nearly as often as it was right, troubling even more this already troubled interpretive model. He says:

> Semper tamen cum spiritibus immundis magnam et mirandam familiaritatem habens, eosdem videndo, cognoscendo, colloquendo, propriisque nominibus singulos nominando, ipsorum ministerio plerumque futura praedicebat. In longe vero futuris atque remotis, sicut et ipsi, frequentius fallebatur: in propinquioribus autem, et quasi infra annum futuris, minus falli consueverat.

All the same, he retained a very close and most remarkable familiarity with unclean spirits, being able to see them, recognizing them, talking to them and calling them each by [its] own name, so that with their help he could often prophecy the future. Just as they are, too, he was often mistaken about events in the distant future, or happenings far away in space; but he was less often wrong about matters nearer home or likely to occur within the coming year.\(^{437}\)

Meilyr’s accuracy improves with temporal and spatial proximity – the same kind of proximity to the landscape that initially gives Gerald his authority as an author in both the *Topographia* and the *Itinerarium*. Likewise, Meilyr’s interpretive powers are qualified and contextualized, not absolute, reflecting Gerald’s own qualified authority in the *Itinerarium*. Gerald goes on to explain how it is that demonic interpretation functions, and uncannily mirrors his own authorial project:

> Sicut enim hostis ille antiquus, longis rerum experientiis et subtilitate naturae, ex signis quibusdam conjecturalibus argumentando de praeteritis, argute futura conjectat, sic et, indiciis haud dissimilibus, hominibus insidiando, interioriem mentis conceptum per exteriora quandoque perpendit.

From his long experience of things and by natural intuition, drawing his conclusions from certain conjectural signs and from his knowledge of what has

---

\(^{436}\) GCO VI, 57.

\(^{437}\) GCO VI, 57-58; Thorpe, 117.
happened in the past, the Old Enemy can foretell the future with great skill. In the same way, and by taking note of the same revealing signs, he can insinuate himself into men’s hearts, and sometimes discover the workings of their minds from exterior appearances.\textsuperscript{438}

Gerald, too, I have argued, attempts to project history in much the same way, drawing conclusions from signs (\textit{ex signis}) from past events (\textit{praeteritis}) and constructing his texts in such a way as to anticipate future events. This stems from his own type of experience – not necessarily with things generally, as the Devil, but specifically with typological modes of reading and understanding the world through texts. Gerald adds the Meilyr passage and discussion of imperfect modes of reading just as his own methodology is cast into doubt.

Three other major additions to Version II also deal with prophecy and foresight. In the chapter following the Meilyr episode, Gerald adds a \textit{res notabilis} that occurred when Henry II passed through Cardiff on his way to Ireland in 1172. This prophetic encounter appears to stem from divine rather than demonic sources: A holy man with a tonsure and wearing a white habit appears to Henry II as he is leaving prayers after Mass. The holy man addresses Henry II in English, saying, \textit{God hold thee, cunning} (in Version III Gerald adds the helpful translation: \textit{quod Latine sonat, Deus te custodiat, rex}).\textsuperscript{439} He then says that Christ, Mary, John the Baptist, and Peter all command Henry to outlaw work on the Sabbath, and that if he does so, \textit{nihil unquam inchoabis quod fine bono non compleatur, vitamque feliciter consummabis} (“all your undertakings will meet with complete success, and you will live happily until the end of your days”).\textsuperscript{440} Otherwise, he says,

\begin{quote}
\textit{[Q]uia nisi hoc feceris, vitamque maturius emendaveris, priusquam annus iste praetereat, tales de re quam plus in mundo diligis rumores audies, talenque turbationem inde recipies quae tibi usque ad exitum vitae non deficiet.}
\end{quote}

If you fail to do as I say . . . and if you do not soon mend your ways, before this year is out you will hear such news of what you hold most dear in all the world, and you will be so troubled by it, that it will stay with you until the end of your life.\textsuperscript{441}

Henry spurs his horse on to leave the man, but recants after going eight steps. By that time, however, the man has vanished, and cannot be located in the town. Gerald points out the truth of the man’s prophetic words, noting that the following Lent, Henry’s sons Henry, Richard, and

---

\textsuperscript{438} GCO VI, 59-60; Thorpe, 119.
\textsuperscript{439} GCO VI, 64.
\textsuperscript{440} GCO VI, 65; Thorpe, 124. Note here how “happiness” again accompanies successful fulfillment of prophecy, as in the \textit{Topographia}. See above, “Proximate Endings,” Chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{441} GCO VI, 65; Thorpe, 124.
Geoffrey had rebelled against him with Louis, king of the French. God, says Gerald, sent many such premonitions and warnings to Henry II (*multas et alias praemonitones et castigationes*) to try to convince him to repent of his ways before he died, which the king refused to heed.

Taken alone, this passage parallels other passages about Henry II that Gerald added in later versions of the *Topographia* (such as the archers at Finglas or the holy orchard), showing how God sought to punish or warn Henry through divine miracles and portents. By virtue of a retrospective frame, Gerald is able to construct the arc of Henry’s life from the portent to prefigured event and, eventually, ignominious death. In both the *Itinerarium* and the *Topographia*, Gerald sets up his eventual work in the *De Principis Instructione*, where this arc is fully enunciated.

Taken within the context of the Version II additions, moreover, this passage provides a counterpoint to the Meilyr episode. It depicts another quasi-supernatural individual with prophetic powers, and yet this one has divine origins. Whereas Meilyr’s foresight is limited by proximity and conditioned on demonic guidance, the mysterious holy man delivers to Henry a focused message seemingly received directly from the divine sources. This message turns out to be truth, as history shows; Meilyr’s interpretive power is far less reliable.

The episode of the holy man also stands in contrast to the final two additions dealing with prophecy, which include the passage about Simon, the red-headed steward whose status as the offspring of a human mother and an incubus gave him the ability to anticipate all the needs of the household, and an extended discussion on the Flemish practice of prognostication from the shoulderblades of rams. The Simon episode, because of his origin, recalls Meilyr from the earlier chapter.

The addition to the description of Flemish prognostication from rams’ shoulders highlights a third type of prophecy, this one solely based on human skill. The addition doubles in length the previous description of this practice, providing yet another gloss on the concept of prophecy by adding four episodes of prognostication to the one previously contained in the *Itinerarium*. Gerald describes this practice in Version I:

> Hoc autem mihi videtur hac de gente notandum, quod in armis arietum dextris, carne nudatis, et non assis sed elixis, tam futura prospeciunt, quam praeterita et antea incognita longe respiciunt; tempore quoque praesentia, sed loco absentia, quasi prophetico quodam spiritu arte miranda cognoscunt; pacis et guerrae signa, caedes et incendia, domestica adulteria, regis statum, vitam, et obitum, rimularum quarundam et notularum indiciis certissime declarant.

A strange habit of these Flemings is that they boil the right shoulder-blades of rams, but not roast them, strip off all the meat and, by examining them, foretell the future and reveal the secrets of events long past. Using these shoulder-blades, they have the extraordinary power of being able to divine what is happening far

---

442 Chs. I.XII and I.XI.
away at this very moment. By looking carefully at the little indents and protuberances, they prophesy with complete confidence periods of peace and outbreaks of war, murders and conflagrations, the infidelities of married people and the welfare of the reigning king, especially his life and death.\footnote{GCO VI, 87; Thorpe, 145.}

Gerald then describes one particular episode, in which a woman reads a shoulder-blade that, unbeknownst to her, comes from her husband’s flock, and reveals her own infidelity. In Version II, Gerald adds other instances, in which a man reads the shoulder-blade of a goat rather than a ram (and laments the fact that the man has such a small herd), telling of the number of people who managed to avoid devastation after Henry I’s death by leaving, a farcical episode in which a messenger farts while carrying the bone and wishes it up the nose of the reader, who sees it in the bone and retorts, and finally the prognostication of a theft, in which the reader claimed he could hear the warning bell ringing and trumpet sounding, even though the reading occurred before the theft itself.\footnote{See GCO VI, 88-89; Appendix C for Ch. I.XI.}

Unlike the episodes of prophecy that rely on demonic powers, the Flemish practice is based on a human skill: by “looking carefully” at them \textit{(longe respiciunt)}, they can see the future \textit{(futura prospiciunt)}. Though he does not explicitly call it such, this practice bears close resemblance to the practice of reading, particularly the type of reading that Gerald advocated in the \textit{Topographia} when examining the miraculous book of Kildare. In that passage, Gerald describes a model of sympathetic, wondrous reading that reveals more wonders the more often a reader engages in it: \textit{Haec equidem quanto frequentius et diligentius intueor, semper quasi novis obstupeo, semper magis ac magis admiranda conspicio}. ("For my part, the oftener I see the book, and the more carefully I study it, the more I am lost in ever fresh amazement, and I see more and more wonders in the book.")\footnote{GCO V, 123.} Both reading the book and reading the shoulder-blades reveal wonders \textit{(miranda, admiranda)}, and the discovery of those wonders is related to the amount of time and diligence applied to seeking them out \textit{(longe respiciunt, quanto frequentius et diligentius intueor)}.

This type of reading, I have argued, ought to be employed not just for books, but for the landscape itself, as Gerald does to report on how the signs of nature reveal and anticipate future events. Here too, the Flemish practice of reading shoulder-blades reveals the same \textit{type} of wonders that Gerald reports in the \textit{Itinerarium}: “periods of peace and outbreaks of war, murders and conflagrations, the infidelities of married people and the welfare of the reigning king, especially his life and death.”\footnote{Thorpe, 145.} These are precisely the type of wonders foretold by the wondrous portents of nature which make up the Welsh signifying landscape.

In Version II of the \textit{Itinerarium}, Gerald presents a number of mirrors of his own interpretive and authorial project in the form of prophetic accounts. By adding extended
passages on Meilyr, Simon, the holy man at Cardiff, and the Flemish practice of reading shoulder-blades, Gerald explores different modes of foresight and sets up additional models for his own project. This concern with the different modes of prophecy may stem from Gerald’s new setting, the school at Lincoln (and would coincide with his concern for categorizing monstrosity in Version IV of the *Topographia*). But more immediate to the text, these additions provide both the opportunity to inform the reader on how to read the figural history that Gerald is attempting to create, as well as the chance for Gerald to assess and examine his own project faced with the *Itinerarium*’s “failure” in light of the Third Crusade.

**Refusing to Write Present Politics**

A second and very disconcerting set of additions and changes to Version II of the *Itinerarium* involves contemporary political strife in Wales. Throughout the text, Gerald adds at least six of what I term “silence clauses,” or *reticentia* (Isidore 2, 21, 35). Gerald introduces these clauses with the same type of time/space indicators that he uses for the *notabilia*, connecting them to the territory demarcated by the chapter by announcing that they take place “within these borders” (*his in finibus*) and “in our own days” (*nostris diebus*). Rather than introduce *notabilia*, however, these silence clauses explicitly refuse to narrate the tales they refer to, only alluding to the horrible crimes and blood feuds caused by political upheaval in Wales.

The six silence clauses are excerpted below in Chart 5. They each bear a similar structure and convey exactly the same message: Gerald refuses to relate what horrible crimes have been committed in that particular region of Wales. These silence clauses contrast sharply with the *notabilia*, which Gerald habitually introduces with *mihi notabile videtur*, which means, “It seemed noteworthy (i.e. worthy to be written down) to me,” or *notandum est*, “I must write this” or “it should be written.” Instead, Gerald actively denies his usual role as author-historian, saying in, for example, Clause 2, *aliis explicare locum damus* (“I leave the passage to others to explain”), or again in Clause 3, *aliis explicare materiam damus* (“I leave the material to others to explain”), or most strongly in Clause 5, *noster explicare stilus abhorruit* (“our pen abhors to write about it”).

Importantly, while Gerald refuses to write about these crimes in the *Itinerarium*, the Welsh landscape memorializes them within itself. Gerald constructs several of the silence clauses to give Wales an active role, while he himself takes a passive one. In Clause 1, the borders of Wales (*Walliae fines*) are the subject of the sentence; though Gerald will not speak of them, “it is enough that the borders of Wales hold in memory and abhor” the excessive crimes that have been committed (*satis Walliae fines memoriter tenent et abhorrent*). Likewise in Clause 4, though Gerald does not say what the local crimes are, he assures us that *Kambria non ignorat* (“Wales is not ignorant of them,” or in Thorpe’s translation, “Wales knows only too well”).

These silence clauses interrupt both the narrative flow, such as it is, of the *notabilia* within each chapter, and seriously disrupt the vision of the figural landscape that Gerald presented in Version I. Rather than present some notable thing which can be read, interpreted,
and understood, and which builds up a landscape potent with meaning, these silence clauses depict the Welsh landscape as resisting description, memorializing the unspeakable crimes, but simultaneously refusing to have them written into the text. In these silence clauses, both Gerald’s narrative power and the power of the figural landscape of Wales are stopped cold by a political reality that encroaches on the literary construct, putting even more pressure on Gerald’s model of projected history.

Chart 5: Version II Silence Clauses

1. **Quanti vero et quam enormes excessus**, super fratrum et consobrinum exoculationibus, ob miserarum terrarum ambitiones, in his inter Waiam et Sabrinam, Maileith scilicet, Elvail, et Warthrenniaun finibus, his nostris diebus acciderint, *satis Walliae fines memoriter tenent et abhorrent.* (I. I; GCO VI, 19)

Wales recalls with horror the great number of terrible disasters which, as a result of the miserable desire to seize possession of the land, have occurred in our time, among bloodbrothers and close relations, between the Wye and the Severn, that is in Maelienydd, Elfael and Gwrthrynion. (Thorpe, 80)

2. **Quanti vero et quam enormes excessus** super matrimoniiis cruentiissimis, protractis tamen potius quam contractis, et sanguinolento divorcio praepeditis, ceterisque multis crudeliter exactis, hoc nostro tempore finibus istis acciderint, *alis explicare locum damus.* (I. II, GCO VI, 36)

I leave it to others to tell you about the inhuman crimes which have been committed there in our own times: marriages most cruelly brought about, inflicted rather than contracted, only to be cut short by separation and bloodshed, and many other savage acts of violence. (Thorpe, 96)

3. **Super excessibus autem partium istarum creberrimis et cruentiissimis, nunc provincialium in castellanos, nunc vice versa, vindicis animi talionibus, castellanorum in provinciales, quae nostris accidere temporibus, alis explicare materiam damus.** Ultimi tamen excessus enormis, caelisque cruentae, nostris diebus hic perpetratae, quam praeterire tamen, ne scelerosis in exemplum trahi possit, satius existimavi, vere auctor extiterat Anglorum rex Henricus secundus; vicecomes autem Herefordiae, Ranuphus Poerius, machinator. (I. IV; GCO VI, 49-50)
I leave it to others to tell the story of the bloodthirsty outrages which have been committed one after another in these parts in our own lifetime, sometimes by the local inhabitants at the expense of those in command of the castles, and then, the other way round, the vindictive retaliations of the castle-governors against the locals. Ranulf Poer, Sherriff of Herefordshire, was the person responsible for the most recent terrifying atrocities committed here with such inhuman slaughter in our own times, although Henry II, King of the English, was the real instigator. I have thought it better not to relate them in detail, lest they serve to encourage other equally infamous men. (Thorpe, 109)

4. His autem in finibus, nostrisque diebus, caeco dominandi ambitu, rupto consanguinitatis et consobrinorum foedere, fides quam enormiter in perfidiam evanuerit, diffuso per Gualliam pravitatis exemplo, Kambria non ignorat. (I. V; GCO VI, 61)

Wales knows only too well how, in this same neighbourhood and in our town times, through a blind lust for conquest and through a rupture of all the ties of common blood and family connection, evil example has spread far and wide throughout the land, and good faith has disappeared, to be replaced by shameful perfidy. (Thorpe, 121)

5. In his autem de Kantrefmaur finibus, kemmoto videlicet de Kaoc, illud ad animum revocans, “Dolus, an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?” et illud, “Et si non recte possis, quocunque modo rem;” quam enormiter in subditos, hoc nostro tempore, curia vindictam exercuerit, noster explicare stilus abhorruit. (I. X; GCO VI, 81)

My pen quivers in my hand as I think of the terrible vengeance exacted in our own times by the King’s troops on the subject people of the commote of Caeo in Cantref Mawr, and I call to mind the lines: Fair dealing or stratagem, which seek you in your foe? And again: If justice fails, use any means you can or will. (Thorpe, 139)

6. Quid autem, mortuo Oeneo, vel etiam in extremis agente, filii ejusdem, pravo dominandi ambitu, fraterra non respicientes foedera, diebus nostris inter se gesserint, hic praetereo. (II. VIII; GCO VI, 134)
I shall pass over in silence what was done by Owain’s sons in our own days, when he himself was dead or dying. In their desperate attempts to gain the inheritance, they showed a complete disregard of brotherly ties. (Thorpe, 193)

One of these silence clauses, Clause 3, is part of a larger project of rewriting. In I.IV, De transitu per Coid Wroneu et Abergavenni, cum notabilibus suis, Gerald makes a series of changes to the text in Version II and III in describing the so-called Massacre at Abergavenny.\footnote{See Appendix C, I. IV for the full progression.}

In Version I of the Itinerarium, Gerald describes in detail how William de Braose, a Norman nobleman in the Welsh marches, summoned Seisyll ap Dyfnwal and six other noblemen to his castle under pretext of peace, and then had them murdered. Gerald equivocates on William’s level of guilt by partially blaming the sherriff, Ranulf Poer, and claiming that William tried to intercede against the plan. In Version II, the description of the massacre is entirely removed, replaced by the silence clause, which places the blame squarely on Ranulf Poer and Henry II. Gerald likewise rewrites a section on William’s involvement. Thus, between Version I and Version II of the Itinerarium, the description of the event itself is deleted, the blame Gerald places on William de Braose decreases, and the blame on Ranulf Poer and Henry II increases. In Version III, however, Gerald rewrites the passage on William again, leaving the question of the extent of his involvement more open.\footnote{Version I reads “Praedictus vero Guillelmus de Breusa, qui vere non auctor sceleris nec executor extiterat, sed tantum executionis non impeditor.” Version II, as found in MSS Hc, reads, “Guillelmus autem de Breusa, qui vere non auctor sceleris, non machinator extiterat, nec executor, sed tamen executionis non impeditor.” Version III reads, “Guilelmus autem de Breusa, qui vere non auctor sceleris, quod potius tacere decrevimus quam exprimere, non machinator extiterat, sed vel executor, vel executionis non impeditor.” GCO VI, 53, note 1.}

Version II’s additions highlight Gerald’s own ambivalence to the Welsh political situation. On the one hand, he had been a member of the court, and accompanied Baldwin as part of an official delegation both to preach the Third Crusade and to help establish Canterbury’s prominence over the Welsh churches. But by Version II, Gerald had left the court in disgust, having never been compensated satisfactorily for his devotion. Wales itself, moreover, was faced with a kind of identity crisis: Half-settled by Norman lords who clashed with the local Welsh princes, and subject to incursions by the English crown, Wales was faced with a loss of sovereignty.\footnote{For additional information on the Welsh political situation, see R. R. Davies, Age of Conquest: Wales, 1063-1415 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).} For Gerald, three-quarters Norman and one-quarter Welsh, whose “side” to be on was a fundamental problem. Michael Richter notes that Gerald wrote his histories “while still trying his luck with the Normans,” a fact that is often “not fully appreciated” by scholars seeking to paint Gerald as an unabashed voice for the Welsh position.\footnote{Michael Richter, Giraldus Cambrensis: The Growth of the Welsh Nation (Aberystwyth: National Library of Wales, 1976) 2.} Keeping silent was a prudent course of action; these silence clauses make the events present by being noted as absent, an
attempt by Gerald to negotiate the dual position, one enacted in himself, of Norman versus Welsh.

But these silence clauses have an even greater impact on Gerald’s textual model of the figural landscape. They interrupt the idea of a signifying landscape that figures successful crusade through marvelous notabilia by imposing a Welsh landscape all too real, dealing with contemporary feuds and slaughter brought on by political vagaries and instability. The contemporary Welsh political landscape stands in contrast with the figural Welsh landscape of Version I, with its balance of wonder and nostalgia signifying successful crusade. Though in both versions Gerald preserves the landscape’s active character, in Version II Gerald is unable (or unwilling) to interpret its signs as prefiguring any kind of resolution. Thus, instead. Gerald adds passages that both question his own “prophetic” interpretive abilities and contribute to the instability of the landscape he interprets.

Unfinished Works: Journey for St. David’s

A third set of changes in Version II shows Gerald on the cusp of a radical change in course, and again invokes the importance of the fines Kambriae. As he was becoming more interested in Welsh political boundaries (though he is reluctant to speak about politics overtly), Gerald also became more interested in Wales’s religious boundaries: specifically, the question of the metropolitan status of St. David’s.

Gerald already included a long, historical excursus about the metropolitan rights of St. David’s in Version I of the Itinerarium. The preaching delegation reaches St. David’s at the exact midpoint of the work, in the final chapter of Book I. The history of St. David’s begins Book II, in which Gerald, as discussed above, laments the lost rights of that “ancient and authentic city.” Gerald traces the arrival of the pallium from Caerleon to St. David’s (Menevia), and then the loss of the pallium during a time of plague, when the archbishop fled to Dol in Brittany. After listing the bishops of St. David’s to the present day, he says:

From what we read, no Archbishop of Canterbury, except Baldwin, the present one, has ever entered Wales (Kambriae fines intrasse), either before the subjugation or after it. With praiseworthy devotion to the service of the Cross, from whence cometh our salvation, Baldwin has undertaken the task of traveling through our rough, remote and inaccessible countryside. In attempt to encourage people to take the Cross, he has planned to celebrate Mass in every one of the Welsh cathedrals.  

Gerald continues by noting, “Until recent times the see of St. David’s was in no way subject to Canterbury,” and by reciting the story, attributed to Bede, of how the seven Welsh bishops

---

451 Thorpe, 164. See Chart 6 below for the Latin.
452 The story is found in Bede, Historica Ecclesiastica, II.2.
refused to pay homage to Augustine, who had been sent by the pope as Archbishop and papal legate around the year 602. Gerald then recounts how Bishop Bernard (r. 1115-1148) attempted to reinstate St. David’s metropolitan rights, and finally describes a few natural miracles associated with the site.

The way Gerald casts Archbishop Baldwin’s circuit through Wales in Version I is very interesting. Gerald points out that no Archbishop of Canterbury has ever entered Wales using the phrase *Kambriae fines intrasse*, literally, to penetrate the borders of Wales. Baldwin’s mission sounds quite a bit like the rhetorical boundary penetrations that Gerald ascribes to Henry II in the *Topographia Hibernica*. But instead of acknowledging this political overtone, he attributes Baldwin’s unique visit solely to a desire to preach the crusade. Gerald thus glosses over the obvious politics of the visit, in which, by performing Mass at each of the Welsh cathedrals, Baldwin literally enacts Canterbury’s authority – and by extension, English royal authority – over Wales. Despite its context, which continually emphasizes St. David’s lost metropolitan rights, this passage uncomfortably avoids the issue of Canterbury’s supremacy. Presumably, this has to do with Gerald’s own official role in the delegation’s success, and his contemporary affiliation with (and hopes for advancement from) the royal court.

In Version II, Gerald makes a significant change: He deletes the line about Baldwin celebrating Mass. Baldwin’s tricky bit of religio-political theater no longer disrupts Gerald’s historical narrative of Welsh religious independence. Without this key detail, Baldwin’s trip is less threatening to St. David’s asserted claim; Gerald’s stated purpose for the trip, the preaching circuit, is much more believable. As depicted below in the chart, the detail about celebrating mass reappears in Version III (c. 1214), after Gerald’s fight for St. David’s has been lost.

**Chart 6: Version Comparison of Performing Mass**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Version III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De nullo vero Cantuariensi antistite legitur, vel post subactionem istam vel ante, Kambriae fines intrasse, praeter hunc solum; qui legationis hujus occasione, et salutiferae crucis obsequio, terram hispidam, tam inaccessibilem et remotam laudabili devotione circuivit, <em>et in singulis cathedralibus ecclesiis, tanquam in investiturae cusjusdam signum, missam celebravit.</em></td>
<td>De nullo vero Cantuariensi antistite legitur, vel post subjectionem istam vel ante, Kambriae fines intrasse, praeter hunc solum; qui legationis hujus occasione, et salutiferae crucis obsequio, terram tam hispidam, tam inaccessibilem et remotam laudabili devotione circuivit.</td>
<td>De nullo vero Cantuariensi antistite legitur, vel post subjectionem istam vel ante, Kambriae fines intrasse, praeter hunc solum; qui legationis hujus occasione, et salutiferae crucis obsequio, terram tam hispidam, tam inaccessibilem et remotam laudabili devotione circuivit, <em>et in singulis cathedralibus ecclesiis, tanquam investiturae cusjusdam signum, missam celebravit.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The deletion of this detail in Version II may indicate that Gerald already anticipated some role for himself in asserting St. David’s metropolitan rights, which, as described below, he did in earnest from 1199-1203. No longer attached to the court or in Baldwin’s retinue, Gerald edited Version II for a different type of audience: one that might be sympathetic to St. David’s claims.

Another change to Version II further strengthens the argument that Gerald was aware of, and possibly preparing for, an attempt to vindicate St. David’s metropolitan status, and also aware of the implications of Baldwin’s visit to Wales and his celebration of mass in its cathedrals. In the very first chapter, in which Gerald describes how Baldwin initially crossed into the borders of Wales, he adds the detail that the canons of St. David’s formally protested Baldwin’s visit to Rhys, Prince of South Wales:

As soon as he returned home, certain of the canons of St. David’s, moved by zeal for their own church, and leading men of his court whose approval and support they gained, went to see Rhys. They made every effort to convince him that he should refuse to allow the Archbishop of Canterbury to enter into the innermost parts of Wales, which up until then had been totally unheard of, and especially to the See of St. David’s [Menevia], which is the head of Wales. They said and
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453 GCO VI, 15-16.
claimed that, if the Archbishop were to proceed, great prejudice and damage would without a doubt be done to the future attempts to recuperate her [Menevia’s] ancient dignity and the honors of a metropolitan seat. This, I say, they pressed on the prince all in one voice, but because of that man’s innate behavior and natural kindness, not wanting to cause the holy man confusion by rebuff, they were unable to persuade him.  

This addition does a number of things. It shows the canons of St. David’s actively asserting their church’s metropolitan rights prior to Gerald’s involvement with the case. It is a rare moment illustrating Welsh resistance to Baldwin’s mission because of its local religious and political implications, rather than focusing on the delegation’s ultimate mission of recruiting for the crusade. And importantly, it shows Rhys in a position to protest the Archbishop’s delegation, but deciding not to. Gerald attributes this to Rhys’s own sense of hospitality and courtesy, rather than to any right to enter Wales held by Baldwin as part of his office.

These two changes in Version II indicate that Gerald of Wales became much more attuned to the question of St. David’s metropolitan status around 1197, and indicate the possibility that he was anticipating some kind of involvement in the assertion of those rights. Indeed, only two years later he found himself embroiled in litigation at the papal curia over both St. David’s status and his election as its bishop. A closer examination of Gerald’s role in the St. David’s affair, and his literary strategies before the papal curia, is the subject of Chapter Four. This study shows that Gerald indeed deployed the Itinerarium to help in his case before the Pope, and provides yet another example of how Gerald revised the function and content of his works to further different objectives.

**The Journey of Gerald -- Version III (1214)**

As discussed at the beginning of the above section, in Version II Gerald adds a preface dedicating the Itinerarium to Bishop Hugh of Lincoln. In Version III, he changes the dedication from Hugh, who died in 1200, to Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury. Stephen Langton had been consecrated in 1207, but only recently arrived in England because King John refused to recognize him. This resulted in a papal interdict which was only lifted in May 1213. During the interdict, many recognized churchmen left England: William de Montibus, for example, lived out his life in Scotland. John finally relented, and Stephen Langton returned to England, but animosity remained; soon after Langton’s return the barons revolted and events precipitated the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215, which Langton himself witnessed.

---

454 I have departed from Thorpe’s translation on 76-77, who emphasizes different aspects of the Latin through his word choice.

455 Though the recruitment itself had political implications; in the De Rebus, Gerald recounts how both the Anglo-Norman Earl of Pembroke and Rhys, Prince of Deheubarth complained of the loss of men due to Gerald’s preaching, thus rendering them more vulnerable to attack by the other. Butler, 101-102.
Gerald, having returned to England and come to an agreement with Archbishop Hubert in November 1203, retired again to Lincoln but took a number of trips, first to Ireland,\textsuperscript{456} and then to Rome once more, this time as a pilgrim, from 1206 to 1207.\textsuperscript{457} He began work on his *Speculum Duorum* and his autobiography, *De Rebus a Se Gestis*. He updated the *Expugnatio* and the *Topographia*, presenting the β-version and fifth version of those texts to King John c. 1209. He also wrote a life of St. Remigius and a life of his friend and former patron, Bishop Hugh of Lincoln, who was now considered a saint. In 1214, incredibly, the canons of St. David’s again offered him the bishopric after Geoffrey of Llanthony’s death, which Gerald declined. By 1214, two things were clear, which affected the interpretive lens of the *Itinerarium*: Gerald would never be an archbishop of St. David’s, and he would never write the history of a successful crusade. (This was particularly so after the disastrous Fourth Crusade in 1204.) Instead, based on the changes in Version III of the *Itinerarium*, which he presented to Stephen Langton in 1214, he sought to reestablish his legitimacy before Canterbury and memorialize his own “marvelous” role during the preaching circuit-cum-proxy crusade on the portentous Welsh landscape.

