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Abstract

In this study the manuscript transmission, dissemination and reception of Gerald of Wales’ *Topographia Hibernica* (TH) and William of Rubruck’s *Itinerarium ad partes Orientales* (Itinerary) in England c.1185-1500 have been explored. The TH and the Itinerary are well known texts and have been carefully examined by modern scholars. Nevertheless, the afterlives of these two medieval texts have largely been neglected. Similarities in the authors’ approach and interests alongside the obvious difference in subject matter, i.e. the focus on two opposing ends of the believed peripheries of the world, have made the two texts worthy of consideration together.

In chapters I and II, the extant manuscripts of each text have been examined. As a consequence, the list of extant TH manuscripts, as provided by Robert Bartlett and Catherine Rooney, has been supplemented with two additional medieval manuscripts. The number of known medieval manuscripts of the Itinerary has also increased with the inclusion of one previously thought lost. In addition, through the examination of the manuscripts, the surviving attestations from catalogues and correspondence and through the subsequent re-use of the texts within other medieval narratives, this study offers a geographical and literary mapping of the dissemination of both works. It also examines the various uses to which the TH and the Itinerary were put, highlighting in particular the political significance of each text.

Furthermore, in chapter III the contents of each manuscript containing the TH or the Itinerary are considered in order to explore the significance, if any, of the accompanying texts. The study culminates in chapter IV with an examination of three medieval bibliophiles: Simon Bozoun, John Erghome and John Gunthorpe, whose association with one or other of the text have offered a further contextualisation of the interest in the text, particularly in relation to their wider book collections.

An approach which considers the text’s afterlife contextualises the work within its literary and socio-cultural milieus offering a wealth of information. By examining the availability of, and to a lesser extent the uses of, information regarding the Irish and the Mongols in England through these two specific texts, this study also hopes to help enhance our understanding of English attitudes to the two geographical extremities of the known medieval world.
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INTRODUCTION

‘I really felt as if I were entering some other world’\(^1\)

A myriad of sentiments and images spill vividly onto the page with those words uttered by William of Rubruck. He had found himself where few Europeans had ventured: in the midst of a Mongol prince’s encampment. These were words the thirteenth-century friar would repeat, encapsulating the wonderment he felt, as he reached the even larger encampment of the Mongol Great Khan, Möngke. A literary device, certainly, but one that illustrated William of Rubruck’s fascination and bewilderment in face of the new and different things he beheld. The underlying reaction expressed by these words in his *Itinerarium ad partes orientales* (*Itinerary*), that is the interest in the known and unknown world around him, is also expressed by the earlier late-twelfth century author, Gerald of Wales. However, Gerald’s curiosity encompassed both East and West. Indeed, in part, his knowledge of the tradition of information about the ‘Wonders of the East’ and his interest in the miraculous and monstrous in nature encouraged Gerald to search for those same elements on Europe’s western periphery. In his *Topographia Hibernica* (*TH*) Gerald wrote,

> 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 also are made remarkable by their own wonders of nature.\(^2\)

This study will examine the manuscript transmission, dissemination and reception of the *TH* and the *Itinerary*, specifically in England from when Gerald is believed to have

---

\(^1\) WR. I.14, p.71: as the chapter and paragraph divisions in the English translation of the *Itinerary* follow A. van den Wyngaert’s own divisions in the Latin edition found in the *Sinica Franciscana*, I have given page references only to the English translation.

\(^2\) O’Meara, p.31; *TH*, ‘Prefatio Secunda’, pp.20-21; his interest in comparisons with the ‘East’ were such that five of the final six chapters of the first recension of Bk.I were on that subject *TH*, I.34-37, 39. Subsequent recensions had an additional chapter extolling Gerald’s preference for the West over the East, *TH*, I.40. All references to the Latin text of the *TH* are to the Rolls series displaying the book number followed by chapter. Where the text has been quoted in English I use, where applicable, J.J O’Meara’s penguin edition with page references. Any other translations will be my own unless otherwise stated.
begun composing the TH to the close of the fifteenth-century. It aims to establish where each of these texts was available and to whom; to explore reasons why the texts were disseminated and to examine the cultural context within which these texts were created, transmitted and read. However, in addition to considering the corpus of manuscripts of a single text, this study also considers each codex on its own merits, considering, where possible, the individual’s interest or response to these texts. This in turn allows a greater exploration of the uses to which each of these texts may have been put, within their respective literary, political, religious and socio-cultural contexts. As these texts are largely ethno-geographic histories, a further aim of this study is also to explore the English interest in the known and unknown world outside its own peripheries.

In order to understand the extent to which ethno-geographic/historical material was available in England and its influences, a number of texts would have to be studied in the manner outlined above. To name a few, the texts of Jacques de Vitry, Marco Polo, Ordoric of Pordenone, the relevant sections in Bartholomew Anglicus’ De Proprietatibus Rerum (DPR), Honorius Augustodunensis’ Imago Mundi and other ethno-geographical descriptions, which on occasion served as introductions in histories/chronicles, require detailed individual studies. The choice of these two specific texts was partly in order to examine two texts which were written before the texts of Marco Polo, Ordoric of Pordenone and the Mandeville-author gained such notoriety that they overshadowed earlier notions and interests in the marvels of the world. Yet, on the other hand, the TH and the Itinerary continued to be disseminated after the above three texts began to circulate.

A comparison of the afterlives of a text describing medieval Ireland and its people with those of a text describing the people of medieval Mongolia and the people seen en-route may, at first, appear incongruous. However, the underlying preconceptions, interests and attitudes of their audiences are likely to have been the same, making this a significant pairing in a number of ways which will be surveyed below.

An examination of these two men and their works is as much a study in contrasts as it is in similarities. Gerald, the university-educated courtier enjoyed a level of education which was likely to have been far superior to that of William of Rubruck, the provincial

---

3 It is not my intention to use c.1500 as a date signifying the ‘end of the Middle Ages’: it is an arbitrary choice and is used as a matter of convenience.
4 See p.163 n.83 for those texts which have recently been examined in this manner.
Franciscan *lector*. Similarly, although neither were strangers to life at court; as a royal chaplain and envoy, Gerald’s exposure to such a life is known to have been extensive. Both made their initial dedications to the works above to a powerful king of the day: in Gerald’s case to Henry II of England and in William’s to Louis IX of France. Yet, for Gerald, Henry II was but a segment of his intended audience; in contrast, for William of Rubruuck, Louis IX may have been his sole intended audience. Indeed Gerald’s confidence in the popularity and longevity of his work and its continued success had him boasting to a critic:

> It is our desire that you should know that the above historical works of ours [the *TH* and *EH*], which you now consider so trivial, in time to come will, as we believe and, indeed, know for certain, survive for a very long time, and be more valued than very many works.

The subject matter chosen for the texts offers the simplest of geographical contrasts of the farthest west and farthest east. Nevertheless, here too lay their greatest similarity. The two men believed that they were exploring the furthest extremes of the known habitable world, recording for posterity little-known information. Gerald and William were keenly aware of the novelty of their subject matter.

The two texts differ not only in their scope, but also in their structure and use of previous scholarship. The structure of the *TH* is more focused and thematic. Gerald had envisaged it in three books: the first, which examined the topography and wildlife of Ireland; the second, which considered Ireland’s marvels and miracles; the third which included the origins of the Irish people, the various invading settlers, some ethnographic observations of the Irish people and an analysis of the religious practices of the Irish clergy. William of Rubruuck’s overall structure was framed by the narrative of the onward and return journey. The first chapter was a topographical description of his journey until his

---

5 See pp.30-33.
7 John of Plano Carpini, the papal envoy, had embarked on a similar journey to William a decade earlier. By having it read aloud at the various Franciscan houses he visited on his return, he had ensured the dissemination of his *Historia Mongalorum*, Salimbene de Adam, *The Chronicle of Salimbene de Adam*, eds. J. L. Baird, G. Baglivi, & J. R. Kane (Birmingham, 1986) pp. 197-8, 203; William’s sole mention of John of Plano Carpini is to a Friar John adapting his clothing so as to avoid insulting the Mongol khan, *WR*, XIX.(6), p.132.
arrival at Sartaq’s court. Seven chapters of ethnographic detail such as descriptions of the Mongol dwellings, diet, clothing, and other customs followed. The subsequent chapters were written partially in the form of diary entries interspersed with topographic, ethnographic and historical observations along their route as well as the occasional anecdote that he was told of the peoples and places he had failed to see.

The difference in the extent of their reliance on other sources, particularly to the known authorities, was linked in part to their respective levels of education. Within the later recensions of the TH Gerald drew on classical, patristic and biblical sources to a considerably greater extent than William of Rubruck. ⁸ Gerald may also have made use of certain Irish texts. In Bk.II he drew upon an established tradition of ‘wonder’ writing and fantastical beasts using, for example, similar marvels to those discussed in the Irish Nennius’ Lebor Breátnach. ⁹ Similarly, he drew heavily upon the Lebor Gabála or an analogous text, for both style and structure in Bk.III. ¹⁰ In contrast, and perhaps indicative of the reading material available to a provincial Franciscan lector, within the Itinerary there are four references to Isidore’s Etymologies, one possible reference to the pseudo-Methodius Revelationes and another to a ‘history of Antioch’. ¹¹ Despite this possible disparity in their learning, both shared a certain self-assurance in their own observations to draw doubt on, and even correct, the established authorities. Gerald did so with regards to the views of Bede and Solinus and William in relation to the ideas of Solinus and Isidore of

---

⁸ This has been examined in greater detail in the French translation of the TH, see J.-M. Boivin, L’Irlande au Moyen Âge : Giraud de Barri et la Topographia Hibernica (1188) (Paris, 1993); cf. for classical works consulted by Gerald, see E.E. Best, Classical Latin Prose Writers quoted by Giraldaus Cambrensis (unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Univ. of North Carolina, 1957) and G.I.E. Sullivan, Pagan Latin Poets in Giraldaus Cambrensis, (unpublished Ph.D thesis, Univ. of Cincinnati, 1950) – regretfully, I have not had the opportunity as yet to read the latter two items.

⁹ There are some similarities between the mirabilia used by Gerald and that of the thirteenth-century Nordic King’s Mirror. The King’s Mirror: Speculum Regale: Konungs Skuggsía, trans. L. M. Larson (New York, 1917). Although the impact of the prevalent oral culture, as argued by Meyer and Young with regards to the transmission of these mirabilia to the King’s Mirror, should not be underestimated, nor should the possibility that they both had access to the same sources. K. Meyer, ‘The Irish Mirabilia in the Norse Speculum Regale’, Eria 4 (1910) pp.1-16 and J.Young ‘Two of the Irish ‘mirabilia’ in the ‘King’s Mirror’, Etudes Celtiques III (1938) pp.21-26 – both articles were reprinted in Studier over Konungs Skuggsía, ed. M. Tveitane (Bergen, 1971); cf. W.Sayers, ‘Konungs Skuggsía: Irish marvels and the king’s justice’, Scandinavian Studies vol. 57:2 (1985) pp.147-161.


¹¹ For Isidore of Seville see WR, XVIII.(4), XIX.(1), XXI.(2), XXIX.(46), pp.128, 130, 138, 210; for a possible citation from Revelationes see WR, XXXVIII.(3), p.266; The ‘history of Antioch’ could be either the chanson d’Antioch or a similar text, from where William may have conflated his readings of the name ‘Kerbogha’ with ‘Coir Cham’ WR, XVII.(1) p.121. For discussions of Kerbogha and divination see Robert the Monk, Robert the Monk’s History of the First Crusade:Historia Therosolimitana, trans. C. Sweetenham (Aldershot, 2005) pp.153-7; or perhaps something similar to Graindor of Douai’s vernacular Chanson d’Antioche which borrowed material from Robert the Monk at the point at which Kerbogha entered the narrative, C. Sweetenham, ‘Introduction’, Robert the Monk’s History, pp. 37-38; William claimed to have had a number of books with him on his journey, however the only books mentioned specifically were his Bible, Psalter and Peter Lombard’s Sentences, WR, XVI.(3) p.120.
Seville. Gerald’s corrections prompted him to make excuses for Bede and Solinus citing their distance from their subjects stating,

Neither would it be strange if these authors sometimes strayed from the path of truth, since they knew nothing by the evidence of their eyes, and what knowledge they possessed came to them through one who was reporting and was far away. For it is only when he who reports a thing is also one that witnessed it that anything is established on the sound basis of truth.¹²

Similarly, William of Rubruck wrote:

I enquired about the monsters or human freaks who are described by Isidore and Solinus, but was told that such things had never been sighted, which makes us very much doubt whether it is true.¹³

Regardless of the structural differences in these texts, their approach to the subject matter was similar. William may not have displayed the same interest in natural history or *mirabilia*, but both professed an interest in topographical landmarks, the customs of the people, the law of the land, the organisation of the people and their armies, their cultural interests (e.g. music), language, religious practices and ‘historical’ origins. It is striking to note that this is in many ways not dissimilar to the interests of a twenty-first century ethnographer.¹⁴

¹² *TH*, I. 3; O’Meara, p.35.
¹³ *WR*, XXIX.(46), p.201.
¹⁴ For example, see C.D. Holmes & W.Parris, *Anthropology: an Introduction* (New York, 1981; 3rd ed.) which considers the following as important topics of investigation: personality and culture; technology; environment; economy and systems of organisation, kinship and marital/sexual customs; government, law and defence; belief systems and the arts.
For present-day scholars the *TH* and the *Itinerary* fit uneasily into established literary categorisations of medieval writing. Misidentifying Seneca for Cicero, Gerald believed the following definition of ‘*historia*’ to epitomise the *TH*. He wrote,

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 judgement of the past, a witness of the times, a pathway for life, life to tradition, a messenger from antiquity, the light of truth’.  

Certainly, by that self-categorization, Gerald at least would have also viewed William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary* within this all-encompassing term ‘*historia*’. Robert Bartlett has suggested that ‘“history” was the only term then available to categorize writing of this kind’.  

Certainly, in its simplest form ‘*historia*’ may be best translated as narrative. Indeed, our preconceptions about a word which ties the concept almost solely to that which has past, often clouds our understanding of the many dimensions that the word and concept represented in the Middle Ages.  

Finally, of great importance to this study is the predominantly English dissemination of the two texts, prompting a key question of this study: why was such an interest evident in England? Gerald’s largely English-based dissemination is related primarily to his active role in its transmission in the kingdom he resided in, William of Rubruck’s to England is considered more unusual. Invariably the English dissemination of the *Itinerary* is attributed almost solely to Roger Bacon’s interest in the text.  

A wealth of scholarship has been devoted to the two texts examined here – yet, the ‘reading’ or the availability and influence

---

15. “*Hystoria*” inquit, “est antiquitatis autoritas, testis temporum, via vite, vita memorie, nuntia vetustatis, lux veritatis”, Gerald’s Letter to William de Montibus, *Speculum Duorum*, pp.170-1; cited from Cicero, *De Oratore*, II.9; Gerald refers to the definition in the *EH*, Scott, *EH*, p.11 and it is also repeated by Ranulf Higden in the prologue of the *Polychronicon*, ‘Historia namque est antiquitatis auctoritas, testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memorie magistra vite, nuncia vetustatis’, p.6.


18. see pp.203-204.
of these texts, individually or collectively, within a framework of other literary interests and changing attitudes in Europe has been given scant attention.19

This introduction offers a synopsis of the working methods used within this body of research, a brief historiography of the interest in the marvels of East and West and by extension topographical/ethnographical material, and the differences in the interest accorded to these texts by historians and anthropologists, followed by short bibliographical sketches of the two authors. In Ch.I, the manuscript tradition, the dissemination both manuscript and textual, and the reception of the TH is examined. It attempts to place the transmission, reading and use made of the text within the context of earlier views of Ireland and medieval Anglo-Irish relations. Ch.II offers a comparable analysis of the manuscript tradition, dissemination and reception of the Itinerary in England. Here, too, the transmission and reading of these texts is placed within the context of earlier views of the East and Anglo-Mongol relations. Ch.III examines the accompanying texts within the English manuscripts of the TH and Itinerary as a further means of investigating how these texts were understood in the Middle Ages. Notwithstanding random choice and the ‘miscellany’, this chapter explores the various dimensions of the collecting and reading of historiae in the Middle Ages with its propensity to include not only narratives of the past, and even the present, in the form of chronicles and annals, ancient and contemporary topographical and ethnographical lore, mirabilia but also as a form of the present and past, and the prophetic in the hopes of understanding the future. The paucity of anecdotal evidence relating to reading practices suggests that drawing generalisations regarding medieval reading interests from these two texts would be of little profit. A much larger study of more manuscripts and texts is required, and even so it is unlikely that a ‘model’ of reading interests could ever be imposed. Therefore, of considerably higher value, will be the examination of individual owners/readers within their own cultural milieu in ch.IV. Thus, three men from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have been chosen: Simon Bozoun, prior of Norwich Cathedral; John Erghome of the Augustinian friars of York and John Gunthorpe, dean of Wells Cathedral. Not only can they be identified within a place

19 The exception is the recent unpublished doctoral research of Catherine Rooney which considers the transmission and dissemination of the manuscripts of the TH alongside the manuscripts of other texts by Gerald of Wales, C. Rooney, The Manuscripts of the works of Gerald of Wales (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Cambridge, 2006).
and time, but evidence of other reading material available to them enables us to draw a more holistic picture.

**Methodology**

**Dissemination and Reception Studies**

Maurice Bevenot’s attempts to produce a critical edition of the treatises of St. Cyprian allowed him to formulate ideas on investigating the nature of medieval manuscript transmission. Some aspects of his work were peculiar to the nature of the transmission of early-medieval patristic texts and indeed a text which in itself was composed of a number of reordered sub-texts. Nevertheless, the practices he put in place can be applied to the study of the texts under consideration here. Bevenot discussed the fundamental importance of assessing what he termed the ‘external’ evidence provided by the manuscripts such as ‘script, date, origin and order of contents’ as well as the ancestry of the manuscripts and their movements. This was to be done in conjunction with an examination of the ‘internal’ evidence which entailed ‘errors, agreements and disagreements with other manuscript copies’. Yet, for him these investigations were merely auxiliaries to his primary purpose: the establishment of an authoritative text.\(^{20}\)

In examining the manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae (HRB)* Julia Crick exemplified Bernard Guenée’s call for the understanding of the ‘diffusion of medieval histories... [and] the historical culture of their readers.’ Her methodology focused on understanding this historical culture by assessing when, where and by whom the work was copied, providing a two-fold product: first, ‘the identification of branches of transmission’ and second, ‘chronological and geographical characteristics of branches of the transmission’.\(^{21}\) Although this was done by establishing groups of texts along Bevenot’s methods, it offered a more comprehensive analysis by listing and analysing the variants rather than making use of the textual tradition to produce a single ‘authoritative’ version.


\(^{21}\) Crick, vol.IV, pp.1-2, 9-12, 16-19, 196, 218.
This study borrows heavily on the principles of investigating manuscript transmission, dissemination and reception as practiced by Bevenot and Crick. I have categorised this examination into five different strands of the transmission, reception and dissemination of a text which will be considered in this study: establishing the \textit{manuscript tradition}, \textit{manuscript dissemination}, the \textit{literary dissemination}, the \textit{reception} and the \textit{associated contents} of a text.

\textit{Manuscript tradition}

The value of establishing the manuscript tradition by including all manuscripts of a particular text, rather than merely attempting to establish an authoritative text is one that has only been given its due importance from the second half of the twentieth century. Using Bevenot’s model the \textit{stemmata} in this study will consider both lines of descent as well as show the dating of the manuscripts.\footnote{For Bevenot’s example see Bévenot, \textit{Tradition of Manuscripts}, p.47.} Straight lines (\(\longrightarrow\)) will denote a direct, established relationship between either two manuscripts or a manuscript and a particular recension. Broken lines (\(\longrightarrow\)) will denote an indirect relationship, one where either the relationship has not been conclusively proven, or one where there may, at one time, have been an intermediary manuscript. Each manuscript shelfmark has been enclosed in a box. Where the lines are filled, e.g. \(\text{BL. Add. 34762}\) this has been aligned with the y-axis of the stemma denoting time and thus the date of the manuscript. However, where a box has been bordered by broken lines: \(\text{Rec. BC}\) they are of an indeterminate time and have not been aligned by chronology.

To assess the \textit{manuscript dissemination} is to examine where these texts were made available to a reading audience and their movements, thereby establishing a manuscript geography of the text. This will take into account the shifting and multiple locations of dissemination which a single manuscript can have. The focus here will be to examine the manuscript’s physical dissemination concentrating on the ‘external’ evidence from the codices’ provenance and ownership. The principal questions under consideration here are where the text was available, to whom was it available, and what patterns of ownership emerge from such information in relation to extant and attested manuscripts.
The textual dissemination of a text is an examination of other medieval authors who knowingly used the work, and, if known, where the work was used by these other authors; thereby further reinforcing the geographical transmission of the text as identified through the manuscript dissemination. In essence, the appraisal of the textual dissemination of a text is similar to that above; except that its aim is not only to identify the work’s audience but also those who facilitated a wider circle of dissemination of the source-text through their use of it.

The section on the reception of the text draws on the evidence gleaned from the discussion of the physical and textual dissemination. The purpose here is to examine what portions of the text were of particular interest and why. However, a conscious decision has been made to exclude an examination of marginalia within the manuscripts under consideration here, partly due to the exigencies of time and partly because many of the marginal additions were made in indeterminate sixteenth-century hands; of those that are of an earlier date, many of the marginal annotations cannot be conclusively assigned to an identified reader/owner or even institution.

Finally, a further aspect of studying the reception of a work is the examination of that work’s place within the codex is its associated contents. The methodological approach of Ch.III has been threefold. First, to consider briefly texts that appear with more than one manuscript of either of the two texts. This approach has drawn on Crick’s study of the manuscripts of the HRB and their associated contents, which considered those texts which appeared with two or more copies of the HRB. Such an action was to assist in distinguishing between ‘significant and random’ connections; therefore identifying those manuscripts which merely had ‘genealogical’ relationships. Second, where the combination of contents can be verified during the Middle Ages to consider the contents of each English- and Irish-produced manuscript. Thus, it offers a further contextualisation of the text when a possible audience or readers or owner can be identified. This gains greater significance when the text survives in too few manuscripts to provide a more generalised view of the text’s transmission, reception and dissemination in a particular time and place. Third, where individuals with a more extensive collection of texts can be identified, to examine the TH or Itinerary within the context of the manuscript-collection and the wider book-collection. As more tangible responses such as commentaries, correspondence or

23 Crick, vol.IV, p.19
reactions from author-identified marginalia are scarce or wholly absent, understanding an individual’s wider interests can offer some of the few opportunities to surmise possible general responses. A consideration of the associated contents within manuscripts of the *TH* and *Itinerary* may also assist in understanding further the purposes to which these texts could be and were used. For example, could its role have been that of the didactic text by which to better understand the way man should deport himself through its representation of either good or bad behaviour? Or, the descriptive academic work necessary for making and understanding prophetic and biblical interpretation? Could it instead have been used as a practical guide for a better understanding of other places and people for pragmatic purposes of war, travel, diplomacy, political gain or trade? Were these, instead, the ideal texts from which to draw materials for sermons either for their *mirabilia*, anecdotes or perhaps to preach the impending apocalypse?

**The Limitations**

When considering a methodology for examining the transmission, dissemination and reception of texts, it must be prefaced by an acknowledgement of the limitations of such an exercise. The inherent problems faced in such a study begin first with a consideration of the non-systematic practices of the production, preservation and survival of manuscripts and the scarcity of surviving evidence.

Occasionally, a manuscript may offer information of its provenance in the form of inscriptions or through the evidence of institutional pressmarks. However, such evidence, unless explicitly stated, rarely offers information as to where the codex was produced and could hide the transitory nature of some manuscripts in the stated institution or with the person mentioned.

The growing use of independent scribes and the increased literary activity generated by secular clerks, lawyers, universities, towns and the mendicant orders, brought with it other changes to the production of manuscripts. Monasteries may have been moving towards the use of commercial centres for the repair of manuscripts and for commissioning/buying new and second-hand manuscripts or even receiving them as gifts,
nevertheless, such activities within the monastic houses did not come to an end. The statutes of the English Benedictines in 1277, 1343 and in 1444 actively encouraged their monks to maintain their scriptoria.\textsuperscript{24} Robert, prior of Bridlington [f.1147-1160], offered a vivid picture of what he expected of his canons. His list of suitable occupations included:

\begin{center}
Reading, expounding, and preaching the Word of God before the brethren, and practising for divine worship by reading, as well as singing. Preparing parchments for the scribes, writing, illuminating, ruling lines, scoring music, correcting and binding books.\textsuperscript{25}
\end{center}

The creation of a single codex could require the cooperation of many, from a single scribe or group of scribes, to rubricators, illuminators and correctors. Also to be taken into consideration were the parchment-makers, parchment-preparers, the ink makers and after the writing/copying processes, the binders. While many of these jobs may have been undertaken in-house, there were a growing number of professional scribes who were either based in commercial centres or were itinerant. Two aspects of late-twelfth/thirteenth century life contributed to the growth of commercial production and the drop in the costs of production: the rise of universities and the creation of the mendicant orders. Primarily, the role of the stationer originated hand in hand with the growing scholarly communities. The stationer not only created the book, but would also often buy it back for re-sale. As cost was clearly an issue for poverty-stricken students the development of the \textit{pecia}-system of copying was a further feature of this period: quires could be rented individually to facilitate speedy copying. Similarly, the rise of the mendicant orders, particularly the Dominicans and the Franciscans who relied on books for their itinerant preaching and teaching, and lacked scriptoria within their convents, necessitated the growth in commercial book trade. Without the need for books which could be placed on a lectern the \textit{vade mecum}, the small portable book, which could easily

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
accompany the friar on his travels, gained popularity.\textsuperscript{26} Although manuscript production may have become cheaper over the course of this period, the copying of texts still required a commitment of time, effort and expense. A more thorough study of evidence regarding to the costs of in-house production, commercial production and the levels of production within religious institutions is certainly required.\textsuperscript{27}

If script or production practices peculiar to an institution or individuals cannot be used to identify a manuscript’s initial provenance, wills, charters, inventories and booklists or catalogues offer an alternative means of establishing provenance. Their primary limitation is that they offer a glimpse of the manuscript’s location at a specific moment only. Furthermore, medieval catalogues or book lists are notoriously problematic, not only by their poor survival rate but by their very method of compilation. Where they exist for an institution, rarely do they list all manuscripts let alone all the manuscripts’ contents, giving little scope to ascertain the continued presence of contents within a specified codex. The common tendency to list only the first item of each codex, or perhaps the text within the codex which the compiler thought most important is particularly misleading. Furthermore, as Michael Clanchy has pointed out, many of these lists function as inventories rather than catalogues as they do not identify how and where to find the individual item.\textsuperscript{28} Often they are the only means of piecing together an institution’s collection. This can be assisted by the examination of medieval pressmarks. Unfortunately this practice was also neither universal nor systematic, with varying styles for various purposes. For example, the pressmark at Norwich Cathedral Priory was alphanumeric, so a typical pressmark could by ‘K. VIII’. It is likely that Norwich had a pressmark-prefix of ‘L. ’ specifically for a neighbouring cell, thereby denoting, in this


\textsuperscript{27} Surviving obedientiary rolls from Norwich Cathedral, such as the rolls of the cellarer in 1297-8 allow an insight into some of these costs. For example, it suggests that a preliminary preparation of the parchment cost 4d per quire and a further treatment preparing the parchment for writing cost 3d a quire. A number of other costs are also detailed for illumination and binding. It is evident that the pecia system was in place here, as often texts were copied piecemeal. Of especial interest is their employment of a specialist parchment-maker (pargamenarius) named Simon The copying of a pecia of Gratian’s Decretum cost 18d in 1298-9, whereas a pecia of the work of Peter of Blois cost 10p in 1303-4, reflecting perhaps the different value placed on these different texts. It is interesting to note that a copy of Innocent IV’s Apparatus in quinque libros Decretalium, for which Simon Bozoun’s copy in the mid-fourteenth century was priced at 35s [item 13 on the list], was bought for Henry de Lakenham in 1303-4 for 46s and 8d; see the obedientiary rolls in CBMLC:IV pp.294-7; cf. N. Ker, ‘Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory’, Books, Collectors and Libraries (London, 1985) pp.266-272.

\textsuperscript{28} M. Clanchy, From Memory to Written Record (Oxford, 1993: 2nd ed.) p.158.
instance, location. Yet it has been suggested that the rest of its book collection may have been organised roughly by the date of acquisition.\textsuperscript{29}

The study of book-collections, especially in fourteenth-century England, has been greatly assisted by two extensive medieval texts: the \textit{Registrum Anglie} and Henry of Kirkestede’s \textit{Catalogus}.\textsuperscript{30} However, they epitomised the selectivity discussed above. The former was established under the aegis of the Franciscans, who travelled extensively examining various library collections but chose to include only items of theological and patristic interests. The second, the \textit{Catalogus}, was more inclusive. However, not only was Henry of Kirkestede led primarily by the contents of the Bury St. Edmunds’ collection and texts mentioned in Ranulf Higden’s \textit{Polychronicon} and Vincent of Beauvais’ \textit{Speculum Majus} amongst others, his catalogue was never completed.\textsuperscript{31}

The lists rarely, if ever, give substantial information of possible owners or readers of a manuscript. This is, however, perhaps related to the thornier issue of collective versus personal ownership of books within a religious environment. Similarly, the problems associated with evidence regarding reading in the Middle Ages are immense. First it requires the search for evidence of reading through marginalia, readers’ marks and commentaries, however even in the exceptional occurrences of such matter, rarely is it attributable to a person, place or even time. Thus in the same way that reconstructing a medieval library from a writer’s source, can be unreliable, this information though valuable can be difficult to contextualise.

Our knowledge of the material ownership of books by cleric, monk or mendicant is sparse. The sense of books ‘belonging’ to a person often jarred with notions of monastic and mendicant views of poverty and personal possessions. Humbert of Romans in his \textit{Expositio Regulae} criticised excessive personal and institutional accumulation of books as well as the reluctance in some Dominican convents to share their books with others.\textsuperscript{32} Although anecdotes of books being sold or bought offer us a more pragmatic

\textsuperscript{30} They have now been edited by the \textit{CBMLC} series as \textit{CBMLC:II} and \textit{CBMLC:XI} respectively.
\textsuperscript{31} For Henry of Kirkstede’s sources see \textit{CBMLC:XI}.
view of book-possession, the idea of collective possession remained strong. As the instrument for the transmission of texts, the book must also be viewed as a cultural object, symbolic of wealth and status.

The differences in the scope and content within these book-collections can be explained by the divergent approaches of the various monastic and mendicant rules towards book provision and reading. This, therefore, could also effect the access and availability of certain texts. The Benedictine rule suggested the yearly exchange of books; books for devotion and contemplation. Other orders had different views on the act of reading as a means of devotional practice. The close association of the Franciscans and Dominicans with the universities, initially unforeseen, saw a changing emphasis on the purpose of reading for these orders, with an increased emphasis on reading for learning, extracting information, preaching and devotion rather than solely contemplation and devotion. Relative to lay book-collections of the time, the religious institutions in England had access to a vast and varied assortment of written material. Nevertheless, the size of individual book-collections of monasteries, mendicant convents and cathedrals varied greatly, from the larger collections at St. Augustine’s in Canterbury or the abbey of Bury St Edmunds to what may have merely been the small one-cupboard collections of lesser houses.

Similarly, the level of organisation within each religious institution with regards to their book collection also varied. As early as the late-eleventh century, Christ Church Canterbury appointed a librarian (custos librorum) who kept an account of which books were on loan; a practice which, the Dominicans would maintain in the mid-thirteenth century, as advocated by Humbert of Romans. While an individual house’s collection may have been meagre, the access accorded to other libraries of the same rule, or even simply neighbouring houses could be great. Although lending systems and practices were neither universal nor regularised, nevertheless, letters, catalogues, borrowers-lists and occasionally inscriptions in individual manuscripts, point to the practice being in use.

From some religious houses friars were allowed to borrow a book for their lifetime. On their death, the borrowed book did not always revert to the lending house but to the friar’s own convent or province. Clearly this was a matter of concern, for in 1249 the Roman provincial chapter of the Dominicans made a special note stating that if non-Dominicans borrowed a book they were required to sign a pledge or make a deposit.35

Poor survival due to the lack of adequate care must also be considered. In his *Instructiones de Officis Ordinis* Humbert of Romans set out the duties of high ranking officers of the order and suggested that the provincial ensure that friars sent to study had adequate books and writing material. He also provided instructions for a librarian. The librarian’s duties included ensuring all books were kept in good order, and safely protected as well as creating a catalogue in which the books were to be kept classified by subject matter. The librarian was also required to recall books in order to inspect their condition.36 Yet, none of the manuscripts, or library catalogue entries, suggest that any special provisions were made for the preservation of the codices examined here. Similarly none were considered sufficiently valuable to be chained, although Gerald of Wales himself bemoaned the injustice of certain of his books being kept locked away in cupboards.37 Of course, in this instance, if this referred to the *TH*, it may have been in response to its content. According to Richard de Bury, certain institutions were so cavalier about the books in their care that some books were ‘covered with litters of mice and pierced with the gnawings of the worms’.38

While few of the scribes, or even patrons and commissioners of the manuscripts surveyed here have left us their names, it is apparent that they too offer a mark of authorial intent; an authorial intent which is directed not at the individual texts but at the production of the codex as a whole. Caution is required that connections are not misleadingly created bringing the texts into a relationship which are anachronistic. Finally, no study such as this would be complete without considering the role of the *florilegium*. The *florilegium* in its selections and arrangements offer considerable insights

37 *DK*, ‘Praefatio Secundo’, p.161; see p.126 below.
into a variety of aspects of medieval life and medieval education; these were the choice
examples lifted from years of reading.39

Difficulties also stem from dealing with the medieval ‘miscellany’. Charles Briggs
discusses the miscellany as a creation of necessity that emerged in the early Middle Ages
for both pragmatic and conceptual theological reasons. Pragmatic because the concept of
the book changed ‘from a repository of one or more unified works to a container of
heterogeneous miscellaneous texts’ as an act of preservation. The theological concept, to
quote Briggs again was ‘a conception of texts that was both global and hierarchical, in
whose circle the individual textual segments, rather than being considered autonomous,
were seen as parts of a whole, belonging to a textual stream neither interrupted not
interruptible: a conception quite typical of Christian written culture.’40 Discussions of
medieval miscellanies are further compounded by the multiple and opposing definitions for
the word available within current scholarship. Scahill sees the miscellany as something
which ‘has cohesion of some kind, which may be external – directed towards some function
– or internal, in which the relationship of texts with each other and the shaping of the whole
are factors.’ Theo Stemmler identifies three types of multiple-text manuscripts: the ‘well-
wrought book carefully made up of mutually corresponding parts’; the ‘miscellany’ which
he defined as a ‘somewhat arbitrary, casual collection of texts’ and finally an anthology
which was an intermediate form of collection with ‘a careful collection selected as
representative specimens of various genres’. Lastly, Marilyn Corrie sees the anthology as a
form for which the selection and arrangement of texts are controlled and the miscellany
which here holds the more intermediate position having ‘a degree of cohesion’ in its
arrangement, if not the selection of items. Although the nature of the miscellany has been
considered by scholars in the field of medieval manuscripts studies, yet it is often with a
view to vernacular texts, rather than Latin texts circulating in England.41

Regardless of the nomenclature used, Stemmler’s three-pronged view of multiple-
text collections is a useful one, as is Corrie’s emphasis on arrangement within the codex.
The dangers of over-emphasising the value of a collection which has merely been due to a

particularly where the thematic structure is hidden from the modern scholar because of more recent categorisations of
scribe copying a codex in its entirety, when only a portion of that codex may have initially been sought, must be considered. Where possible the manuscript genealogy must be traced to look for the first and earliest combinations of texts. However, as a note of caution, this does not negate the value of examining the later medieval collections once the *stemma codicum* can be established. Examples of entire collections being copied wholesale reinforces the versatility of medieval books and may still demonstrate the compiler/owner/reader’s interest in the texts. Furthermore, although production may have been becoming cheaper, easier and more efficient during the period under consideration, nevertheless manuscript copying was no idle task. It remained time-consuming in its in-house preparation and may have been relatively costly even when purchased loosely bound from commercial book vendors or professional scribes.

The possible later re-ordering, additions and omissions of the contents of a manuscript, either contemporaneously, later in the Middle Ages, or in the manuscripts’ subsequent post-medieval history must also be considered. Here too, this requires the careful examination of the manuscript’s codicology, although book-lists and contents-lists can assist in establishing contents at a given moment.

Finally, and perhaps the greatest of the limitations on a study such as this is the difficulties associated with manuscript survival to the present day. More often than not, our perception of medieval book collections is skewed by the vagaries of survival; natural disasters, pillaging, sale and deliberate destruction have all taken their toll on the book-collections of the Middle Ages. Neil Ker in the *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* drew attention to one of the greatest challenges within this field of study: the comparatively low proportion of surviving manuscripts in proportion to that which is known to have existed through library catalogues, correspondence references and surviving literature. Susan Cavanaugh’s doctoral research on *Books Privately Owned in England, 1300-1450* has been instrumental in collecting various book-lists and references in wills to individual owners, both secular and lay. For example, Richard de Bury’s *Philobiblon* suggests a vast personal collection. Richard de Bury, bishop of Durham, Lord Chancellor and Treasurer, as well as the tutor to the young Edward III, was wealthy and well-travelled

---

and is likely to have amassed such a collection. Despite this, few extant manuscripts have been associated with this self-confessed bibliophile.43

The history of the book in England is indebted to the work of those who like John Leland and John Bale made attempts to catalogue works which have since been lost. Yet, our dependence on that type of evidence is equally problematic. For example, the criteria for inclusion in Leland and Bales’ lists were clearly preconditioned by their own interests. Their concentration on histories at the expense of listing those patristic and theological texts so prized in the centuries earlier further distorts this view. The survival of a number of medieval manuscripts is certainly indebted to the antiquarian-collectors, particularly of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Men like Archbishop Matthew Parker, Richard Talbot, Henry Arundel, Lord Lumley, Paul Petau, Isaac Voss, William Cecil or even Robert Cotton ensured the survival of these manuscripts through the appropriation or purchase of the codices, again either due to chance or their specific interest in the subject matter of those texts.

It would take the discovery of just a couple of manuscripts (especially for William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*) to give a wholly different picture of a text’s transmission, dissemination and reception. Therefore, the survival of these texts cannot be a fair indicator of the popularity of the text, or lack thereof, in the Middle Ages; in most instances it may merely denote the level of interest in the text in the intervening centuries which gainsaid its survival. Despite the obvious limitations, studies such as these should not be confined solely to those texts which survive in greater numbers. Even if these more ‘popular’ are slightly less vulnerable in these respects, it will only be when the transmission, reception and dissemination of texts with lower manuscript survival rates are fully surveyed that a more complete picture of book-production, interests and use in England at this time can be determined.

In addition to the limitations of obtaining the relevant information, there are other difficulties in the analysis of the evidence. In essence, this study examines attitudes to the Mongols and the Irish and the English world-view through the examination of literary responses (i.e. the use of the text by other writers) and of cultural objects (i.e. the

43J.B. McGovern investigated the possible surviving extant manuscripts and identified only three, J.B. McGovern, ‘Bishop Richard of Bury’s library’, *Notes & Queries* (1913) pp.341-344.
manuscripts). However, these responses and much of the information used from the manuscripts give only ‘snapshots’ of evidence frozen in time and sometimes space. It does not always allow for an understanding of the fluctuations in attitudes, fails to appreciate the influence of oral transmission, is limited by the social status of its readers and much of its evidence will always be irrecoverable.

‘Genres’ / Historiography of the study of marvels

To an extent, Ch.III will consider if the accompanying texts within each manuscript offers insights into the possible medieval categorization of the individual text or even the purposes to which these texts could have been put. To speak blithely about ‘genres’ in relation to these two texts, and indeed many a medieval text, would be at best simplistic, at worst misleading; particularly when the types of categories often post-date the texts and where perhaps the definitions of the categories were pre-determined by those very same texts.

The TH and the Itinerary in relation to current genre specifications have been viewed as the early precursors of a ‘scientific’ anthropological practice, albeit often as the naive ‘primitive’ predecessor steeped in traditionalism, religion and superstition. The ambiguity of these texts, at least according to present-day standards, often allows the more encompassing term of ‘travel-writing’ to be the easiest term of reference. Jean Richard’s all inclusive definition written for the Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental series suited a multitude of texts. Yet, as Richard discusses, this ‘genre’ of travel and pilgrim literature is merely a blanket term to gather together texts that can be similar and disparate almost simultaneously.44

Unlike the Itinerary, the TH is not framed by an actual journey.45 Here, it is Gerald’s presence as a foreigner observing Ireland and the Irish which allows the TH to be seen as such, in addition to its association with Gerald’s travel-framed IK and more

44 J. Richard, Les Récits de Voyages et de Pèlerinages:Typologies des sources du moyen âge occidental A-I.7 (Turnhout, 1981) pp.8, 36; Michele Geuret-Laferté also warns against the dangers of oversimplifying any discussion of a genre of these types of texts and highlights the wealth of diversity in such texts that are thought of collectively as travel literature, Geuret-Laferté, Sur Les routes, p.17.
45 For Mary Campbell’s discussion that the Itinerary is one of the earliest examples of a travel text which is both expressed in a first-person voice and which deviates to include inconsequential autobiographical travel details see M. Campbell, The Witness and the Other World: Exotic European Travel writing 400-1600 (New York and London, 1988) p.115.
ethnographically descriptive DK. In place of such an ambiguous blanket term, perhaps it is ‘historia’ which should be explicitly reclaimed for the two texts examined here. Joan-Pau Rubiés writes, with regards to later sixteenth-century examples of travel-writing that:

Renaissance cosmography was in fact a very flexible genre with a mixed genealogy, combining ancient geography (dwelling on the diversity of places, climates and peoples), medieval *mirabilia* (organizing strange natural phenomena in a theological world-view), and the trader’s manual (with economic and navigational information).46

Any description of the *TH* or the *Itinerary* would certainly not be out of place with the definition above. Indeed a simple substitution of ‘trader’s manual’ for ‘warrior’s manual’ or ‘reconnaissance manual’, taking into account Gerald and William’s observations about the respective fighting abilities, organization and practices of the Irish and the Mongols, would make it even more ideally suited. Rubiés views the development of travel literature in the sixteenth century as having branched into two overarching types: the itinerary with ‘lengthy descriptions devoted to geographic, economic, ethnological and political information on the one hand, and the historical narrative, on the other.’ He writes that although ‘more often than not historians tended to combine chronological narratives with geographical analysis… the authors were distinctly aware that there were two main types of narrative: the historical chronicle and the description of peoples, lands and their products.’ He cites Gaspar Correa, a Portuguese chronicler who wrote in his *Lendas da India*,

I shall write nothing about these lands, peoples and trade, because there have been others who have already done this, of which I have seen some volumes… therefore, if it pleases God, I shall only attempt to write

---

very fully about the noble deeds of our Portuguese fighting in these parts of India.47

Rubié’s reads this as an example of the distinction between the two types of writings and, indeed, this may be so. Yet, of greater interest is Correa’s need to excuse the exclusion of this type of information when writing about the ‘noble deeds of our Portuguese’ and in effect to implicitly direct his readers elsewhere for such information.48 In fact, not only does it appear to stress the strength of the interdependence between the two previously but also suggest that circumstance rather than design necessitates the neglect of this element of the ‘historia’. The greatest difference within these later sixteenth-century accounts and their medieval predecessors appears not to be their structure nor choice of material, but the sophistication in a writing style which numerous prior examples can give, and the diversity of subject matter because of the greater expanse of geographical areas which could be considered as a result of further European sea-explorations. Had earlier medieval authors felt similarly about this interdependence of the description of the place and people with the narratives of the past?

As mentioned about, Gerald had claimed Cicero’s definition of the historia as the very definition for his TH.49 The emphasis on ‘truth’ which that definition ensured suggested that the importance of the description of all aspects of the past and present was such that it could be ‘a witness of the times’. Indeed, Gervase of Canterbury’s distinction between a history and a chronicle in the twelfth-century also emphasised this search for ‘truth’.

It is characteristic of history to tell the truth, to persuade those who read or hear it with soft words and elegant phrases and to inform them about the deeds, ways and lives of anyone it truthfully describes; it is an essentially rational study.50

---

49 See p.5.
Not only was the emphasis on understanding the actions of the past or present but also the ‘ways’, the customs of people, in the route towards understanding this ‘truth’. Yet what did ‘truth’ mean? Was ‘allegory’ truth? Could rhetoric, where it performed one of the Christian historia’s primary goals of moral edification through the narration of events and deeds which embodied the power of God on Earth, ever be considered untruthful?

The study of these events, deeds and lives, and thus by default geography, ethnography and natural history was for the betterment of mankind. Orosius in his *Adversus paganos* had provided a literary model within the geographical framework he had created for his universal history, which was to be followed by other influential medieval authors such as Isidore of Seville, Bede, and in fourteenth-century England most notably by Ranulf Higden in the *Polychronicon*. The structure and content of the *Adversus paganos* offered within it the framework for Christianity: a predetermined linear chronological development planned by God, as well as the spatial development of a universal history through Daniel’s interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream [Daniel ch.2 v.37-40, ch.7 v.17-27] of the succeeding kingdoms moving from East to West until the advent of the final eternal kingdom. Andrew Merrills has examined this integral interdependent form of writing and understanding of Geography and History within the works of Orosius, Jordanes, Isidore of Seville and Bede. Merrills suggests that Bede envisioned his own time to correspond with that of Augustine’s sixth age, an age in which Christianity would be spread to every corner of the world. Hence, following Orosius’ model where this awareness of Christianity arose out of the East and moved West, the end of an earthly history would have to be associated with the far west, implicitly making the events and actions of this part of the world as important, and perhaps even more so, than any other location.

It was not only a literary tradition which required a description of place and people to contextualise a narrative of the past or present. Medieval theories of location and climate, developed from earlier sources from Antiquity, suggested a fundamental relationship between location and the physical and behavioural characteristics of people, thus impacting on their actions. Furthermore, these influences were believed generally

---

51 A. Merrills, *History and Geography in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2005) pp. 57-64.
52 Merrills, *History*, pp. 234-239.
to be static through time. It is this attitude which allows the medieval authors of encyclopaedia or chronicles to use and re-use the words and descriptions of, for example, Isidore of Seville and Solinus with regards to people, place and things as recurring and enduring ‘truths’. Thus it was not solely that ‘historia’ was the only convenient label; other terms were unnecessary.

The earth, the world around the everyday man, was but a small portion of man’s place within the wider universe. While belief in a spherical earth was largely accepted, the portion of inhabitable land remained debatable. Nevertheless, medieval cosmology certainly promoted man’s relationship with God as identified and structured within its terrestrial and celestial planes. The discovery of the New World is certainly important in modern anthropology and geography, not only because the encounter with unknown people and locations brought more sophisticated lines of enquiry for those branches of study but because it brought the accepted authorities more forcefully into doubt. This emphasised the need for a more personalised and sustained study of the unknown which has contributed to our view of the study of people and place as being divergent from the study of past, except as and when it is required as a contextualising framework. Nevertheless, this was not purely a post-New World phenomenon. Ease of transport and travel, the reduced costs of books and education and the growing tolerance of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake may have had its part to play.

In the Norwegian King’s Mirror, the narrator breaks from what he calls his ‘profound’ questions to ask his father about a ‘topic of entertainment’; the marvels of Ireland, Iceland and Greenland. He was eager to hear about,

fire and strange bodies of water, or the various kinds of fish and the monsters that dash about in the ocean, or the boundless ice both in the sea and on the land, or what the Greenlanders call the "northern lights," or the "sea-hedges " that are found in the waters of Greenland.55

54 The medieval scholar was not entirely oblivious to the idea of changes within ‘national’ customs or characteristics. Ranulf Higden repeating the metrical description of the Welsh of either Walter Map, or some other anonymous author, wrote that over time due to proximity and influence the Welsh had become more like the English, Polý, Bk.I, p.410.
This combination of an attitude of horror with fascination for God’s miracle or abhorration has certainly been an important aspect in the historiography of marvels. Understanding the medieval approach to, and interest in, marvels or wonders is intrinsically linked with any study relating to the medieval interest in living creatures, man or animal, topography and their place within creation. Yet, a fundamental problem arises in relation to definition. What was a marvel? What distinguished it from a miracle, or a prodigy; at what point did the marvellous become monstrous or vice-versa?

Augustinian theological thought offered the creation of the world by God as the ‘miracle of miracles’ and, therefore, ‘all natural things are filled with the miraculous’.\textsuperscript{56} This suggested that wonder could be experienced everywhere as the miraculous was ostensibly present in all things. Man, however, had become so accustomed to the more ‘normal’ witnesses to events or occurrences such as birth, or growth, or the setting of the sun that it was the more unusual which attracted interest. Thus, according to Augustine, wonder at the marvellous was experienced in three ways. First, the wise man’s identification of the marvellous and his understanding of it through careful study which signified a representation of God’s abilities and power. Second, the ignorant man’s innocent joy at the unknown and unusual, a marvel which the educated man might take for granted, and finally the ‘true’ miracle which could only be produced by the intervention of God. Anselm, in his \textit{De Conceptu Virginali} suggested a hierarchy of sorts distinguishing between those things which occur through the will of God, those which are created by nature ‘according to the power God has given it’ but which may not be easily understood, or those which occur because of the will of man.\textsuperscript{57}

However, this does not explain the interest in such matters. While medieval theologists would primarily engage in such debates in order to understand specific situations such as the idea of the virgin birth, an interest in the marvellous was by no means new to the Middle Ages. Within the Greek and Roman classical traditions, portents and ‘monstrous’ births were seen as evidence of the gods’ displeasure. John Bloch Friedman discusses the duality of the word \textit{monstrum} within medieval


\textsuperscript{57} Anselm, \textit{De Conceptu Virginali} 2.11, cited in Ward, \textit{Miracles}, p.4.
Christendom, while the classical connotations of the word certainly remained, it was also seen as an example of God’s ability and desire to invert the norm as a means of teaching a lesson and a visual symbol of God’s power.\textsuperscript{58}

There was also a rich tradition which invoked marvels as a form of allegory, as seen in texts from late antiquity such as Boethius’ \textit{De Consolatione Philosophiae}, the \textit{Physiologus} and Martianus Capella’s \textit{Marriage of Philology and Mercury} and later in Bernard Sylvester’s \textit{Cosmographia} and Alain of Lille’s \textit{De Natura Rerum}.\textsuperscript{59} Similarly, there were a number of medieval collections of marvels comparable to those of Pliny and Solinus, such as for example Anglo-Saxon \textit{Wonders of the East} and the \textit{De Situ Indiae}.\textsuperscript{60} Greta Austin argues that the Anglo-Saxon \textit{Wonders of the East} embraces Augustinian thought and provides in its depiction of the monstrous races a representation of salvation for man in all his many forms.\textsuperscript{61} Yet, discussions of these types of marvels were not limited to the East and, by extension, to other unknown and unfamiliar lands. In addition to the marvels found in Gerald’s \textit{TH}, Gervase of Tilbury in his \textit{Otia Imperialia} also indulged in such discussions, and many of his marvels were located in medieval Christendom. The \textit{Otia Imperialia} represents, like Gerald of Wales’ \textit{TH}, the growing interest in this type of literary material in the twelfth century. In the encyclopaedic works of Bartholomew Anglicus and Vincent Beauvais, marvels or rather the marvellous properties of things also played an important role. Much of the material presented in the two texts was recycled from the authoritative literary texts of the day. From the late thirteenth century, the works of Marco Polo and Ordoric of Pordenone would also excite similar interest because of the newer more wondrous marvels they depicted. Indeed, Daston and Parks suggest that the use of marvels was important in establishing the authority of texts which contained travel accounts or topographical descriptions. It was a form of authenticating newer information by packaging it in the ‘romantic rhetoric of wonder.’\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{58} Friedman, \textit{Monstrous Races}, pp.108-123.
\textsuperscript{60} With regards to these texts and attitudes to the East see pp.143-147 below.
\textsuperscript{62} Daston and Parks, \textit{Wonders}, p.33; this sentiment is also reiterated by Greenblatt, \textit{Marvellous Possessions}, p.14.
Even if it was acknowledged that the marvellous was present everywhere, there was a school of thought, as expressed in the Architrenius of John of Hauteville that ‘natural knowledge existed at the very edges of the world’ and this view certainly corresponds with other popular views. Martin Camargo reads the Travels of Sir John Mandeville as a ‘rhetorical diagram’ which stresses the similarities of the furthest ends of the known world. Others were more explicit in drawing this comparison. This can be seen in Ordoric of Pordenone’s Relatio in which he emphasised the similarities in the story about the Scythian lamb with that of the barnacle goose, thereby once again tying together the different ends of the world in the discussion of a single phenomenon.

An interest in the ‘marvellous’ and ‘monstrous’, or rather the alterity of the ethnographic/topgraphic descriptions has typified some of the more recent historical scholarship on Gerald and the TH. This has been a departure from more traditional approaches to the TH and Itinerary which have focussed on the details contained within it and the attitudes expressed. The wealth of ethnographic detail available in both suggests that both texts would be considered to be examples of the medieval contributions to the development of the ethnographic text and anthropological writing. However, here they have been largely ignored. Common perceptions of medieval attitudes amongst anthropologists are that ‘the Western world was fettered by the orthodoxy of the Christian church, which saw no need to search beyond biblical interpretations’ or, ‘in order for anthropology to come into being, it was necessary that travelogue fantasies of this kind be overcome.’ Even in analyses which are more considered and which acknowledge

64 Daston and Parks, Wonders, p.62.  
67 The medieval influences on the study of ethnography/anthropology merits a mere paragraph, p.33 Holmes & Parris, Anthropology, p.33  
that were "a number of individual writers in both periods [Antiquity and the Middle Ages] who displayed some interest in cultural differences," this is stated with the caveat that "the number of such writers was not large, and their anthropological interests made little impression on their contemporaries". \(^6\) Although more sympathetic treatment of the influence of the Middle Ages can be found, for example in Margaret Hodgen’s *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* and in Michael Hoffman’s ‘The History of Anthropology Revisited – a Byzantine Viewpoint’, it remains cursory at best.\(^7\)


The diversity of Gerald of Wales’ interests, as manifested in his substantial body of extant texts, suggests a man with an enthusiasm for knowledge, learning and adventure. Of the various works listed in Gerald’s Catalogue brevior librorum suorum, only three no longer survive.\textsuperscript{71} The most complete picture of Gerald’s life and personality is drawn from his own works, such as De Rebus et se gestis, De Invectionibus and De iure et statu Menevensis Ecclesiae.\textsuperscript{72} His mixed descent, as the son of William de Barry, the castellan of Manorbier Castle in Pembrokeshire, and grandson of Nest, the daughter of Prince Rhys ap Tewdwr and infamous mistress of Henry I, enabled him to have access to men with powerful secular and ecclesiastical connections, albeit not always to his best advantage. Gerald enjoyed a number of influential positions. He was made archdeacon of Brecon in 1175 and during his years of favour was a court chaplain, diplomatic envoy and companion of Archbishop Baldwin throughout his crusade-preaching tour through Wales. However, towards the latter stages of his life Gerald did not hold any documented office. It was his attempts at becoming bishop of St David’s, which he finally renounced in 1203, that gained him the most notoriety.\textsuperscript{73}

His education was of the best available at the time; it began at Gloucester Abbey and was followed by two spells at the schools in Paris. His first visit to Ireland in 1182, was swift in the wake of the new settlers, many of whom were his kinsmen. It was, perhaps, because of his knowledge of Ireland and experiences there that Henry II regarded him a suitable companion for his son, Prince John, to Ireland.\textsuperscript{74} In the years immediately after

\textsuperscript{71}For the ‘Catalogus’ see BL, Cotton Domitian I f.306b, printed in GW, Opera, I, pp.421-423; Time and fame have also attributed to him some spurious works such as the ‘Descriptio Mundi’ ascribed to Gerald of Wales in BL, Cotton Cleopatra D V, however, the text is that of the ‘geographia’ section of Roger Bacon’s Opus Majus.

\textsuperscript{72}GW, Opera, I & III.


\textsuperscript{74}A witness list of a St. Mary’s Abbey, Dublin, charter places him in 1186, Chartularies of St. Mary’s Abbey, Dublin vol.1 [RS 143] (London,1884) pp.171-3.
Henry II’s death, one of his roles within the royal court appears to have been that of a diplomatic envoy for the regent Queen Eleanor to the Welsh princes. Yet, by 1193–4, he was mysteriously out of favour, linked perhaps to his support of Prince John’s rebellion or to his dispute with the abbot of Biddlesden, William Wibert – a favourite of the then archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter.75 Nevertheless, as will be discussed further in Ch.I, this did not immediately deter him from making his work available to a wide audience.

The *TH*, or so Gerald claims, took him three years to complete and was completed in time for Archbishop Baldwin to read during his journey through Wales in 1188.76 Some suggestions have been made as to his purpose in writing it. In the first dedication of the work, to Henry II, Gerald stressed the novelty of all that he viewed and his desire to record it. The most recent discussion of Gerald’s possible motives for writing and his sources has suggested a debt to Adam of Bremen and a motive fuelled by wanting to rejuvenate the need for a complete conquest of Ireland.77 Indeed, one of the reasons for writing the *Vaticinalis Expugnatio Hibernica* (EH) was a glorification of his family especially with a view to promoting them to Henry II.

**William of Rubruck**

P. Anastasius van den Wyngaert, editor of the most recent Latin edition of the *Itinerary* in 1929, suggested that William of Rubruck, of the Order of the Friars Minor, was born sometime between 1215 and 1230.78 Without explanation Igor de Rachewiltz limited this further to between 1215 and 1220.79 By de Rachewiltz’s and Van den Wyngaert’s earliest estimates, William of Rubruck would have been nearing forty when he set out on his journey, and would have been around the same age as Gerald when he wrote his *Itinerary*. Apart from Roger Bacon’s reference to having met William of Rubruck, little else is known bar what stems from his own text which merely amounts to descriptions of his own corpulence. His toponym certainly suggests that he was from Rubruck near Cassel.

75 See pp.231-233.
76 *IK*, I.2 p.20.
78 Wyngaert, p.147.
in French Flanders. In addition, his references to Paris and St. Denis suggest some familiarity with the Île de France.\textsuperscript{80} With regards to his time in the east, his recognition of one of Eljigidei’s (the Mongol general) envoys at Sartaq’s camp suggests that he was in Cyprus with the French king when Eljigidei sent an embassy to Louis XI in 1248.\textsuperscript{81} Peter Jackson also proposes that William’s knowledge of the Nile suggests that he is likely to have continued alongside the crusading armies to Egypt in 1249-1250.\textsuperscript{82} Paul Pelliot, relying on an account by Giacomo d’Iseo relating an anecdote told to him by Het’um the King of Armenia in 1259 about a Flemish lector at the Franciscan convent at Nicosia, suggests that this was likely to have been a reference to William of Rubruck. This would mean that William may not have been solely based at Acre as a lector as the conclusion to his text implies.\textsuperscript{83}

Shortly after 13\textsuperscript{th} April 1253, William of Rubruck embarked on a two-year long journey across much of Asia, arriving back by 15\textsuperscript{th} August 1255.\textsuperscript{84} William was clearly aware of John of Plano Carpini’s mission to the Mongol court and even includes a detail not found in the \textit{HM} of John of Plano Carpini and his entourage adapting their outward appearance to appear more suitable as a papal envoys.\textsuperscript{85} Had he arrived from France with Louis in 1248, for which sadly there is no evidence, perhaps William may have met John de Plano Carpini in Paris in 1247.\textsuperscript{86}

Perhaps, as he discussed in the sermon he gave on Palm Sunday in Constantinople, it was to fulfil one of the tenets of the \textit{Regula Bullata} of the Friars minor that he undertook the mission.\textsuperscript{87} The possibility of conversion does seem to have been an important motive. Further, fuelled by rumours of Sartaq's conversion to Christianity, and hence hoping for tolerance and patronage for his mission, it may have seemed a favourable time for

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{80} WR, XXI.(6) p.140; Jackson, ‘Introduction’ \textit{WR}, p.40; for his familiarity with the Ile de France and his use of French glosses see \textit{WR}, XIII.(10), XVIII.(4), XXXII.(1) pp. 109, 128, 221.
\item \textsuperscript{81} WR, XV.(3) pp.115-6; Joinville, ‘The Life of St. Louis’ \textit{Chronicles of the Crusades} (London, 1963) p.197.
\item \textsuperscript{82} WR, XXXVII.(8) p.257; Jackson, ‘Introduction’, \textit{WR}, p.40.
\item \textsuperscript{83} Jackson, ‘Introduction’, \textit{WR} , pp. 41, 276 – the anecdote is thought to have been related to Giacomo at Tripoli in 1259; if William was that lector it is not unlikely that he studied at the Parisian \textit{studia generalia} prior to his appointment in Nicosia. For Franciscan education and the training of lectors see Robson, \textit{Franciscans in the Middle Ages}, pp.58-68.
\item \textsuperscript{84} However, he had reached Tripoli by 15\textsuperscript{th} August 1255, \textit{WR}, XXXVII.(18), p.275.
\item \textsuperscript{85} \textit{WR}, XIX.(5), p.132.
\item \textsuperscript{86} For a further discussion as to whether William of Rubruck joined the entourage of Louis IX in France or whether he belonged to the Holy Land province of the Friars Minor, see Jackson, ‘Introduction’ \textit{WR}, pp.40-41.
\item \textsuperscript{87} ‘I was going among these unbelievers in accordance with our Rule’, \textit{WR} ,I.(6), p.67; Ch.XII of the Regula Bullata and Ch.XVI of the Regula non-bullata stated that ‘provision [should be made] for those friars who desired to go among the Saracens and other infidels’.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
undertaking this most arduous journey.\textsuperscript{88} William was fortunate to have met Andrew of Longjumeau, after Andrew’s own disastrous mission to the Mongol court. It was from Andrew of Longjumeau that William heard of the plight of the Germans in captivity, one of his primary purposes for his journey.\textsuperscript{89} Indeed, William’s credentials were verified at the Mongol court by his knowledge of Andrew’s mission.\textsuperscript{90} In the \textit{Itinerary} he corrected explanations given by Andrew, such as the reason for Keu Chan’s death and used his knowledge of Andrew’s journey passing round the Caspian Sea to demonstrate that the Caspian Sea was in fact landlocked.\textsuperscript{91} A further anecdote, regarding the custom of passing people or things sent to the court through fire, presumably for purification, suggests a certain level of discussion about Andrew’s journey at Louis’ court.\textsuperscript{92} Most significantly, the above examples confirm that William must have been in Caesarea with Louis between 1251 and 1252 to have met with Andrew.

Unlike John de Plano Carpini, William of Rubruck does not address future readers in his account, nor did anyone chronicle William of Rubruck reading his \textit{Itinerary} to others, as Salimbene had for Carpini.\textsuperscript{93} Yet William’s reasons for recording this account for posterity are equally clear. They were directly related to the friar’s relationship with the crusader-king of France, to whom the \textit{Itinerary} is addressed in the form of a letter. The gifts William of Rubruck claims to have been given by both King Louis and Queen Margaret may suggest a close relationship.\textsuperscript{94} Similarly, the presence of Gosset, the clerk, is further evidence of his association with Louis IX as Gosset’s primary purpose was to be responsible for the funds given to the group by Louis. Furthermore, it would be Gosset who would subsequently deliver William’s report back to the Louis.\textsuperscript{95} William of Rubruck often stressed that his journey was not undertaken as a royal envoy for the French king, but that he had been asked to pay attention to his surroundings and report back.

On his return, arriving at the then Armenian port of Korykos, William had his entourage’s belongings sent separately by ship to Acre. He and his group continued

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{WR}, I.(7) p.67.
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{WR}, XXIII.(2), p.144; much to his dismay, he was never to meet the German prisoners \textit{WR}, XXXIII.(1) p.226.
\textsuperscript{91} \textit{WR}, XVIII.(4), pp.128-9.
\textsuperscript{92} William wrote, ‘This constituted, therefore, a twofold reason why Friar Andrew and his colleagues had to pass between fires: firstly, inasmuch as they were bringing gifts and, in the second place, because these were destined for someone who was already dead, namely Keu Chan’, \textit{WR}, XXXV.(3), p.241.
\textsuperscript{94} William had been given a Bible by King Louis and an illuminated psalter by Queen Margaret, \textit{WR}, XV.(5), p.116.
\textsuperscript{95} \textit{WR}, I.(10), XIX.(10) pp.69, 134.
overland to the port of Ayas where they then crossed the sea to Nicosia. Yet here, meeting with his Provincial Minister General, he found himself returning close to Ayas to Antioch where they continued overland to Tripoli for a chapter meeting on the 15th of August. Once back in Acre, the same Minister General decided that he could not do without William who was to stay and teach in Acre, instead of fulfilling William’s desire to go to Louis. According to William,

The Minister determined that I was to teach in Acre and would not let me join you, ordering me to send in writing, by the bearer, what I wished to say. I would implore you to write to the Minister to give me leave to join you.

Had William been allowed to travel to meet Louis in person on his return, perhaps this account may never have been written.

---

96 WR, XXXVII. (16-18), pp.273-5.
Fig. I 1 Map of Britain and Ireland in the *Topographia Hibernica* Paris, BNF 4846 Lat.
I. GERALD OF WALES AND THE TOPOGRAPHIA HIBERNICA

Gerald of Wales’ *oeuvres de jeunesse*,¹ his *Topographia Hibernica (TH)*, *Vaticinalis Expugnatio Hibernica (EH)*, *Itinerarium Cambriae (IK)* and the *Descriptio Cambriae (DK)* have received wide scholarly attention; not only for Gerald’s views of the Irish and Welsh people, or the topography, ethnography, wildlife and history of Ireland and Wales, but also for the study of leading twelfth-century English figures such as King Henry II, King John and Archbishop Baldwin; crusade-preaching in Wales; and the initial movement of Anglo-Norman marcher lords to Ireland. Furthermore, also in relation to this quartet of texts, Gerald’s classical influences, his understanding of marvels, miracles and monstrosities, and his place within the changing intellectual milieu of the twelfth century, have also been considered. However, hitherto little detailed attention has been paid to the afterlife of Gerald’s many texts particularly during the Middle Ages.²

Until most recently, little or no work has been devoted to the medieval reception of the *TH*, with only brief overviews of the text’s survival within the manuscript descriptions of Dimmock’s Rolls Series edition and the lists and descriptions provided by Robert Bartlett and Brian Scott. Catherine Rooney’s doctoral research has provided the most recent list of manuscripts, with partial provenance information and with a special consideration of the contemporary production of the manuscripts during Gerald’s lifetime, especially in relation to palaeographical and codicological practices in twelfth-century English scriptoria. Rooney has offered valuable insights with regards to the environment within which the manuscripts were created and first disseminated, particularly in comparison to the writing and dissemination of other twelfth-century texts.

Rooney also included a briefer examination of the later medieval and early modern manuscripts of all Gerald’s works and added a further six previously unlisted manuscripts of

---

¹ Gerald of Wales refers to his quartet of texts on Ireland and Wales as such in the second prologue of the last of the four works, the *DK*, dedicated to Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury (1207-1228), *DK*. ‘Prefatio Prima’ p.157; cf. Thorpe, ‘Description’, p.213; The titles are as they were listed by Gerald in the *Catalogus brevior librorum, GW, Opera*, I, pp. 421-3.

the *TH*. This study adds a further two manuscripts to that list: Bodleian Library, Fairfax 20 and Royal 13 D I. It also offers additional information on the text’s medieval manuscript transmission and establishes previously unidentified relationships between manuscripts.\(^3\)

More is also required in relation to the medieval reception of the *TH*. Jean-Marie Boivin’s French translation of the *TH* was prefaced with a brief discussion of the medieval interest in the text, Rory McTurk has explored Chaucer’s use of Gerald of Wales in the *House of Fame* and Churchill Babington identified the extent of the debt owed to Gerald’s *TH* by Ranulf Higden in his *Polychronicon*. Here, I have attempted to bring together these various aspects of the *TH*’s medieval reception, examining these texts in greater detail where necessary and adding to that the interest in the text as seen by Bartholamaeus Anglicus, Walter Bower and various sermon-writers and compilers. The different combinations of excerpts taken from the *TH* have also been considered in greater detail particularly in relation to the political and social issues of the day.

Thus, in this chapter, the extant manuscripts of the *TH*, attested manuscripts (drawn from correspondence, medieval library catalogues, other texts, lists and inventories) and surviving excerpts of the *TH* will be examined for an understanding of the text’s transmission, dissemination and reception c.1185-1500. Written in three books, the first concentrated on the geographical landscape of Ireland and its animals; the second, the marvels and wonders of Ireland and other European anecdotes of *mirabilia* considered relevant by Gerald, including the hybrid creatures Gerald claimed were produced as a result of the practice of bestiality; and the third, was devoted to Ireland’s origin myths and more contemporary past, stretching from the mythical coming of the alleged granddaughter of Noah to Henry II, ethnographic observations of the Irish and Gerald’s view of the Irish clergy. The *TH* has been variously referred to as *de mirabilibus hibernie, historia et topographia hiberniae* or *topographia hibernica*, although Gerald, in his *Catalogus brevior librorum* written after 1195, listed it as *Topographia Hibernica*. However, medieval contemporaries such as Robert of Basevorn, Francesco Petrarch, Thomas Brinton and Walter Bower commonly referred to it as the *De Mirabilibus*

\(^3\) See pp.63-83.
Although Jeanne-Marie Boivin has suggested that the late thirteenth-century author, Jean de Meun’s reference to his own translation of the *TH*, as *Le livre des merveilles de Hyrlande*, in his prologue to the translation of Boethius’ *Consolation of Philosophy* was likely to have been a reference to Bk.II of the *TH* alone; it too was likely to have been a reference to the *TH* in its entirety.  

The rich manuscript tradition of the *TH*, at least compared with other texts by Gerald, begs the question – to what extent were the negative images of the Irish, in the Middle Ages and after, a product of ‘Giraldiana’? The backlash against Gerald and the *TH* in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries suggest it had a strong influence on the negative stereotypes of the Irish, albeit furthered by contemporary events such as, for example, the wars of the mid-seventeenth century. Yet, was the influence of the *TH* on negative stereotypes of the Irish as true for the Middle Ages? Was the *TH* ploughed for its abundant negative imagery, or instead, for its more positive hagiographical anecdotes? Can the *TH* be seen to have substantially altered the image of the Irish in England in the Middle Ages? In order to offer the necessary contextual background, the perceptions of the Irish in England before and after the *TH* was written, Anglo-Irish relations and historiography shall be surveyed.

---

4 GW, *Opera, I*. pp.421-3; With regards to the other authors see, pp. 109, 115, 119-121.
Views of Ireland

Any examination of the interest in, and impact of, the TH in England must take into consideration the perceptions of Ireland prior to the appearance of Gerald’s texts. It must be stressed that the emphasis here centres on the classical and medieval writings about Ireland specifically available to medieval England.

Classical and early-Christian views

Within the classical model of the descriptions of the world, accounts of Ireland were topographically-oriented, with occasional descriptions of the people and place which invoked notions of barbarity, emphasizing the peripheral placement of Ireland relative to the author’s location. Philip Freeman’s extrapolation of all known references to Ireland in extant classical and early Christian texts highlights certain common features, particularly within descriptions popular in the Middle Ages such as those of Pliny, Pomponius Mela, Solinus, Orosius and Jerome.  

Three recurring features of these descriptions are evident: a description of its location as a measurement of its distance from Britain and/or Spain; the plentiful nature of the land, livestock and fauna, occasionally with suggestive corresponding imagery of greed and gluttony; and finally allusions to barbarity, generally in terms of behavioural traits, invariably in terms of their martial and sexual practices. This is best illustrated through the words of

---

7 For the various selections see P. Freeman, Ireland and the Classical World (Austin 2001) pp.28-115; in addition, regarding the Irish people Strabo wrote, ‘Concerning this island I have nothing certain to report, except that the people living there are more savage than the Britons, being cannibals as well as gluttons. Further, they consider it honourable to eat their dead fathers and to openly have intercourse, not only with unrelated women, but with their mothers and sisters as well. I say these things not having trustworthy witnesses, and yet the custom of cannibalism is said to be found among the Scythians.’. Freeman, Ireland, p.46 (Strabo has already placed Ireland north of Britain suggesting that Ireland was at the northern most limit of the habitable world hence allowing for the comparisons with the peripheral Scythians see pp.38-47); Although Strabo is mentioned by name by Josephus, Tertullian, Jordanes, Priscian and Albertus Magnus no translation of the work was made into Latin until the 1450s and little is known of any possible medieval dissemination, A. Diller, The Textual Tradition of Strabo’s Geography (Amsterdam, 1975) pp.88, 97; cf. Kenney, Sources for the Early History, pp.110-155, Kenney includes descriptions of Ireland until c.700 including, therefore, Solinus, Ethicus Ister, Nennius and Gildas.
Solinus who wove together the ethnographic observations of Pomponius Mela’s *Cosmographia* with the locational description of Ireland by Pliny:

Britain is surrounded by many significant islands, of which *Hibernia* comes closest to it in size. The latter is inhuman in the savage rituals of its inhabitants, but on the other hand is so rich in fodder that the cattle, if not removed from the fields from time to time, would happily gorge themselves to a dangerous point. On that island there are no snakes, few birds, and unfriendly and warlike people. They treat right and wrong as the same thing.\(^8\)

The Christian apologist, Orosius, in Bk.I of the *Historiae adversum paganos* made but a brief mention of Ireland and Britain. He appeared favourable, restricting his comments to location and their name, the *Scotti*.\(^9\) Outwith this more geographical genre, Orosius’

---

\(^8\) *Collectanea Rerum memorabilium* 22.2-6, ed. T. Mommsen (Berlin, 1895), Latin text and trans. cited in Freeman, *Ireland*, pp.86-7; there are two further passages about the Irish where mothers are described as feeding their babies using the tips of swords and the use of leather in boat-building. P. Freeman excludes them as later additions, Freeman, *Ireland*, p.125 n.148. The popularity of Solinus’ *Collectanea* requires little discussion here, its use as a digest of geographical and ethnographical information has been well documented. Although it is known that Pomponius Mela drew on Strabo and Agrippa for his material, little is known of how accessible Pomponius Mela’s comments on Ireland were in the Middle Ages, *Pomponius Mela: Geography/ De Situ Orbis* A.D.43 trans. P. Berry (Lampeter, 1997) pp.I-III; see Freeman, *Ireland*, pp.48-9. Pliny’s medieval transmission was derived principally from Solinus’ use of the *Historia Naturalis* within the *Collectanea rerum memorabilium*, as well as the debt to the *Historia Naturalis* owed by Orosius and Bede. Similarly, Pomponius Mela’s *De Chorographia* may also have received wider attention through Solinus’ exploitation of it. Men such as Robert of Cricklade, William of Conches, Alexander Nequam, Thomas of Cantimpré, Bartholomeus Anglicus and Vincent of Beauvais, also had access to Pliny’s text and from the late-fourteenth century revived direct transmission, B.M. Olsen, ‘The Production of Classics in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries’, *Medieval Manuscripts of the Latin Classics: Production and Use*, eds. C.A. Chavanne-Mazel & M.M.Smith (Los Altas Hills, 1996) p.3; cf. M. Chibnall, ‘Pliny’s Natural History in the Middle Ages’, *Empire and the Aftermath: Silver Latin II*, ed. T. A. Dorey (London & Boston, 1975) pp.57-78.

\(^9\) *Historiae adversus paganos*,1.2.75 80-82, Latin text and translation cited in Freeman, *Ireland*, pp.111-113; Although King Alfred had the *Historiae* translated into Old English, the translator improved on Orosius’ observations on the northern Germanic lands but, despite his proximity to the subject, condensed what little was written about Britain and Ireland. The one additional piece of information about Ireland pertained to Ireland’s location on the sailing route from Norway, *The Old English Orosius*, ed. J. Batley (Oxford, 1980) Li p.19; *Two Voyagers at the court of King Alfred : the ventures of Ohthere and Wulfstan together with the description of Northern Europe from the Old English Orosius*, ed. N.Lund & trans. C. E. Fell (York, 1984) p.21; Christine Fell, however, disagrees with Niels Lund and believes that the reference is not to Ireland but Iceland and is the result of a scribal error, C. Fell ‘Some questions of language’, *Two Voyagers at the Court of King Alfred*, p.63.
contemporary, Jerome, in his *Adversus Jovinianum* offered a scathing and purportedly ‘eye-witness’ representation of the Irish as sexual deviants and cannibals, who,

> when they come across herds of pigs and cattle in the forests, they frequently cut off the buttocks of shepherds and their wives, and their nipples, regarding these alone as delicacies.

The absurdity of the anecdote appears to highlight a perceived Irish irrationality, in choosing the buttocks and nipples of humans rather than the ample livestock available, rather than their supposed cannibalism.\(^{10}\)

Apart from Jerome, the descriptions within these more popular classical works were all based on hearsay, unlike the descriptions to be written in successive centuries which had a more personal touch. There is little evidence to suggest that these earlier accounts had any contemporaneous influence.

**Early medieval views (c.500 – c.1100)**

The advent of Christianity and the attempts at a standardisation of Christian religious practice in western Europe offered the context for subtle alterations to descriptions of Ireland and the Irish. Three characteristic features typify the early medieval descriptions of Ireland in England and on the continent. First, the image of a religious and learned Ireland, an ‘island of saints’ gleaned mainly from the transmission of ideas of Ireland via hagiographies of Irish saints and other representations of early medieval Irish learning and piety; second, the continued influence and the often verbatim use of the descriptions of Solinus, repeated through Isidore of Seville, as particularly exemplified in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis*.

---

\(^{10}\) Freeman has suggested that Jerome was clearly influenced in his views by his antipathy towards Pelagius, whom he appears to have believed was Irish, hence perhaps influencing the description above. Alternatively, suggesting *Scoti* or Irish parentage for Pelagius, may have been the worst insult that he could inflict if the reputation of the *Scoti* on the outskirts of the world were such, Freeman, *Ireland*, pp.100-1. Perhaps Jerome was drawing on Strabo or some similar description, whose literary model required a peripheral people to be cannibalistic, see Freeman, *Ireland*, pp.38-47.
Anglorum (HE); and finally the re-evaluation of the natural wealth of Ireland in conjunction with ideas of paradise.

The seventh to ninth centuries have been viewed as a time which witnessed the flowering of Irish learning and its dissemination to continental western Europe. Despite the occasional anti-Irish invective, Ireland was basking in the reputation of her sanctity and scholarly achievements of those like Sedulius Scottus and Johannes Eriugena.¹¹ The volume of hagiographies of Irish saints which emerged at this time further exemplified this.¹²

Hagiographies of Irish saints may have been plentiful, nevertheless few offered descriptions of Ireland or the Irish themselves. The Vita S. Brigidae metrica proves a rare exception in which a description of Ireland and its inhabitants is provided:

An island of fame there is far away in the west,
Which the learned call the land of Ireland, hospitable its fame;
Rich in jewels of cloth and in fine minerals,
In yellow gold, in warriors, sky, sun and flocks.

Honey flows, from the beautiful milky-white plains of Ireland and from the clothing, weapons, produce, strength and men.
Of frenzied bears there are none here: nor has Ireland ever produced the seeds of the raging lions.

There are no serpents in Ireland, the sod is sacred
They have no wild, ravening monsters nor lions;

¹¹ cf. D. O Croinin, ‘Hiberno-Latin literature’, A New History of Ireland vol. 1 (Oxford, 2005) pp. 395-7; He also suggests that Alcuin was known to have had a derisory attitude towards the Irish perigrinati, but that any ‘anti-Irish sentiment was the exception, not the rule, D. Ó Cróinín, Early Medieval Ireland 400-1200 (London, 1995), p.222; this early cooperation did not come to an end in the ninth century, for even in 1070 a convent at Regensburg was given to a community of Irish pilgrims, and Kathleen Hughes discusses interactions between various places on the continent, such as Regensburg, Rome, Citeaux, and Ireland in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, K. Hughes, Early Christian Ireland: Introduction to the Sources (London, 1972) pp.277-8; Richard Sharpe discusses this cooperation in the form of literary exchanges of hagiographies in the second half of the twelfth century, R. Sharpe, Medieval Irish Saints’ Lives (Oxford, 1991) pp.27-29; and for the later period see T. O. Fiaich, ‘Irish Monks in Germany in the Late Middle Ages’, The Churches, Ireland and the Irish, eds. W.J Sheils & D. Wood (Oxford, 1989) pp.89-104.

But gentle peace, civility, and poets of much dexterity;
Many holy clerics teaching the people.¹³

Undeniably, the context pre-supposes a favourable portrayal of Ireland. Yet, the contrast of the respect given to the Irish religious alongside the image of the ‘gentle peace, [and] civility’ with Gerald’s later twelfth-century description in the TH of Ireland and its inhabitants (both man and beast) is marked.

Bede’s HE, a popular work with a substantial influence on subsequent English histories and chronicles, displays all three features of the early medieval descriptions of Ireland as discussed above. Indeed, Bede’s constant references to bishops Aidan, Adomnan, and Colombanus, reinforced this image of the island of saints. Nonetheless, the Venerable Bede was also defensive about what he saw as an earlier error within the practices of the Church in the northern half of Ireland: the dating of Easter. This adherence to a practice, which he believed to be wrong, he blamed on the remoteness of the Irish monks.¹⁴

¹³ O Croinin, Early Medieval Ireland, p.221, quote taken from p.24 (paragraph 2 is of my own translation):
Finibus occiduis describitur optima tellus,
Nomine & antiquis Scotia scripta libris.
Insula diues opum, gemmarum, vestis, & auri:
Comoda corporibus, aëre, sole, solo.
Melle fluit, pulchris & lacteis Scotia campis,
Vestibus, atque armis, frugibus, arte, viris.
Vrsonum rabies nulla est ibi: sæua leonum
Semia nec vnquam Scotica terra tulit.
Nulla venena nocent, nec serpens serpit in herba,
Nec conquesta canit garrula rana lacu.
In qua Scotorum gentes habitare merentur:
Inelyta gens hominum, militie, pace, fide. BHL 1458

¹⁴ Bede had stressed that the Church in southern Ireland were in line with the more accepted dating practices, A. Thacker, ‘Bede and the Irish’ Beda Venerabilis: Historian, Monk, & Northumbrian, eds. L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald (Gröningen, 1996) p.42; Thacker suggests that the importance Bede gives to the Easter controversy was due to the close links between the Irish of Iona and ‘the development of Northumbrian Christianity’ and the fact that in 640, as Pope-elect, John IV had mistakenly believed that the Irish were Quartodecimans and heretical (i.e. celebrating Easter on the day of the Jewish passover rather than a Sunday). During the synod of Whitby this accusation was a vital argument for those who wanted to follow the Roman dating system. Thacker also discusses the previous misinterpretation by scholars of Bede’s view of the Irish, who argue that Bede knowingly suppresses the Irish role within the English church, particularly through a stress of the ‘supremacy of the Roman church’, Thacker, ‘Bede and the Irish’, pp.31-4, 38-42.
For the topographical detail in his description, Bede relied heavily on Isidore and Pliny. While drawing on their accounts he evoked further images of Ireland as the resplendent island, imbued with ideas of an earthly paradise. Yet this should be considered within the context and framework of the overall work. Bede praised Irish piety, their learning and their intellectual generosity, calling them, ‘heralds of the truth to bring this people [the English] to the faith’.\(^\text{15}\) The topographical imagery and even the religiosity of Ireland were described as a backdrop to emphasise Ireland’s symbiotic relationship with Britain, particularly England. We are urged to believe Irish religiosity for as Bede shows, much of England’s religiosity is owed to Ireland. Similarly, Ireland complemented England, and Britain, in its location and climate. Ireland was offered as the mirror image of what England was before. Thus conjoined with the depiction of a somewhat ‘primitive’ Ireland, was also the image of a country abundant with riches, with a harmless people, a ‘gens innoxia’, who were on friendly terms with the English. At the close of the \textit{HE}, the Irish are depicted as having embraced the Roman church fully, thereby coming the full circle; the Irish had helped bring Christianity to the English and then, returning the favour, the English were instrumental in bringing the Irish to conformity.\(^\text{16}\)

Despite the occasional criticism of Ireland at this time - such as Alcuin’s complaint against Irish scholars, Bede’s approach to the issue of the dating of Easter and the continued access to the works of Pomponius Mela, Pliny and Solinus - the general impression from the surviving written sources is of a land and people on the peripheries of the known world but spiritually respected and hence, metaphorically considerably closer.\(^\text{17}\) Indeed a scribe of Pomponius Mela’s \textit{de chorographia} after copying from him that the Irish were ‘<more> ignorant of virtues than other people’ added that ‘however, to some extent they are knowledgeable.’\(^\text{18}\)

\(^{16}\) Thacker, ‘Bede and the Irish’, pp.33-35.
\(^{17}\) Alcuin’s main complaint was that the Irish view of the computus was different to his own, O Croinin, \textit{Early Medieval}, p.221; Apart from this he appears to have maintained an amicable correspondence with a number of Irish scholars S. Allott, \textit{Alcuin of York c. A.D. 732 to 804: his life and letters} (York, 1974) pp.42-7.
Changing Twelfth-century views of Ireland

When called on to offer a description of Ireland, twelfth-century chroniclers such as Henry of Huntingdon would draw on the authority of Bede. Apart from Gerald’s TH and EH, extant medieval manuscripts suggest that there was only one other topographical description of Ireland in circulation outwith a larger narrative text: Henry of Huntingdon’s prefatory chapters of his Historia Gentis Anglorum (HGA), largely extracted from the opening chapter of Bede’s HE, contained a ‘Description of Britain’ which included a portion on Ireland. This selection circulated independently and was borrowed heavily, although most often for its ‘Description of England.’ However, BL, Additional 40007 is a late-twelfth century example of the section on Ireland being chosen independently for inclusion. Similarly, subsequent to a mention of Prince John’s journey to Ireland in 1185, Ralph de Diceto digressed from his narrative and also offered Henry of Huntingdon’s description of Ireland.19

Like the HGA, the Vision of Tundale, written by Marcus, an Irish monk, c.1149 on the continent and dedicated to Abbess Gisella of St. Paul’s in Regensburg, was a further means of gleaning a description of Ireland and the Irish.20 This favourable description, in anticipation of the main literary attraction, a narrative account of a vision seen at Cork by a knight from Cashel, is almost solely topographical and undeniably influenced by Bede’s HE. Yolande de Pontfarcy suggests that it was derived from the same source to which Gerald had access.21 Certainly comments such as, ‘snakes, frogs, toads and all venomous animals are unknown there, to the extent that its wood, leather thongs, horns and clay are known to triumph over all poisons’ or ‘it is quite famous for its religious men and women but is also well known for its cruel battle’ are similar to sentiments expressed by Gerald.22

---

19 de situ et populo hibernie’, BL, Additional 40007 f.39 (c.1195, produced perhaps at St. Paul’s Cathedral or in St. Mary’s Abbey, York in the thirteenth century), this text is also in BL, Cotton Faustina A VIII f.109; Ralph de Diceto, Ymagines Historiarum vol. II. (London, 1876) pp.34-5 – this brief description of Ireland is in fact offered twice, first within his very concise geographical description of the known world vol.1 p.10.


22 Marcus, Vision of Tnugdal, p.111; for the Latin text, Visio Tnugdali, ed. O. Schade (1869); for a later Latin critical edition see Visio Tnugdali Lateinisch und altdeutsch, ed. A.Wagner (Erlangen 1882); although this section would have been available to readers of the Latin Visio in England, this section was excluded from the Middle English translation, de Pontfarcy, ‘Introduction’, pp.11-12; The text was translated a century later into German and incorporated into Helinand of Froidmont’s chronicles. It was subsequently included by Vincent of Beauvais in his Speculum Historiale and was consequently translated into Middle English. Through Vincent of Beauvais, the work was also accessible to John of Tynemouth who used it in his
By the early-to mid-twelfth century subtle differences begin to appear within the available description of Ireland and the Irish, with a return to the more condemnatory aspects of the classical legacy of describing Ireland. Ireland and the Irish were being equated with barbarity once more despite the evident Christianization of Ireland. Yet, these twelfth-century authors were not wholly reliant on the authority of the classical written word for their views.

It has been argued that the lack of Roman involvement in Ireland allowed for the development of a ‘Celtic’ church with substantial differences to the continental models, especially after the fundamental differences aired at the Council of Whitby in 664, a view which a reading of Bede’s HE with its discussion of the schism, and the TH with its discussion of the ‘primitive’ nature of Irish priests, would undoubtedly support. Regardless of the inaccuracy of this viewpoint, it gained ground in twelfth-century England and continental Europe. The twelfth-century understanding of Ireland, and the Irish church, was closely intertwined with the changing nature of Church organisation in the ongoing implementation and aftermath of church reforms throughout Western Europe. The perception that the Irish church was slow to respond to these reforms allowed Ireland to be viewed as primitive and backward.

Bernard of Clairvaux [b.1090-d.1153], in his Vita Sancti Malachie, was an early proponent of the vilification of the Irish. He wrote that,

Never before had he known the like, in whatever depth of barbarism; never had he found men so shameless in regards of morals, so dead in regards of rites, so impious in regard of faith, so barbarous.

\footnote{Historia Aurea and the Sanctilogium britanicum. However, in the process of transmission, the above description of Ireland is excluded in Helinand of Froidmont’s Chronicon. Hence, it is lacking from the Speculum Historiale, the Middle English translation and John of Tynemouth’s works. There are eight extant Latin manuscripts with provenances based in England, one manuscript of an Anglo-Norman translation and five manuscripts of a Middle English translation surviving. For a discussion of the Latin transmission, and Vincent of Beauvais and John of Tynemouth’s use of the text see N. F. Palmer, ‘Visio Tnugdali’: the German and Dutch translations and their circulation in the Late Middle Ages (Munich, 1982) pp.1, 5-20, 23; for the Middle English text see The Vision of Tundale ed. from BL. ms. Cotton Caligula A II, ed. R. Mearns (Heidelberg, 1985); cf. E.L. Rambo, Colonial Ireland in Medieval English Literature (New Jersey, 1995) p.101.

\footnote{cf. J. Muldoon, Identity on the Medieval Irish Frontier (Gainesville, 2003) pp.72-74.}
in regard of laws, so stubborn in regard of discipline, so unclean in regard of life. They were Christians in name, in fact pagan. There was no giving of tithes or firstfruits; no entry into lawful marriages, no making confessions: nowhere could be found any who would either seek penance or impose it.²⁴

This should be placed within the context of his subsequent words that:

barbarous laws disappear, Roman laws are introduced; everywhere the ecclesiastical customs are received, their opposites are rejected. Churches are rebuilt, clergy is appointed in them, the solemnities of the sacraments are duly celebrated; confessions are made, congregations come to church, the celebration of marriages grace those who live together, Everything was so much changed for the better, that today the word which the Lord speaks by the prophet is applicable to that nation; those who before were not my people are now my people.²⁵

Bernard of Clairvaux’s principal object within this work was to attribute these successful reforms almost solely to Malachy and his leadership, thus, if the Irish had been little more than savages previously, religion could still be their salvation.²⁶ It would be views such as these,

²⁶ This can also be seen earlier in the text when Bernard of Clairvaux writes ‘He (Malachy) extirpated barbaric rites, he planted those of the Church. All out-worn superstitions (for not a few of them were discovered) he abolished and, wheresoever he found it, ever sort of malign influence sent by evil angels.’ Bernard of Clairvaux, Life of St. Malachy of Armargh, p.17; cf. ‘Vita Sancti Malachie’, p.315.
expressing the need for reform within the Irish church, which may have influenced the papal policies of Adrian IV, Alexander III and Innocent III. As John of Salisbury claimed in the Metalogicon, a papal edict had been issued confirming Henry II’s right to claim Ireland in the 1150s citing the spurious ‘Donation of Constantine’. If the Laudabiliter bull, as extant within either Ralph de Diceto’s Ymagines Historarium or Gerald’s EH, are believed to be the document referred to by John of Salisbury, then clearly it was issued under the aegis of reforming the Irish church.

The defamatory religious views of the Irish as expressed by Bernard of Clairvaux had their counterpart in William of Malmesbury’s Gesta Regum Anglorum (GRA). The changing nature of political power in England from the mid-eleventh century in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest and the fluctuating relations between the new settlers and power-displaced native inhabitants allowed for a shifting view of the Irish in the literary outpouring of the twelfth-century England. First completed c.1120, and then revised in 1127, William of Malmesbury in his GRA represented Ireland as dependant on the English and the English crown stating:

What would Ireland be worth without the goods that came in by the sea from England? The soil lacks all advantages, and so poor, or rather unskilful, are its cultivators that it can produce only a ragged mob of rustic Irishmen outside the towns; the English and French, with their more


28 J. Gillingham, ‘Beginnings of English Imperialism’, The English in the Twelfth Century (Woodbridge, 2000) pp.5-18; J. Gillingham, ‘Civilizing the English’, Historical Research (London, 2001) pp.35-43. Although both Roger of Howden and Ralph Diceto offer information about Ireland, particularly in relation to Henry II’s visit there, papal legates and in Ralph Diceto’s case the Laudabiliter neither make explicit judgements about the Irish people, although as John Gillingham has shown there was an inherent sense of superiority which emanates from their interest in Ireland Gillingham ‘Beginnings of English Imperialism’ and for Roger of Howden’s attention to Ireland see J. Gillingham, ‘Travels and views of Roger of Howden’, pp.85-6.
civilized way of life, live in the towns, and carry on trade and commerce.\textsuperscript{29}

The context for this remark was a discussion regarding King Muirchetach’s sycophantic dealings with Henry I: ‘Muirchetach, king of the Irish and his successors… were so devoted to our king Henry that they wrote nothing except that would please him and did nothing except what he told them to do.’ William claimed that after an isolated attempt to ignore this relationship, Muirchetach was subjected to the cessation of trade and communication, an event which Muirchetach regretted and never allowed to be repeated again.\textsuperscript{30} Therefore, particularly noteworthy here is William’s acknowledgement of a prior relationship between an Irish king and the English king manifest through trade routes and the implied pseudo-client status of the Irish king, as well as the strong suggestion of the existing migration of English and French people to Ireland for the reason of trade in the late-eleventh/early twelfth century.

John Gillingham has argued that William of Malmesbury was the first English author to equate a Christian people with barbarians, a concept usually reserved for pagans, and that this reflected his ‘profound classical scholarship’ as well as the association of economic development with ‘civilized’ behaviour.\textsuperscript{31} This, he argues, was an aspect of a much wider issue of acculturation, not of the English in Ireland, but of the various eleventh- to mid-twelfth century settlers in England. John Gillingham, Rees Davies and Robert Bartlett have shown that twelfth-century England was beginning to see a clear denigration of these border-land peoples of the ‘celtic fringe.’ Closely related to the developing fashion for a more Franco-centric perception of the English, within a framework of ‘civilising the English’, was the disparagement of the people previously closely associated with the English.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{29} WM, GRA.V.409, pp.738-41.
\textsuperscript{30} WM, GRA.V.409, pp.738-41.
These twelfth-century views of Ireland demonstrate a certain ambivalence. Henry of Huntingdon, the author of the *Vision of Tundale* and Ralph de Diceto persisted with the description of Ireland offered by Bede. Ralph de Diceto and Roger Howden were keenly interested in the political relations between the kingdom of Henry II and Ireland in relation to the submission of Irish kings, John’s role there and papal policy and legates. The issues of Irish Christianity and church reforms remained important but were portrayed as moving towards a satisfactory resolution. William of Malmesbury’s more derogatory view of the Irish, however, could be seen as the product of his classical learning, which was shared by Gerald of Wales in the *TH*. The seeds of discontent against the Irish were being sown, but the extent to which Gerald intensified these negative views through his writings is not so apparent. Therefore, the question to be considered in the discussion of the literary dissemination and reception of the *TH* below is the extent to which these later more derogatory views were sustained and perhaps even increased in England from the late-twelfth until the fifteenth century through the transmission, dissemination and reception of the *TH*. 
Anglo-Irish Relations from 1169 to c.1500

To contextualise the above and later representations of Ireland, a brief exploration of the nature of Anglo-Irish relations is also necessary. Were the views mentioned above fostered, exacerbated or even changed by the events which unfolded after 1169? Anglo-Irish relations prior to 1169, and even after, are little highlighted in the English chronicles. However, letters, charters, archaeological sources and other records have demonstrated the existence of religious, educational, economic and diplomatic ties prior to the influx from England and Wales as well as after. Certainly the anglicization of parts of Ireland after the late 1160s has been well documented. Yet, to what extent was the reverse true? Was there an adequate Irish presence in England to make itself felt and to help create an impression of Ireland and the Irish independent of any literary views?

Religious ties

A previous commonplace of Anglo-Irish ecclesiastical history had been to suggest that the strong links prior to the Council of Whitby in 664 withered away following the dating-disagreement over Easter and that the subsequent development of the two churches was in isolation; one more ‘Celtic’, the other more ‘Roman’. However, Kathleen Hughes demonstrated the continued links between the churches of Ireland and central and northern England, through the transmission of texts and ideas between England and Ireland after the synod of Whitby.

34 However, Hughes warned against assuming that in the aftermath of the 816 Council of Chelsea (when Irishmen were prohibited from baptising, celebrating the Eucharist and hearing mass) all contact ceased between two churches, arguing that this was not an indication of Irish-xenophobia, but a manifestation of greater continental influences in England. she stresses instead the influence of Canon 43 of the Second Council of Chalon-sur-Saône (813) where similar legislation was enacted to prevent Irish priests ministering and consecrating other priests when their credentials as bishops were under question, K. Hughes, ‘Evidence for contacts between the churches of the Irish and English’, Church and Society in Ireland A.D.600 -1200 ed. D. Dumville (London, 1987) pp.49-67. Furthermore, it is important to consider to what extent this was the result of a wider movement for the devolution of power to the Anglo-Saxon bishops, J. Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society (Oxford, 2005) pp.123-4; For continued contact, literary influences, Irish scholars and possible Irish foundations in England see M.W. Herren, ‘Scholarly contacts between the Irish and the southern English in the seventh century’, Peritia vol. 12 (1998) pp.24-53 and S. Duffy, Ireland in the Middle Ages (Basingstoke, 1997) pp.49-50.
In addition, more recently emphasised is the Irish church’s continued interactions with Rome, especially in the eleventh century, casting doubts on the previous assumption that the twelfth-century reforms of the Irish church were due, primarily, to the efforts of English ecclesiastics such as Lanfranc and Anselm. There was also the issue of the primacy of the see of Canterbury. In Lanfranc’s letter to Pope Alexander II he stated that, ‘my predecessors have exercised a primacy over the church of York and the whole island of Britain, and also over Ireland’, even though no basis for this claim has been found within Irish sources. Nevertheless, primacy could also be claimed as Lanfranc and Anselm had consecrated a number of Irish bishops in their time, although this was to change after the Synod of Kells in 1152 when Armagh and Dublin were made archbishoprics, with ultimate authority given to Armagh.

It was this believed earlier relationship which may have led to John of Salisbury’s request for papal permission for a ‘conquest’ of Ireland. Pope Adrian’s bull and the extant letters of Pope Alexander III present this as an integral aspect in Anglo-Irish relations. The excuse for such an endeavour was couched in the language of a crusading mission allowing the more ‘advanced’ Rome-influenced and reforming church in England to dominate the church in Ireland which it depicted as primitive and backward. This missionary zeal must certainly be seen within the climate of reform evident on the continent and in England. Indeed, Aubrey Gwynn and Donnchad Ó Corráin, have suggested that the synod of Cashel of 1101 was not merely the Irish church finally entering into a phase of reform but them leading the way as an

36 See for example the oath of Patrick, a monk of Worcester at his consecration as bishop of Dublin in London in 1074: ‘Wherefore I, Patrick who have been chosen to rule Dublin, the capital city of Ireland, do hand to you, my reverend father Lanfranc, primate of the British Isles and archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury, this charter of my profession; and I promise that I shall obey you and your successors in all things which pertain to the Christian religion’, *The whole works of the Most Rev. James Ussher*, eds. C.R. Elrington & J.H. Todd vol. IV (Dublin, 1847) pp.564-5 cited in Gwynn, *Irish Church*, p.75; For the consecration of other bishops see Gwynn, *Irish Church*, pp.75, 78, 81-83, 103, 106-109;113-15.
37 John of Salisbury, secretary of the archbishop of Canterbury stated in his *Metalogicon*, ‘In response to my petition the pope granted and donated Ireland to the illustrious English king, Henry II, to be held by him and his successors, as his letters still testify. He did this by that right of standing from the Donation of Constantinople whereby all islands are said to belong to the Roman Church. Through me the pope sent a gold ring set with a magnificent emerald as a sign that he had invested the king with the right to rule Ireland’, cited in Watt, *Church and the Two Nations*, p.35; for the Latin text see *Metalogicon*, ed. C.C.J.Webb (Oxford, 1929) 4.42, pp.217-8.
attempt to counterbalance the attempts at primacy from Canterbury, and was strongly supported by Muirchertach Ua Briain for that very reason. Nevertheless, Gerald’s portrayal of the Irish priests suggests that this may not have been the common perception in late twelfth-century England. In the sermon Gerald claimed to have given at Dublin, for which he reused a large portion of the *TH* and for which he nearly suffered bodily harm at the hands of Felix, the bishop of Ossory, he depicted the Irish church and its members in no uncertain terms as primitive and depraved and in need of reform.

After 1169, the religious ties between Ireland and England were firmly strengthened. The appointment of bishops in all English-administered areas required the approval of the English king. In addition, within the English-administered church an element of anti-Irish feeling was allowed to develop. During Henry III’s minority, William Marshal (who held substantial lands in Leinster) ordered that no Irishman could be made a bishop, which Sean Duffy views as an attempt to strengthen colonial expansion. Even though Pope Honorius III denounced this measure, the growing number of Anglo-Irish members of cathedral chapters ensured the supremacy of the English candidates in episcopal elections. Yet, the relationship between the churches of Ireland and England appears to have been only episodically uneasy and almost always enmeshed within the political upheavals of the day. Indeed the 1317 *Remonstrance*, which cited the English crown’s neglect of their duties by the church as a principal grievance, can be interpreted in this manner.


41 Dublin was especially important, its archbishop could often hold a second administrative post; for example, Henry of London also served two terms as a Justiciar of Ireland. Indeed, the anglicisation of the church in Ireland is perceived to have begun in Dublin from the early thirteenth century with the use of Dublin’s St. Patrick’s cathedral as a training ground for future clerks of the Anglo-Irish administrative system. For the archbishops of Dublin see, M. Murphy, ‘Balancing the Concerns of Church and State: the Archbishops of Dublin, 1181-1228’, *Colony and Frontier in Medieval Ireland: Essays presented to J.F.Lydon*, ed. T.Barry, R.Frame and K.Simms (London, 1995) pp.41-56; J.A. Watt, *The Church in Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1983 reprinted – first published 1972).


With regards to the Irish presence in England for religious purposes, Virginia Davis lists 216 Irish secular clerics who were ordained in England between 1350 and 1500. The majority were ordained in London but a smattering of men appear to have been ordained in other southern dioceses such as Bath and Wells, Coventry and Lichfield, Canterbury, Ely, Exeter, Hereford, Lincoln, Rochester, Salisbury, Winchester and Worcester. More importantly, Davis notes that of the ordinands in the diocese of London, the Irish represent the largest group of non-English ordinands at 363. The majority appear to have been of Anglo-Irish descent and, significantly, little distinction seems to have been made regarding their heritage; they appear to have been collectively viewed as ‘Irish’. The decrease in the numbers of clerical migrants in the 1390s can be explained by the Absenteeism act of 1382. In 1413, once again in an attempt at curbing absenteeism, the English parliament expelled all Irishmen except for the students, religious and those who had inheritances in England. Davis, however, suggests that the levels of migration may coincide with the decrease in power by the Dublin government which may explain the resurgence in clerical migration in the mid-fifteenth century.44

Educational ties

Mary Somners estimates there to have been 190 Irish scholars at Oxford from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century. She notes that the majority were of English descent, although three of the fifty-two scholars in the thirteenth century may have been of Gaelic-Irish origin. For the fourteenth century, the origins of only ten of fifty-eight scholars can be ascertained, of whom two were Gaelic Irish. Nine of the eighty scholars in the fifteenth century came from dioceses that were largely populated by the Gaelic Irish. However, as naming practices had become even more ambiguous, their origins can not be conclusively determined.45 Although the majority may have been of Anglo-Irish descent, they were seemingly collectively viewed as Irish.

44 V. Davis, ‘Irish migration to England in the Late Middle Ages: the evidence of 1394 and 1440’, Irish Historical Studies, vol. XXXII no.125, pp.2-21; Indeed Watt suggests that by 1399, except for Dublin and the adjacent dioceses, the direct influence extended by the English crown was waning, Watt, Church in Medieval Ireland, p.148.

45 She records that the fifty-eight scholars in the fourteenth century represent 4% of the university body, and the eighty scholars in the fifteenth century constituted about 8% of the academic population. The Irish scholars were part of the Australes nation. M.H.Soames, ‘A prosopography of Irish scholars’ Medieval Prosopography, vol.18, (1997) pp.144-187.
The Irish also journeyed to England for a legal education. The establishment of the Inns of Court from the 1340s allows for more substantial recorded evidence regarding Irish law students in England. Paul Brand suggests that most were from families of English origin. However, irrespective of their origins, difficulties were being made for the Irish students with regards to their admittance. In 1421, and again in 1442, a complaint was made specifically about the ‘English born in Ireland’ Even if admitted, in 1437 it was decided that no Irishman could become a ‘fellow’ and that any Irishman made a ‘fellow’ before 1437 was to be expelled. Although, the specific mention of the ‘English born in Ireland’ may suggest that the Gaelic Irish would never have been welcome, it also suggests the growing ambiguous identity of the Anglo-Irish in the fifteenth century that they could simultaneously be termed ‘Irish’ or ‘English born in Ireland.’ Paul Brand records that not all the Inns of Court maintained their exclusion of Irish ‘fellows.’ As to the reasons for the ban, Brand does not view it as an attempt to pursue the Absenteeism act, xenophobia, or even an attempt by lawyers to guard their profession in England from outsiders usurping their position. Instead he suggests a growing resentment against the Irish students because English ‘fellows’ on completion of their studies assisted in the teaching at the Inns, which the Irish, who returned home after their studies, were unlikely to have done.\footnote{46}

In addition, Irish students gained a certain notoriety for violent behaviour. According to the St. Alban’s chronicle and the parliamentary rolls of 1429 some Irish, Welsh and Scottish students had threatened certain local gentlemen with arson in exchange for money; yet perhaps this should be seen within a wider climate of disruption and violence during the minority of Henry VI.\footnote{47} Somners views the violence associated with the Irish scholars at Oxford within the context of disputes between ‘nations’ and ‘town and gown’ incidents. Of the 190 recorded Irish scholars, fifty-two were listed as having some involvement in a dispute or crime. Nevertheless, she suggests that it was the reputation for civil disturbance rather than the actual number of misdeeds which led to the requirement of a special license for each student.\footnote{48}

\footnote{48} Somners, ‘Prosopography’, p.147; The \textit{Close Rolls} state that on the 15\textsuperscript{th} of December 1413 at Westminster Henry gave permission for ‘all beneficed clerks, graduates and other clerks studying at that university who were born in Ireland and Wales’ to remain – although it does mention a ‘proclamation lately made throughout all England’ which referred to a requirement that
Economic ties

The nature of the trade after 1169 reflected the interdependent relationship between Ireland and the Crown and requires little attention here. An Anglo-Irish economic relationship was not new. Dublin had been an integral stopping-point on the trade route between Scandinavia to England. In a miracle account in the *Vita Wulfstani* William of Malmesbury made a passing remark that, ‘some Bristolians, accompanied by other Englishmen, were, as often, on a voyage to Ireland for purposes of trade’. A surviving charter of Henry, duke of Normandy from Rouen, prior to becoming king, demonstrates a flourishing trade route between Ireland, Chester and Rouen c.1150-1.49

Poul Holm suggests that an active component of this link was the continued slave trade between Bristol and Dublin, even though Anglo-Saxon law codes had repeatedly prohibited the selling of Christians as slaves abroad. The slave trade was eventually banned in Bristol by William I and in 1102 this was further reinforced by a general prohibition at the Westminster Council.50 This issue of a Christian slave trade would become important to the twelfth-century English commentators and their views of Ireland. William of Malmesbury’s wrote,

it was at his [Lanfranc’s] instigation too that the king [William I] had frustrated the schemes of these rascals who had an established practice of selling their serfs into Ireland... the king was

---


50 Holm identifies an increase in the slave trade in the second half of the eleventh century which came to an end in the twelfth century due to English legislation, P. Holm, ‘The Slave trade of Dublin, ninth to twelfth centuries’ *Peritia* vol.V (1986), pp.317-45.
reluctant, for he enjoyed a share of the profits from this traffic which they paid him.\textsuperscript{51}

As an established and lucrative practice between England and Ireland, it suggests that King William himself had few moral misgivings. By the twelfth century, Irish involvement in the slave trade would be viewed as an example of Irish criminality and ‘primitive’ development in comparison to the English. In the \textit{EH} Gerald wrote that at the synod of Armagh in 1170 it was ruled that all English slaves should be set free. Indeed, Gerald interpreted the justification for the conquest of Ireland as a punishment for former misdeeds, in particular the slave trade, stating that, ‘so now also those who bought them, have by committing such a monstrous crime, deserved the yoke of slavery.’\textsuperscript{52}

Of particular interest here, in relation to Anglo-Irish trade, is the migration, or expeditions, of Irish merchants to England. Although English customs records for the late-fourteenth and fifteenth centuries offer a good account, sadly this was not as true for the two previous centuries. For the latter two centuries, those recorded are believed to have been primarily of Anglo-Irish descent. Yet as Wendy Childs has noted, ‘with a common language and cultural background’ many may not have been noted in the records as ‘Irish’. For those who were, their Irish association did not necessarily lessen their ability to succeed. Childs lists a number of successful Irish merchants in England, in particular John Bannebury who become mayor of Bristol in 1398.\textsuperscript{53} However, Ralph Griffiths interprets the treatment of one of these Irish merchants, Henry May, as an example of continued and sustained prejudice against the Irish.\textsuperscript{54}

\textbf{Co-operation, Absenteeism and the Chroniclers}

The events of 1169 were the result of diplomatic co-operation between Diarmaid MacMurchadha, king of Leinster and opportunists in England and Wales which heralded

\textsuperscript{51} WM, GRA, iii. 269 pp.496-499; in William’s \textit{Vita Wulfstani} this is accorded to Wulfstan, ‘Vita Wulfstani’ pp.100-101.
\textsuperscript{52} Scott, \textit{EH}, pp.70-71.
momentous change to the course of Irish history. Displacement, intermittent warfare and assimilation for the new and existing inhabitants of Ireland followed swiftly on its heels. The general scholarly consensus holds that Henry II’s involvement was triggered by alarm at Richard de Clare’s growing power, particularly after his consequent increased prominence in Ireland following the death of his father-in-law, Diarmait MacMurchada, and that Henry’s desire to leave England was perhaps further necessitated by his need to leave until the furor over Thomas Becket’s death had subsided.