*Rewriting History*

First, though, Gerald had to reestablish his credibility before the archbishopric after the long and arduous fight for the independence of St. David’s and the Welsh see. As illustrated above in Chart 6, the detail that Baldwin celebrated mass at the four Welsh cathedrals is back in the text. This detail is located prominently in the first chapter of Book II, on St. David’s itself. With the litigation for St. David’s long behind him, and now trying to establish a relationship with the new Archbishop of Canterbury, there is no gain for Gerald in burying the fact that Baldwin was seeking to assert and strengthen Canterbury’s influence over the Welsh churches in the course of the preaching circuit. In fact, the opposite is true – as we shall see shortly, Gerald seeks in this version to show his zeal for the preaching circuit by emphasizing his own role.

A second major set of changes, I would argue, also illustrate an attempt to reestablish legitimacy in England after the damage to Gerald’s reputation and authority brought on by the fight for St. David’s. In Version III of the *Itinerarium*, Gerald makes a number of changes that concern the idea of prophecy and of prophetic history. First, he changes the account of how he found the book of Merlin Sylvester, essentially rewriting the story to excise his own association with that work, and second, he adds a number of details to his description of Meilyr, the Welsh soothsayer. Interestingly, while a significant change to this passage seems to discredit the idea of prophetic history, the additional changes seem to bolster Meilyr’s own credibility as an authentic soothsayer, and suggest possible hermeneutical categories for his type of foresight.

\textsuperscript{456} The exact date of this is unknown; it took place after his final defeat in Rome and before his pilgrimage there in 1206. Gerald mentions the trip in the *De Invectionibus*. J. Conway Davies, “Giraldus Cambrensis,” 194-195.

\textsuperscript{457} During this pilgrimage Gerald stayed at the Schola Angliae in Rome and offered all his possessions to the Pope, who received them and then reconferred them to Gerald.
Qualified Futures

As discussed in the previous chapter, in the final versions of the *Topographia Hibernica* and the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, Gerald made a series of changes to the prophecies he had previously reported. In Version V of the *Topographia*, Gerald adds and conflates two prophecies from the *Expugnatio* to goad John into returning to Ireland. But in the ß-version *Expugnatio*, Gerald deleted other sixteen prophecies of Molig of Ireland and Merlin Sylvester (also called Celidon), and qualified those of Columba the Irishman. He also deleted Book III, which was an introduction promising a full translation of Merlin Sylvester’s work.⁴⁵⁸ Gerald hopes John will fulfill the remaining prophecy through successful conquest, but removes any prophecy that had not come to pass.

In the *Itinerarium*, Gerald similarly excises Merlin Sylvester’s work – and not only the work, but the very fact that he found it. In Version I, Gerald reported that he had found the work of Merlin Sylvester while spending the night at Nefyn, saying: *Ea nocte jacuimus apud Newein, vigilia videlicet Paschae floridi. Ubi Merlinum Silvestrem, diu quaesitum desideratumque, archidiaconus Menevensis invenit* [“We spent that night at Nefyn, as well as the vigil of Palm Sunday. There, the Archdeacon of St. David’s found the long-sought and desired book of Merlin Sylvester.”].⁴⁵⁹ This book was the one he was to include as Book III of the *Expugnatio*. In the introduction to Book III, he claims to have found the book and diligently translated it, but suddenly stops short of publishing the translation for fear of offending those currently in power.⁴⁶⁰ There Gerald states:

> In huius igitur inquisicione libelli cum penitimos Kambrie fines frustra pluries transpenetrarassem, tandem viro sancto et litteratissimo Cantuariorum archipresuli Baldewino in salutifere crucis obsequium laudabili per Kambriam legacione fungenti, regio mandato comes effectus, in remotissima quadam Venedocie provincia et Hibernico mari contermina, que Lein vocatur, in veneracione quadam ab antiquo repositum, operam adhibens et impensam, diu quaesitum desideraturnque demum non absque labore libellum elicui.

I had several times penetrated the most remote areas of Wales in my search for this book, but all to no purpose. Subsequently, on the king’s orders, I was accompanying that saintly and most learned man Baldwin archbishop of Canterbury, who was nobly fulfilling the duties of legate throughout Wales to further the cause of the Cross of our salvation. It was then that, at long last, in a very remote province of Gwynedd called Lleyn, which borders on the Irish sea, I

---

⁴⁵⁸ See Appendix B.
⁴⁵⁹ GCO VI, 124, and 124 note 5.
brought to light, not without some difficulty, and by dint of much effort and expense on my part, the book which I had so long searched for and longed to find, and which had been hidden away there and treated with a certain superstitious awe from remote antiquity.\textsuperscript{461}

Gerald continues by describing his role as a translator, how he had solicited others who knew the Welsh language better than he to assist him, and even goes so far as to write out the first line of the book before cutting himself off. This entire section, comprising more than 65 lines of text, is deleted in the βI version, c. 1209.

In Version III of the *Itinerarium*, issued about five years after the β-version, Gerald changes the line about the finding of the book from *archidiaconus Menevensis invenit*, the Archdeacon of St. David’s found, to *archidiaconus Menevensis dicitur invenissse*, the Archdeacon of St. David’s is said to have found.\textsuperscript{462} By this change Gerald really does rewrite history, changing the facts of his tale to exonerate himself from the fallout had resulted from his alleged discovery and subsequent trumpeting of the Welsh prophecies. In this way, he turns the fact of the discovery into mere rumor, which combined with the deletion of the *Expugnatio*’s Book Three, allows Gerald to claim plausible deniability to his new audiences. Though the content of the prophecies themselves remains unknown, in 1214 an even more precarious political situation existed than when Gerald broadcasted his restraint in the α-version of the *Expugnatio* c. 1190, and Gerald’s own standing was much less certain.

In this vein, Gerald also adds material to the description of the Welsh soothsayer, Meilyr. Meilyr’s foresight was due to the fact that he could see unclean spirits, who would direct him to people’s lies and tell him other events of the future. Gerald adds Meilyr in Version II, and in Version III Gerald states:

\begin{eqnarray*}
\text{Contigit aliquando, spiritibus immundis nimis eidem insultantibus, ut Evangelium Johannis ejus in gremio poneretur: qui statim tanquam aves evolantes, omnes penitus evanuerunt. Quo sublato postmodum, et Historia Britonum a Galfrido Arthuro tractata, experiendi causa, loco ejusdem subrogata, non solum corpori ipsius toti, sed etiam libro superposito, longe solito crebrius et taediosius insederunt.}\textsuperscript{463}\end{eqnarray*}

When [Meilyr] was harassed beyond endurance by these unclean spirits, Saint John’s Gospel was placed on his lap, and then they all vanished immediately, flying away like so many birds. If the Gospel were afterwards removed and the *History of the Kings of Britain* by Geoffrey of Monmouth put there in its place,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{461} Scott and Martin, *Expugnatio*, 255.
\item \textsuperscript{462} GCO VI, 124, and note 5; see also Appendix C for II.VI.
\item \textsuperscript{463} GCO VI, 58.
\end{itemize}
just to see what would happen, the demons would alight all over his body, and on the book, too, staying there longer than usual and being even more demanding.\textsuperscript{464}

This proves, he continues, how much reverence is owed to the gospels, and that perjury on a gospel runs the risk of eternal damnation.

Modern scholars often bring attention to this passage, noting Gerald’s disparagement of Geoffrey of Monmouth with glee, and either reveling in its wittiness, or decrying Gerald’s own seeming hypocrisy. For if Geoffrey of Monmouth’s \textit{Historia Regum Britanniae} is full of lies, such that unclean demons revel on it, surely a similar criticism could be made of Gerald’s own historical texts? How can Gerald levy this barb at Geoffrey while at the same time owing so much of his material to it, indeed, using it as one of the bases for the underlying Welsh historical past?

Three responses come to mind. First, Gerald made this remark much later than the original versions of his two historical works. Again, a lack of scholarly attention to the versions of Gerald’s works has resulted in a conflation of Gerald’s positions over time. In the \textit{Topographia}’s later versions, Gerald qualifies much of his more outlandish material by distinguishing between asserting the truth of the subject and merely relating what he has been told. Much of that material involved Gerald’s own projected history, his expectation of \textit{quaestum vel conquaestum} that should have resulted and therefore rendered his text allegorically complete. As those expectations faltered, Gerald qualified his position, ultimately “finishing” his text with Version V, directed at John, who then won a decisive conquest of Ireland. The marvels and miracles of Wales, likewise, build up a signifying landscape for Wales in the \textit{Itinerarium}, which Gerald originally sought to make a prelude to the successful Third Crusade, and then attempted to recast through the subsequent versions. But here, too, Gerald increasingly constricts the perceived authority of his role as an author, placing, as described above, the onus on the reader to discern fact from fiction.\textsuperscript{465} By Version III, he can accuse Geoffrey of falsehoods because Gerald does not claim to assert the truth of the fabulous stories in the \textit{Itinerarium}, just to relate them to the reader.

A second point involves the different purposes to which Gerald’s and Geoffrey’s narratives were put. By Version III of the \textit{Itinerarium}, I argue, Gerald is seeking to reestablish his own legitimacy in England, as well as memorialize himself on the Welsh landscape. He had reinserted the detail about Baldwin celebrating mass, no longer seeking to bolster claims of Welsh independence in any immediate way. Interestingly, the \textit{Historia Regum Britanniae} was also credited with keeping alive a claim of Welsh independence: by reporting King Arthur’s disappearance to Avalon to have his wounds tended to, Geoffrey of Monmouth’s work fed British hopes that Arthur would return. As Gerald himself relates in the \textit{Speculum Ecclesiae},

\textsuperscript{464} Thorpe, \textit{Journey}, 117-118.
\textsuperscript{465} See the above discussion on Eliodorus’s description of fairy land and Gerald’s subsequent disclaimer on its truth.
Porro quoniam de rege Arthuro et ejus exitu dubio multa referri solent et fabulæ constringi, Britonum populi ipsum adhuc vivere fatue contendentibus, ut fabulosus exsufflatis, et veris ac certis asseveratis, veritas ipsa de caetero circiter haec liquido pateat, quaedam hic adjicere curavimus indubitate veritate comperta. . . .

Propter hoc enim fabulosi Britones et eorum cantores fingere solebant quod dea quaedam phantastica, scilicet et Morganis dicta, corpus Arthuri in insulam detulit Avalloniam ad ejus vulnera sanandum. Quae cum sanata fuerint, redibit rex fortis et potens, ad Britones regendum, ut ducunt, sicut solet; propter quod, ipsum expectant adhuc venturum sicut Judaei Messiam suum, majori etiam fatuitate et infelicitate, simul ac infidelitate decepti.

Many tales are told and many legends have been invented about King Arthur and his mysterious ending. In their stupidity the British people maintain that he is still alive. Now that the truth is known, I have taken the trouble to add a few more details in this present chapter. The fairy-tales have been snuffed out, and the true and indubitable facts are made known, so that what really happened must be made crystal clear to all and separated from the myths which have accumulated on the subject . . .

[T]he credulous Britons and their bards invented the legend that a fantastic sorceress called Morgan had removed Arthur’s body to the Isle of Avalon so that she might cure his wounds there. According to them, once he has recovered from his wounds this strong and all-powerful King will return to rule over the Britons in the normal way. The result of this is that they really expect him to come back, just as the Jews, led astray by even greater stupidity, misfortune and misplaced faith, really expect their Messiah to return. 466

Gerald twice reports how Henry II had sought to locate Arthur’s grave, and how “in our own lifetime” [nostris diebus] there was staged an exhumation of Arthur’s grave at Glastonbury. Accounts of other medieval historians lead to a date of c. 1190-1191. 467 Gerald’s first description of the exhumation is in the De Principis Instructione, the first book of which dates from before 1199. It is only in the second account from the Speculum Ecclesiae that Gerald explicitly references the British hope that Arthur will return, and states that he intends his description to quash that hope and as a corrective to the mistaken historical accounts. The Speculum Ecclesiae dates to c. 1216, after Gerald’s changes to the Itinerarium show him distancing his own work from the idea of Welsh religious independence. His disparagement of the Historia Regum, implicitly in the Speculum Ecclesiae, and explicitly in Version III of the

467 According to Thorpe, Ralph of Coggeshall records the discovery in 1191 in his Chronicon Anglicanum, while Adam of Domerham recorded that Arthur’s body had lain in the tomb for 648 years, which, counting from Geoffrey’s date of 542 for the Battle of Camlann, yields a date of 1190. See Thorpe, Journey, 281 n. 630.
Itinerarium, implies he sought to distance himself from being associated with Welsh political independence as well.\textsuperscript{468}

Finally, Gerald is seeking to supplant Geoffrey as the source of Britain’s textual past. Gerald and Geoffrey are quite alike, both historians, both from a mixed Welsh and Norman background, and both treating similar subject matter. In Version III of the Itinerarium, Gerald wants to establish his own corpus as the textual foundation for Wales. Thus he adds a salient detail to the presentation of the Topographia to Archbishop Baldwin (added line in italics):

\begin{quote}
Archidiaconus quoque loci ejusdem opus suum non ignobile, \textit{Hibernica} ibidem \textit{Topographiam} archiepiscopo praesentavit. \textit{Quod ipse gratanter accepit, singulisque diebus obter inde vel legeis vel audiens attente, tandem in Angliam reversus, lectionem una cum legatione complevit.}\textsuperscript{469}
\end{quote}

At that place, the archdeacon gave his not insignificant work, the Topography of Ireland, to the archbishop. The Archbishop received it graciously, and every day read a small portion or had it read to him with close attention, and turning back toward England, completed the reading together with the mission.\textsuperscript{470}

According to this detail, Gerald’s own work, the Topographia, was read each day of the delegation’s journey. The journey through Wales thus has a new subtext – where the Welsh underlying past had relied on Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Arthurian material and the St. David’s history, now Gerald’s own historiography provides the fodder for the textual past. And indeed, by Version III, references to Geoffrey’s Historia Regum Britanniae are crowded by nearly nineteen references to a different corpus of works: Gerald’s own. As discussed below, by imbuing the Itinerarium with his own corpus, Gerald seeks to memorialize himself – his works – his memory – on the landscape of Wales.

Two other additions to the Meilyr passage illustrate a kind of ambivalence toward the idea of prophecy in general, actually bolstering Meilyr’s credibility as a soothsayer. First, Gerald adds a passage to the story of the downfall of Enoch, Abbot of Strata Marcella, who ran off with a nun during the night. Meilyr, he says, announced this on the day after it happened, claiming that a demon in the form of a huntsman told him the news. In Version III, Gerald adds, “The date on which [Meilyr] made this announcement was noted carefully, and many who heard what he said remembered having done so: yet it was only eight days or so later that definite information arrived and that the affair became common knowledge.”\textsuperscript{471} This line reinforces the

\textsuperscript{468} This may be particularly notable concerning that, by 1203 and the end of his fight for St. David’s, the Welsh princes were the only source of his support.
\textsuperscript{469} GCO VI, 20.
\textsuperscript{470} Translation here is my own; Thorpe has, “The Archbishop received it graciously and read a portion of it with close attention each day during the journey, or else had it read to him. When he returned to England he read the remainder of the book in the presence of his retainers.” Thorpe, Journey, 80-81.
\textsuperscript{471} GCO VI, 59 and n.3; Thorpe, 118.
marvelousness of Meilyr’s prophetic powers by appealing to outside verification, namely the notation of the date and the memories of numerous witnesses.

A second addition answers the question of how Meilyr could “see” the unclean spirits he communicated with. Gerald poses this problem in Version II, asking:

> Inter haec autem onmia admiratione dignissima, hoc solum censui magis admirandum, quod oculis carneis spiritus illos tam aperte videbat: quia spiritus oculis corporalibus, nisi assumptis corporibus, videri non solent. Si vero corpora, ut videri possent, assumpserant, ab aliis quoque praecipue praesentes et prope positi quomodo videri non poterant?472

Among all of these things worthy of admiration, however, I believe this one thing to be more marvelous, that he was able to see those spirits plainly with his physical eyes: because spirits cannot be seen with corporal eyes unless they themselves have assumed corporeal form. But truly, if they had taken on a corporal body so that they may be seen, why were other individuals who were surely present and standing nearby unable to see them?

Gerald’s critique of Meilyr’s vision poses a scholastic quaestio about the nature of visions, for certainly other spiritual visions suffered from the same logical dissonance. This critique gives Gerald the opportunity to critique and cast doubt on his tale of Meilyr from a didactic vantage point. But in Version III, Gerald provides an answer, still in the scholastic vein. He suggests:

> Sed forte corporali visione miraculosa visi sunt haec. Cujusmodi visione rex Balthasar in Daniele vidi manum scribentis in pariete, “Mane, Techel, Phares,” hoc est, appensum, numeratum, divisum; qui et eadem nocte regnum pariter et vitam amisit.473

But perhaps they were seen by a miraculous corporeal vision. With this type of vision, King Belshazzar from the Book of Daniel saw the writing on the wall, “Mene, Tekel, Peres,” which means “numbered, weighed, divided.” That same night he lost both his kingdom and his life.

This passage introduces a possible hermeneutical category for Meilyr’s corporeal vision of spiritual bodies, based on a biblical model of spiritual sight from the Book of Daniel. This suggestion again serves to reinforce Meilyr’s credibility. It provides a possible explanation for Meilyr’s powers, and also aligns that power with a biblical model.

---

472 GCO VI, 61.
473 GCO VI, 61 and n.2.
Taken together, the changes to the Meilyr episode in Version III recast the Itinerarium’s Book I Chapter V in an interesting way. That chapter begins with the marvelous description of Caerleon, which is analyzed above.\textsuperscript{474} In this passage, Gerald establishes a sacred past for Wales stitched from Arthurian legend as well as the history of Menevia, St. David’s Cathedral. Caerleon and Menevia loom large as two “ancient and authentic” places on the Welsh landscape, illustrating the depth and significance of the land itself. Gerald’s journey over the landscape, the delegation’s journey, is a journey not so much to preach the crusade as it is to experience and engage the Welsh marvelous past.

After the description of Caerleon, Gerald describes Goldcliff, where, as Monika Otter also notes, his challenge to dig down into the rock to extract “sweet honey from the stone and oil from the rock,” is also a challenge to the reader to “dig down” into the text to find the interpretive gold. But the Meilyr passage from Version II seems to question the idea of interpretive truth; Otter interprets him as a problematic figure for the author, led by demons and false histories, and often mistaken. Gerald’s critique of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae seems particularly jarring in the context of the full chapter, given that much of Caerleon’s historical description comes directly from that work. Even Gerald’s key link between Caerleon and St. David’s, the prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius that “Menevia shall be dressed in the pall of the City of the Legions,” the idea that the archepiscopal pallium was transferred from Caeleon to Menevia, is attributable to the Historia Regum Britanniae.\textsuperscript{475}

The result is not very satisfactory from the point of view of narrative cohesiveness: Meilyr’s visions are true, corporeal spiritual visions, except when he is mistaken; the Historia Regum is false, especially (as I contend) concerning Arthur’s death, except when it is true, concerning Arthur’s connection with Caerleon. The resulting “message” about interpretive reading, reading for the “sweet honey” below the surface, is a wild goose chase through “interpretive quicksands,” resulting in, as Otter concludes, a horizontality and self-referentiality that keep the reader squarely in the narrative mode, rather than pointing vertically to an allegorical meaning beyond the work.\textsuperscript{476}

But by reading across the versions of the text, another story emerges. This story places authorial intention and context behind the Itinerarium’s additions, allowing the construction of an alternate landscape. This Welsh landscape is not dissonant with conflicting stories, but resonant with built up narrative layers. The content may ultimately contradict substantively and lead to post hoc interpretive quagmires, but the process of revision shows Gerald pushing on the boundaries of what history can do, and attempting to direct his text to project future outcomes.

In Version I of Chapter I.5, Gerald describes the ruins of Caerleon, its history and connection with St. David’s, and Goldcliff, urging the reader to “dig down” into the archeological depth of a landscape suffused with wonder and nostalgia, a landscape analogous to the Holy Land. In Version II, grappling with interpretive crises of prophecy and Welsh political violence, he adds

\textsuperscript{474} See above, “Nostalgia.”
\textsuperscript{475} Historia Regum Britanniae VII.3.
\textsuperscript{476} Otter, 129-155.
the original description of Meilyr and a silence clause at the end of the chapter. In Version III, seeking to supplant the Arthurian material with his own corpus, Gerald adds the remaining details about Meilyr, discrediting the *Historia Regum* while offering explanations, through the *quaestio*, of Meilyr’s vision. If the result leads us in interpretive circles, it is only because Gerald’s failure to get a satisfactory conclusion has resulted in a landscape groaning with the weight of multiple narrative possibilities. But the structure persists: a landscape marked by narrative depth, scarred with visible tales, suffused with wonder and loss. This allegorical landscape is an analogous landscape, a Celtic figure of the Holy Land, across which the preaching delegation makes its own crusading pilgrimage. In the final set of changes to Version III, Gerald perfects this image, finishing it with a history he can finally fully create: his own.

*The “Odoporion Giraldi”*

A final set of changes to Version III brings the reader’s focus back to the delegation’s journey through Wales, and particularly to Gerald himself. First, Gerald makes a number of changes that concern crusade. Following the failure of both the Third and the disastrous Fourth Crusade, it was obvious he would never be a crusader in the Holy Land, or more importantly, write the history of a successful crusade, as Baldwin had asked him to do. Not that he necessarily wanted to go on crusade – he was absolved of his crusading vow twice at his own request – but two particular additions in Version III deal directly with the question of crusade, and significantly, they come in the very first and the very last chapters of the work.

In the first passage, Gerald adds extra details concerning his own decision to take the cross at Hereford. Whereas in Version I Gerald tells us he took the cross at the *importunam instantiam* – literally the troublesome or annoying insistence – of the King, Archbishop, and Justiciar, in Version III it is important to Gerald to sound as if he acted of his own free will, having carefully considered the task in light of the injury done to the cross, and moreover, that he was the first one to stand up. He says:

\[
\text{Ubi sermone statim super negotio crucis ab archipraesule publice facto, et per interpretrem Walensibus exposito, primus omnium, ad importunam quae praecesserat regis instantiam, et pollicitis plenam tam archiepiscopi quam justitiarii toties ex parte regis commotionem, qui scripsit haec, aliiis exemplum praebens, se primus erexit, et ad valdissimam quoque omnium inductionem, praemissis quidem occasionaliter adjutam, post crebras et anxias secum disputationes, ob temporis demum injuriam et crucis Christi contumeliam, propriae rationis persuasione, ad pedes viri sancti provolutus crucis signaculum devote suscepit.}^{477}
\]

---

^{477} GCO VI, 14.
When the Archbishop had publically delivered the sermon on the work of the cross, and it had been explained to the Welsh by an interpreter, he who wrote these words, thanks to the importune insistence which the King had given earlier, and the persuasion and oft-repeated promises of the Archbishop and the Justiciar, acting as an example for others, was the first to stand up, and for the strong encouragement to the others and adding to what they had just been told, after much anxious disputation with himself, in light of the injury and insult being done to the Cross of Christ, of his own free will threw himself at the feet of that holy man and devoutly took the sign of the cross.

The Version III addition, marked by italics, removes the focus from the insistence of others and emphasizes Gerald’s own agency. It is important to Gerald, by the time he revises Version III, that his decision to take on the cross be motivated by personal, fervent devotion and desire.

In the second addition, or rather set of additions, in the final chapter, Gerald inserts two particular episodes which alter the reading of Archbishop Baldwin. In Version I, Baldwin’s description is followed by one sentence concerning how his kindness proved ineffectual in his capacity as archbishop, which in turn is followed by a discussion of the quarrel between the crown and the priesthood and Thomas Beckett’s martyrdom. We are told that Thomas’s success is “nullified” by his first successor, and that his second chose another path – another type of martyrdom, if you will – by making good on his crusader vow and traveling to the Holy Land, where he died at the siege of Acre in 1190. Taking into account Gerald’s proclamation of the recruiting journey’s success in the previous chapter (if only the kings and earthly rulers had gotten their acts together), Baldwin’s death at Acre aligns him with Thomas, dying as a martyr, a fact which overshadows any perceived weakness at the administrative task of being an archbishop.

By contrast, Baldwin’s ineffectiveness is highlighted in both additions to Version III. To underscore his own sentiments, Gerald adds a line from a letter written by Pope Urban to Baldwin, “a most fervent monk, a warm abbot, a tepid bishop, a remiss archbishop” (Unde et eidem Urbanus papa quandoque scripsisse recolitur in hunc modum: “Urbanus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, monacho ferventissimo, abbati calido, episcopo tepido, archiepiscopo remisso, salutem, etc.”). In the second addition, Gerald makes it clear that Thomas’s martyrdom was clearly the more useful. First he adds a horrifying account of the deathbed vision had by Richard of Dover, Thomas’s “first successor,” in which he hears a terrible voice saying, “You have torn my Church asunder! I in turn will uproot you from the earth!” (vocem ... terribilem coelitus emissam, saying “Dissipasti ecclesiam meam, et ego eradicabo te de terra”). He follows this with a long exposition lamenting that, if only Thomas had been succeeded in the first place or the second (Si talis enim martyri pontifex primo loco vel etiam secundo successisset) by someone who would have continued the fight against the throne, the

478 GCO VI, 149.
479 GCO VI, 150.
Church would have held on to the benefits won by Thomas, and the successor would have won a martyr’s untarnished crown in heaven (*pro carnali corona corrupta in terris incorruptibilem et immarcescibilem sumens in coelis*).

This successor is clearly not Baldwin. After such a rhetorically charged, hopeful, and invested account of the miraculous vision of an angry Thomas and the lament of the lost “good fight,” the account of Baldwin’s death at the siege of Acre is made less a parallel to Thomas’s martyrdom and more yet another piece of evidence for Baldwin’s feebleness. Only on his preaching circuit does Baldwin act “viriliter”; when he arrives at the Holy Land, Baldwin finds only men in the height of desolation and desperation (*in summa desolatione jam positos et desperatione*), afflicted by fatigue, famine, and climate. Of his death, Gerald tells us: “He was about to end his own life there in the Holy Land: but he gave [the men] such succor as he could, by gifts and presents, by words and by the example of his own life, embracing them in Christian charity” (*diem feliciter in terra sacra clausurus extremum, singulos pro posse vinculo caritatis amplectens, sumptibus et impensis, verbis et vitae meritis, confirmavit*). Baldwin’s charitable death is not a very practical or useful one – especially given the failure of the crusade altogether. Baldwin’s fight is misguided; the archbishop would have been better off staying home.

As it is, the people will have to wait for another Thomas to renew the rights of the clergy. Gerald includes just after Richard’s deathbed vision an almost apocalyptic prophecy of future hope, in which the glory of St. Thomas will be rekindled, and the flame of the faith of the people will be renewed by – notably – signs and prodigies, as if by bellows and winnowing-fans (*et fidei fervor, qui jam refrixerat, ut igne caritatis reflammescat, signis recrebrescentibus et prodigiis tanquam follibus quibusdam et ventilabris exagitetur*). Gerald himself will of course never fight for the Church’s rights as an Archbishop, but perhaps Stephen Langton, to whom Version III is dedicated, will.

If an actual journey to the Holy Land proves fruitless, the journey through Wales takes on all the more significance. In addition to these anticipatory signs and prodigies already dotting the miraculous landscape of Wales, Gerald adds yet another marvelous thing: himself. The first hint of this new focus comes with a change in the title of the work. As Richard Sharpe notes, the *tituli* of medieval works are important sources of evidence about a text itself. Importantly, the incipits of Version I and Version II are found in manuscripts that definitively date from Gerald’s lifetime, and though no Version III manuscripts exist from Gerald’s own lifetime, it can be inferred that the incipit is part of his revisionist project as well. In Version I, the work’s incipit reads, *Incipit Itinerarium Giraldi Kambrensis et tam Kambriae quam Britanniae*

480 GCO VI, 151; Thorpe, 208.
481 GCO VI, 151.
483 Rooney, 117.
484 Evidence of Gerald’s manuscript production show him highly involved with the creation and distribution of his texts, the manuscripts of which contain a plethora of textual apparatus: tables of contents, incipits, chapter headings, and marginal *notulae*. Moreover, the Version III incipit is worded the same as that of Version II, with two exceptions: the substitution of Stephen’s name for Hugh, and the use of the term “*odoporicon.*”
descriptio (Here begins the Itinerary of Gerald of Wales, and a description of Wales as well as Britain). In Version II, Gerald changes the title to better reflect its contents, given that he never completed a full description of Britain, and memorializing Baldwin’s trip: Incipit Itinerarium Giraldi Kambrensis et laboriosa Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Baldewini per Walliam Legatio (Here begins the Itinerary of Gerald of Wales, and the Laborious Delegation of Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, through Wales). Before the new “First Preface,” he also adds the line Hugoni Lincolniensi episcopo magister Giraldus Kambrensis (To Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, master Gerald of Wales). In Version III, he changes the initial dedication from Hugh of Lincoln to Archbishop Stephen, but makes one other significant change as well, turning from the word itinerarium to that of odoporion, and calling the work the Odoporion Giraldi. The title is: Stephano Cantuariensi Archiepiscopo. In Odoporion Giraldi Prefatio Prima. (To Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury. First Preface of the Odoporion of Gerald).

The Greek ‘Οδοιπόρον,’ like itinerarium, means the relation of a journey. Regarding the title Itinerarium, Stephen Nichols notes:

... Gerald chooses to cast the account of the crusade preaching as a pilgrimage, an Itinerarium. By the late twelfth century, the Itinerarium stood for a literary form with almost a millenial association with the Holy Land, from the fourth-century Itinerarium Egeriae to eleventh-century accounts of Charlemagne’s putative pilgrimages to Palestine. In every sense, the Itinerarium, in a context where the Holy Land is an issue, represents a pretext for crusade as a declaration of prior Christian rights in Palestine.

Gerald’s title, Itinerarium Kambriae, thus projects an ideology onto the form of the work and the space-time in which it takes place. From the outset, Wales shares with Palestine an aura of sacred time and space, although the reasons do not become fully apparent until later.

Interestingly, Nichols’ conclusion is correct, but his analysis relies on a title that never appears in the text itself. And in Version III, on which Nichols bases most of his work, Gerald calls his work the Odoporion Giraldi, not the itinerarium. Nonetheless, Nichols is not wrong to say that Gerald is deliberately recalling a tradition of texts concerned with the Holy Land. The term hodoeporicon, too, seems to have been used to indicate a pilgrimage or holy journey to the Holy Land. The most famous of these now (because of its female author) is Huneburc of Heidenheim’s Hodoeporicon of St. Willibald from the eighth century, detailing the life of the holy man and his pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Two works which may be contemporary with

\[485\] See GCO VI, 3 n. 1; and 12 n. 1.
\[487\] This is because Nichols uses Thorpe’s translation rather than the actual Latin text from the Rolls Series. His analysis of other aspects of the work also suffers from this; he discusses passages added several decades apart as a uniform whole.
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Gerald’s are the *Hodoeporicon Ricardi Regis*, mentioned by Dimock in the glossary of the *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*,\(^{488}\) and the twelfth century *Hodoeporicon et pericula Margarite Iherosolimitane* by Thomas Froidmont. Both of these texts are about the experiences of the main personage while on the Third Crusade.

Gerald’s use of this term, then, implies that he is appropriating it for the specific purpose of invoking its pilgrimage and crusade connotations. It marks a deliberate development in the way Gerald is conceiving of his text: it only appears in Version III, in which many of his other changes specifically deal with the issue of crusade. Gerald does change the titles and prefatory descriptions of his texts as he revises; for example, the late versions of the *Topographia* say that the second part deals with prodigies “not those only which are found in this country, but others also, of whatever kind and wherever existing, which are of the same description,”\(^{489}\) as opposed to those simply dealing with Ireland. The switch from *Itinerarium* to *Odoporion* evokes more explicitly the literary tradition of purposeful (religious) travel to the Holy Land. By Version III, and evidenced by his revisions to the texts, the journey of Baldwin is no longer the intended focus: Gerald’s journey, his *odoporion*, is. Given the textual tradition, we could read *Odoporion Giraldi* as something like “The Pilgrimage of Gerald” or “The Crusade of Gerald.” This fits in exactly with my argument for the Third Version, that Gerald is creating a landscape for Wales analogous to, and which can can substitute for, the Holy Land, to go on his own pilgrimage or crusade.

In a second example, also added in Version III, Gerald gives a “miracle” sermon at Haverfordwest, after the Archbishop. He describes:

> Ubi et pro mirando, et quasi pro miraculo ducebatur a multis, quod ad verbum Domini ab archidiacono prolatum, cum tamen lingua Latina et Gallica loqueretur, non minus illi qui neutram linguam noverunt, quam alii, tam ad lacrimarum affluentiam moti fuerunt, quam etiam ad crucis signaculum catervatim accurrerunt.\(^{490}\)

Many found it odd and some, indeed, thought it little short of miraculous, that when [the archdeacon] preached the word of God, speaking first in Latin and then in French, those who could not understand a word of either were just as much moved to tears as the others, rushing forward in equal numbers to receive the sign of the Cross.\(^{491}\)

---

\(^{488}\) He states: “Odoporion, 3, 1.3; Gr. ‘Ọδοιπόριον. Giral dus, in the third edition only of the Itinerary, thus calls his history of archbishop Baldwin’s progress through Wales. According to Leland, a metrical history of Richard I.’s expedition to the Holy Land was entitled “Hodoeporicon Ricardi Regis.” See Professor Stubbs’ Preface (xxxvi) to the *Itin. Regis Ricardi.*” (GCO VI, 235).

\(^{489}\) Forester, 7-8.

\(^{490}\) GCO VI, 83.

\(^{491}\) Thorpe, 141, modified slightly to preserve the use of the third person.
This passage does two things. First, it lends to Gerald a bit of the air of the marvelousness himself, a portentousness which, as discussed in Chapter 4, he cultivated during and after the St. David’s affair. And importantly, it highlights the power of Gerald’s voice in the third person, the register of Gerald-as-traveler, as opposed to Gerald-as-narrator. By Version III, the reader is used to hearing the voice of Gerald-as-narrator interrupting the text first-person accounts of notabilia (saying something like hoc autem mihi notabile videtur). But the added voice of Gerald-the-traveler, “the archdeacon,” is more numinous and more deliberate: readings from his book frame each step of the delegation’s journey, and his Latin and French sermon inspires the unlettered Welsh.

And Gerald-the-traveler does not speak Welsh. Scholars have long debated whether Gerald of Wales actually knew Welsh or not, and have used this passage to try and solve the riddle. Unfortunately, this passage yields no definitive answer, for Gerald (the author) is deliberately constructing his character of “the archdeacon” so as to alienate him from the Welsh landscape. He is positioning himself as a foreigner in a foreign land. Together with the details about his taking the cross, Gerald seems to fashion himself as, literally, a peregrinus: pilgrim, foreigner, and exile. The notion of pilgrimage, at its heart, requires the pilgrim to be foreign – the work of the pilgrimage is in the displacement of the self from home to elsewhere. Gerald’s home is Wales, and in order to create his journey as the same type of “work” as a pilgrimage, he must create himself as Other, as a foreigner to the land through which he is traveling. Even at the moment when he is closest to home, so to speak, when Gerald tells us that he lives in Ewias, he does so in the first person, out of the context of the contemporary journey, and very clearly closes off the passage by saying, Sed ad rem revertamur (“But let’s return to our story”).

These changes to Version III draw on and emphasize the detail in the “First Preface,” added in Version II, that “[T]he pursuit of letters brings us little except dislike as long as we live, but once we are dead our fame is immortal. Like a last will and testament [testamenti], what we have written down in black ink is only of importance [auctoritas] when we ourselves no longer exist.” In 1214, when he released Version III of the Itinerarium, Gerald was nearly seventy years old. It was obvious he would be neither a crusader, nor archbishop of St. David’s. In the final version of the Itinerarium Kambriae, then, Gerald emphasizes those elements which draw attention to Wales’s sacred space – the marvels, miracles, and underlying sacred text – and emphasizes the role of himself as literal peregrinus – pilgrim, foreigner, exile. Shut out of St. David’s, a Norman in Wales and a Welshman in the court, Gerald writes himself as a pilgrim in odopon Giraldi – a pilgrim on his own crusade through the horridi fines of Wales, always searching for his Jerusalem.

And he is narrating something else, too. There is one final addition – and by final I mean that it appears in only the later two of the three manuscripts of Version III, which the editor

---

492 GCO VI, 47.
493 Thorpe, 65.
James Dimock is certain comes from the hand of Gerald, and may indicate the beginning of the next version of the text, an example of the ongoing process of Gerald’s revisions. He adds:

Id etiam pro valde mirando, de loco praescripto Lanthonei dicto, vel potius quasi pro miraculo duximus, quod in summis quibus clauditur undique montium verticibus, non petrosis aut saxosis, sed mollibus magis et herbosis, Parii lapides reperiri soleant; qui et *Liberi* vulgo dicuntur, quia secabiles, ferroque quodam modo polibiles, sese quasi liberaliter praestant; ex quibus ecclesia ipsorum jam extat egregie constructa. Super quo quidem et hoc mirandum, quod quaesitis ad unguem per montana lapidibus illis, et ex toto prorsus abstractis, nullisque relictis qui reperiri ibidem amplius possent, infra tertium aut quartum diem iterum requisiti, tanquam dono seipsos offerentes, et se quaerentibus ostendentes, in copiosa multitudine reperiuntur.

We have considered it as a true marvel, or rather as if a miracle, concerning the aforementioned place Llanthony, that although the lofty mountain-tops which shut it in on all sides are formed, not of stones and rocks, but rather of soft earth covered with grass, stones of marble are accustomed to be found there, which are commonly called free-stones *[Liberi]*, because they prove to be cut and polished in a way with iron tools as if liberally *[liberaliter]*; from these the church is already splendidly constructed. Indeed, concerning them there is even this marvel, that these stones, having been sought completely through the region, and having been taken away just entirely, and with none at all remaining which could possibly be found more anywhere, they, being searched for again after the third or fourth day, as if offering themselves as a gift, and showing themselves to those seeking, are found in a copious great number.

As Gerald writes the landscape of Wales, snatches of narrative, *notabilia*, the collocations of history, keep coming to the surface. He can collect as many of them as he can to build his church, to write his history, to narrate the landscape and his own journey through it, but they will keep coming up, just as numerous as before, as if gifts, waiting to be taken. Gerald is keenly aware that the narrative layers of the past rest just below the surface, and in his *Itinerarium Kambriae*, we see his attempt to literally bring up, through a process of figural narration, allusions to a narrative past, populations of marvels and portents always pointing beyond, and the act of rewriting and revision itself. In the *Itinerarium Kambriae*, we have a snapshot of one man’s attempt to grapple with that most miraculous and marvelous thing: the process of history.

---

494 Dimock, GCO VI, xviii. Dimock thinks it was left out of the early Version III manuscript due to a scribal omission.
495 GCO VI, 45.
496 See also Thorpe’s translation, 105.
Between 1215 and 1218, Gerald of Wales presented a revised and expanded version of his work *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae* (“The Rights and Status of St. David’s Church”) to the newly appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton. This work chronicles the bitter litigation between Gerald and the prior Archbishop, Hubert Walter, before the papal curia nearly a decade earlier. There, Gerald fought for papal recognition first, of his rightful election as bishop of the Church of St. David’s in Wales, and second, of St. David’s ancient status as a metropolitan see – mother church of its own archdiocese of Wales, separate and independent from Canterbury rather than subject to it.

At the end of the *De Jure*’s new prologue addressing the book to Stephen, Gerald explained why he waited so long to publish it openly:

Sed quoniam historiae cursus, quae lege scribendi venia data veris insistere vereri non debet, quosdam magnos in oculis hominum viros tangere videtur et notare; rarique sunt hodie scriptorum remuneratores, et promptissimi ubique injuriarum ultores; inter apocripha potius annumerari et sub incerti auctoris titulo latere noster ex industria libellus elegit. Satius enimvero et longe securius videbatur praemium omittere laboris incertum, quam odium incurrere periculumque de professione certissimum.497

The law of writing should grant history the freedom to pursue the truth. But since history seems to mention and observe certain men whom people consider great, and these days those who reward history-writers are rare, but those who are readiest to avenge injuries are everywhere, our little book deliberately chose to be numbered among the apocrypha and hide under the title of uncertain authorship. For it seemed to be more satisfying and safer by far to pass over an uncertain reward for one’s labor, rather than to incur hatred and certain danger for its public acknowledgement.

Gerald had good reason to be cautious. His depiction of his adversaries in the *De Jure* was far from complimentary, and his own past experience showed them quick to retaliate. Over the course of the litigation, which lasted from 1199 to 1203, Gerald journeyed to Rome three times.

497 *De Jure*, GCO III, 116. Special thanks to Dr. Carin Ruff for her assistance with this particular translation. Unless otherwise specified, Latin translations are my own.
to plead his suit. At the papal court he was welcomed, but back in England – despite papal letters of protection – he found himself and his supporters persecuted by the justiciar, his income revoked, and his journey obstructed; he was even briefly imprisoned in France by a castellan who hoped to ransom him.

Nevertheless, Gerald prevailed. Not in the suit, of course – the Pope annulled the elections of both Gerald and his challenger, and sent the question of St. David’s status to a committee back in England, where it was not pursued. Rather, Gerald prevailed in his project of writing history. Gerald wrote three works covering the St. David’s litigation: the De Jure, which provides an essentially narrative account, De Invectionibus (“Invectives”), a compilation of all of the documents, testimony, and letters presented at or resulting from the litigation, and De Rebus a Se Gestis or De Gestis Giraldis (“The Acts of Gerald”), an autobiography, whose third book, now largely lost, integrated letters and documents with colorful narrative passages, according to the surviving table of contents. Without these works, only sparse sources exist: two letters in the papal register announcing the verdicts, a handful of documents in the Canterbury archives, and short passages in contemporary chronicles.

In these three works, Gerald provides the reader with a literary reconstruction of events, detailing not just the legal proceedings themselves, but describing his travel, cost, conversations with others, strategies for dealing with the opposition, motives for pursuing the suit – in short, the full story of how one man perceived himself negotiating a legal process, with all that entailed. This perception results in bias, of course; Gerald’s account of his own legal battle is obviously weighted toward his side, though what few documents survive elsewhere show Gerald’s fidelity to his sources. But Gerald’s bias makes his case all the more fascinating: we get a glimpse of precisely what Gerald thought he was doing, and why. As he writes and rewrites his case, he highlights his litigation strategies with rhetorical moves, reinforcing the literary aspects of his case as well as the literal.

---


499 De Jure, GCO III, 196-241 and 291-297.

500 Aside from Gerald’s account, Pope Innocent III’s decisions are preserved two letters from his 1203/1204 register, preserved in Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Reg. Vat. 5, fol. 72r-132v. This is edited in Othmar Hageneder, et al., eds., Die Register Innocenz’ III: Pontifikatsjahr 1203/1204, Vol. 6 (Vienna: 1995). In Letter 74, he informs the Bishops of Ely and Worcester that he has cancelled both the election of Gerald and of Walter, abbot of St. Dogmael’s, and orders them to oversee a new election. Id. at 102-104. In Letter 89, he refers the status of St. David’s to the Bishop of Durham and the Prior of York (at Gerald’s request, both are from the archdiocese of York rather than Canterbury). Id. at 145-47.

501 De Rebus a Se Gestis is edited in GCO I, 3. Only the first 19 of Book III’s 238 chapters survive. Citations to the De Invectionibus and the De Rebus will include both the page number followed by the book and chapter number in parenthesis.

In this chapter, I examine the distinctly literary strategies Gerald employs as he makes his case, particularly his use of books and the importance of historical sources and precedent. I then compare how he portrays witnesses and live testimony. The dynamic between written and oral sources, how they work together and how they come into conflict, reveal a deep anxiety over the question of authenticity, and insecurity about how each type of testimony was to be treated. I conclude by briefly discussing Gerald’s professed motives for pursuing the suit, which he explains in a catalogue of thirty dreams and visions that he alleges prefigured his success in Rome.

Gerald believed his texts could do something. As the previous chapters have demonstrated, the evolution of the Topographia and the Itinerarium show that Gerald expected his texts to elicit certain actions and reactions from different audiences, and that failure for that expectation to come about caused him to revise his texts. The St. David’s litigation was one of these crisis moments. Gerald expected his books, histories, and archival evidence to persuade in court; they did not. The power of the written word was not more powerful than the Archbishop’s purse. So once again, he revised: Version V of the Topographia and Version III of the Itinerarium, as discussed above, and a project of writing about his own life and failed conquest, cataloguing his own visions and portents to memorialize his own place in his own history.

Background of the St. David’s Case

In early 1199, Gerald, then in his mid-fifties, was living a life of quiet study in Lincoln, having retired from service in King Richard’s court in 1196. Three-fourths Norman and one-fourth Welsh, Gerald had strong family ties to both the Norman marcher lords of Wales and Ireland as well as the native Welsh princes. These ties both helped and hindered Gerald in his service to the crown: On the one hand, this made him an excellent companion and guide on royal and religious delegations to the Celtic west. He accompanied the then-Prince John on his disastrous conquest of Ireland in 1186, and likewise accompanied Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, on a circuit through Wales in 1189 to preach the Third Crusade. On the other hand, Gerald found that his connections to the rebellious Welsh princes hindered his opportunities for advancement. In 1177, when the bishopric of St. David’s became vacant on the death of Gerald’s uncle, advisors suggested to King Henry II that Gerald be appointed in his place. Henry allegedly replied, Nec regi nec archiepiscopo opus est aut expendiens nimis probum aut strenuum, ne vel Angliae corona vel Cantiae cathedra detrimentum sentiat, in ecclesia Sancti David episcopum esse (“It is neither necessary nor expedient for King or Archbishop that a man of great honesty or vigour should be Bishop in the Church of St. David, for fear lest the crown of England or the See of Canterbury should suffer loss thereby.”). Later he revealed secretly to a few confidants,

---

503 See the prefaces to the Topographia Hibernica and Expugnatio Hibernica; Itinerarium Cambriae and the Descriptio Cambriae.
504 De Rebus, GCO I, 43 (I.10); translation from Butler, The Autobiography of Gerald of Wales, 61. The Autobiography is a narrative of Gerald’s life, consisting of translated passages of the De Rebus, De Jure, De
non esse tutum archideaconum illum, quia Reso principi Suthwalliae et aliis fere
cunctis Walliae majoribus sanguine propinquus erat, in cathedra Menevensi
collocari; nec expedire per talis viri promotionem . . . Wallensibus vires dare
eorumque superbiam augmentare.

that the Archdeacon was not a safe man to set over the See of Mynyw [St.
David’s], because he was akin by blood to Rhys, Prince of South Wales, and
almost all the other great men of Wales; nor was it expedient by the promotion of
such a man . . . to give new strength to the Welsh and increase their pride. 505

This justification was voiced again in 1199 by Hubert Walter, who had been appointed
Archbishop of Canterbury in 1193 after serving in the Exchequer and as the English Justiciar (an
uncommon route for a churchman, as Gerald pointed out to the Pope) 506 Peter de Leia, who had
been appointed bishop of St. David’s in 1177 over Gerald, died in 1198. The chapter at St.
David’s wanted to elect Gerald the new bishop, and put together a shortlist of candidates, with
Gerald at the top of the list. 507 Upon being informed of the chapter’s first choice, the new
Archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter, voiced violent opposition, vowing that Gerald would
never hold the bishopric of St. David’s because of his family ties. Gerald notes in his
autobiography two other reasons for Hubert Walter’s objection: personal antagonism over
Gerald’s role in depriving William Wibert, a friend of Hubert’s, of his benefices, and a suspicion
that Gerald, upon becoming Bishop of St. David’s, would seek to assert an ancient claim that St.
David’s was once the mother church of a Welsh archdiocese, separate from Canterbury’s
religious and political control. 508

Hubert was not about to let that happen. Hubert offered instead two choices, both
English – Alexander, abbot of Ford, and Geoffrey, prior of Llanthony – both of whom the
chapter rejected. The chapter was then ordered to send four members, with letters of ratification,

---

505 GCO I, 43; Butler, 61-62.
506 De Invectionibus, supra note 498, at 97 (I.iv); and Davies’ translation in the introduction at 11-12:
“That good man, the bishop-elect of Bangor, was called from the cloister, and I from the study. From what place
was the archbishop called? From the exchequer. And what is the exchequer? It is a place of the public treasury in
England, a kind of square table in London, where the king’s dues are collected and counted. This was the study, and
this the gymnasium in which the archbishop had grown old, this was the training from which he was summoned to
all the gradations of his promotion in the church, like nearly all the English bishops. In England, ‘qui bene
computat, bene disputat’ [he who counts well, reasons well]. Last year he was justiciar, and being deprived of that
office by the papal court [for holding it concurrently as Archbishop – AS], he immediately contrived to be appointed
chancellor to the king. This office he also recently lost, but never rested until he recovered it.”
507 De Rebus, GCO I, 94-96 (III.iv).
508 Id. at 95; J. Conway Davies, “Giraldus Cambrensis, 1146-1946,” Archeologia Cambrensis 99 (1946-
to King Richard in Normandy in order to elect a bishop. Gerald, finally roused from Lincoln, joined the delegation in London as its fourth member. The justiciar, Geoffrey FitzPeter, again offered the delegates the two choices, and they again refused, saying they were not authorized to withdraw their own nominees or accept others.\textsuperscript{509} They were ordered to take the extraordinary (and expensive) step of traveling overseas to the king.

By the time two of the delegates arrived in Anjou, however, Richard had been killed. They hastened instead to John, who gave them a favorable hearing. After John was crowned on May 27, 1199, Gerald and two other canons of St. David’s appeared before him and presented the chapter’s letters, demanding that Gerald be allowed to be elected. John assented, though he refused to announce his assent in public, due to Archbishop Hubert’s dissuasion.\textsuperscript{510} The canons returned to St. David’s victorious nonetheless, and the chapter elected Gerald unanimously on June 29.

Gerald and the chapter decided that, rather than receive consecration at the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Gerald should instead travel to Rome to be consecrated, and while there, establish St. David’s long-dormant claim that it held metropolitan status. The day after his election Gerald left for Ireland, conferring with and securing support from his kinsmen there. In his absence, the canons received orders from Archbishop Hubert to appear before the justiciar on August 15, 1199, to elect and receive Geoffrey, prior of Llanthony, as their bishop. If they refused, the archbishop threatened, Geoffrey would be sent to them already consecrated.\textsuperscript{511} The chapter responded with letters protesting that they had elected Gerald, which they sent to the Archbishop, the priory of Llanthony, and to the Pope. Gerald set off for Rome shortly thereafter, to fight for both St. David’s metropolitan status and his own canonical election as bishop. The subsequent litigation before the papal curia would last four long years, from the end of 1199 to 1203.

\textit{Books Not Bribes: Gerald’s Literary Strategies}

After an arduous journey, Gerald finally arrived in Rome on November 30, 1199.\textsuperscript{512} He describes presenting himself to the pope as follows:

\begin{quote}
[A]ccedens ad pedes papae sc. Innocentii III. qui tunc praesidebat, et papatus ejus anno secundo, vi. libros suos, quos ipse studio magno compegerat, ei presentavit; dicens etiam inter caetera: “Praesentant vobis alii libras, sed nos libros.” Libros autem illos papa, quia copioso literatus erat et literaturam dilexit, circa lectum suum indivisos per mensem fere secum tenuit, et elegantia ac sententiosa verba
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{509} J. Conway Davies, 256.
\textsuperscript{510} Id. at 256-257.
\textsuperscript{511} Archbishop Hubert had done this once before in 1197, consecrating Robert, bishop of Bangor, without election by the chapter. This was in the process of appeal before the papal court while Gerald was in Rome. Id. at 258 n. 3.
\textsuperscript{512} \textit{De Rebus}, GCO I, 119 (III.xviii). Gerald says he arrived “circa festum Sti. Andrae.”
cardinalibus advenientibus ostentabat; deinde vero singulis cardinalibus singulos precario concessit. *Gemمام autem Sacterdotalem* prae caeteris dilectam a se separari non permisit.\(^{513}\)

Approaching the feet of Pope Innocent III, who was then in the second year of his papacy, he presented him with six books, which he had composed with much study, saying among other things, ‘Others give you pounds (*libras*), but I give you books (*libros*)’. Now the Pope, who was most learned and loved literature, kept all these books together by his bedside for about a month and used to display their elegant and pithy phrases to the Cardinals who visited him, and finally gave all save one to different Cardinals who asked for them. But the *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, which he loved beyond the rest, he would not suffer to be parted from him.\(^{514}\)

Scholars generally analyze this scene in terms of bribery of the papal curia, mainly because of Gerald’s allegations that bribes were behind the archbishop’s victory. J. Conway Davies calls Gerald’s gift of six books “a weighty, if somewhat innocent bribe.”\(^{515}\) John Moore, however, characterizes them as “an appropriate gift for one Paris alumnus to give another,” and later asserts that, though the papal court was often accused of corruption, Innocent III’s judgments were not bought with money or gifts.\(^{516}\) Though Gerald’s gift of six books (no doubt richly bound and perhaps illustrated) was certainly valuable, Moore notes that, “neither [Gerald] nor the pope seemed to think anything wrong was being done.” Rather, the books were part of a “‘gift-giving’ culture of an earlier era, when giving gifts was not only good manners but a sign of the importance of the giver.”\(^{517}\)

Innocent himself had denounced judicial bribery when he was a cardinal, lamenting, “Woe to you who have been corrupted by pressure or bribery . . . . You pay no attention to the value of a case, but to the value of a person; not to laws but to bribes; not to justice but to money.”\(^{518}\) Despite this high standard, Gerald was certain that Hubert’s silver corrupted both the pope and the cardinals, writing after the fact in the *De Jure*,

\(^{513}\) Id. Gerald retells this story in slightly different words in the *De Jure*, GCO III, 336.

\(^{514}\) Butler, 164-165.

\(^{515}\) J. Conway Davies, 261.

\(^{516}\) John C. Moore, *Pope Innocent III (1160/1-1216): To Root Up and to Plant* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009) 78 and 99. Both Gerald and Innocent III had studied law at Paris. Moore recounts a story of the bishop of Hildesheim, who came to the Pope seeking absolution, but then gave him a costly silver vase. Innocent III accepted the vase, but then sent the bishop a gold one.

\(^{517}\) Moore, 98-99.

When, therefore, his opponents perceived that the Archdeacon’s suit was daily becoming more acceptable to the Court and that their fraudulent fiction was now almost unmasked, . . . they had recourse to a most efficacious remedy, a salve that blinds the eyes (oculos) and makes some purses (loculos) heavier and others lighter, a last refuge and a bow that never misses its mark in the Court of Rome, and strove with the vastness of their bribes to corrupt, first the Chamberlains and the Counsellors, and next the Pope and the Cardinals, that so the election of the Archdeacon might be annulled. [. . .]

For the Archbishop, after peace was made between himself and the Archdeacon, was wont to assert that the controversy had cost him eleven thousand marks . . . .

Whether Archbishop Hubert indeed bribed the court is an unanswerable question, but Gerald’s strong condemnation of the tactic certainly indicates he did not see his gift of six books in the same light. Rather, in the quoted passage Gerald sets up a strict dichotomy between bribes (libras) and books (libros), distinguishing himself from the “others” – the cronies of the archbishop, for example – who engage in such practices.

But I would argue that Gerald’s gift of books was, nevertheless, intended to affect Innocent III’s decision-making more than mere, good-mannered gift exchange. Not in the manner of purchasing a favorable judgment, but rather in preemptively establishing an authoritative, intellectual, and informational connection with Innocent. No scholar (to my knowledge) has considered what these books were, what information they contained, and what, if anything, they had to do with Gerald’s presence in Rome. In fact, the gift of these books can be interpreted as a strategy that enabled Gerald to make the first argumentative move, establishing his own credibility and authority with the judge who would eventually decide the case.

This can be seen when one considers the gift itself. In all likelihood, the six books consisted of Topographia Hibernica (The Topography of Ireland), Expugnatio Hibernica (The Conquest of Ireland), Itinerarium Cambriae (The Journey through Wales), Descriptio Cambriae (The Description of Wales), Gemma Ecclesiastica, or as Gerald calls it in the above passage,

\[519\] De Jure, GCO III, 263-264; Butler, 292-293.
Gemma Sacerdotalis (The Jewels of the Church), and Vita Sancti Caradoci, (The Life of St. Caradoc). These works could attest both to Gerald’s character as well as setting up points of factual information.

Regarding his character, the works display Gerald’s wit and erudition, as well as his authority on Wales and Ireland, and on the unique religious challenges of those areas. It would be readily apparent to the Pope, who as Gerald tells us (quoted above) “was most learned and loved literature,” that Gerald was a kindred spirit, highly literate, well read, trained in both theological disputation and the law, and (important for any lawyer arguing a case) a gifted storyteller. Gerald’s status as a familiaris of the English court, which he served until 1196, would also be ascertained, as the Topographia and Expugnatio show Gerald accompanying John on his conquest of Ireland in 1186, while the Itinerarium Kambriae traces his circuit through Wales with Baldwin, the previous Archbishop of Canterbury, to preach the Third Crusade.

Having established his credibility and authority was no doubt useful when Hubert sent letters attacking Gerald’s character, as will be discussed below.

Additionally, at least two books had more targeted functions. One rather straightforward connection between Gerald’s mission and his gift is the Vita Caradoci. As almost a side-note to the St. David’s controversy, part of Gerald’s mission to Rome was to obtain Roman canonization for Caradoc (or Caradog). Though the Vita is now lost, Gerald also includes two of St. Caradoc’s miracles in the Itinerarium Kambriae attesting to his holy stature.

No doubt the Vita contained such miracles in even greater detail, providing persuasive evidence for canonization. And in fact, when Gerald returned to Britain after his first journey to Rome, among the letters he carried back were ones providing for the canonization of St. Caradoc.