A further commonplace of Irish historiography is that English kings were inconsistent in their interest in Ireland. Robin Frame, Beth Hartland and Peter Crooks have revised current scholarship on the English kings’ involvement and interest in Ireland in the late-thirteenth century and fourteenth-century and have established that the crown maintained a careful control and interest in Ireland throughout. Only three English kings of this period, Henry II, John and Richard II visited Ireland. Edward III had intended to journey to Ireland in 1332, yet delegated this to his son, Lionel of Clarence, in the 1360s after he was forced to postpone his expedition.

For those in royal government, as the records of the Dublin parliament of 1297 suggest, Ireland may have appeared to have been a land always at boiling point. The loudest complaints rebuked the absentee landlords whose lands were most easily encroached by Gaelic Irish

---

55 There were precedents for such co-operation, for example see entries in the ASC for 937AD (A, B, C, D at the Battle of Brunanburh) 1049AD (D - with Irish assistance a Welsh king sails up the river Usk) 1051-2 (C, D, E - Harold recieves Irish support) 1055 (C, D - Aelfgar’s Irish support) 1067, 1069 AD (D - Harold’s sons’ flee to Ireland and return with support); cf. K. Maund, Ireland, Wales, and England in the Eleventh Century (Woodbridge, 1991) pp.164-5,167. Ireland remained an excellent repository for mercenary forces and support even after the eleventh-century Norman conquest of England. Arnulf, the brother of Robert de Belllesme, earl of Shrewbury, travelled to Ireland in 1100 to gain support for those barons supporting Duke Robert’s cause against Henry I succession to the throne. Similarly, Henry II made use of Diarmait MacMurchada’s fleet in Wales in 1165, Gwynn, Irish Church, p.110; cf Ó Cróinín, Early Medieval Ireland, pp.270, 277.

56 This has been more than adequately discussed by H.G. Orpen, J. Otway-Ruthwen and S. Duffy; the main primary sources are Gerald of Wales’ EH, The Song of Dermot and the Earl and William of Newburgh’s chronicle; Gillingham offers a convincing argument for the use of ‘English’ here rather than Anglo-Norman or Cambro-Norman in. Gillingham, ‘The English Invasion of Ireland’, pp.151-160.

attack.\textsuperscript{58} Sean Duffy suggests that towards the end of the thirteenth century the heightened sense amongst the Anglo-Irish of belonging to a ‘kin’ grouping, even when that actual blood relationship was lacking, exacerbated tensions.\textsuperscript{59} To what extent did news of Gaelic Irish resistance, attack or reconquest, or even infighting between Anglo-Irish communities colour perceptions of Ireland and the Irish in England?

Edward Bruce’s relative success in Ireland also worried those in authority. The subsequent Irish Princes’ \textit{Remonstrance} to the Pope which petitioned for the recognition of Edward Bruce as king, claimed ill-treatment by the English, requiring Edward II to send emissaries on his behalf to the papal curia. A further concern for the Irish parliament was the perceived dangers of assimilation as legislated against in the ‘Statutes of Kilkenny’ in 1366. This evident growing ambiguity in a person’s ‘Anglo-Irish’ or ‘Gaelic Irish’ heritage could, one might expect, only increase in the more distant England. However, when anti-Irish sentiment was expressed in writing in the counter-\textit{Remonstrance} it did not originate in England but from the Justiciar and King’s Council in Ireland. It appeared to be largely retaliatory, accusing the native Irish of similarly culpable deeds as those the Anglo-Irish were accused of in the \textit{Remonstrance}.\textsuperscript{60}

Prior to embarking on his first expedition to Ireland, Richard II made an attempt at combating absenteeism by issuing a decree on 16 June 1396 at Westminster that all ‘men of whatsoever estate or condition born in the king’s land of Ireland’ should return immediately because the king was following with ‘a sufficient fleet of ships and vessels of war.’\textsuperscript{61} Similarly, in 1413, when Henry V banned a number of Irishmen, it was reportedly to promote the, quiet and peace within the realm of England, and for the increase and stocking of the land of Ireland.

\textsuperscript{58} By the end of Edward I’s reign it is estimated that half of Ireland’s Anglo-Irish lords were absent, S.Duffy, \textit{Ireland}, pp.141-144; Frame, \textit{English Lordship}, pp.53-9.
\textsuperscript{60} Watt, \textit{Church in Medieval Ireland}, pp.139-142.
\textsuperscript{61} CCR: \textit{Richard II} (1392-1396) p.295.
The few exceptions to this banishment were those that were in the fields of education and religion and also included, ‘merchants born in Ireland of good report, and their apprentices at present’. The essence of this was repeated once again on March 22, 1417, at Westminster. Yet again, the reason stressed was that ‘the king’s will is to provide for the safe guard of Ireland against the rebel Irish.’ Evidently, it was not solely due to fears of Irish violence, particularly amongst the students, or even a general xenophobia but an attempt to curb absenteeism and what was being seen as the encroachment of Irish lands. In the fifteenth century, particularly during the years of Henry VI’s minority, the situation was considerably aggravated by the conflict between two high-ranking Anglo-Irish landowners: Lord Talbot and the Duke of Ormonde (both had held the position of Lieutenant of Ireland consecutively).

The English chroniclers largely ignored affairs in Ireland. Brief insertions regarding Henry II’s visit to Ireland, John’s knighthood by Henry II and his excursion to Ireland, Piers Gaveston’s exile to Ireland and Edward Bruce’s mission to Ireland were rare exceptions. In the anonymous Vita Edward Secundi, in a section regarding an early defeat of Edward Bruce and his followers by Edward Butler, the Justiciar, the description of the Irish was evocative of the sentiments expressed by William of Malmesbury and Gerald of Wales. They were depicted as a pastoral uncultivated people, living outside towns in the wilderness of the mountains and forests. Richard II’s expeditions to Ireland gained greater attention: Henry Knighton and Thomas Walsingham, writing during Richard II’s reign included incidental remarks about his journey there; Jean Froissart offered a lengthier description. Froissart also offered a rare description of what were supposed to be four native Irish princes: they were represented as crude in their appearance, behaviour and even eating habits. This description too is reminiscent of the TH. Froissart had asked William de Lisle, one of Richard’s courtiers, about St.

---

Patrick’s Purgatory ‘and whether the stories told about it were true’. Although this was information that could have been gained from a number of different sources, when Froissart stated that, ‘he questioned him about the wonders and strange things which people say are to be seen there, and inquired whether there was anything in it’, it does strongly suggest that this may have been information which Froissart gleaned from the TH or some Gerald-derived text, such as, perhaps, the Polychronicon.  

‘The Irish’

Medieval English views of Ireland were not influenced by any threat of an invading Irish force. Unlike in the mid-seventeenth century, the threat of Irish forces as a punitive force invading England was not feared, except perhaps during the years of power for Robert and Edward Bruce. Only scattered examples of overt distrust survive. According to Froissart, Thomas, duke of Gloucester criticised Richard II’s expedition to Ireland for in his view,

Ireland is not a place where there’s anything worth winning. The Irish are a poor and nasty people, with a miserable country that is quite uninhabitable.  

The fourteenth-century preaching handbook Fasciculum Morum suggests a view of Ireland perhaps influenced by literary works rather than any knowledge of Ireland and the Irish. The single comment concerning Ireland in the chapter on Avarice stated that:

in Ireland and Wales one readily finds thieves that steal their neighbours’ cows, oxen, and other

---


Froissart, Chronicles, p.405.

Froissart, Chronicles, p.422.
cattle, for which they are openly called ‘thieves’.

But not so in England, God be praised.⁶⁸

A fundamental issue which dogs medieval Anglo-Irish historiography is the definition of who the ‘Irish’ were. Were all those born in Ireland to be considered ‘Irish’ even if they considered themselves distinct from the native Irish because of the English origins of their ancestors? Or more importantly at what point did they become ‘the English born in Ireland’? A cross-border aristocracy remained very much in existence, albeit perhaps to a lesser degree than in the late-twelfth/early thirteenth century. Nor was migration of the English (from England) static to particular periods. The Irish princes’ Remonstrance of 1317 mentioned ‘the English inhabiting our land, who call themselves of the middle nation, are so different in character from the English of England’. Yet, the Statutes of Kilkenny of 1366 stressed that ‘no difference of allegiance shall henceforth be made between the English born in Ireland, and the English born in England, by calling them English hobbe, or Irish dog.’ In England, the tendency was to refer to the Anglo-Irish and native Irish collectively as Irish, as evident in the chronicle of Adam of Usk; perhaps with a greater emphasis on their provenance than as a symbol of collective identity. Some did make the additional distinction between the two. Thomas Walsingham in Ypodigma Neustriae wrote that the ‘Hibernici’ had been ordered home, however that was ‘because the mere Irish, rivals of the Anglo-Irish were destroying the land.’ Similarly, according to the anonymous Eulogium historiarum, Richard’s purpose for his expedition was to assist the ‘the true Irish English’ (‘Hibernici veri Anglici’) against the ‘the pure Irish’ (‘puros hibernicos’). John Lydon suggests that from the late-fourteenth century that there was a growing association in England between the terms ‘hibernicus’ and ‘inimicus’. The term ‘the wylde Irishman’ was becoming more consistently used for those not loyal to the crown, irrespective of their origin.⁶⁹ Clearly, the understanding of, or even criticism of the Irish, was becoming a matter of greater importance when those of


English origin were also beginning to be counted within those numbers. It is within this intellectual, political and social climate that the dissemination of the *TH* must be viewed.

Trade, religion and politics allowed for a cross-pollination of Anglo-Irish influence, but the very silence on difference and the lack of ‘Otherness’ within much of the rhetoric of the surviving sources suggests not only a tolerance but working relationships. It is perhaps unsurprising that observers from the twelfth century, when England, accustomed to almost a century of economic, martial, legal, social and religious changes with considerably more continental influences than before, would perceive customs in the Irish as wholly alien to them; which, as John Gillingham has suggested, solidified an imperialistic English view.\(^7^0\) This would prove to be the framework within which observers of Ireland in England would view the Irish. England continued to embroil itself in continental affairs, and remained a principal political player in Western Christendom perhaps enabling such notions of superiority to grow, embedding it firmly within the English psyche.

---

Thirty-nine medieval manuscripts of the *TH* are extant. Although the majority contain the complete Latin text, some are abbreviations, translations or may contain fragments of the text. The most recent list of the medieval manuscripts of the *TH* can be found in Catherine Rooney’s unpublished doctoral thesis. She added the following six medieval manuscripts to those previously known through the list provided in the appendices of Robert Bartlett’s *Gerald of Wales*: Leiden, B.P.L 13, Cambridge, Emmanuel College 1.1.3, Cambridge, Gonville & Caius College 290/682, Manchester JRUL 217, BNF Latin 11111, and London, College of Arms Vincent 418 and BL, Royal 13 B XVIII. Two further manuscripts, BL Royal 13 D I and Bodleian, Fairfax 20 can also be added to this list. An additional manuscript, now lost should also be considered. Once a part of the Phillips library as MS 26642, the codex was auctioned at Sotheby’s on 25th November 1969. This manuscript, previously bound with Phillips MS 26233 (now Aberystwyth, NLW, 13210) and Phillips MS 26641 (now Princeton, Scheide Library 159, formerly Phillips 26641 and then subsequently Edinburgh, NL Acc. 9193/13), was auctioned first to Dawson’s of Pall Mall, and then sold to the antiquarian bookseller and collector Alan Thomas on 27th November 1969, after which it disappeared from view.

The table below lists the manuscripts of the *TH* and includes their provenance and date (where known), and their categorization into recensions by Dimmock, Bartlett and by myself. I have collated the text of Bk.I of Gerald’s *TH* of all the manuscripts below except for Paris, BNF 11111, Cambridge Emmanuel College 1.13 and CCC 400 (for the final manuscript I have relied on Dimmock’s collation of Bk. I).

---

71 This total includes the lost Phillips MS 26642.
72 At his death in 1981, this manuscript was not in his collection sold at Sotheby’s and may instead have been sold privately in the intervening years. This manuscript is not listed in the A. Thomas sale catalogues (1969 -1974, cat. 21-27, 29-33). It was sold to Dawson’s of Pall Mall for approx. $7200. The catalogue suggested that it was a late thirteenth-century manuscript (c.1280).
## Fig. 2 Manuscripts of the TH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rec.</th>
<th>Dimmock/ [Bartlett] Rec.</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cambridge, UL Mm.5.30</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ramsey Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>Cambridge, St. Catherine’s College Lv.87</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN1</td>
<td>Paris, BNF Latin 11111</td>
<td>13th (perhaps 1290)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Irish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rb2</td>
<td>London, BL Royal 13 B XVIII</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>London, BL Harley 3724</td>
<td>14th (early/ 13th RB?)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presented to Peterhouse after 1418, Thomas Lane/Allen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cambridge, Peterhouse 1.8.1</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>London, College of Arms Vincent 418</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>London, BL Additional 44922</td>
<td>12th - 13th c.1200</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson B 483</td>
<td>12th - 13th c.1200</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le</td>
<td>Leiden, B.P.L 13</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Les Dunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Douai, BM 887 (872)</td>
<td>12-13th c.1200</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
<td>Merton Priory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 400</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Rawlinson B 188</td>
<td>12-13th c.1200</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Christ Church Canterbury Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>London, BL Arundel 14</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN48</td>
<td>Paris, BNF 4846</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Cambridge, Emmanuel College 1.1.3</td>
<td>15th (1481)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>John Gunthorpe, dean of Well's Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cambridge, UL Ff.1.27</td>
<td>14th early</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bury St Edmunds Abbey : Copy of Royal 13 B VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Dublin, NLI 700</td>
<td>12th - 13th c.1200</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
<td>Hereford, Cathedral of St. Ethelbert Vicar's Choral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Laud Misc 720</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>'late editions'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Aberystwyth, NLW 3074D</td>
<td>13th-14thc early</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>[unidentified]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>London, BL Royal 13 A XIV</td>
<td>13th-14thc early</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>'late editions'</td>
<td>Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>London, BL Cotton Cleopatra D V</td>
<td>14th early</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>'late editions'</td>
<td>Robert de Popoulton, Yorkshire or Hulne?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN41</td>
<td>Paris, BNF Latin 4126</td>
<td>14th early</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>'late editions'</td>
<td>Vm, B, C, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>London, Lambeth Palace, 622</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>'late editions'</td>
<td>V, B, S, C, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>London, BL, Additional 17920</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Abb 1</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>Rouerge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>London, BL, Additional 19513</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Abb 1</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>Avignon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>London, BL Harley 4003</td>
<td>14thc</td>
<td>Abb 2</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>Holme St Benet's?/ Norwich?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>London, BL Royal 14 C VI</td>
<td>14th - early</td>
<td>Exc 1</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>V, B, C, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fb</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Fairfax 20</td>
<td>14th - mid</td>
<td>Exc 1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Norwich - Simon Bozon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>London, BL Cotton Claudius E VIII</td>
<td>14th - late</td>
<td>Exc 1</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>Norwich for Hugh Despencer, b. of Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>Cambridge, UL Mm.2.18</td>
<td>14th - late</td>
<td>Geoffrey Whighton</td>
<td>Exc 2</td>
<td>Compiled and written by Geoffrey de Wightoun, Oxford Franciscans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>London, BL Royal 13 D I</td>
<td>14th/15th</td>
<td>Exc 3</td>
<td>exc</td>
<td>St.Peter's Church, Cornhill London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Cambridge, Gonville &amp; Caius 290/682</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Exc 4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Adam de Lakenheath, Chancellor of Cambridge 1372-1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>Manchester, JRUL Latin 217</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Exc 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Stephen Lawless, prior of St. Mary's Dublin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Untraced Phillips 26642 last with Alan Thomas 1969 | 13th (1280?) | un. | n/a | Robertsbridge? |

**Textual tradition**

The manuscript tradition of the *TH* is one of overlapping clusters of stemmata. James Dimmock categorized it into five groups: the first, second, third, fourth recensions and the ‘late MSS’, which he believed also shared a common recension. The basis of his classification was in relation to additions made to the text. The first recension was structurally different and considerably shorter. Hence, structural differences, with the occasional textual addition and a recitational prologue, exemplified the second recension. Further additional material typified the third and fourth recensions. Yet, the additions made to the fourth recension bore similarities to the additional material found in what Dimmock termed were a series of ‘late’ manuscripts. The changes to these, he proposed, were due to additions most likely to have been done by
someone other than Gerald.\(^1\) However, the discovery of NLI 700 (I), a late twelfth-century witness of this last category of \(TH\) manuscripts changed how these ‘late manuscripts’ were viewed.

For the most part, Robert Bartlett’s summary of manuscripts followed Dimmock’s model of the \(TH\) textual tradition. The summary included other previously undiscovered manuscripts, especially those containing excerpts made of the \(TH\) such as BL, Cotton Claudius E VIII (Ce) and BL, Royal 14 C VI (R14), and offered further recension information.\(^2\) Brian Scott’s research on the manuscripts of the \(EH\), many of which circulated with a copy of the \(TH\), further augmented the textual tradition of the \(TH\). Scott demonstrated the importance of \(I\) and also highlighted the relationship between \(I\) and Dimmock’s ‘late mss’: BL, Cotton Cleopatra D V (D), BL, Royal 13 A XIV (Ra), BL, Harley 4003 (Hb), NLW, 3074 D (Ab), as well as the additions made to Royal 13 B VIII (R) which were incorporated within CUL, Ff.1.27 (F) (Dimmock’s 4\(^{\text{th}}\) recension). Furthermore, he contended that many of the extant late-twelfth/early-thirteenth-century manuscripts may have originated from a scriptorium, or perhaps scriptoria, directed personally by Gerald.\(^3\)

Extant are a number of manuscripts which display the various recensions in transition; some in the form of marginal additions later incorporated into recensions, as will be seen in \(R\), \(I\), & CCC 400 (C), others in the abrupt shifts from the copying of one to the other as can be seen in BL, Additional 34762 (A34). The multitude of changes and borrowings from various manuscripts and recensions over a period of time, some perhaps under Gerald’s own supervision, suggests that the transmission of the manuscripts of the \(TH\) is one woven with overlapping recensions and later changes.

**Recension A**

This, the earliest and most concise version, was translated by J.J O’Meara in 1951 and used for the Penguin translation of 1982. Dimmock made no exaggeration when he wrote that

---

3. Scott, \(EH\) pp.lxi, xlv-xlvi, lxx, With little certainty as to Gerald’s location, especially in the later years, it is perhaps best to consider the scriptoria from where he may have had manuscripts copied.
it ‘contains far less than half of the treatise as it finally issued from his pen some thirty years, perhaps, afterwards’.\textsuperscript{4} However, particularly in light of the discovery of \textit{I}, his view that the changes to the \textit{TH} occurred over such a long period of time, should be treated with some caution. This earliest version concentrates most fully on the subject at hand: Ireland and the Irish. Completed c.1188, it lacked many of the additional matter, the theological and moralizing exegetical digressions, that were later to be found included.

\textbf{Fig.13 Rec. A Stemma}

Of the seven surviving manuscripts of this version, CUL Mm.5.30 (M) a late-twelfth-century manuscript, is believed to be the earliest. This portable single-text codex lacks the third folio of the first quire which contains the text of the dedication and the first chapter of the first recension. It begins again in the middle of the second chapter. Consequently, Dimmock used

the late-thirteenth/early-fourteenth-century Harley manuscript and the fifteenth-century Peterhouse manuscript to establish this version; as did J.J. O’Meara in his translation. Sc, which contains the complete text of the TH, dates from the late thirteenth century/early fourteenth-century. Rooney suggests that Paris, BNF 11111 (BN1) another late-thirteenth century manuscript may have shared the same exemplar as the Harley manuscript.\(^5\) Despite its mutilated form, the extant first seven chapters and the preface of the fourteenth-century manuscript BL, Royal 12 B XVIII (Rb2) reveals it to be of this recension. Similarly, the first six chapters of BL, Additional 34762 (A34) immediately identify the manuscript as belonging to rec.A, although midway through Bk.I.12 the text changes to that of a rec.B. The small close hand found in this manuscript, is very similar to one found in the manuscript of the De Inventionibus and Speculum Duorum at the Vatican library, Reg. Lat. 470, particularly as seen on f.53r and f.69v. This manuscript is believed to have been closely influenced by Gerald.\(^6\) Could A34 have also originated from within Gerald’s circle and thereby represent a hybrid text in transition? Indeed this hybrid manuscript may reveal the fortunes of manuscripts of rec.A during Gerald’s lifetime. In a letter sent to Hereford Cathedral c.1218 Gerald wrote that he was sending new versions of the TH and EH and asked for the earlier versions to be returned.\(^7\) Could his efforts to update copies of the TH thus explain why only one complete rec.A manuscript survives from Gerald’s lifetime? College of Arms, Vincent 418 (V) and Peterhouse 1.8.1(P), both of the fifteenth century, are also of this recension.

The immediate mark of identification of this version is the lack of the recitational introduction, found within almost all other manuscripts.\(^8\) However, the structure and content of Bk.I’s first four chapters of this cluster of manuscripts is a more conclusive indicator of this edition. The differences between the opening portion of rec.A and the other recensions are demonstrated by the table below:

---

\(^5\) As I have not had the opportunity to view this manuscript or a microfilm of it, it has not been considered within the subsequent discussions.

\(^6\) Speculum Duorum, trans. M. Richter, see Fig.2 and Fig.4 pp.lx, lxii; although much of the characteristics of the hand in Fig.3 are also similar, the ‘et-notae’ prove to be the distinguishing feature.

\(^7\) ‘For in the meantime I have sent by the same bearer the T.H and the Prophetic History of the Conquest of Ireland in rough form, two different works, but bound together in one volume. When you have received from me an approved and emended text- which you will very soon – please send back the other one.’ Scott, EH, p.liii; cf. GW, Opera, 1, p.409.

\(^8\) The exceptions, excluding the manuscripts with abbreviations and excerpts are: W and Ab. In A33 this section is missing, however, it is very likely to have been in the original text.
Recension B

The changes to rec. A were not long in coming. Rec. B includes the recitational introduction written specifically for Gerald’s public reading of the TH held in Oxford, in 1188 or 1189. The main identifying markers of this edition are the inclusion of this recitational introduction, the structural changes to the first four chapters of Bk.I, and in Bk.I, the following additions: 9

Bk I:

Introitus: add Introitus ad recit.

ch. II: add ‘Hispanicum... esse videtur’ ahead of the paragraph ‘Sic quidem... in latum expanditur’ which in Rec. A was part of ch. I

ch. III: add ‘Solinus vero in centum... Hibernia fecundatur’ ahead of the paragraph ‘Est autem hibernia... esse dignoscitur’ which in Rec. A was part of ch. I

ch. VI in Rec. A this chapter formed the end of the preceding chapter. Add ‘Terra nimium... pluvis abundant’, ‘Ceterum ipsos... constet, et carere’, ‘Ob tantam igitur... esse putantes.’

ch. VII add ‘Hic autem notandum... Connacciam occidentales.’ at the end. [C-margin]

ch. IX add ‘Quaelibet enim regna... regnum anguillis caret’

ch. XII add ‘Quoniam igitur longe... feliciter exulare compellunt’, ‘Forsan et hoc signare... velocitatis vigor accrescit’ (excluding the quote from Eccl. ch.XXXV v.26).

ch. XIII This chapter was not only expanded from its counterpart in Rec. A but it also endured considerably structural changes. This chapter in rec. B is distinctive from recensions C and D because it lacks five biblical quotes (found in the margins of C and text of D see below, and in L) and the section ‘Numquid enim olla... illam diligentibus.’

ch. XIV add ‘Periculum quoque avis... tuba vocem exaltant’, ‘Acetae vero... copia major.’

---

9 Only substantial additions, of more than one phrase to the text of Rec. A, have been included, principally as shown in Rh, W, A44 and A34 (from Bk.I, ch.14 onwards) from Book I. Missing folios from Rh do not allow an examination of the text from Book I ch. XXIV to Book II, ch XI.
ch. XV  add ‘Sed hi quidem... immunem arbitrarer’ ‘Ad idem etiam... ex cera procreatio.’
ch. XXI  An entirely new chapter to rec.B.
ch. XXIII like rec.A most of ch. XXIII is lacking and instead the section ‘Falcons Hibernia praeter... Desunt et philomenae’ of ch. XXIII forms the conclusion to XXII.
ch. XXIV  add ‘Hanc autem... facit herbositas’ ‘Sub arbore .. mane conspicitur.’
ch. XXVI  add ‘Videtur tamen.. distare consuevit.’ [C-margin]
ch. XXVII except for the section ‘Talpae quidem.. et nocentissimum’, which in rec.A forms the conclusion of the preceding chapter, the rest of the chapter is new to rec.B.
ch. XXXII add ‘Quinimmo omnia.. ac sedasse tumorem.’
ch. XXXIII add ‘Advenarum tamen... porcinæ nocent.’ [C-margin]
ch. XXXVI add ‘Praeter enim usalìa... varietates tot adversitatem.’
ch. XXXVII add ‘Quanto siquidem.. hic Pallas atque Diana.’
ch. XL the opening section ‘Quanto igitur.. benigiore natura respexit’ forms the conclusion of the preceding section in rec.A.

Of the surviving manuscripts of rec.B, all but one of the seven date from Gerald’s lifetime, i.e., the late-twelfth century/early-thirteenth century. The seventh is the fourteenth-century Leiden, BPL 13 (Le).

Fig.1 5 Rec. B Stemma
Westminster Abbey, 23 (W) could not have served as an exemplar for any of the other manuscripts of this cluster. It contains only the first eight paragraphs of Bk.I ch.13 unlike the considerably extended chapter found in all other manuscripts of this recension. Indeed, if Bk.I ch.13 is used to trace the textual tradition of this recension, it can be seen that in the margins of C additional material is found alongside this extended chapter, mainly in the form of extra biblical and patristic quotations. A34 mentioned above as the hybrid rec.A/B, appears to share a close relationship with C. This manuscript changes recension in the middle of ch.12 and this shift in recension is particularly marked in ch.13. This manuscript uses the original rec.A version of ch.13 excluding the final paragraph, and then incorporates the newer version with all the marginal material found in C within the body of its text. Using Bk.I ch.13 again as an example, it can be noted that BL, Additional 44922 (A44) and Bodl. Rawlinson B. 483 (Bb) show common characteristics, they both include the same selected marginal material from C.

Furthermore, the marginal additions of C in Bk.I and the additions incorporated into A34 and Douai 887 (Do) make both manuscripts hybrids of a sort, as they bear a striking resemblance to the additional material found in rec.C. However, the lack of the second and final paragraph of Bk.I ch.40, and therefore the final paragraph of Bk.I, identify A34 as a manuscript of rec.B. Similarly, at first glance Do appears to share most of the characteristics of rec.C, and indeed Catherine Rooney has suggested that it was most closely linked to B and its derivatives. However, Do, like A34, also shares Bk.I ch.40 and other variations with the Rec.BC branch of transmission and hence is more likely to have been derived from C. Could C have been an exemplar, or a copy of the exemplar, which produced the additional material in rec.C and rec.D?

Le displays certain peculiarities which may suggest that it was copied from two different exemplars or from an exemplar copied in that way. At first glance Le appears to have

---

10 This shift in recension in ch.13 coincides with what might be a change in hand (or perhaps merely a lighter ink, in a slightly different size) on f. 6v of A34.
11 The two manuscripts share with C, in the body of their texts, the two quotations found in the margins of paragraphs 17 and 18. However, they exclude the marginal material from C in paragraphs, 2, 15, 18 (three further quotations), 19 and 21.
12 In Bk.I there is, however, a striking omission which may help demonstrate a more definitive relationship with Do and either rec.C or rec.D. The clause ‘ideoque, natura... quam spatiosas’ from Bk.I ch.4 in Do is lacking in C and rec.C, but is a found in rec.D. Could this suggest that rec.C and rec.D evolved within the same period of time?
13 Rooney, Manuscripts, pp.48-49.
many of the marginalia from C within the body of its text. Yet, there are three instances within Bk.I where the Le agrees with R, B, F and I:

Introitus: C, D etc., ‘nihil’; R, B, F & Le ‘nil’

Recension C

The inclusion of Gerald’s letter to William de Vere with many of the rec.C manuscripts suggests that this recension was completed before William’s death on 24th December 1198. In addition, B also offers some further chronological limits for the dating of this recension. Towards the end of the manuscript is a half-composed dedication to William de Longchamp, bishop of Ely. The TH in R, which was copied from B, judiciously omits even this partial dedication. The incomplete dedication in B may be explained by William de Longchamp’s forced expulsion from the kingdom in the October of 1191.

Supplementary to the additions to Rec.B, and all marginal annotations in C, the distinguishing features of this edition are as follows:

Bk. I

Introitus: ‘Unde et in egregiiis… vatum presagia vivam’; ‘nec tantum in hac.. undecunque concordia’
ch. II: add ‘Tante siquidem… Loegriam dixere.’ [C-margin, D]
ch. III: add ‘Sicut enim Gallia… aura fecundat’ [C-margin, D]
ch. VI: add ‘Vel potius si non.. quam corrumperet’ [C-margin, D]
ch. XII: add ‘Item in Ecclesiastico.. malitiam mulieris’ (quotation from Eccl. XXV. 26) [C-margin];
ch. XIII: add ‘Unde et… dicuntur’[C-margin, D, Le] add ‘Non enim cogitationes.. vestris’(quotation from Isaiah LV v.8) [C-margin, A34, D, Le]; ‘Item “Mel

nimis.. opprimetur a gloria” ‘(three quotations from Proverbs XXV v.27, Proverbs XXV v.16, Proverbs XXV v.27) [C-margin, A34, D, Le (has only the second two quotes); ‘Item in eodem, “non justificabitur vir compositus Deo” (quotation from Job XXV v.4) [C-margin, A34, D, Le] ‘Numquid enim olla... illam diligentibus se’ (includes quotes from Eccl. I 2, Eccl. I 6. [C-margin, A34, D, Le]

ch. XX : *add* ‘Haud aliter animalia.. somnus alit’; [C-margin, A34]

ch. XXIII: *add* ‘De crioeriis hic albis, earumque naturis, Item, sicut albae.. se posset reperiri’. This addition forms a new chapter which is appended to the final section of the previous chapter, ‘Falones Hibernia.. et philomenae’ as found in Rec. A & Rec. B. [C-margin, A34, Le]

ch. XXVII: *add* ‘Idem, exiguuo.. terribilis esse perhibetur’ [C-margin, A34, D]

ch. XL: *add* ‘Veresimile tamen esse.. inclementia major’

Of *rec.C*, there are five surviving manuscripts. Two of these, *B* and *R*, are late-twelfth century manuscripts. Paris, BN 4846 Lat (BN48), BL, Arundel 14 (A) and BL, Additional 33991 (A33) may be slightly later, dating from the late twelfth century/early thirteenth century. The fifth and last manuscript of this group is *F* an early fourteenth-century manuscript. The map of Britain was a shared distinctive feature of *A, A33* and *BN48*, found also in *C* (*Rec.B*) and incorporated within the map of Europe found in *I*, f.48r (*Rec.D*).

*Fig. I 6 Rec.C stemma*
B is likely to have been the exemplar for the original text of R. However, R’s marginal additions suggest an additional source.\textsuperscript{15} F was copied from R, both in its original form and with the marginal additions interpolated within the text. The inclusion of this additional material in R and the body of text in F has often been viewed as a different recension in itself. However, the considerable resemblance between these additions and those in I make these two manuscripts of a hybrid recension between Rec.C and Rec.D. The inclusion of the IK in B suggests that the earliest version, Rec.Cβ, could have been written was 1191.

**Recension D**

Supplementary to the additions made above to rec.C, the distinguishing features of this recension are:

**Bk.I**

ch. XII: \textit{add} ‘Fertur etiam hoc.. remittit illesam’ [R- margin]

ch. XXIII: \textit{add} ‘Communiter etiam... revertuntur’

ch.XXVIII: \textit{add} ‘Unde satis historice... in Hibernia nullae’ [I – margin]

ch. XXIX: \textit{add} ‘De his autem... venena valent’ [I, R – margin; F]

ch. XXXI: \textit{add} ‘Contigit autem nostris diebus... resumpta repatriavit’

ch. XL: \textit{change to} ‘Verisimile tamen videtur... humidior temperatos’

This recension has generally been known as a ‘later’ version or a fifth recension, primarily because the witnesses to the version as seen by Dimmock were all of the fourteenth century or later. Formerly Phillips 6914, I was rediscovered in 1946 when it was bought at Sotheby’s. Until then it was believed that the changes within the other manuscripts were due to later scribal interpolations. I, and its late-twelfth century script and illustrations offered a different avenue of thought. Bodleian Laud 720 (Ba) containing similar illustrations, with many textual similarities further reinforced this.

\textsuperscript{15} With regards to the text of the \textit{EH} see, Scott, \textit{EH}, pp. xliii-xlix.
This version appears to have had the most sustained transmission, with extant copies from the late-twelth century to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Two particular chapters in Bk.I typify this recension: chapters 9 and 40. The changed last paragraph of ch.40 ‘Verisimile tamen.. humidior temperatos’ is peculiar only to this recension. Similarly, ch.9 demonstrates the textual similarities of this group. For example, all the manuscripts of this group in paragraph 3 lack the words ‘lochia scilicet’ but instead after the word ‘trahunt’ have ‘Lochie quoque vel nulle sunt hic valve rare’16. This addition is found in the margin of R, further supporting Brian Scott’s discussion of the relationship between I and R.17

A further insertion, ‘item ut Italia, Apulia, Calabria, Sicilia salmonibus’ found in the margin of I and within the text of BL, Harley 4003 (Ha), can also be found in the margin of C of rec.B. As mentioned above, the marginal additions of the C can be found in the manuscripts of rec.C and rec.D (although for I some of these are marginal additions rather than within the text). There is clearly a link, but a direct association between this manuscript and rec.C is harder to ascertain.

16 There are some slight variants: Cl and BN41 have ‘vel perrare’ and Ab has ‘vel rare’.
17 Some further examples of this are Bk.I 12 paragraph 13 ‘Fertur... illesam’; the final clause of ch.14 ‘Diemque laudantes.. innumere’ although the manuscripts of rec. C all have ‘infinite’ instead of ‘innumere’; and Bk.I 29 paragraph 3 ‘De his.. venena valent’; For a discussion of this relationship with regards to the text of the EH see Scott, EH, pp.xliv-xlix.
Of the fourteenth-century manuscripts, BL Cotton Cleopatra (Cl) and BL, Royal 13 A XIV(Ra) share many orthographical similarities. A further, previously unattributed manuscript, NLW, 3074D(Ab) can also be added to this group. Lambeth Palace 622(La), a fifteenth-century manuscript which like Ab also lacks the illustrations of I and Ba, also contains this recension of the text. All of these manuscripts, with the exceptions of Ba and BN41, contain both the TH and the EH.

*****

Although Dimmock had suggested a period of around thirty years during which Gerald may have made changes to the TH, the extant manuscripts suggest that most of these changes are more likely to have been made within little more than a decade from when Gerald originally finished the TH. Rec.B, with its recitational introduction was certainly completed a couple of years after Gerald first finished the work, perhaps as early as late-1188 although it cannot be precisely dated. The dedication to William de Longchamp in B, discarded midway after his expulsion, suggests that the text which is of Rec.Cβ would have to have been completed sometime around October 1191 and R which was copied from B, without the now defunct dedication to William de Longchamp, must have been completed after October 1191. This dating of the two manuscripts to late 1191 or shortly after is further supported by Gerald’s own dates for when he composed the IK. Both B and R contain the triplet of texts which include the TH, EH and IK. However, rec.D remains harder to date more precisely. Although Scott argued convincingly by means of script, layout and the text of the EH that I was of a much earlier date than Dimmock had suggested, the date given of c.1200 remains vague and imprecise. In chapter IV I argue that the reason for the lack of extant manuscripts of Gerald’s quartet of Irish and Welsh texts in circulation together was because of Gerald’s loss of favour combined with a realisation, shortly after the DK was finished in c.1194, that the audience for his welsh texts was going to be limited. After this date, the only collections of the TH, EH and IK together are found in manuscripts which were ultimately copied from an exemplar which was created before 1194. Therefore, I which is thought to have emerged from Gerald’s

18 See pp.230-234.
own scriptorium/scriptora, and contains only the TH and EH was sent in that form very specifically by design. Although this cannot be fully substantiated as yet, the date of I’s creation is more likely to have been in the last few years of the twelfth-century than at the end of the th is likely to be closer in time to 1194 than away from it.

**Abbreviations and Excerpts**

The following ten manuscripts fall into two groups: those which contain an abbreviated form of the TH and those which contain selected extracts. In the first group are: BL, Royal 19513 (A19), BL, Royal 17920 (A17) and Hb; and in the second are: BL, Royal 14 C VI (R14), Bodleian Fairfax 20 (Fb), BL, Cotton Claudius E VIII (Ce), CUL Mm.2 (CM2), 18, Royal 13 D I (R2), Gonville and Caius 290/68 (G) and JRUL Latin 217 (MJ). Notably, none are contemporary to Gerald’s lifetime, or even later in the thirteenth century. All ten manuscripts date from the fourteenth-century.

**Abbreviation 1 [Abb.I] – Philip of Slane’s *Libellus de descriptione hiberniae***

The presentation copy of Philip of Slane’s abbreviation of the TH was written as an offering of documentative evidence on behalf of Edward II to Pope John XXII in response to the Irish Princes’ Remonstrance. This copy has not survived, but A19, a copy made most probably at Avignon has, as does A17, a Provençal translation.\(^{20}\) Philip of Slane’s use of the TH is as follows:

Bk I.  

Bk. III.  
[III.4-5] the fourth invasion of Ireland, Slanius king of all Ireland, the provinces of Ireland.

\(^{19}\) The significance of these abbreviations and extracts will be discussed below, pp.95-103.

\(^{20}\) Wilhelmina Wüstefeld argues that the translation could not have been made from A19 but from a different manuscript, because of the poor copying quality of A19, W. Wüstefeld, ‘Two Versions of the Purgatory of St Patrick’, *Non Nova, Sed Nove: Melanges de Civilisation Medievale*, ed. W. Noomen (Gröningen, 1984) p.293.


Bk. III.  [III.1-9] the various invasions of Ireland and the English king’s right to Ireland; [III.37] The Norwegian invasion under Tuireais; [III.40-46] The Norwegians in Ireland, the various kings from Tuireais to Ruraidh O’Connor, and subjugation of Ireland only accomplished by Tuireais and Henry II.  

Abbreviation 2 [Abb.2]

*Hb* is the sole fourteenth-century witness to this abbreviated form of the *TH*. This abbreviation was grafted from a manuscript of *Rec.D*. The abbreviated portion is not extensive and affects Bks.I and II only. The altered chapters are listed below:


The alterations involve the remocal of allegorical explanations which accompany the descriptions.  

---

21 The text of *A17* has been published by J. Ulrich, *Frère Philipe. Les Merveilles de Ireland: texte provençal* (Leipzig 1892). The concordance above was provided by Jacques Ulrich, alongside the translation and the text of the *TH* p.iv.: Ulrich states that ‘qui abrègeet omet beaucoup et n’ajoute presque rien’; and gives four instances of these with p. rels of 2 (line 8-18), 24 (12-15), 25 (4-8), 26 (line 12) 28 (line 2) and this last lengthy interpolation is mainly to add information about the Purgatory of St. Patrick as discussed by Wustefeld.  

22 There is one exception: in [I.22] one allegorical explanation comparing the crows’ action of dropping shell fish to the ground from a height to smash the shell with the devil raising men to prominence and allowing them to be embroiled.
Excerpt 1 [Exc.1]

Exc.1 is found in R14, Fb and Ce. It is a compilation of certain carefully selected chapters of the TH and the EH. It consists of the first six chapters of Bk.III and the opening rubric of chapter seven where it ends abruptly to be followed by excerpts from the EH. The relationship of these manuscripts and their provenance will be discussed in greater detail below. The readings from the selection taken from the TH suggest that Exc.1 agrees most closely with readings of rec.B. The order of selections is as follows:

Bk III: [III.1] Arrival of Caesaria, omitting Gerald’s doubts about the accounts of the Flood ‘Verumtamen cunctis.. fuerat reservata’; [III.2] Arrival of Bartholanus, omitting the marvels; [III.3] Arrival of Neimihd, omitting the final paragraph on Ruanus’ death, (a brief reference is made to this is made in the margin); [III.4] Invasion of the five sons of Dela [III.5] Slainge become overking of Ireland; [III.6] The invasion of the songs of King Miles of Spain [III.7] conflict between Hebero and Herimon – title only;

EH:


Bk.I: [I.46] Description of Henry II.

Bk.II: [II.5] privilege of Pope Alexander III and Pope Adrian IV.

Fig.1 8 Exc.1 stemma

Recension B?

Exc. 1

early 14th, before 1323

BL, Royal 14 C VI

mid 14th [1344-1352]

Bodleian, Fairfax 20

late 14th, c.1400

BL, Cotton Claudius E VIII

with acts of vice is included, but this may be because it immediately precedes a short section of the inability of crows to build safe nests for their young.

23 See pp.95-102.
Excerpt 2 [Exc.2]

Exc.2, like excerpts 3, 4 and 5, survives as a unique witness in CM2. It was primarily a compilation of marvels selected by the fourteenth-century Oxford friar, Geoffrey Wighton. The order of selections is as follows:


Bk.II [II.4] Lake in Munster with two islands; [II.5] Lake in Ulster with Patrick’s Purgatory; [II.6] Island with incorruptible bodies; [II.7] marvellous wells; [II.8] other marvellous wells; [II.9] origins of Lough Neagh; [II.10] the fish with gold teeth; [II.12] the phantom island; [II.13] of Iceland; [II.14] of the northern whirlpool [II.15] the Isle of Man; [II.16] the creation of islands after the flood; [II.19] the female shape-shifter is offered the sacrament; [II.28] miracles of St. Kevin; [II.29] miracle of St. Colman; [II.30] wine-producing stone in Munster; [II.34] miracles in Kildare; [II.36] St. Brigid fire which only women can tend; [II.48] the archer who approached St. Brigid’s fire and his punishment; [II.44] Dublin’s speaking cross; [II.46] the cross’s refusal of the penny; [II.50] the punishment of Philip of Worcester and Hugh of Tyrell.

Bk.III [III.12] the musical abilities of the Irish.

The inclusion of the extracts on the dormice [Bk.I. ch.20] and singing grasshoppers [Bk.I. ch.21] demonstrates that Geoffrey de Wighton’s copy of the TH could not have been a rec.A manuscript. Nor could it have been from Rec.D group, as instead of the phrase ‘omnei fidei fundamenta’ in Bk.I.28 as written in this manuscript and all other recensions, the Rec.D cluster have the phrase ‘omnem fidei revelatae gratiam.’ Furthermore, in the final selection from Bk.III, the reading ‘frueremur’ rather than ‘fungeremur’ is unique to certain Rec.B manuscripts. 24 Yet, as Catherine Rooney has also noted, there is an isolated instance where the reading agrees with A of Rec.C, having instead of ‘evaipoverit’ or ‘exala evaipoverit’, the word ‘exalaverit’. 25

24 C, Bh, A44, and A34 have the reading ‘frueremur’ rather than ‘fungeremur’; not only do Rh, W, Le and Do have the reading ‘fungeremur’ but they also lack the extract on the dormice which can be found in C (margin), A34. and A44.
25 Rooney, Manuscripts, p.44.
Excerpt 3 [Exc. 3]

G is a selection of excerpts from chapters drawn from all three books of the TH written in the margins of the text of Peter Lombard’s Sentences. As this manuscript contains ch.40 of Bk.1 from the EH, which is found only in manuscripts of the EH which contain rec.D of the TH, it is fairly likely that the TH was abbreviated from a rec.D version. More importantly the use of the word ‘favorabiliter’ instead of ‘verisimiliter’ in Bk.I, ch.6 is also a strong indication that this excerpt was made from a rec.D manuscript. The manuscript was given to Gonville and Caius College by Adam de Lakenheath, chancellor (1372-1374).

The order of selections is as follows:

Bk.II : [II.7] marvellous wells; [II.8] other marvellous wells; [II.9] origins of Lough Neagh; [II.15] the Isle of Man; [II.19] the female shape-shifter is offered the sacrament; [II.28] miracles of St. Kevin; [II.46] the cross’s refusal of the penny; [II.55] Ireland’s vindictive saints.

EH

Bk.I [I.40] the prophecy related to Henry II in Wales regarding God’s retribution if he did not reform.

Excerpt 4 [Exc.4]

Exc. 4 found in Rd, a late-fourteenth century/fifteenth century manuscript, contains a compilation of select marvels described in the TH. The brevity of the following selections

---

26 Rooney, Manuscripts, p.57.
27 This chapter appears on in the following manuscripts containing the EH: only appears in I, Ab, Ra & L*. This chapter also appears (perhaps originally?) in the IK, I.6, pp. 64-66.
makes any association with a particular recension difficult to ascertain. The selections are in the following order:

Bk.II:  [II.5] Patrick’s purgatory in Ulster; [II.7] The well in Ulster where people do not age [II.4] the lake in Munster where no one dies; [II.7] the well in Munster where people age; [II.30] the wine-producing well of Munster; [II.6] the island in Connacht where bodies are incorruptible; [II.51] the mill which does not grind stolen goods.

Bk.III:  [III.36] the staff belonging to Jesus; [II.44, 46] Dublin’s speaking cross; [III.2] the baptism of Ruanus by Patrick.

Excerpt 5 [Exc. 5]

The final excerpted version of the TH is extant in the fifteenth-century manuscript MJ which, like Exc.1, is drawn solely from bk.III of the TH. The selections from the TH are:


Appended to this collection of extracts are the papal privileges of Adrian IV and Alexander III as found in EH [II.5]. According to Scott the papal privilege of Alexander III is found only in the first recension of the EH, which travelled primarily with Rec.BC/Rec.C manuscripts.28

****

Unfortunately, it is not possible to ascertain the source-versions for Abb.1 or exc.4. Of the remaining manuscripts discussed above, all of the selections appear to have been made from recensions after rec.A. Exc.1 was most likely to have been made from a rec.B manuscript. Indeed, the inclusion of the privilege of Alexander III from the EH suggests that it was taken from a manuscript of the α version of the EH. Manuscripts of this version of the EH which also

28 Pope Innocent III’s privilege is found in the following manuscripts which also contain the TH: Do, A34, B and R.
contain the TH are all of Rec.B, Rec.BC or Rec.C. Hence, it is likely that exc.5 which also draws on the α version of the EH was also drawn from Rec.B, Rec.BC or Rec.C manuscripts. Similarly, Exc.2 was drawn from a rec.B, rec.C or perhaps one of the many hybrids versions of the text. Exc.3 and Abb.2 provide examples of manuscripts of this type drawn from Rec.D.
The medieval transmission of Gerald of Wales’ *TH* appears to be three-pronged, rooted first during his life-time, second from the late-thirteenth to the mid-fourteenth century, and the third in the fifteenth century. The dates and provenance of these manuscripts have rested mainly on ‘ex libris’ and ‘ex dono’ inscriptions, medieval library catalogues and occasionally the dating of the script of the manuscript. Of the extant manuscripts (including the now lost Phillipps manuscript), twenty-two have identifiable medieval provenances. Of these manuscripts, excluding the two Avignonese manuscripts containing Philip of Slane’s abbreviation (*Exc.2*), all but five can be located in England in the Middle Ages. The exceptions are *BN1, Ra* and *Cl* which may have originated, or have been in Ireland; *MJ* was certainly written in Dublin. *Le* was part of the collection of the Cistercian abbey of Dunes in Flanders.

12th/13th manuscripts in circulation during Gerald’s lifetime

There are thirteen extant manuscripts, which by script and textual analysis are believed to have been written during Gerald’s lifetime:

Rec.A: M, A34 (*rec.AB* – After 1191)
Rec.B: A44, W, Bb, C (*rec.BC*); Do (*rec.BC*)
Rec.C: B, A33, BN48, A, R (*rec.CD*)
Rec.D: I (*rec.CD?*)

The majority of these extant manuscript are those of *Rec.B* and *Rec.C* and noticeably at least three of these are hybrid texts of the *TH* as seen in *A34, C, R* and *I*. In addition, Catherine Rooney suggests that of these manuscripts, *M, I, B, R, Bb, C* and *BN48* may have been written under Gerald’s own direction.²⁹ *Do* and *A34* share many stylistic features such as the number

---

of columns and colours used in Bav. Reg. Lat. 470, which could also suggest an origin close to Gerald.\(^{30}\)

\(^{30}\) See above, p.71.
M has possible associations with Ramsey Abbey in the thirteenth century, claimed as such because of a note in the manuscript regarding a land dispute. However, as mentioned above, there is also the possibility that this manuscript may have been closely associated with Gerald himself.

The Ex Libris in the illuminated I indicates that this manuscript belonged to Hereford Cathedral’s Vicars Choral in the later Middle Ages. Although, Brian Scott has speculated whether this was the manuscript containing the TH and EH as mentioned by Gerald in a letter to Hereford Cathedral, he acknowledges that the evidence is insufficient to determine this conclusively. More significantly, he has credibly argued that the additions made to the two texts were likely to have been made under Gerald’s supervision. He has suggested that the notae indicating marginal additions are similar to that in Vatican MS. Reginensis Lat. 470 which Yves Lefévre had argued originated from Gerald’s scribes, wherever they may have been located.

It has also been suggested that two other manuscripts, B and R which share a close textual relationship, originated from Gerald’s scriptoria. B was located at Canterbury, Christ Church cathedral, in the fifteenth century as shown by an inscription with the name, W. Bonyngton, and the date, 1483. The inscription reads ‘the Book of Friar W. Bonyngton and through him restored in 1483 to the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury’. A copy of the TH had appeared, as Item.299, in the catalogue of Christ Church Canterbury drawn up during the time of Prior Henry of Eastry (1284-1331). Here it is described as the ‘Descripcio Hibernie facta a Geraldo Cambrensi.’ The only other item listed here, as part of the codex, is the EH as

32 There is a reference to a ‘Walter Mybbe’ who has not been identified.
33 Scott, EH, pp.xlvi, lii-lv.
34 The plural is used here to reflect the uncertainty of Gerald’s whereabouts over much of the time that many of the revisions may have occurred, and therefore the various scriptoria which he may have had the opportunity to use.
35 ‘Liber fratris W.Bonyngton, monachi ecclesie Christi Ciantuar. Et per eum reperatus a[n]i 1483’ B, f.1; Bonyngton appears to have been a popular name for the area. A William Bonyngton and his wife Christina were buried at the Parish church of St. George’s in 1464. The manor of Bonyngton belonged to the archbishopric of Canterbury; Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward I, vol. III, 1292-1301 (1898), p.498.
36 Published in M.R.James, The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover (Cambridge, 1903) p.50.
‘Vaticinalis hystoria eiusdem’. If the ambivalence generally shown by compilers of medieval catalogues to titles and additional contents of a codex past the first item is considered, it does not disallow B to be one and the same as the above catalogue entry, which consisted of the TH, the EH, and the IK.

From the fourteenth century, R can be placed at the Abbey of St. Augustine, also at Canterbury. Not only does it contain an ex libris inscription, which reads ‘liber Sancti Augustini extra muros cantuarie’ it is also Item.906 in their fourteenth-century catalogue. Of course, as mentioned above this manuscript, with its illuminations and marginal additions, has links with I or a manuscript very like it, and served as the exemplar for F.

A34, whose text of the TH begins as rec.A but then abruptly shifts to rec.B, looks in its layout and script remarkably like other manuscripts which are believed to have originated from Gerald’s scriptoria. This manuscript also contains the EH and the IK, although the text of the EH is incomplete. A pressmark in red, ‘C XCII’, is written on f.2 and it has been suggested by the unusual form of the pressmark, if the first ‘C’ is taken to be a letter rather than the roman numeral, that this may have belonged to Norwich Cathedral Priory. If it were so, it is likely that it only became part of the Norwich collection after the fire of 1272 as it is believed that the pressmark system was put in place after a catalogue was ordered in 1315, and that class mark A represents those codices which survived the fire.

Fig.1 9 Inscription from Do f.1v

37 The catalogue in Dublin, Trinity College, MS D.1.19 printed by M.R. James was previously believed to be of the late-fifteenth century. However, the forthcoming edition by B.C. Barker-Benfield suggests the 1370s.
38 See pp.68, 71.
39 This has been suggested by a scribble by a previous unidentified British Museum Curator.
From its inscription, of ‘Liber eccl[esi]e b[ea]te Marie de M[er]ton’, it is evident that Do has a medieval provenance of Merton priory, although it was mistakenly attributed to Nuneaton by Neil Ker. Brian Scott, who also identifies this with Merton priory, draws on the similarities of the text of the EH in both Do and A34 which could presuppose that the same comparison may also exist for the text of the TH.

The changing trends in script, from the Gothic textura to the use of more Gothic cursives, particularly at a time when the more distinct cursive anglicana was beginning to be developed, makes thirteenth-century hands difficult to date precisely or to allocate a location solely on script. This is made more problematic when there is little other evidence of provenance for these manuscripts. A44, W, B and C, all rec.B or rec.BC manuscripts, lack any identifying markers relating to their provenance. Similarly, BN48, A33 and A, all rec.C manuscripts which carry the additional feature of Gerald’s map of Britain and the letter addressed to William de Vere (also found in C), cannot be identified.41

Curiously, at least in their original form, all these manuscripts appear to have been single-authored, in many cases single-text, codices. Although A44 is now bound with a composite group of four texts transcribed in the thirteenth-century text, it does not appear to have been so at first. The fifteenth-century title on f.1 ‘Palladius de agricultura et tropographia (sic) vel historia hibernie’ suggests a date as to when the texts were combined. The fourteenth-century inscription on the flyleaf of Bb suggests that it was once bound with Pomponius Mela’s De chorographia, yet it is difficult to establish if this was only temporarily so.