More relevant to the St. David’s matter, however, was the Itinerarium Kambriae. As discussed in the previous chapter, that work follows the preaching circuit, but is also filled with natural observations, notable Welsh miracles and marvels, and amusing and often poignant tales about contemporary politics and religious matters. At the very center of that book, as the literal turning point in the journey ending Book I and beginning Book II, the preaching delegation arrives at St. David’s. Gerald takes the opportunity to begin Book II to lament St. David’s loss of its metropolitan status:
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520 J. Conway Davies, 261 n.3. All these works are edited in the Rolls Series and various other editions except for the Life of St. Caradoc, which is lost.
521 If the dedications were included in the papal presentation copies, they would have illustrated that the original recipients were some of the most powerful men in England: King Richard (Expugnatio), Bishop Hugh of Lincoln (later St. Hugh of Lincoln) (Version II of the Itinerarium), and even, ironically, Hubert Walter himself (Version I of the Itinerarium and the Descriptio Kambriae). No doubt Gerald would also mention that he had presented the Topographia as a series of lectures at the new Oxford University in 1189. See De Rebus, GCO I, 72-73 (II.xvi).
522 Itinerarium, GCO VI, 85-87; Thorpe, Journey, 144-145.
523 De Jure, GCO III, 182-83.
Quoniam igitur caput est Kambriae Menevia, et urbs olim metropolitana, quanquam hodie plus nominis habens quam ominis, antiquae tamen et authenticae matris nostrae tanquam exsequias plangere, et funus prosequi lamentabile, cineresque semisepultae lacrimosis deplorare singultibus non abstinui.\(^{524}\)

St. David’s is still the capital of Wales, but once also was a metropolitan city, although today, having more of the name than the power, I have not forborne to weep at the obsequies of our nevertheless ancient and authentic mother church, and to follow her most mournful hearse and to lament with tearful sighs her half-buried ashes.\(^{525}\)

Gerald follows this powerful rhetorical picture with a history of St. David’s, tracing how St. David moved the archbishopric from Caerleon to Menevia (now St. David’s), bringing the pallium (the religious vestment denoting an archbishop’s status) with him. The pallium was lost when Sampson, St. David’s twenty-third Archbishop, fled from Wales to Brittany due to plague. Until Henry I of England conquered Wales, however, Gerald attests that the Welsh bishops continued to be consecrated by the Bishop of St. David’s, and that it was only in recent times that the three latest Bishops of St. David’s were sent to Canterbury to be consecrated.\(^{526}\)

In the second version of the *Itinerarium* (the likely version he gave to the Pope), Gerald makes two changes to the text that may indicate his intention to pursue the St. David’s case. First, as discussed above in Chapter 3, he deletes a detail just after the history of St. David’s explaining how Baldwin planned to celebrate mass in each of the four Welsh cathedrals.\(^{527}\) Thus the text reads:

> From what we read, no Archbishop of Canterbury, except Baldwin, the present one, has ever entered Wales, either before the subjugation or after it. With praiseworthy devotion to the service of the Cross, from whence cometh our salvation, Baldwin has undertaken the task of travelling through our rough, remote, and inaccessible countryside.\(^{528}\)

Baldwin’s journey is therefore not focused on asserting the power of Canterbury by celebrating mass at the cathedrals, but only on preaching the Third Crusade. In another addition to Version II, at the very beginning of the *Itinerarium*, Gerald notes that the canons of St. David’s tried to stop Baldwin from entering Wales, arguing before Rhys, Prince of South Wales, that

\(^{524}\) *Itinerarium*, GCO VI, 101.

\(^{525}\) I have modified the translation from Thorpe’s to better follow the Latin. See Thorpe, *Journey*, 159-60.

\(^{526}\) *Id.* at 160-63. Note that in Version III of the *Itinerarium*, the number of archbishops between David and Sampson is increased to twenty-five. *Id.* at 161 n.263.

\(^{527}\) *Itinerarium*, GCO VI, 105 n.1. Interestingly, this detail is back in Version III, after Gerald lost the case in Rome. See Chart 6, above.

\(^{528}\) GCO VI, 104-105; Thorpe, *Journey*, 164. Latin quoted in Chart 6, above.
praebjudicium magnum et gravamen in posterum antiquae dignitati suae recuperandae, et metropolitaneae sedis honori, posse procul dubio provenire (“great prejudice and damage would without a doubt be done to the future attempts to recuperate her [Menevia’s] ancient dignity adn the honors of a metropolitan seat”).

Rhys lets the Archbishop proceed, Gerald is careful to note, only because “a rebuff of this sort would greatly wound the Archbishop’s feelings.”

It is because of hospitality, not by right, that the Archbishop enters Wales.

Gerald’s “innocent bribe” to the Pope, then, carried a weighty agenda. The gift of books allowed Gerald to make an all-important first impression, establishing rapport, authority, and credibility. Additionally, he was able to present the case for St. David’s first in the guise of historical narrative rather than in an adversarial proceeding. The “ancient and authentic” rights of St. David’s are not in question in the *Itinerarium*; they are historical fact, written well before Gerald was called to be bishop.

This strategy was certainly successful in the case of St. Caradoc, and equally successful, I would say, in establishing a rapport with Pope Innocent III. This was all the more important because a mere ten days after Gerald’s arrival, messengers from the archbishop arrived with a letter denouncing Gerald to the court. This letter inveighed against Gerald’s Welsh background and against his election (which the archbishop characterized as uncanonical and coerced), accused him of stealing the seal of St. David’s to forge documents, and claimed that his attempt to raise the metropolitan status of St. David’s was a pretense for sowing rebellion and dissention among the Welsh.

Gerald was given the opportunity to reply in a public hearing on January 7, and turned each of Hubert’s charges against him. At least two of his arguments would have been partially addressed by his gift of books, and Gerald’s reply is particularly interesting in terms of his emphasis on language and authenticity. To the charge that he was a Welshman, Gerald argues on the one hand that he was both Norman and Welsh, which would have also been apparent from, for example, the *Expugnatio Hibernica* and the *Itinerarium Kambriae*. But on the other hand Gerald points out the fallacy of keeping a Welshman out of an ecclesiastical post in Wales because of his background, reasoning, *ergo a simili nec Anglici in Anglia, nec Franci in Francia, nec Italici in Italia prefici debent nec promoueri. Permisceantur ergo pastores ignari linguarum et boni inuenientur predicatores* (“On that same showing Englishmen ought not be given preferment or promotion in England, nor Frenchmen in France, nor Italians in Italy. Let pastors
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529 GCO VI, 15-16. I have departed from Thorpe’s translation on 76-77, which emphasizes different aspects of the Latin.

530 *Id.*

531 The letter is found in the *De Invectionibus*, 83-85 (I.i), and translated by Davies in that work’s introduction at 44-47.

532 Gerald speaks of his lineage in the *Expugnatio* in Chapter II.10, “Praise of the Race of the FitzGeralds.” Scott and Martin, 156-57. He describes the marriage of his grandfather, Gerald of Windsor, to Nest, daughter of Rhys ap Tewdwr, in the *Itinerarium* at I.12, Thorpe, *Journey*, 149.
Gerald scores another point in his reply to the charge of forgery. Hubert accuses Gerald of forcibly taking the chapter’s seal and forging the documents of his election. He urges the Pope:

\[
\ldots \text{[T]estibus non testimoniis credi oportet, presertim cum plura efficere possint et solemnt, quod testimoniis eorum qui testes nominantur voluntates non consonent, sicut ueri sigilli uel furtiua subreptio, uel ablatio uiolenta, uel impressionis adulterine cum uero sigillo, sicut plerumque fit, expressa similitudine.}
\]

[C]redence should be placed in witnesses (testibus), rather than in documentary evidence (testimoniis); for there are many ways whereby documentary evidence may be, and often is, rendered inconsistent with the intentions of those who are mentioned as witnesses, for instance, by the abstraction, forcible or clandestine, of an authentic seal, or by a counterfeit impression taken from it.534

Gerald responds to the archbishop’s accusation line by line, but his argument is essentially three-fold. First, he asserts that Hubert is simply trying to smear Gerald’s character, and that he provides no proof, nor any promise or suggestion of proof, that Gerald took the seal. Second, he notes that if credence should only be placed in witnesses, then no credence should be placed in Hubert’s letter, which Gerald points out stands alone against “the formal decree of my chapter, the letters of the people and clergy of my country, and the testimony of my clerks who stand here before you, and, in spite of my unworthiness, unanimously acclaim my election . . . .”535 Finally, he points out that Hubert’s detailed accusation shows that he is in fact quite familiar with the methods of forgery, and in protesting his own innocence on that charge, Gerald quips, Librorum enim fabricator hactenus esse solembam, non signorum . . . (“Hitherto I was wont to be a maker of books, not of seals”).536 The pope, as a recipient of some of those books, knew that all too well.

Despite Hubert’s assertion that live witnesses were to be preferred over documents, Gerald, a self-professed vir litteratus (man of letters), consistently emphasizes the evidentiary power of written sources in the narrative of his case, even, as in the case of his six books, when they were not officially admitted as evidence.537 In another example of this, Gerald describes an
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533 De Invectionibus, 86; translation Davies, 48-49.
534 De Invectionibus, 84; translation Davies at 46.
535 Davies, 51-53.
536 De Invectionibus, 89; Davies, 53.
537 Id. at 47. He begins his reply to the archbishop’s letter by saying, “I have thought it right in your hearing to reply to the letter of the archbishop, in which under the pretence of dissuading you, he has undertaken to write invectives against me – I wish it had been with his own and not another man’s pen – and so to defend my character; in order that he may learn how useless and unprofitable it is, and how open to retaliation, to make an attack in writing upon men of letters, and by insulting writing to provoke a reply by those who are skilful in
episode that took place in the papal chambers after Gerald’s hearing and before the Easter arrival of an emissary from the archbishop, Buon Giovanni. Finding the pope in a good mood, Gerald brought up St. David’s metropolitan claim. Innocent III called for his Register, which contained a list of all the archbishoprics, kingdom by kingdom, and the dioceses subject to them, and had the entry for England read aloud:


‘The Metropolitan Church of Canterbury has subject to it the following Churches: Rochester, London’, and so on in order, and when the suffragan Churches of England had been enumerated, after a rubric ‘Concerning Wales’, the text proceeded, ‘In Wales there are the Churches of Mynyw, Llandaff, Bangor, and St. Asaph’. And on hearing this, the Pope said with a mocking smile, ‘See here is the Church of Mynyw enumerated with the rest’. But Giraldus made answer, ‘Nay, neither it nor the other Churches of Wales are enumerated with the rest in the same way, to wit, in the accusative, as were the Suffragan Churches of England. If they had been in the accusative, then in truth they might be held to be subject to Canterbury’.

Gerald’s point is that the Welsh churches cannot be subject to Canterbury because they are not in the accusative case. The English church names, all ending with the accusative –em, modify suffraganeas ecclesias istas (those suffragan churches), also in the accusative case, and identified as belonging to Canterbury. The Welsh churches, by contrast, are in the nominative and genitive: simply a list of “the Church of St. David’s, of Llandaff, of Bangor, and of St. Asaph.” This grammatical distinction leads the Pope to point out that the manuscript writing.” Later, Gerald amuses the pope with tales of the archbishop’s embarrassing Latin mistakes, which he had also included in the Gemma Ecclesiastica at II.36. See De Invectionibus, I.5; Butler, 281-84.

538 De Jure, GCO III, 165-66.
539 Butler, 183.
rubrication also indicated Wales was not subject to Canterbury, and he says to Gerald, “You may be sure, then, of one thing, that our Register is not against you.”

This exercise piques Innocent’s interest in the question of St. David’s, leading him to quiz Gerald on whether St. David’s retained any papal privileges, how it lost its pallium, and how much time had elapsed since Canterbury began asserting rights over it. Answering these to the Pope’s satisfaction, he said to Gerald, “If what you say can be proved, it will be an easy matter to secure the right that you demand. Therefore I would have you write down and deliver to us all the evidence whereby the rights of your Church may be the more clearly proved.”

Gerald immediately put himself to the task of writing a full history of St. David’s from the establishment of Christianity in Britain until Henry I. At the end of it he asserted that the facts had both documentary and testimonial support, being collected from authentic writings (ex scriptis igitur authenticis), and able to be attested to by many elderly men still alive in Wales who could remember when both Wales and Scotland were only subject to Rome. Innocent III, apparently swayed by Gerald’s arguments (and the fact that an independent Welsh archdiocese would yield tithes to Rome of up to 200 marks per year, which Gerald did not fail to mention), promised him that when the time came, justice would not be denied him (justitiaque non negabitur).

Despite the emphasis Gerald places on his own books and histories, however, they were not as persuasive to the Pope as he thought. Shortly before Easter, Buon Giovanni, an emissary of Archbishop Hubert, arrived to present Hubert’s objections to Gerald’s election as bishop. In this version of events, Giovanni claimed that Gerald had been rejected by the king, so the canons had instead elected Walter, the abbot of St. Dogmael’s, while at London. This was, Gerald alleges, a machination of the Archbishop, who was trying to weaken Gerald’s support base in Wales. When the Pope asked when such an election took place, Buon Giovanni replied that it took place “a little before Christmas,” when Gerald had already appeared before the papal curia. The Pope annulled the election, but instead of confirming Gerald, as seemed to have
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548 In fact, Walter had been on the short list originally presented by the chapter to the king, but Hubert had initially rejected all the candidates in favor of Geoffrey, prior of Llanthony. But when Geoffrey heard Gerald was appealing to Rome, he refused to take the position. Hubert then approached Walter, who was a kinsman of Gerald’s (and, Gerald says, “quite illiterate”), thinking to weaken his family ties and support in the chapter back in Wales while Gerald pursued the case in Rome. *Id.* at 58-59.
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been his original intention, he referred the question of his election to a commission of judges back in England. \(^{550}\) Gerald attributed this development to bribery. \(^{551}\)

Gerald then requested a commission to examine the status of St. David’s, which Innocent III refused. As W. S. Davies notes, commenting on Innocent’s letter to Archbishop Hubert, the pope “had evidently failed to grasp the essential points of the archdeacon’s case, and was not inclined to attach much importance to the question of the status of St. David’s.” \(^{552}\) Innocent only assented after Gerald searched the papal archives, and discovered a letter in the papal register of Eugenius III promising a hearing on the matter – for it had been raised once before by Bernard, Bishop of St. David’s in the time of Henry I, who had pursued the claim in the 1140s but died before the promised hearing could commence. \(^{553}\)

Official documentary evidence, rather than Gerald’s books, testimony, and historical narratives, seemed to carry the day with respect to Gerald’s legal claims, despite Gerald’s insistence on their authenticity. When Gerald returned home in the summer of 1200, he therefore proceeded to search the archives of St. David’s, to see

\begin{quote}

\textit{utrum a tempore Bernardi episcopi aliqua relictam supra statu Menevensis ecclesiae literarum munimenta. Et tandem literas easdem super statu bullatas bulla Eugenii papae, variato tantum principio, quia clero et populo Menevensi directas; necnon et alias bulla Lucii II. signatas et Bernardo episcopo transmissas; ambas autem fere obsoletas et obesas duique deperditas, per curam et investigationem non modicam vix extraxit.}
\end{quote}

whether any records were left from the time of Bishop Bernard, which concerned the standing of the Church of Mynyw [St. David’s]. And at length he found the same letter, sealed with the seal of Pope Eugenius, though with a different heading being addressed to the clergy and people of Mynyw, together with others bearing the seal of Lucius II and addressed to Bishop Bernard. Both these letters were worm-eaten and almost worn to pieces, having been long mislaid, so that it was only after careful search that he discovered them. \(^{554}\)

The pope was suitably impressed when Gerald brought these before the curia in 1201. After inspecting the writing and authenticating the seals, he ordered a hearing in the open Consistory where they were read aloud to all the cardinals. As a result, the suit would gain status, and no longer be “regarded as a new matter and without precedent, as it had seemed on [his] first

\(^{550}\) Davies, \textit{Introduction, De Invectionibus}, 57.
\(^{551}\) Butler, 191-92.
\(^{552}\) Davies, \textit{Introduction, De Invectionibus}, 57. This also casts doubt on Gerald’s portrayal of his gift of books and their subsequent conversations.
\(^{553}\) \textit{Id.} 35-36, 57.
\(^{554}\) \textit{De Jure}, GCO III, 186-87; Butler, 200. The letters themselves are in \textit{De Invectionibus}, II.i, iii, vi, vii, viii, ix, and x.
coming” (*non novum illud vel inauditum, sicut in primo Giraldi adventu visum fuerat, amodo videri posset*). The archival letters accomplished what Gerald’s histories could not, providing important outside proof of Gerald’s contentions.

Unfortunately by this time, additional complications in Gerald’s case had risen. After hearing that the Pope nullified the election of Walter, abbot of St. Dogmael’s, during Buon Giovanni’s visit, Archbishop Hubert approached Peter, abbot of Whitland, and offered him the bishopric of St. David’s on the condition that he turn the chapter against Gerald. This they kept secret from Walter, so he would also continue to pursue his case. When Gerald returned to Rome, he had two live opponents on his heels: Andrew, clerk and procurator for the Archbishop, and Reginald Foliot, a member of the chapter of St. David’s and procurator for Walter. The next stage of the suit would be a battle of witnesses rather than writings.

‘False, Fools, and Foliots’: Witnesses and Testimony

Books and documents could be corrupted by time, as in the case of the forgotten, worn and worm-eaten papal letters in St. David’s archives. But witnesses could be corrupted by people. Such is Gerald’s view of witnesses and live testimony during the next stages of the suit. First by bribes and gifts, and then by threats, confiscation of goods, and violence, Archbishop Hubert coerced and terrorized the chapter of St. David’s until it seemed that all were against Gerald. This was especially acute in England, where proceedings of the papal commissions were held throughout 1202 at Worcester, Brackley, Bedford, and St. Albans. In one scene at St. Albans, Gerald describes how the clerks of St. David’s were threatened by public officials (for Archbishop Hubert, concurrently holding the position of King’s chancellor, also controlled the royal seal) that, if they failed to give evidence against Gerald in England, they would be compelled to travel to Rome to testify there. But in order to testify against Gerald in England, by order of the pope, the witnesses had to be either too old or too poor to travel. This lead to an almost farcical scene in which the clerks “vied with one another in attacking Giraldus” (*ad testificandum contra Giraldum certatim omnes accurrerunt*):

Proinde et miseri vano hujusmodi timore perterriti, passim ad perjuria prosilierunt. Quidam enim ut inter senes ad purjuria recipiuntur, se sexagenarios, cum non essent; alii vero ut inter pauperes perjurate possent, se xl. solidorum reditus aut facultates non habere falso jurabant. Dupliciter itaque perjuri sunt, dum falsum scieret et sponte jurant, ut illico jurati falsissimum testificantur; sicut ex attestationibus eorum Romae publicatis postmodum patuit
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And so forthwith these wretches, panic-stricken by this empty terror, leapt forward here, there and everywhere to perjure themselves. For some, that they might be admitted to perjure themselves among the old men, said that they were sixty, though they were not; others again, that they might commit perjury among the poor, falsely swore that they had no so much as forty shillings income. And so they were doubly perjured, since wittingly and of their own accord they swore falsely that straightaway they might swear more falsely still; as was afterwards clear from their evidence when it was made public at Rome . . . .

Gerald offers numerous such examples in England of witness intimidation and persecution. But in two particular episodes at the papal court, Gerald recounts instances of the manipulation of oral testimony when entered as written, recorded evidence. Gerald’s description of these two episodes provides important detail regarding the problem of authenticity of witnesses, and of the corresponding legal records they produced.

When Gerald returned to Rome the first time, on March 4, 1201, he was prepared. Having learned what was persuasive to the papal court, he armed himself not with histories, but with both archival documents and live witnesses to testify regarding the status of St. David’s. Andrew and Reginald Foliot were less prepared. When the Pope asked them to respond to Gerald’s evidence, it was revealed that they had letters authorizing them as procuratores only for the suit against Gerald’s election as bishop. Andrew explained to the Pope that letters authorizing them to argue the status of St. David’s had been stolen while they were in Parma. But when the Pope asked him why the other letters were not stolen also, he had no answer. Andrew and Foliot requested a delay in the proceeding to gather more witnesses from England, which the Pope granted, but also awarding Gerald half his expenses from Archbishop Hubert, and granting him new letters of protection and providing that he was, during the course of the suit, the rightful administrator of St. David’s.

The litigation over Gerald’s election continued. The Pope assigned the case to two of his cardinals, Suffredo and Peter of Capua. Both sides were ordered to present the facts of their respective elections. Gerald went first, relating the circumstances of his election on July 29, 1199. Foliot, representing Walter, abbot of Dogmael, went next, but forgetting, Gerald says, his instructions to lie, said that Walter had been elected a little before Christmas, nearly six months later. This caused great commotion in the court (which was filled with Gerald’s supporters), since first elections always have priority. Andrew began protesting that the court had misunderstood, “doing his best to throw everything into confusion,” and much disputation
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followed. Finally, Suffredo ordered both parties to write out their statements word for word, and threatened Foliot with excommunication if he changed his story.\(^{563}\)

This threat, it turns out, was not very effective. Foliot submitted a statement declaring that Walter was in fact elected in January 1199 by Archbishop Hubert, just after the death of the prior bishop Peter de Leia, and then that election was “solemnized” by the chapter of St. David’s just before Christmas that year.\(^{564}\) This obviously inconsistent statement was pointed out by the court’s observers and noted by Cardinal Suffredo, but to no avail:

> [N]one the less, when the adversaries loudly protested and raised a tumult, since the other Cardinal [Peter de Capua] favoured the Archbishop and since it seemed that owing to the lapse of time the facts might have been forgotten, the written statement was accepted, and no punishment was imposed upon them for their falsehood and disobedience. And so the opponents of Giraldus to the very last directed all their efforts to prove this fiction by false witnesses.\(^{565}\)

Eventually, Andrew and Foliot requested a delay in the case of Gerald’s election as well. The Pope reluctantly postponed the case to the following year, and arranged for commissions in England to take testimony of witnesses there, according to various conditions.\(^{566}\) The archbishop, as noted at the beginning of this section, did not adhere faithfully to the pope’s strictures.

After being persecuted in England, Gerald made it back to Rome in January 1203. At the Great Consistory around Epiphany, he gave a speech denouncing the archbishop, and presented to the Pope letters attesting to the archbishop’s wrongdoing by his only remaining public supporters, the princes of Wales. Gerald’s adversaries attempted to throw his character into doubt by accusing him of simony, a charge which would have discredited his testimony in the other suits. But this backfired when Gerald instead discredited their witnesses, noting that Foliot had been excommunicated the previous year and was therefore ineligible to testify, a witness named Peter claimed to be a deacon but was not, and a monk named Golwen, nicknamed “The Fool,” had deserted his monastery. Gerald remarked, *Tales itaque testes conta nos produxerunt, Falsos, Follos, et Foliotos* (“Such are the witnesses they produce against us: False, Fools, and Folietos”).\(^{567}\)

This foolish monk Golwen had another trick up his sleeve, giving rise to an incident similar to Foliot’s changed testimony, though this time favorable to Gerald. Gerald had earlier excommunicated Golwen for deserting his monastery and becoming an unauthorized itinerant preacher for profit. Before the Pope’s chamberlain, Golwen accused Gerald of stealing his
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\(^{564}\) GCO III, 192.
\(^{565}\) GCO III, 193; Butler, 208.
\(^{566}\) De Jure, GCO III, 194-95.
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horse, and insisted that Gerald’s horse in Rome was in fact his. Gerald vehemently denied this, acknowledging that one of his Deans had confiscated Golwen’s broken-down nag along with his false relics, but that it was not the same horse as the large, strong, and valuable horse that had brought Gerald to Rome.\textsuperscript{568} Golwen’s persistence led the chamberlain to sequester the horse, and Gerald found himself defending his election before the papal court by day, and defending his horse before the chamberlain by night.\textsuperscript{569}

To end this distraction, Gerald decided \textit{ut fraudem hanc et falsitatem detegere et artem adversam arte eludere posset} (“to expose their fraud and falsehood and to outwit guile with guile”).\textsuperscript{570} Gerald had a friend testify before the chamberlain that the confiscated horse had been a gelding, whereas the horse in the stables was a stallion. Immediately Golwen leapt up and insisted that his horse had been a stallion, saying \textit{Certe mentiris plane. Immo ille meus equus testiculos habuit, et quicquid bonus equus habere debuit, et adhuc habet; quod et dominus camerarius nunc perpendere poterit; et statim si placeat, videri faciat et probari.} (“You lie without a doubt and I will prove it. My horse had testicles, and everything a good horse ought to have, and has them still, as the Lord Chamberlain may perceive and, if it so please him, may cause to be seen and proved without delay.”).\textsuperscript{571} Gerald immediately requested that this statement be entered word for word in the record as evidence, explaining as an aside that on account of so many statements and contentions, it was the usual practice in Rome to carefully take down everything in writing.\textsuperscript{572} A small delegation of servants went with Golwen to verify the horse’s “evidence.” The servants returned and reported that, though the monk made a careful examination, he could not find anything there “except a useless rod and an empty bag” (\textit{praeter virgam inutilem et peram vacuam}). The chamberlain reported this to the pope, who “dissolved in laughter” (\textit{resolutus in risum}) and ordered the horse restored to Gerald.\textsuperscript{573}

A few days later, Innocent III and his retainers were relaxing by a fountain, and, calling over Gerald, he asked him how the suit over the horse had gone. Gerald replied again that he had “met guile with guile,” and then, punning on the double meaning of the Latin word \textit{testes}, added that if the monk had lacked witnesses (\textit{testes}) like the horse, he might have been more proficient in religion and less in suits and litigation. He then repeated several jokes made by one of Golwen’s colleagues, who teased him,

\begin{quote}
Multa tibi mala, Golwene, testes fecerunt. Testes a domo tua et fratrum consortio te turpiter ejecerunt. Testes tibi religionis et honestatis commodum ademerunt. Testes tibi nunc equum istum et omnem hic honorem abstulerunt.\textsuperscript{574}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{568} GCO III, 249-252.
\textsuperscript{569} GCO III, 251: “omi fere die mane coram papa in consistorio, vespere vero coram camerario vexabatur.”
\textsuperscript{570} GCO III, 251; Butler, 278.
\textsuperscript{571} GCO III, 251; Butler, 278, translation modified slightly.
\textsuperscript{572} \textit{De Jure}, GCO III, 251.
\textsuperscript{573} Butler, 279; \textit{De Jure}, GCO III, 252.
\textsuperscript{574} \textit{De Jure}, GCO III, 253.
Testes have always given you much trouble, Golwen. Testes got you shamefully thrown out of your house and fraternal order. Testes deprived you of religion and the comfort of honesty. Now testes have lost you that horse and all honor here.

The pope burst out laughing and responded, Suntne tales testes, quos contra te producunt? ("Are these the type of witnesses they produce against you?").

This provoked Gerald to complain about his adversaries’ use of bribes, to which the pope reassured him that “the unbending justice of the Roman curia will always be clear in the end on the merits of the cause, and not of the persons” (Curiae namque Romanae inflexibilis aequitas causarum meritis non personarum semper in fine clarescet).

By the end of the case, however, Gerald was convinced otherwise. Before narrating the scene with the pope in the De Jure, Gerald reflected on his success in winning back his horse due to an “empty bag” (vacua pera). He recalled how his supporters were heartened by his success, sure that it portended likewise for his other suit:

Dicebant enim fere cuncti per curiam, et quasi prognosticum ex hoc eventu sumebant, conjectantes hanc victoriam archidiaconi, veluti praebulam, alias quoque victorias ejus in magnis negotiis consecutivas absque dubio praenuntiasse.

Quod revera,
Si curia severa,
Si justitia mera,
Si falsitas sera,
Si fides sincere,
Si aequa statera,
Ubi vacua pera,

juxta vaticinium et spem complurim provenisset.

For almost all of them drew an omen from this event and foretold that this victory was beyond a doubt the herald of other victories in great matters that should follow.

And in truth it is clear,
If the Court were severe,
And Justice sincere,
If truth did not fail,
But held equal the scale,
Though empty the bag,
assuredly the hopes and prophecies of many would have been fulfilled.\footnote{Butler, 279. A literal translation of Gerald’s verse would be, “If the court were severe,/ If justice were pure,/ If falsehood was past,/ If faith had been sincere/ If the scales were equal,/ Where the bag was empty.”}

Here, the “empty bag” does not refer to the horse, but to the purse of the archbishop’s money Gerald imagines tipping the scales of justice at the court. In the end, the Pope annulled the elections of both Gerald and his challenger, and sent the question of St. David’s status to a committee back in England. Rather than pursue the claim, Gerald, recognizing the futility of continued fight, unexpectedly assented to a deal with the Archbishop of Canterbury allowing Geoffrey, prior of Llanthony, to be elected bishop of St. David’s in 1203. In exchange, he arranged for his position the archdeaconry of Brecon to go to his nephew Phillip, whose education he had promised to oversee.

\textit{Vos, Quasi Monstrum}

For Gerald, the “hopes and prophecies of many” were not idle references. As discussed in Chapter 2 and above, the idea of prophecy drove much of Gerald’s revisionist tendencies as he sought to write histories that would be finished or fulfilled by projected future events. And yet also as we have seen, Gerald does not shy away from writing imperfect or incomplete histories where the projected events will not come to pass. In this way he presents a troubled model of authorship: where the author knows and expects both too much and too little, and, in Gerald’s case, finds himself in danger of slipping too close to his own subject matter. As we saw in the \textit{Topographia}, Gerald’s proximity to the Irish landscape, after the failure of both Irish conquest and crusade, caused his own authority to become unstable and, judging by the cessation of revisions, untenable.