**Mid-13th – 14th century manuscripts**

Rec.A: Sc, Rb2, H, BN1
Rec.B: Le (rec.BC)
Rec.C: F (rec.CD)
Rec.D: Ba, Ra, Ab, Cl, BN41
Unidentified: Phillips 24461 (missing)

41 Gerald’s map of Europe is also found in I, f.48r.
Map 2 TH in the late-13th/14th c.
Although there are witnesses to each of the various recensions of the *TH* during this time-period, the higher number of surviving manuscripts of *Rec.A* and *Rec.D*, the shortest and the lengthiest versions of the *TH* respectively, is particularly interesting. Of the eleven manuscripts which fall within this category, potential medieval locations of five of these manuscripts, *F, Ra, Cl, BN41* and *Le* can be ascertained.42 The inscription and contents list in *D*, previously bound with *F*, indicates that *F* belonged to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds. However, many of the texts in this manuscript are not listed in Henry of Kirkestede’s *catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis*.43

Not only do *Ra* and *Cl* have potential geographical connections, sharing the possible provenance of Ireland, they also share a close textual relationship as shown in the stemma of *Rec.D* above. The first six items of *Ra*, which includes the *TH* belonged to the Dominican house in Limerick.44 *Cl* was also a fourteenth-century manuscript and in the Dominican hands of Geoffrey Hereford, bishop of Kildare (1449-1464).45 However, as Geoffrey Hereford is also recorded in the register of John Stanberry, b. of Hereford (1453-1474), as rector of Mitcheldean from 1465 until his death c.1469,46 this manuscript need not necessarily have been in Ireland at all.

Much of *BN41* was written by, or for, Robert of Popoultong a Carmelite friar. As the inscription, ‘Ora pro Populton qui me compilavit Eboraci’ on f.211v suggests Robert de Popoultong may have personally copied some of the texts for this codex from manuscripts in York. John Bloch Friedman suggests that this was likely to have been from the large collection

42 This does not include the missing Phillips manuscript. For *Le* see, p.94.

43 For the chequered history of this manuscript and CCC 66, see D. Dumville, ‘The sixteenth-century history of two Cambridge books from Sawley’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* vol.4 (1980) pp.427-444; J.Fleming provides a reconstruction of the Sawley manuscript. Although the reconstruction is correct, the claim on p.130 that the *TH*, the *Vita S.Patricii* and Henry of Saltrey’s *De Purgatorio Patricii* ‘come from the manuscript copied at Sawley Abbey, rather than the one transcribed at Bury St. Edmund’ is incorrect. J. Fleming, *Gille of Limerick (c.1070 -1145)* (Dublin, 2001) pp.125-130; Henry of Kirkestede never completed the monumental task he had set himself; for a discussion of Henry of Kirkestede’s methods and the compilation of the catalogue see CBMLC:XI.

44 *Ra*, f.10v.

45 This manuscript also contains an abbreviated form of the Symbolum Electorum, which could be found in the Franciscan friary in Hereford, Trinity College 749. *Cl* also contains the ‘geographia’ section of Bk.IV of Roger Bacon’s *Opus Maius* – a further text which was available at the Franciscan friary in Hereford as seen in BL, MS Royal 7 F VII (13th ex) which contains Bk.IV of Roger Bacon’s *Opus Maius*.

of the Austin friars at York, but it could as easily have been the extensive library of the Abbey of St. Mary’s.\textsuperscript{47} However, according to Julia Crick, ff. 33-105 which contains the \textit{TH} are of an earlier fourteenth-century Gothic hand and were later combined with the present contents of the codex, presumably by Robert of Popoulton himself.\textsuperscript{48}

The untraced Phillips manuscript may perhaps be placed at the Cistercian abbey at Robertsbridge. This manuscript was one part of three, the other two sections are now Aberystwyth NLW 13210 (formerly Phillipps 26233) and now Princeton, Scheide Library 159 (formerly Phillips 26641 and then subsequently Edinburgh, NL Acc. 9193/13). Julia Crick in her summary catalogue of the manuscripts of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s \textit{Historia Regum Britanniae} lists the Aberystwyth manuscript and states cautiously that all three sections were bound together in Matthew Parker’s time. Andrew Watson in the revised edition of Ker’s \textit{MLGB}, despite listing the \textit{TH} portion as untraceable, appears to suggest that they could be considered as having been originally a single codex.\textsuperscript{49} The manuscripts written during this time for which a provenance cannot be established are: \textit{Rb2, H, Ab} and \textit{La}.

**Fifteenth-century manuscripts**

Rec. A: \textit{P, V}
Rec. B: \textit{E}
Rec. D: \textit{La}

The surviving manuscripts from the fifteenth-century suggest a preference for the early versions of the \textit{TH}, whether by deliberate choice or coincidence is however harder to decipher. \textit{P} was given to Peterhouse by Thomas Lane, Master of Peterhouse from c.1436 until his death.

\textsuperscript{47} Friedman, \textit{Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Late Middle Ages} (Syracuse, 1995) p.41; This may have been the same Robert of Popoulton who was prior of the Carmelite convent at Hulne in 1364, M.O. Anderson, ‘The Scottish Materials in the Paris Manuscript Bib. Nat., Latin 4126’ \textit{Scottish Historical Review} 28 (1949) pp.31; Leland noted a copy of the \textit{TH} at St Mary’s Abbey, York, in the sixteenth century, \textit{CBMLC:IV}, p.788; Furthermore, as discussed below, copy of the \textit{TH} was also available at the Augustinian convent in York in the late-fourteenth century.


\textsuperscript{49} \textit{MLGB suppl.}, p.58; A rubric at the foot of f.64v in Aberystwyth, NLW 13210 states that a certain William Woodchurch acted as scribe for Geoffrey of Monmouth’s \textit{HRB}, of course, this does not suggest that he was also the scribe for William of Malmesbury’s \textit{HRA} in the Edinburgh manuscript or for the \textit{TH}, Crick, vol.III, pp. 6-7.
in 1471. This item along with three other codices were left to the library and can be found listed in the Old register of Peterhouse, alongside the 1418 Peterhouse book catalogue.\textsuperscript{50} The provenance of $V$ and $La$ have not been identified. However, with regards to $E$, this was a manuscript commissioned by John Gunthorpe.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{50} ‘Peterhouse UC48’, \textit{CBMLC:X}, pp.445, 534.; although officially still part of the Peterhouse collection, this manuscript is currently housed in the Cambridge University Library.

\textsuperscript{51} See pp.286-291.
Map 3 TH manuscripts in the 15th century
Abbreviations and Excerpts

As listed earlier, ten medieval manuscripts contain seven different versions of excerpts/translations/abbreviations of the TH. All, except for Hb and MJ, were compiled in the fourteenth century. Hb is a late-thirteenth century abbreviation and MJ can be dated to 1436. There is insufficient information to establish the provenances of Hb, however the distribution of the remaining nine manuscripts will be considered below. Of course, as suggested above, Hb may have only been an unintentional abbreviation of the TH. Nevertheless, it is tempting to see this practice of extracting gobbets of interest as a reflection of the growing tradition of florilegia and the interest in creating compilations from the fourteenth century onwards.

Abbreviations

Of the two abbreviated versions of the TH, Abb.1’s provenance is outwith England and is firmly based at the papal court in Avignon. There are two surviving manuscripts of this version of the text: A19 and A17, the first the Latin abbreviated form of the TH as created by Philip of Slane, bishop of Cork and the second, the translation made of it into Occitan. The former is written in an Italian chancery hand and is likely to have been written at Avignon. Wilhemina Wüstefeld suggests that the translation may have been made for a young nobleman from Rouerger, made perhaps also in Avignon, and that the contents of this codex were not translated from A19 but from a more careful copy.52

Excerpts

The three manuscripts containing exc.1 all originated in Norfolk. R14 (xiv) and Ce (c.1388) share not only the selection of short treatises in R14 (including the extracts from the TH) but also the anonymous Flores Historiarum which the treatises precede. Consequently, it

---

has been suggested that \textit{R14} may have served as exemplar for the Cottonian manuscript.\footnote{Rooney, \textit{Manuscripts}, p.63; BL, Manuscripts Online Catalogue, Royal 14 C VI : http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/manuscripts/HITS0001.ASP?VPath=c!/inetpub/wwwroot/mss/data/msscat/html/39197.htm&Sear ch=14+C+VI&Highlight=F} However, despite Edmund Craster and Noel Denholm-Young noting a comparable relationship with \textit{Fb} (xiv\textsuperscript{mid} c.) of a Norwich Cathedral Priory provenance to these two manuscripts, \textit{F20} has generally been overlooked.\footnote{H. H. E. Craster and N. Denholm-Young, \textit{Summary Catalogue: collections and miscellaneous MSS. acquired during the second half of the 17th century}, Vol. II, part II (Oxford, 1937) pp.781-2.} In fact, a textual and codicological assessment of the manuscript reveals \textit{F20} as the more likely exemplar for \textit{Ce}.

\textit{R14} was a large manuscript, written in a clear script with little ornamentation. The regional interpolations within the \textit{Flores Historiarium} in \textit{R14} which extended from creation to 1323, led to speculation about the manuscript’s provenance. The main portion of the chronicle, which extended to 1307, interpolated material of interest to the abbey of St. Benet in Hulme and Norwich Cathedral. However, a later interpolation for the years 1305 to 1323 with information relevant to Tintern Abbey, not present in the other two manuscripts, suggested a provenance of Tintern abbey. Nevertheless, Julian Harrison has convincingly argued that despite the Tintern Abbey interpolations within this codex, it was most likely to have originated in East Anglia, and have been a Holme St Benet’s product.\footnote{J. Harrison, ‘The Tintern Abbey Chronicles’, \textit{Monmouthshire Antiquary}, XVI (2000) pp. 85-91.}

The other two manuscripts have indisputable links with Norwich, thereby, conveniently placing all three manuscripts in Norfolk in the fourteenth century. \textit{Fb} can be identified with Norwich Cathedral Priory and, in particular, Simon Bozoun, prior of Norwich Cathedral from 1344 to 1352.\footnote{\textit{Fb} f. 13v. bears the inscription: ‘Liber fratris Symonis Bozoun prioris Norwic.’ This manuscript is also listed as ‘Cronica Westmonaster’ in Simon Bozoun’s booklist on f.15v of \textup{L}*.} This too was an unassuming manuscript with simple ornamentation. \textit{Ce} was commissioned c.1388 by Henry Despencer, who was bishop of Norwich from 1370 until 1406.\footnote{L. Coote, ‘The Crusading Bishop: Henry Despenser and his Manuscript’, \textit{Prophecy, Apocalypse and the Day of Doom :proceedings of the 2000 Harlaxton Symposium}, ed. N. Morgan (Donington, 2005) p.49.} Yet, here the physical similarities to the other manuscripts end. This was a large deluxe manuscript with a greater number of shorter treatises alongside the \textit{Flores} than the other two manuscripts. The \textit{Flores} was followed by a continuation by Adam of Murimuth until 1341 and excerpts from other chronicles. Its opening folios and the first folio of the text of the \textit{Flores} in

56 \textit{Fb} f. 13v. bears the inscription: ‘Liber fratris Symonis Bozoun prioris Norwic.’ This manuscript is also listed as ‘Cronica Westmonaster’ in Simon Bozoun’s booklist on f.15v of \textup{L}*.}
particular were very ornate, with detailed illuminated capitals, heraldic arms and the use of some gold-leaf.

An examination of the two Norwich manuscripts reveals the debt owed by *Ce* to *Fb* (see Fig. I.8 below). Indeed, *Fb* contains a number of additions not present in *R14*: a copy of a letter from Hugh of Nonant, b. of Coventry to William b. of Ely (Item.11), a Domesday extract relating to Yarmouth, Henry III’s charter to Yarmouth, followed by Edward III’s charter to Yarmouth (Item.14), an extract from Roger of Wendover relating to the death of Henry II and his sons (Item.15), a list of the priors of Norwich Cathedral (Item.16), an index to the *Flores* (Item.17) and finally two items both hurriedly scribbled on what may have been a flyleaf, the first, an interpolation from Roger Bacon’s *Opus Minus* regarding the miracle of a woman in Norwich who survived despite not eating or drinking for twenty-five years, and the second a metrical prophecy (Item.18). All these extra items, even the scribbles, appear in the large Cottonian manuscript in its carefully executed *textura quadrata* hand. Furthermore, the Cottonian manuscript reproduces the error within the excerpt from the *EH* as found in *Fb* but not the *R14*.58 The error was within the text of the *Laudabiliter*, the papal bull which Gerald of Wales claimed was issued by Pope Adrian in 1155. Unlike in *R14*, in the two later manuscripts *Laudabiliter* is attributed to Pope Urban III rather than Pope Adrian IV.

---

58 The extract taken is of *Laudabiliter*, the papal bull which Gerald of Wales claimed was issued by Pope Adrian in 1155. Unlike *R14*, in the two later manuscripts they are addressed to Pope Urban rather than Pope Adrian.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Library, Royal 14 C VI</th>
<th>Bodleian Library, Fairfax 20</th>
<th>British Library, Cotton Claudius E VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLATION</strong>: a'1 - 33v</td>
<td><strong>COLLATION</strong>: a'1-5v, 6v 12r-2v 7v 8r 9v 10r 12v-14r 11v</td>
<td><strong>COLLATION</strong>: a’1-129v 30r-35r 31v 32r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTENTS</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>CONTENTS</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>CONTENTS</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Description of Rome f.1</td>
<td>1. Description of Rome f.1</td>
<td>1. ‘De fundationibus ecclesiarum per Angliam, vel monasteriorum, antequam regnum sibi subjugassent Normanni’ f.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of England f.2v</td>
<td>2. Description of England f.3</td>
<td>2. ‘Prophetia a quodam spiritu pythonico’ f.1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Castles in Armenia f.3v</td>
<td>3. Castles in Armenia f.4</td>
<td>3. ‘Prophetia Homeri’ f.2r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The seven miracles of the World f.4v</td>
<td>4. The seven miracles of the world f.4</td>
<td>4. ‘Visio facta Thome Cantuariensi, dum esset in ecclesia S. Columbae in Francia; de rege quodam ungendo, et ejus victorius’ f.1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Miracles of England f.4</td>
<td>5. Miracles of England f.4v</td>
<td>5. Two letters, from Emperor Frederick to Saladin and from Saladin to Emperor Frederick. f.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ‘De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt’ f.5</td>
<td>6. ‘De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt’ f.5v</td>
<td>6. ‘De jocalibus et vasis pretiosis quae R. Edwardus III. agnoscit se mutuo accepsisse, pro expeditione suorum negotiorum, ab abbate de Redyng: et promittit se vel eadem restituere, vel pretium solvere’ f.2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ f.5v</td>
<td>7. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ f.6v</td>
<td>7. ‘Ricardus I. rex Angliae, in captione detentus, investivit Hen. VI. imperatorem regno suo per pileum ejus’ f.2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.6</td>
<td>8. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.7</td>
<td>8. Letter from Pope Clement III to the Scottish church 1188.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Coronation of King Richard from Roger of Howden’s chronicle f.6</td>
<td>9. Coronation of King Richard from Roger of Howden’s chronicle f.7v</td>
<td>9. ‘Predictiones astrologorum’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Roger Hovedon f.7</td>
<td>11. letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely f.8v</td>
<td>11. Fragment from Roger of Wendover’s Flores Historiarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Flores Historiarum to 1307 f.9</td>
<td>12. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Roger Hovedon f.10</td>
<td>12. domesday extracts relating to Yarmouth letters patent of Edward III to Yarmouth dated 10 July 031333. and f.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td>13. Fragment of the Flores Historiarum: from creation to 635AD f.13</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Continuation till 1323 with matter relating to Tintern Abbey. f.255</td>
<td>14. letters patent of Edward III to Yarmouth dated 10 July 1333. and a domesday extract relating to Yarmouth f.71</td>
<td>14. Description of Rome f.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. letters patent of Edward III to Yarmouth dated 10 July 1333 and a domesday extract relating to Yarmouth f.71</td>
<td>15. A fragment from Roger of Wendover’s Flores Historiarum f.73</td>
<td>15. Castles in Armenia f.8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A fragment from Roger of Wendover’s Flores Historiarum f.73</td>
<td>16. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344 f.73v</td>
<td>16. The seven miracles of the world f.8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344 f.73v</td>
<td>17. Index to the Flores Historiarum (incomplete - begins at E) f.74</td>
<td>17. Miracles of England f.8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Index to the Flores Historiarum (incomplete - begins at E) f.74</td>
<td>18. A passage on early English history, extract from Roger Bacon’s Opus Minus and a metrical prophecy f.81</td>
<td>18. ‘De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt’ f.9v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A passage on early English history, extract from Roger Bacon’s Opus Minus and a metrical prophecy f.81</td>
<td>19. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ f.10</td>
<td>19. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ f.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ f.10</td>
<td>20. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.10v</td>
<td>20. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.10v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.10v</td>
<td>21. Coronation of King Richard from Roger of Howden’s chronica f.10v</td>
<td>21. Coronation of King Richard from Roger of Howden’s chronica f.11v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Coronation of King Richard from Roger of Howden’s chronica f.10v</td>
<td>22. Henry of Huntingdon’s prophecy of the Norman conquest f.11v</td>
<td>22. Henry of Huntingdon’s prophecy of the Norman conquest f.11v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Henry of Huntingdon’s prophecy of the Norman conquest f.11v</td>
<td>23. letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely f.11v</td>
<td>23. letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely f.11v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely f.11v</td>
<td>24. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Roger Hovedon. f.12v</td>
<td>24. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Roger Hovedon. f.11v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Roger Hovedon. f.12v</td>
<td>25. Index to the Flores Historiarum</td>
<td>25. Index to the Flores Historiarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Index to the Flores Historiarum</td>
<td>26. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344 f.23</td>
<td>26. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344 f.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344 f.23</td>
<td>27. A passage on early English history, extract from Roger Bacon’s Opus Minus and a metrical prophecy f.81</td>
<td>27. A passage on early English history, extract from Roger Bacon’s Opus Minus and a metrical prophecy f.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In *Fb*, the twelve-folio Quire.1 has all the additional material from *R14* with one extra item, the letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely. Quires.2-6 have the *Flores* from creation to 635AD, where the *Flores* ends abruptly midway through a sentence at the end of the quire. Clearly, the brevity of the *Flores* was not by design but by accident. Appended to this manuscript are then three loose leaves. The first two leaves contain the Domesday entry for Yarmouth, and a charter relating to Yarmouth. The third leaf has on its recto a fragment of Roger of Wendover’s chronicle and on its verso a list of priors up to 1344, i.e. when Simon Bozoun the owner of the manuscript became prior. In *Ce*, the first three quires contain a selection of additional material; the next twenty-seven consist of the *Flores* and the final two quires of the continuation and additional prophecies.
The close textual relationship of $Fb$ and $Ce$ sheds light on the original medieval codicological format of $Fb$ in the Middle Ages. Although, the treatises in $Ce$ appear in a slightly different order to that of $Fb$, this different order in Fairfax codex is probably due to the loss of a large portion of the manuscript prior to its ownership by Charles Fairfax and its early modern rebinding and possible reorganisation. It is likely that in $Fb$ too, the additional treatises and the index of the \textit{Flores Historiarium} originally formed two or three quires, which preceded the chronicle or were perhaps loosely bound but attached to the manuscript. See below for a possible reconstruction.

\textbf{Fig.I 11 A possible reconstruction of Bodleian, Fairfax 20 ($Fb$)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codicology of $Fb$</th>
<th>Possible Structure of $Fb$</th>
<th>Structure of $Ce$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Items 1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 folios</td>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 folio</td>
<td>Item 14 (with Item 16 on the verso)</td>
<td>Item 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quire</td>
<td>Items 1-12</td>
<td>Items 13-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete quire</td>
<td>Item 17 - incomplete Index to the \textit{Flores Historiarum}</td>
<td>Item 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>Item 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loose folio</td>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>Item 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 quires + missing quires</td>
<td>Item 13 (\textit{Flores Historiarium})</td>
<td>Item 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or never a part of $Fb$</td>
<td>Item 29 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, $Ce$ could allow us to establish the missing portion of the Bodleian manuscript’s \textit{Flores Historiarum} after 635 AD. However, as can be seen in the table above, the contents of the $Fb$ and $Ce$ are not found in the same order. If the two manuscripts are compared, Items.14 and 15 in $Fb$, which were on loose folios are found copied before Items.13-24 in $Ce$. Items.1-12 of $Fb$ are Items.13-24 in $Ce$. Item.17 which in $Fb$ is an incomplete index to the \textit{Flores Historiarum}, the index begins with entries for E, in $Ce$ is found as a complete index as Item.25.

This arrangement suggests that the three loose folios found towards the end of $Fb$, ff. 71-73 (items 14 and 15) originally formed a larger quire with contents identical to Items.1-12 in $Ce$, and that the other folios are simply now missing. Although the order of Item.14 (f.73r)
and Item.15 (ff.71-72) are inverted in Ce, as loose folios in Fb this may reflect its original order. As it is already clear that a number of quires are missing from the text of the Flores in Fb, as well as the first few folios of the Index, this scenario is not implausible. What is difficult to explain is the list of the priors of Norwich found on f.73v of Fb. In Ce this is found as Item.26 after the Index to the Flores when one would expect it to be found directly after Item.12 in Ce. Perhaps it was added later in the manuscript because the scribe of Ce recognised that the list had been a later addition.

When large chronicles such as these had an index, it appear likely that the index was only loosely bound at the end of the codex. This was especially true for manuscripts owned by Simon Bozoun. 59 F.81 of Fb looks like it had always been a flyleaf of hastily added scribbles placed at the end, which might explain why in c.1388 when the copy was made for Henry Despencer they were added at the end of the first three quires. From the material in common it is clear that Ce is a very faithful copy of Fb which suggests that the Cotton manuscript can act as a witness to the original form of the Flores Historiarum in Fb. The argument for an expanded size of Fb is further supported by the value it was given in Simon Bozoun’s book-list.

The book-list, is a list of thirty-one items belonging to Simon Bozoun, which had values placed alongside each item. 60 Fb was valued at 20s on this list. If this is compared with another of Simon Bozoun’s manuscripts, BL, Royal, 14 C XIII (L*), also valued at 20s, a discrepancy is apparent. L* was a large manuscript of three-hundred and ten folios with dimensions measuring 1ft 2 5/8 in x 8 3/4 in, thus more similar to Ce in size. Fb, which consists of eighty-one folios, lacks any substantial ornamentation which would justify its value. When another of Simon Bozoun’s manuscript is examined: Bodley 264, which is more comparable in size with Fb, this discrepancy is marked. This manuscript which consisted of approx. 182 folios was valued at only 10s, suggesting that Fb must certainly have been a considerably larger manuscript at one time.

59 In L*, another Bozoun manuscript, the index to the Polychronicon is now found before the text of the Polychronicon. However, it was originally either a loose quire or bound at the end, see Appendix I for details.
60 L*, f.15v; see p.269.
If \( Fb \) can be shown to be the exemplar of the bulk of the Cotton manuscript, how does \( R14 \) fit into this tradition? Although, it could be the exemplar of \( Fb \), \( R14 \) is written in a careful textura hand, very easy to read, and therefore, unless done so deliberately, it would have been impossible to mistake Urban for Adrian, as discussed above, when \( Fb \) was transcribed.

What significance can these selections and the establishment of a relationship between \( Fb \) and \( Ce \) have? These extracts from the \( TH \) and the \( EH \) were clearly copied in their entirety from manuscript to manuscript, and perhaps only an investigation of the associated texts of the exemplar of these manuscripts, perhaps \( R14 \) or a missing exemplar, could truly furnish an explanation regarding their choice. If it was \( R14 \), a date of creation after 1307, and more likely after 1323, would give a suitable context: if like Philip of Slane’s abbreviation of the \( TH \) it was written as a response to the remonstrances of the Irish princes, and claims of neglect according to the Laudabiliter. It fits into attempts at justifying the English conquest of Ireland.

In regards to the relationship between the three manuscripts, the link to \( Fb \) has implications for Lesley Coote’s examination of \( Ce \). Lesley Coote views the accompanying tracts to the Flores Historiarium as a glossing, a sort of explanatory ‘setting’ for the main text. She does not appear to be aware of either \( R14 \) or \( Fb \), and sees their selection as an example of the interest in such tracts within the political climate of England in c.1388. 61 Certainly, Henry Despencer or whoever commissioned it for him may have seen their contemporary relevance. Nevertheless, as much of this combination of texts may have been in place long before it was copied for Henry Despencer, this should not be overstated.

Unlike many medieval manuscripts, the manuscript containing \( exc.2 \) offers pertinent provenance-related material. Responsibility for assembling this select anthology, lies with Geoffrey of Wighton. 62 While his toponym suggests the village of Wighton in North Norfolk, little else is known of him except that he was a Franciscan based at the convent at Oxford where he had gained his Bachelor of Theology by 1358. On 7\(^{th} \) May 1365 the Minister General was approved by the Pope to confer the D.Th. on Geoffrey Wighton pending an examination at

---

61 Coote, ‘Crusading Bishop’ pp.43-51; Lesley Coote does draw attention to the contents of \( Fb \) elsewhere, however she merely states that they are ‘somewhat similar to BL MS Cotton Claudius E VIII’, L. Coote, Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England (York, 2000) p.276.
62 ‘Iste liber est fratris Galfridi de Wyghtone quem fecit scribi de elemosinis amicorum suorum’, CM2, f.1r.
a *stadium generale* approved by the Franciscan order.\(^{63}\) This large, substantial codex, ideal for reading from a lectern, is our sole witness to his reading interests. It is a fascinating collection of excerpts, from a variety of treatises.\(^{64}\)

*Exc.3* is another manuscript with an early alliance with a centre of learning. It was given to the The Hall of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which had previously been Gonville Hall and which was later to become and Gonville and Caius College, by Adam de Lakenheath. Adam de Lakenheath had received his Bachelor of Theology by 1363, and as the inscription on the flyleaf of, ‘Liber collegii Annunciationis b. Marie Cantebrig’ex dono Mag(ist)ri Ade Lakyngythe doctoris in theologia’ suggest at the time of this donation he was a Doctor of Theology. From 1372 until 1374 he was also chancellor of the Cambridge. However, his personal association with the excerpts of the *TH* is not guaranteed. The excerpts were written in the margins and this particular selection is found towards the end of the manuscript in a different hand to much of the other marginal material.\(^{65}\)

*Rd* and the treatise ‘Mirabilia Hibernia’ offer a unique witness to version 4. This too, like the *exc.2* comprises selections from Bk.II of the *TH*, albeit with a different choice of marvels. The short tract travels alongside two other items titled ‘Mirabilia Anglie’ and ‘Mirabilia Orientis.’ *Rd* has been associated with St. Peter’s Cornhill in London in the fifteenth century, thus a unique feature of this provenance is that it is of a secular church rather than a monastic or mendicant institution. Julia Crick suggests that this late-fourteenth century manuscript of possible Glastonbury abbey provenance was written after 1385.\(^{66}\)

The provenance of *exc.5* can also be determined. This manuscript, MJ, is associated with Stephen Lawless, a subprior of St. Mary’s Abbey Dublin. Thus the manuscript can be dated to before 1436, when Stephen Lawless became abbot. He died two years later.\(^{67}\)


\(^{64}\) For a list and discussion of the contents see pp.248-249, and Appendix I.


Outwith England

*BN1*, *Ra* and *Cl* may have originated, or have been in Ireland, and *MJ*, as discussed above, was certainly in Dublin in 1436. In addition, there are the two manuscripts, *A19* and *A17*, associated with Avignon. *Le*, a later manuscript, provides a fourteenth-century provenance due to the fourteenth-century inscription of ‘liber beate Marie de dunis’ ascribing possession to the Cistercian abbey of Les Dunes in Flanders. The presence of this text in Ireland is perhaps unsurprising with regards to its subject matter. Its dispersal to Avignon through Phillip of Slane is known, however nothing is known of how it was made available in Les Dunes or even to Petrarch. Nevertheless, as the references made to the *TH* by the thirteenth-century authors Jean Le Meun and Gautier de Metz suggests, the text was already known on the continent before Phillip of Slane’s abbreviation.

Library catalogues/attested copies

While the discussion above offers a partial view of the work’s physical or manuscript dissemination, a greater indication of the work’s geographical dispersal can be found within the extant medieval library catalogue entries. Of the entries in surviving medieval library catalogues; only three manuscripts, *B*, *R* and *P* are extant.

The other non-extant entries can be found in the late-twelfth century or early-thirteenth century catalogue of the Augustinian house at Bridlington, a late-thirteenth century catalogue from Glastonbury abbey and a late-fourteenth century catalogue of the Austin friars in York, where this manuscript was part of the substantial collection of John Erghome.

In addition, the sixteenth-century lists of John Leland and John Bale identify further manuscripts of the *TH* at Battle Abbey, Hyde Abbey in Winchester, Faversham Abbey, St.

---


69 John Erghome’s collection is discussed below, pp.279-286.
Mary’s Abbey in York and the Franciscan convent at Reading.\textsuperscript{70} Gerald’s own correspondence suggests also that there were copies sent to Lincoln and Hereford. No manuscript has survived that can be associated with Lincoln Cathedral, however it has a fifteenth-century provenance of Hereford even if there is no certainty that this was the manuscript referred to by Gerald.

These attestations offer little further information about the recension of the \textit{TH} or even what other texts were bound with it. Nevertheless as the maps above have shown (see maps.1-3) they demonstrate the wider geographical dissemination of the work. Most notably, the presence of the \textit{TH} in the Bridlington catalogue suggests an early dissemination to a northern location, when much of what we know of the dissemination of that period is concentrated in the South. While this section has explored who the \textit{TH} was available to, and where the \textit{TH} was available to be read, the following section will look briefly at the tangible evidence we have for the act of reading or hearing the \textit{TH}.

**Contemporary readings and the intended audiences**

That the earliest evidence of the reception of the \textit{TH} is offered from his own writings, is perhaps unsurprising considering Gerald’s enthusiasm for drawing attention to any praise or notice paid to him or his works. Evidence for the early dissemination of the \textit{TH} is well served by Gerald’s own letters. By Gerald’s admission, his one-time teacher William of Montibus, based in Lincoln, had read the \textit{TH} as a copy of both the \textit{TH} and the \textit{EH} had been given by Gerald ‘in one volume to the church of Lincoln.’\textsuperscript{71} Gerald’s reply to William of Montibus’ reactions to his work, also tells us that the works were at Lincoln and a further letter discusses that he had sent a copy to Hereford Cathedral.

Similarly, in a letter to Hereford Cathedral, Gerald remarks that Robert de Beaufey, canon of Salisbury possessed a copy and read the \textit{TH} repeatedly. Although Lewis Thorpe comments that other remarks by Gerald about this may suggest that Robert de Beaufey was

\textsuperscript{70} CBMLC IV, p.788.
\textsuperscript{71} For the text of the letter see, Gerald of Wales, \textit{Speculum Duorum: or a mirror of two men: preserved in the Vatican Library in Rome Cod.Reg.Lat. 470}, eds. Y. Lefèvre & R.B.C Huygens (Cardiff, 1974) pp.168-75; William of Montibus died in 1213 p.xlii and although dating of this text is difficult clearly it was some time after that of Baldwin’s death. According to Gerald he went to Lincoln in 1196 and was taught by William de Montibus, Butler, \textit{Autobiography}, pp.127-8 – \textit{De Rebus a se gestis Bk.III. ch.IV}, p.liii n.2.
merely at the reading at Oxford discussed below. According to John Bale, Robert de Beaufey’s interaction with the text was such that it moved him to write the now non-extant *Encomium Topographiae*.\textsuperscript{72} In the same letter to Hereford, Gerald also mentioned twice in passing that Walter Map, archdeacon of Oxford, too had praised the work.

Mentioned in his *De rebus a se gestis*, and as discussed by Lewis Thorpe, was Gerald’s decision to host a three-day reading of the entire text of the *TH* at Oxford. It is clearly for this occasion that Gerald made the first of many changes to the text and added the special introduction for the oral recital of the *TH*. Gerald claims to have prepared an elaborate occasion of feasting and reading, reminiscent of the classical Roman authors. On the first day he invited the poor of Oxford, on the second the Masters and the particularly gifted or renowned students and on the final day, *all* others – as Thorpe remarks, what many of them would have made of Gerald’s Latin text, now considerably lengthened with learned classical, patristic and biblical quotes, is hard to fathom.\textsuperscript{73} Furthermore, Gerald tells us that he presented a copy of the text, shortly after it was completed, to Archbishop Baldwin on 8\textsuperscript{th} March 1188 when they set off on their travels in Wales. Again, we are assured that it was read.\textsuperscript{74} However, apart from Petrarch’s far from complimentary comments about Gerald’s choice of matter, calling the *TH* ‘thin matter’, these are the only surviving comments of the act of reading the *TH*. Petrarch did, however, like Gerald’s style of writing but was more interested in the information about *Ultima Thule* than Ireland.\textsuperscript{75}

The dedications to Henry II, Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, William de Vere, bishop of Hereford, and Prince Richard also suggest an intended audience for the *TH*. Gerald’s belief in his literary ability and his social standing is evident in these dedications, and is further emphasised in his dedications of the *EH*. In c.1210, the *EH* was sent with a new dedication to King John and was accompanied with a copy of the *TH*.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{73} Thorpe, ‘A public reading’, p.457.
\textsuperscript{76} Scott, *EH*, p.261.
Evidently, Gerald was sensitive about the initial reception of the *TH*. He felt compelled to defend it in the prologue to the *EH* against criticisms raised, particularly in relation to Bk.II. The main objections, he writes, were to the examples of bestiality and their resulting hybrid offspring. He countered the arguments by suggesting what he considered to be similar biblical and patristic examples.\(^7\) Gerald’s opening words of this prologue to the *EH* is a synopsis of the *TH* after which he states that,

at the insistent request of many men of rank, I have taken on the task of setting out in its own separate volume the deed of our own time and the sequence of events in this latest conquest of Ireland.\(^8\)

Implicit here is the understanding that these ‘many men of rank’ are insistent because they are familiar with the *TH* and eagerly anticipate a fitting conclusion to Bk.III of the *TH* with the *EH*.

Gerald’s letter to William de Vere, bishop of Hereford from 1186 until 1199, which accompanies a cluster of *rec. C* manuscripts, offers insights as to which portions of the *TH* Gerald himself preferred and was especially proud of. Of Bk. I he wrote that he was particularly anxious that the chapters on the birds, ‘de feris’ and ‘de vermibus’ be read. From Bk. III Gerald highlighted the ethnographic descriptions of ch.10, the chapters praising the musical abilities of the Irish and two of the later chapters, which had been new to *rec.B*, praising Henry II’s titles and those of his sons. The comparative wealth of Gerald’s own reaction to his text does skew the surviving view. The defensive nature of his tone with regards to criticism denotes perhaps his bitterness at his lack of favour. Yet Gerald’s descriptions of the criticisms are such that one would expect more of the same after Gerald’s lifetime.

---

\(^7\) Scott, *EH*, pp.4-5.
\(^8\) Scott, *EH*, pp.2-3.
TEXTUAL DISSEMINATION AND RECEPTION

Tangible contact with a text is difficult to quantify due to the sparsity of recorded information. The majority of interaction with a text of reader or listener, either now or then, is always likely to remain unrecorded and lost to us. Therefore, the re-use of words, images and concepts, which the following section will deal with, remains to be a fruitful avenue of research in how an audience receives a text. The textual dissemination of the TH shall be considered in two ways: first, the purpose for which excerpted forms of the TH were created and manipulated; and second, the manner in which the TH was used by other authors. This approach also offers a further extended picture of the geographical dispersal of the TH than suggested above by the extant manuscripts. However, the most prolific borrower of Gerald’s various works was indeed Gerald himself. His love for repeating his finely-crafted prologues is found not only in his De Rebus a Se Gestis but also in the Symbolum Electorum within which he copied the various prologues of his works, descriptions and speeches i.e. the finest examples of his rhetorical ability in one place.\(^79\) Often so pleased was he with particular passages, he would reuse them within the body of other texts. For example, clearly delighted with the style and rhyme he used the following passage in the TH, EH and the IK, albeit with minor changes in each.

\[
\text{longe fortius timenda eorum ars, quam Mars, eorum pax, quam fax; eorum mel, quam fel; malitia quam militia; proditio quam expeditio; amicitia defucata; quam inimicitia despicata.}\(^80\)
\]

You must be more afraid of their wile than their war; their friendship than their fire; their honey than their hemlock; their shrewdness than their soldiery; their betrayals than their battle lines;

\(^79\) In De rebus a se gestis, Gerald re-uses Bk.II 19, 27-39 of the TH.
\(^80\) TH, III.22; EH, II. 39 (Scott, EH, pp.104-107); DK, II.9, p.224.
their specious friendship than their enmity despised.\textsuperscript{81}

As this section is not found in \textit{rec.A} of the \textit{TH}, it is conceivable that it was added after it had been composed for the \textit{EH}.

In some instances it is possible to see which version of his text he may have used for borrowing material. For example, Bk.I ch.14 of \textit{De Rebus a se gestis} is an amalgamation of ch.19, 27-31 of Bk.II of the \textit{TH}. There are two particular portions within ch.14 which are particular to \textit{Rec.D} of the \textit{TH}: one, a re-structured quotation from Ephesians v.18 from Bk.II ch.27 and the other the final sentence of Bk.II ch.31. The quotation from Ephesians is found only in \textit{Rec.D}, although in \textit{I} it is found only as a marginal addition. The second instance in ch.31 is similar. The words ‘Quia plerumque quod altum est hominibus, abominabile est apud Deum; et e diverso’ are found at the end of the chapter only in manuscripts of \textit{Rec.D}.\textsuperscript{82} Therefore it is likely that between 1208 and 1216 when Gerald may have been writing \textit{De Rebus a se gestis}, \textit{Rec.D} was his favoured version of the \textit{TH}.

\textbf{Abbreviations}

\textit{Abb.1}, the \textit{Libellus de descriptione Hiberniae}, was compiled by Philip of Slane, the Dominican bishop of Cork, who died in 1327. He presented his adaptation of the \textit{TH} to Pope John XXII at Avignon in 1324 on behalf of Edward II. Yet, Philip of Slane’s abbreviation of the \textit{TH} was, to a large extent, faithful to the original text.\textsuperscript{83} Wüstefeld has drawn attention to the two main additions to this text. The first related to a justification of English rule in Ireland and over the Irish church. Philip stressed that the Pope should support English wishes in regards to episcopal appointments and by giving his utmost support to the church in Ireland. The second was in relation to the island in Lough Derg which was increasingly becoming known as St. Patrick’s Purgatory.\textsuperscript{84} The answer to why he felt the need to adapt the work when a mere copy of the \textit{TH} could have sufficed lies in the subject matter of certain chapters in Bk.II which had drawn criticism even during Gerald’s lifetime. Chapters 20 to 24, and their tales of

\textsuperscript{81} O’Meara, p.107.
\textsuperscript{82} In \textit{I} the words ‘Quia… apud Deum’ are found only in the margin. The additional clause ‘et e diverso’ is found in \textit{Ba} and \textit{Cl}; and in \textit{De Rebus} it is expressed as ‘sicut et e diverso plerumque contingit’.
\textsuperscript{83} See above, pp.77-78.
bestiality and the resulting offspring are omitted. Although Bk.II.19, the chapter about the talking wolf remained, its inclusion was perhaps to highlight the prophecy as told by the wolf about the success of the English invasion, giving credence to England’s rights and overlordship. Anecdotes from the chapters on the marvels of the lakes, islands and wells and the miracles of the many Irish saints are of course included. However, two miracles located within the see of Armagh were omitted, a result perhaps of the rivalry between the sees of Armagh and Cork. 85 Bk.III is, however, more severely dealt with. The first nine chapters were of the utmost importance as they detailed the waves of invaders to Ireland, with a specific mention of the rights of the English kings to Ireland in Bk.III.9. However, the ethnographic observations of the Irish, the criticisms of the Irish church, marital and martial practices, fiery temperaments, or even their praiseworthy musical capabilities are discarded. Philip returns to the TH only to draw it to a close with Feidhlimidh’s Norwegian invasion leading to Gerald’s praise of Henry II.

Wilhelmina Wüstefeld interprets this omission as symbolic of Philip’s personal allegiance to the Irish. However, perhaps it should be seen in context with Philip’s two visits to the papal court at Avignon. He had been entrusted with negotiating church reforms, one of which was the power to reprimand Irish clergy who did not ‘preach loyalty to the king.’ As Margaret Murphy and James Watt have discussed, he was sent not only for religious reasons, but also for political reasons related to the ‘Remonstrance of the Princes’ which had charged the English kingdom with the crime of not fulfilling its promise as stated in Laudabiliter of upholding and supporting the Irish church. 86 Pope John XXII although more favourable to the English than to the Irish princes, had sent a copy of the letter to Edward II, now extant only in Walter Bower’s Scottichronicon. 87 The Libellus formed Philip’s dossier of counter-arguments against the 1317 Irish Princes’ Remonstrance. Therefore, in order to emphasize improvement in the state of the Irish church and the role of the English there, it is understandable why he would choose not to repeat Gerald’s perception of the Irish as ‘bad Christians’, and the supposedly alcoholic habits of the Irish clergy, even if Ireland’s dependent status was emphasised. Could Philip of Slane’s undertaking to abbreviate the TH under the auspices of

87 Frame, Political Development, p.187.
the king, presuppose Edward II’s familiarity with Gerald of Wales’s *TH*, particularly once it was completed?

Unlike Philip of Slane’s abbreviation in *Abb.1*, the purpose of *Abb.2*, found in *Hb* a late thirteenth-century manuscript of unknown origin and provenance, is not so easily identified. The abbreviator excludes the *TH*’s recitational introduction, the list of chapters and the prefaces to Bks. I and II. However, the preface to Bk. III does remain. From chs. 12-22 of Bk. I, which consist of descriptions of the birds and animals of Ireland, the abbreviator, fairly consistently, truncates the chapters by excluding the allegorical explanations. In Bk. II the only changes made are the omission of ch. 3 regarding the effect of the moon on the tides, and human brains and bone-marrow and the reorganisation of chs. 1, 2 and 4; ch. 4 on the marvellous islands of Munster and Ulster is placed before the chs. 1 and 2. However, from ch. 5 of Bk. II to the end of Bk. III nothing is abbreviated. There are two possible explanations, one simply that the abbreviator loses interest in making his text more concise, especially as there are far fewer long-winded allegorical explanations. Alternatively, the miracles, supernatural marvels, hagiographical anecdotes, prophecies, origin myths and ethnographic observations were of greater interest to an abbreviator who had also included within the same codex the *EH* and Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* with its pseudo-historical material, origin myths, prophecies and descriptions of conquests and war.

**Excerpts**

The excerpted form of the *TH* found in *R14, Fb* and *Ce* forms a composite text alongside extracts from the *EH*. It includes the first seven chapters of the third book of the *TH*, beginning with the origin myths derived from the *Lebor Gabalá* which described the various waves of peoples inhabiting Ireland from Cesara, Noah’s niece, until the final wave ending with Gurguntius, king of the Britons who, it was said by Gerald, sent the Basque people to settle in Ireland. The text of this last chapter is excluded and only the title is included. The final wave of invaders, the English, is addressed by the inclusion of the descriptions of Henry

---

88 For the list of altered chapters and their chapter headings see above, pp. 77-8.
89 See p. 242 for a description of the contents of this manuscript.
II from the *EH* as well as abbreviated descriptions of certain other key people who featured in the *EH*: Raymond, Meiller, Hervey and William FitzAldelin.90

To an extent, the selection suggests a rhetorical exercise in comparison; the descriptions of Raymond and Meiller, two of Gerald’s nephews, depicted as courageous and brave, are contrasted with two somewhat unsavoury characters: Hervey of Montmorency and William FitzAldelin. Although Hervey was married to Gerald’s niece, Gerald had taken exception to him as he was reported to have influenced Henry II against Raymond, Gerald’s favourite. The description of William FitzAldelin in the *EH* is a particularly scathing one, further augmented in a later chapter outwith this selection with the remark that FitzAldelin, ‘had done nothing of any note in Ireland.’ Except for William FitzAldelin’s description, the other selected descriptions are heavily abbreviated. The main focus of these descriptions is on the physical characteristics of the men, most markedly so with regards to the lengthy description of Henry, of which only a quarter is included by the compiler.

The choice of descriptions is perplexing: some of the prominent figures from the narrative such as Richard de Clare ‘Strongbow’, Hugh de Lacy and John de Courcey are excluded. Was the compiler interested in the difficulties faced by Raymund and Meiller and largely caused by William FitzAldelin and Hervey? Yet, the details of the difficulties which could be found in these chapters were excluded by the compiler. Was there perhaps a didactic message within this choice of descriptions; a warning against ‘judging a book by its cover’. The representations of Raymond, Meiller and Henry II shared the characterization of flawed outward appearances yet with honourable and courageous personalities. In contrast, a common aspect of the descriptions of Hervey and William is Gerald’s depiction of their favourable outward appearance as a counterfoil to emphasize his description of their rather unpleasant personalities.

This selection of excerpts is completed with a further excerpt from the *EH*; Gerald’s version of the infamous *Laudabiliter* bull proclaiming Henry’s right to Ireland as granted by Pope Adrian. The scribes of the Fairfax and Cotton manuscript mistakenly attribute the bull to

90 See pp.77-78.
Pope Urban. Could this early fourteenth century selection have also served as a response to the claims of the 1317 Remonstrance of the Irish Princes and Edward II’s exchanges with John XXII regarding Ireland?

Apart from the biographical descriptions, the pattern of choice stresses Henry II’s right and therefore the English crown’s right to Ireland. The selection reinforced Gerald primary’s argument within the EH that Ireland was a land accustomed to waves of invaders, thereby justifying the ‘final’ one. As Rees Davies has pointed out, despite both Geoffrey of Monmouth’s claims that Arthur had conquered Ireland for England, and Gerald’s that the Irish kings had submitted to an over lordship of Arthur, ‘Ireland fitted uncomfortably, and at best marginally, into any pan-Britain mythology.’

Would this then have been ample reasoning for the reinforcement of that claim, but primarily through Gerald’s emphasis on Henry II’s claim rather than any prior mythic entitlement?

These extracts from the TH and EH were copied in their entirety from manuscript to manuscript. Perhaps only an investigation of the associated texts of the missing exemplar of these manuscripts could furnish an explanation/some understanding of its purpose. In all three manuscripts it is accompanied by other short treatises, these ‘settings’, as Lesley Coote describes them, appear to be syntheses of what was considered to be useful pieces of information

Excerpt 2

Exc.2 is found within a compendium of a various scientific and geographic treatises. Geoffrey of Wighton’s contents list on f.1r of CM2 refers to this abbreviation as De Mirabilibus, however, this is a reference to the entire text and not solely to Bk II. The excerpt is an interesting collection of detail, drawn mainly from Bks.I and II of the TH with the occasional interspersion of Geoffrey’s own voice. For example, in one instance where he tires.

91 Davies, First English Empire, pp.47-8.
of Gerald’s verbosity entirely, in a discussion about singing grasshoppers, he merely adds ‘and to shorten the chapter...’

Geoffrey is highly selective of Bk.I and devotes considerably more attention to Bk.II. Here too, like Philip of Slane after choosing various anecdotes up to ch.19 he skips forward, omitting chapters on bestiality and hybrid creatures to more saintly miracles. His general method of selection follows the order in which the chapters are written in the book, except in one instance. Having discussed the St.Brigid’s fire which no man is allowed to blow on [ch.36] he skips forward to ch.48 where an example is given of the punishment meted out to an archer who attempted to blow on the fire, after which he returns to the original structure and discusses the speaking cross in Dublin in ch.44. Geoffrey had little interest in Bk.III, choosing to include ch.12 only, the complimentary chapter about the musical talents of the Irish.

This anthology fits best into our understanding of Gerald of Wales as the educated man with an intense interest in the natural sciences, a product of his Parisian education, which Geoffrey of Wighton studying in Oxford would have responded to. Placed alongside Gerald are the well-known authorities of Solinus, Boethius, Ethicus, Macrobius, Ovid, Arabic texts in translation, and John of Salisbury’s Meta
gologue. This codex displays characteristics of the typical fourteenth-century compilation, a florilegium of authoritative learned material.

Excerpt 3

The excerpts in this manuscript were written in the margins of Peter Lombard’s Sentences. Although G dates from the thirteenth-century, these excerpts are in a fourteenth-century bastard anglicana hand. Although it may have been made under the auspices of Adam de Lakenheath, it may also have been added after the donation to Gonville Hall.

The selection of excerpts in G is drawn from all three books of the TH. From Bk.I the compiler was interested in the location of Ireland, its weather and hawks and falcons, and from Bk. II, wells, lakes, the female shape-shifter, miracles of St. Kevin and the penny which was

---

93 ‘et capite truncato’, CM2, f.145r.
refused by the speaking cross at Dublin. The choices from Bk.III, apart from the praise of Irish musical abilities, were mainly derogatory selections regarding the Irish clergy.\(^{95}\)

**Excerpt 4**

Although the selection of excerpts in *Rd* are taken from eleven different chapters of the *TH* they contain the briefest selection of textual material. It is not a verbatim use of the *TH*, instead the compiler offers a précis of particular marvels of Ireland chosen primarily from Bk.II with two exceptions from Bk.III.\(^{96}\) The compiler did not follow Gerald’s internal structure but arranged the selection according to geographical area instead. He grouped together his choices from Ulster and then Munster, after which he adds a single item of interest from Connacht and Ossory each. His penultimate two items were the anecdotes about Jesus’ staff purportedly in Ireland and the ‘speaking cross’ in Dublin, completing his selection with a mention of Ruanus, the man claimed to have been baptized by St. Patrick who lived to a considerable age. These were found among a collection of marvels relating to England and the ‘East’.

**Excerpt 5**

*MJ* is a fifteenth-century copy of the *Polychronicon* made by Stephen Lawless, subprior of St. Mary’s Abbey Dublin, later prior from 1431. The selection of excerpts here was taken solely from Bk.III of the *TH*.\(^{97}\) They included the discussion of the various settlers to Ireland, excluding, however, the chapter about Slanius, whom Gerald termed the ‘first king of Ireland’. The excerpter then moved swiftly through the text to include the invasion of the ‘Ostmen’. This selection is then rounded out with Bk.II ch.5 of the *EH* with its papal privileges of Adrian IV & Alexander III, which of course legitimised the English invasion and settlement of areas of Ireland. Like exc. 1, the choice of excerpts reflect the English justification of their right to Ireland and the view that Ireland was a land accustomed to repeated invasions.

\(^{96}\) See pp.81-2.
These excerpts, apart from exc.1 and exc.5, reflect the abiding interest in the *mirabilia* within the *TH*, and its use for select vignettes of interest. However, like Gerald’s initial critics, these compilers had little interest in perpetuating Gerald’s tales of hybrid people like the horse-woman or the ox-man. *Exc.3*, unlike the others, appears to have an interest in the perceived lax reputation of the Irish clergy. However, was this an example of xenophobic criticism, or rather, a more universal censure regarding the neglect by bishops of their pastoral care. *Abb.1, exc.1* and *exc.5* also demonstrate how portions of the text could be used to successfully emphasise the right of the English crown to overlordship of Ireland. Were the above issues those which other medieval authors who used portions of the *TH* were concerned about?

**Other medieval authors**

Of the medieval borrowers, Ranulf Higden is often cited as the most substantial in terms of the ideas and words of the *TH* found in his *Polychronicon*.

The following section draws on the work of numerous literary historians to examine the debt owed to Gerald of Wales by Bartholomew the Englishman, Ranulf Higden, John Trevisa (by way of translations of the *De proprietatibus rerum* and the *Polychronicon*), John of Fordun, Walter Bower, Geoffrey Chaucer, authors or compilers of sermon *exemplas* and *ars praedicandi texts* and, finally, bestiaries.

**De Proprietatibus Rerum (DPR) and Trevisa’s translation**

Bartholomew the Englishman’s *De Proprietatibus Rerum (DPR)*, an encyclopaedic text written c.1245, enjoyed an immense and immediate success; as Salimbene, a fellow Franciscan

---

98 For example, James Conway Davies’ proposed work on the medieval dissemination of the *TH* would have concentrated solely on the *Polychronicon*, Aberystwyth, NLW, J.Conway Davies Papers (Box 29) ‘notes for unpublished article “Reception and uses of Gerald’s Historical Material”’. 
writing in the 1280s attested amongst scholarly circles at Paris.\(^9^9\) The contents of Book XV which described the places and people of the world, arranged in alphabetical order, make this all-encompassing nineteen-volume work of particular interest here.\(^1^0^0\) Bartholomew the Englishman’s conservative manner concerning his choice of trusted authorities for his multi-volume encyclopaedia will be considered in ch.III below, nevertheless Solinus and Isidore were not, as he claimed, his sole authorities for his description of Ireland.

Although the opening lines of the section on Ireland consisting of a locational description were derived from Isidore, M.C. Seymour suggests that the subsequent matter regarding the more topographical description, such as the plentiful fields of Ireland, and the *mirabilia*, with the exception of the remark about precious stones, were from the *TH*, and that Bartholomew returned to the older authority of Solinus only after. Yet, when the marvels within the next section are examined closely, it can be seen that the discussion of the lake within which a tree-pole is changed simultaneously into iron, stone and wood and the lake in which coral turns to ash and vice-versa, is not found in *TH*. These two anecdotes are, however, found in the Irish Nennius and in the Norwegian *King’s Mirror*.\(^1^0^1\) The marvels listed immediately after this section, of the island where dead bodies remain incorruptible and a further island where men do not die, are common to the *TH* and the two texts mentioned above. Therefore, this portion of the entry on Ireland cannot be attributed to Gerald in its entirety. In fact, the final section, after Bartholomew the Englishman had genuinely quoted from Solinus’ *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* and Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologies*, for which Seymour states ‘this brisk account of the Irish is not found in Giraldus’, is more likely to have been influenced by the *TH*. Although not a verbatim-copied passage, its observations share many of the sentiments of the ethnographic observations made in Bk.III. ch.10 of the *TH*. Bartholomew draws attention to the strange attire of the Irish, their courage and propensity to turn to anger and their choice of abode in woods and mountains, and their preference for hunting over an

---


\(^1^0^0\) There is no recent printed edition or modern translation of the Latin text. John Trevisa’s fourteenth-century translation has been published, M.C Seymour, *On the Properties of Things: John Trevisa’s translation of Bartholomaeus Anglicus *De proprietatibus rerum*, a critical text*, Vol.I&II (Oxford 1975,1987). This translation was first printed by Wynkoun de Worde for Roger Thorney at the end of the fifteenth century. There is evidence of Bk.XV having circulated separately in England in the fourteenth century in S* and in BL, Arundel 123 (entitled *Geographia Universalis*).

\(^1^0^1\) *DPR*, p.768; see p.3 n.8.
honest day’s work. Furthermore, in his description of ‘Scotia’, Bartholomew acknowledges the perceived ethnic and cultural links as supported by Gerald, referring specifically to clothing and customs for these similarities.

Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon*

The *Polychronicon*, written by the Chester-based Benedictine monk, Ranulf Higden, was also a work which received wide interest within the author’s lifetime. First completed in 1327, it was later revised and reissued at least twice before the author’s death. It spawned a number of continuations and translations, of the latter most notably that of John Trevisa, vicar of Berkeley, who had also provided a translation of *DPR*.