In the case of the St. David’s narratives, the \textit{De Invectionibus}, \textit{De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae}, and his autobiography the \textit{De Rebus a Se Gestis}, Gerald deliberately invokes this instability through a number of prophetic visions. In the sixth book of the \textit{De Invectionibus}, otherwise a sourcebook full of the documents pertaining to the suit, Gerald described this triumphant scene, as told to him by Maurice de Wlatmorgan (Glamorgan):

\begin{quote}
Uidebatur enim ei [Mauricii] \ldots quod Rome coram papa constitutus uideret ibi Giraldum et clericos archiepiscopi Cantuariensis contra ipsum missos, qui cum porrigerent papae litteras cum multis sigillis dixerunt, hee sunt antitetes prelatorum tocius Anglie contra Giraldum, quia uerba eadem Latina uel Gallica pono, quibus tam ipse quam papa et alii uisi sunt uti. Et dominus papa inspexit et dixit, Da michi pennam cum incausto, et subiunxit, ego has antitetes cancellabo, deformabo, et abradam. Et sic fecit, et dixit Gallice, Despuille us Gerold, et ipse se uestibus spoliauit exceptis femoralibus, et flexis genibus cum se prosterneret ante altare papa cum uirgis eum percussit dicens, ego consecro te in episcopum, et
\end{quote}
omnes cardinales eum simili modo per ordinem percutientes assensum perbuerunt. Post hec uerba introductus fuit post altare in secretum locum, paulo post reductus fuit indutus omnibus ornamentiis episcopalibus excepto baculo, et tunc querens papa quare baculo careret, suum baculum ei detit nouum, non pictum, sed capud habentem eburneum et pomellum aureum.\textsuperscript{579}

It seemed to [Maurice] . . . that in Rome before the pope he saw constituted there Gerald and the clerics of the Archbishop of Canterbury sent against him, who said, as they presented the pope letters dangling with many wax seals, “These are testimonies (antitetes) of the prelates of all of England against Gerald” (because the word is the same in Latin or French, I put the one by which he himself as well as the pope and the others seemed to use). And the lord pope inspected them and said, “Give me a pen and ink,” and wrote, “I cancel, discredit, and abrogate these testimonies.” And having done so, he said in French, “Come before us, Gerald,” and that man removed his vestments except for his trousers, and after prostrating himself with bent knees before the altar, the pope struck him with his staff, saying, “I consecrate you bishop,” and all the cardinals likewise struck him in order in assent. After these words Gerald was taken behind the altar to a hidden room, and was led back out a little later dressed with all the episcopal ornaments except the crosier, and then the pope seeing how he lacked a crosier, gave him his own new one, unpainted, but with an ivory head and a golden handle.

Gerald had had this scene in mind ever since Maurice related this vision to him while they were studying together at Paris in the 1170s. And indeed, as we can see from the \textit{De Jure} and his other works, Gerald believed this outcome would play out until the very last moment.

Unfortunately it was not to be. Whether (as Gerald believed) because of bribes, or simply due to a realization that Gerald’s election would cause an unacceptable political situation, the pope annulled both elections. But what is interesting is that the vision of Gerald’s consecration is not just a single, imaginary capstone to the \textit{De Invectionibus}. It is the nineteenth of thirty visions, all of which seem to foretell of his success in Rome, and the same catalogue of visions also ends his autobiography, the \textit{De Rebus a Se Gestis}.\textsuperscript{580} Gerald reported that these visions were seen by priests, holy women, hermits, and children. In some, Gerald appears as a star in the sky, a lion entering the church, a sun, or dressed as an archbishop following St. David.\textsuperscript{581} In others, Gerald is seen defeating beasts, such as a three-headed monster, or three wolves, signifying Gerald’s enemies: Walter, abbot of St. Dogmael’s, Peter, abbot of Whitland, and Archbishop of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{582} Or Gerald receives items conferring religious legitimacy, such

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{579} \textit{De Invectionibus}, 217-18.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{580} According to the table of contents, as the final book is lost.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{581} \textit{De Invectionibus}, 6.vi (sun), 6.x (lion), 6.xii (star); 6.vii (as archbishop).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{582} \textit{Id.} at 6.xiii (monster), 6.xiv (wolves).}
as a pastoral staff, or a portion of the relics of Canterbury. Gerald says they explain one of his motivations for pursuing the suit: “on account of various visions and dreams, which seemed to prefigure [Gerald’s] certain promotion to the throne of St. David’s, or promise other greater things.”

The fact that this catalogue ends two works which narrate Gerald’s utter failure in Rome sheds some light on his own conception of history – one in which present signs could foretell future events – but presents a puzzle as to Gerald’s own authority and interpretive ability. Regarding the visions, Gerald acknowledged their authenticity was difficult to determine, saying, “When mention was made of these visions before him [Gerald], he used to say that they were without doubt divine foreshadowings and revelations, if their fulfillment followed, but diabolical illusions meant to deceive, if otherwise occurred.” In other words, only time – only history – would tell.

These visions are interesting in that they are not about conquest or crusade, but about Gerald himself. In the context of his own failed conquest, Gerald places himself at the center of his own analysis of projected history. In this sense, Gerald himself becomes the portent, just like the frogs prefiguring Irish conquest in the *Topographia*. In the *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*, Gerald makes this transformation explicit, acknowledging not only his role as author or character, but that of a portent signifying a projected history:

Consedentibus autem adhuc et conferentibus coram altari quodam a latere dextro justiciario et archidiacono, ecce monachi ejusdem ecclesiae ad Giraldum intuendum et quibusdam ad aliis ostendendum per turbas astiterunt. Quod considerans justiciarius archidiacono, qui cum ipso loqui potius intendebat, illud ostendit, dicens: “Nonne videtis, qualiter hi monachi catervatim huc concurrunt, et vos quasi monstrum aliquod cum admiratione conspiciunt?”

Now while the Archdeacon and the Justiciar were thus sitting and conferring together to the right of the altar, behold the monks of the Church stood by in throngs to gaze at Giraldus and to point him out to others; and noting this, the Justiciar said to the Archdeacon, who was absorbed in their conversation: ‘Do you not see how these monks come crowding about us and gaze at you with wonder, as though you were some portent?’

He finishes the chapter by reflecting on the idea that he stands as a portent signifying resistance to Canterbury and the Archbishop, even should that resistance fail. He recounts the words of
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583 Id. at 6.x (pastoral staff), 6.xv (relics).
584 Id. at 206, (6.ii).
585 Id. at 206.
586 GCO III, 208.
587 Butler, 233.
Llewellyn, Prince of North Wales, at a feast later, when asked whether Gerald’s attempt was worth the trouble.

Dico longe melius et laudabilius electo fore jura S. Davidis, ne nimio silentio deperirent, contra tantos adversarios et Angliam totam vindicasse, quamvis tamen evincere non possit. Quia, quamdiu Wallia stabit, noblie factum hujus, et per historias scriptas et per ora canentium, dignis per tempora cuncta laudibus atque praeconiis efferetur.

I say it were far better and far more glorious for the Elect [of St. David’s, that is, Gerald –ed.] to have vindicated the rights of St. David against such mighty adversaries and against all England, lest through silence overlong they should perish, even though victory might not be his. For as long as Wales shall stand, this man’s noble deed shall for all time be noised abroad with worthy praise and honor, whether in written chronicles or upon the lips of poets. 588

In the De Jure, regarding the fight for St. David’s, Gerald writes himself as the portent signifying the possibility of an independent Welsh see and the restoration of the glory of St. David’s. This effort fails. But in writing that failure, Gerald also ensures the value of his texts – the value of history – in memorializing and witnessing that effort. Prince Llewellyn declares that his deed will be remembered both in written histories and in song, for it is better to remember the effort, “lest through silence overlong [the rights of St. David’s] should perish” (ne nimio silentio deperirent). Gerald is fighting against the silence of lost history by writing his own, a project also echoed in the Itinerarium’s Second Preface: hoc opusculo quasi speculo dilucido . . . posteritati praesentavi; ne vel studium otio depereat, vel laus silentio delitescat (“I presented this work, as if a clear mirror, to posterity, lest either study should perish from laziness, or praise disappear with silence”). 589 It is in that mirror that we see reflected not merely isolated tales and descriptions of Wales, Ireland, and St. David’s Cathedral, but the very idea of an interconnected web of history, framed in typology, and ultimately reflecting the man, Gerald himself.

588 GCO III, 209; Butler, 234. 589 GCO VI, 13.
CONCLUSION

HISTORY IN THE TYPOLOGICAL MODE

In a way, this new study goes back to a very old theme. In 1959, Erich Auerbach triumphantly reported an interpretive breakthrough, that typology – understanding historical biblical events as also prefiguring future, historical events – was “the dominant view in the European Middle Ages”:

At that time [in an earlier study of Dante] I lacked a solid historical grounding for this view . . . . I believe I have now found this historical grounding; it is precisely in the figural interpretation of reality which, though in constant conflict with purely spiritualist and Neoplatonic tendencies, was the dominant view in the European Middle Ages: the idea that earthly life is thoroughly real, with the reality of the flesh into which the Logos entered, but that with all its reality it is only the *umbra* and *figura* of the authentic, future, ultimate truth, the real reality that will unveil and preserve the *figura*. In this way the individual earthly event is not regarded as a definitive self-sufficient reality, nor as a link in a chain of development in which single events or combinations of events perpetually give rise to new events, but viewed primarily in immediate vertical connection with a divine order which encompasses it, which on some future day will itself be concrete reality; so that the earthly event is a prophecy or *figura* of a part of a wholly divine reality that will be enacted in the future. 590

Pratically speaking, he describes, “phenomenal prophecy” or prefiguration occurs when a *figura*, “something real and historical . . . announces something else that is also real and historical. The relation between the two events is revealed by an accord or similarity.” 591 A *figura* is a concrete, historical event, but it is something more as well: it points toward a future reality that is more real, as he says, an “authentic, future, ultimate truth.” The *figura* only makes sense in terms of the future revelation, which “will unveil and preserve the *figura*.”

This hermeneutical mode dominated biblical interpretation and medieval scholarly discourse. This dissertation suggests that typology is not limited to biblical interpretation, but extends to an entire conception of history, a medieval worldview based on a model of figure and fulfillment. 592  When Gerald of Wales writes history, he imagines himself writing down Ireland

590 Erich Auerbach, “Figura,” in *Scenes from the Drama of European Literature* (New York: Meridian, 1959) 71-72.
591 Id. at 29.
and Wales’s *umbrae* and *figurae*, concrete, historical events which point to a future reality. This mode of historiography is something more than a “link in a chain of development” – more than a simple chronological account of causal relationships. (At the very least, this dissertation has illustrated that Gerald’s works are anything but chronological!) Rather, this mode relies on recounting discrete episodes which, while they themselves are real, historical events, point to a larger, authentic, future reality.

Importantly, Gerald’s “divine order” (per Auerbach’s formulation) is not divine judgment, but (by and large) successful crusade in the Holy Land. It is thus a much more proximate projected history, but still a reflection of a supposed divine order, one based on a western Christianized conception of history in which a European Christian “regains” its spiritual home, Jerusalem. Possession of the earthly Jerusalem as a proxy for possession of the heavenly Jerusalem is the goal of Gerald’s “authentic, future reality.” Gerald imports the primarily theological mode of typology into a much more secular, historiographical context, using it to structure and give meaning to the landscapes of Ireland and Wales, incorporating the seemingly insignificant history of that corner of the Western world directly into the folds of Christian salvation history.

Of course, the beauty of true typology is the benefit of hindsight and perfect foresight: the Old and New Testaments are already written, and eventual divine judgment is certain. Matching up two sacrificial goats in Leviticus to the first and second coming of Christ, to use one of Auerbach’s examples, or Eve to Mary (the Eva/Ave topos common in the writings of the Church fathers), is all very well when you have both halves of the typological equation before you. When Gerald is writing, however, his “authentic, future reality” is still uncertain. It is based on his own hopes and assumptions about the proper order of things: successful Irish conquest, successful Third Crusade, and successful demarcation of a Welsh archdiocese, with himself as the archbishop. For Gerald, the “authentic, future reality” is found etched in the geographic past; particularly in the *Itinerarium*, the key loci of Gerald’s hermeneutics are themselves “ancient and authentic” cities: Menevia and Caerleon. Based on his interpretation of the landscape around him, Gerald wrote figural histories, unfinished histories that would be fully realized by future events.

Unfortunately for Gerald, these future events never occur, leaving his typological equation hanging. This pressure drives Gerald to revise, redirecting his texts to alternative, proximate ends. The *Topographia Hibernica*, which maps the contours of conquerable, religious, and marvelous space in Ireland, is left unfinished by a lack of recognition from the court and a failure of both Irish conquest and the Third Crusade. Gerald redirects that text almost immediately to a clerical audience, seeking to establish an authoritative voice, but finds such a voice elusive as he adds more and more textual scaffolding to the work: illustrations, letters instructing the reader how to approach the text, and maps (see Plates 1 and 2, below), all trying to orient the work, and Ireland, toward its larger audience. Finally, after his failure to
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593 Id. at 29-30.
594 See, for example, Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, 3.22.4 and 5.19.1.
establish a Welsh archdiocese and the dramatic failure of the Fourth Crusade, Gerald redirects Version V of that text closer to home, sending it with the *Expugnatio* in order to spur King John to attempt conquest in Ireland once again. John’s actual conquest of Ireland in 1210 provides a proximate ending to the text much more humble than Gerald’s initial stated goals.

In the *Itinerarium Kambriae*, the typological relationship between the journey through Wales and the Third Crusade is much more pronounced and developed, but ironically, the Crusade had already failed by the time Gerald wrote Version I of that work. I characterized the resulting text as “in crisis”: it is in a sense a *figura* signifying nothing, pointing to a crusade that has already failed. Version II questions the idea of prophecy while simultaneously anticipating a different crusade: Gerald’s journey to Rome to fight for the rights of St. David’s. That new context still makes good use of the crusading discourse, though it involves a legal battle for diocesan territory rather than a military battle for the spiritual homeland of Christianity, Jerusalem. The failure of that battle strips the work even of that organizing context, and leaves the focus of Version III of that work squarely on Gerald, who with the landscape itself is now the text’s main character. The resulting “journey through Wales” takes place on a proxy landscape deliberately created to evoke the Holy Land, yet without the forward-looking context of crusade to guide the text, leaves it less a crusade and more a pilgrimage, an homage to the meaning that could have been, a memorialization of the man and the attempt. And the idea of Wales as a proxy landscape for Jerusalem is neither far-fetched nor unique to Gerald: Pope Calixtus II’s canonization of St. David and subsequent grant of a privilege to the cathedral in 1124 allowed two pilgrimages to St. David’s to substitute for one to Rome, and three for one to Jerusalem. Thus the later “monkish” rhyme:

Meneviam pete bis, Romam adire si vis –
Merces aequa tibi, redditur hic et ibi;
Roma semel quantum, dat bis Menevia tantum.\(^{595}\)

Seek St. David’s twice, if you wish to go to Rome –
The rewards gained from here and there are equal for you;
Once to Rome gives as much as twice to St. David’s.

The literature following the St. David’s litigation also adheres to a “failed” typological mode. Gerald’s autobiography *De Rebus a Se Gestis*, quoted at length throughout this study, begins with a description of Gerald in his youth, building sand churches on the shore while his brothers built sandcastles, being called “the little bishop” by his father, and eventually being entrusted to the care of his uncle for his education, who was at that time bishop of St. David’s and also, coincidentally, named David.\(^{596}\) The entire story of his life is built to point toward the

---


\(^{596}\) GCO I, 22-23.
eventual attainment of the bishopric of St. David’s. And yet by the time Gerald was writing his autobiography, c. 1208-1216, this chance had already passed. The reader shares what must have been also Gerald’s confusion and indignation at the outcome: all signs pointed to success, and yet led to failure.

Gerald’s ultimate conclusion is that he himself is the figura, awaiting some future reality that will “unveil and preserve” the meaning behind his life and works. He is the portent all too proximate on the landscape of Ireland, the searching pilgrim in Wales, and the monstrum fighting for St. David’s against all odds. This becomes explicit in his later works, two of which, as discussed above, contain a catalogue of thirty visions attesting to his attaining the bishopric of St. David’s. The De Invectionibus also includes a number of poems in praise of Gerald’s valiant attempt and comparing his efforts, for example, to that of Hector protecting Troy. One in particular begins Spes tua Roma tibi defecit teque reliquit [“Your hope has failed you and abandoned you in Rome”] and ends:

Troie defensor cum Troia corruit Hector,  
  Laus tamen Hectoris et fama perhennis erit.  
Stat cum iure suo Giraldus, iuris amator,  
  Et tutor, merito laudis honore virens.

Hector, defender of Troy, fell with Troy  
  And yet the praise and fame of Hector will be eternal.  
Gerald, lover and defender of law, stands with his law  
  Vigorous with deserved honor of praise.  

Gerald’s extreme self-presentation in these works is part and parcel of his project to archive himself as a figura. Part of his project is documentary; he recounts the narrative of the litigation and copies out every document and letter issued, which will preserve source material for any future litigants. But more than that, he archives his own role, his own character – be it Giral dus, iuris amator et tutor, as above, archideaconus, as in the Itinerarium, or simply magister G – to ensure that history will remember his name. Though in Auerbach’s formulation, the future event is to “unveil and preserve” the figura, Gerald does not leave “preservation” to chance.

And what that future completing event might be remains a mystery, except insofar as it is historiography, and history for history’s sake, that will provide Gerald vindication. Thus he says to William de Montibus in a letter regarding the Topographia Hibernica:
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597 After the litigation and his second retirement at Lincoln, Gerald was again offered the bishopric of St. David’s; he refused.  
598 De Invectionibus, 181.  
599 As in the De Invectionibus, 187 et passim.
Ad hystioriarum autem historicorum commendationem audiatur illa Senece
tanquam huius opere descriptio: ‘Hystoria’, inquit, ‘est antiquitatis autoritas, testis
temporum, via vite, vita memorie, nuntia vetustatis, lux veritas.’

Listen to what Seneca has to say in praise of historians and history; it is almost a
description of my book: ‘History’, he says, ‘is the authority of the past, a witness
of the times, a pathway for life, the life of memory, a messenger of antiquity, the
light of truth.’

The contention of this dissertation is simply that history, for Gerald, could and should affect the
future, and that sensitivity to its signs and portents could and should foretell certain events
through a typological relationship, not a causal one. And when that typological relationship fails
to come to pass, it is in history, yet again, that solace is taken, by rewriting and revising the
figural geographies into a new alignment, to wait for the truth to come.
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600 Speculum Duorum, 170-171. I have changed the translation for better sense with my argument; the
original editors have “‘History’, he says, ‘is the judgment of the past, a witness of the times, a pathway for life, life
to tradition, a messenger from antiquity, the light of truth.’"
This (unfortunately damaged and patched) folio shows the map of the British Isles, oriented with East at the top of the map, that accompanies many copies of Version III of the Topographia.

Plate 1
This map of Europe orienting the British Isles (at the bottom) toward Rome (at the top) accompanies a Version V text of the *Topographia Hibernica*.
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The groupings of manuscripts into versions below follow those of the Rolls Series editor, James Dimock, and Catherine Rooney. Please note, however, that the contents of individual manuscripts can often vary from its version grouping.

Many manuscripts contain a list of chapter headings at the beginning of the text (a table of contents) as well as embedded chapter headings. Due to limitations of space, utility, and insufficient information in the editions, this chart does not trace additions or changes to the table of contents between versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Version III</th>
<th>Version IV</th>
<th>Version V+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;First&quot; Preface</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Introitus ad Recitationem</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;There are two motivations for poets: a memorial for enduring fame, 1* and patronage of illustrious princes. Lacking the second, the first urges Gerald to write to the best of his ability. He chooses Ireland as his subject, being peripheral both geographically and in literature, enunciating the power of rhetoric and language to render the subject worthy. &quot;Topography of Ireland&quot; as in</td>
<td></td>
<td>1* [Unde et … praesagia vivam] pg. 3n3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quotes from Statius, Ovid about honor through ages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2* [nec tantum … concordia] pg. 7n3. The second distinction will tell of prodigies not only of Ireland, but others, in other countries, which are similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a clear mirror, for the better class and the use of the lower orders. GW also to discuss nature, genealogy and customs and manners. The division of the work into 3 parts. 2*

“Second” Preface

Gerald is sent by Henry II to accompany John to Ireland, where he would see 1* many different things from their country, and make inquiry into them. Compares to the countries of the East, geographical extremes which both have miracles of Nature. Has observed and written them down, giving them to Henry II rather than perishable earthly gifts. 2*

1* [ubi non tanquam … notarem] pg. 20n4. GW, sent by the King, not as a fugitive, but in the office of an explorer, and would write about what he saw.

2* [Dignas, etc.] pg. 21n2. In addition to this, an exposition on the deeds and virtues of Henry II and his sons.

Distinction I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Geographical situation of Ireland, to the west, parallel with Spain, three days’ sail from both Great Britain and Iceland. 1* Its size compared with Great Britain. 2* Rounder, while Britain more oblong. 3* Its uneven, mountainous terrain, woods, marshes, sandy.</td>
<td>+ 1* split into Ch. II</td>
<td>2* split into Ch. III</td>
<td>3* split into Ch. IV</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I.II – De Hispanico mari, duobus brancis Britanniam et Hiberniam complectente | -- | + Britain and Ireland surrounded by waters of the Spanish Sea. Ireland thus ‘separated from the rest of the known world’ | + 1*[Tantae, etc.] pg. 24n6. Compared with Great Britain, therefore about as large as Wales and | + | + |
and ‘nature’s especial repository.’ Its size compared with Great Britain. 1*

Scotland. Some etymology of Britain, called Loegria from Locrine, eldest son of Brut.

| I.III – De variis Solini, Horosii, et Ysidorii, sententiis; quibusdam veris, quibusdam erroriis | -- | + | GW analyzes opinions of Solinus, et al. on the size of Ireland. Bede is wrong in regard to serenity (as will appear in the Expugnatio). (See pg. 25n3.) 1* Ireland moderate, exactly between Iceland and Spain. Rounder, while Britain is more oblong. But, as Bede notes, it extends below the meridian of Britain. | + | 1*[Sicut … fecundat] pg. 25n4. Air quality from East to West – East brighter and clearer, more inclement; West cloudy and thick, more mild and wholesome. |
| + | + | + | + |

| I.IV – De qualitate Hiberniae | -- Part of Ch. I [Ireland’s uneven, mountainous terrain, woods, marshes, sandy.] | + | Ireland is uneven, its soil is marshy. 1* 2* Pools and lakes are on mountains and hills. There are beautiful but limited plains. 3* Low elevation at sea-coast, then very high, and sandy. | + | 1*[et vere … aquas stare] pg. 26n1 Truly a desert, impassable, but well watered (quote from Psalms) 2*[Videas … stare] pg. 26n2. You can see standing waters on mountains. |
| + | + | + | + |


<p>| I.VI – De ventositate, et pluvositate; earumque causis | + [No chapter break between fertility and windiness.] The country more than others suffers from storms and rain. Trees in the west uprooted by the north-west | + | 1* [Terra nimirum … pluviiis abundat] pg. 27n2. Meteorological explanation for the abundant rains and wind. Rain called various names by its elevation, mist, clouds. 2* |
| + | + | 2*[seu liquidi seu concreti, nunc nives, nunc] pg. 28n1. Called snow or rain whether it is solid or liquid. |
| + | + | + | + | 4*[Vel potius …] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>I.VII [I.3] – <em>De fluminibus novem principalibus; et alis pluribus nuper emersis</em></td>
<td>+ GW enumerates the names of the nine ancient rivers, then some rivers which divide the island into districts, then the two branches of the Shannon. Ireland formerly divided into 5 provinces; Merlin ‘predicted they would be reduced to one.’ 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.VIII [I.4] – <em>De lacubus; et eorum insulis</em></td>
<td>+ The land has many lakes with fish and islands, on which lords often have accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.IX [I.5] – <em>De marinis, et fluviabilibus, et lacuum piscibus; eorumque defectibus</em></td>
<td>+ There are many sea-fishes, and the lakes and rivers have species of fish unto themselves. The Shannon has lampreys <em>1</em> <em>2</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 2*[periculosas] pg. 32n3. Lampreys are a “dangerous” delicacy. (The note from Forester indicates that Henry of Huntingdon tells us King Henry of Huntingdon tells us King)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1*[Alosis praepinguibus] pg. 32n2. And oily shad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 6*[Creta noctuis…] pg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 5*[item … salmonibus] pg. 33n3 Certain areas of Italy are missing salmon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Ireland is missing certain other types of fish.** 3*<sup>4</sup>  
Henry I’s death was caused by overindulging in lampreys. – ABS.)  
3*[barbuli] pg. 32n.6  
The barbel fish is added to the list of missing fish.  
4*[Quaelibet, etc.] pg. 33n1.  
Every country is missing certain types of animals. 5* 6*  
33n4.  
And Crete has no owls, the Mediterranean no herring, and Hungary, no eels. |
| **I.X [I.6] – De piscibus novis, et alibi non inventis**  
There are three species of fish unique to Ireland. One similar to trout 1*, likewise the umber 2*, and a third like the trout without spots. 3*  
Their seasonal habits and an example of fish keeping to their respective lakes.  
3*[primos… vocant] pg. 33n8.  
The first is called Glassans, the second Cates, the third, Brits.  
1*[quae et salares dicuntur] pg. 33n5  
Called salares.  
2*[thymallis qui … persimiles] pg. 33n6  
(change) “The tymal, which is commonly called the umber, and similar [to the salares]”.  
[hawk, falcon, sparrow-hawk]  
The nature of the birds, how their numbers never increase, info from Cassiodorus on the parents beating their young. 1*  
/Some sparrow-hawks have white spots, some red./ The males are stronger, though the females are strong too, because they are birds of prey. 2* 4* 5*  
1*[Quoniam, etc.] Four sections, pg. 35n.3  
moral allegorical interpretation: so too should parents breed their sons, and the Lord chastens the sons he loves, and sons are sent forth from their homes, and fathers and pastors gradually receive sons.  
2*[Forsan, etc.] Four sections,  
6*[vel in gyrum falcando] pg. 38n1.  
Optional etymology.  
Gerfalcons are from gyrofaciendo [making a circle] or from making a scythe-motion in a circle.  
3*[Item, etc.] pg. 36n4  
Add’t quote from Ecclesiasticus.  
4*[Fertur … ilaesam] pg. 37n2.  
Interesting information about their nests, and seizing a bat to keep warm.  
I.XI [I.7] – De avibus, earumque defectibus. 1*  
Ireland has aquatic birds, some of which are the same as other countries; some are different. |
| + | + | + | + | + | + |
pg. 36n3. This may signify that the female sex is stronger than the male in evil. Quote from Cicero. 3* Because in this bird the strength of the male wanes, while the female is stronger as it ages. White spots and red spots displaced to here in II+/

5*[Item accipitres, etc.] to end of chapter, pg. 37n2. How the falcon pursues its prey, how the hawk is different. Hawks’ more delicate nature compared to fleshly/earthy delights of man; falcons rejecting delights of the flesh soar higher in virtue. Etymology of the birds’ names. 6*

I.XIII [I.9] – De aquila; eiusque natura

+ different: see pg. 39n1. GW’s original chapter on the eagle describes facts about its nature – vision, height of flying, and long life – and then provides a general moralization, comparing the eagle to holy men who seek God’s mysteries.

+ * see pg. 42n1 and 2, quotes. Gerald rewrites the entire eagles chapter for the second version. The three attributes (vision 1*, flight, long life) are split up and moralized separately. GW continues on the theme of flight to the heavens (in the mind) by elucidating the chain of being, from stones, to plants, to animals, man, angels, God. Man’s desire to unlock the secrets of God is therefore perverse, b/c man is inferior. Discussion full of biblical quotes, interspersed by 2* 3* 4* 5* Quote from Job. 6* God

+ 1*[unde et … dicuntur] 39n2. etymological note, eagles from eyes.

2*[Non enim, etc.] pg. 41n2. added quote from Isaiah.

3*[insipientes… sapite] pg. 42n1. Added quote from psalms.

4* [vir ille … testatur] pg. 42n2. amplified quote.

5* [Item, quotes] pg. 42n3. quotations about eating too much honey.
is the potter to the potsherd. Frail potsherd cannot use reason to transcend reason. We can also not entirely understand nature, as God does not reveal nature entirely to man. 7*

6*[Item, quote] pg. 43n1 about being justified.

7*[Numquid, etc. to end of section] pg. 44n3. Continued discussion on the ineffability of nature. God has showed his wisdom ‘in portions as it were in rivulets’ and he is the ‘fountain-head’. Fun quote from Augustine.

1.XIV [I.10] – De grue, eiusque natura [crane]

+ GW describes details about the crane: its numbers, how it keeps watch on one foot holding a stone. Moralized to keeping vigilant against sin against death (stone is sacred duty). 1* 2* The crane can digest iron, this is like being inflamed with charity. Other birds which are plentiful in Ireland, peacocks, hens, 3* quails. 5*.

+ 1*[praelatorum ecclesiae] pg. 46n2. Rather than being an example for “us” to keep vigilant, changed to refer to bishops watching over their flocks.

+ 2*[periculum … exaltant] pg. 46n4. Detail of the crane’s warning cries, moralized to pastors warning their churches.

+ 3*[Acetae … copia major] pg. 47n1. Snipes 4* in large numbers.


+ 5*[Diemque, etc.] 47n3. And larks.

1.XV [I.11] – De bernacis ex abiete nascentibus; earumque natura

+ The nature of barnacle geese. How they are born without mating. How they are eaten on fasting days because they aren’t flesh.

+ 1*[sed hi … arbitrarer] 48n5. That this is error, because it is actually flesh.

+ 2*[ad idem, etc.] 49n3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter [I.12]</th>
<th>De avibus biformis, earumque natura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>The osprey 1* has one talon and one webbed foot, for hunting and swimming. How it hunts. Moralized, so too the devil catches souls with temporal prosperity (the peaceful foot) and then drags souls to hell (the taloned foot).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Likewise bees are generated from honeycomb.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter [I.13]</th>
<th>De avibus quasi adulterinis, et non veris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Some birds are similar, but not true species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter [I.14]</th>
<th>De martinetis, earumque naturis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>The kingfisher (or martinet). Their characteristics, including coloring. When dead they never decay, give off a pleasant odor, and when hung, 1* continually change their feathers. Moralized – so too holy men, dead to the world, give off the odor of virtue, casting off the garment of the flesh for the new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>1*[mortuae quoque] pg. 51n2. clarifies, when hung while dead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter [I.15]</th>
<th>De cygnis et ciconis; earumque naturis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Gerald discusses swans and storks in turn, moralized with lessons about not mourning death (swans) and looking forward to the coming age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>*[quod instat] 52n2. clarifies, the “wintry season of this world” is the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.XX [I.16] – De avibus, hiemali tempore non comparentibus</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.XXI – De cicadis, quae decapitate dulcius canunt; diuque mortuae per se reviviscunt</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.XXII [I.17] – De cornicibus hic varis, earumque naturis</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.XXIII – De croeriis hic albis; earumque naturis</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXIV [I.18] – De feris, earumque naturis</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXV [I.19] – De taxo; eiusque natura</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXVI [I.20] – De castore; eiusque natura</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXVII – De mustelis; earumque naturis</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### I.XXVIII [I.21] – De vermibus, eorumque defectibus; et venenosis omnibus hic deficientibus

Moralized: thus the greater are conquered by the lesser. Moles 2* 3* are lacking in Ireland/4* /Mice/ 2*[vel naturali defectu, vel] 61n7. either by natural defect, or…

| + | Ireland has no poisonous reptiles. 1* St. Patrick driving out the poisonous snakes is probably a myth; rather, a natural deficiency. + | + | + | 1*[unde … nullae] 62n1. A saying about where reptiles are located. |

### I.XXIX [I.22] – De venenosis vermibus, qui huc alloti statim moriuntur; et toxico malitiam amittente

Poisonous reptiles cannot live on the island if they are brought. So in writings of ancient Irish saints, animals would die and poison would lose its venom. 1* So say merchants concerning stowaway frogs. It seems that the influence of the air or soil 2* causes this.

| + | Poisonous reptiles cannot live on the island if they are brought. So in writings of ancient Irish saints, animals would die and poison would lose its venom. 1* So say merchants concerning stowaway frogs. It seems that the influence of the air or soil 2* causes this. + | + | + | 1*[De his, etc.] 63n2. What Bede has to say on the subject. |

### I.XXX [I.23] – De pulvere terrae istius venenosos vermes necante

The soil drives away poisons

| + | The soil drives away poisons + | + | + |

### I.XXXI [I.24] – De corrigiis terrae contra venena conferentibus

The boot-thongs made of leather from this country are efficacious against poison, as GW has witnessed. 1* 2*

| + | The boot-thongs made of leather from this country are efficacious against poison, as GW has witnessed. 1* 2* + | + | + | 2*[Contigit, etc.] 65n1. It happened in GW’s time that a snake entered a boy’s belly; was healed by going to Ireland. |

### I.XXIV [I.25] – De

<p>| + | + | + | + | + |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.XXXIII [I.26]</td>
<td>De variis insulae laudibus; terraeque naturis</td>
<td>A frog recently found in Ireland, read as an omen of impending conquest. Frog not born in Ireland (lacks the seeds). 1* Probably was brought over on a ship and managed to live for some time (not poisonous like a toad).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXXIV [I.27]</td>
<td>De comparatione orientis et occidentis</td>
<td>The climate of the country is temperate. The air is healthy as are the inhabitants. 1* They never get fevers. There is rain but no thunderstorms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXXV [I.28]</td>
<td>Quod omnia elementa in oriente pestifera</td>
<td>All the elements in the east are poison – earth, water, air, storms, sun, food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXXVI [I.29]</td>
<td>De venenorum ibidem malitia</td>
<td>In addition, families and hosts contrive to poison each other. Man is poisonous to man. 1* No security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.XXXVII [I.30]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let the East have the East, and let us have the West! Health of the climate. 1*

I.XXXVIII [I.31] – De laudabilibus hic quarundam rerum defectibus
+ The deficiencies of the West – thunderstorms, earthquakes, wild animals, poison – are good.

I.XXXIX [I.32] – Quod fons venenorum in oriente
+ The east is the origin of poisons, which lose their force the farther away you go. You may say the east has many medicines. Nature puts many remedies where there are many diseases. /West more desirable than East./

I.XL – Quod occidentalia commoda sunt orientalibus praeferrenda
-- [no new chap. In M, includes first section but not second] /West… East/ [made into its own chapter, I assume]

Distinction II

Version I

Version II

Version III

Version IV

Version V+

Preface [II.33] – Incipit Distinctio Secunda, De Mirabilibus Hiberniae et Miraculis
+ Now Gerald will write of things worthy of wonder (miranda) – both marvels wrought by nature and miracles by saints. The “marvels of the West” cp. to Marvels of the East. Gerald as author/editor “even in these later days.” Though some may find the content unbelievable,

+ 1*[Nic mihi, etc.] 74n3. Gerald changes the end of the preface from testimony, refuting himself against slander, and emphasizing his role as eyewitness. Nothing can truly be contrary to nature, which is God, since He is the creator of all things. Regions far from the center of the earth always have prodigies.

+ 2*[Si quid … novem] 76n1. New things should not be condemned simply because it is new, quote from Horace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1 [II.34]</td>
<td><em>De Hibernico mari undosissimo; variisque fluxibus eiusdem et refluxibus</em></td>
<td>Gerald assures that they are all from eyewitness or the testimony of credible men. <em>1</em> God is wonderful (bible quotes) and history does not spare the truth, 2* including things which are damned in the present and lauded in the future, etc. (see 74n3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2 [II.35]</td>
<td><em>De contrariis aequoreis fluxibus in Hibernia et Britannia</em></td>
<td>Historia veritati non parcit. 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3 [II.36]</td>
<td><em>Quod luna tam liquores moderatur quam humores</em></td>
<td>The Irish Sea is always choppy and hardly ever tranquil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4 [II.37]</td>
<td><em>De duabus insulis; in quarum altera nemo moritur; in alteram feminei sexus animal non intrat</em></td>
<td>The tides are opposite between Britain and Ireland, the motion of the tides and rivers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II.3** – Description of two marvelous islands – the first where no female can enter without dying, has a church with celibates called Heaven- |

**II.3** – A cemetery only open to men, and an island where no woman may give birth. |

**II.3** – Gerald adds the 4 most important considerations, in case you might not have access to his book. 3* |

**II.3** – Gerald corrects. 3*[ut autem, etc.] 79n7.  Gerald adds in the 4 most important considerations, in case you might not have access to his book. 3* |

**II.3** – Gerald corrects. 3*[ut autem, etc.] 79n7.  Gerald adds in the 4 most important considerations, in case you might not have access to his book. 3* |

**II.3** – Gerald corrects. 3*[ut autem, etc.] 79n7.  Gerald adds in the 4 most important considerations, in case you might not have access to his book. 3* |
| II.V [II.38] – *De insula, cuius pars una bonis, altera malis spiritibus est frequentata* | + | An island divided into two parts, one with a beautiful church visited by angels and saints, the other with nine pits visited by devils. If someone enters the pits they are tortured, but will not go to hell afterward. 1* | + | 1* [Hic autem, etc.] 83n1, n2 Cmarg, W. The island is called St. Patrick’s Purgatory. Why it is so called. | + | Scholastic History, which also mentions the Tree of the Sun, as it appears in the letter of Alexander to Aristotle. [Peter Comestor?] | + |
| II.VI [II.39] – *De insula, ubi hominem corpora sub divo positae non putrescunt* | + | An island 1* where bodies don’t decay; men may recognize their ancestors. Also has no mice; they will die 2* if brought. | + | 1* [cui nomen Aren] 83n3. Called Aren. [this is mistaken, see note] | + | 2* [statim] 84n2 “immediately” | + |
| II.VII [II.40] – *De mirandis fontium naturis* | + | A well in Munster, hair turns grey. A spring in Ulster that does the opposite. 1* Spring in Connaught that ebbs and flows like the sea. Also one in Wales. 2* 3* 4* | + | 4* [In meridionali, etc. … aequae deficiunt] pg. 85n5. Wells with strange properties in the south of Britain, France, Normandy. Petrifying well in Ulster. Norway. A wood near Wimborn with petrifying ground. 5* A fountain in Hungary which turns into ice, then stone. 6* 7* 8* | + | 1* [Hunc … volentes] pg. 84n5. Frequented by women and those desirous of avoiding grey hairs. 2* [in prov … Canterbocan] pg. 85n2. Specifically where in Wales. 5* [Quod … complet] pg. 86n3. A quotation from Palladius on similar effects in | + | 3* [Item … fervet] pg. 85n4. A well that does similar things mentioned by Trojus Pompeius (taken from Solinus). 8* [contra communem fontium naturam] pg. 87n6. Against the nature of wells. |
| II.VIII [II.41] – De duobus, Britannicae scilicet Armoricae, et Siciliae, fontibus admirandis | + | A fountain in Brittany which causes storms. A fountain in Sicily agitated by the color red. Quote from Virgil’s Georgics. 1* These wonders not possible to understand. Quote from Virgil. Two interesting rock formations in Connaught. | + | Cappadocia. 6*[est fons in Suevia, etc.] pg. 87n3. In Switzerland, a spring which only flows during the day. 7* 7*[est fons in Pictavia] 87n5 A well in Poitou that 8* only runs in the summer. |
| II.IX [II.42] – De lacu magno, miram originem habente | + | A lake in Ulster, with a huge amount of fish, which flooded a town known for bestiality from a well which was left uncovered. The towers of the town still visible under the lake’s waters. 1* Details about the river Bann. | + | + | + |
| II.X [II.43] – De pisce, tres dentes aureos habente | + | Two years 1* before the English invaded Ireland, a 1* [Non multo] pg. 93n2. Not long before. 3*[quinquaginta … continentes] DELETED pg. 93n9. In our time a | + | + | + |
fish was found of immense size that 2* had three golden teeth of fifty pounds weight. 3* The gold presaging the golden times of the future impending conquest. 4* 2*[ut fertur] pg. 93n4. it was said

93n5: [quos aureos … coloris fuco] ADDED pg. 93n6. GW qualifies his previous statement – no longer weighing 50 pounds, and that they were probably just the outward appearance of gold and not really gold.

hind was found with golden colored teeth.

<p>|II.XI [II.44] – * De insulis borealis; quarum fere omnium dominum Norwagienses habent. | + There are northern islands mostly held by Norwegians, very piratical people. 1* 1*[Notandum, etc.] pg. 94n4. Isidore and Orosius on how many islands there are, and how many are inhabited. GW’s own count. | + |
|II.XII [II.45] – * De insula primo instabili, tandem per ignem stabili facta | + Recounts the story of an island, made stable by fire. Characteristics of the element of fire. | + |
|II.XIV [II.47] – * De voragine maris naves absorbente | + Characteristics of a whirlpool. 1* 1*[Quatuor, etc.] pg. 97n1. The philosophers identify 4 of these, in the 4 quarters of the world; fixed principles. | + |
|II.XV [II.48] – * De Mania insula; quae, ratione venenorum vermium, quos admitit, Britanniae censetur applicanda | + The isle of Man belongs to Britain, on account of the poisonous reptiles that exist there. | + |
|II.XVI [II.49] – * Quod longe post diluvium, nec subito sed paulatim, et | + Because poisonous reptiles can be found on islands, it can be suggested that | + |
| quas per eluvionem, insulae natae sunt | islands were formed gradually from deposits | + | + |
| II.XVII [II.50] – De Tyle, occidentali insula, quae apud orientales est famosissima, cum occidentalibus sit prorsus incognita | The famous island Ultima Thule, in Virgil, Solinus. 1* None of the western islands have its nature, though places in the North do. 2* 3* | 1*[Ultra Tylen, etc.] pg. 99n1. More details of Solinus’s characterization. | + |
| + | | 3*[Augustinus, etc.] pg. 99n5. Augustine places Thule in India, confusing Thule with Tylis. | + |
| II.XVIII [II.51] – De chorea gigantum, ab Hibernia in Britanniam translata | The Giants’ Dance in ancient times brought from Africa to Ireland; 1* vast size of the stones, their arrangement. Aurelius Ambrosius has Merlin bring them to Britain as a memorial. | 1*[Unde … conspiciuntur] pg. 100n4. A replica visible there today. | + |
| + | | + | + |
| II.XIX [II.52] – De mirabilibus nostri temporis. Et primo, de lupo cum sacerdote loquente | The story of how a wolf approached a priest and requested last rights for his dying female companion. The priest wants to withhold communion, but the wolf sees he has it 1*. He de-skins the she-wolf to prove they are human underneath and the priest administers communion. The wolf 2* leads the priest back to the road. 3* 4* The matter discussed at a synod; Gerald not present, but consulted, and wrote a letter with advice. 5* 6* 7* | 2*[presbytero praebens iter] pg. 103n1. allowing the priest to resume his journey | + |
| + | | 6*[Sed animal … trahenda] pg. 105n1. Is the animal a brute or man? A quaestio. | + |
| + | | 7*[Augustinus, etc. to ch. end] pg. 105n2. On the humanity of monsters in Augustine’s Civitate Det. Apuleius’s Golden Ass. Folkloric “magic arts” from Wales – people turned into pigs, witches who turn into hares. GW agrees with Augustine that demons and wicked cannot change their natures, only their outward appearances, though God can change natures (Lot’s wife). GW brings up but | + |
| + | | 3*[Inter … provocabunt] pg. 103n4. Priest asks wolf about the hostile race (English) now inhabiting the island, wolf says for their sins. | + |
| + | | 5*[Non itaque … assumperit] pg. 104n1. God became human for salvation, here a man has become a wolf. | + |
| + | | 1*[sub indumento] pg. 102n2. under his garment | + |
| + | | 4*[Similem … dolos] pg. 103n7. Sin and punishment in the bible. | + |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.XX [II.53]</td>
<td>De muliere barbata, et in tergo cristata</td>
<td>A woman with a beard and a crest down her back, though not a hermaphrodite, who attended court. 1* (duplici prodigio monstruosa)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 1*[Nostris, etc.] pg. 107n2. Also a story of a hermaphrodite in Connaught, half-bearded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXI [II.54]</td>
<td>De semibove viro semiviroque bove</td>
<td>A homo prodigosus, with a human body and ox-like extremities. Frequent the court of Maurice; put to death b/c of the implications of bestiality. Another example of a cow giving birth to a man-calf. 1*</td>
<td>+ 1*[Sed et, etc.] pg. 109n1. GW brings up the question of the humanity of the monsters – the question of it walking, laughing. Quote from Ovid. Refuses to make nature’s “excursus” the subject of disputation.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXII [II.55]</td>
<td>De vacca cervina</td>
<td>A half-deer, half-cow in Chester.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXIII [II.56]</td>
<td>De hirca ad mulierem accedente</td>
<td>On a goat belonging to Roderic, king of Connaught, which was seduced by a woman. Exclamations on bestiality. GW includes a verse of his on the subject. 1*</td>
<td>+ 1*[Vis genitiva, etc.] pg. 110n3. Gerald adds another verse. (the crime makes itself known in creating a prodigy)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXIV [II.57]</td>
<td>De leone mulierem adamante</td>
<td>A similar case at Paris, of a lion with a woman. Quote from Leviticus. The Lion was killed as a memorial. 1*</td>
<td>+ 1*[De Pasiphe, etc.] pg. 111n4. Some say Pasiphae and the bull is a myth, but it is actual fact.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXV [II.58]</td>
<td>De gallis alter in Hibernia quam alibi</td>
<td>Roosters crow at different intervals, even if they are</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXVI [II.59] – De lupis in Decembri catulos habentibus</td>
<td>Wolves often have cubs in December either because of the mild climate or as a sign of treason and plunder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXVII [II.60] – De corvis et ululis circa Natale pullos habentibus</td>
<td>Ravens and owls had babies at Christmas 1*, signaling a future event. 2* 1*[et praecipue … Mediae] pg. 113n1. in Meath, especially 2*[Sicut, etc.] pg. 113n2. Hugh de Lacy’s death.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXVIII [II.61] – De miraculis; et primo de pomis, et corvis, et merula sancti Keivini</td>
<td>The apples, ravens, and blackbirds of St. Kevin. Apple-bearing willows, crows that don’t land on his feast day. 1* The story of the blackbird nesting in his hand. 1*[In Italia, etc.] until the last section pg. 114n1. GW includes similar events: Ravenna, Italy, crows and ravens flocking on the feast of St. Apollinaris; Lisbon, ravens at St. Vincent’s tomb; Auch, France, a bear submitting to the yoke after killing an ox during the funeral procession of St. Firmin; Constantinople 2*, the waters recede on the day of St. Clement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXIX [II.62] – De cercellis sancti Colemanni, quasi mansuetis, et ad injurias fugitivis</td>
<td>The teals of St. Colman in a small pool in Leinster are tame. 1* If attacked, will fly away, and water becomes putrid. One accidentally boiled was found unhurt. One purposefully boiled would not cook; caused the death of its eater. 2* 1*[Sunt autem … numero] pg. 117n2. There are always 13, as if a convent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXX [II.63] – <em>De lapide, vinum quotidiem miraculose continente</em></td>
<td>+ A stone outside a church provides wine everyday through the merit of the saint. 1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+[Simile, etc.] pg. 119n1. A similar miracle mentioned in the Dialogues of St. Gregory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXI [II.64] – <em>De pulicibus, a sancto Nannano deportatis</em></td>
<td>+ Fleas expelled by St. Nannan to a nearby meadow.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXXII [II.64] – <em>De ratis, per sanctum Yvorum a Fernegen expulsis</em></td>
<td>+ Rats expelled by bishop, whose books they probably gnawed.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXXII [II.66] – <em>De campana fugitiva</em></td>
<td>+ A bell which, unless it is exorcised, appears at the church of St. Finnan in the morning.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXXIV [II.67] – <em>De variis Kildariae miraculis; et primo de igne quasi inextinguibili, cinereque non excrescente</em></td>
<td>+ St. Brigid’s fire, tended by nuns and holy women, as if inextinguishable.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXXV [II.68] – <em>De igne a Brigida sua nocte servato</em></td>
<td>+ St. Brigid tends the fire on the 20th night.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXXVI [II.69] – <em>De sepe circa ignem; intra quem mas non intrat</em></td>
<td>+ Men not allowed past the hedge which surrounds the fire. Brigid’s pastures regrow at night. Virgil quote.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XXXVII [II.70] – <em>De falcone Kildariae, quasi domestico et mansueto</em></td>
<td>+ A falcon which would hunt, would only mate away from the church. Killed by a rustic, moralized.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| II.XXXVIII [II.71] – De libro miraculose conscripto | A book in Kildare containing the gospels. Leads the eye along illustrations. Angelic skill. 1*  
1*[Haec, etc.] pg. 124n1. Gerald says the more often he looks at them, the more new things he discovers and admires. (admiranda) |
| II.XXXXIX [II.72] – De libri compositione | An angel furnishing the designs to the scribe, with St. Brigid praying. |
| II.XL – De mirandis sanctorum refugiis | Wonderful places of refuge protected by saints: Ulster, St. Beanus protects birds and eggs; Munster, St. Brendan protects all animals 1* on a particular tract of land, and hounds will stop the chase if the prey goes there. The fish only available to the hungry, like manna, will not keep.  
1*[apri et] pg. 125n1. Added boars to the list of animals |
| II.XLI – De saltu salmonis | The salmon miraculously leap up the waterfall created by the river mentioned above. |
| II.XLII – De modo saliendi | The mechanics of a leaping salmon. |
| II.XLIII – De vita sancti Brendani | A brief account of the life of St. Brendan, his seven year voyage, visions that he saw. Might be thought impossible, but all things are possible in God. Biblical quotes. 1* Nature ‘sporting herself’ in private more than in public. Fuller accounts found in the Vita Brendani.  
1*[et quoniam … abyssis] pg. 128n1. Added quote from Psalms |
<p>| II.XLIV [II.73] – | + |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.XLV [II.74] – De cruce immobili facta</td>
<td>When the city was invaded by Strongbow, the citizens wished to carry off the cross with them; it would not be moved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XLVI [II.75] – De denario cruci oblato bis resiliente, et tertio post confessionem remanente; et ocreis ferreis miraculose restitutis</td>
<td>A penny offered by an invading archer thrown back twice, remained after he confessed to pillaging the bishop’s residence. A young man who had sworn on the cross that he didn’t steal confessed later, claiming to have been persecuted by the cross ever since.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XLVII [II.76] – De phrenetico apud Fernas, verbis de praeterito futura praedicante</td>
<td>A prophetic madman at Ferns, predicts war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XLVIII [II.77] – De sagittario, qui sepem Brigidae transiliit, insaniente; et alio tibiam amittente</td>
<td>An archer who jumped the hedge to blow on St. Brigid’s fire loses his senses, dies. Another’s leg withers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.XLIX [II.78] – De tritici semine, per imprecationem Corcagiensis episcopi non</td>
<td>Miraculous failure of a crop of wheat illegally planted against the bishop’s orders. The next</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.L [II.79] – De Philippo Wigorniensi, apud Archmachiam passione percusso; et Hugone Tyrello divinitus flagellato

Other invaders who pillaged churches and holy places are punished.

II.LI [II.80] – De molendino, quod nec diebus dominicis, nec de furto vel rapina quicquam molit

A mill in Ossory which will not work on Sundays, nor grind anything taken by theiving or pillage.

II.LII [II.81] – De molendino quod feminae non intrat

A mill made by St. Fechin in the side of the rock, into which no women may enter. When Hugh de Lacy led his troops, an archer took a girl into the mill and raped her, he was punished with an internal fire and died.

II.LIII [II.82] – De duobus equis, qui avenam de eodem molendino raptam comedentes statim interierunt

Though Hugh de Lacy caused all stolen grain to be restored, two soldiers fed some to their horses, which died.

II.LIV – De sagittariis apud Fineglas divinitus condemnatis

It happened that during some storms archers at Finglas tore down trees that had been planted by holy men for fires. Most of the troops died of sickness within a few days. The rest tried to flee, were

1*{de molendino surreptam} pg. 134n3. Stolen from the mill

1*[miraculose nimis] pg. 134n1. made miraculously by St. Fechin

1*[rege Henrico] and [fulminante] pg. 135n2,3.

2*[Quia … pugillo] pg. 136n1. Another quote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface [II.84] – Incipit Distinctio Tertia; de terrae istius habitatoribus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>GW will now discuss the inhabitants of the country, and the arrival of different races (nationes) to the island. 1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.I [III.85] – De primo adventu; Caesarae scilicet, nepitis Noe, ante diluvium</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>According to the ancient Irish histories, the first inhabitants of Ireland were Caesara and 350 followers who tried to avoid the flood. Gerald a compiler of history, not the judge. 1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.II [III.86] – De secundo adventu; Bartholani scilicet, trecentis annis post diluvium</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Bartholanus, descendent of Japeth, arrives with his three sons. Etymology of place names. Cultivated the land, prospered, fought with giants, died of pestilence. Ruanus lives long enough to relate the history to St. Patrick. 1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1*[Ruanus etc] pg. 142n4. Ruanus lived for 1500 years. 2* 3*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.III [III.87] – De tertio adventu;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Nemedus arrived with his</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.IV [III.88] – De quarto adventu; quinque scilicet fratrum et filiorum Dela</td>
<td>+ The five brothers, sons of Dela, arrived and split the country into five parts, which met in Meath, “the middle.”</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.V [III.89] – De primo Hiberniae monarcha; scilicet Slanio</td>
<td>+ Slanius the first king of Ireland. He reunited the five portions of Meath to make it one province, but it has half as many cantreds. On the cantred measure. Nine successors in 30 years.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.VI [III.90] – De quinto adventu; quattuor scilicet filiorum Milesii regis, de partibus Hispaniae. Et qualiter Herimon et Heberus regnum inter se diviserunt.</td>
<td>+ After much warfare, sons of King Milesius from Spain arrived and subdued the island. Two of the brothers, Herimon and Heber, divided the kingdom between them.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.VII [III.91] – De fratrum inter se discordia; et qualiter, interfecto Hebero, de Hiberniensis populo primus Herimon monarcha fuit.</td>
<td>+ Discord and war results in Herimon becoming the first king of the Irish people which inhabit the island today. Possible etymology of Hibernienses. Connection with Scots, from Gaidelus and Scota.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.VIII [III.92] – De Gurguntio Britonum</td>
<td>+ From Geoffrey of</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rege, qui Basclensis in Hiberniam transmisit, et eandem ipsius inhabitandum concessit

Monmouth, Gurguntius, king of Britain, allows a fleet of Basques to inhabit Spain. Hence it appears the kings of Britain have some claim to Ireland by right. 1* /another right is because Biscay, where the Basques are from, is now under the authority of Aquitaine./

We also read that Arthur had the Irish kings tributary to him.

III.IX – De triplici novo jure
+ [no new chapter]
De duplici novo jure, see pg. 149n1. 1* Two new claims are from voluntary cession and confirmation from the Pope. For the kings of the West have made piece treaties. 2* Will be treated more later.
+ /Biscay…Aquitaine/ moved to a chapter with a three-fold new claim.
+ 2*[et Henrico … agente] pg. 149n5. Henry II directing an expedition
+ 1*[praeter id] pg. 149n4. Besides the Biscay connection…

III.X [III.93] – De gentis istius natura, moribus, et cultu
+ The Irish: “left to nature” when born, barbarous dress, methods of riding and battle. 1* “Primitive” pastoral life. Few tilled fields or orchards. 2* Lack of mining or manufacture. Well endowed by nature but habits are uncouth, geographical remoteness to blame.