As a universal chronicle, following in the model of the works of Orosius and Eusebius, it opened with an account of the known world, moving from east to west with brief descriptions, culminating with lengthier accounts of Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and England. The description of Ireland immediately follows a chapter devoted to islands of the ocean, including Iceland and Ultima Thule, for which the *TH* was cited and used as a source. The Irish section consists of the following five chapters:

I.32. *De Hibernia*  
I.33. *De incolis prioribus*  
I.34. *De incolarum moribus*  
I.35. *De locorum prodigiis*  
I.36. *De sanctorum preconii*

---

103 *DPR*, pp.812-813.  
105 Poly. I. pp.322-324.  
106 The following concordance for the Higden’s five chapters on Ireland with the *TH* is taken from C. Babington, ‘Introduction’ *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis*, vol.1 ed. C. Babington (London, 1865) pp.xxxvii. Poly. I.32 (an account of Ireland’s location, topography and wildlife): [III.7]; [I.1]; [I.1]; [I.2]; [I.4]; [I.25-27]; [I.7-11]; [I.22]; [I.5]; [I.4]; [I.18]; [I.7]; [I.18]; [I.22-3, 25].  
107 Poly. I.33 (an account of the waves of invaders in Ireland’s past): [III.1-5]; [III.11]; [III.7-8]; [III.36-38]; [III.40]; [III.43-6].  
108 Poly. I.34 (ethnographic observations of the Irish): [III.10,11]; [III.19-24]; [III.26]; [III.35]; [II.19]; [II.1]; [II.43].  
109 Poly. I.35 (mirabilia drawn from Bk.II): [II.4-7]; [II.28]; [II.9]; [II.19]; [II.7 – Babington is mistaken here, this portion is not drawn from the *TH* but instead from Bartholomeus Anglicus *DPR*]; [II.42-3]; [II.29].  
110 Poly. I.36 (a brief account regarding the Irish clergy, monks and saints): [II.55]; [III.27-9]; [III.32-4]
Higden had provided a selected bibliography in his introduction to the *Polychronicon* where he claimed to use three of Gerald of Wales’ works, the *TH*, the *IK* and the *Vitam regis Henrici Secundi sub triplici distinctione*. It is evident that the section on Ireland relied solely on the *TH*, and that the *IK* do not appear to have been used for the *Polychronicon*. In his preface, Higden claimed the role of compiler as opposed to an author. He claimed that he would distinguish between that which he offered, by prefacing it with ‘Ranulphus’ written in red, and other authors used. Yet, for the section on Ireland he is far from consistent in this practice. He cited as his authorities Bede, Solinus, Isidore and Gerald of Wales, failing to mention his use of the *DPR*.

Higden’s decision to veer from Gerald’s three-part internal structure is striking. His careful and concise amalgamation of Gerald’s words is clearly that of someone familiar with the work. Within this geographical preface, the description of Ireland is second only to the description of England in both quality and quantity. A clear message emerges from the forceful manner in which Higden began his description of Ireland. Prior to any discussion of the Irish, their ways or land, Higden first established the English crown’s claim to Ireland. The chapter opened with the words:

```
Hibernia Þat is Irlond and was of olde tyme
incorporat in to Þe lordschippe of Bretayne, so
seiÞ Giraldus in sua Topographia.112
```

This is a theme reinforced by his second chapter on Ireland where he draws only from the chapters on the waves of invaders from bk. III of the *TH* and makes a special point of stating that, ‘And so hit semeþ Þat Irlond schulde longtime to Britayne by lawe of olde tyme.’113

---

111 *Poly.* I.2, p.24; J. Taylor suggests that Ranulf Higden used both the *IK* and the *DK* for his section on Wales, Taylor, *Universal Chronicle*, p.58. However, the verse description of Wales is taken verbatim from Walter Map’s poem ‘Cambriae epitome’, *The Latin poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes*, ed. T. Wright (London, 1841) pp.131-146; it is of course possible that Walter Map may have used Gerald’s *IK* and *DK* as his sources.


113 *Poly.* I.33, ‘Ex quo videtur quod de jure antiquo Hibernia debeat ad Britanniam pertinere’ pp.344-5.
For the subsequent chapter, regarding the ways of the Irish, Higden claims to begin with the words of Solinus but, in fact, uses verbatim the final paragraph of Bartholomew the Englishman’s section on Ireland mentioned above. For the ensuing discussion, Higden returns to the TH where he remained faithful to the sentiments expressed by Gerald and presented a hardy, war-mongering people, who except for their talents in music, were to be condemned for their way of life, and represented as alien and abominable particularly in relation to marriage, clothing, work-ethic, loyalty and even their manner of relieving themselves!

It is this last observation suggesting an inversion of accepted norms, for, ‘among hem many men pisseP sittynge and wommen stondynge’, which offers some hint as to the recension of the TH available to Higden.\textsuperscript{114} This phrase from Bk.III.26 of the TH is a later addition found in \textit{rec.C} and \textit{rec.D} and in the margin of \textit{C} and \textit{A34} of \textit{rec.BC}. It could be speculated that as Higden may have had access to a manuscript which contained the \textit{TH}, \textit{EH} and \textit{IK}, as suggested by his introduction, it would have been a manuscript not dissimilar to a codex such as \textit{A34}, \textit{B}, \textit{R} or \textit{F}.

Higden may not have engaged in a full discussion of Irish bestiality but he did not refrain from alluding to the shape-shifters and human physical deformities. Yet he attributes these deformities to incest and ‘unlawful’ sexual intercourse rather than explicitly referring to bestiality.\textsuperscript{115} The absence of any discussion of those ‘marvels’ regarding hybrid-creatures from the subsequent chapters is, therefore, unsurprising. The one exception in ch.35 is the reference to the itinerant wolf-human couple, although this is portrayed by Gerald, as well as Higden, as a ‘true’ marvel. Higden included anecdotes regarding the marvellous islands and lakes, but here digressed from the \textit{TH} to add the two marvels found in Bartholomew the Englishman’s \textit{De Proprietatibus Rerum}.\textsuperscript{116} In his final chapter in the section on Ireland, he drew on bk. III, praising and reproving the Irish clergy, while also discussing Gerald’s view that Irish saints were more likely to be vindictive. His use of the \textit{TH} concluded with a discussion of the archbishop of Cashel’s remark regarding the lack of martyrs in Ireland and the relics revered by the Irish.

\textsuperscript{114} ‘In hac quente quamplures viri sedendo, mulieres stando urinam emitunt’, \textit{Poly.} I.34, pp.358-9.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Poly.} I.34, pp.358-9.
\textsuperscript{116} The two marvels are discussed above p.117.
It is this final section which offers one of the best examples of Higden responding directly to the TH. The archbishop of Cashel had reportedly stated,

> It is true.. although our people are very barbarous, uncivilized, and savage, nevertheless they have always paid great honour and reverence and they have never put out their hands against the saints of God. But now people have come to the kingdom which knows how, and is accustomed, to make martyrs.\(^{117}\)

Higden recognized the basis for this barbed comment. On using it he added, preceding it with the requisite ‘Ranulphus’ in red,

> Þe bisshop seide so, bycause Þay kyng Henry Þe secounde was Þoo i-come in to Irlond freschliche after Þe martirodom of Seint Thomas of Canturbury.\(^{118}\)

When the proximity of Chester to Ireland and the bustling trade between Ireland and Chester is considered, it is of some surprise that Ranulf Higden did not offer any contemporary observations of the Irish. As Simon FitzSimon who travelled from Ireland through Chester in 1323, a mere four years before Higden finished the first version of the Polychronicon, noted, ‘we reached the city of Chester, which is in England, on Holy Thursday. Ships from Ireland arrive continuously at this port.’\(^{119}\) While this may simply be indicative of the reliance on the authority of the written word, it may also be a reflection of an understanding of the English

---

\(^{117}\) ‘Verum est.. quia licet gens nostra barbara nimis et inculta, et crudelis esse videatur, viris tamen ecclesiasticis honorem magnum et reverentiam semper exhibere solet, et in sanctos Dei nulla occasione manum extendere. Sed nunc in regnum gens advenit, que martyres et facere novit et consuevit’, TH III.32.


descent of most of the Irish merchants in England and that they were not the same people described by Gerald as the Irish.\textsuperscript{120}

The acknowledged use of Gerald of Wales’ \textit{TH} by Ranulf Higden suggests that a brief overview of the dissemination of the \textit{Polychronicon} offers a glimpse into the increased exposure Gerald’s \textit{TH} received in the fourteenth century. Over a hundred and thirty-eight complete and partial medieval manuscripts of the \textit{Polychronicon} are extant. In conjunction with the twenty-five attested manuscripts from library catalogues and wills, a picture of a vastly popular text emerges.\textsuperscript{121} Although mainly in religious hands, a limited lay ownership can also been identified. Higden’s \textit{Polychronicon} received an even wider dissemination through the various continuations made of it, for example by John of Tynemouth, Thomas Walsingham and Adam of Usk. This often verbatim use of the \textit{Polychronicon} ensured an even wider fourteenth-century and fifteenth-century indirect dissemination of the \textit{TH}.\textsuperscript{122}

In addition to the above, there are also examples of the final chapters of Bk.I of the \textit{Polychronicon}, that is the chapters relating to Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England, circulating separately in the late-fourteenth-century St. Albans manuscript, BL Royal 13 E IX and titled ‘Compendiosa descriptio Britannie’.\textsuperscript{123} Although William Caxton rearranged the order of the descriptions when he printed John Trevisa’s translation of this section as \textit{Descripcion of Britayne} in 1480, he shortly followed this publication with Trevisa’s entire text in 1482. By 1495, Wynkyn de Worde had also published the chronicle in translation, swiftly followed three years later with another, \textit{The descripcion of Britayne}.\textsuperscript{124}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{120}] See above for Wendy Child’s discussion regarding Irish merchants in Chester and Bristol, p.49.
\item[\textsuperscript{122}] Although the extant manuscripts of Trevisa’s translation do not suggest that it reached a wider audience than the Latin text, at least in manuscript form, its accessibility to a lay audience ensured that it reached a more diverse audience. He translated the work into the vernacular c.1385-1387 at the request of Lord Beverley for whom he was vicar, D.C Fowler, \textit{The Life and Times of John Trevisa, Medieval Scholar} (Washington, 1995) p.177; There are nineteen manuscripts of this translation, of which sadly none have been associated with any person or place in the Middle Ages - for a full list see Fowler, \textit{John Trevisa}, p.250.
\item[\textsuperscript{123}] BL, Royal 13 E IX, ff.160-169v.
\item[\textsuperscript{124}] Taylor, \textit{Universal Chronicle}, pp. 140-142
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Scot(t)ichronicon – John of Fordun and Walter Bower

Any discussion of John of Fordun and Walter Bower extends the scope of this analysis beyond the English kingdom. Nonetheless, the cross-border political, cultural, religious and intellectual relationships between northern England and southern Scotland fully justifies its place here, particularly as Walter Bower believed that John of Fordun, his main source, had travelled around Britain and Ireland in order to collect material for his chronicle.¹²⁵

Walter Bower, a canon of St. Andrews and later Abbot of Inchcolm, used the *Chronica gentis Scottorum* of the Aberdeen chaplain, John of Fordun, to write his *Scottichronicon*. Like John of Fordun’s *Chronica*, the *Scottichronicon* opened with the Scottish origin myths of Gathelos and Scota. Walter Bower, writing a century later, also added a contemporaneous account, ending the chronicle with the death of King James I of Scotland. The origin myths of the Scottish people were closely integrated with that of the Irish. Indeed John of Fordun’s response to the tumultuous events in Scotland at the end of the thirteenth century and early fourteenth century, was to include Baldred Bisset’s pleading to the Pope which reinforced the origin myth of Scota and Gathelos and the Irish link, thereby counteracting the Brutus origin myth with its implicit acknowledgement of English superiority.¹²⁶

John of Fordun’s main sources for his brief descriptions of Ireland, or so he claimed, were John of Genoa’s *Catholicon*, Bede, Isidore of Seville and Robert Grosseteste.¹²⁷ Yet towards the end of his verbatim copy of Isidore of Seville’s description he adds,

¹²⁷ This reference to the *Catholicon* is rather unusual, as John of Genoa’s etymological approach to the word ‘hibernia’ would give him little new information which had not been found in Isidore or Bede, Joannes Balbus, *Catholicon* (Westmead, 1971 – reprint of the 1460 Mainz edition); The sole surviving, rather brief, reference to Ireland in the extant writings of Robert Grosseteste: Dicta 8. f.8v Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 798 (SC 2656) cited in The *Electronic Grosseteste*, http://www.grosseteste.com/cgi-bin/dicta-display.cgi?dictum=8, is not used by Bower.
There are there, marvellous springs and lakes, whereof I will say nothing at present. But, in that land, there are many other wonderful things, whose properties I will not describe, as it would, I think, beget weariness in the reader.\textsuperscript{128}

Could this in fact have been a reference to the TH? Clearly, relaying much of Gerald’s opinions of the Irish would have been counterproductive to his portrayal of the Scots, especially as John of Fordun was keen to emphasise that,

the Scottish nation, writes \textit{Isidore}, is that, originally, which was once in Ireland, and resembles the Irish in all things – in language, manners and character.\textsuperscript{129}

A fleeting reference to marvels and miracles was, in contrast, considerably more positive. If, as has been suggested, John of Fordun travelled extensively to collect material, this could have been a work he had came across.

In the opening matter of Walter Bower’s chronicle, after offering John of Fordun’s description of Ireland in relation to the origin myth, he added,

In the book of the miracles of Ireland I have found it written as follows – that the Hibernians are also called Gaitheli and Scoti.\textsuperscript{130}

Walter then included Gerald’s view of the invention of Gaelic following the fall of Babel and Gerald’s comment on the affinity of the Scots and Irish.\textsuperscript{131} Despite acquiescing with the

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{John of Fordun’s Chronicle of the Scottish Nation} vol.1 ed. W. Skene (Llanerch, 1993), pp.14-16.
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Fordun’s Chronicle}, p.14.
\textsuperscript{130} ‘\textit{In libro de mirabilibus Hibernie sic scriptum reperi quod Hibernienses dicti sunt eciam Gaitheli et Scoti}’, Walter Bower, \textit{Scotichronicon} vol.1, ed. J. & W. Macqueen (Aberdeen, 1993) I.18 p.44.
Gathelos-Scota origin myth, Walter did not offer a description of the Irish as favourable as John of Fordun’s. After following John of Fordun’s example of offering Bede’s description, he broke away, offering his own prose and presenting sentiments similar to Gerald’s by drawing indiscriminately from his various sources which included Bartholomew the Englishman and the TH.\textsuperscript{132}

Walter Bower was twice-more influenced by TH. He deviated from his narrative in Book XII and presented a further description of Ireland, here ascribed to a ‘John of Ireland.’\textsuperscript{133} This description was, however, slightly more favourable. Here, in Book XII is Bower’s most extensive use of the TH. He exercised a peculiar custom of using merely the first paragraph of each chosen chapter.\textsuperscript{134} His main interests appear to be topographical with an interest also in the wildlife. One short section was devoted to the two islands on the lake in Munster and the marvellous well in Munster which turns hair white and the corresponding well in Leinster which never turns hair white, but states that ‘there are other most wonderful marvels in Ireland; but let this selection suffice.’\textsuperscript{135} The more derogatory ethnographic and historical observations from the TH were evidently unwelcome in this section of his work. Here those types of observations would have repercussions on the depiction of the Scots and their origin myths. These excerpts in Book XII of the Scottichronicon were a digression from his main narrative, which Walter Bower acknowledges with the statement ‘now let us turn back to the annals’.\textsuperscript{136}

These excerpts had been preceded by a discussion of the Irish princes’ Remonstrance in 1317 and their copy of Laudabiliter, the very documents against which Philip of Slane had created his abbreviation of the TH.\textsuperscript{137} Walter Bower justified the inclusion of the excerpts from the TH stating,

\textsuperscript{131}Scot., vol.1, I.18 pp.44-45.
\textsuperscript{132}Scot., vol.1, I.19 pp.46-49, 127-129; the editors J. & W. Macqueen see Bower’s additions here as a deliberate attempt to contradict John of Fordun’s view by inserting ‘hostile comments, directed as much against his Gaelic-speaking fellow countrymen as against the Irish’.
\textsuperscript{133}Scot., vol.6, XII.36, pp.410-411
\textsuperscript{134}The editors offer a concordance for Walter Bower’s use of the TH in the three chapters: Bk.XII.34 – [I.5-6]; [I.8]; [I.9]; [I.12]; [I.13]; [I.14]; [I.15]; Bk.XII.35 – [I.24]; [I.28]; [I.29]; [I.30]; [I.31] I.33]; Bk.XII.36 – [I.33]; [I.38]; [II.4]; [II.7], Scot., vol.6, pp.404-411, 483-485.
\textsuperscript{135}`Sunt et alia quam admiranda Hibernie mirabilia, de quibus ista sufficiant.’ Scot., vol.6, Bk.XII.36, pp.410-411.
\textsuperscript{136}`Nunc ad annalia revertamus’, Scot., vol.6, Bk.XII.36, pp.410-411.
\textsuperscript{137}This copy of the Laudabiliter although textually very similar to the copy on the EH is closer to the fourteenth-century copy found in the Book of Leinster and the copy sent with the petition to the English c. 1317-1319.
I have carefully inserted the foregoing remarks about the Irish in this work so that the Scots may learn never to be willing to be subject to the tyranny of the insufferable rule of the English.  

The very pleasing account of Ireland placed in Book XII, in contrast to that found in Book I, can therefore, also, only reflect well on Scotland, regarding their already well established affinity with Ireland.  

Finally, nearing the end of his chronicle, he praised the musical abilities of King James I of Scotland, which he claimed surpassed that of the celebrated and talented Irish; Walter Bower had, once again, turned to ‘de mirabilibus Hibernie’ to discuss the Irish and music. This, too, further reinforced Gerald’s own comments that Scotland because of its relationship with Ireland, also shared in these innate musical talents and that,  

In the opinion, however of many, Scotland has been now not only caught up on Ireland, her instructor, but already far outdistances and excels her in musical skill.  

Walter Bower certainly manipulates the TH very carefully and sees no paradox in the contrasting representations of Ireland offered. His apparent ignorance of the true identity of the author has three possible explanations. First, a careless mistake which stemmed from ‘true’ ignorance of the author’s name; second, that he had access to a collection of excerpts put together by someone called ‘John of Ireland’; and third, that this was a deliberate misrepresentation of the author by Walter Bower, in part because perhaps he was well aware that those familiar with the text would also have been aware of Gerald’s more disparaging views of Ireland.

139 Scot., vol.8, Bk.XVI.28-29, pp.305-309.  
140 O’Meara, p.104; TH, III.11.
Geoffrey Chaucer and the House of Fame

From Walter Bower’s substantial, and occasional verbatim, use of the *TH* the discussion shifts to a different form of borrowing: that of ideas, concepts and imagery. Rory McTurk asserts that Geoffrey Chaucer displayed an awareness of the *TH* in his poem *House of Fame* written c.1379. His argument centres on two instances where Chaucer was influenced by the *TH*. The two occurrences are related to passages regarding eagles [*TH* I.12,13] and St. Brigid [*TH* II.34-37, 48]. In Gerald’s discussion of the eagle and its ability to look at the sun in close proximity, he offers an allegorical representation of two contrary types of people; one who is contemplative and the other who tries too hard to attempt a full understanding of everything. McTurk argues that it is this second representation of the eagle which Chaucer borrows, and as this representation is more unusual, this suggests Chaucer’s familiarity with the *TH*.

Rory McTurk also offers a plausible explanation with regards to Geoffrey Chaucer’s whereabouts during the years 1361-1366. He suggests that Chaucer is likely to have been in the service of Lionel of Clarence in Ireland, and offers thereby a speculative and practical reason as to Chaucer’s familiarity with the *TH*. These two topics reflect the vignettes of interest already shown by other fourteenth-century excerpts of the *TH*.

---


142 McTurk, *Chaucer*, pp.53-64.
Gerald would have been delighted with the use made of his various mirabilia anecdotes in sermons, theological commentaries and ars praedicandi texts, justifying the additions made to the TH as urged by Archbishop Baldwin. Nevertheless these fourteenth-century examples do not represent an exhaustive search for this type of use. Siegfried Wenzel has discussed a substantial collection of sermon manuscripts which are in need of editing. There are likely to be considerably more references to the TH in extant sermons, preaching manuals and commentaries. Although Wenzel’s purpose was mainly to identify the sermons and their incipits, from this alone John of Bromyard’s acquaintance with Gerald of Wales is identified. An Easter Sunday sermon titled ‘Alleluia’ in CUL, Kk.4.24, attributed to John of Bromyard from his Exhortationes opens citing Gerald of Wales ‘Narrat, karrissimi, Giraldus historiographus de quedam.’  

BL Harley 3760 contains a larger sermon collection of Thomas Brinton, bishop of Rochester. Amongst these sermons he makes four references to Giraldus Cambrensis and his De mirabilibus Hibernie. However, as Mary Devlin has shown only one of these references relates to the TH. The other three references are from the EH, and are, in fact, all to the same anecdote regarding Gerald’s vision at Chinon; one of Thomas’ staple exempla for his Good Friday sermon. The reference to the TH was the use of the story of the disappearing island off the Irish coast as an exemplum in an undated sermon. Thomas Brinton had begun his religious life at Norwich Cathedral priory, and continued his education first in Oxford, and then Cambridge at the new Trinity Hall endowed by William Bateman, bishop of Norwich. Thomas Brinton is also known to have spent time at Avignon and Rome. He was incepted as a

doctor of Canon Law in 1364 and became bishop of Rochester in 1373.\textsuperscript{146} He would certainly have had ample opportunity of coming across the \textit{TH} at any of these locations.

John Waldeby, an Austin friar, is also known to have made use of the very same anecdote from the \textit{TH}.\textsuperscript{147} John’s use of this vignette was not in a sermon but in his \textit{Commentary on the Lord’s Prayer}.\textsuperscript{148} John of Waldeby, author also of the monumental \textit{Novum Opus Dominicalic}, was an Austin friar at York in the late-fourteenth century. He too, like John of Bromyard was a reputed scholar and aware of a great number of texts.\textsuperscript{149} He joined the Austin friars in the 1330s at Lincoln and then studied in Oxford gaining his D.Theol. by 1354. From then on it is believed that he remained at York until his death in 1372, except for a recorded sojourn at Perugia for the General Chapter in 1354.\textsuperscript{150} Of course his familiarity with this excerpt maybe due to the reading of some other text, or perhaps can be explained by John of Erghome’s donation of a copy of the \textit{TH} to the library of the York Austin friars.

Finally, Robert of Basevorn, in his fourteenth-century \textit{Forma Predicantium}, also displayed a familiarity with the \textit{TH}, again referred to as \textit{Mirabilia Hibernie}.\textsuperscript{151} Robert of Basevorn’s two references to Gerald are not interrelated. The first was used to support his call for preachers to be eloquent. The second was to urge the use of interesting examples of marvels at the beginning of a sermon. He wrote that this was a way not only to interest the reader (or perhaps even listener) but also to make the message of the sermon more memorable.

One way is to place at the beginning something subtle and interesting, as some authentic marvel which can be fittingly drawn in for the purpose of

\begin{footnotes}


\footnoteref{148} According to R. Sharpe, ten copies of John of Waldeby’s \textit{Commentary of the Lord’s Prayer} are listed in M.W Bloomfield’s \textit{Incipits of Latin works on the virtues and Vices}, 1100-1500 (Cambridge, 1979). BL, Royal 7 E ii, which contains a late-fourteenth-century example of this text at f. 29 has a provenance of Brasenose College, Oxford; There is another copy of John of Waldeby’s \textit{Commentary} in BL, Royal 8 C I, art. 1.


\footnoteref{150} Wenzel, \textit{Latin Sermon Collections}, pp.40-44.

\end{footnotes}
the theme. For instance, suppose that the theme is concerned with the Ascension of the Assumption: *a spring rose from the earth*. One could adduce that marvel which Gerald narrates in his book, *De mirabilibus Hiberniae* about the spring in Scicilia.\(^{152}\)

Of particular note is Robert’s implicit assumption that many of his readers would be familiar with the anecdote from the *TH* regarding the spring.

Sermons and commentaries were undeniably a wider means of transmitting ideas to a broader socio-cultural group than manuscripts which were invariably restricted to monastic, mendicant and educational environments. Yet our understanding of this is limited by what survives of sermons. As the examples above show, what survive are rare occurrences of written sermons, commentaries and texts demonstrating and instructing the art of sermon-making. The few surviving remarks about Ireland and indeed the *TH* are less of an indication of the interest in Ireland and the *TH* rather than the wider interests and materials available to the educated elite of the sermon-givers of the fourteenth century. Siegfried Wenzel has suggested that John of Bromyard’s use of the word ‘karissimi’ to address his audience suggests an undetermined audience of both clerical and lay.\(^{153}\) Nevertheless this neither suggests that a presupposed familiarity with Gerald’s work can be assumed, nor does it imply that the listeners would learn much about the text or author. To many, perhaps it would merely be the mention of another authoritative religious literary figure. Yet, these examples above do suggest a casual knowledge of Gerald and his *de mirabiliae hiberniae* amongst the university-educated elite.\(^{154}\)

**Bestiaries**

The *TH* has a complex symbiotic relationship with the bestiary tradition. Although this is not a genre that is considered here in any detail, it cannot be ignored entirely. Not only did

---


\(^{154}\) See p.236 for an example of the practice of referring to the *TH* and *EH* as one item.
Gerald draw on existing bestiaries, but other bestiaries were, in turn, influenced by the *TH*. The bestiary tradition, like many other medieval texts, did not remain static in its transmission, interweaving material from new sources. Ron Baxter’s examination of the transmission of bestiaries in medieval England has highlighted three manuscripts which pay tribute to the *TH* in its borrowings. These three examples demonstrate the early use of the *TH* to augment the bestiary tradition. CUL, II.4.26, an early thirteenth-century manuscript which may have its provenance in Revesby, contains additional material from three different sources, one of which, regarding the kite, was the *TH*.\(^{155}\) These additions are also found in Bodley 764 and Harley 4751, two mid-thirteenth-century manuscripts. Both have a unique illumination of barnacle geese.\(^{156}\)

The Bodleian manuscript also bears some interpolated text about badgers. Baxter suggests that this mid-thirteenth-century manuscript may have been produced for Roger de Monhaut, a Justiciar of Chester, at the scriptorium at Salisbury.\(^{157}\) Four chapters from the first recension of the *TH* were used to supplement the bestiary from the chapters on the Barnacle goose, osprey, kingfisher and badger.\(^{158}\)

*****

Thus, of the known uses of the *TH* by other medieval authors, the interest is largely similar to those found in the excerpts made of the text. First and foremost, it reflects the continued interest in the *mirabilia* in the *TH*. The descriptions and symbolism of the animals discussed in the *TH* is also apparent through Chaucer’s use of the *TH* and the use of the text in the bestiaries. Lastly, as seen in the opening of the *Polychronicon* and Walter Bower’s use of

---

\(^{155}\) Although R. Baxter suggests a possible provenance of the Cistercian abbey of Revesby, Neil Ker in the *MLGB* rejects this association, *MLGB*, p.158.

\(^{156}\) See BL, Harley 4751, f.36r.


\(^{158}\) See Harley 4751 ff. 50v, 58v-60 and Bodley 764 ff. 30, 36-8; According to McCulloch the information is drawn from Bk.I 16 and Bk. I 17, and the association is made because the bestiaries reflect the same order in which this information is found in the *TH*, F. McCulloch, *Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries* (Chapel Hill, 1960) pp.35-36 n.42; cf. Bartlett, *Gerald*, p.222 n.84.
the *TH*, the origins of the Irish and the discussions of England’s right to Ireland remained an important concern.

**Patterns of Readership of the *Topographia Hibernica***

This method of analysis to identify patterns of readership may prove to be somewhat superficial due to the vagaries of chance which affect the survival of so many medieval manuscripts, and indeed texts. Nevertheless, the extant and attested manuscripts, and their use by other authors, have been examined according to the social status and educational background of the owners/readers, the availability of the text within secular versus religious institutions, religious affiliation, and geography to offer some preliminary observations.

The interest in this text is not one that crosses the boundaries of social hierarchy. While there is little certainty that Henry II or any of his sons read the text, it is clear from the dedications that Gerald hoped for this. It was certainly never done in Gerald’s presence as he was highly unlikely to have ignored this within his writings. Gerald’s bitter retort in the *IK* that the dedication of the *TH* to Henry had been a waste of his time certainly suggests this.\(^{159}\) Yet the numerous dedications made by Gerald to high ranking churchmen, such as Hubert Walter, William Longchamp and Hugh of Lincoln, suggests that Gerald was hoping for an influential readership. Indeed the number of single text codices surviving from Gerald’s lifetime suggests a concerted effort to disseminate the text, as does the evidence of Gerald providing amended editions of the text in exchange for earlier recensions. Over the duration of this period, the interest in it by men of standing within courtlife such as Walter Map, Philip of Slane and Geoffrey Chaucer is also evident.

A number of the later owners have affiliations with scholarly circles. Clearly, only a literate elite would ever have access to such a text. Yet, men like William Montibus, Geoffrey Wighton, Adam de Lakenheath, John Erghome, Thomas Brinton, John of Waldeby and Thomas Lane, master of Peterhouse and John Gunthorpe were not merely educated but men at the forefront of education in their respective generations. The possible interest in his books

---

\(^{159}\) *IK*, ‘Prefatio Prima’, p.7.
within centres of learning, may perhaps have began with Gerald’s measures for self publicity through his three-day reading at Oxford but was nevertheless sustained over time by a genuine interest in his work.

Powerful bishops, abbots and priors, number amongst the readers and possible readers of this text such as: Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury; Philip of Slane, bishop of Cork; William Longchamp, bishop of Ely; Hugh, bishop of Lincoln; Geoffrey Hereford, bishop of Kildare; Thomas Brinton, bishop of Rochester; Robert of Popoulton, perhaps the same prior of the Carmelites at Hulne in 1364; Walter Bower, abbot of Inchcolm; and John Gunthorpe, dean of Wells Cathedral. Ranulf Higden of St. Werburgh’s Abbey in Chester in his capacity as a ‘historical’ adviser to Edward III can also perhaps be considered within this list of influential religious men.¹⁶⁰ Neither Simon Bozoun, prior of Norwich cathedral, nor Henry Despencer, bishop of Norwich instigated the selection of excerpts of the TH and EH. Nevertheless, they too can be considered here as possible readers of the excerpts of the TH.

The TH was available to cathedrals, monastic and mendicant institutions including the Benedictines, Cistercians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinian canons and friars. Of course little can be deduced as to what actual reading may have occurred within these houses and the manuscript evidence is not adequate to make any generalizations as to particular interest in these texts in relation to religious affiliation. The surviving evidence does suggest a largely religious audience, yet it must be remembered that codices had better chances of survival within an institutional environment. Lord Berkeley, patron to John Trevisa, is a rare surviving lay example of a possible awareness of Gerald of Wales, albeit through the medium of the Polychronicon.

Geographically, the circulation was predominantly in the Midlands and southern England [see map.3]. Two particular clusters are apparent; one an East Anglian triangle of sorts and the other a similar cluster in southern England. A note of caution must be made in

this instance for, is this evidence of readership or merely the nature of the collection of information and the preservation of medieval manuscripts following the dissolution? Is this, however, a much greater reflection of the general book readership and the concentration of the larger, wealthier, monastic and mendicant houses in the midlands and south? Furthermore, this is more likely to be a reflection of the greater survival of books from areas in the south due to the interest of men such as Archbishop Matthew Parker, Richard Talbot and Lord Lumley, especially in the southern East Anglian region in the sixteenth century; as well as heavily reliant on the efforts of John Bale and John Leland in their individual bibliographic investigations. The transmission to York, Bridlington, Hulne and, perhaps, through Walter Bower’s knowledge of it to St. Andrews, are exceptions to this largely central and southern concentration. The appearance of the text in the late-twelfth/early-thirteenth-century Bridlington library catalogue displays a rather early dissemination of this text to the north (see map.1).

The geographical dispersal to Scotland may also be explained through York. In relation to Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum historiale*, Voorbij has discussed Walter Bower’s contacts with the Augustinian houses of Herefordshire, Yorkshire and Glastonbury, suggesting with some considerable caution that the work may have been borrowed from one of these houses. Could this have also been his method for getting information about the *TH* and hence his confusion about some of its material and author? Walter Bower evidently had access to the writings of John Erghome, which offers greater scope for the possibility that he may have become aware of the text through association with York.

**Conclusions**

The manuscripts of the *TH* were predominantly disseminated in England. Yet, the work spread: to Ireland where Philip of Slane made his abbreviations which were in turn disseminated in their Latin and vernacular forms to Avignon and Rouergue; to Limerick,
Dublin and perhaps Kildare; and to Scotland by the fifteenth century. On continental Europe it was read by Gautier de Metz and Jean de Meun; as well as Petrarch. Certainly, within a broad intellectual climate, where national or rather regnal boundaries could have little significance in regards to the pursuit of information, and with consideration of Gerald’s own travels and ability to physically disseminate his work, this is not surprising.

In England, there appear to have been three loci of transmission. First, the initial propagation of the text from Gerald’s unidentified scriptorium/scraptorium primarily to central and southern England. Second, south-east England in particular East Anglia in the late-thirteenth/fourteenth century; and finally also in northern England in York, which is most likely to have been the route to the work’s transmission to Scotland. Certainly, Robert of Popoulton’s manuscript which contains a number of rare historical treatises relating to Scotland reflects the interchange of material in northern England.164

To a great extent the late-twelfth- and thirteenth-century physical dissemination appears to have been largely due to the activities of Gerald of Wales himself. It was with the voice of a bitter man when Gerald complained in the second preface of the DK, that,

A number of famous men, whom I have met and who are known to me personally, show such contempt for literature that they were in the habit of immediately locking up in their cupboards the excellent works which I present to them, condemning them, as it were, to perpetual imprisonment.165

As he became a more accepted authority his works spread and were copied. That may be too simplistic an explanation. The second wave of diffusion in the fourteenth century may instead have been related to a wider interest in a medieval world-view, due perhaps to a changing

164 Friedman, Northern Book Owners, pp.41-52.
intellectual climate. This idea will be further developed in ch.IV on the associated texts within the manuscripts examined in this chapter.

The diffusion of the contents of the Gerald’s TH also offer some interesting avenues of exploration. Philip of Slane, Walter Bower and Ranulf Higden remained faithful to the topographical information in their borrowings/adaptations of the TH. From the evidence of the literary borrowings there was less interest in a substantial and faithful transmission of Gerald’s ethnographic observation, except in Higden’s Polychronicon. The excerpts made of the TH and the culling of information for exemplas ensured that the mirabilia enjoyed the greatest dissemination in the Middle Ages. Yet, within the use of this mirabilia little attention has been paid to Gerald’s examples of hybridity and bestiality. Unlike the other anecdotes of half-breed creatures, the vignette regarding the wolf-human couple from Ossory was considered acceptable, yet this is because their predicament is explained as a result of a saint’s machination and therefore a ‘true’ marvel rather than a contravention of the natural order.

The TH would be used repeatedly in the early modern era to support and refute England’s claim on Ireland. The extent to which this may have been through the extensive availability of Higden’s Polychronicon rather than the TH remains to be examined. Although the text was used in this way by Edward II and Philip of Slane, Ranulf Higden and the anonymous compiler of exc.1, it was not utilised to the same extent as it would be later. John Erghome, in the catalogue of the Austin friars highlighted his view of the TH as an Origines gentium listing it alongside such texts as Nennius, Bede and tales of Troy, Alexander and Rome under the heading ‘Historiae Gentium’. A similar approach can be seen in Walter Bower’s use of the TH to explain the ‘ancient’ affinity between the Irish and Scots.

The TH was truly a multi-faceted text, as the various possible interpretations and uses of it demonstrate. This chapter has attempted to show where the TH was available and to whom, and how it was received through the responses of other medieval authors in their use of the text. However, to gain a more complete understanding of its place within other literary
works of the period, an analysis of the associated texts within the various codices of the *TH* is also needed.\textsuperscript{166}
Fig.II 1 from *Itinerarium ad partes orientales*, Cambridge, CCC 66a, f.67r
II. WILLIAM OF RUBRUCK AND THE \textit{Itinerarium ad partes orientales}

THE MONGOLS AND THE EAST

In this chapter, the contemporary reactions and the medieval textual afterlife of William of Rubruck’s \textit{Itinerary} will be considered. The extant manuscripts have been examined, in terms of the geographical dissemination and the possible interests of their owners/readers, particularly questioning the view that the \textit{Itinerary} received its widest medieval and English dissemination through Roger Bacon’s use of it in his \emph{Opus Majus (OM)}. Finally, this study considers the transmission of the \textit{Itinerary} within a political and intellectual context. In order to place the reading of the \textit{Itinerary} within a political and socio-cultural context, the following must be considered briefly: first, views of the East prior to the advent of the Mongols; second, political relations between England and the Mongols; third, the post-medieval transmission of this text and hence its survival, as well the state of contemporary scholarship.

To date, in-depth study of the transmission and dissemination of the manuscripts of the \textit{Itinerary} has been negligible. There have been a number of editions of the Latin text published since Hakluyt made use of the incomplete text of Royal 14 C XIII to publish it in 1598. It was printed by Samuel Purchas in the early seventeenth century, then subsequently by Francisque Michel and Thomas Wright in 1839, William Woodville Rockhill in 1900, C. Raymond Beazely in 1903 and the Anastasius van den Wyngaert in 1929. Any consideration of the manuscripts has been done by the work’s early nineteenth-century editors, C.R. Beazely and Anastasius van den Wyngaert.\footnote{The Texts and Versions of John de Plano Carpini and William de Rubruquis, ed. C.R Beazely (London, 1903) pp.xiv-xx; P. A van den Wyngaert in \textit{Sinica Franciscana: Itinera et Relationes Fratrum Minorum Saeculi XIII et XIV}, vol. I (Florence, 1929) pp.158-159.} Despite the inaccuracies within the manuscript descriptions, Beazely’s longer, more elaborate descriptions have proved more popular with recent editors and translators of the text such as Peter Jackson and David Morgan in the English translation of 1990 and Claude and René Kappler in the French translation of 1997.\footnote{Editors of the text like P. Jackson & D. Morgan in \textit{The Mission of William of Rubruck} (London, 1990) pp.52-3 and C. & R. Kappler, \textit{Voyage dans l’Empire Mongol 1253-1255} (Paris, 1997) pp.59-62. C.R Beazely’s edition, \textit{The Texts and Versions of John de Plano Carpini and William de Rubruquis}, ed. C.R Beazely (London, 1903), pp.xiv-xx which is inaccurate with...}
van den Wyngaert’s Latin text which has been the basis of the translations, his briefer but more accurate manuscript descriptions in the Latin edition has largely been ignored. A reappraisal of the manuscript tradition has therefore been necessary, particularly as the Leiden manuscript, V, was not considered by either Beazely or van den Wyngaert. Also new to this study is the examination of the Itinerary’s wider dissemination within England through the study of the manuscripts, medieval library catalogues and medieval chronicles. Although the newly located manuscript at the Beinecke Library, MS 406 has not been considered fully within this study, it too offers a further dimension to the dissemination of the Itinerary.

In comparison to the research done on the transmission and dissemination of the text, the reception of the Itinerary has fared better. Jarl Charpentier offered a descriptive account of what had been borrowed from the Itinerary by Roger Bacon for his Opus Majus, while Michèle Geuret-Laferté presented an analysis of the material borrowed. She concentrated solely on those portions of the Itinerary which were used in the Geographia section of Roger Bacon’s Opus Majus and not the materials used in Book VII of the Opus Majus which has been considered here.

The primary difficulty faced in the study of the Mongols and their impact on medieval Europe is the ambiguous treatment of all Eastern peoples within the intellectual and literary discourse of the Middle Ages. Names of peoples, the attribution of habits, customs, and religious practices were often considered interchangeable between the various peoples of the unknown lands outwith Europe. Rarely was any real distinction made in reference to the actual location of the people described, except in highly generalised terms such as “Ethiopian”, “Indian” of “Eastern/Oriental”. In 1290 the clerk of Enghien in his La Manière et les faitures des monstres des hommes wrote,
In foreign nations they are not a bit like they are here. You know truly that the Oriental is quite otherwise than we are.\(^6\)

Evidently, for some, all things ‘foreign’ were equated with the ‘East’. However, more importantly, the practice of seeing the various people of the east as distinct while yet allowing ‘Eastern’ to be a vague, all-encompassing term can still be found in studies of medieval perceptions of peoples of the East. For the most part, this has been a tool of convenience due to the very ambiguity with which they have been described.

As a ‘new’ group of people emerging without an established tradition of terminology, the Mongols were particularly prone to this treatment. The far-reaching dominion of the Mongol Great Khan in the thirteenth century and fourteenth century, the largest empire of the time, covered a vast expanse. Yet, who were these Mongols? In the twelfth century, amongst the various nomadic groups of people in the Mongolian steppe were the Mongols, the Kereyid, the Naiman, the Tatars, the Merkits, the Qonggirats, the Ongguts and the Kirghiz, who can perhaps collectively be described as Turko-Mongol as the various groups spoke a form of either Turkish or Mongolian. However, although intermarriage within the groups was widely accepted, conflict and competition between the different groups was also rampant. Nevertheless, by 1206 Chinggis Khan, a Mongol, had brought together all these groups under his rule, defeating the traditional enemies of the Mongols, the Tatars. However, it was as a bastardisation of the name ‘Tatars’ that the people of the Mongol empire became known. It was suggested by Matthew Paris, the thirteenth-century English chronicler, that Louis IX, king of France, had linked the name, ‘Tartars’ with a the Latin word, ‘Tartarus’ or Hell, however this was an association already made in 1236 by Quilichinus of Spoletto. Alternately, the name ‘Tartar’ was linked to the island of Tarachonta where, according to Ethicus Ister, Gog and
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Magog were reputed to have built a city. Nonetheless, the previous dominance of the ‘Tatar’ people, in the Mongolian steppes may explain the use of this name as a general term of identification. Once consolidated, the expansion continued through conquest and the acceptance of client-kingsdoms within the fold. By Chinggis Khan’s death in 1227, Peter Jackson estimates that Mongol dominion stretched ‘from Manchuria to the Caspian and from the Siberian forests to the Hindu Kush.’

---

Views of the ‘East’

‘The Marvels of the East’ and other early-medieval views

Alongside the images of the ‘East’ drawn from the Greek classical tradition, as found in Pomponius Mela’s *De Chorographia* or Pliny’s *Historia Naturalis*, was the additional pervading biblical influence. It offered descriptions of the splendour of the Garden of Eden (a paradise believed to be in the east), the story of the expulsion of Cain with its tantalizing prophetic hints regarding the whereabouts of his descendants, discussions of the ‘lost tribes’ of Israel believed to be wandering the deserts of the ‘East’, as well as stories which emphasised the wealth and wisdom ostensibly found in abundance from the ‘East’. The Plinian descriptions with its dog-headed people, the ‘cynocephali’ or the ‘hippodes’, the horse-footed people, to the more mundane ‘garamantes’, the Ethiopian who did not marry, gave to a medieval audience a world of stark contrasts to that of their own. The Plinian images of the ‘East’ and its people, disseminated widely in medieval Europe through the popular works of Solinus, Martianus Capella, Ethicus Ister, Isidore of Seville, and their numerous derivatives, providing ideas of the east further enhanced by more contemporary veneers. The cycle of narratives and letters regarding the heroic exploits of Alexander the Great in India, also indebted to the Greek classical tradition, offered additional inspiration regarding the unknown eastern lands, and captured the medieval European imagination with its discussion of a wealthy, fascinating while yet alarming ‘East’.

Reconciling these descriptions within a Christian framework could prove difficult. Medieval exegetes were made especially anxious by the notion of the possible existence of abnormal ‘monstrous’ groups of people in the east from these earlier literary traditions. Their perceived differences were such that often the very humanity of these creatures was under debate, as is evident in Bk.XVI ch.8 of Augustine’s *De civitate dei*. He wrote,
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It is not, of course, necessary to believe in all the kinds of men which are said to exist. But anyone who is born anywhere as a man (that is, a rational and mortal animal), no matter how unusual he may be to our bodily senses in shape, colour, motion, sound, or in any natural power or part or quality, derives from the original and first-created man; and no believer will doubt this. [...] Moreover, the explanation which is given of monstrous human births among us can also be given in the case of some of these monstrous races. For God is the Creator of all things.9

Augustine’s view was inclusive and did not preclude human origin theories regarding the existence of these people, such as their possible descent from Cain. Examples of this in English narratives were articulated for example in the poem Beowulf, where the monster Grendel and his mother could be referred to as ‘Cain’s Kin’. Similarly, in the northeast corner of the thirteenth-century Hereford mappamundi, the people situated in the east by Alexander’s gate were described as the ‘sons of cursed Cain’.10

The ‘Marvels of the East’, a work primarily derived from the Epistola de mirabilibus Indiae of Pharasmanes II of Iberia to Emperor Hadrian and which bore considerable Plinian overtones, was also available in medieval England. BL, Cotton Tiberius B V, offers a fascinating insight into an Anglo-Saxon perception of the ‘East’ particularly in its accompanying illuminations.11 The ‘East’ within this text offered a dichotomy of impressions,
both as paradise, in its wealth and splendour, as well as the home of abnormality in the shape of the monstrous. Indeed, descriptions of wealth such as the abundant vineyards or the colossal wealth depicted by the vast ivory couch were immediately followed with a description of birds with ‘four feet, and a cow’s tail and an eagle’s head’. In the prologue to the *Topographia Hibernica (TH)* Gerald of Wales demonstrated his awareness of ‘Marvels of the East’. Indeed, he even claimed to be offering his marvels of Ireland and elsewhere in Europe as a counterbalance to those of the East.

The vast literary output regarding the heroic Alexander’s exploits in Asia, especially *De situ Indiae*, the alleged letter from Alexander to Aristotle, also enjoyed immense popularity. They too presented a very similar East to that above, albeit with a focus predominantly on India. These texts concerning Alexander largely derived from the third-century Greek ps. Callisthenes narrative and translated into Latin a century later by Julius Valerius, bore many similarities to the ‘Marvels of the East’. They offered their medieval European audiences similarly ambiguous images of Alexander and his men fighting deadly battles against hordes of serpents, hard-backed crabs, angry lions and menacing vultures, while carrying dazzling weapons plated with newly-looted and apparently widely-available gold. Here too, the ‘East’ was approached as a thriving environment for the monstrous and grotesque, as well as a land of riches and plenty.

These images of the monstrous and grotesque embodied within these groups of peoples (or beasts) coexisted, uneasily at times, with the biblical images of paradise and the lands of ‘milk and honey’. However, in time Biblical scholars merged aspects of the classical heritage within a Christian framework and by the twelfth century, Pliny’s ‘monstrous races’ were more
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13 See p.1.
frequently being conflated with lost or fear-inducing apocalyptic biblical groups such as the descendants of Cain, ‘The lost tribes of Israel’ and even Gog and Magog.¹⁶

The descriptions of the peripheral, barbaric and cannibalistic Scythians in *De Chorographia*, would also prove important to discussions of the ‘East’. The term Scythian, in its more inclusive form, incorporated peoples of lands stretching from northern Europe, as Pomponius Mela might have intended, to those of central Asia. Indeed, Josephus’ identification of the Scythians as Gog/Magog was apparent in Jerome’s fifth-century commentary on the verses in Ezekiel relating to Gog/Magog. This dubious honour would also be shared in the early-medieval period with the Goths and Huns. Furthermore, the early-medieval ps. Methodius *Revelationes* identified the Alans, a group of people whom William of Rubruck would encounter, as a Scythian people and more importantly also with Gog/Magog.¹⁷ Gog/Magog, often invoked at times of stress, represented this further prevalent image of the East: a place of absolute terror of apocalyptic dimensions, if not the home of the apocalypse itself.

Returning to the Alexander-cycles, in the second redaction of *Historia de Preliis*, Alexander was praised, not only for fighting beasts near the Caspian gates as mentioned in *De situ Indiae*, but also for protecting Europe by building the great gate which imprisoned the barbarous hordes for perpetuity. The highly influential ps. Methodius *Revelationes* portrayed Alexander as having protected Europe not merely from groups of war-like people, but from the very horsemen of the Apocalypse.¹⁸

Of the impending apocalypse, the Biblical ‘Book of Revelation’ had merely stated that:

[20:17] And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison. And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four
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quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea.¹⁹

Notably this offered neither an association with a particular group of people nor an area from whence these people would emerge. Scott Westrem has identified two different strands of thought regarding Gog and Magog within the medieval intellectual tradition; an allegorical and a literal view. Augustine, commenting on the biblical extract above in Bk.XX ch.11 of De Civitate Dei, interpreted Gog/Magog as the manifestation of evil within society, rather than an invading alien people, thus epitomising the allegorical view.²⁰ Nevertheless, the more literal interpretation was also widely held. The twelfth-century author, Peter Comestor in the popular Historia Scholastica claimed that behind the gates were the ten lost tribes of Israel whom Alexander had impeded from devastating Europe. Although Gog and Magog were not explicitly linked with the lost tribes, it was certainly implied.²¹ Nor were these views confined solely to Christian Europe.²² Peter Jackson has discussed references to Gog/Magog and their enclosure by Alexander within the Muslim literary tradition, including the Qu’ran in Sura 18: vs.82-98.²³ The thirteenth-century reactions to the Mongols were undoubtedly predetermined by this eschatological heritage.
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¹⁹ Similarly Ezekiel in his prophecies against Gog from Magog, the Prince of Meshech (Ezekial 38, 39) only suggested that Gog along with his army on horseback would come from the North.

²⁰ ‘For we are not to understand ‘Gog and Magog’ as if these were the names of some barbarous nations established on some part of the earth: whether as the Getae and Massagetae (as some have supposed, because of their initial letters of their names) or some other foreign peoples not under the authority of Rome… on the contrary… it is made clear to us that they are spread throughout all the world’, Augustine, City of God, pp.993-4; S.D. Westrem, ‘Against Gog and Magog’, Text and Territory: Geographical Imagination in the European Middle Ages, eds. S. Tomasch & S. Gilles (Philadelphia 1998) p.67-8; A.H. Bredero, ‘The Announcement of the Coming of the Antichrist and the Medieval Concept of Time’, Prophecy and Eschatology, ed. M. Wicks (Oxford, 1994) pp.5-6.


The ‘East’ in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries

The intellectual movements and the increased flow of information about the East following the crusades allowed for the development of further and more contemporary representations of the East. Nevertheless, it was often confined to the Holy Land itself and its immediate surroundings. The lands beyond the Caucasus mountains remained shrouded in mystery; little was still known of what lurked behind Alexander’s gate. The concurrent development and expansion of the schools and universities in western Europe ensured that the highly-educated had access to newer texts on the people and places of the world, such as John of Sacrobosco’s *De Sphaera* and Honorius Augustodunensis’ *Imago mundi*, as well as the continued use of the authoritative works of Pliny, Solinus and Isidore.

John of Sacrobosco’s *De Sphaera* spawned a number of other similar works; in England, Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, and John Pecham, archbishop of Canterbury each wrote a work similarly titled. John of Sacrobosco’s *De Sphaera*, and its various commentaries and imitators were primarily interested in geometry and the spherical nature of Earth, the celestial circles around Earth, the planets, eclipses, time and zonal or ‘climate’ differences. These texts did not include systematic descriptions of places and people, except for the occasional observation of ‘eastern’ or rather ‘south-eastern’ areas within the discussions of the division of the world into latitudinal zones. John of Sacrobosco limited this to an observation of the dark skin-colour of Ethiopians, a theoretical validation that Ethiopia was not within the more ‘temperate habitable zone’ but between the Tropic of Cancer and the Equator.24 Within the commentaries and other *De Sphaera* texts there appears to have been a need to answer the question of the habitability of the equatorial regions demonstrating the interest in these questions at the universities.25

Honorius Augustodunensis’ *Imago Mundi* composed, perhaps, during his sojourn in England c.1096 until 1100, began with a description of peoples and places. He offered first a

---

more general look at the world and its zonal divisions, turning then to a description of Paradise, then India and the monstrous and the beasts before he began to discuss other more known places. Within the brief section on India he too reiterated and discussed the anecdote regarding Alexander and the gate:

Mount Caspian is in India, from which the Caspian Sea is named. Between it and the sea are a ferocious people, Gog and Magog, whom it has been said were enclosed by Alexander the Great, and who may be fed with human flesh or the raw animal flesh.26

Existing scholarly information had little access, or perhaps even interest, in contemporary information regarding the East, allowing for the continued reliance and therefore repetitions of some of the more commonplace images such as the monstrous cannibal of the Plinian discourse and its derivatives.

Following the first crusade, existing and developing travel routes aided the transmission of more accurate information.27 Similarly, the flow of people from western Europe included not only those with mercantile and military interests but also pilgrims to Jerusalem who now enjoyed easier and greater access.28 Some, like Saewulf, a twelfth-century English pilgrim, left written accounts of their travels. Yet even Saewulf was largely reliant on Bede’s *de locis sanctae terrae*.29 In part, this was due to the expectation that the nature of holy sites would always remain unchanged. Indeed, the prevailing theories of climate and place and its influence
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on the nature of the inhabitants allowed for the views of different groups of people, as well as places, to be accepted as static.\footnote{30}{See I.Metzler, ‘Perceptions of Hot Climate in Medieval Cosmography and Travel Literature’, \textit{Reading Medieval Studies}, vol. XXIII, (Reading, 1997) pp.71-3, 75-79; cf. Bartlett, \textit{Gerald}, pp.165-167.}

Literary texts, reports and networks of letters contributed towards the development of a more accurate awareness of at least a portion of the ‘East’. Simon Lloyd has demonstrated the survival of vast numbers of letters sent from the Holy Land to English correspondents and the active interchange of such knowledge. Lloyd describes a well-oiled machinery of dissemination with the Papacy as its hub transmitting copious letters to prelates and courts within Christendom.\footnote{31}{Lloyd, \textit{English Society}, pp.34-41; Apart from some 63 extant letters between 1206 and 1317 from people based in the Latin East and in allied regions (see Lloyd, \textit{English Society}, ‘Appendix I’ pp. 248-252), some twenty-one letters have survived from crusaders sent directly to England, thirty-two forwarded or sent by the papacy, twelve sent by other western Europeans (excluding a further nine which may also have been sent to England) and four letters of intelligence sent to England, Lloyd, ‘Appendix 3’, \textit{English Society}, pp.256-7.}

There were also other networks of dissemination: in England, Adam Marsh, the Oxford Franciscan, who on receiving access to letters from King Louis IX and Bishop Odo de Chateauroux, sometime after April 1251, forwarded the letters to Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln. The letters were sent with the request that they be returned once read, as Adam Marsh himself was required to return them to his source, the Provincial of the English Franciscans, William of Nottingham.\footnote{32}{The letters were regarding ‘the destruction of the Christian army in Egypt’ and ‘the state of the Promised Land’, \textit{The Letters of Adam Marsh} vol.1 ed. C.H. Lawrence (Oxford, 2006) pp.54-55; cf. Lloyd, \textit{English Society}, p.38.}

Of the narrative texts that circulated following the advent of the crusading movement, two deserve special mention for their popularity in Europe and their documented transmission to England: William of Tyre’s \textit{Chronicle} and Jacques de Vitry’s \textit{Historia Orientalis (HO)}. Although chiefly an account of Christian personalities and events of the crusades, with a lengthy digression regarding the history of the Levant from c.600, William of Tyre did, on occasion, intersperse his material with brief descriptions of people and places. The overriding image presented was not wholly new; the East was depicted as a place of wealth and splendour inhabited by a warlike, brutal and godless people. The latter is particularly exemplified in the following description of the people of Egypt who are depicted below as both wealthy and as possessors of martial ability and courage, albeit in inadequate supply to be victorious.
Valiantly they strove to resist and to return our blows with vigour. Both in courage and strength, however, they were wholly unequal to us... Their camp, which was full of all kinds of riches and comforts, was abandoned, and their only thought was to save their lives by flight. Our forces then turned back as victors to the enemy’s camp. There they found the treasures of the Egyptians, immense quantities of gold and silver, precious utensils of various kinds, pavilions and tents, horses, breastplates, and swords in great abundance.  