III.XI [III.94] – De gentis istius in musicis instrumentis paritia incomparabili
+ Their skill in playing musical instruments; harmony, speed. To some (who do not understand it) it might sound discordant. Compared with Scotland
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.XIII</td>
<td>De primis musicae consonantiae inventoribus</td>
<td>From Genesis, music invented by Tubal before the flood, written on two pillars, one of stone, one of brick. Philosophers say Pythagoras, others say Linus Zetus and Anxeos. [mostly from Isidore]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XIV</td>
<td>De musicorum instrumentorum cultore praecipuo et ornatore</td>
<td>On King David. Augustine on David.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XV</td>
<td>De nomine musicae</td>
<td>Music from the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XVI [III.95]</td>
<td>Quot reges ab Herimone usque ad Patricii adventum regnaverunt. Et quod insula per ipsum ad fidem est conversa</td>
<td>From Herimon to Patrick reigned 131 kings. When Patrick arrived from Britain 1* he found idolatry and superstitions, preached Christianity. Set up Armagh as the metropolitan see, set up bishops. 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XVII [III.96]</td>
<td>Quod archiepiscopi in Hibernia fuerunt.</td>
<td>No archbishops until the papal legate John Papyrio 1*[regnante … filio] pg. 161n4. During the reign of Laegerius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XVIII [III.97] – Quod tria corpora, Patricii scilicet, Columbae, et Brigidae, apud Ultoniam, in Dunensi civitate, his nostris diebus inventa sunt et translata</td>
<td>The bodies of the three saints found in Down, in the year John first came to Ireland, lying in a vault. Were translated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XIX [III.98] – De Hiberniensibus in fidei rudimentis inculissimis</td>
<td>Irish are ignorant in the rudiments of Christianity: having vices, not paying tithes; in marriage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XX [III.99] – De eorum nequitiis et proditionibus</td>
<td>Their treachery in oaths. See 165n2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXI [III.100] – De securi, quam semper in manu quasi pro baculo bajulant</td>
<td>They always carry an axe. 2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXII [III.101] – De argumento nequitiae, et novo desponsationis genere</td>
<td>See 167n4 (chs. 22-24 are all one). A new custom of making an oath: processing around a church, oaths on relics, then drinking one another’s blood. 1* Exclamations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXIII – Quod alumnos et collactaneos</td>
<td>[no new chapter; a marginal note] Exclamations. They love</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXIV – De advenis eodem vitio contaminatis</td>
<td>+ [no new chapter; a marginal note] Strangers and foreigners soon adopt the customs.</td>
<td>+ 1*[adeo mali ... colloquia prava] pg. 168n3. From Gregory of Nanzianzus, that wormwood contaminates the honey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXV [III.102] – De novo et enormi regni et dominii confirmationis modo.</td>
<td>+ A king’s inauguration in Ulster 1*, whereby he has intercourse with a white mare 2*, which is then killed and chopped into a broth, in which he bathes and drinks.</td>
<td>+ 1*[Turpis ... artificem; quoniam; circumcisio depromi] pg. 169n1. Cmarg, Bb. GW will tell the story because history doesn’t allow modesty over truth. 2*[non minus impudenter quam imprudenter] pg. 169n2. Rhetorical flourish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXVI [III.103] – De multis in insula nunquam baptizatis, et ad quos nondum fidei doctrina pervenit</td>
<td>+ Many unbaptized, and some totally ignorant. Sailors’ tale of the uncivilized Irish, found naked in a coracle, never seeing timber, bread, cheese, clothes, not knowing Christianity. 1* 2* 3*</td>
<td>+ 1*[Verumtamen ... emittunt] pg. 171n3. Ecclesiastics who have wives, wear long hair, fillets, have different hand signs. Men pee sitting; women standing. 2*[Ad haec ... natio] pg. 172n1. This nation prone to jealousy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXVII [III.104] – De clero Hiberniae, in multis laudabili</td>
<td>+ Irish remarkable for their chastity, devotion and fasting, but only during the day. 1*</td>
<td>+ 1*[Inter, etc.] pg. 172n4. But they drink excessively at night. Amazing that it doesn’t give rise to lust. 2* A few clergy are sincere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXVIII [III.105] – De proelatis ex</td>
<td>+ GW reproaches prelates</td>
<td>+ 1*[Quoniam ... praeco mutus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Page Numbers/References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pastorali negligentia corripiendis</em></td>
<td>who cannot correct their flock for being guilty themselves.</td>
<td>pg. 174n1. Cmarg, Bb. Quote from St. Gregory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*There are no preachers. All saints are confessors, not martyrs.</td>
<td>2*[Mirum … martyrii nulla] pg. 174n5. Amazing that such a violent nation has no martyrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXIX – <em>Quod omnes episcopi Hiberniae de monasteriis electi sunt</em></td>
<td>+ See 175n1, part of previous ch. Bishops only perform duties of a monk, because they are all elected from monasteries. Quotes from St. Jerome to Rusticus the monk.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXI – <em>Quod quidam intus esse videntur, qui foras missi sunt; et e diverso</em></td>
<td>-- GW amazed that prelates who are so bad are revered as holy men. Two possible reasons: unfaithful saints’ lives, or the church is being deceived. Eventual punishment. 1*</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXII [III.107] – <em>De obliqua Cassiliensis archiepiscopi responsione</em></td>
<td>+ While Gerald was preaching these things, the archbishop of Cashel replies that, due to the English invasion,</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
henceforth Ireland will have plenty of martyrs. (See pg. 179n1.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXIII [III.108]</td>
<td>De campanis, et baculis, aliisque huiusmodi sanctorum reliquis: tam ab Hibernico et Scotico quam et Wallensi populo in magna reverentia habitis (see 179n2)</td>
<td>+ The objects of the saints revered by people and clergy of Ireland and Wales 1*, sworn upon more than the gospels; special vindictiveness of the saints for broken oaths. 1*[et Scotiae] pg. 179n2 and n4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXIV</td>
<td>De baculo virtuosissimo quem baculum Jesu vocant; et sacerdote duplici passione percusso</td>
<td>+ 1* In Wales, the relic of St. Patrick's horn, irreverently blown by a priest, causes 2* him to lose the power of speech and a lethargy with loss of memory. GW sees him rememorizing the psalms. 3* 1*[Inter universos… translatus] 180n1 See note on chapter title, position. Cmarg, Bb. The staff of Jesus, supposedly used by Patrick to expel poisonous reptiles. 2*[ore… retorto] pg. 181n1. …his mouth to contort… 3*[Cui … plena] pg. 181n3. Making a pilgrimage to Ireland restores him slightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XXXVI [III.110]</td>
<td>Quot reges a tempore Patricii usque ad Turgesii adventum regnaverunt</td>
<td>+ 33 kings reigned from Patrick until the coming of Turgesius.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 838 the Norwegians, led by Turgesius, conquered Ireland and built defensive castles, which are now ruined.

GW notes that there is a discrepancy between what the Irish say in their annals and what the English say, that the castles were built by Gurmund. Some say it’s the same person, two names. GW suggests Turgesius is a seneschal of Gurmund.

GW discusses that in Geoffrey it says that Gurmund came from Africa, invited by the Saxons.

How Turgesius was killed by a trick involving men dressed as women.

This trick led to a massacre of the remaining Norwegians, who fled.

Subtle question of the King of Meath, destroying the Norwegian castles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Ostmannorum adventu</td>
<td>Norwegians came again, under the guise of peace as if to work, built cities. Numbers swelled and they began to rebel. 1* Irish learned use of axe from Norwegians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XLIV [III.118] – Quot reges in Hibernia regnaverunt, ab obitu Turgensii, usque ad ultimum Hiberniae monarcham Rothericum</td>
<td>+ 17 kings between Turgesusius to Roderic 1* and by whom Dermitius was ([est] 188n3) 2* expelled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XLV [III.119] – Quot reges fuerunt a primo Herimone, usque ad hunc ultimum Rothericum.</td>
<td>+ 181. Kingship acquired not with coronation, unction, or hereditary right; only by force of arms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XLVI [III.120] – Quod a primo adventu suo usque ad Turgensium, et ab obitu Turgensii usque ad ultimum regem Henricum secundum, gens Hibernica manserit inconcussa</td>
<td>+ The Irish from their first king until these times (with the short interruption of the Norwegians) were unconquered until subjugated by Henry II. Addressed directly to him. 1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XLVII [III.121] – De victoriis Anglorum regis Henrici secundi</td>
<td>+ The victories of Henry II, our western Alexander.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.XLVIII [III.122] – De titulis et triumphis eiusdem variis recapitulatio</td>
<td>+ Conquering of Ireland a ‘penetration of the secrets of the ocean and nature’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1*[Dicti … adventi sunt] 187n3. Why they are called Ostmen.  
1*[et usque … praesidet] pg. 188n2. Roderic still governs Connaught.  
2*[fuerat] pg. 188n3. had been expelled.  
1*[Anno, etc.] pg. 189n3. Adds date.  
1*[superborum … calcatis et] pg. 190n1. Henry II trodding on the necks of the proud.  
3*[haec … explicabit] pg. 193n1. “all this, I
hidden things’ – an intellectual conquering, not just geographical. Rhetorical exclamations on his attempted and potential victories, enemies 1*, quotes from Caesar, Seneca. 2*/GW shall write up the true history of Henry’s victories at his command./ 2*[Quanto, etc.] pg. 191n5. Greatly expanded rhetorical matter, quotes from Jerome, David, Solomon. Henry as a prince learned in literature, rise to glory, etc. etc. 3*

say, who shall fully relate?” Added so late that it indicates irony – no one can relate it at this point, Henry dead, infamous.

| III.XLIX – De titulis filiorum: et primo de Anglorum rege Henrico tertio | -- | See pg. 191n5. | + | GW begins with his own verse, rebellion of Henry’s sons. Describes Henry III in kind in peace, bold in war, died unexpectedly. | + | + |


| III.LI – De diversitate duorum | -- | + | Differences between Henry III and Richard. Both noble. Rhetorical flourishes. Good qualities of the sons from the father. GW and history, writing about those who can banish you. The father as everything to everyone. | + | + | + |

| III.LII – De Britone, et Hibernico | -- | + | On Geoffrey, count of Brittany, and John, of Ireland. Their stature, one distinguished, the other will be. Geoffrey’s smooth talking as a | + | + | 1*[nec mult. dies ejus] pg. 200n1. Nor did God multiply his days.
| III.LIII – De fratum inter se, et cum patre, discoridia. | -- | + | How great they could have been had they all stuck together. Instead, a tree shorn of its boughs. | + | | | | III.LIV – De Saxonica, Hispanica et Sicula | -- *[Tantae… injunctum] /GW will write it up, etc./ See 202n2. 1* | + | Offer to follow up with his three daughters. | + | + | + | + | Postscript (in about ½ the MSS) | + | Omne tulit punctum, qui miscuit utile dulci. | + | + | + | + |
Appendix B

Expugnatio Hibernica Versions Chart

To read: Vertical columns indicate the chapter number and contents of the α- or β-version, respectively. The content of a section that has been changed or omitted is indicated in the α-version column, and the type of change is described in the β-version column. Line numbers are from: Scott and Martin, eds. and trans. *Expugnatio Hibernica* (Dublin: Royal Academy of Ireland, 1978). Because the *Expugnatio Hibernica* is not analyzed in this dissertation, full summaries have not been given.

Only chapters with changes are included in the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>α – version</th>
<th>β – version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface – <em>Introitus ad Recitationem</em></td>
<td>Prefacio prima in librum expugnacionis hyberniae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introitus ad Recitationem</td>
<td>Intro.40 adds a quote from Horace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro.57, 61 adds tons of add’l authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro.87 adds extended quote from Augustine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro.92 adds extended quote from Cassiodorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro.96-140 replaced by extended discussion of prodigies (check – it’s totally similar to Version III, TH Preface to Dist. II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>… in tres quoque libellos…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… in duos libellos…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intro.201 “De visione” (adds chapter heading for added chapter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preface II</td>
<td>Illustri Pictavensi Comiti Ricardo Giraldus Cambrensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefacio secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Incipit liber Vaticinalis Historie a Giraldi Kambrensi digestus super Hibernica expugnacione secunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De exilio Dermitii princeps Lagenie et eiusdem per Anglorum Regem Henricum secundum restitutione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7, 9 adds details about his family, the sons of Nesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.12 adds details about movement of troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.71 adds a ‘marvel’ that where the army seemed to be, all the grass was tromped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two prophecies, one Merlin Celidon, one Moling of Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All: scored out in I; missing in Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.14-15</td>
<td>In crastino … occurrunt. Detail of great rejoicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.18-20</td>
<td>Reimundus … effectus fuerat. Raymond having general assent to be leader over the army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.13: in hec verba The edict of Henry “in these words”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Just a note, chapter 20 is the same as <em>Vita Remigii</em> 27 and <em>De Principis Instructione</em> II.3 (with later additions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.39-49</td>
<td>Nec hoc … declarabitur. Two prophecies of Merlin Sylvester concerning the martyrdom of Thomas Beckett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>De Occursu Comitis Anglorum Regi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.10-14: Tunc impletum… exponetur. One prophecy of Merlin Sylvester, one of Moling of Ireland, concerning Henry’s coming as a storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>De Stephanide Regi Reconciliato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>De Borealis Hibernie Principibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.18-36</td>
<td>Tunc impletum … exponetur Three prophecies: Moling, Merlin Sylvester, and Merlin Ambrosius on the subjugation of all to the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>De Rege Revocato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Qualiter …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>adds a qualification, saying that the dreams given to prophets by angels are quite different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>45:43-48: Impleta sunt … palam erit. Prophecy of Merlin Sylvester dealing with the rebellion of Henry’s sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46:55: adds additional detail about the character of Henry II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book II</th>
<th>α-version</th>
<th>β-version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:36: adds paragraph anecdote of a brave deed of Meiler being ambushed by Irish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interfeccio Dublimensium apud Ossiriam</td>
<td>Reimundi in Hiberniam revocacio et Basilie responsacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De Genere inter se connexione</td>
<td>Generum confederation et maiorum subsequenter confeodacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Privilegiorum Impetracio</td>
<td>Privilegii Impetracio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:5</td>
<td>Topographia ‘nostra’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10:4: adds sentence praising more of his kinsmen by name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Descriptio Herveii</td>
<td>Herveii Descriptio et Reimundi ab eodem facta delacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15:53: Topographia ‘nostra’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.10: Tune impletum … vaticinium Introducing a prophecy of Merlin Sylvestris</td>
<td>17.10: changed to ‘Tune impletum esse videtur illud Merlini Celidonii dictum, ut dici solet, quia nihil de Merlinorum dictis asserimus.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.54: impletum est… Introducing a prophecy of Columba the Irishman</td>
<td>17.54: add ‘ut dicitur’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.60: vates … Another prophecy of Columba</td>
<td>17.60: add ‘ut fertur’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.66: habet… Another of the same</td>
<td>17.66: add ‘dicitur habuisse’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.76: retinenda… Explanation of how prophecy could be read</td>
<td>17.76: add ‘vel potius longe post sub Hamone de Valoinges iusticiario fraudulenter destructa et per Meilerium recuperata.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Original Text</td>
<td>Added Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.50 adds detail about Meiler’s luck having children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>De Adelini filii revocacione et Hugone de Laci eidem subrogato</td>
<td>Adelini filii revocatio et Hugonis de Laci prefeccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>De Hibernie regno sub Hugone de Laci pacificato</td>
<td>Hibernie sub Hugone de Laci incastellacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.22: Topographia ‘nostra’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.17: adds detail about burial of Lawrence archbishop of Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.9: regni dominium… subieccionem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detail about Heracleius offering the king crown and allegiance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.9: omitted in Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adds chapter 27, the king’s reply to the patriarch and his threat. Also found in DPI II.27-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>De regno Palestino in Saracenorum manus devoluto</td>
<td>In crucis obsequia principum signacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.40-41: Tunc impletum … earum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prophecy of Merlin Celidon concerning the exile of Thomas Beckett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.12 adds detail about Eleanor’s divorce and remarriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.35: adds detail that secret flight was written about and recorded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.40-41: scored out in I, omitted in Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.120-2: scored out in I, omitted in Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.140, 141: adds details about Henry’s downfall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.157: adds quote from Lucan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.16-26: Tunc impletum … Ludovico filio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 prophecies of Merlin Sylvester dealing with John’s conquest of Ireland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.8: adds detail that Ranulf Glanvill was the justiciar of all England.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.16-26: scored out in I, omitted in Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.36: habeant… Ireland has four prophets…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.36: habere dicantur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.36: habeant… Ireland has four prophets…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.42: adds biblical anecdote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.132: adds analysis of regnal situation under John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39.52: et tam … transeamus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now let’s turn to the Prophetic Part …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.52: [I, Cl, Hb, Rb] ‘dum ea que scimus loquimur, et que vidimus fideliter testati sumus, novis de cetero historicis tam indolis egregie gesta futura digno coequanda et explicanda stilo nunc relinquamus.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Book III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>α-version</th>
<th>β-version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The third book concerning prophecies (Preface only)</td>
<td>Omitted in Beta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

*Itinerarium Kambriae* Versions Chart

To read: Vertical columns indicate the contents of a particular version. Numbered asterisks map out added sections of text horizontally across rows. Numbered asterisks embedded within textual summary indicate the placement of the subsequent added section. Match the numbered asterisks across the row in order to trace textual changes and additions.

1.1 = Rolls Series Edition chapter numbers
+ = Version contains the chapter
-= = Version does not contain the chapter
1* = Indicates placement of added section. Match numbered asterisks horizontally across graph.
1* [Unde et … praesagia vivam] pg. 3n3. = The added section with reference to Rolls Series edition footnote (page 3, footnote 3) and Latin catch words indicating the passage.
/text/ = text has been moved between versions, but not substantially altered

The groupings of manuscripts into versions below follows those of the Rolls Series editor, James Dimock, and Catherine Rooney. Please note, however, that the contents of individual manuscripts can often vary from its version grouping.

Many manuscripts contain a list of chapter headings at the beginning of the text (a table of contents) as well as embedded chapter headings. Due to limitations of space, utility, and insufficient information in the editions, this chart does not trace additions or changes to the table of contents between versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Version III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSS: R, B, F</td>
<td>MSS: Hc</td>
<td>MSS: D, Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Preface</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>// MS B has the first portion of the first prefence, through the quotation from Juvenal, at the end of the treatise with the dedicatory heading, “Guillelmo Eliensi episcopo.” See pg. 7n.2//</td>
<td>Gerald directs his work to Hugh of Lincoln (“Hugoni Lincolniensis episcopo magister Giraldu Kambrensis”). 1*</td>
<td>1* See 3n.1. Gerald rededicates: “Stephano Cantuariensi Archiepiscopo. In Odoporon Giralde Praefatio Prima.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gerald muses on the different stations of mankind and wonders where the poets and men of letters have gone. He identifies lasting fame as the poet’s inheritance, though not wealth. He disparages courtly life, and commits himself to literature for the sake of posterity, though he would not mind reward. Gerald expresses regret at</td>
<td>2* See 7n.3. Replaces Hugh with Stephen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
directing his earlier works toward princes. He hopes that Hugh 2* has time to read his works and finds them pleasurable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Second Preface</th>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Version III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ [Incipit Itinerarium Giraldi Kambrensis; et tam Kambrae quam Britanniae descriptio] 1* see 12n1</td>
<td>+ 1* [Incipit Itinerarium Giraldi Kambrensis; et Laboriosa Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Baldewini per Walliam Legatio] see 12n1</td>
<td>+ 4*[per te … archiepiscopo] 12n2 Gerald replaces “Hugo Lincolniensis episcopo” with “Stephane Cantuariensis archiepiscopo.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald states his objective to describe the journey of Archbishop Baldwin through Wales, and all the places, streams, funny stories, notable events, the Welsh people’s origins, habits, and behaviors, and likewise the country itself: 2* All this shall be presented as if in a clear mirror. He dedicates his work to posterity. 3*</td>
<td>2*[patriae naturam… descriptionem] 13n1. Gerald deletes the reference to the Welsh people, and replaces the text with “patriae naturam, naturaeque mirandos interdum excursus, patriae quoque descriptionem” (nature of the country, the marvelous excesses of nature, and also a description of the country). [Presumably he deleted the reference to the description of the Welsh because of the intervening appearance of Descriptio Kambriae. –ABS]</td>
<td>3* [per te . . . archiepiscopo] pg. 13n.2. Gerald dedicates his work to posterity on behalf of Hugh of Lincoln. 4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 1188, 1* the same year that Saladin overcame Jerusalem, Archbishop Baldwin entered into Wales. Just after Ash Wednesday at Radnor Baldwin, accompanied by Ranulf de Glanville up to here, met Rhys ap Gryffud. When he delivered a sermon which was interpreted 2*, I who wrote these words got up and took the cross at the instigation of the King, et al. 3* Other people sign up for the cross as well, Rhys means to but is later dissuaded by his wife. 4* Mass is celebrated in the</td>
<td>4*[Accesserunt…non valebant] 15n2. The canons of St. David’s try to inhibit the progress of Baldwin by petitioning Rhys, in case his journey to the metropolitan see of St. David’s harmed the interests of the church. Rhys doesn’t want to hurt the archbishop’s feelings so lets him proceed. 5*[vice quadam] 17n1. detail about the battle lines</td>
<td>1*[apostolatus … Palestina Gwidone] 13n3. A list of other rulers at the time is inserted in between.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*[Walensibus] 14n3 That is, interpreted into Welsh</td>
<td>3* [se primus … rationis persuasione] 14n5. Adds detail that he was the first to stand up and that he acted of his own free will in light of the injury done to the cross.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Version III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 1 – De transitu per Herefordiam, et Radenouram; cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>+ 4*[Accesserunt…non valebant] 15n2. The canons of St. David’s try to inhibit the progress of Baldwin by petitioning Rhys, in case his journey to the metropolitan see of St. David’s harmed the interests of the church. Rhys doesn’t want to hurt the archbishop’s feelings so lets him proceed. 5*[vice quadam] 17n1. detail about the battle lines</td>
<td>+ 1*[apostolatus … Palestina Gwidone] 13n3. A list of other rulers at the time is inserted in between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ In 1188, 1* the same year that Saladin overcame Jerusalem, Archbishop Baldwin entered into Wales. Just after Ash Wednesday at Radnor Baldwin, accompanied by Ranulf de Glanville up to here, met Rhys ap Gryffud. When he delivered a sermon which was interpreted 2*, I who wrote these words got up and took the cross at the instigation of the King, et al. 3* Other people sign up for the cross as well, Rhys means to but is later dissuaded by his wife. 4* Mass is celebrated in the</td>
<td>2*[Walensibus] 14n3 That is, interpreted into Welsh</td>
<td>3* [se primus … rationis persuasione] 14n5. Adds detail that he was the first to stand up and that he acted of his own free will in light of the injury done to the cross.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
morning and Ranulph goes home. Hector and Maelgwn are signed to the cross.

At this point GW must tell us about the castellan of Radnor castle during the reign of Henry I housing his dogs in the church of St. Afan – went mad, he went blind. Had himself led to Jerusalem to the front lines and was killed. 5*

Same time, only a short distance away in Gwrthrynion, Einion (who we just saw above signed with the cross) was hunting and a man shot a doe with 12 tines, which was sent off to Henry II. Man who shot it fell ill.

Staff of St. Curig in Gwrthrynion heals swellings and tumors for a penny. 6*

III – De transitu per Haim et Brecheniauc, cum notabilibus suis

+ They progress into Brecknockshire; sermon, people signed with cross. Journey to Llanddew, sermon. GW gives Baldwin the TH. 1*

The lake that turns green, elders consulted as to what it signified – devastation caused by Hywel ap Maredudd.

A priest called Hugh dreams three times of an old man who sends warning to William de Braose concerning tithes; goes to see “the archdeacon” 2* who recognizes the words of Augustine. Will de Braose confronted, punished.

On princes squandering money that ought to go to the church, like Henry II.

William de Braose always spoke piously. 3* 4* He would interrupt his conversations to pray. His wife also very devout. 6*

In the same area, a boy who tried to

prisoner in Gwrthrynion, in a castle built by Rhys, with the miraculous handbell of St. David. They didn’t free him so God burnt down the whole town, except for the wall where the handbell hung.

A church in Llywel burned down and everything was destroyed except for the pyx.

In Elfael (where the handbell is now) there are two pools which burst from their banks when Henry I died.

Before the death of Henry II, in Normandy, all the fish in a certain pool fought and self-destructed.

Wales recalls with horror the number of disasters in these regions: Maelienydd, Elfael and Gwrthrynion.

1* [Quod ipse... complevit] 20n6. Baldwin read a portion of it each day during the journey and finished it along with the trip.

2*[qui scripsit haec] 21n5. The archdeacon writing these words


5*[onerare sed verius] 23n1. The scribes are honored for the work, or rather, overburdened.

6*[Qui utinam... consecuti] 23n3. Prays that they both have eternal glory. See also tenses in verbs, implying William de B’s death (after 1211) 23n2.

7*[Miraculum... ceciderunt] 3 sections 24n3. Similar miracles: a woman who stole money by kissing it stuck to the altar, a parson’s...
steal some pigeons from a church of St. David’s in Llanfaes stuck to the stone. GW saw the man when he confirmed the events before David II, GW’s uncle. 7*
The torque of St. Cynog. The Horn of St. Patrick, which is discussed in the TH. 8*
GW comments on the reverence of Celtic peoples for the relics of the saints, as the saints are so vindictive. Another marvel of St. P’s horn. A wild sow suckled by a dog with a sense of smell better than hunting dogs. 9*
GW tells a tale of the disinheritance of Mahel through the evil deeds of his adulterous mother Nesta. A woman’s evil nature in various quotations. 10*
Mahel, son of Nesta’s daughter (who inherited the other Mahel’s share), was quite evil to Bishop David II (GW’s uncle) and was killed by a stone.
Brecknock called so after Brychan, in ancient times, in Welsh annals, whose 24 religious daughters are remembered in many churches. One, St. Eluned, has a feast at which young men and women are seized by a frenzy and mime any work they have illicitly done on a Sunday.
The region’s fertility and abundance. The fish. 11* The lake of Brecknock. An event where the ‘real king’ of Wales, Gruffydd, causes all the birds on this lake to burst into song. 12* This area well sheltered by mountains, including Arthur’s chair. 13*

Also groans, though this may be the ice. 13*[Quanti … damus] 36n6. Silence clause #2, bad marriages cut short by violence.

lover stuck to a tomb she accidentally sat on, and a priest who had sex and then handled the psalter of St. Kenelm stuck to it (the psalter of St. Kenelm being miraculous b/c of Quendrada’s eyes fell on it.)
8*[His verbis, Vidimus … plena] 26n7. Extended section on St. Patrick’s horn from the TH inserted.
10*[et alibi … gaudet] changed quote 30n4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III – De Ewias et Lanthonei, cum notabilibus suis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Description of the idyllic valley of Ewias, Llanthony Abbey, where St. David had his original chapel, wreathed</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with ivy. Originally founded by two hermits on the Hondu. Etymology of Hondu in Welsh. The climate healthy, illness rare. 1* Used to be great, now supplanted by the daughter house, despoiled by the English and vice. Past priors who did harm and were punished by God in death.

An anecdote of how Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, during the reign of Henry I (as his justiciar) visited and admired it, who said that the entire treasure of the King couldn’t build such a cloister (the mountains).

The founders William de Laci and Ernisius, but soon became too rich. GW beseeches bustling activity to go to Gloucester to leave the monks in peace at Llanthony. On rule of Augustine, Benedict, Cistercians. Quotes. Cistercian avarice. 2* 3* 4*

The difference between Cluniacs and Cistercians – Cluniacs will ruin good land, Cistercians will build up fabulous buildings and massive wealth on poor land. 5* or 6*

Cistercians no longer allowed to buy manors. The Augustinian canons described as most content. Eventually GW hopes to write a book on the monastic orders.

GW tells us that he lives here – has a dwelling adjacent to a castle in Brecknockshire at Llanddew.

| IV – De Transitu per Coed Wroneu et Abergavveni, cum notabilibus suis | + They travel from Llanddew through Coed Grwyne and Abergavenny. GW tells how Richard de Clare was ambushed (1136) in these woods by Iorwerth after sending back his men. A 1*[Super excessibus … machinator] 49n2. Text in // is deleted. GW inserts silence clause #3: He will leave it to others to tell of the bloodthirsty outrages. Ranulf Poer was the real man responsible, although 4*[Guillelmus autem de Breusa… desaevientibus] 53n1. William de Braose, not the author of the atrocity I have chosen to pass over in silence, nor the machinator, yet 

| 3*[Exemplum … cupiditatem] 44n3. A joke of Richard I – has given his three daughters Superbia, Luxuria, and Cupiditas to the Templars, Benedictines, and Cistercians. 4*[Id etiam … reperiantur] Rd, Camden. 44n4. The free-stones of Llanthony Priory. 6*[Praeterea isti … abstinerent] 46n3. Rather than forgo their multiple courses in famine, Cluniacs will allow their lands to be drained, while the Cistercians go hungry. |
sermon is preached and many take a cross, Arthenus shamed by Baldwin into taking cross.

1* [See 49n2] //It happened in our own days that William de Braose summoned Seisyll ap Dyfnwal and six other noblemen under a pretext of peace and they, gathered together, were closed up in the town/castle. Soldiers were set upon them and they were killed. (although Will neither present in assent nor advice.) Seisyll’s lands were ravaged and his small son killed and wife captured.//

Punishment for wickedness avenged. After seven years the sons and grandsons of those murdered played a trick on the constable, took the castle and burned it down.

2* [See 51n3] // Of all the castles in Wales this one is spotted most frequently with disgrace. Something about William de Braose and the king, and fortune, and how it was really Ranulf Poer who convinced King Henry II to do this, William tried to intercede, for a short time later near Monmouth… //

… Ranulf and his men were attacked, but not taken unawares. They fought but received many wounds, and Ranulf died, though he was able to make a final confession despite the fact that his throat had been cut.

3* [See 53n1] //The aforementioned William, though not the author of the atrocity nor yet the executor, nevertheless was not the impeditor of the slaughter.//

He had been thrown into the moat and

Henry II was the real instigator.

2*[Praeterea … castrum erigeret] 51n3. A short time later Ranulf Poer was building a strong-point at Dingestow near Monmouth…

3* See 53n1 //The aforementioned William, not the author, nor machinator, nor executor of the atrocity, nevertheless was not the impeditor of the slaughter.//

execution, while the murder-squads were carrying out their order …
was pulled out and made captive, rescued at the last minute by his own troops. Thus people involved in crimes to a lesser extent also get a lesser punishment: Judas, Jews, Pilate for Christ. Henry II for this, as shall be discussed in DPI.

The warlike men of Gwent, three instances of their arrows striking during battle, their use/fashioning of a bow.

| V – De Transitu per Oschae castrum, et Legionum urbem, cum notabilibus suis | + A large group signed to the cross at Usk. Baldwin’s sermon, also William, bishop of Llandaff. Alexander, Archdeacon of Brecon, acted as interpreter. Crossed through Caerleon.
Caerleon, ancient and authentic city’s history and description.
Julius and Aaron, protomartyrs of Britain, martyred and buried there.
Arthur’s court here, and also the metropolitan see given over to David of Menevia, as the prophecy of Merlin Ambrosius, “Menevia shall be dressed in the pall of the city of Legions.”
Goldcliff, if only someone would dig down and extract the riches. 1*

+ 1*[Notandum, etc.] 57n1. In our days in this region lived a Welsh man named Meilyr (called Kambrensis) who could tell the future. This was because on Palm Sunday he had sex with a girl who he’d loved who was actually a succubus 2* and went mad. He was healed many years later at St. David’s but was still familiar with unclean spirits and could 3* prophecy. Often wrong about events far in the future. Unclean spirits would appear to him in the form of huntsmen pursuing souls. He could tell lies because devils would point at them.

4*
The downfall of abbot Enoch was made known by Meilyr. 5* Meilyr had seen a vision of a demon as a huntsman who told him that Enoch had run off with a nun. But Enoch returned more humble than ever.
Meilyr discusses a woman with Cynan Abbot of Whitland, who confesses that he lusted after her and allows himself to be punished. The devil (Old Enemy), from experience of natural things and conjectural signs, can foretell the future with skill.

An incubus who knew many things, identified by Meilyr. Imminent war foretold – just so Hywel attacked the area. Hywel worried Henry II would take

+ 2*[sicut forma praefererat] 57n2. As if he was preferring the form.

3*[plerumque] 57n4. often prophecy.

4*[Contigit … exorbitat] 58n3. When he was harassed by the devils too much, St. John’s Gospels would be placed on his lap and they would vanish. But if Geoffrey of Monmouth was placed on his lap, they would reappear and stay longer and be more tedious.

Barnabas used to place the Gospel of Matthew on people who were ill. Power of the Gospels, esp. oaths.

5*[sicut … apparuit] 59n3. the date was noted carefully though verification didn’t come until eight days after.

6*[sed forte…amisit] 61n2. Maybe it was a supernatural type of spiritual vision, like when Belshazzar saw the hand writing on the wall.
vengeance, is assured by Meilyr that he will be caught up in France. Also prophesied about the siege of Usk Castle, though was wrong about his own death.

GW wonders how Meilyr was able to see the demons physically – bodily sight of spiritual beings. 6*

Silence Clause #4 – blind lust for conquest.

| VI – De transitu per Novum burgum et Kaiirdif, cum notabilibus suis | + Many people took the cross at Newport. The old ford of Nant Pencarn, etymology. Merlin Sylvester on the old ford of Pencarn, if crossed by a strong man with a freckled face the Welsh will be beaten. Crossed by Henry II. Earl William of Gloucester Castle attacked by feudal dependent Yvor and taken prisoner, despite his fortifications. 1*  
Off Cardiff there is a small island called Barry, from St. Baroc, who lies in a chapel wreathed with ivy, which a certain noble family owns.  
On this island there is a small crack which makes a noise like blacksmiths (quote from Aeneid), maybe from the rushing seawater, but able to be heard when tide is out and shore is dry. +  
1*[In hoc eodem … plenius ostendetur] 64n2. 1172 in Cardiff, Henry II’s return from Ireland, greeted by the English-speaking man “God hold thee, King” 2* in white who disappears. Rebellion 3* causes his eventual death. Greater length in DPI. | + 2*[quod Latine … rex] 64n4. Which in Latin is Deus te custodiat, rex  
3*[per aliquem filiorum] 66n1. Of some of his sons |
| VII – De Sede Landavensi, et monasterio de Margan, cum partium illarum notabilibus | + A sermon the next day at Llandaff, English on one side and Welsh on the other, many take the cross. Baldwin celebrates mass at the high altar of the cathedral. Margam abbey renowned for charity, in times of famine God would increase its stock of food.  
A Welshman who claimed the land set fire to the barn, lost his reason and went mad, baying like a dog and burning +  
2*[et Ambrosius … narrat] 70n2. St. Ambrose tells the same story in the Hexameron.  
inside, died.

A man who hit another and killed him in the refectory found dead the next day in the same spot.

During famine, boat sent for provisions to Bristol 1* not returning, a field miraculously ready for harvest a month early.

In our own lifetime, the sons of Caradog ap Iestin. Cadwallon murdered his brother Owain, was punished by God by a building falling on top of him.

Owain’s greyhound defended him and was wounded in many places, later sent to Henry II.

On Dogs in Suetonius’s “Habits of Living Creatures” 2*: a dog bewailing its master’s murder attacks the murderer in the crowd. The dog and murderer duke it out in judicial combat, dog wins and murderer was hanged. Pliny and Solinus have a similar story of a king who was locked in prison was saved by a pack of dogs. 3*

| VIII – De Aveniae et Neth fluviis transcurris; de Abertawe quoque, et Goher; cum notabilibus suis + |
| Crossing the rivers Avon and Neath with Morgan, son of Caradog (mentioned above) as their guide. Quicksands almost engulf Gerald’s packhorse with all his books and baggage, it is only just rescued. They hurried rather than go slowly 1*. Crossed from the diocese of Llandaff into that of St. David’s. Bishop David II (GW’s uncle) also had problems at this ford with a horse: a chaplain who had been suspended from his duties was finding the ford for the bishop and took off on his best horse, only to return when he was reinstated and compensated. |

+ 1* [moderata maturatione] 72n3. better to advance slowly.

+ 3*[eadem vero … referente] 74n4. The same night two monks make a joke about the ‘hard journey’ – the day before being ‘too soft’ re: quicksands.

+ 2* note that words in brackets in this section get taken out in III
At Swansea mass is said. Cador asks the Archbishop if he can give 1/10 of his possessions to be remitted of half the penance of going on crusade because of his infirmity. Returns later and offers a second tenth for the entire portion, admired for his cleverness by Baldwin.

The story of Elidyr the priest, who in childhood saw two tiny men who take him to their underground land. At insistence of his mother, tries to steal a golden ball and could never return again. When questioned later in life by Bishop David II he would burst into tears, still remembered some words from the language.

Bishop David II told Gerald that make of these words were like Greek. Compares some words, the word salt, with Welsh, Greek, and Latin. GW refuses to speculate on whether it is true, following Augustine, where all things are possible in God.

IX – De Lochur et Wendrayth fluviiis transcursis; de Kedwely quoque; cum notabilibus suis

They cross to the river Loughor and to Kidwelly Castle. In this region a battle was fought where Princess Gwenllian led an army against Maurice of London. GW likens her to Penthesila, queen of Amazons. Maurice of London was tricked by his wife into attacking his deer when she said they were savaging the sheep.

X – De fluvio Tewiensis navigio transcurso; de Kaermerdyn quoque; et Albaelandae monasterio, cum

They crossed the river Tywi in a boat and headed to Carmarthen. They passed Llanstephan and Laugharne, which had been captured 1* by Rhys ap Gruffydd after the death of Henry II. Rhys 2*[sonat autem … alneti] 81n2. Pengwern means head of the alder grove.

3*[In his … abhorruit] 81n3. Silence Clause #5. His pen abhors to write of the detail about how they were captured.
| **notabilibus suis** | ravaged the countryside and besieged Carmarthen but couldn’t take it. Carmarthen etymology from HKB from Merlin. GW describes Carmarthen, some of the ruined walls are still visible, how it is situated on the river, among woods and meadows. The three ancient royal castles of Wales: Dinevor, Aberffraw, Pengwern. Near Dinevor there is a well which ebbs and flows (in TH) Pencader is to the north. When Rhys was captured Henry II sent a knight to examine Kinevor. The priest leading him took him by the hardest route and ate grass, so the knight brought back the news to Henry that it was inaccessible only fit for bestial people. Henry sent Rhys back. While traveling to Whitland Baldwin was told by messengers that a Welshman who was coming to meet him had been murdered. Baldwin prayed over the body and the next day the 12 murderers-archers were signed to the cross as punishment. Crossed three more rivers to Haverfordwest, etymology of cleddau for sword. | horrible vengeance inflicted by the King’s troops, quotes from Virgil and Horace. |
| XI – De Haverfordia et Ros; cum notabilibus suis | + In Haverfordwest Baldwin gave a sermon and so did Gerald. 1* An old blind woman asked her son to bring back something of the Archbishop’s and he brought back the turf he had been standing on. She prayed over it and pressed it to her eyes and regained her sight. The Flemish have been settled here although they are in constant conflict. | + 3*[apud castellum Radulphi] then out in 3rd version. 84n4. at Chateauroux. |
| | | + 1*[Ubi et ... accurrerunt] 83n1. Miraculously, though GW preached in Latin and French, those who could not understand it were just as moved to take the cross. 2*[famosus] Gerald deletes et Kambrensis, 84n1. 4*[Pharaoni ... revocabit] 86n4. Just like Pharaoh. |
with the Welsh. Skilled in wool and hard workers. GW laments the Welsh being treated poorly.

GW must tell us about this in his own time: a famous Welsh prisoner tricked three children into his cell with him and threatened to kill them, and got his life assured.

A similar event, in France. A prisoner who had been blinded yet knew the castle well threatened to throw the lord’s son over if the castellan wouldn’t cut off his testicles. On the third time he really did (it hurts in the teeth) but the prisoner jumped over with the boy anyway as vengeance.

The castellan of Haverfordwest is Richard FitzTancard. Interestingly, all his brothers predeceased him. Likewise with Rhys ap Gruffydd.

When Richard was young he was caught in a rainstorm near the hermitage at St. Ismaels inhabited by Caradog. His hunting hounds would not come inside until Caradog indicated it was all right.

Caradog wished his body to be buried in St. David’s but it was seized by Tancard three times, each time he fell ill. Third time he let the body go. Despite heavy rain the pall and body was not wet. Buried and many miracles occur.

A strange habit of the Flemish – telling fortunes from the shoulder-blades of rams. Once a William Mangunel asked his wife, pregnant by another man, to read a bone from his own flock, and she revealed her sin.

| **notabilibus suis** | fortification built by Arnulf de Montgomery. How it was protected by Gerald of Windsor (GW’s grandfather) when besieged by the Welsh. The trick of pretending they had plenty of supplies. How Gerald married Nest, who bore him many children. This family responsible for the sea-coast of South-Wales held by the English and the storming of Ireland. In our own times, a weasel tricked into thinking her children were killed poisoned some milk with her venom; seeing her children safe, she knocked over the milk. It happened elsewhere that a weasel whose baby was carried off by a kite pretended to be dead, lured the kite over, bit it and killed it. Description of the fortified mansion of Manorbier (where GW was born) – fishpond, orchards, church, sea, proximity to Ireland means healthy air. Province of Dyved most productive. GW asks pardon for lavishing such praise, but it was where he was born. Unclean spirits in Pembroke. Two poltergeists. GW possibly a presage of change from wealth to poverty. The spirits refuse to be exorcised. 1* 2* Lightning often strikes the church. Abelard replying to a Jew on lightning striking loftier things on earth. 4* 5* 6* The falcons of the region liked best by Henry II (from EH). 96n3 (w/ various words changed in III). A third manifestation (the two poltergeists being 1 and 2) – a red haired man named Simon in the house of Ely crisp of Stackpole. Simon took over as steward and ran the household well. By chance he was seen with other fellow-demons and was dismissed, told them he was the son of a rustic girl and an incubus who had appeared as her husband. 7* 2*[Notandum … tegit] 94n3. In our own time there was a woman possessed of a devil in Poitou. Devil would crawl around in her body. He would shame people in public for their sins, but after they confessed he wouldn’t know them. 3* 3*[quod enim scio, nescio] Rd, Camden 95n2. add’l detail of what the devil said. 4*[interdum … permittuntur] 95n4. Lightning disc. continued: never strikes lavatories, likewise never synagogues, according to Abelard. 5*[Unde et … demonstravit] 96n2. A dispute between Cistercian monks in France and a knight, a violent storm destroyed the monks’ crops but not the knight’s – he says God shows the land is his rightfully. Monk replies that when the devils rode through they left the knight’s land untouched. 7*[Similis… deluisse] 98n1. A similar instance in Denmark, a priest who attached himself to the archbishop, speaking of the devils before Christ was born. Said he himself jumped down a well, then got up and left, vanished. Seen by two other priests in the Alps on the way to the Roman curia on the same day – a devil in disguise. | | **XIII – De transitu per Kamros et Neugol, cum notabilibus suis** | They travel to St. David’s, through Camrose and Newgale Sands. A curious phenomenon while Henry II was wintering in Ireland: the wind blew so hard that petrified tree trunks of an | | | | | | | |
ancient forest before the flood were visible. (EH cross-ref)
At St. David’s they were given accommodation by Peter de Leia, who had been with them the whole way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book II</th>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II</th>
<th>Version III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incipit</td>
<td>+ St. David’s, the capital of Wales, was once an archbishopric, once an ancient and authentic mother-church. GW proposes to tell us how the archbishop’s pall came to St. David’s and its history.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – De Sede Menevessi, cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>+ From HKB, St. David (uncle of Arthur) receives the Pallium from the City of Legions. The remoteness of St. David’s, David very devout, as GW’s Vita says. The best miracles from the Vita that you can read. GW lists the 23 1* archbishops that have held the position since David until Samson, then how the pall was lost in Samson’s time and taken to Dol, because of poverty 2*. Until subjugation of Welsh by Henry I, Welsh bishops were consecrated by bishop of St. D’s, no profession to any other church. From Samson to Henry I, there were 21 3* bishops. From the subjugation of Wales to present there have been three bishops, consecrated at Canterbury. 4* 5* GW reads that no Archbishop of Canterbury except Baldwin has never entered Wales, before the subjection or after it. He came to preach the cross and 6* celebrate mass in all the cathedrals. St. David’s not subject to Canterbury until recent times, from Bede, story of 7</td>
<td>4*[tempore … secundus] see 104n1 (omitted??) MS errors 6<em>omission: [et in … celebravit] 105n1. Omits detail about celebrating mass. Back in 3rd version. 9</em>[viginti vel] 106n6. twenty or thirty.</td>
<td>1* [quinque] see 102n3 and n4. Twenty five. 2*[aut potius… hostilitatem] 103n2. or rather because of the coming of the English and Saxon wars. 3*[novidecim…Wilfre] see 103n6. Nineteen. 5*[Sicut et … consecratus] 104n4. a fourth, Geoffrey, consecrated in the time of King John by Hubert Walter. 7*[quia … fluvium] 105n6. because it stretched all the way to the Severn. 8*[nisi… prodissent] see 106n1. GW adds that the witnesses testified “truly or” falsely, changes the location to Meaux, and specifies that the testimony regarded making a profession to Canterbury, before Pope Eugenius. 10*[antiqui juris] Rd, Camden 107n2. Its ancient right. 11*[in hunc modum… transmigravit] 107n4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welsh bishops. Now 4; maybe Wales used to be bigger 7*. On Bishop Bernard’s attempt to claim the rights of St. David’s. He would have been successful if witnesses hadn’t testified falsely at the council of Rheims. 8*

On Bernard’s personality. Disposed of church lands foolishly, giving away 9* thirty carucates where ten were wanted.

How the situation seems to Gerald, will be difficult to recover 10*. The name of the site, Valley of Roses. Better called valley of Marble. The story of the Llech Lafar Stone, written about in EH. 11*

Two miracles: a river running with wine, a spring with milk. The tame jackdaws.

Ireland can be seen on clear days; a tale of William, son of William 12* 13* wanting to conquer it, but doesn’t say “God willing”.

Copies out the passage from the EH.


II – De transitu per Kemmeis, et monasterium Sancti Dogmaelis, cum notabilibus suis

+ Baldwin celebrates mass at the high altar in St. David’s and leaves behind Gerald to preach there.
  Two events: a man plagued by toads, similar to one GW read about with rats. And a rich man dreamed of putting his hand into a stone and finding a gold necklace – he did and got bitten by a viper. (in EH) 1*
  Spent night at St. Dogmaels, gave sermons. One man encouraged by his wife, another hindered. Wife has horrible dream and child dies.
  Field where sermon was preached marked for a chapel, GW has no time to tell you about all the miracles.

+ 1*[Quod autem, etc… Illud… includi] 111n3. Rhys ap Gruffydd captures Llanyver Castle (1191) against several oaths he had sworn. Gruffydd, the real instigator, published by God and Rhys made prisoner two years later.
  About this time Rhys had also stolen the torque of St. Cynog and hidden it in Dievor (torque in I.2).
| III – De fluvio Teivi, et Keirdigan, et Emelyn, cum notabilibus suis. | + River Teifi has lots of salmon. Their leaping abilities, as described in the TH. Nearby a church dedicated to St. Llawddog with his mill, bridge, and garden. Beavers in the Teifi, a very long description which is repeated in DW I.5 and partially repeated from the TH. 1* How the beaver avoids hunters in the West and East. 2* Add’l section from TH. Continued on their journey to Lampeter, passing a battlefield where Gruffydd defeated the English just after the death of Richard de Clare. A tumulus on the top of the hill which changes size, and destroys your weapons. | + 1*[Ex salicum, etc. ... ad secandum] 116n3. additional details about the beaver. | + 2*[De quibus ... avarus opes] 117n2. Quotes about beavers from Cicero, Juvenal, and St. Bernard. |
| IV – De transitu per Pontem Stephani, per monasterium quoque Stratflur, per Brevi, et ecclesiam Paterni magni, cum notabilibus suis. | + Sermons preached by Baldwin, GW, and monks. Accompanied to Strata Florida and met by Cynwrig ap Rhys, described. Sermon preached to Rhys’s sons. Llandewi Brefi, David’s church, on top of the hill that rose up while he was preaching there on the Pelagian heresy. Elected as archbishop after this miracle, though also received it from Dyfrig at Caerleon earlier. Stayed night at St. Padarn’s, sermon. This church has a layman as its ‘Abbot.’ Now much reduced – better when St. Peters Gloucester was administering it during Henry I’s reign. On seeing the lay abbot with a band of armed men a knight from Brittany was dissuaded from traveling ever again. Comments on this wicked people. | + | + |
| navigio transcurso, et | They crossed the River Dovey into North Wales. Rhys and Peter de Leia go home (edge of territory). Baldwin and GW met the next day by Gruffydd ap Cynan, apologizes for being late. Territory of Cynan. How they prefer the spear to the bow here. Met by Maredudd ap Cynan, gives poor man his cloak to sew cross on. |
| terra filiorum Canani, cum | +
| notabilibus suis | |

| VI – De Traitmaur et Traitbochan transcursis; de Nevin quoque, Kairarvon, et Bangor, cum notabilibus suis | +
| | Passed through rivers. 1* Spent the night at Nefyn where GW found 2* the works of Merlin Sylvester. A marvelous island where none of the monks die from disease, only old age. A sermon, and passing through Caernarfon. Journey so rough that they dismounted and proceeded on foot, rehearsing/making a prelude of their pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Stop to rest, Baldwin jokes that they should whistle. A bird nearby sings; Baldwin jokes again that nightingales are very smart birds to never come to Wales. At Bangor, where Baldwin celebrated mass at the high altar, bishop of Bangor importuned into taking the cross. | +
| + | 1*[Transieramus … Traibochan] 124n3. crossing the rivers (wrong order) 2*[dicitur invenisse] 124n5 (also, Britannica for Kambrica, 124n1) GW is said to have found these works. |

| VII – De Monia Insula, cum notabilibus suis | +
| | They cross to the island of Monia (Anglesey) and are met by Rhodri ap Owain, sermons by Baldwin, Alexander the interpreter, and Seisyll from Strata Florida. None of the youths from Rhodri’s household take the cross – later they were wounded and killed by robbers, cross now marked on bodies as scars. GW tells us Rhodri illicitly married to his cousin. Geographical size of Anglesey. The three islands off the shores of Britain: | +
| + | 1*[quae Mania dicitur] 127n3. Called the island of Man. 2*[quam … excusavit] 132n4. Quintilian said it was from the picture. |
Anglesey, Wight, the third. 1* About Anglesey's fertility and etymology.

A few interesting things worthy to mention: a stone shaped like a femur that always returns to the same spot, tested by Hugh, Earl of Shrewsbury. When a man tied it to his thigh, his thigh turned gangrenous. A couple who has sex at the spot will not get pregnant, and the stone will sweat. There is also a hill called Listener's Rock, which you cannot hear over.

Hugh, Earl of Shrewsbury once shut his dogs up in a church dedicated to St. Tyfrydog – they all went mad, and he died within a month when pirates were attacking.

Henry II tried to lead an army into Gwynedd and was defeated at Coleshill, ravaged many holy places and many of his troops were killed, as GW says in the TH, the Celtic Saints are more prone to vengeance.

GW's uncles sent by the King: Henry FitzHenry and Robert FitzStephen. Their deeds in the EH. Both fared poorly in this campaign.

An island inhabited by hermits which is overrun with mice when they quarrel, called Priests' Island – no women allowed there.

A dog without a tail, naturally. On the inheritance of natural defects: in children whose parentage was previously disputed. Also possible by concentration: a woman who looked at a painting of a black man and had a black baby. A nervous tic.

VIII – De Cunewe

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back in Bangor, Baldwin orders the</td>
<td>2* [Quid autem, etc.] 134n1. Silence clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluvio navigio</td>
<td>1* [prophetizavit, sicut Vaticinalis Historia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcurso, et Dynas Emereis, cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>body of Owain Gwynedd to be removed from the church b/c he died excommunicate. They continue the journey past the hilltop of Ambrosius, where Merlin prophesied to Vortigern. About the two Merlins, Ambrosius and Sylvester. Merlin Sylvester prophesied more and more openly than his namesake, as the EH will tell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX – De montanis Ereri, cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>The Snowdon mountains, and their abundant pastureland. Two lakes with natural marvels: one with a floating island, one with fish with only one eye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X – De Transitu per Dugannu et Rudhelan, sedem quoque Lanvelvensem; de vivo sabulo, et Koleshulle, cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>Crossed the river Conway on to Rhuddlan, where they were entertained by Dafydd, son of Owain. A spring near which ebbs and flows every day, and also at other times. Many take the cross. They go to the poor see of St. Asaph where Baldwin celebrates mass. And pass a successful mining works. Rode across quicksand the next day and passed Coleshill. How Henry II suffered defeat here. The three times Henry has attempted to invade Wales. Unsuccessful because did not trust local lords. Quote from EH. The body of a Welshman killed at Coleshill protected by his dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI – De fluvio Deiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcurso, et Cestria, cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>Came to Chester the third day before Easter. The River Dee moves its banks and the locals prognosticate by it. Salmon. Chester is burial place of Holy Roman Emperor Henry V and also King Harold, both hid their identities as hermits and revealed it only on their deathbeds. 1* GW saw cheese made from deer milk, Countess of Chester has tame deer and gave gift to Baldwin. In the same neighborhood a stag-cow hybrid was born (TH). Also near here a dog had a litter by a monkey – the prodigies killed by a rusticus (his master upset with him). 2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII – De transitu per Album monasterio et Oswaldestreo; Povisiam quoque et Slopesburiam, cum notabilibus suis</td>
<td>Easter in Chester, many take cross and Gryffudd ap Madog renounces his cousin-wife. Entertained well by William FitzAlan. A young man reluctant to take the cross when it was being preached by Bishop Reiner because he wanted to take vengeance on his master found his spear broken into pieces in his hand. Powys has excellent horses. 1* Henry II invaded here but was forced to withdraw because of the storm. 2* Elegant sermons by Baldwin and Gerald case many to preach the cross. They excommunicate Owain Cyfeiliog for not showing up. Anecdote about Owain and Henry II at dinner, passed bread by the king and he breaks it into small pieces 3* – habit of keeping benefices open. 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII – De transitu per Gueneloc et Bromfeld, castellum</td>
<td>Shrewsbury to Malpace. The Jew’s joke of Archdeacon Sin, Dean Devil and Evil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
de Ludelawe, et Leonis monasterium, usque Herefordiam, cum notabilibus suis.1*

Street to Evil Pass. Arriving again at Hereford.
Many signed to the cross: 3000. If only the crusade had been led properly. Quote from Gregory the Great, Paul’s shipwreck.

| XIV – Descriptio Cantuariensis archiepiscopi Baldewini 1* | + | GW has given us a description of Baldwin’s preaching mission, which was a prelude to his going on crusade. |
| | + | Physical appearance. His progression from archdeacon 2* to monk, promoted to bishop and then archbishop. |
| | + | Kindness made him ineffectual. 3* On Thomas Beckett. 4* Victory lost by the remiss successors. 5* |
| | + | 6* Baldwin on crusade, men gravely afflicted 7*, dies. Commends to God. 8*. |
| | + | 1*[Baldewini] 148n1. NB: after first preface. This chapter placed at the beginning, after the first preface in Hc. |
| | + | 7*[cruciatos] 151n6. GW changes detail that crusaders were tortured. Changes back to gravely afflicted in Version III. |
| | + | 2*[Unde et… and quem canonice adeptus fuerat] 148n5. detail about archdeaconry. |
| | + | 3*[Unde et … salutem] 149n1. Whence Pope sent him an address, to fervent monk, and negligent archbishop. |
| | + | 4*[nostris diebus] 149n4. detail to TB’s success |
| | + | 5*[Unde … exagitetur] 150n4. Deathbed scene of Archbishop Richard of Dover |
| | + | 6*[inter primos… hic secundus] 151n2 (changed from Inter primos hic tamen) |
| | + | 8*[Amen, explicit] 152n4. Here ends the Itinerarium Giraldi. |
Appendix D

*Descriptio Kambriae* Versions Chart

To read: Vertical columns indicate the contents of Version I and Version II/III, respectively. The content of a section that has been changed or omitted is indicated in the Version I column, and the type of change is described in the Version II column. Text and page numbers are from the Rolls Series. Because the *Descriptio Kambriae* is not analyzed in this dissertation, full summaries have not been given.

I = Indicates Rolls Series Edition chapter numbers
+ = Version contains the chapter
-- = Version does not contain the chapter
* = Indicates an added section.
1* [Unde et ... praesagia vivam] 3n3. = The added section with reference to Rolls Series edition footnote (page 3, footnote 3) and Latin catch words indicating the passage.
/text/ = text has been moved between versions, but not substantially altered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book I</th>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II/III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| First Preface  
*In Kambriae Descriptione* 
Prefatio Prima | + [Huberte] [quem discretio pariter morumque venustas laudabilem reddunt] 155n3 | + *[Stephane] T has Hugo Lincoliensis episcopo * [quem religio pariter et literatura comm.] 155n3 |
| Prefatio Secunda. Ad eundem. | + [misplaced leaf] | + *[unde ... veneratur] 164n2 |
| I – De Longitudine 
Kambriae, et latitudine; 
qualitate eiusdem, [aequalitate] et inaequalitate. | + | + *[diebus nostris praefuit] 167n1 (III) |
<p>| II – De divisione Walliae totius in tres partes | + Rhys, who now reigns. | + *[Leuelinus filius Iorwerth, Iorwerth filius Oenei] 167n2 (III) David was thrown out in 1194, basis for dating DK |
| III – De genertatione principium Walliae | + David ap Owain | + *[id est... villa] 169n5 |
| IV – Quot cantaredos Wallia continet, quot | + | + |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V – De duobus montanis; a quibus aquae nobiles emanentes, Walliam egregie dividunt et distinguunt | Curias principales, et quot sedes cathedrales | + Beavers, from IK  
+ *[pedibus scalpendo] 174n5 an addition also found in IK III but not I or II  
+ *[De quibus … avarus opes] 175n2 an addition also found in IK III  
+ *[Dissenyth… Arthro] 176n2 an addition also found in IK III |
| VI – De amoenitate Walliae et fertilitate |  | +  
+ *[et fere cunctis] 177n4  
+ *[et Norwagensium] 177n7 |
| VII – Unde dicta sit Kambria, et unde Wallia |  | + |
| VIII – De gentis huius natura, moribus, et cultu. Et primo, de audacia eiusdem, agilitate, et animositate |  | +  
+ *[ac si … perit] 180 n2 |
| IX – De sobria euisdem coena, et parcimonia | -- [Version I manuscripts are defective until I.17] | +  
+ |
| X – De hospitalitate et dapsilitate |  | +  
+ *[cuiusmodi … solent] 184n1 (III) |
| XI – De crinium tonsura, dentium cultu, et barbae rasura |  | + |
| XII – De ingenii acumine et subtilitate |  | + |
| XIII – De symphonicis eorum cantibus, et cantilenis organicis |  | + |
| XIV – De verborum facetia et urbanitate |  | + |
| XV – De loquendi audacia et securitate |  | + |
| XVI – De divinatoribus in hac gente, et quasi arreptitiis |  | +  
+ *[unde … enunciabunt] 195n1 (III) |
| XVII – De generositas amore, et geneologia longe | --, then +  
...vesci solent. 201n2  | +  
+ *[Sunt, etc.] 201n6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book II</th>
<th>Version I</th>
<th>Version II/III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **I – De inconstantia gentis huia et instabilitate; fidei quoque sacramentique reverentia nulla** | + | + *
|  | [f]oroque… see n 206n2 | *[tam ecclesiasticis… replicando] 206n2 |
| **II – Quod rapto vivunt; et pacis amicitiaeque foedera non custodiant** | + | + *
|  | *[Id tamen, etc.] 208n9 |
| **III – De marito conflictu invalido; turpique fuga et illaudabili** | + | + |
| **IV – De ambitiosa terrarum occupatione; et inter fratres divisione** | + | + *
|  | *[Quibus … bonum]212n2 |
| **V – De gravi eorum exactione; et immoderantia** | + | + |
| **VI – De incestus criminie; ecclesiariam quoque per successiones et participesabusione** | + | + *
|  | *[juxta… arrogantiam] 213n4 |
|  | *[Similiter, etc.] 215 n1 |
| **VII – De peccatis eorum; et tam Britanniae quam Trojanae, meritis urgentibus, amissione** | + | + *
|  | See 215 n4 for the displaced portion of the 2nd preface |
|  | *[Adeo… vapulabit] 216n7 |
| **VIII – Qualiter gens ista sit expugnanda** | + | + |
| **IX – Qualiter, expugnata, sit gubernanda** | + | + *
|  | See 225n4: Unde et expulso prorsus veteri … [GW suggests the complete recolonization of Wales or that it become a game preserve.] |
|  | *[et finium… novimus] 223n4 |
|  | *[Tria sunt… recusant] 225n4. Replaces game-preserve with three things causing the ruin of the Welsh people. |
| **X – Qualiter eadem resistere valeat, et rebellare** | + | + |