By the late twelfth century the *Chronicle* had reached England. In 1231, Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester, was also known to have brought back a copy which found its way to St. Albans to be used in the chronicles of Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris.  

Influenced by William of Tyre, Jacques de Vitry’s three-part *Historia Hierosolimitana abbreviata*, or rather the first part of the work, the *HO*, also enjoyed success in England. This work offered eye-witness accounts of Nestorian, Jacobite and other Eastern Christian practices, as well as his criticisms of the Eastern Church, and descriptions of livestock and birds. It, too, offered topographical descriptions in conjunction with anecdotes of the past. Jacques de Vitry perpetuated the view that Alexander had bound the cannibalistic Gog and Magog behind the gate. Yet, he did not identify Gog and Magog with the ten lost tribes (i.e. Jews), whom he also said had been locked up, but who would be, ‘led back to the Holy Land.’
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Finally, more detailed contemporary accounts were being made available, even if their attention remained focused west of the Caspian Sea.\(^{36}\)

The appearance of a further influential text, the spurious *Letter of Prester John* offered hope to the Christian populace of western Europe. It suggested that Christianity had spread, successfully, to a large, prosperous and united realm somewhere in the far East.\(^{37}\) Otto of Freising’s *Two Cities* was the earliest witness to mention Prester John, variously described as Christian king, priest, and perhaps a descendant of the Magi, before the story exploded onto the western European psyche through the medium of the *Letter*; sometimes addressed to Frederick Barbarossa, and in other instances to Manuel Comnenos. This text too would prove highly significant in western Europe’s attempts to understand the Mongols. In the *Letter*, Prester John offers a description of his lands, ‘the three Indies’. The imagery and tone had much in common with texts relating to the Alexander cycles.\(^{38}\)

Indeed, Jacques de Vitry had been heavily influenced by the *Letter* and a tract entitled *Relatio de Davide*, which he and Cardinal Pelagius of Albano had brought to the attention of Pope Honorius III, by way of a Latin translation of the text.\(^{39}\) This text also described a mythical Christian king in the east called David, who was thought to be Prester John or Prester John’s son. Therefore, for Jacques de Vitry, the far east offered the possibility of hope; a hope of assistance for the crusades, or at least a possible propagandic tool with which to motivate participants of the Fifth Crusade.\(^{40}\) If they could but have known it, the *Relatio de Davide* and
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its three different versions were a somewhat disguised, or misunderstood, body of information regarding the then still unknown Mongols.\textsuperscript{41}

In England, wild and varied rumours regarding Prester John and King David found their way fairly swiftly into Ralph of Coggeshall’s \textit{Chronicon Anglicanum}. Prester John and King David were believed to be one and the same, and he had already subjugated the Persians, Medes and other lands under Muslim control (‘multas alias terras et provincias Saracenorum’). Furthermore he had rushed to assist the Holy Land and had been saved the necessity of defeating all the unbelievers (‘totum paganismum’) because of his success at conversion.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{Eschatology and the Mongols}

The news of Mongol invasions in Eastern Europe in the mid-1230s brought an awareness of the Mongols, and the threat of the Mongols, tangibly closer. Tales of the devastation left in their wake spread swiftly, especially after the battle in Liegnitz in April 1241. The Mongol intentions may have been otherwise, but their probable push west after the winter of 1241 was halted by other news. Baatu, the Mongol prince who had led the expedition, withdrew due to the death of the Great Khan, his uncle Ogedai.\textsuperscript{43} Despite their withdrawal, the fear of an invasion of Latin Christendom failed to diminish. Especially alarming, was the association that some were making of the army of the Mongols with Gog and Magog of the Book of Revelations.

The Dominican friar, Julian of Hungary, who had been sent as an envoy by King Béla IV of Hungary, was the first European to associate the Mongols with Gog and Magog when he wrote about Baatu Khan’s advance in 1237.\textsuperscript{44} In England, Matthew Paris in the \textit{Cronica

\textsuperscript{42} Ralph of Coggeshall, \textit{Chronicon Anglicanum}, ed. J. Stevenson (London, 1875) p.190 – the words ‘quorumdam falsiquorum commentis’ had been struck out in red. D. Carpenter has discussed the various possibilities as to when it was written in D. Carpenter, ‘Abbot Ralph of Coggeshall’s Account of the Last Years of King Richard and the First Years of King John’, \textit{HER} vol. 113 n.454 (1998) pp.1210-1230.
\textsuperscript{43} Morgan, \textit{Mongols}, pp.136-141, 179; Peter Jackson has more recently suggested other possibilities: divisions amongst the Mongol command, logistical difficulties, a depleted force and that perhaps the conquest of western Europe had never been Baatu’s intention, Jackson, \textit{Mongols and the West}, pp.71-74.
\textsuperscript{44} Westrem, ‘Against Gog and Magog’, p.65.
Maiora (CM), finished before his death in 1259, also equated the Mongols with the followers of the Antichrist and the lost Jewish tribes in his entry for 1240.  

Gregory IX, clearly fearful of the unknown apocalyptic threats of the east, in his ‘Cum hora undecima…’ bull of 1235 addressed at that time to William of Monteferrato OP and his entourage to western Asia, gave them considerably enlarged spiritual powers, such as the ability to ‘preach, baptize, reunite churches, absolve excommunicates, dispense from irregularities, reconcile schismatics, and bless sacred vestaments.’ The bull when reissued by Innocent IV and successive popes included an even greater geographical expanse, which by 1253 also included the Mongols.

The monstrous races, tales of Prester John, Gog and Magog and the lost tribes of Israel must undoubtedly have been in the minds of men like John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck. However, William of Rubruck in particular, whilst not wholly correcting many of these beliefs of the east, did little to corroborate and thereby encourage such views. Conversely, John of Plano Carpini did establish the existence of the ‘monstrous races’ in his History of the Mongols (HM). Nevertheless, marked was his disassociation as an eye-witness of these ‘monstrous races’, although he forcefully attempted to establish the reliability of this information, using phrases such as ‘so we are told with absolute certainty’ or ‘so we are told as a certain truth.’ For example, of the land of Burithabet, or Tibet, he said:

The inhabitants are pagans; they have an incredible or rather discreditable custom, for when anyone’s father pays the debt of human nature
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45 CM, vol.IV, pp.76-78; Jackson, ‘Medieval Christendom’ p.354; Godfrey of Viterbo in his Pantheon had also associated Gog and Magog with the lost tribes of Israel and that they had been enclosed by Alexander, J. K Wright, Geographical lore, p.288.

they collect all the family together and eat him; we were told this for a fact.\textsuperscript{47}

William of Rubruck’s observations were different. With regards to the Tibetans, William of Rubruck reiterated John de Plano Carpini’s sentiments but with an additional explanatory element. He wrote that they were:

a race whose practice was to eat their dead relatives, from the pious motives of providing them with no other grave than their own bellies. Nowadays, however, they have abandoned this custom, since every [other] people found them abhorrent.\textsuperscript{48}

William’s more pragmatic approach to such information is also clear in a further description. He wrote, ‘of this country Isidore says that it contains dogs so large and ferocious that they attack bulls and kill lions.’ By offering a more practical account of the capabilities of these dogs, William de-sensationalised the anecdote by adding,

what is true, I learned from tales I heard, is that towards the Northern Ocean dogs are used, on account of their great size and strength to draw wagons, like oxen.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{47} JPC, HM, pp.24, 30-31, Jackson does suggest that Carpini was paying attention to local beliefs of the ‘monstrous races’ and was not merely reiterating what he may have read from Isidore and Solinus, hoping to prove correct any preconceptions he may have had. P. Jackson, ‘Medieval Christendom’, p.368.

\textsuperscript{48} WR, XXVII.(3) p.158.

\textsuperscript{49} WR, XIX.(1) p.130; M. Geuret-Laferté uses this example to show how Bacon, when not in agreement with William prefers the earlier version by Isidore and fuses the two to create a more palatable version for himself, M. Geuret-Laferté, ‘Le voyageur et le géography: L’insertion de la relation de voyage de Guillaume de Rubruck dans l’Opus Majus de Roger Bacon’, La géographie au Moyen Âge. Espaces sacrés, espaces vécus, espaces rêvés, Actes de la journée d’études d’Arras (Arras,1998) p.93; Burke, OM, ‘In this region are dogs of such size that they kill lions and pull down bulls. Men hitch them to chariots and plows’, pp.382-383.
Generally more sceptical of things not witnessed first-hand, William of Rubruck highlighted the problems of relying on local witnesses for such information. In relation to tales of Prester John, whom William was told was originally a Nestorian herdsman, he recorded:

The Nestorians called him King John, and only a tenth of what they said about him were true. For this is the way with Nestorians who come from these parts: they create big rumours out of nothing.\(^{50}\)

Therefore, similarly, he was keen to clarify all that he had not seen, by saying,

I enquired about the monsters or human freaks who are described by Isidore and Solinus, but was told that such things have never been sighted, which makes us very much doubt whether [the story] is true.\(^{51}\)

The Mongols were described as fierce, arrogant and warlike, but neither John of Plano Carpini nor William of Rubruck associated the Mongols with Gog and Magog. Nevertheless, English scholars like fellow Franciscans Adam Marsh and Roger Bacon would see the eschatological implications of the arrival of the Mongols.\(^{52}\)

**England, the Mongols and the East**

English contact with, and awareness of, the Mongols within decades of their emergence onto Western Christendom’s horizon had been facilitated by the events of the previous centuries and the successes and failures of the various crusading enterprises. As briefly

\(^{50}\)WR, XVII.(2) p.122.

\(^{51}\)WR, XXIX.(46) p.201.

\(^{52}\)For a comparisons of Adam Marsh and Roger Bacon’s views see D. Bigalli, *I Tartari e l’Apocalisse: Richerche sull’eschatologia in Adamo Marsh e Ruggero Bacon* (Firenze, 1971).
discussed above, Europe had developed a greater familiarity with the near east, which allowed for considerable political, intellectual and cultural interchange. The Mongols had, however, been completely unknown; the written authorities of the day such as Isidore and Solinus, or even the highly popular Alexander cycle had not hinted at their existence. They, therefore, provoked both fear and curiosity, especially in attempts to write them into the existing categorization of the known world. The Novgorod chronicle would be amongst the earliest European chronicles to describe the atrocities committed by the Mongols in 1221-2. Yet, it would not be till 1236, through the above-mentioned Julian, envoy of King Bela IV of Hungary that reliable information about the Mongols filtered through to western Europe.53

Although the Mongols had mysteriously retreated in 1242, many feared that worse was yet to come. In the letter calling all bishops, abbots and priors to the Council of Lyon, Pope Innocent IV wrote that a matter of great concern was finding a 'remedy against the Tartars, and others contemptuous of the Christian faith and persecutors of the Christian people.'54 The Council of Lyon of 1245 was attended by a number of English churchmen; most notably for their interest in things eastern: Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, and his good friend Adam Marsh, of the Oxford Franciscans. The papal decision to send information-gathering and diplomatic expeditions was clearly a matter of much discussion and speculation at Lyon. Adam Marsh’s letter to William of Nottingham in which he discusses his arrival at Lyon with Robert Grosseteste, suggests that two English Franciscans, John of Stanford and Abraham of Larde were being considered for the role of papal envoy to the Mongols.55 Were these, then, the English friars who were to accompany Friar John of Portugal; a delegation which may have initially been intended for the Mongol court but were then re-routed to Syria and Cyprus where Laurence was sent as a legate?56

---

55 Adam Marsh, ‘Adae de Marisco Epistolae’, Monumenta Franciscana, vol.1 ed. J.S. Brewer, CCXIII, p.377; Adam Marsh’s letters are currently being edited by C.H. Lawrence. To date only vol. 1 has been published and vol. 2 which contains the letter above is forthcoming.
56 Jackson, Mongols and the West, p.88.
The *Annals of Burton* recorded the arrival of a refugee at the papal court, a Russian archbishop called Peter, who was questioned about the Mongols with a set of nine questions by the Pope.

First regarding their origins, second their beliefs, third their rituals of worship, fourth their ways of living, fifth their strength, sixth their population, seventh their intentions, eighth their observance of laws and ninth their reception of envoys.\(^{57}\)

As one of only two surviving witnesses to this incident, both English, the Burton annals also provide Peter’s answers. Similarly, Matthew Paris had collected, along with this report of the interview of the Russian archbishop, Peter, a number of letters from high ranking churchmen, rulers and mendicants of Eastern Europe in regards to attacks from the Mongols which he included in his *Chronica Majora*.\(^{58}\) His predilection for collecting a variety of official documents was so great that by 1237 he began his *Liber Additamenta*, where six such letters about the Mongols have been placed. Matthew Paris’ collection of letters, the majority dating from the early 1240s when the attacks were still a real threat, reveals the level of fear, and the consequent rumours of cannibalism and blood-thirsty actions of the Mongols as news disseminated within Europe. The *Liber Additamenta* also provides a unique witness to Andrew of Longjumeau’s description of the Mongols.\(^{59}\) Queen Blanche of France, mother of Louis IX and sometime regent of France, had also proved useful in disseminating information about the


\(^{58}\) The letters included are from: Henry Count of Lorraine, to Henry, duke of Brabant (his father-in-law), Frederick II’s circular letter urging cooperation, and Ivo of Narbonne to Archbishop Gerald de Mulemort of Bordeaux, *CM*, vol.IV, pp.270-277, 298-300, 337-344, 386-390, 547.

\(^{59}\) In the Liber Additamenta, Matthew Paris includes the letters of: a Hungarian bishop to William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris written on 10 April 1242 [46]; Henry Raspe, landgrave of Thuringia to Henry I, duke of Brabant in 1242 [47]; circular letter from the abbot of St.Mary’s, Hungary, anon written on 4 January 1242 [48] : Jordan, the provincial vicar of the Franciscans in Poland on 10 April 1242 [49] R. a Dominican and J. a Franciscan ; Friar Jordan of Pinsk forwarded by a friar of Cologne; for a discussion of these various letters see J.J. Saunders, ‘Matthew Paris and the Mongols’, *Essays in Medieval History presented to Bertie Wilkinson*, eds., T.A. Sandquist & M.R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969) pp.116-132 and S. Lewis, *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora* (Aldershot, 1987) pp.116-132. Andrew of Longjumeau initially embarked to the east as a papal envoy. He was subsequently sent again in 1248 as Louis IX’s envoy. It is unclear as to when his account may have been written.
Mongols, sending copies of letters received to Henry III, and was the initial source for at least two of the letters included by Matthew Paris.\(^60\)

The 1248 call for crusade was not instigated solely to support the Holy Land and the recovery of Jerusalem, but was also to be directed against the Mongols. However, Christopher Tyerman suggests that it was a certain distrust of the French which may have compelled Henry III to request that the English crusaders leave a year after their French counterparts. When the English entourage under the leadership of William Longsword arrived, their concentration on Cairo (they had arrived in order to prevent the capture of Damietta) suggest that their primary motive was not a reaction to the Mongol threat.\(^61\)

Louis IX of France may have had more direct contact with the Mongols than Henry III, yet Henry’s son Edward, as prince and later as king, would prove with his efforts to be a more equal counterpart to the French monarch.\(^62\) In 1260, Alexander IV appealed directly to Edward to persuade his father to send assistance to counteract the Mongol threat, and according to Matthew of Westminster in May, 1261, prelates at a council at Canterbury discussed amongst other things ‘the common provision which was to be made for resisting the Tartars’.\(^63\) The bishop of Marseilles’ response to this papal call was certainly swift for he was in the Levant by October 1260.\(^64\) If the English response was not as swift, it may perhaps have been due to the general state of political unrest in England at the time.

From 1265 to 1281 Aka, the Mongol Il-Khan sent six diplomatic entourages to the English Court.\(^65\) One such group consisted of six ambassadors, ‘some of the most distinguished men of his race, with an interpreter’ who arrived in 1277. The Bury St. Edmunds’ chronicler


\(^{64}\) For more information see Papal registers of Urban IV n.102, 103, 392 & Clement IV n.113 where warriors were given the privileges of crusaders, J. Richard, ‘The Mongols and the Franks’, p.51 n.26.

\(^{65}\) For a discussion of these missions to the English court see M. Prestwich, Edward I (London, 1988) pp.330-331; With regards to Europe more generally see Jackson, Mongols and the West, pp.165-175 and Rachewiltz, Papal Envoys, pp.149-154.
who noticed this demonstrates the ever-increasing knowledge of the Mongols for he explained that the ‘Tartars’ were actually ‘called Mongols’ (dicuntur Moal).  

By 1270, the possibility of having the Mongols as allies had Edward also exchanging embassies with Abaqa in order to request support. The subsequent Mongol advance on Syria seemingly demonstrated the success of the alliance. However, the Mongols readily entered into negotiations with Baibers, the Mamluk sultan, quashing any ideas of a joint venture. Nevertheless, maintaining diplomatic ties did not end here, for the Bury chronicle suggests that Edward I reciprocated an act of diplomacy by sending an embassy in 1280. In 1287, once again, Edward I appeared to be interested in embarking on crusade, demonstrated by his taking of the cross. Although negotiations in regards to this were dragged out, the fall of Acre certainly spurred activity. That same year the Bury chronicler noted that Raban Sauma, the Nestorian monk from the Mongol court met with Edward I at Bordeaux in October 1287 ‘to renew and strengthen the long-standing friendship of the king and his predecessors with the Tartar kings’. The Mongols were clearly viewed as possible allies for he reported that Edward I had told him:

   my mind is relieved on the subject about which I have been thinking [the crusade], when I hear that King Arghun thinks as I think.  

Following this meeting, Edward I during his first parliament back in England gave an audience to a different embassy from Arghun, the Il-Khan and sent them with presents of falcons and greyhounds. In 1289 again a further Mongol embassy arrived from the Il-Khans, led by a
Genoese Buscarello de Gisolfo, bringing with them letters for Edward I and Phillip IV. The letter to Phillip, the only one of the two to survive, suggested that Arghun was planning to be in Syria and had offered assistance in the form of horses.72 Buscarello returned again the following year with another embassy. This time it was led by two newly-baptised Christians called Andrew and Dominic, clearly a further attempt by the Il-Khan to ingratiate himself with western Christendom, closely followed within weeks by another envoy Saabedin Archaon.73 In the interest of maintaining diplomatic ties, in 1292, Edward despatched Geofffrey de Langley at a cost of £6000 to the Il-Khan again exchanging exotic gifts; gerfalcons (requested by Arghun) from Edward and a Persian leopard from the Il-Khan.74

A decade later, Pope Boniface VIII urged Edward once more to recover the Holy Land with the added incentive of Mongol success.75 When western Europe heard that the Il-Khan Ghazan had taken Jerusalem there was great delight. This snippet proved to be one of the few instances where the Mongols became an item of interest to the English chroniclers. One rendering of the event was that that a Mongol prince, Ghazan’s (or Cassanus’) brother, Paganus had married a devout Christian Armenian princess. However, when their first child was born ‘hairy and rough like a bear’ [‘hispidus et pilosus, velut ursus’], Paganus ordered that the child be burnt. Instead, due to its mother’s pleadings the child was baptised at which point the hair fell out and the father converted to Christianity.76 The ensuing victory in the Levant, the chronicler stated was by a collaboration between the Il-Khan and the kings of Armenia and Georgia who had ‘invoked the aid of Christ and fought against the saracens’.77 The Annales Regis Edwardi Primi even concocted a letter from Ghazan to the Pope which appears to have

72 Prestwich, Edward I, p.331; The letter of credence of Nicholas IV which also accompanied the entourage suggests that the Mongols were certainly willing to assist the English. Original Papal Documents, [923] p.416.
74 Prestwich, Edward I, pp.313-4, 328-331.
75 Original Papal Documents, [1014] p. 462.
76 Flores historiarum, ed. Luard, pp.300-301 this tale was also repeated by William Rishanger; For a full list of medieval European chroniclers who refer to this event see S. Schein, ‘Gesta Dei per Mongolos 1300. The genesis of a non-event’, EHR xciv (1979) p.806, n.1.
77 ‘invocato contra Sarracenos Christi adjuvatorio, dimicarunt’, p.300; This incident spurred the Middle-English poem ‘The King of Tars’ which told of a King of Tars who married a Armenian christian princess; this was likely to have been rendering of a possible marriage of Ghazan with an Armenian princess. However, although there is no record of any of Ghazan’s seven wives having been Armenian, the king of Armenia, Sempad, had just married a Mongol princess and it may have been this story which was inverted L.H. Hornstein, ‘Historical background of the King of Tars’, Speculum 19 pp.404-414.
been a paraphrasing of the letter of Prester John as recorded in Vincent of Beauvais *Speculum Historiale*. No one seemed aware of Ghazan’s conversion to Islam in 1295.  

By the fourteenth century direct political relations with the east appeared to have subsided. Edward II was in contact with the Il-Khans, although still clearly ignorant of their conversion to Islam as demonstrated when he praised Oljeitū for 'extirpating the abominable sect of Mahomet.' The Il-khans clearly played on European preoccupations with the legend of Prester John in their negotiations with Western Europe, even to the extent that the claim made to Andrew of Longjumeau that the Great Khan Güyük’s mother had been a daughter of Prester John was revived by Abaqa’s ambassadors who claimed that his father’s chief wife Doquz Khatan (Abaqa’s mother) was also a daughter of Prester John.  

The urgent necessity to vanquish this threat had disappeared. There was a greater preoccupation with matters closer to home and the crusading zeal was at an ebb. Het’um’s *Flos Orientalis* in 1307 suggested that the Mongols were eager to help the Christians, which was perhaps the reason for the text which he presented to Clement V. It is relevant to note that when Richard Pyson printed Het’um’s *Flos Orientalis* in England sometime between 1517-1520 for Edward, the Duke of Buckingham, England was once more involved in a period of crusader-frenzy.

**Mongol historiography**

From the late-thirteenth century onwards another group of texts describing the Mongols, amongst other subjects, aroused the interest of western Europe. These were the accounts of Marco Polo, Het’um, Ordoric of Pordenone and the Mandeville-author, which offered a return to the earlier type of descriptions of the ‘East’. They had an added advantage over the *Itinerary*; the ability to provoke, to shock and induce wonder through narratives

---

78 Prestwich, *Edward I*, pp.331-2; Boniface VIII in a letter in 1300 to Edward I discusses this and mistakenly claims that Ghazan had converted to Christianity, Schein, ‘Gesta Dei per Mongolos 1300’, pp.806, 812, 817.
80 Jackson, *Mongols and the West*, p.98.
relating to marvels, monstrosities, sumptuous feasts and abundant wealth. Certainly, considering the extant manuscripts of these works, in contrast to the texts of John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck, they were immensely popular in both Latin and the vernacular in England and in the rest of Europe. Nevertheless, as Joan-Pau Rubiés has convincingly argued, these texts did a lot more than simply feed the European fascination with the monstrous and fantastic and instead, apart from the *Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, would temper some descriptions with interest and considered explanations. In fact, it would often be the medieval European redactors, through illustrations who amplified the images of monstrosity and wonder rather than the texts themselves.

Post-fifteenth century European Mongol historiography is primarily an exercise in listing the republication of all these texts in print. The efforts of Richard Hakluyt, the great travel-enthusiast, ensured a degree of exposure of these texts, especially for the *Itinerary* perhaps unseen before when he published his *The Principal navigations, voyages* in 1598. Both William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary* and John de Plano Carpini’s *HM* circulated in compilatory publications including the texts of Marco Polo, Ordoric of Pordenone and Haytoum. To mention only a few, a collection was published in Paris in 1634, in Leiden in 1729 and a further collection in London in 1745. This continued interest in the Mongols was no longer fuelled by the futile search for the ‘Christian king’. In the quest for Prester John, Ethiopia had displaced the Mongols. This was undeniably a period of greater travel – in conjunction with trading enterprises, increased numbers of missionaries and the growth of travel-writing as an independent genre, which undoubtedly, as in the case of Hakluyt fuelled the interest in travel and the travellers themselves.

---


84 Rubiés, *Travel*, pp.35-40.

85 For a full list of translations and printed versions see Wyngaert, *Sinica Fransiscana* pp.159-161.

86 The interest was such that the Royal Society of London sent one of its Fellows, and also a Clerk to the Privy Council, Sir Robert Southwell to Lisbon in 1666 to interview Jeronimo Lobo, a Jesuit returned from Ethiopia C.F. Beckingham, ‘Ethiopia and Europe’, *European Out thrust. The European Outreach and Encounter: The First Phase c. 1400-c. 1700: Essays in tribute to David Beers Quinn on his 85th Birthday*, eds. C.J. Clough & P.E.H. Hair (Liverpool, 1994) pp. 77-95.

87 For discussions of European travel and subsequent expansion in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries see D. Arnold, *The Age of Discovery 1400-1600* (London and New York, 1983); This interest was evident in 1732, when the geographer H. Moll had the Great Tartary, with the tract of the Moscovite Ambassador’s travels from Moscow to Pekin in China published. Similarly,
More recently, the *Itinerary* has often been dismissed as unpopular and largely unread by William’s contemporaries. The *Itinerary*’s reputation as an unpopular text, at least amongst modern scholars, is in part due to the relative popularity of the *HM*. Salimbene’s contemporary comments about reading the *HM* and its popularity, and the relatively greater number of extant manuscripts of the *HM* have reinforced this view. Furthermore, John of Plano Carpini’s *HM*, along with the account of the Dominican Simon de St. Quentin, has often been especially praised because of Vincent of Beauvais’ use of them in his encyclopaedic *Speculum Historiale*, despite there being no surviving manuscript of Simon de St Quentin’s work. Scholarship of William of Rubruk’s *Itinerary* has tended to focus on the use of the text as a ‘quarry’ for facts on Mongol history and the European presence there. Nevertheless, more recent scholarship has focused particularly on its use in understanding European perceptions of the Mongols and the ‘Other’ and political negotiations between Europe and the Mongols.

Despite the fairly recent translation of the text, only one work has touched on the nature of the texts themselves: Michele Guéret-Laferté’s *Sur les routes de l’empire Mongol : ordre et rhetorique des relations de voyage aux XIIe et XIVe siècles* has examined the form and

Dr. John Cook’s *Voyages and travels through the Russian Empire, Tartary, and part of the Kingdom of Persia* was also published in 1770; see J. Cook, *Voyages and travels through the Russian Empire, Tartary, and part of the Kingdom of Persia*, ed. A.L. Fullerton (Newtonville, 1997).

88 ‘... apart from the wide use made of it in the geographical sections of Bacon’s *Opus Majus*, there is no evidence that anyone read it’, from P. Jackson & D. Morgan, ‘Introduction’, *The Mission of William of Rubruck: His journey to the court of the Great Khan Mongke 1253-1255*, trans. Peter Jackson (London, 1990) p.51, or, ‘The English Franciscan Roger Bacon, who later met Rubruck is the only person known to have read his report’. P. Jackson, ‘Medieval Christendom’s encounter with the alien’, *Historical Research* vol. LXXIV no.186 November 2001 p.367; Of course, if by these two statements Peter Jackson was mainly referring to the fact that William of Rubruck is not referred to by any other known surviving medieval authors apart from Roger Bacon, then he is correct.


structure of the text in the context of, and in comparison with, other texts about the Mongols and the East.\textsuperscript{91} Mongol historians and historians of European perceptions of the Mongols have often ignored the value of a study of the dissemination and reception of this, and other such texts.\textsuperscript{92} The Itinerary has largely been neglected due to the paucity of extant manuscripts; the work has survived in only six medieval manuscripts.\textsuperscript{93} Furthermore, it appears as though due to some unspoken agreement on the futility of the scope of such a subject, scholars have tended to perpetuate the faulty findings of C.R Beazely in 1903, occasionally even ignoring amendments suggested by P.A van den Wyngaert in his seminal critical edition in the Sinica Franciscana.\textsuperscript{94} A reappraisal of the manuscript tradition and manuscript dissemination is therefore necessary.

\textsuperscript{91} M. Guéret-Laferté, Sur les routes de l’empire Mongol: ordre et rhetorique des relations de voyage aux XIIe et XIVe siècles, (Paris, 1994).
\textsuperscript{92} This is beginning to change see p.163 n.83.
\textsuperscript{93} The scholarly consensus had previously been that there were five medieval manuscripts extant. Beazeley had suggested that the nineteenth-century editors Michel and Wright also knew of another manuscript in the Phillipps library, which he claimed had originally been bought from the library of John Cochrane, Carpini et Rubruquis, ed. C.R. Beazely, p.xx. A week prior to the submission of this thesis, the location of this Phillipps manuscript was established as being a manuscript in the Beinecke Library at the University of Yale, ms.406, see p.268.
MANUSCRIPT DISSEMINATION

Medieval manuscripts of the Itinerary

Excluding the two seventeenth-century manuscript copies made of Hakluyt's 1598 printed edition, six manuscripts of the Itinerary are extant. The dates of the six medieval manuscripts range within a seventy-year period from after 1282 to c.1400. Only four manuscripts, Cambridge Corpus Christi College MS 181 (C*), Leiden MS Vossius Lat. F. 77 (F*), Cambridge Corpus Christi College 66a (D*) and Yale, Beinecke Library, 406 (Y*) contain the complete text of the Itinerary.¹

The contents of the two earliest manuscripts, C* and F* are identical except for three items.² As will be discussed below, in relation to the text of the Itinerary they are also very close. It has been suggested that Y* is closely related by textual analysis to C* and thus by association to F*. Certainly, one of the other texts found in Y*, an excerpt from Ethicus Ister’s Cosmographia relating to Gog and Magog is also found in C* and F* immediately after the text of the Itinerary. The third manuscript, D*, had a complicated past due to the machinations of the sixteenth-century bibliophile Archbishop Matthew Parker which will be discussed further below. The final two manuscripts, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 407 (S*) and British Library MS Royal 14 C XIII (L*), like the earliest two manuscripts, form another pair of sorts, albeit in a different form. Although this second pair does not share all of the same contents, they share their provenance and have considerable similarities with regards to their script. In both, the text of the Itinerary is identical: bearing even more similarities than Van den Wyngaert's definitive 1929 Latin critical edition of the work suggests; the two manuscripts

¹ The location of the sixth manuscript, Yale, Beinecke Library, 406, formerly Phillipps 6343, was established a week prior to the submission of this thesis. It was not considered by P.A.van den Wyngaert for the Latin edition or Peter Jackson for the English translation. Due to lack of time this manuscript has not been considered fully in this discussion,and any information used in relation to it is derived from the Sotheby’s Phillipps manuscripts sale catalogue of 1971 and the Beinecke library catalogue, see Appendix I.
² for the contents of these manuscripts see pp.257-265 and Appendix I.
end at the same point, halfway through a sentence in the middle of what is ch.XXVI of the printed edition.\textsuperscript{3}

If multiple versions of the \textit{Itinerary} ever existed, none have survived. The shortened version of the text, as found in \textit{L*} and \textit{S*}, exists due to misfortune rather than design. Until the abrupt break mid-ch.XXVI in \textit{L*} and \textit{S*} the differences between the five manuscripts are minimal, as is also the case for differences between the three manuscripts containing the complete text. The primarily orthographical differences are the result of variations in customary spellings, careless scribal practices or misunderstandings.

An analysis of ch.IV demonstrates this:

\textsuperscript{3} Both manuscripts end with the words, ‘In ista terra sunt multe provinciae, quarum plures adhuc non obediunt Moalis. Et inter’, \textit{S*} f. 67v.; cf. \textit{L*} f.238.
Ch. IV

(1.) Ipsum
cosmos, hoc est lac iumentimum, fit hoc modo. Extendunt
cordam longam super terram ad duos palos fixos in terra, et ad illam
cordam ligant circa horam tertiam pullos equarum quas volunt
mungere. Tunc stant matres iuxta pullos suos et permittunt se pacifice
mungi. Et si aliqua est nimis indomita, tunc accipit unus homo pullum
et supponit ei permittens parum sugere, tunc retrahit illum et
emunctor lactis succedit.

(2.) Congregata ergo magna multitudine lactis, quod est ita dulce
sicut uaccinum, dum est recens, fundunt illud in magnum utrem siue
buccellum, et incipient illud concutere cum ligno ad hoc aptato, quod
grossum est inferius sicut capud hominis et cauatum subtus; et quam
cito concutient illud, incipit bullire sicut unum nouum et acescere
siue fermentari, et excutiunt illud donec extrahant butirum.

(3.) Tunc gustant illud; et quando est temperate pungitiuum bibunt:
pungit enim super lingam sicut uinum raspei dum bibitur, et
postquam homo cessat bibere, relinquit saporem super lingam lactis amigdalini, et multum reddit interiora hominis iocunda, et etiam inebriat debilia capita; multum etiam prouocat urinam.

(4.) Faciunt etiam caracosmos, hoc est nigrum cosmos, ad usum magnorum dominorum, hoc modo. Lac equinum non coagulatur; regula enim est quod nullius animalis lac, in cuius fetus uentre non inuenitur coagulum, coagulatur; in uentre pulli equi non inuenitur, unde lac eque non coagulatur. Concutiunt ergo lac in tantum quod omne quod spissum est in eo uadit ad fundum recte, sicut feces uini, et quod purum est remanet superius, et est sicut lac album sicut mustum album. Feces sunt albe multum, et dantur seruis, et faciunt multum dormire. Illud clarum bibunt domini, et est pro certo ualde suauis potus et bone efficacie.

(5.) Baatu habet XXX homines circa herbergiam suam ad unam dietam, quorum quilibet qualibet die seruit ei de tali lacte centum equarum, hoc est qualibet die lac trium milium equarum, excepto alio lacte albo quod deferunt alii. Sicut enim in Siria rustici; dant tertiam
partem fructuum, ita oportet quod ipsi afferant ad curias dominorum suorum lac equarum tertie diei.

(6.) De lacte uaccino primo extrahunt butirum, et bulliunt illud usque perfectam decoctionem, et postea recondunt illud in uentribus arietinis quos ad hoc reseruant. Et non ponunt sal in butiro, tamen propter magnam decoctionem non putrefit; et reseruant illud contra hyemem. Residuum lac quod remanet post butirum permittunt acescere quantum acrius fieri potest et bulliuent illud, et coagulatur bulliendo; et coagulum illud siccant ad solem, et efficitur durum sicut scoria; ferri; quod recondunt in saccis contra hyemem. Tempore hyemali, quando deficit eis lac, ponunt illud acrum coagulum, quod ipsi uocant griut, in utre, et super infundunt aquam calidam, et concutient fortiter donec illud resoluatur in aqua; que ex illo efficitur tota acetosa, et illam aquam bibunt loco lactis. Summe cauent ne bibant aquam puram.
Of the five manuscripts there are sixty-nine variations in Ch.IV of which two are later additions made to $D^*$ in an early-modern hand and a further two which are instances of interlineated text, also in $D^*$. Of the latter two, the inclusion of the word ‘faciunt’ corrected the text and the second addition of the word ‘anno’ on top of ‘die’ was evidently a mistake. The remaining variants will be examined under the following categories: single-mss variants and group variants.

*Single variants:* These are instances where all manuscripts agree except for one. No examples of this kind can be found in $L^*$. For the ease of identification, line numbers have been used. The first word shown is the common form of the word and the second is the variation.

1. $C^*$

| saporem | sapore |
| efficacie | efficacie |
| scoria | scorria |
| deficit | deflicit |

The first variant may have been the result of not noticing an expansion sign in the exemplar. The other three variations are insignificant and appear to be either orthographical mistakes or preferences.

2. $F^*$

| matres | mitres |
| ergo | *om.* |
| diei | die |
| bulliunt | <et> bulliunt |

Again the variations appear to be orthographical errors. The omission of ‘ergo’ on line 8 does not change the meaning of the sentence.
3. $D^*$

retrahunt illum | retrahunt *eum vel illum*
acescere | *acessere*
etiam | *om.*
mustum | mussum
Siria | *siuia*
butirum | butyrum
ponunt | *reponunt*
butiro | butyro
butirum | *butyrum*

The variants here consist of two instances where the text of ‘retrahunt *eum vel illum*’ and ‘*reponunt*’ has been corrected. The corrections agree with all other extant manuscripts. ‘Butyrum’ and other derivatives or the word are consistently spelled with a ‘y’ in this manuscript. The omission of ‘etiam’ is linked to the missing word ‘faciunt’ which was later then interlineated above.

4. $S^*$

Ipsum | Spum
rustici | *⇒ rustici*

In both cases, the variants are due to scribal errors and within the second instance the text has been corrected to agree with the other surviving manuscripts. Thus within this chapter, $L^*$ has no variant readings from $S^*$ except for the two above, yet the correction of the first should have been fairly obvious to anyone with some grounding in Latin and the second had already been corrected. When tested by the group variants, does this relationship remain strong?
Group variants: Instances where more than one manuscript shares a variant. Here the word within the bracket is the word chosen from van den Wyngaert’s edition. Hence, there are occasions when the variant will agree with van den Wyngaert’s choice.

1. C* and F*

Within this chapter, there are nineteen instances where these two manuscripts agree with each other but not the other manuscript. Indeed, the majority could be merely orthographical preferences however the variant of ‘sicut’ on line 24 in these two manuscripts may be suggestive of their closer relationship. Apart from S* and L*, these two manuscripts share the greatest number of similarities.

2. D*, S* and L*

Within this chapter, there are nineteen instances where these two manuscripts agree with each other but not the other manuscript. Indeed, the majority could be merely orthographical preferences however the variant of ‘sicut’ on line 24 in these two manuscripts may be suggestive of their closer relationship. Apart from S* and L*, these two manuscripts share the greatest number of similarities.
Of these twelve common variants, the majority could be due to the misreading of abbreviations by the scribes and orthographical preferences – yet the coincidence of the same variants being used especially with regards to the addition of ‘ad’ between ‘usque ad perfectam’, the omission of ‘magnum utrem’ to be replaced solely by ‘in’ suggests a close relationship. Similarly the consistent choice of ‘desiccant’ rather than ‘siccant’ for these three manuscript does not change the meaning of the sentence, for the two words are nearly synonymous, yet could demonstrate an attempt at faithful copying. One variant is of particular interest as it does change the meaning and this is the use of ‘casalia’ rather than the ‘homines’ of the other two manuscripts. In fact, either word could fit within the context of the paragraph. Using the word ‘homines’, as all printed editions of the Itinerary do, suggests that Baatu the Mongol Prince had stationed around his vast encampment, at a day’s ride away, thirty men who each day sent him the milk from a hundred mares; ‘casalia’ suggests thirty small dwellings or perhaps even small villages instead. The words are adequately different to suggest that the use of ‘casalia’ in the three manuscripts does denote a relationship.

3. C*, F* and D*

Of these six common variants, similar to the examples above, the majority may be due to orthographical preferences, errors and mistaken expansions of abbreviations. The omission
of the word ‘lac’ does not alter the meaning of the sentence, and although the joint omission of this word could perhaps symbolise a relationship, it is most likely to be purely coincidental.

4. C* & D*

buccellum] buccellum

The use of a double ‘cc’ or single ‘c’ is certainly an orthographical preference

5. C*, F* & S*

mungi] inungi

6. C* & S*

mungere] inungere

I would be very hesitant to suggest that common occurrences of these variants necessarily suggests a relationship between these two manuscripts or even indeed in the three manuscripts in the example above. The more common verb for milking, which is what the rest of the paragraph clearly refers to was ‘mulgere’ – however ‘mungere’ which could more commonly mean ‘to wipe off’ or ‘to blow the nose’ was derived from the same root. ‘Inungere’ or ‘Ungere’ meant ‘to anoint’ which would not fit this context. This is far more likely to be due to the misreading of an exemplar, especially in one where the ‘i’ may not have been dotted. In the case of S*, it is also therefore understandable why the scribe of L*, need not have made the same mistake.

This sample chapter certainly demonstrates the very close relationship between C* and F*, and between S* and L*. It also shows that although there are few differences between all five manuscripts, D* appears to show a closer relationship with S* and L* than C* and F*. The relationships between the two pairs will be considered in more detail below.
Provenance and ownership of the Itinerary

Manuscript provenance, mentions in medieval library catalogues and a general understanding about the relevant medieval libraries offer a wealth of information of the work’s dissemination. All the manuscripts listed above, except for $F^*$, bear medieval pressmarks. Despite the absence of a medieval pressmark, Julia Crick and Elizabeth van Houts have tentatively assigned the provenance of $F^*$ to Normandy. This association has perhaps been extrapolated for two reasons: the existence of a rare treatise regarding the kings of France and their antecedents, ‘Antenor et alii profugi..’ and the fact that this text is found in Leiden B.P.L 20 which also shares in common Recension F of the *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* (GND). Indeed, it is thought that Leiden, BPL 20 originated at Le Bec in Normandy and was Robert of Torigni’s autograph manuscript.\(^1\) However, as $C^*$ also shares most of the same contents, if the association of $F^*$ with Normandy is based purely on contents then it may be primarily circumstantial. $F^*$’s subsequent history is particular illustrious. It belonged to Paul Petau (1568-1614), the French antiquarian who annotated the margins. Like much of Paul Petau’s collection, it was passed to his son, Alexander Petau, whose collection was bought in 1650 by Isaac Voss (1618-1689) on behalf of Isaac’s employer Queen Christina of Sweden. As one of her chief librarians it is unsurprising that the manuscript was later amongst his own collection, and then bequeathed to his son Gerard Voss who donated it to the collection of the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit in Leiden.\(^2\)

The pressmark, ‘In.3.J’ is found on f.1 of $C^*$. This has been identified as a pressmark used by the Benedictine abbey of St Mary’s in York.\(^3\) No existing book-lists of the collections at St. Mary’s attest to this manuscript, however, its presence can not be discounted there due to the type of text represented by the *Itinerary*.\(^4\) The appearance of Matthew Parker’s, or his


\(^{2}\)See Appendix I.

\(^{3}\)M.R. James compared this pressmark with Oxford, CCC 224 and Cambridge, CCC 309, *CCC cat.*, vol.1 p.421.

\(^{4}\)Although St Mary’s did merit a sizable entry in the *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*, the fourteenth-century Franciscan catalogue (123 items) and a fifteenth-century catalogue from St Mary’s also survives with a number of entries, this manuscript appears in neither. However, the *Registrum*, designed as it was to select particular texts for its catalogue, does not paint an accurate picture of their book collection. Similarly, the fifteenth-century catalogue, which is unlikely to have been an official list but one perhaps made for personal use, is an index to particular authors and subjects.
secretary’s, well-known red-crayon pagination explains the survival of this manuscript. The codex was donated by Parker to Corpus Christi in 1593.\(^5\)

Parker’s interest in another manuscript of this text led him to have two codices divided; a twelfth-century manuscript originating from Sawley and an early fourteenth-century manuscript from Bury St Edmunds, into two portions each.\(^6\) Each Sawley portion was attached to a Bury St Edmunds’ portion. Parker donated one of these manufactured manuscripts to the Cambridge University Library, now known as MS Ff.1.27 (F) and the other to Corpus Christi College as MS 66. The fourteenth-century Bury St. Edmunds’ section has since been detached and is now CCC 66a (D*).\(^7\)

The book collection of Bury St Edmunds was certainly one of the largest in England in the later Middle Ages. On examination of the pressmark system in use there, it has been surmised that the collection may have consisted of around 2100 codices.\(^8\) No catalogue has survived; nevertheless 270 manuscripts from this library are extant. D* bears a Bury St Edmunds’ pressmark of J.90.\(^9\) Furthermore, the fragmentary contents list attached to D*, which bears the original folio numbers, are written in a style, and hand, similar to that of Henry of Kirkeystede. Henry was in most likelihood the armarius at Bury St. Edmunds and was perhaps at his most active between 1361-1379 under the abbacy of John Brinkley. Richard Rouse suggests that it was Henry of Kirkstede who is likely to have introduced the pressmark system at Bury St Edmunds. It is also thought that Henry may have been responsible for listing the contents of various Bury manuscripts on flyleaves of the codices when he was piecing together the Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis. Neither William of Rubruck, nor the Itinerary

mainly of patristic, theological and canon law texts. This is a highly selective catalogue which incorporates the pressmarks of the manuscripts it includes which has made identification with the few surviving extant manuscripts easier. This is perhaps due to the nature of the genre of the text and its associated texts. The Itinerary is amongst a collection of historical texts such as William of Jumièges and Robert of Torigni’s histories, and Einhard’s Life of Charlemagne which are types of texts not selected by the authors of either of the two catalogues. This catalogue can be found in BL MS Harley 2268 ff.295r-304v, CBMLC:IV, pp.677-9, 681.

\(^5\) van Houts GND, p.cxiii.
\(^7\) A contemporary table of contents with the inscription, ‘Liber de communitate monachorum S. Edmundi in quo subscripta continentur’, is found pasted onto a loose leaf preceding the opening folio of the manuscript, D*, f.1 (previously); cf. Cat.CCC, pp.137-145.
\(^8\) CBMLC:IV, p.44.
\(^9\) D*, on a looseleaf preceding f.1, previously paginated as p.116.
are mentioned in the surviving remnants of this extensive fourteenth century name-index catalogue. Yet, it is vital to remember that the Catalogus was never meant to be an official catalogue of works at Bury St Edmunds and, furthermore, was never completed.

Symbolic of the close relationship between the scriptoria of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds and Norwich Cathedral is the copy made of this catalogue in the fourteenth century, at, or for, Norwich. Sadly, the manuscript containing this catalogue has not survived. Our knowledge of it is due to John Bale (1495-1563), bishop of Ossory’s notes made for his Index Britanniae scriptorium, an encyclopedia of literary biographies. Bale used the Norwich copy to supplement twenty-six entries in his work, of which twelve were entries which were new, or had been substantially augmented. The new entries were: Caradog of Llancarfan, William of Rubruck, Hugh of Ireland, ‘Matthew of Westminster’ (listed twice), Ranulf Higden, and Roger of Wendover. Richard Sharpe has suggested that this inclusion of the unknown ‘Hugh of Ireland’ may in fact be a reference to Hugh the Illuminator who features in the first title of the collection of texts in S*: the ‘Itinerarium Symeonis Semeonis et Hugonis illuminatoris.’ Of these six additions, excluding the reference to Caradog of Llancarfan, the works of these authors can all be found in the four surviving manuscripts which belonged to Simon Bozoun, the prior of Norwich Cathedral from 1344 to 1352, two of which were the above-mentioned S* and L*.

Like F*, a French provenance has also been suggested for Y*. This manuscript has been dated to c.1400. Strikingly, Y* shares with F* and C* the excerpt from Ethicus Ister’s Cosmographia on Gog and Magog, which follows immediately after the Itinerary in all three manuscripts.

---

11 CBMLC:X1 p.186; Rouse, Catalogus de Libris, pp.ci-ci.
12 Bodleian, Fairfax 20 contains the Flores Historiarum, attributed to the unknown ‘Matthew of Westminster’ and the text of Roger of Wendover’s chronicle, Wendover’s chronicle occurs again in CCC 264, and the Polychronicon, by Ranulf Higden can be found in L*. The Itinerary can be found in both L* and S*. see pp.270-279.
13 This manuscript’s early provenance is largely unknown. It belonged to Francois Xavier Laire (1738-1801) the librarian for Cardinal Etienne Charles Lomenie de Brienne. Sir Thomas Phillipps bought it from Frederick North, 5th Earl of Guilford (1766-1827) and it remained in the Phillipps collection until it was sold at Sotheby’s in 1971.
Even though the provenance of a manuscript can be identified, it is only rarely that any inkling as to who owned or read it can be ascertained. Although much of the information about such matters is hidden and unlikely ever to be recovered, glimpses into reading practices are offered by tackling other aspects of codicological examinations of these manuscripts which will be discussed later. However, we are most fortunate in the final two manuscripts of the *Itinerary* for they both bear an inscription with the name of an individual; Simon Bozoun, the prior of Norwich cathedral. Furthermore, the survival of a list of books in *L* belonging to Simon Bozoun, also offers a much greater insight than otherwise possible into the book-collecting practices and interests of an individual. Simon Bozoun’s book list is a list of thirty-one items, of which four are extant. The lack of a medieval catalogue for Norwich Priory makes the survival of this book-list vital. The two manuscripts *S* and *L*, listed as Items.26 and 30 respectively, unlike the other two extant manuscripts belonging to Simon Bozoun, also bear Norwich Cathedral library pressmarks. These are ‘S xxiii’ for *S* and ‘P lxi’ for *L*. In regards to the subsequent history of these two manuscripts, *L* came into the hands of Lord Lumley (c.1533-1609). *S*, the third manuscript of this text acquired by Matthew Parker, was subsequently donated to Corpus Christi College in 1575. Clearly the survival of the manuscripts due to the interest shown in these particular texts, or at least associated texts in these codices by sixteenth-century antiquarians such as Matthew Parker, Lord Lumley and Paul Petau can not be underestimated. Had other examples of the *Itinerary* come into the hands of any of these men, perhaps a greater selection of William of Rubruck’s work may have survived.

14 In *S*: ‘Liber fratris Symonis Prioris Norwic’, f.1; in *L*: ‘Liber fratris Symonis Bozoun prioris Norwici’ f.15; the recent editors of the *Itinerary*, P.Jackson for the English and C.& R. Kappler have failed to appreciate this connection for P.Jackson and the Kapplers have assumed that both manuscripts date from the fifteenth century, although the Kapplers do suggest that *S* may be from the late-fourteenth century, Jackson, ‘Introduction’, *WR*, p. 52; Kappler, *Voyage*, pp.61-2.

15 See pp.270-279.
A revised stemma of the Itinerary

The stemma of the *Itinerary* as found in Van den Wyngaert’s *Sinica Franciscana* (Fig. II.2) can be found below, along with a revised version accompanied with discussion of the changes made (Fig.II.3). Except for the newly located Yale, Beinecke Library 406, I have personally examined all the manuscripts of the *Itinerary*.

**Fig.II 2 A. van den Wyngaet’s stemma of the Itinerary**

![Diagram of the stemma found in van den Wyngaert's Sinica Franciscana](image)

**Fig.II 3 Reconstructed stemma of the Itinerary**

![Diagram of the reconstructed stemma of the Itinerary](image)
As mentioned above, the two manuscripts C* and F* share the same associated texts except for three items. C*, believed to be the exemplar for the Leiden manuscript and the earliest manuscript of the text, was thought to have the most authority. Hitherto, the Leiden manuscript has been dismissed as a worthless copy and ignored in the process of establishing the authority of the text. However, Elizabeth van Houts work on William of Jumièges’ b GND and Julia Crick’s work on the HRB have suggested that this is unlikely as both date F* as the earlier manuscript thus suggesting only two possibilities; they were both copied from the same exemplar,\(^\text{16}\) or that in fact, C* may have been copied from F*. Yet, the examination of the text of the Itinerary in both manuscripts suggests the former possibility has the most merit. For example, within the very first chapter of the text a homoteleuton of the phrase ‘nec alicuīus … tunc cum’ omitted from F*, but found in C*, suggests that C* could not have been copied from it.

The differences between the manuscripts may largely be orthographical, nevertheless, even within these scribal preferences it can be seen that the text of D* shows more similarities to the Norwich manuscripts than C* and F*. In the margins of S*, at the end of the incomplete text of Itinerary on f.67v are the words ‘h[i]c deficit | m[ultu] vide | ap[ud] S[anctum] Edm[und]i | residuu[m]’, these are clearly written in a later hand of perhaps the sixteenth century and do not reflect a medieval knowledge of D*.

Intriguingly, James Dimmock has shown that four of the items in the F portion of D*/F were copied from R, a manuscript from St. Augustine’s, Canterbury. The hand of these items in F is the same as that of the text of the Itinerary in D*. Furthermore, the style of illuminated capital of the Itinerary (see p.128) is very similar in style to the illuminated first letter of the TH in F.\(^\text{17}\) It is tempting to wonder if the Itinerary was copied from a manuscript at, or from, the Abbey of St. Augustine’s Canterbury.\(^\text{18}\)

---


\(^{17}\) F, p.253 (or f.1v of the fourteenth-century Bury St. Edmund portion).

\(^{18}\) The Abbey of Bury St Edmund’s shared a close relationship with neighbouring monastic houses such as the Abbey of St. Benets in Hulme, Norwich Cathedral and St Albans as well as the more distant St. Augustine’s in Canterbury and Canterbury Christ Church Cathedral from where a number of manuscripts were copied. For Lesley Coote’s argument that D*/F was created as a gift to a king, see pp.263-4.
The final two manuscripts, $L^*$ and $S^*$, form another pair. Van den Wyngaert suggested that $L^*$ may have been copied from $S^*$ but not vice versa. He did not believe there was adequate evidence for this hypothesis which was based on the text of Ordoric of Pordenone’s *Relatio* found in both manuscripts.\(^{19}\) However, $L^*$’s reliance on $S^*$ can be demonstrated through a codicological examination of the two manuscripts. $S^*$, known as the *Liber Itinerariorum* in the book-list, consists now of six items. The first four items are each written in a separate collection of quires, each in a different hand. This codex has a value of 40d. placed beside it in the book list.\(^{20}\) In contrast to the value of 20s. placed alongside $L^*$ it is a rather meagre amount. $S^*$ is, of course, roughly a third of the size of $L^*$. Moreover, the title of *Liber Itinerariorum* used in the book-list also suggests that initially the contents which had belonged to Simon Bozoun, may have been restricted to the first two or three booklets, the three itineraries. The value of this codex also suggests that the booklets may have been only loosely bound together. This could suggest that the other items may have been added when the manuscript passed into the Norwich Cathedral Library book collection when the item acquired its pressmark.

The last quire of the incomplete text of the *Itinerary* has almost an entire folio left blank, suggesting that the text was left incomplete because the next quire required was unavailable to the scribe or that the exemplar was incomplete. The abrupt end of $S^*$ does not correspond with the end of a quire of the closest manuscript to it geographically, the Bury manuscript, and must, therefore, have had a different exemplar. The *pecia* system was clearly in use in Norwich at this time as can be seen from the obedientary rolls and the structure of that system may have been used to copy this text. It may be possible to speculate that this text, which may have been circulating quire by quire, may have gone further afield, at least in England, than is commonly believed.

$L^*$ is a large manuscript consisting of twenty-five quires, with the catchwords written in the same style and hand as the catchwords in $S^*$. The hand of Item.3, Ordoric of Pordenone’s

---

\(^{19}\) Wyngaert, pp. 163, 396.  
\(^{20}\) This value has previously been mistakenly published as 40s, see p.269 for a facsimile of the list.
Relatio in S* is in fact very similar to the hand of the scribe of L*. The texts in this codex however do not form individual booklets, as texts runs from quire to quire without a break. It is most likely that L* was a manuscript made under Simon Bozoun’s direction, and that the travel accounts of William of Rubruck and Ordoric of Pordenone were copied from S*. The relationship of the two manuscripts can be seen in the following ways:

First, textually: William of Rubruck’s text is identical in both, even down to the imperfect ending. Second, the nature of the codices: S* is an amalgamation of a number of quire-booklets. Mario Esposito, in his edition of Simon fitzSimon’s travel account had claimed that the first three items were written in the same hand and formed a composite booklet. However, although the Itinerarium and the Relatio are quite likely to have been written in the same hand, the first item, the incomplete version of Simon Semeonis appears to have been written in a different hand. Nevertheless, the first three items in particular bear similarities to what Pamela Robinson has termed booklets. Each text has been written individually in a set of quires each, with blank folios to the end of each set of quires.

The contrast within the structure of L* is marked. This manuscript is written uniformly in the same anglicana hand – and the texts run from quire to quire with breaks of as little as two lines to a half-folio break. This is a planned composite codex. This loose form of the S* is further reinforced by the value or cost alongside it in the booklist. This has been often mistranscribed and published as 40s, it is in fact 40d the cheapest of all the items in the list. This value, of a mere 40d suggests that this manuscript could not have been bound at the time, but merely collected together loosely and perhaps with only items. L* with its 310ff. had a value of 20s.

The personal interest in both manuscripts is further reinforced by the vellum tabs in the manuscripts at the start of each text which assist in finding a text speedily. L* also has handy text-finders, in the form of red rubrics at the top of many of the folios indicating the main

21 Esposito, Itinerarium, p.2.
23 See pp. 269, 272.
Of course as both these manuscripts do also bear Norwich Cathedral Priory library pressmarks, the possibility of the vellum tabs being a later development cannot be ignored. Devices used to simplify reading practices, such as indexing, clearly show that the text once circulated was known to at least a few and was not kept in oblivion until a chance finding by Hakluyt from within the library of Lord Lumley.

**Medieval Library catalogues/ Attested copies**

Medieval English library catalogue entries for the *Itinerary* are not as abundant as they are for the *TH*.\(^\text{24}\) Similarly, attestations to the texts in England are few and are limited in the information they provide. A copy of the *Itinerary* or the *Historia*, or possibly both together, can be found amongst a list of books given by Henry de Overton, abbot of Peterborough to Peterborough Abbey. Aside from Roger Bacon, the work may have also been available to another well-known thirteenth-century man, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester.

The availability of more complete records for Peterborough Abbey in the 1660s allowed Simon Gunton to compose his *The History of the Church of Peterburgh*, within which he was able to list the book-donations for each abbot. With regards to Henry de Overton he wrote:

> His Library was but small, only these Books.
> 
> 
> 
> *Liber de vita, & moribus Tartarorum.*\(^\text{25}\)

---

\(^\text{24}\) However, unlike William of Rubruck who was merely added to the copy of Henry of Kirkestede’s bibliographic catalogue made at Norwich, John of Plano Carpini was provided with an entry. Henry of Kirkestede did not rely solely on the contents of manuscripts at Bury St Edmunds for his work. He consulted other sources such as Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum Historiale*; hence, his inclusion of John of Plano Carpini’s text, may be a recognition of Vincent of Beauvais’ use of the *History of the Mongols* rather than attesting to the existence of any copy of the work in Bury St Edmunds that he may have seen, Henry of Kirkestede, *Catalogus*, p.liv; cf. CBMLC:XI, p.xcv.

\(^\text{25}\) S. Gunton, *The History of the Church of Peterborough*, ed. S. Patrick in 1686 (facsimile edition London, 1990) p.49; These references to books given to the Peterborough Abbey by its various bishops have been collected and edited with explanations for each work in *CBMLC:VIII*; for Henry de Overton, see ‘BP18’, pp.44-45.
It is possible that this last item, *Liber de vita et moribus Tartorum* refers to William of Rubruck and John de Plano Carpini’s text, as Roger Bacon refers to the two items separately as *Vita tartarorum* and *De moribus tartarorum* in his *Opus Majus*.\(^{26}\)

Evidently there was some interest at Peterborough in the Mongols, for when the late-fourteenth-century catalogue, the *Matricularium*, was written there were two entries for treatises on the Mongols. The *Matricularium* was larger and somewhat different to the twelfth-century Peterborough Abbey catalogue. The *Matricularium* was a partial catalogue; Bibles, glossed commentaries and books on canon law were all excluded. A further peculiarity of the list is that some of the extant books demonstrate that often the first item in the codex is not listed; a reversal of the usual practice of contemporary catalogue creation. However, as this is not wholly consistent for all the surviving books, some doubt as to the uniformity of the practice must be allowed.

The first reference to the Mongols was entry 271 in the catalogue\(^{27}\):

S.xij.

a. Versus de induciis urinarum
b. Liber qui dicitur morale scolarium
c. Tractatus de terra tartarorum

The second entry, Item.294 was to a slightly more extensive codex\(^{28}\):

S.xiij

a. Tractatus de xij abusionibus claustri
b. Tractatus de xij abusionibus seculi
c. Historia tartarorum
d. Libellus de uita et moribus tartarorum et eorum actibus

---

\(^{26}\) However, the editors of the Peterborough catalogues suggest only William of Rubruck as a possibility.

\(^{27}\) *CBMLC: VIII*, p.154.

\(^{28}\) *CBMLC: VIII*, p.160.
Each entry in the *Matricularium* was designated an alphanumeric mark such as the ‘S.xij.’ and ‘S.xiiij.’ used above. The extant manuscripts show that this did not correspond to a pressmark, furthermore, the sequence of the marks in the *matricularium* was alphabetical rather than alphanumerical (e.g. X.vi, Y.vi, Z.vi, A.vii, B.vii, C.vii etc.).

Hence, although the two entries about the Mongols are in an alphanumerical sequence this may be purely coincidental. Abbot Henry de Overton’s book is more likely to be that of the second entry and may perhaps even reflect that it could be both the texts of John de Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck.

The close relationship between Peterborough and neighbouring religious houses deserves some mention here. The extant manuscripts and records from Peterborough suggest ‘a local network of borrowing and exchange’ with Ely, Ramsey, Crowland and more substantially the abbey of Bury St. Edmunds. While it is impossible to tell if the texts listed above at Peterborough Abbey owed their existence to the copies of the *Itinerary* at Bury St. Edmunds and Norwich earlier in that century, or even vice versa, nevertheless this dissemination within a relative geographical proximity is noteworthy.

**Attested copies**

Referring to the *Itinerary* and William of Rubruck, Roger Bacon wrote, ‘I have examined this book with care, and I have conferred with its author’. It is probable, as Michèle Geurêt-Laferté has surmised amongst others, that the two men are most likely to have met in Paris. As to when exactly, sometime between 1257 and 1267, the known dates for Roger Bacon’s time in Paris, have been suggested. On his return to Acre in 1255, William of Rubruck had wanted to travel on to King Louis by then back in France. However, due to his teaching

---

29 *CBMLC:VIII*, pp.49-51.
30 As is the pressmark of *S* patriis, the Norwich manuscript, which was ‘S.xxiiij’, see above, p.179.
31 *CBMLC:VIII*, pp.xxviii-xxix.
responsibilities in Acre, William’s own wishes were not gratified and he was denied permission to leave.34

As a former student at Oxford and Paris, Roger Bacon was clearly a well-educated man and his interest in the new mendicant orders was such that by c.1256 he had joined the Franciscan order.35 By sometime around 1257, Roger Bacon had returned to Paris. Yet, once there, due to suspicions of the nature and validity of some of his opinions, he was kept under close supervision, presumably at the Franciscan studium in Paris.36 What these two men, of the same order, perhaps of a similar age may have made of each other is even harder to ascertain.37

For William of Rubruck his role as a missionary may have been his primary role in preparation for the end of the world, but for Roger Bacon it would be education, and the correct use of education for understanding the end of the world which appeared to be his primary goal; even though advanced scholarship was viewed suspiciously by the early Franciscan order. It is for this reason that Roger Bacon’s use of the Itinerary, the most up-to-date information available to him, is the ultimate compliment to William of Rubruck: it is the only contemporary’s account used for his ‘geographia’ section.

Surprisingly, although John of Plano Carpini and the HM are also mentioned in the Opus Majus, the HM was barely used. The manner in which Roger Bacon refers to the two works together, suggests that his personal copy may have contained both items together (in a manner similar to F* and C* perhaps). It was most likely in Paris that Roger Bacon became acquainted with the HM. In 1247, John of Plano Carpini had visited Louis IX in Paris as a papal legate and Vincent of Beauvais’ introduction to, and use of, the HM was most likely to

35 Hackett suggests that Roger Bacon may have been at Oxford from c.1227/28 – 1235/36, and was a Regent Master in the Arts at Paris until sometime around or after 1247, J. Hackett, ‘Roger Bacon: His life, career and works’, Roger Bacon and the Sciences: commemorative essays, ed. J. Hackett (Leiden, New York, Koln, 1997) pp.13-16.
36 This should not, however, be confused with his later ‘imprisonment’. It was after a chapter meeting in Paris, sometime between November 1277 and Pentecost 1279, that Roger Bacon was condemned for upholding ‘suspected novelties’ and was subsequently imprisoned; an imprisonment which according to Sidelko is likely to have been little more than house-arrest. As to what these novelties are, there has been much debate but little consensus. This is most likely to have been linked to Aristotelian condemnations of 1277, P.L Sidelko, ‘The condemnation of Roger Bacon’, JMH, vol.22 no. 1 pp.69-70.
37 J. Hackett considers the text of the Opus Tertium in which Roger Bacon states that he had been studying for forty years. Hackett suggests that this was written c.1267/68 and would suggest that Roger Bacon came to Oxford in 1228, most likely at the age of 13/14 and was there born c. 1214/15. J. Hackett, ‘Roger Bacon: His Life, Career and Works’; Rachewiltz has suggested sometime between 1215-1220 for William of Rubruck although van den Wyngaert has suggested sometime between 1215-1230 – although as discussed above, neither offer any justification for their suggestions.
have been a result of this visit to Paris. Had Roger Bacon felt compelled to mention the $HM$, despite making little use of it, because of John de Plano Carpini’s seniority and notoriety?

At around the same time that Roger Bacon may have been introduced to the two texts, another copy of the *Itinerary* may have been in circulation. Based on an insertion in John of Wallingford’s thirteenth-century abbreviation of Matthew Paris’ *CM*, Peter Jackson has suggested that Simon de Montfort was gifted a copy of William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*. However, John of Wallingford in his entry for 1257 merely stated that:

> And also this year, the book, which had been commissioned for the Earl of Leicester, Simon de Montfort, came, concerning the life and customs of the tartars and of their strength and wars and of their supplies, which contains as much writing as a psalter. That which one desires to examine, he will be able to discover at St. Albans in the *liber Additamentorum*.

This same abbreviation by John of Wallingford was consulted, and copied, verbatim in some instances by John of Oxnead (died c.1293).

Davide Bigalli, who had relied solely on John of Oxnead’s version, accepted the statement at face value, and assumed this reference to be to the letters regarding the Mongols found in Matthew Paris’ *Liber Additamenta [LA]*. Bigalli did not seem to be aware of the relationship between John of Oxnead and John of Wallingford’s chronicles. Even so, that knowledge would not have clarified the identity of the text. Peter Jackson who did correctly attribute this to John of Wallingford states of both Johns,

---

39 For the Latin text see p.190.
40 John of Oxnead: 2 MSS - Cotton Nero D II and BL Egerton 3142 pp.217-216 AD1258; John of Oxnead is believed to have been a monk of Hulme St. Benet, Gransden, *Historical Writing*, vol. I, p.402.
Their claim that the book could be found in the *Liber additamentorum* at St. Alban’s is surely based on a confusion with the documents gathered by Matthew Paris. ⁴²

Peter Jackson is, instead, convinced that this is William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*, stating further:

> Whether Bacon’s copy [of the *Itinerary*] was the book *de vita et moribus Tartarorum* approximately the length of a psalter, which the chronicler John of Wallingford (d.1258) says was presented to Simon de Montfort in 1257, we cannot tell. ⁴³

In fact, this speculative query can be categorically rejected. First, there is little to suggest conclusively that this text was the *Itinerary*. Presumably, Peter Jackson’s assumption rests on Roger Bacon’s terms of reference for the *Itinerary* as *de moribus tartarorum*. ⁴⁴ However, this ignores Roger Bacon’s specific reference to the *HM* as *vita tartarorum*. ⁴⁵ Thus if the reasoning behind Jackson’s assumption can be validated, then it would be more correctly ascribed to both works: the *Itinerary* and the *HM*. Second, if this was the *Itinerary* and even the *HM*, due to the date at which John of Wallingford suggests the event occurred, it is highly improbable that this was Roger Bacon’s copy. Roger Bacon is only likely to have met William of Rubruck that year, that is 1257. He was yet to complete his *OM* which was requested by Pope Clement IV in 1265 and sent c.1267, within which he included portions of the *Itinerary*. Why his own copy of these works is likely to have been in St Albans and gifted to Simon de Montfort, especially when Roger Bacon was supposed to be in Paris, is hard to fathom, and makes little sense chronologically. It is certainly not impossible that a copy made by Roger Bacon was sent to St Albans, yet again there is little evidence to corroborate this. Peter Jackson

---

⁴² Jackson, *Mongols and the West*, p.154, n.18.
⁴³ Jackson, *Mongols and the West*, p.139.
⁴⁴ Burke, *OM*, pp.372, 416, 789,792,796
⁴⁵ For Roger Bacon’s reference to *HM* as *vita tartarorum*, Burke, *OM*, p.789.
perhaps offers this speculation bearing in mind the tentative suggestion made by Richard Southern that the *Itinerary* may have been introduced to England by Roger Bacon.\textsuperscript{46}

Jackson overlooks John of Wallingford’s debt to Matthew Paris’ *CM*. It is clear that in this passage John of Wallingford was amalgamating information from the *CM* which sheds a little more light on the identity of this text. If the following passage from the *CM* is considered in conjunction with the passage from John of Wallingford’s abbreviation, the words in bold are those which have been copied:

1a.) John of Wallingford:
And also this year, the book, which had been commissioned for the Earl of Leicester, Simon de Montfort, came, **concerning the life and customs of the tartars** and of their strength and wars and of their supplies, which contains as much writing as a psalter. **That which one desires to examine, he will be able to discover at St. Albans** in the *liber Additamentorum*.\textsuperscript{47}

1b.)
Eodem etiam anno venit mandatum scriptum quod tantum continet litterae quantum continere creditur unum Psalterium *de vita et moribus Tartarorum* ad Comitem Legecestrie Simon de Monteforti, et de eorum fortitudine et guerra et de acquisitionibus, **quod qui inspicere desiderat apud Sanctum Albanum** in libro Additamentorum **poterit reperire**.

2.) Matthew Paris
In the course of this year, these detestable Tartars destroyed the Assassins, a race still more detestable,

\textsuperscript{47} from ‘Ex cronicis Iohannis de Wallingford’ *MGH Scriptores* vol. XXVIII, pp.510-511.
and who carry knives about them. **If any one is desirous of learning the impurities of these Tartars, and their mode of life and customs,** or to read of the superstitions and fury of the Assassins, **he may obtain information by making a diligent search at St. Alban’s.**

2b.) Matthew Paris

Assessini a Tartaris destruuntur. Circulo ejusdem anni Tartari detestabiles Assessinos destabiliiores, quos cultelliferos appellamus, destruxerunt. **Ipsorum Tartarorum immunditias, vitam, et mores si quis audire desiderat,** necnon et Assessinorum furorem et superstitionem **apud Sanctum Albanum diligens indagator poterit reperire.**

Matthew Paris had not mentioned that this information regarding the Mongols could be found in the *LA*. Matthew repeated shortly after the section quoted above, ‘Anyone making a careful search and inquiry at St. Albans may find there an account of their [the Mongols] most filthy mode of life.’

Was this merely an instance where Matthew Paris was uncharacteristically vague and where John of Wallingford with his familiarity with Matthew Paris’ work could be more specific?

John of Wallingford had been the infirmarer at St. Albans before he retired to Wymondham, ten miles west of Norwich, a St. Albans cell in 1257 where he died a year later. His friendship with Matthew Paris was such that Matthew Paris drew a portrait of John of Wallingford, now found on f.42v of Cotton Julius D. VII. Had John of Wallingford, while abbreviating this portion of the *CM*, perhaps at Wymondham, arrived at the section regarding

---

49 *CM*, vol.V pp.654-655
the Mongols and the Assassins and recalled a brief anecdote about Simon de Montfort which he conflated with what he knew of the contents of the *Liber Additamenta (LA)*? Certainly, other works attributed to John of Wallingford such as his description of the climates of the world, the inclusion of a drawing of an Elephant in BL, Cotton Julius D VII (at his instigation) does show a man interested in the peoples and terrain of his known world. His somewhat similar interests may explain this recollection of Simon de Montfort’s request. Simon de Montfort is recorded as having been in St.Albans on the 11th of November 1257 when he granted the demesne tithes of Luton to St. Albans, for which he received letters of confraternity the next day.  

To better understand this, Matthew Paris’ means of drawing his readers’ attention to the *LA* within the *CM* needs to be examined. Explicit references to the *LA* were often, although not always, accompanied by a sign, such as for example a drawing of a harp in the *CM* with a corresponding drawing of a harp in the *LA*. Out of a total of seventy-six references in the *CM* to look to the *LA*, twenty-nine use such signs. However, there are certain anomalies: three of these references were written in the margin, from the earlier portion of the *CM* which Richard Vaughn believes is in Matthew Paris’ own hand and reflects his decision to create the *LA* some years after he had begun his *CM*. Two further references in the *CM* alert the reader to look for documents in the *LA*, but for which no corresponding documents in the *LA* can found. There are also seven instances where letters in the *CM* are duplicated in the *LA*, but for which no reference has been made.

Nevertheless, what requires emphasis here is how particular Matthew Paris was in the *CM*, about ensuring that documents could be located easily; being coy was not a trait familiar to him. This lack of a reference to the *LA* is unlikely to have been an oversight. A further instance (the only other) in the *CM* where Matthew asks the reader to look elsewhere in St Albans, in regards to miracle accounts from Lincoln and Chester, reinforces this point. In this passage Matthew Paris writes:

---

52 Maddicott, *Simon*, pp.103-104.
53 Vaughn, *Matthew*, p.79
In the church of Lincoln twenty miracles shone forth as evident, on being examined into, not to speak of the others, which are innumerable. And in the church of Chichester an equal number, or more, were made manifest and every day added to their number; and if anyone one desires to see an account of those examined into, he can find writings concerning them in the church of St. Albans.\(^{54}\)

An account of the miracles above cannot be found in the LA and were clearly in some other manuscript. This is the only other example in the CM where Matthew Paris asks the reader to look for a text in St. Albans which is not in the LA. This further suggests that Matthew Paris was likely to have been referring to an entirely different text which contained a treatise on the Mongols, than that within the LA.\(^{55}\)

The question that requires asking is why Matthew Paris, with his deep abiding interest in the East did not choose to include this work (regardless of whether it was the Itinerary, the HM or some other text). He had successfully inserted Andrew of Longjumeau’s account into the LA; perhaps this other text was too long, or perhaps in 1257, a mere two years before his own death he simply had neither the time nor capability. Alternatively, if this event occurred at Wymondham rather than St. Albans perhaps John of Wallingford simply got confused and assumed that the text about the Mongols which he had heard about was likely to have been the same as the text he knew Matthew Paris had used.

Nevertheless, does Jackson’s belief that this is the Itinerary have merit? The section within the CM suggests that a text about the Assassins may have been included within the text on the Mongols. If such is the case, then, indeed, the only extant text of the Mongols which

---


\(^{55}\) It must be stressed here that this practice is only common to the Chronica Majora, as his method in the Historia Anglorum was rather different.
contains any information of the Assassins is William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*. Yet, the information in the *Itinerary* about the Assassins, or rather the Nizari Isma’ilis, is sparse and says nothing of their beliefs or superstitions. If these were two separate documents, this could very well be a reference to a tract on the Mongols and the separate anonymous *tractatus de locis sancte terre* which provides an account of the Assassins, closer to the description provided above, or even Jacques de Vitry’s *HO* which had used the anonymous tract. Indeed, this latter suggestion is perhaps most likely, for in the earlier portion of the *CM* (the section in which Matthew adapted Roger of Wendover’s chronicle), he suggested in the margins that looking at Jacques de Vitry’s *Historia Orientalis* would provide further information about the Assassins.

Networks of dissemination:

The evidence to claim the text discussed above as either the *Itinerary* or the *HM* or even both is insufficient. Yet, it highlights a different aspect to the dissemination of information about the Mongols. If this was in fact either text, how had they reached England so swiftly? Could this have been, as Jackson suggests, due to the influence of Roger Bacon? Perhaps, but there may have been many more ways for these texts to disseminate to England. The following while largely speculative, offers a wealth of possible networks of intellectual exchanges regarding the Mongols in mid-thirteenth century England.

William of Rubruck took his leave of Louis IX at Jaffa sometime between May 1252 and June 1253. His readers are assured of his having the king and queen’s favour, by his remarks on the expensive gifts of a Bible and a Psalter which he received from them. He returned to Acre from his journey in 1255, and as mentioned above, was not given permission to set out immediately to the king. Roger Bacon’s *OM* testifies that he had met William, and scholarly consensus locates this meeting in Paris. If William had made it that far, it is fairly

56 There is no mention of the Assassins in the accounts of Andrew of Longjumeau, John de Plano Carpini, or Simon de St. Quentin.
57 Morgan, *Mongols*, pp.17-8, for their defeat by the Mongols see pp.146-151 and for a discussion of a possible embassy sent to the English crown in 1238 see pp.175-6.
58 ‘si quis autem scire dsiderat de Assessinorum mansione et ritu et detestabili superstitione, librum de Historiis querat Orientalium’, *CM*, vol.1 p.288.
59 See p.33.
certain that he would have been granted an audience with Louis IX; not only on account of the work or Louis’ interest in the Mongols, or mendicants in general, but also due to the friendship he claimed.

Louis IX would have made for a more effective information-conduit than Roger Bacon. After all, it is quite likely that it was Louis, directly or indirectly, who had facilitated the dissemination of *HM* to the encyclopaedist Vincent of Beauvais for his *Speculum historiale*. John of Plano Carpini had been despatched as papal legate to Louis on his return from the East to dissuade Louis from embarking on crusade at that particular time. According to Salimbene, John had visited the Franciscan convent at Sens and was eagerly publicising his book for, ‘he had with him the book that he had written on the Tartars’. This eagerness to discuss his work makes it all the more probable that it may have been during John’s visit to Louis IX that Vincent of Beauvais was made aware of the *HM*. Vincent of Beauvais enjoyed the patronage of Louis IX and indeed spent considerable time with him after Louis’ return in 1254. Louis had him brought to Royaumont where he supervised the education of Louis’ children amongst other duties. Although the first edition of the *Speculum Historiale* had been completed in 1246 before his move to the Cistercian house, it is thought that the expansion of the work from thirty to thirty-two books, amongst which was the inclusion of the excerpts from the accounts of John de Plano Carpini and Simon de St. Quentin, was related to his move to Royaumont and was done at the instigation of Louis IX.

Could Louis have not done something similar for the *Itinerary*? Louis IX had a close relationship with the Paris Franciscans and was their main benefactor. Louis’ court in the years 1256 and 1257 was by any standards vibrant and bustling; especially as the negotiations for the 1259 Treaty of Paris with the English king were in progress; offering through Louis, and others at his court, a myriad other avenues of dissemination of these works.

---

60 Salimbene had already discussed on two occasions that, ‘he [John] had this book read to the Brothers, as I myself heard as often as he undertook the task of relating the facts about the Tatars.’ Salimbene, *Chronicle*, pp.197-8, 203.
61 L.K.Little, ‘Saint Louis’ Involvement with the Friars’, *Church History*, vol.33.2 (1964) p.135.
62 Voorbij, ‘Bower’s use of Vincent of Beauvais’, *Scot.*, vol. IX, pp.260-280; Interestingly, the version of the *HM* used by Vincent of Beauvais is of the second expanded recension; of which the only two manuscript witnesses are F and C, see below pp.249-251.
For example, Adam Marsh, the Franciscan theologian from Oxford, the close friend and mentor of Simon de Montfort, a man much admired by Roger Bacon and well known to many Franciscans was in Paris from around August 1257. The patent roll of 22nd June 1257 states that he, accompanied by Hugh Bigod and Walter Cantilupe, the bishop of Worcester, had the power to negotiate peace terms on behalf of Henry III until Ascension Day the following year (2nd May 1258). In the role of their advisors, their companions were Simon de Montfort and Peter of Savoy. 64 Not only has Adam Marsh’s interest in the Mongols, especially leading to the Council of Lyon, been discussed briefly above, but also his role in disseminating information about the Holy Land to Robert Grosseteste. 65

Apart from discussing the Mongols with Louis IX himself, Adam Marsh could have met with William of Rubruck or Roger Bacon in Paris. Contrary to previous scholarly thought, Jeremiah Hackett has argued that it is highly unlikely that Roger Bacon was taught by either Robert Grosseteste or Adam Marsh. Yet, it is clear that Roger Bacon had some degree of acquaintance with the two, or at least had seen them and heard them speak. Hackett even suggests the possibility that Roger Bacon may have met with Adam Marsh and Robert Grosseteste either before or after the Council of Lyon. 66 While there is still a great deal of uncertainty about the provision for accommodation for mendicants at the French court, or if they congregated at the Franciscan convent in Paris, the possibility of Adam Marsh meeting Roger Bacon and William of Rubruck there is not wholly unlikely. This makes the prospect of Adam Marsh as facilitator for the dissemination of information about the Mongols to Simon de Montfort and England, just as much a possibility as Roger Bacon.

The other noted close friendship was of course the more direct link between Simon de Montfort and Louis IX which requires little discussion here. They shared many common

---


65 See p.157.

66 Hackett, ‘Roger Bacon: his life, career and works’, pp.11-12, 14-5.
interests, not least amongst them their crusading interests. In the years 1255 to 1258, according to Maddicott, Simon de Montfort was frequently in Louis’ company, travelling regularly to the French court, and not only in his capacity as advisor to Adam Marsh.\(^{67}\)

There was also an element of official diplomatic correspondence in the transmission of information about the Levant. Queen Blanche, Louis’ mother had previously been instrumental in disseminating information about the capture of Damietta to Henry III. As this letter follows immediately a letter sent to Louis by the Mongol khan in Matthew Paris’ *Chronica Majora*, it is tempting to wonder if she had also forwarded this letter from the Mongol khan to Henry.\(^{68}\) Although she had died in 1252, nevertheless could this custom of transmitting information between these powerful, neighbouring monarchs, who were also brothers-in-law, have continued and come to Matthew Paris or Simon de Montfort’s attention there?

Matthew Paris appears to have had access to a number of documents and letters from the royal court. Between 1220 and 1259 Henry III visited St. Albans nine times and, at least according to Matthew Paris, Matthew was able to speak freely to the king.\(^{69}\) Indeed, Matthew Paris’s possible relationship with Louis IX must also be considered here. Matthew Paris writes that in 1248 he undertook a mission to Bergen to act as an emissary to King Hakon of Norway. The purpose of his journey was to deliver letters from Louis IX to persuade Hakon to uphold his vow and embark on crusade with Louis. No explanation has as yet been found as to why Matthew was chosen for this mission. He did have some connection with Norway in regards to the Abbey of St. Benet Holm, and it was perhaps this which brought Matthew to Louis’ attention.\(^{70}\) Could this help explain how Matthew Paris had access to Andrew of Longjumeau’s account of the Mongols? Furthermore, if the reference above is to either the *HM* and/or the *Itinerary*, could this dissemination be due to Louis IX?

In addition to this plethora of friendships and possible chance encounters, away from Paris, Master Nicholas, whom Roger Bacon praises lavishly in connection with Robert

\(^{67}\) Maddicott, Simon, pp.90-92, 205-6.  
\(^{68}\) Liber Additamenta, pp. 163-167.  
\(^{69}\) Vaughn, Matthew, pp.12-13.  
\(^{70}\) Vaughn, Matthew, pp.6-7; It has also been suggested that Matthew’s toponym of ‘Paris’ may perhaps have been related to time possibly spent at the university in Paris, where he may have been known to Louis.
Grosseteste and Adam Marsh, was also Simon de Montfort’s son’s tutor. Roger Bacon’s praise of the man is such that George Molland believes he must have been a close acquaintance. A further possible link, with particular relevance here, is that George Molland suggests that this Master Nicholas may have been the same person Matthew Paris mentions as Nicholas the Greek. According to Matthew Paris, Nicholas the Greek helped Robert Grosseteste translate the Testament of the twelve patriarchs, but more importantly, Nicholas the Greek was a cleric at St. Albans.

![Fig.II 4 Networks of Dissemination](image)

The shaded boxes denote those who are believed to have been in Paris in 1257

The purpose of the above discussion, also shown through the chart above is not to suggest a definitive way in which this text, if it was the Itinerary and/or the HM, disseminated, via Roger Bacon or not; but to suggest the multiplicity of ways in which, and people through whom it could have been done.

---

71 Molland, ‘Roger Bacon’s knowledge’, p.162.
Patterns of dissemination

Map 4 Manuscripts of the Itinerary
The dissemination of the manuscripts of the *Itinerary* and other attestations suggests that in England there were three strands to this interest. The initial interest is manifest in the work’s dedicatee, Roger Bacon’s use of the text within a work destined for and commissioned by one of the foremost powerful figure of western Europe, the Pope, and the potential availability of the text to Henry III’s brother-in-law, a man of vast influence and power, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester. This interest corresponds with the similar attention given to other accounts of the Mongols in the first fifteen years after the Council of Lyon in 1245; Vincent of Beauvais use of the *HM* and Simon of St. Quentin’s account, Matthew Paris’ inclusion of Andrew of Longjumeau’s report, and Roger Bacon’s awareness of the *HM*. Evidently, there was a desire to receive contemporary information of this new enemy. It was only in the mid 1260s that the possibility of a Mongol alliance began to be considered. Furthermore, the 1250s was a decade of eschatological expectation. Matthew Paris had expected that the world would end in 1250 and his illuminated representations of the Mongols gleaned from the highly descriptive letters he received demonstrates his belief in their role within this. Yet, the world had not ended and the more common belief at the time, heavily influence by the Joachite prophecies amongst others, offered 1260 as year the world would end with Emperor Frederick II identified as Antichrist. Despite Frederick’s death in 1250, there remained a certain element of apocalyptic fervour which helped escalate the need for information about these possible harbingers of doom.

Second, the continued interest in these texts in the 1280s as seen in the surviving manuscripts *C* and *F*, could reflect the continued crusading interest in England. Edward I in the late 1280s was still hoping for that elusive Mongol alliance as his meeting with Rabban Sauma suggests which would make a further crusade to the east successful. Evidently, possible allies could require as much or even more investigation than potential enemies.

Third, the fourteenth-century interest in the *Itinerary* forms a neat triangle in the Benedictine houses of Norwich, Bury St. Edmunds and Peterborough as seen in map.4. Apart from the non-extant Peterborough manuscript, the other three manuscripts are all collections of some wider geographical interest as will be discussed in ch.III. Could this be a reflection of the increased university attendance by members of monastic institutions in this area and the wealth
of the Benedictine houses in south-east England which enabled them to have large and varied book collections? Could this represent the wider scholastic acceptance of this information about the Mongols within the English literary tradition, albeit on a relatively small scale.
Roger Bacon and the Opus Majus (OM)

It was in the interest of gaining an understanding of the status of philosophy within the study of theology and to offer an interpretation of Aristotle that Pope Clement IV, previously secretary to Louis IX and papal legate to England during the barons’ rebellion, had requested that Roger Bacon write about the topics they had discussed previously. Jeremiah Hackett posits that, therefore, it is unlikely that the OM had been completed already; instead, it had to be speedily put together by 1267/68 when it was sent to Pope Clement.72

Hackett also suggest that this was Roger Bacon’s way of advocating a revision of the education system within the schools and universities, which is perhaps best demonstrated through the structure of the work and the variety of topics discussed. The OM was divided into seven books on: the four causes of ignorance and error; the affinity between Philosophy and Theology; the usefulness of studying languages; the usefulness of Mathematics (including its use towards the study of Astronomy, Optics, Theology, Chronology, Astrology and Geography); Optics; Experimental Science; and Moral Philosophy.

In relation to information about the Mongols the sections of interest are Bk.IV on mathematics and Bk.VII on moral philosophy, where Roger Bacon makes reference to the HM and the Itinerary The material gleaned from the Itinerary was used in two different sections within the OM: the section now known as ‘geography’ in Bk.IV on ‘Mathematics’ and the fourth section within Bk.VII on ‘Moral Philosophy’ which offered a comparison of the known religions in the world.73 This preference for the Itinerary may have been due to its content, but perhaps was also a consequence of his meeting with William.

72 Pope Clement VI, previously Cardinal Guy le Gros de Foulques, had been private secretary to King Louis IX as well as papal legate to England during the Civil War. Clement’s IV request was issued on June 22, 1266 from Viterbo. Bridges, Opus Maius p.xxi; Roger Bacon had initially met with him c.1263/4 after he had initiated contact through Raymond of Laon, a cleric in Cardinal Guy le Gros de Foulques’ household, Hackett, ‘Roger Bacon: His life, career and works’, pp.17-18.

73 For discussions of the use of William of Rubruck by Roger Bacon for the ‘geographia’ see Geuret-Laferté, ‘Le voyageur’, pp.81-96; cf. D.Woodward & H.M. Howe ‘Roger Bacon on Geography and Cartography’, Roger Bacon and the Sciences, pp.201-2; For a brief discussion of the book on Moral Philosophy see J. Hackett ‘Epilogue: Roger Bacon’s Moral Science’ Roger Bacon and the Sciences pp.405-409, however, no mention is made here of the use of the Itinerary.
Peter Jackson had previously claimed that ‘no one apart from Roger Bacon read William of Rubruck’.\footnote{Jackson, ‘Introduction’, WR, p.51.} This has, at times, been misconstrued in two ways. Firstly, that Roger Bacon is the only person who knew of this text. Raymond Beazely’s incorrect dating of the two Norwich manuscripts to the fifteenth century, the general disregard of the individual surviving manuscripts, particularly $F^*$ and a lack of appreciation of the expense and effort that the copying of a text would have entailed in the Middle Ages has contributed to this view. Secondly, Christopher Dawson’s suggestion that,

Roger Bacon’s account seems to have aroused the interest of his countrymen, for except in England William and his travels were practically forgotten until modern times...\footnote{Dawson, Mission to Asia, p.88.}

or Mary Campbell’s view that William of Rubruck received

most of his medieval dissemination through Roger Bacon’s inclusion of long passages from his letters in the\emph{ Opus Majus}

or even Igor de Rachewiltz’s that,

William’s work has survived in a number of mss which derive from three codices all found in England. After three centuries of oblivion, the\emph{ Itinerary} was discovered and published by Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas...
.. If the pioneer Franciscan explorers were soon forgotten, the rich mass of information that they had gathered in their reports was not lost. Much of it, as we have already seen, was incorporated in the works of their great contemporaries, Vincent of Beauvais and Roger Bacon.\textsuperscript{76}

relies on a number of assumptions. First, according to Rachewiltz that after the thirteenth century there had been little interest in the text, a view which the discussion above dispels. The inclusion of $Y^*$ within this examination demonstrates that $F^*$ is no longer the only non-English witness to the \textit{Itinerary}.\textsuperscript{77} Second, that reading of the \textit{OM} in England during the Middle Ages encouraged people there to gain access to William of Rubruck’s text. Third, that William of Rubruck’s \textit{Itinerary} received its widest medieval dissemination indirectly through Roger Bacon’s use of it in the \textit{OM}, which it is also assumed enjoyed a high level of popularity at this time.

More recently Jackson, although repeating the above distorted view of the medieval dissemination of the \textit{Itinerary}, has discounted the medieval circulation of Roger Bacon’s \textit{OM} as well as the \textit{Itinerary}:

Rubruck’s own report to King Louis was a commendably full document; but it would languish in relative obscurity for over three centuries. Indeed, only the English Franciscan Roger Bacon is known to have read it.[...] Bacon duly inserted citations from Rubruck’s book, sometimes with specific attribution, in his own \textit{Opus Maius} (c.1267), although this too barely circulated.\textsuperscript{78}

\textsuperscript{76} de Rachewiltz, \textit{Papal Envoys}, pp. 141, 207.
\textsuperscript{77} See pp.265.
\textsuperscript{78} Jackson, \textit{Mongols and the West}, p.138.
To what extent are the above views an accurate reflection of the dissemination of the two texts in the Middle Ages? This will be discussed in greater detail below. First, the physical dissemination of the manuscripts of the *OM* will be considered, in order to assess Christopher Dawson’s view that Roger Bacon’s use of the *Itinerary* may have inspired the *Itinerary’s* dissemination in England.

**The Manuscript Dissemination of the Opus Majus**

The use and manipulation of authoritative texts were commonplace. Yet the ‘authorities’ often required the benefit of centuries of circulation. The early acceptance of the authority of a contemporary was more unusual. The transmission of the *Itinerary* through Roger Bacon was highly selective, more so than Vincent of Beauvais’ use of the *HM*. Was Roger Bacon’s use of the *Itinerary*, as Dawson suggests, the reason for William of Rubruck’s relative popularity in England?

Roger Bacon’s present great renown appears to have led some to presume that his *OM*, either in its entirety or in parts, was well known in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Judging a work’s diffusion, or even popularity, by the numbers of its extant manuscripts is obviously fraught and can only ever be a partial story. No surviving manuscript of the *OM* contains the complete text of all seven books. The only near-complete manuscript versions of the *OM*, of which there are three, lack sections five and six of Bk.VII. The manuscripts are Bodleian, Digby 235, the copy that was made of Digby 235 which is now Dublin, Trinity College 381, and the subsequent copy of the Dublin manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College 1294.79 The exemplar has been dated to the fifteenth century and the copies date from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries respectively. With regards to the medieval circulation of the *OM*, it is the separate dissemination of the various constituent parts that is of greater interest. A.G. Little’s list of manuscripts, the only attempt at publishing a list of the extant codices, records the survival of 44 manuscripts of some portion of the *OM*. Of these, the

greatest number of extant manuscripts are of Bk.V or *Perspectiva* and are primarily of the fourteenth and fifteenth century. However, *Mathematica*, Bk.IV, ranks second, a high proportion of which are of the ‘Geography’ section of Bk.IV alone.\(^{80}\)

Little identified sixteen medieval manuscripts which contained Bk.IV in some form or another. There are three ways in which the ‘Geographia’ section circulated.

1. In manuscripts which contained Bks.I-IV:

   1.) London BL, MS Cotton Julius D V (xiii. ex)
   2.) Rome, Vatican MS 4086 (xiv. in)
   3.) Paris, BN, MS Nouv. Acq. Lat 1715 (perhaps a copy of the Cottonian ms). (xv.)
   4.) Winchester College 39 (xv.)\(^{81}\)
   5.) Oxford, Bodl. Library, Digby 235 (xv.)

2. In four manuscripts which solely contain Bk.IV:

   6.) London, BL, MS Royal 7 F VII (xiii. ex)
   7.) London, BL, MS Cotton Tiberius C V (xv.)
   8.) London, Lambeth Palace MS 200 (xv.)
   9.) Paris, BN, Nouv. Acq. MS Lat 7455 (xv.)

3. In three manuscripts which contain excerpts of Bk.IV which including the ‘geography’ section, or the ‘geography’ section alone\(^{82}\):

   10.) Madrid, El Escorial g.iii.17 (xiii. )
   11.) London, BL, MS Cotton Otho D I (xv.)

---

\(^{80}\) Little, ‘Roger Bacon’s Works’, pp. 379-386.

\(^{81}\) Bk.IV is incomplete.

\(^{82}\) Three further manuscripts with excerpts from Bk.IV have been identified. They are two seventeenth-century MSS and one eighteenth-century MS. They are Bodleian, Seldon Supra 79, Oxford, University College 49 and Paris, Bibl. Mazarine 3488.
12.) Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 426 (xv.)
13.) Oxford, Bodl. Library, MS. E Museo 155 (xv. in)
14.) Wolfenbüttel, Herzogl. Bibl. 4125 (xv.)

A further previously unidentified manuscript can be added to this section of the list:

15.) London, BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra D V (xiv.)

With regards to Bk.VII on Moral Philosophy there are, apart from the three manuscripts mentioned earlier, two extant manuscripts. The earliest, and only, manuscript of Bk.VII in its entirety is Vat. Lat. 4295. There is no surviving excerpt of section 4 of Bk.VII alone. Indeed, there is only one extant manuscript, British Library, Royal 8 F ii (xv), with a portion of Bk.VII which circulated separately. Unfortunately this manuscript does not contain the relevant section, containing instead sections I, II, and a portion of section III of Bk.VII.

Mary Campbell’s view of the medieval dissemination of the *Itinerary* as dependant through Roger Bacon’s use of it in the *OM*, can be correct only when the fifteenth-century manuscripts are considered. If the numbers of surviving manuscripts alone are considered, for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries Peter Jackson may be correct to an extent in discounting the dissemination of either text, but fails to take into account the vagaries of survival.

---

83 Item 4 in this manuscript, which contains the ‘geography’ section of Bk.IV of the *OM* was given the incorrect title of ‘Descriptio Mundi’ written in a later hand. This text was then mistakenly attributed, in the same later hand as its spurious title, to Gerald of Wales, the author of the three previous texts in that codex.

84 Little ‘Roger Bacon’s Works’, pp.379, 385-6; the *Philosophia Moralis* was edited by Eugenio Massa, see *Rogeri Baconis Moralis Philosophia*, ed. E. Massa (Zurich, 1953).
Fig.II 5 Extant manuscripts of the Itinerary and OM

Dawson’s suggestion that the OM influenced its readers to read the Itinerary, while not improbable, is unlikely. On the basis of extant manuscripts alone, it is clear that at least in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries William of Rubruck did not receive a wider dissemination through Roger Bacon’s OM. If extant manuscripts can be a clear indicator of popularity, William of Rubruck’s Itinerary had as much of a readership as the transmission of William of Rubruck through the OM in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.⁸⁵ In essence, the dissemination of William of Rubruck, seen through the number of extant manuscripts was not much wider through Roger Bacon’s OM in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries than on its own. This is not to suggest that its dissemination was negligible and should be largely ignored, but the fact that Roger Bacon’s OM was largely disseminated in the fifteenth century does not mean it shared a similar dispersal in the two preceding centuries.

⁸⁵Of the first category of manuscripts, which contained Bks.I-IV, the thirteenth-century ms BL, Cotton Julius D V, was partially destroyed in the fire of 1731 and Vatican MS 4086, which may be the exemplar of the fifteenth-century Paris manuscript. Other items within Cotton Julius D V have a connection with Dover priory, which offers a possible provenance. In the second category all the manuscripts, which contained Bk.IV of the OM, apart from BL, Royal 7 F VII, which has tentatively been attributed to the Franciscan convent in Hereford, no provenances can be established. Of the third category which consists of the circulation of the ‘Geography section’ separately, except for Madrid, El Escorial g.iii.17 and British Library, Cotton Cleopatra D V, the other three manuscripts are all fifteenth-century manuscripts. From the associated manuscripts it is clear that Cambridge CCC 426 and BL, Cotton Othan D I are identical. BL, Cotton Otho D I can be dated to after 1443. Bodleian, e. Museo 155 was a manuscript written at Oxford by a man named John Cokkes in the early part of the fifteenth century. Finally, there is the Vat. Lat. 4295, the sole witness to the complete text of Bk.VII, which Eugenio Massa claims was Roger Bacon’s autograph manuscript.
Roger Bacon stated in his *OM*, ‘I have examined this book with care, and I have conferred with its author’, offering credibility to the information he was about to include. Yet, in order to fit within the overriding theme of the *OM*, William’s views of the Mongols were subverted rather than reinforced. The primary purpose of Roger Bacon’s use of the *Itinerary* was to adapt the information gained to enhance his argument for the revision of the standard academic curriculum. His model, he seemed to hope, would better enable the educated religious to come to a greater understanding of the Antichrist and the end of the world. There were three aspects to his use of the *Itinerary*: he showed how education could be used to identify the geography of the apocalypse, the identity of the enemy and a chronology of the apocalypse. It was used, first, as a source of topographic and ethnographic detail of which Roger Bacon made a highly selective use; second, to place a strong emphasis on William’s brief description of Alexander’s Gate, and the people enclosed by it, thereby consigning it firmly within the apocalyptic framework of the Antichrist, Gog and Magog and the lost tribes of Israel; and finally in order to discuss and compare the known religions of the world, within a chronological framework of the impending apocalypse.

Roger Bacon remained convinced that knowledge of the locations of peoples and places was vital, believing that: ‘He who is ignorant of the places of the world lacks a knowledge not only of his destination but of the course to pursue.’

Yet, instead of offering a comprehensive description of the places and people of the world, including those that his readers, at least Pope Clement IV, would have been more familiar with, he wrote that these known places did not merit attention,

but rather those more notable and famous in Scripture and philosophy; from which the tyrannical nation will come and have come that

86 Burke, *OM*, pp.320-1.
are reported from the past to have ravaged the world or as destined to do so at some time.\textsuperscript{87}

Within descriptions he chose to include, he was reliant on the old favourites of Pliny, Solinus, Isidore and Aethicus Ister. Nevertheless, Roger Bacon was critical of these authors, writing that, ‘sometimes however many things are found written which authors have gathered from reports more than from experience’ but he praised himself for his own critical eye by adding, ‘wherefore I shall have recourse to those who have in great measure travelled over the places of the world.’; referring in this instance to William of Rubruck and simultaneously assuring the reader of his judgement and ability to discern the truth.\textsuperscript{88} This is, therefore, why and when he breaks from the practice of citing the words of the authorities but instead includes the new voice of William of Rubruck.

Roger Bacon ignored many of William of Rubruck’s anecdotal digressions mainly choosing topographical observations such as, for example, the fact that he could now name a third river, Etilia, to add to Aristotle and Pliny’s list of rivers with a tidal flow.\textsuperscript{89} He offered descriptions of the people encountered by William of Rubruck along his journey and of course the Mongols, drawing heavily on material from the onward journey of William of Rubruck, in order to establish the geographical landscape.\textsuperscript{90}

To explain the identity of the people behind Alexander’s gate, Roger Bacon offered a further reason for gaining knowledge of geographical locations,

Moreover, no small necessity of knowing the places in the world arises from the fact that the Church should have excellent knowledge of the

\textsuperscript{87} Burke, \textit{OM}, p.323.
\textsuperscript{88} Burke, \textit{OM}, pp.323-4; A further example of this is given when discussing the Caspian Sea and the mistakes made by Isidore of Seville and Pliny “For the Caspit and the Hycanii dwell on the shores of that sea; nor does this sea enter from the ocean, as Isidore and Pliny and all other authors write. For in this case they did not have definite experience, either personal or through others, but wrote from hearsay. But in books on the manners of the Tartars and by men worthy of belief who have been in those regions, it is made clear that…’ Burke, \textit{OM}, p.372.
\textsuperscript{89} Burke, \textit{OM}, p.340.
\textsuperscript{90} Burke, \textit{OM}, pp.374-5. 377-389.
situation and condition of the ten tribes of the Jews who will come forth in the days to come [...] Christians and especially the Roman Church should study carefully the location of places, that it may be able to learn the ferocity of nations of this kind and through them learn the time and origin of the Antichrist.\textsuperscript{91}

Drawing on the prophesy of Ezekial and other sources he wrote,

We must give these places careful attention. For Gog and Magog, of whom Ezekial prophesied and also the Apocalypse have been shut up in these places [...] Alexander, as Aethicus states, shut up twenty-two kingdoms of the stock of Gog and Magog, destined to come forth in the days of Anti-Christ. These nations will first devastate the world and then will meet Antichrist, and will call him God of Gods.\textsuperscript{92}

For Roger Bacon the enclosure of the lost Jewish tribes was linked with Gog and Magog, the acknowledged followers of the Antichrist.\textsuperscript{93} Regarding the Mongols in relation to this, he wrote,

For the race of the Tartars has come forth from those places, as we know, since they dwelt behind

\textsuperscript{91} Burke, \textit{OM}, pp.321-2.  
\textsuperscript{92} Burke, \textit{OM}, pp.381-2.  
\textsuperscript{93} Burke, \textit{OM}, pp.321-2.
those gates to the northeast, shut up in the mountains of the Caucasus and of the Caspian.\textsuperscript{94}

Roger Bacon repeated two things often: first, that the gates were broken, and second, as William had passed through the gate with them the ‘Tartars’ lived behind the gates. In sharp contrast to William of Rubruck’s treatment of the Mongols and Alexander’s gate, Roger Bacon was emphatic in their placement within an apocalyptic framework.

At first, in Bk.IV, Roger Bacon seemed quite clear as to who Gog and Magog were:

the Scythian race of Gog stretches across the Caucasus and the Maeotic and Caspian seas as far as India; and all who have been made subject are called Magog from prince Gog, and the Jews likewise, who Orosius and other sacred writers state will come forth.\textsuperscript{95}

However, Roger Bacon’s lack of certainty that the Mongols were Gog and Magog in their entirety can be observed through his reserved tone and the acknowledgement that the Mongols were not the first group of people though to have come from the North East.

For it is true that other races have emigrated from those places and have invaded the world to the south as far as the Holy Land, just as the Tartars are now doing, as Jerome writes in his letters and the histories tell us. [..] Therefore the invasion of the Tartars is not sufficient to fix the time of the

\textsuperscript{94} Burke, OM, p.645.
\textsuperscript{95} Burke, OM, pp.381-2.
coming of the Antichrist, but other facts are required.\textsuperscript{96}

To him they were an example to show that the gate has undeniably broken and to warn people of the forthcoming dangers. Nevertheless, the Mongols were merely a danger along the way, rather than the final battle.

Most striking of Roger Bacon’s account of the gate is the independent explanation offered as to how the gate was broken. It was not due to the machinations of Gog and Magog, whosoever they may have been, for he wrote, ‘but now the gates have been broken, destroyed long ago either by an earthquake or by age.’\textsuperscript{97} This was a novel approach, for even William of Rubruck had implied Mongols collusion in the levelling of the walls of the iron-gated city, although William had also related Isidore’s suggestion that the Huns had broken through the gates before.\textsuperscript{98}

This confusion over the exact status of the Mongols as heralds or harbingers of the Apocalypse is further manifested in his use of the \textit{Itinerary} in Bk.VII. All but one of the references to William of Rubruck and information gleaned from the \textit{Itinerary} about the Mongols, and others, are made within the fourth, and final section of the extant Bk.VII. This section was primarily a comparison of the various known religions. Roger Bacon has been widely acclaimed for this comparison; he was clearly inspired by the description of the great debate of religions held before the Mongol Khan, Möngke, as described by William of Rubruck, where a debate was held between the Muslims, the Buddhists and the Christians. The third group consisted of William of Rubruck and the Nestorian Christians who lived there, who according to William of Rubruck, were by far the most successful within the debate emerging as the victors.\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{96} Burke, \textit{OM}, p.645.
\textsuperscript{97} Burke, \textit{OM}, p.382.
\textsuperscript{98} \textit{WR}, XXI.(2) pp.138-139.
\textsuperscript{99} \textit{WR}, XXXIII.(11-22) pp.231-5.
Roger Bacon categorized the world religions known to him into six key sects which were the Muslims, Mongols or Tartars, Pagans, Idolaters (a reference to the Buddhists at the Mongol court), Jews and Christians. He then suggested that ‘the principal sects do not exceed this number nor can they do so until the sect of Antichrist appears.’ Roger Bacon had here skilfully disassociated the Mongols from the Antichrist and Gog and Magog. Despite being contemptuous of the ‘Tartars’ describing them within his brief descriptions of the various sects as ‘this very foul and wicked race’, in Bk. VII he was more favourable towards them.100

He deplored their ancestor worship, their adherence to purifying their belongings by passing them through fire and that stepping on the threshold of a house could be punishable by death. Of the latter two matters he wrote, ‘both in these two matters and in certain others they are quite barbarous.’101 Nevertheless, he did mention that the Mongols agreed with Christians, Muslims and Jews about the existence of only one God. He further allowed that some Mongols, despite their beliefs followed some Christian rites and that Möngke Khan himself had acknowledged ‘that the religion of the Christians is given by God to man and is the best.’102 This final point is not found written in the Itinerary and it is supposed that William of Rubruck may have suggested this to Roger Bacon. Or perhaps this is further evidence of the rumours regarding the Mongol khans’ religious preferences that were in circulation in the 1260s.

It was only in the description of his return journey that William of Rubruck discussed Alexander’s gate in any detail.103 He had claimed that the gate was at the centre of a city called Iron Gate, and stated quite specifically of this city, that ‘the Tartars have demolished the upper parts of the towers and the buttresses, reducing the towers to the level of the wall.’104 While even William of Rubruck could not deny that the Mongols along with the other groups of people he passed along the way were beyond the notorious Alexander’s gate, nevertheless

100 Burke. OM, p.788-9.
101 Burke. OM, pp.790, 806.
102 Burke. OM, pp.788-792, 796, 803, 807.
103 ‘After them comes the Iron Gate, built by Alexander to keep the barbarian people out of Persia. I shall tell you later of its whereabouts, since I passed through it on my return’, WR, XIV.(3) p.112.
104 WR, XXXVII.(19) p.260.
he never overtly associated them with Gog/Magog, followers of the Antichrist or the lost tribes. He wrote, with regard to the purpose of the gate,

> these used to be Alexander’s barriers, which held in check the barbarian peoples – namely, the herdsmen from the wilderness – so they might be able to overrun the cultivated regions and the cities.\(^\text{105}\)

Peter Jackson and David Morgan have suggested that William of Rubruck was drawing on Godfrey of Viterbo’s *Pantheon*. Yet, Godfrey of Viterbo specifically identified this group with Gog and Magog, while William of Rubruck did not.\(^\text{106}\) In fact there is no explicit mention of Gog and Magog throughout the *Itinerary*.

Throughout his account William mentioned Alexander the Great and the infamous gate five times. Yet he never, at any given time, places this in conjunction with any discussion about the Antichrist and the Apocalypse. In contrast, Roger Bacon’s account abounds with mentions of the Mongols within an apocalyptic framework, often mentioning the gate, Gog and Magog, and the Antichrist. Roger Bacon seems to have extrapolated from William of Rubruck’s text, what William appears to have been loathe to make explicit. As a first-hand reporter of all things in the East, marvellous, monstrous and mundane, he was cautious and appears aware of the effect of his words. It is the armchair traveller, Roger Bacon, who does not suffer the same compunctions and is, instead, happy to read into the words what William of Rubruck only vaguely alludes to, in order to highlight the apocalyptic aspect of these observations. He fails to give due consideration to William of Rubruck’s silences within the text.

---

105WR, XXXVII.(20) p.261.
106Wright, *Geographical Lore*, pp.288, 471. According to Anderson, Godfrey of Viterbo has been credited with portraying Alexander shutting both the lost tribes of Israel as well as Gog and Magog, ‘apparently for the first time’, Anderson, *Alexander’s Gate*, pp.69,74-75.
Nevertheless, although Roger Bacon does manipulate the text of William of Rubruck to offer a more apocalyptic tone he still seems somewhat confused as to his own portrayal of the Mongols within the framework of Gog and Magog. Ultimately even this confusion contributed to Roger Bacon’s overall argument; his plea for a greater awareness of the East and knowledge of apocalyptic traditions. For as he argues,

I know that if the Church should be willing to consider the sacred text and prophecies, also the prophecies of Sibyl and of Merlin, Aquila, Seston, Joachim, and many others, moreover the histories and the books of philosophers… it would gain some idea of greater certainty regarding the time of Antichrist.107

William of Rubruck wove the Itinerary into the established tradition of European views of the East with references to the gates of Alexander. The reasonable explanation for the existence and demise of Prester John, and the element of doubt regarding the authority of the works of Pliny, Solinus and Isidore also challenged some of the pre-existing views. Although the Latin of the Itinerary was not complex, its more prosaic style lacked the excitement and sense of the fabulous found in the ‘Wonders of the East.’ The older view with its monsters and marvels, its opulent while yet threatening ‘East’ continued nevertheless in the more popular later works such as the Relatio of Ordoric of Pordenone and the anonymous Travels of Sir John Mandeville.

Simon de Montfort and the Mongols

Portrayed as an English hero and villain, a reformer and traitor, and even a saint, Simon de Montfort has often divided opinion. Like his father, Simon de Montfort, count of Toulouse, a man infamous for his religious zeal and cruelty in the Albigensian crusade, he too was a

107 Burke, OM, p.290.
renowned warrior. The de Montfort family had a considerable legacy in crusading: apart from his uncles in his own lifetime, his brother Amaury, his nephew John and cousins all had some involvement in the crusade.\textsuperscript{108} Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, also embarked on crusade; he took the cross in 1238 and remained in the Holy Land between 1240 and 1241. Although little is known of his time there, his presence was significant enough to inspire the ‘barons, knights and citizens’ of the kingdom of Jerusalem to write and ask Frederick II to appoint Simon as governor.\textsuperscript{109}

The fall of Jerusalem in 1244 inspired a further crusading flurry. In 1247, Simon de Montfort took the cross once again and planned to embark on crusade, presumably alongside Louis IX in 1248. Much against his will, this plan had to be curtailed. Instead, he was appointed as Henry III’s lieutenant in Gascony, where he was to remain grudgingly for seven years.\textsuperscript{110} Yet, in April 1250, a number of high ranking English magnates met at Bermondsey with the intention of planning their own independent expedition and appointed a close friend of Simon de Montfort, Walter Cantilupe, bishop of Worcester as their leader or capitaneus. Simon Lloyd suggests that Simon de Montfort was among those who met.\textsuperscript{111} Henry III had also taken the cross in March 1250, and in the interest of having as large an entourage as possible accompanying him, Henry petitioned Pope Innocent IV to issue mandates in June and November 1251 to forbid the English crusader-magnates to leave without him. Although their numbers continued to grow, the expedition was repeatedly delayed. In 1252, Henry finally decided on a departure date of 24\textsuperscript{th} June 1256.\textsuperscript{112} Although, they never departed, clearly at the time there was much speculation about a possible crusade. By 1257 the possibility of embarking on crusade alongside Henry III may have faded, yet as Simon de Montfort could not


\textsuperscript{109} Maddicott, \textit{Simon}, pp.24, 30.


\textsuperscript{111} Simon Lloyd, citing Matthew Paris’ \textit{CM} believes that the following men were amongst those who met at Bermondsey: Simon de Montfort, Humphrey de Bohun, earl of Hereford, Walter Cantilupe, Robert de Quenci and Geoffrey de Luci, Lloyd, \textit{English Society}, p.84; Although Matthew Paris does mention all these men in an earlier passage in the \textit{CM} in relation to them having taken the cross, he merely states that, ‘On the 27\textsuperscript{th} April in the year [1250], the chief men amongst the Crusaders of England met at Bermondsey, in London to make arrangements for setting out on their expedition’, Paris, \textit{CM}, vol.III, pp.327,330; cf. Matthew Paris, \textit{Historia Anglorum}, vol.III, p.72.

have foreseen the events of 1258 and after, which would necessitate his presence in England, he may still have been planning his expedition eastwards.

Not only was Simon de Montfort’s prowess in war well-attested, but so, also, was his fascination with learning and religion. John Maddicott, in his seminal biography of Simon de Montfort, paid attention to this famed piety and interest in theology and education; in particular, the benefit gained from his friendships with two eminent learned men, Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln and Adam Marsh, of the Oxford Franciscans. Eudes Rigaud, archbishop of Rouen and another noted Franciscan scholar, was also a close personal friend of Simon de Montfort’s.¹¹³

Eudes Rigaud, prior to becoming archbishop of Rouen in 1248, had been regent master of the Franciscan *studium* in Paris from 1245.¹¹⁴ Eudes was not only closely associated with Louis IX but also appears to have shared his interest and sense of duty regarding the call for crusade against the Mongol threat. From around September 1260 he had started to preach the crusade for Louis IX, and more specifically for a crusade against the Mongols. In April 1261, he called a provincial council in order to discuss,

how the most wicked Tartars had destroyed, and were, from day to day, striving to destroy the Holy Land, and how the pope and king of France willed and ordered that the Holy Land be supported by manpower and by works of mercy.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Maddicott discusses a network of relationships which links Simon de Montfort and Louis IX, with Franciscans men such as Adam Marsh and Eudes Rigaud Archbishop of Rouen. Maddicott, *Simon*, pp.77-105; In 1260 when Simon de Montfort was forced to stand trial, Eudes Rigaud was amongst those who spoke in Simon de Montfort’s defence. Eudes Rigaud even took Simon de Montfort’s son Amauri with him to Rouen, where he was made a prebendary at Rouen cathedral, A.J. Davis, *The Holy Bureaucrat: Eudes Rigaud and Religious Reform in Thirteenth-Century Normandy*, (Ithaca, 2006) p.16.


Simon’s network of associations with Henry III, Louis IX, Robert Grosseteste, Adam Marsh and Eudes Rigaud, and thereby to travellers to the Mongols or those that had read and used such accounts such as Roger Bacon and Vincent of Beauvais, opened a wealth of available information of the Mongol-east for him. Via Louis IX in particular, contemporary up-to-date information about the Mongols was easily available. Simon de Montfort, always the pragmatic military leader, would have recognised the benefits of preparation through the collection of accurate information. Having been forced to abandon his plans in 1248, could this thought have still been on his mind? Simon de Montfort’s possible interest in the Mongols ties in with Prince Edward’s efforts at negotiating with the Mongols and crusading interests. His crusading zeal has been well documented; in particular his justification of his battles against Henry III arriving on the battlefield with his men with the crusaders’ crosses on their armour.

Little is known of his book collection, except that his son Amaury de Montfort bequeathed Simon’s books in 1289 to the Dominican priory of St. Jacques in Paris. Indeed, if Simon’s Mongol text was the Itinerary, Amaury’s own connections may offer a clue as to how one of the manuscripts bore a Norman provenance. Amaury had studied in Bologna and Padua in the 1260s, returning to England in 1275. However, after an imprisonment in Bristol until April 1282, he returned to continental Europe where he can be placed in Paris in 1286. Amaury had benefited from the patronage of Eudes Rigaud and in 1260 had been given a prebendary at Rouen by Eudes, whom he accompanied back to Normandy from England in August of that year.116

Regardless of which text de vita et moribus tartarorum refers to, if it is indeed a title of the text, there can be little certainty as to the extent to which Simon de Montfort, himself, engaged with the text. Nevertheless, this vignette in John of Wallingford’s chronicle is unsurprising, as are Simon de Montfort’s possible reasons for instigating this commission, or why those within his network of friends may have thought to have this done for him.

116 Maddicott, Simon, pp. 95, 198, 370; cf. F.M. Powicke, ‘Presidential Address : Guy de Montfort (1265-1271)’, TRHS s.IV no.18 (1935) pp.3-4 [1-23].
CONCLUSIONS:

William of Rubruck’s Itinerary has been praised by modern scholars for its scope, content and approach. If the relatively small number of surviving manuscripts was due to the work’s lack of contemporary following, I propose four possible reasons: the lack of self-promotion, a general conservative attitude towards such information, or that within a couple of decades the Itinerary was overshadowed by the more wonder-filled competition, and finally the changing role of the Mongols from known enemy to potential ally.

The mid-thirteenth-century literary dissemination of information regarding the Mongols was swift and wide-reaching. All the extant accounts of the journeys of the initial papal envoys found their way into popular encyclopaedic works of the time, within a space of two decades. For example, Vincent of Beauvais had included the texts of John de Plano Carpini and Simon de St. Quentin within three to seven years of their return. Matthew Paris had Andrew of Longjumeau’s account very quickly indeed, as did Roger Bacon, in getting hold of John de Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck. Unlike the anecdotal evidence in Ch.1 of Gerald of Wales’ activities related to the self-promotion of his texts, there is little evidence in this regard to William of Rubruck.

The conservatism medieval authors displayed with regards to new texts may also have played a part. For example, Bartholomew the Englishman whose DPR was completed c.1250 makes no mention of the Mongols. Although this would have been too early for the Itinerary, as a Franciscan in Paris presumably he may have heard of John of Plano Carpini and his HM. Similarly, Ranulf Higden, despite listing Vincent of Beauvais’ Speculum historiale as one of his authorities, either lacked interest or was ignorant of the section on the Mongols by John de Plano Carpini and Simon de St. Quentin, and did not include this in his geographical exploration of the known world, relying instead on Isidore and Solinus.\(^{117}\)

\(^{117}\) Poly, Bk.I cap.II p.24; Alternatively the version available to Higden may have been the first edition of the Speculum Historiale, before he added the material relating to the Mongols.
Furthermore, the content of the *Itinerary* while erudite may not have been particularly appealing. Pierre Chanau comparing the *HM* and the *Itinerary* calls the *Itinerary* ‘a similarly disturbing account’ in its ‘realistic’ approach and suggests that the success of Marco Polo’s later account was because it ‘presented an outdated picture of the Far East which comforted the worried Europe of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries’.\(^{118}\) Despite the occasional incredulous observation the representation of the Mongols as a well-organised and fearsome society perhaps made the threat of them more believable.

Finally the changing approach to the Mongols may have affected the readership of the *Itinerary*. That decade, up to and including 1260, saw the perseverance of the Mongol threat as can also be seen in the letters and thoughts of men like Adam Marsh and Eudes Rigaud, all of whom like Simon de Montfort could have had access to the text. Yet, from the mid-1260s onwards this threat was on the wane. An interest in the Mongols remained, but primarily in the role of potential ally.

Was the *Itinerary* being used in a pragmatic fashion as a reconnaissance text in the late-thirteenth century as seen in *C*\(^{*}\) or *F*\(^{*}\)? Would these men have considered the advice of Het’um in his *La Fleur des histoires de la terre d’Orient* written c.1307, especially his third point? He advised that,

> Reason requireth that whosoeuer wyll moue warre agaynst his ennemys ought to considre iii things: first, he ought to haue iust and reasonable cause or good tytell to moue the waree; the seconde thyng, that he ought to se his power, if he be sufficien for all the cost and furnyssh other thynges belonging to the warre to begynne, maynteyn, and finysshe; the thyrde is that he ought wisely enquer of the condicyon and maner of his

---

\(^{118}\) P. Chaunu, *European Expansion in the later Middle Ages* (Amsterdam, 1979) pp.75,77.
ennemis: the fourth is that he ought to begyn
warre in a conyenent season and tyme.\(^{119}\)

From the five manuscripts, the textual reception and the attestations (if accepted as referring to the *Itinerary*), three strands of transmission can be gleaned. First, the immediate interest can be seen through the powerful political figures of the day and the use of the *Itinerary* by Roger Bacon. Second, it is tempting to see the late-thirteenth century copies as representative of the interest in Mongol alliances that was still apparent. Lastly, in the fourteenth century it continued to be read in south-east England, for example, by Simon Bozoun in Norwich, Bury St Edmunds and Peterborough. These fourteenth-century English manuscripts suggest an academic interest of the wider world, which will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter on associated texts and reading interests.\(^{120}\)

\(^{119}\) Het’um, *A Lytell Cronycle*, p.65.

\(^{120}\) The contents of \(Y^*\) where the *Itinerary* is juxtaposed with allegorical journeys and treatises on the correct manner of living could also suggest a further strand of interest, see p.265.
Fig.III 1 scribe copying a text from the TH BL, Royal 13 B VIII, f.22.
III. ASSOCIATED CONTENTS

An analysis of the associated contents within the manuscripts of an individual text has the potential to enhance considerably our understanding of the text within its intellectual/literary milieu. Yet, a caveat regarding the limitations of such an exercise must be made. Contemporary and later re-orderings of the manuscripts and the difficulties which accompany attempts to categorise medieval texts into currently understood genres can, if not fully considered, offer a false picture of the coherence of the selections in any given codex. Nevertheless, the careful organisation and choice of contents in some manuscripts is evident and should be given greater consideration. Certainly, even when not minutely organised, the costs and efforts of copying material suggest that the possible coherence of the manuscript collection should always be investigated.

ASSOCIATED CONTENTS/TEXTS OF THE Topographia Hibernica (TH) :

The texts or items found in manuscripts alongside the Topographia Hibernica (TH) are numerous and vary in size, subject matter and scope. They range from lengthy texts, such as ‘Matthew of Westminster’s’ Flores Historiarum or Solinus’ De Collectanea rerum memorabilium, often the main feature of the manuscript, to short notes explaining weights and measures and Old English legal terms. There are also chronological variances within the subject matter, with texts such as Ranulf Higden’s universal chronicle, the Polychronicon, which charted the past from the beginning of mankind, to texts which were near-contemporary, such as the mid-to-late fifteenth-century manuscript which contained copies of papal bulls issued by Pope Eugenue IV (1431-1447).

Within her doctoral research on the manuscripts of the texts of Gerald of Wales, Catherine Rooney offered a listing of the associated contents of the manuscripts she had examined. However, Rooney considered the additional contents of all manuscripts containing

---

1 For a discussion of the methodology used for the analysis of the associated contents, the issue of typology in relation to medieval texts and the inherent limitations that must be considered for a study of this kind, see pp.8-28.
the works of Gerald collectively, irrespective of which Giraldian-text, or texts, was included in the codex.\textsuperscript{2} The differences in the scope and content of Gerald’s works necessitate an examination which takes into consideration each text’s individuality. Indeed, the seemingly custom-made collections apparent in some of these manuscripts require an approach which considers each \textit{manuscript} individually.\textsuperscript{3}

Of the manuscripts of the \textit{TH}, the following four are single-text codices: \textit{M}, \textit{W}, \textit{BN48}, and \textit{BN11}. Three other manuscripts, \textit{A44}, \textit{Bb} and \textit{C} were originally conceived as single-text manuscripts but have since gained additional items. Five further manuscripts contain multiple texts, but material written only by Gerald of Wales. Those containing only the \textit{TH} and \textit{EH} are: \textit{I}, \textit{Ab} and \textit{La}. A further two manuscripts contain the \textit{TH}, \textit{EH} and the \textit{IK} together, these are: \textit{A34} and \textit{B}. In addition, it is likely that the copies of the \textit{TH} and \textit{EH} in \textit{Do} once formed a single manuscript and were only subsequently added, perhaps within a century of being transcribed, to their present associated contents.

Several manuscripts of the \textit{TH} fell victim to changes wrought to their organisation and/or content; some during the Middle Ages and some later. There are manuscripts whose additional contents are now lost, or those which were bound together later for convenience or preference. For example, \textit{A44} now holds, alongside the \textit{TH}, Palladius’ \textit{De Agricultura} and Epitome of Vitruvius’ \textit{De Architectura}. Although this section of the manuscript is also written in a script of the late-twelfth century, the two titles found on f.1r suggest that the \textit{TH} was originally a single-text manuscript. The earlier thirteenth-century title is merely, ‘Palladius de agricultura’; thus the later fifteenth-century title of ‘Palladius de agricultura et tropographia <sic> vel historia hibernie’ offers a time-frame for when the codices may have been combined. Similarly, the early-thirteenth-century manuscript \textit{Bb} now consists of the \textit{TH} and a late-fourteenth-century addition scribbled at the end titled a ‘rediculosa petitio’ dated from 1375. However, the inscription on f.1v, ‘Giraldus cambrensis de mirabilibus hibernie et pomponius mela de cosmographia et ymagine mundi hoc continetur preciis xxii s.’ refers to a codex which

\textsuperscript{2} Rooney, \textit{Manuscripts}, pp. 9-20.  
\textsuperscript{3} The following three manuscripts, \textit{Le} (Les Dunes), \textit{A17} (Avignon?), \textit{A19} (Avignon?) are known to be of continental origin. As their provenances are outwith the parameters of this thesis, they have not been considered individually with regards to their collections. As the additional contents of \textit{BN11}, if any, are presently unknown to me, this manuscript too has not been considered here.
at some point had additional items. The combined value of 22s suggests a manuscript of substantial proportions in its dimensions, ornamentation or number of folios. The manuscript presently consists of 42 folios and is of medium proportions (21.8 cm x 16 cm). The value of 22s suggests that the codex must once have been so large as to contain complete texts of Pomponius Mela’s *Cosmographia* and Honorius Augustodunensis’ *Imago Mundi* rather than mere excerpts of the two texts.\(^4\) As to when these items were combined and parted we are unlikely ever to know.

\(\textit{Do}\) is another similar medieval example. Although currently found within a medieval binding, this may not have been its original. As discussed in ch.I, early copies of the *TH* and *EH* appear to have travelled easily as portable booklets. The other items within this codex form two further discrete booklets, each written in a different hand and with a different aspect; it is likely that these contents were only later joined together, perhaps contemporaneously with the fourteenth-century inscription of Merton Priory.\(^5\)

Of the additional material found with C, Gerald of Wales’ *DK* is in fact a sixteenth-century transcript appended to the *TH* by Matthew Parker or someone within his circle. Although the third item within this codex is contemporaneous in script with the *TH*, the different pagination by Parker, or one of his secretaries, in that distinctive red crayon suggests that it may not have been combined until the sixteenth century.\(^6\) This was not Parker’s first such attempt at adding sixteenth-century transcripts of a medieval text to a medieval manuscript. In an attempt to complete the quartet of Gerald’s works, this honour was also accorded to *F* through the addition of a copy of the *DK*.

The ease with which the text of the *TH* in early manuscripts such as *C, A44* and *Do* could be bound with other items is certainly significant. If their existence was due to Gerald’s intention to circulate them, disseminating them loosely bound would have been both convenient and cheap.

\(^4\) For comparable values of contemporaneous manuscripts in relation to their sizes see Simon Bozoun’s booklist, pp.269, 272.

\(^5\) See Appendix I.

\(^6\) The final four leaves now found in this manuscript also form a separate booklet. They are written in a late-thirteenth century hand and are a copy of the verses which are inscribed in the windows of Canterbury Cathedral.
Of the thirteenth-century manuscripts, the *TH* in the now lost Phillipps 26642 was previously bound with a copy of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB*, Phillipps 26233 (now Aberystwyth, NLW 13210) and William of Malmesbury’s *GRA*, Phillipps 26641 (previously Edinburgh, NL Acc. 9193/13 and now Princeton, Scheide Library 159). Julia Crick has suggested the three separate manuscripts were combined by Archbishop Matthew Parker. However, Andrew Watson has suggested that all three portions were once part of the same volume, which originated from the Cistercian abbey of Robertsbridge.\(^7\) *Ba* also endured changes of this manner. The *TH* and Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB* form a composite manuscript. To them are presently added two fourteenth-century items: a combined selection of excerpts from Roger of Howden’s *Chronicon* and the *GRA*, a copy of the Quitclaim of Canterbury and a fifteenth-century poem. However, here too, there is no evidence pertaining to when these items were combined.

*BN41* is the final example of a manuscript with a complicated medieval past. Of the forty-one items currently bound together, scriptural unity within five of those texts (including the *TH*), of a hand which may date from the early fourteenth century suggests that those five items may have once formed a composite manuscript. Thus, it appears that Robert Popoulton, the manuscript’s owner, added the additional material to an existing set in the late fourteenth century.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) Crick, vol. III, p.7; *MLGB: Suppl.*, p.58 – the association of the the *GRA* portion is derived from similarities of the script. Presumably, the similarities of the *HRB* and the *GRA* section has led him to assume that the *TH* portion also had the same origins; William of Malmesbury, *GRA*, p.xvi.

\(^8\) See pp.250-251.
Listed in the table below are all texts found with two or more manuscripts of the TH. Manuscripts in which the presence of a text is unproven for the Middle Ages, have been prefixed by a question mark [?] to denote uncertainty. The significance of its association will be considered in the individual analysis of the manuscript. The manner in which \textit{R14}, \textit{Fb} and \textit{Ce} were copied, resulting in the common contents found in the three manuscripts, has required that all three manuscripts together will be considered as a single witness to the existence of a text in the list below. The list is organised first by the frequency of the appearance of the text. The manuscripts for each text are arranged chronologically in the following order: 1.) complete texts 2.) complete texts whose association is uncertain 3.) abbreviations and excerpts 4.) abbreviations and excerpts whose association is uncertain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Julius Valerius</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey of Monmouth</td>
<td>\textit{Historia Regum Britanniae}</td>
<td>Ba [xiii.], BN41 [xiv.], Rd [xiv/xv. – after 1385], ?H [xiii – after 1279], ?Phillips 26642 - untraced [xiii. – c. 1290], F/D* (\textit{Prophetia Merlini} only) [xiv.], P (\textit{Prophetia Merlini} only) [xv.].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranulf Higden</td>
<td>\textit{Polychronicon}</td>
<td>Rd [xiv/xv. – after 1385], P [xv.- before 1418], MJ [xv. - c.1431], BN41 (fragment on England from Bk.I) [xiv.].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede</td>
<td>\textit{Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum}</td>
<td>Rb2 (xiv.), E (xv. – c. 1482), F/D* (excerpts) (xiv.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{Historia Turpini}</td>
<td>A17 (Provençal translation) [xiv.], A19 [xiv.], Rd [xiv/xv. – after 1385].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig.III 2 Texts occurring twice or more with the TH (excluding other works by Gerald of Wales)
The Manuscript Collections

The single-author codex: the TH with other texts by Gerald

c.1200

1. A34 (TH, EH, IK)
2. B (TH, EH, IK)
3. Do (TH, EH)
4. I (TH, EH)
Later manuscripts

5. Ab \((TH, EH)\) [xiv.]
6. La \((TH, EH)\) [xv.]

Not only are the first four manuscripts listed above dated from within Gerald’s lifetime but they are also manuscripts which may have been produced from within Gerald’s own circle. The first three of these manuscripts contain the earliest version of the \(EH\). I represents what Brian Scott terms the ‘intermediate’ version of the \(EH\), where the body of the text was of the first recension with aspects of the later \(\beta\) version shown through the additions in two different hands made to the \(EH\).\(^9\) The fourteenth- and fifteenth-century single authored-manuscripts, now in Aberystwyth and Lambeth Palace respectively, are of this latter family of manuscripts which share rec.\(D\) of the \(TH\) and the ‘intermediate’ version of the \(EH\).

Gerald’s own letters attest to the circulation of the two texts on Ireland together. His ambitions, his desire for recognition may be reflected in what may have been Gerald’s own attempts to compile a compendium which included the \(IK\). However, that none of these single-author manuscripts contain the fourth of Gerald’s \(Oeuvres de Jeunesse\), the \(DK\), is surprising. In fact, none of the surviving manuscripts of the \(TH\) contain a medieval copy of the \(DK\). Can this possibly intentional omission offer further insights to the transmission of the \(TH\)?

It may be likely that this omission reflected a desire to avoid promoting the \(DK\) to the extent to which the \(TH\) had been. Yet, despite the potentially controversial nature of the \(DK\), where Gerald presented both favourable and unfavourable aspects of the Welsh, it appears out of character for Gerald to have been reluctant to circulate a text to which he had devoted time and effort. Notwithstanding the possibility that all medieval manuscripts carrying the \(TH\) and \(DK\) together have since been destroyed, this remains peculiar. The \(DK\) was a prized text in the sixteenth century with an extensive interest which saw the making of a number of copies. A surviving letter of Richard Davies, bishop of St. David’s in reply to a request from Matthew

\(^9\) Scott, \(EH\), pp.xxxvii, xl-lviii.
Parker, show the considerable efforts made to redeem a copy suggesting, therefore, its better chance of survival than many other texts in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{10}

There are five extant medieval manuscripts of the complete text of the \textit{DK} and one containing extracts of the \textit{DK} and \textit{IK}. The two earliest manuscripts, BL, Cotton Domitian A I and Aberystwyth, NLW, 3024 from the mid-thirteenth and late-thirteenth/early fourteenth century respectively, are both of a second recension which bear a dedication to Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury. Three other manuscripts BL, Cotton Vitellus C X, BL, Cotton Nero D VIII and BL, Royal 13 C III date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and are all of the first recension which are dedicated to Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury. Could this potentially limited contemporary circulation of the manuscripts of the \textit{DK} have been a sacrifice made by Gerald to the politics of the day? Dimmock and Thorpe suggested that the \textit{DK} was completed in the spring of 1194 on the basis of the regnal list in Bk.I ch.3. Remarkably, despite Dafydd ab Owain’s expulsion as prince of North Wales by Llywelyn ap Gryffyud in 1194, Dafydd remained listed as prince. Hitherto, this was seen as conclusive that it was written before the expulsion.

1194 was also the year Gerald faced great personal difficulties and risked a swiftly tarnishing reputation. His subsequent fall from grace may have been due to his possible support of Prince John’s 1194 unsuccessful rebellion. However, in addition, he was being vilified to Hubert Walter over the matter of William Wibert, abbot of Biddlesden. Following Gerald’s duties as an envoy to Wales accompanied by William Wibert in 1192-3, William Wibert had begun a whispering campaign accusing Gerald, or so Gerald said, of traitorous leanings because of his kinship with the Welsh princes.\textsuperscript{11} Yet, this may have affected more than just Gerald’s relationship with Hubert Walter. Making the best of Gerald’s vulnerable position was another of Gerald’s enemies: Peter de Leia, the bishop of St. David’s. Peter exacerbated the situation by making Prince Rhys suspicious of Gerald’s loyalties. The subsequent result was that Gerald’s prebend of Mathry in Pembrokeshire did not enjoy the benefit of the existing


\textsuperscript{11} Butler, \textit{Autobiography}, p.139.
truce and was instead ravaged.\textsuperscript{12} Indeed, in this light, the \textit{DK} could be interpreted as Gerald’s response to this situation: an attempt to regain favour by showing Hubert Walter that his approach towards the Welsh was not overtly biased towards the Welsh. Certainly, Gerald’s suggestion of evicting the inhabitants and turning it into a large forest, towards the end of Bk.II ch.9 would tip him as being pro-English. Notably, this section is not in the later recension of the \textit{DK} and is one of the rare occurrences where Gerald removes text and replaces it rather than merely augmenting the existing prose.

However, to understand better the reasons for the lack of surviving manuscripts containing the \textit{TH} and the \textit{DK}, it is to the transmission of the \textit{IK} to which we must turn, particularly in relation to the manuscripts above. Dimmock identified three recensions of the \textit{IK}. The medieval witness to this first recension was found in the first two manuscripts listed above: \textit{B} and \textit{R}. Textually, this version has been dated to c.1191. The Bodleian manuscript includes, towards the end, a half-composed dedication to William de Longchamp, bishop of Ely. The incomplete dedication in \textit{B} may be explained by William’s forced expulsion from the kingdom in October of 1191. The \textit{TH} in \textit{R}, which was copied from \textit{B}, judiciously omits even this partial dedication. Dimmock also drew attention to the dedication of a copy of the \textit{IK} to Hubert Walter, as mentioned by Gerald in the first recension of the \textit{DK} (also dedicated to Hubert Walter).

Dimmock identified a second version of the \textit{IK} with a dedication to Hugh, bishop of Lincoln. For this, both he and Lewis Thorpe used a sixteenth-century manuscript of this recension. However, \textit{A34} the last of the surviving manuscripts containing the three texts, can also be identified as being of this version. Dimmock suggested that this recension was dedicated c.1197, primarily because he dated Gerald’s time at Lincoln to be between 1196 and 1199 stating: ‘he would not be long, we may suppose, in thus expressing his devotion to Hugh of Lincoln, when brought into something like contact with him’.\textsuperscript{13} Thorpe added to this, ‘as we have seen, Gerald was in Lincoln from 1196 to 1198. He would no doubt have offered a copy of his book to Saint Hugh fairly soon but not immediately after his arrival.’\textsuperscript{14} However, this

\textsuperscript{12} Bartlett, Gerald, pp.24, 59.
\textsuperscript{13} GW, vol. VI, p.xxxvii.
presupposes that Gerald needed to be in the presence of Hugh of Lincoln to gift his works, or that, if he felt such a need to hand it over in person, he would be hesitant to offer his books immediately. Gerald’s correspondence, as discussed in ch.I, implies that he was happy to send items such as this by messenger. Furthermore, his personality suggests that displays of diffidence or humility were unlikely.

Textually, this second version of the *IK* is dated to in or after 1194 because of the inclusion of two anecdotes. One regarding the capture of Prince Rhys by his sons, and the other, that Llywelyn defeated Dafydd and was driven out of Gwynedd; a reference likely to have been to 1194. However, it must be stressed that this anecdote was framed within Gerald’s wider argument about legitimacy in birth and the right to rule and gives few details. With little basis for Dimmock’s dating of the second version to c.1197, the second edition should be more correctly dated to *circa* or *after* 1194.

As stated above, the *DK* is dated to early 1194 to pre-date the defeat of Dafydd, as an explanation for the continued presence of Daffyd over Llywelyn in the regnal list Gerald provided. [*DK I.3*] However, this fails to take into consideration English support of Dafydd at this time. It has been suggested that in 1197 when war had broken out again between Llywelyn and Dafydd that it may have been at the instigation, or with the assistance, of Hubert Walter. Therefore, Gerald who was dedicating this first edition of the *DK* to Hubert Walter, would have been highly unlikely to inflame him by replacing Llywelyn in the regnal list, particularly at a time when that outcome may not have seemed certain. By the subsequent recension of the *DK* in 1215, with the benefit of hindsight and to reflect the current ruler, Llywelyn would of course have to replace Dafydd. Therefore, it is more likely that the *DK* can be dated more generally to *circa* or *after* 1194 rather than specifically to before the early part of that year. Furthermore, as Gerald mentions that a version of the *IK* was sent to Hubert Walter before the *DK*, for all we know this may have been the same version as the one sent to Hugh of Lincoln with merely the dedicatory names exchanged.

---

15 *IK*, II.8, p.134.
This has a further significance in relation to the TH and its lack of circulation with the DK. Firstly, that A34 has the second version of the IK suggests that it was created in or after 1194. As B does not have this later version, it suggests that either it, or its exemplar, which may have first grouped the three texts together, was created between 1191-c.1194.

What I would tentatively suggest is that when Gerald loses favour in 1194, and when perhaps the balanced approach of the DK does little to relieve this matter, it may have been a prudent decision on Gerald’s part not to include the DK in subsequent attempts to circulate the TH. Perhaps by the associations the subject matter would evoke, Gerald then also stopped including the IK. Consequently this may help explain why I, the only contemporary example of the finalised version of the TH, has only the EH to accompany it.

This could also have further significance in relation to the version of the TH which is found in the other rec.C manuscripts such as A and A33. These manuscripts contain the letter of William de Vere. William’s death has meant that this letter, and thus this recension, has been dated to before 1198. However, as the TH in these manuscripts seem to be an earlier form of rec.C than is found in B, it is possible that this version with the letter, though not necessarily any of the manuscripts now associated with it, can be dated more precisely to in or before c.1194.

The Thirteenth-Century Collections

1. A [xii/xiii – c.1200]
2. B [xii/xiii – c.1200]
3. R [xii/xiii – c. 1200]
4. A33 [xii/ xiii]
5. Do [xii/xiii]
6. Sc [xiii.]
7. Ba [xiii.]
8. Hb [xiii/xiv – after 1279]
9. Untraced Phillips. [xiii. – c. 1290]

**BL, Arundel 14 [A]**

A like R shares the discription of being one of two manuscripts which may have originated from Gerald that included within its contents items not written by Gerald from its outset. Alongside the TH is the excerpt from Walter Map’s *De nugis curialium* which circulated independently as *Epistola Valerii ad Rufinum ne ducat uxorem*, Hugh of Nonant’s *Invectica in Gulielmum Longchamp Eliensam*’ (also found in the manuscripts of excerpt 1) and Anselm of Worcester’s *Narratio de fratre laico istius monasterii*. Accompanying this collection by these four late-twelfth century contemporaries were a selection of poems on sleep, the Virgin Mary’s family, serpents and woman. All except for the verses on women can be identified. The first was drawn from Claudian’s preface to the *Panegyric on the sixth consulate of Honorius*. The verse on the Virgin Mary’ family, while not identified as such reappear in two other medieval manuscripts. The verses on the serpents are from Godfrey of Winchester’s *Eppigramata historica*, CXIX. Also attached was a brief English topography which is similar to a description in John of Oxnead’s history of Hulme St. Benet. The final item is drawn from Virgil’s *Georgica* [Bk.I lines 427-435].

**Bodl. Rawl. B.188 [B]**

*B*, which like *A34* consists of the *TH, EH* and *IK*, was initially a purely Gerald-authored collection. The first item, the *TH* has been written in a cluster of five quires, as an individual booklet. The next two items, written in the same hand as the *TH* follow on from each other without a break. However, to the end of these three texts is a circular map of England with a brief description of England’s location around the map which is drawn from the descriptions of Bede and Isidore of Seville.¹⁷ This map is found on the second folio of a bifolium now at the end of the manuscript, and the commentary is written in a thirteenth-century hand. The

¹⁷ *B*, f.94v.
appearance of these folios suggests that they may once have been the flyleaves of this manuscript and would have served as the opening image before the TH.

**BL, Royal 13 B VIII [R]**

The late-fourteenth-century catalogue of St. Augustine’s Canterbury’s entry for R offers an inkling as to its contents at that time:

Gerardus de descripcione hybernie et in eodem libro
Itinerarium Gerardi
purgatorium patricii
Excerpiones de Cronicis Eusebii et
anticlaudianus alani cum A 2o fo. in prohemio parte nortri.\(^\text{18}\)

To call him ‘Gerardus’ and to list the TH and EH together as one text suggests, perhaps, the catalogue-compiler’s unfamiliarity with Gerald’s works. Like A, this manuscript has the distinction of being one of only two manuscripts which may have originated from within Gerald’s sphere of influence which contains a non-Gerald text from its conception. The first five items are written continuously over twelve quires of varying lengths in the same hand. The mise-en-page of the final item, Alan of Lille’s *Anticlaudianus*, with 39 lines per page final item (as opposed to the rest of the manuscript which has 36 lines per page) and the different thirteenth-century script in which it is written suggests that it may not have been conceived together originally. Certainly when all the preceding contents were faithfully copied into F in the early fourteenth-century, *Anticlaudianus* was not at that time present, reinforcing the view that it was combined later, albeit before the late-fourteenth century catalogue entry. Excluding the additional material found in the margins of the TH and EH in R, which as discussed in ch.I make both texts of a later recension, the main body of text is identical to that found in B as is the text of the IK.

The inclusion of the Cistercian monk ‘H’, perhaps Henry, of Saltrey’s twelfth-century text *Tractatus de Purgatorio sancti Patricii* complemented the subject matter of TH. The story

---

detailed the travels of a knight called Owain to an island in Lough Derg in Donegal. The story was given credibility by the claim that the author had heard the story from Gilbert, the Abbot of Basingwerk, who had been asked to establish a monastery at Baltinglass at the request of Diarmait Mac Murchadha. Gilbert had been accompanied by the hero of the tale, a certain knight called Owain, to act as translator.\textsuperscript{19} Within Gerald’s description of Ireland’s marvellous locations, Gerald mentioned the very same place, albeit without offering a specific name. The inclusion of the \textit{Tractatus de Purgatorio sancti Patricii} can be read as a recognition of Gerald’s description and an attempt at providing more information. Indeed, in Higden’s retelling of this section of Gerald of Wales’ \textit{TH}, he borrows from the \textit{Tractatus de Purgatorio sancti Patricii} for further clarification.

The excerpts from the so-called ‘cronicis eusebii’ appear to be a selection of excerpts from a later continuation of the Eusebius-Jerome \textit{Chronicon}. Eusebius’ universal chronicle remained a cornerstone of the religious historical narrative of Christian Europe through its attempt at chronological reconciliation and the material it provided.\textsuperscript{20} The reasons for its inclusion are not easily identifiable; except that perhaps as the text on St. Patrick’s Purgatory had not been in \textit{B}, the exemplar for the first three texts, this selection from the Eusebius-Jerome \textit{Chronicon} had accompanied the \textit{Tractatus de Purgatorio sancti Patricii} in its exemplar.

The \textit{Anticlaudianus sive De officiis de viri boni et perfecti} was a moralizing verse treatise by Alain of Lille on the good man. In it, Nature, wanting to create the ideal man sends Wisdom, Prudence, Reason and Faith on a journey through the celestial heavens to God to obtain a soul for this perfect man. This Perfect Man is then forced to endure the unleashing of the Vices or the ‘lords of Tartarus’, but the Perfect Man triumphs and becomes the ruler of earth.\textsuperscript{21} To an extent, it mirrored the earthly journey to, and through, purgatory and the successful outcome to be hoped for at St. Patrick’s purgatory. Thus a common theme which

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20} They are certainly not from Eusebius’ chronicle, for amongst the people mentioned are Charlemagne and Louis the German, \textit{B} ff.124v.
\item \textsuperscript{21} \textit{Anticlaudianus}, trans. J. J. Sheridan (Toronto, 1973) pp.25-27.
\end{itemize}
can be drawn from these texts is the idea of the journey of salvation and the necessity of understanding the peripheries of the known world as the location of such salvation.

**BL, Additional 33991 [A33]**

The TH is the only near-complete text in this codex. It lacks the first few folios and begins at Bk.I. ch.20. The additional items are a fragment of the *Disciplina Clericalis* and extensive excerpts from Bks.I and II of the *De Sacramentis* of Hugh of St. Victor. All three items were written in different thirteenth-century hands. The *Disciplina Clericalis*, shared with the TH that characteristic of ‘exotic’ stories; it was the embodiment of a text which complemented the fantastical ‘marvels of the West’.\(^{22}\) It was an amalgamation of various allegorical stories situated in the East by Petrus Alfonsus, the converted Jew and personal physician to Henry I c.1100. For his collection of parables and proverbs he drew widely, including popular stories which circulated independently like ‘Barlaam and Josepah’ to the Alexander-stories. Moreover, he offered more incidental types of information about the East, about the annual Muslim pilgrimage to Mecca in one story.\(^{23}\) Nevertheless, the text ends half-way through the second column and only one folio of the *Disciplina Clericalis* with the introit and opening words survive. It is unlikely that the entire text was ever present here.

Attached to these three medieval texts are three paper folios added by the book’s seventeenth-century owner, Sir James Ware, regarding inscriptions in Irish churches. It is not improbable that the first three items were only joined together in Sir James Ware’s time, when these items were bound together with other items of Irish interest, now separated and stored as BL, Additional 33992, 33993 and 33994.

**Douai, BM 887 (872) [Do]**

This manuscript is still encased within a medieval binding. However, the binding is likely to be of the thirteenth century or even of the fourteenth century, rather than contemporaneous with the writing of the *TH* and *EH*. The codicology of the first three items in the manuscripts, a selection of excerpts regarding church councils, a sermon by Alan of Tewkesbury on Apostles 22:14-15 and a selection of letters also by Alan of Tewkesbury suggests that they may not have been part of the original manuscript of the *TH* and the *EH*. The *EH* is incomplete; incomplete by circumstance and accident rather than production. As it is the last item now bound in the manuscript, it gives little indication of what may have once been part of this manuscript prior to its current medieval binding. The *TH*, the letter of Hugh and the *EH* are all written in different hands. In the codex’s later medieval state, it appears to have been a combination of texts made for the convenience of preservation.

**Cambridge, St. Catherine’s College L.v.87 [Sc]**

It is unclear to what extent *Sc* is currently as it was in the thirteenth century. Occasionally when a text begins at a new quire it can offer some inkling as to which texts were conceived of together as booklets. Of course, this could merely reflect the method by which the copying and compilation of this manuscript was achieved by multiple scribes. Items 1-3, all items relating to the legendary Alexander, were written without a break on the first four quires with the last five pages of the fourth quire left blank (ff.45v-47).24

Item 4, the anonymous *Perigrinatio Antiochie* otherwise known as the *Gesta Francorum* written over four quires also forms an individual booklet; like the booklet above the final five folios at the end of the fourth quire were also left blank (ff.91-95). The third booklet contains excerpts from Henry of Huntingdon’s *Historia Gentis Anglorum* (*HGA*) which are followed by the *TH* without rubrics, or even line space, and ends neatly at the end of the next six quires. The subsequent two quires have Urso’s *Liber de Physiognomia* also known

---

as *Physiognomia trium auctorum* (the final three folios ff.187-189 are blank) and the last item within the codex, Gregory’s *De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae*, the topographical description of Rome and its sights is found on the final two quires.\(^{25}\) The manuscript has retained its medieval wooden boards, presumably part of its original binding, on which there are marks where once there would have been clasps.

Here the *TH* appears to have been initially envisaged as a counterpart to the opening chapters of the *HGA* which was a description of England. This may have been purely a matter of scribal convenience, for the content of the manuscript as a whole appear to have a certain level of coherence in its organisation.

By opening with material regarding Alexander, the compiler starts his reader at the farthest east, with the exploits of Alexander, the vivid description of the marvels and wonders of India and the fictitious discussion between Alexander and an Indian Brahmin philosopher. The life and legend of Alexander was widely popular with numerous versions of his life-story extant. The figure of Alexander was one which Gerald invoked in an attempt to cast Henry II in his mould, while also employing the idea of the ‘east’ as a counterbalance to Ireland and his ‘marvels of the west.’ Alexander was a key heroic figure of the Middle Ages, yet he had an uneasy early medieval relationship within a Christian framework. By the later centuries he was more easily accepted on account of depictions of his valour and virtues, despite not being Christian.

The reader is then moved westwards to the Holy Land and the crusades by way of the anonymous *Gesta Francorum*. The move west continues to England with the above-mentioned description from the *HGA*, and then to the western periphery of the known world: Ireland.

The next item forms another booklet of its own. Urso’s *Liber de physiognomia*, an amalgamation of three different treatises reputedly by Aristotle, Loxus and Palaemon on physiognomy was in fact a fourth-century compilation called *Anonymus Latinus*, the earliest manuscript of which in Europe is dated to the early twelfth century. The focus of at least

Palemon’s portion is the use of physiognomy to identify one’s friends from one’s enemies.\textsuperscript{26} The final text returns the reader to the centre of Christendom, to Rome with Gregory’s *De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae*.

**Bodleian Laud. 720 [Ba]**

Although in its present state *Ba* consists of five items, its initial form appears to have consisted of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB* and an illuminated copy of Gerald of Wales’ *TH* with Gerald’s letter to William de Vere preceding it.

Geoffrey of Monmouth’s literary ventures allowed him to embroider legend and myth into the framework of historical consciousness, whilst yet attributing his information to a supposedly reliable and ‘ancient’ source. It captured the imagination of its readers, spawning numerous imitators. The *HRB* remodelled the past through the origin myths it provided and also professed to prophecy the future. Written in the mid-twelfth century at a time of turmoil, the ambiguous wordings of the prophecies were certainly eagerly appreciated.\textsuperscript{27} This pro-Welsh text could also be manipulated to be offered as a propagandist glorification of the kings of England. The role of the English king could embody that of the mythic figure Locrinus in his superiority over his younger brothers, the kings of Scotland and Wales, a myth which would prove especially important in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Hence, to an extent, the *HRB* mirrored the manner in which the *TH* could be used to justify English rule as well as the approach to origin myths of the British Isles.


An additional two-quire portion contains excerpts regarding Scotland and a copy of the ‘Quitclaim of Canterbury’, between Richard I and the William the Lion, written in an early fourteenth-century hand with the later addition in a fifteenth-century hand of a poem titled ‘Miles amat lepores’.  

**BL, Harley 4003 [Hb]**

The earliest portion of *Hb* consisted of the abbreviated *TH* and the *EH* with a set of annals which began in 1167 with Dairmot, king of Leinster’s arrival in England. The final entry in the original hand of the annals is from 1279. However, the entries continue in pencil and in other hands up to 1384. Therefore, the only thing that can be said with any certainty is that this initial combination of the *TH, EH*, and Annals was written after 1279. Indeed it is these accompanying texts which may explain the reasons for the truncated Bk.I of the *TH*. Their inclusion suggests a greater interest in Ireland, the Irish and its past for which the theological symbolism of the various birds and animals described in Bk.I would have been of little interest.

The manuscript also contains a late-thirteenth-century copy of the *HRB*, but this may have been combined much later. Other items continued to be added to this codex, including a paper addition with a diagrammatic description of the kingdoms of the ‘Heptarchy’ added on the flyleaves at the beginning and excerpts from John Major’s *Historia Maioris Britannie* (printed in 1521) in relation to the origins of the Scots and Irish.  

It may perhaps have been its enterprising sixteenth-century owner, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, who added these additional paper items relating to Scotland.

**Untraced Phillips.**

Andrew Watson has surmised that the *HRB* and *GRA* together formed a composite manuscript alongside the *TH*. Of particular interest is that the *HRB* section includes an

---

inscription of the Cistercian abbey of Robertsbridge as well as a scribal note, identifying the scribe as William Woodchurch.\textsuperscript{30} This manuscript can be viewed as a synthesis of the twelfth-century authorities of the history of the British Isles. In this sense, ‘history’ is used to convey the past as well as ethno-geographical description: with the \textit{HRB} it considered the Brutus-related origins and the Welsh past, in William of Malmesbury it considered the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms\textsuperscript{31} and in the \textit{TH} the parallel Irish concerns. By the 1290s when this manuscript was written, these were also the areas over which, particularly after the 1284 annexation through the Statute of Rhuddlan, the English king had a semblance of control.

****

The ease with which the \textit{TH} has been added to items and removed in \textit{A33} and \textit{Do}, as well as in \textit{C}, \textit{Bb}, and \textit{A44}, reinforces the view that much of the early transmission of the \textit{TH} was on loosely bound, easily portable booklets. As these late-twelfth/early-thirteenth manuscripts mentioned above, are all suspected to have been closely associated with Gerald, they may have been dispersed in that form at Gerald’s own initiative.

\textit{Sc} is distinctive within this selection of manuscript-collections by its organisation and subject matter. This English manuscript offers to its reader an exhilarating journey not only round England but also two important centres of pilgrimage, Rome and the Holy Land. The manuscript gives the reader an insight into the more peripheral parts of the known world through the discourse on India which is counterbalanced in the west with Gerald’s \textit{TH}.

The predominant interest in the collections which date from the mid-thirteenth century to the close of the century emphasise the use of the \textit{TH} as a means to understanding the origins and history of the Irish. Of the later thirteenth-century manuscripts, it is with narratives of the past, recent and otherwise in relation to other neighbouring regions, that the \textit{TH} is most closely

\textsuperscript{30} Crick, vol. III, pp.6-7.
associated. In *Hb*, in its initial formation an even more localised view of the past can be seen in the inclusion of the *TH*, stripped of some of its extraneous material in Bk.I, with the *EH* and a set of Anglo-Irish annals.

Of the manuscripts containing Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB*, it is only in *Ba* that a medieval association of the two texts be determined. The interest in the two texts together can be interpreted as the interest in a relatively local past, especially in the common and divergent origin myths that appear in both. Gerald refers to the *HRB* to include Gurguintus, the son of Belinus, into his narrative of the wave of settlers in Ireland, by the permission he gave to the ‘Basclenses’ to settle in Ireland, giving the English crown a two-fold right to Ireland. The alternative divergent origin myth for the Irish which Gerald provided was of course that of Gathelus and Scota, which as Baldred Bisset’s ‘Pleading’ at the papal court showed, would become increasingly important towards the latter end of the thirteenth century to the kingdom of Scotland. According to Gerald,

> The Northern part of Britain is also called Scotia, because it is known to be inhabited by a people which was originally propagated by Gaidelus and Scotia.  

Thus, he linked the Irish and the Scots in an origin myth unrelated to the Trojans. Both *Ba* and *Hb* with the later added Scottish-related matter can be read as attempts to reconcile or even collect together the different origin myths. This approach towards the *TH* bears similarities to Walter Bower’s use of the *TH* in the fifteenth-century. Yet, without knowing when these items were combined, this may be a representation of a more early-modern than late-medieval interpretation of the combined texts.

---

The Fourteenth-Century Collections

1. Ra [xiii/xiv. – after 1275]
2. H [xiii/xiv]
3. F/D* [xiv.]
4. Cl [xiv]
5. G [Adam de Lakenheath D. Theol. xiv. late]
6. Rb2 [xiv.]
7. CM2 [Geoffrey of Whigton OFM, M.A. xiv mid.]
8. BN41 [Robert of Popoulton, ?prior of the Carmelite abbey of Hulne in 1364 xiv. late]
9. R14/Fb/Ce [xiv.]

BL, Royal 13 A XIV [Ra]

The provenance of the first six items of this manuscript is the Dominican convent in Limerick. However, it is unknown if the additional material was added at Limerick or somewhere else. Furthermore, the combination of those items as three distinctive groups of texts or even as one whole cannot be dated.

It is the first group of six texts which is of primary interest here. The contents of this group would have served as the perfect reading material for the Order of Preachers, particularly Innocent III’s influential pastoral work, De Contemptu Mundi. TH, alongside Marbod of Rennes’ Philomela, with its catalogue of animals and birds and Marbod’s poem on gemstones and their properties, offering similar matter in the TH, would have offered copious examples of the marvels of nature: the ideal exempla for the preacher. The portability of this manuscript as evident from its dimensions (23.5 cm x 17.2cm) further reinforces its possible use for the itinerant preacher.33

The second selection of texts was written on a set of six quires and included Richard of Wethersett’s ‘Summa qui bene presunt’, another popular text on preaching and pastoral care

33 This use of similar exempla in other Irish mendicant manuscripts is mentioned in R. Flower, The Irish Tradition (Oxford, 1947) pp.132-133.
and a narrative regarding Joseph of Arimathea. A different hand added a poem, ‘De coniuge’ or ‘Golias de coniuge non ducenda’ on the final page of the quire which may previously have been blank. This was a poem again marriage, where Gawain is persuaded by Lawrence of Durham against marriage.

The third grouping opened with John of Plano Carpini’s Historia Mongalorum and includes a further nine texts written contemporaneously in the one hand. The focus of these items varied from prophetic material, to other treatises on charity and the martyrdom of Thomas Becket. It also included other material regarding the east such as a pilgrimage guide to Jerusalem written in French and the letter of Prester John. Somewhat surprising is the inclusion of a late-sixteenth-century transcription of the Philomela in the third section of the manuscript. Was this merely an exercise in writing and copying on a blank folio in between two texts or does the unnecessary duplication of this text suggest that the first section may have only been combined together with the third, or even the other two sections, in the late sixteenth century after the Philomela had been added in again?

BL, Harley 3472 [H]

The existence of a creed written in Hiberno-English, within this vast compilation of material, has suggested that this late-thirteenth/fourteenth-century manuscript may also be of Irish origin. Indeed, Kathryn Kerby-Fulton has suggested that the combination of contents show some similarity to those of Ra above. Although the two manuscripts do not share any texts apart from the TH, she states that it is H’s ‘mix of prophecy, goliardic poetry and ecclesiastical politics’ which makes it so similar to Ra. Amongst its contents are the apocryphal ‘Manassis Regis Oratio’, Walter Map’s ‘Epistola Valerii ad Rufinum’, an anonymous copy of De Sacramentis, Gregory of Tours, ‘Passio ss. martyrum septem dormientium’ and a collection of hymns. Of particular interest in this Anglo-Irish manuscript is

the copy of the *Laudabiliter*, which reinforced the message of the *TH* of English dominion over Ireland.

**CUL Ff.1.27/CCC66a [F/D#]**

The contents of this manuscript will be discussed in detail with relation to William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*.\(^{37}\)

**BL, Cotton Cleopatra D V [Cl]**

*Cl* begins with three texts by Gerald of Wales: the *TH*, the *EH* and the *Symbolum Electorum* which consisted of excerpts of Gerald’s favourite compositions, in particular speeches and prologues. Appended to this was a work titled ‘De descriptione mundi’, attributed later in the manuscript’s history to Gerald of Wales. It is instead the ‘geographia’ from Bk.IV of Roger Bacon’s *Opus Majus*. As discussed in ch.II, this section concentrated on the world outwith Europe previously unknown and the only contemporary source used by Roger Bacon in this section was the *Itinerary* with a cursory glance at John of Plano Carpini’s *Historia Mongalorum*. This section considers a biblical topography gleaned from Ethicus Ister and Bede followed by the peoples described by William of Rubruck. It abounds with mentions of Alexander and his gate which enclosed Gog/Magog. Therefore, it appears fitting that the next two items in *Cl* are Julius Valerius’ *Res Gestae Alexandri Macedonis* and the *Collatio Alexandri cum Dindimo per litteras facta*. The former was a more general overview of the life of Alexander; the second, an anonymous work detailing an imagined letter and reply between Dindimus, king of the Brahmans, and Alexander.\(^{38}\) Thus the structure of this codex is the reverse of *Sc*. Here it begins in the west and moves eastward. Perhaps it would be more fitting to suggest that it moves the reader around the outskirts of the known world, skirting its potentially marvel-filled and dangerous peripheries.

\(^{37}\) See pp.260-264.

Gonville and Caius, 290/682 [G]

In comparison to other surviving manuscripts of the TH G offers a more unusual example. The manuscript contains Peter Lombard’s Sentences, a staple of the medieval scholar’s book collection, with all additional eighteen items written in the margins. They do not appear to have been placed there as textual gloss but merely as a convenient place to add other items of interest. There are a wide variety of theological tracts, from Bernard of Clairvaux and Augustine’s treatise on the conflict between vices and virtues, Bernard’s homily on the Angel Gabriel, various collections of ‘distinctiones’ and ‘questiones’, Peter Blois’ commentary on Job, Jerome’s Ad Nepotianum de vita clericorum, Chrysostom’s sermon on the Passion, two other treatises by Bernard of Clairvaux, one titled De precepto et dispensacione and the other Sermo in annuntiatione beatae Mariae (also known as De Altercatione quattuor sororum), to the selection from Gerald’s TH. The selection from the TH highlighted certain interests: marvellous wells, the origins of Lough Neagh, the redemption of the shape-shifter on the taking of the sacrament, the criticism of Irish religious practices, praise of the Irish clergy as well as criticism with regards to their pastoral care. This selection ended with the anecdote regarding Henry II in Wales where he is warned of God’s retribution if he failed to reform. These eighteen items written in the margins are written in a number of different hands. The script of the excerpts of the TH is particularly distinctive, as it is written in a close cursive anglicana and its aspect suggests that it was hurriedly written.39

CUL Mm. 2.18 [CM2]

This mid-fourteenth-century manuscript, compiled by Geoffrey Wighton OFM, M.A also offers an example of what may have been in a typical scholar’s florilegia; in organisation and method. Its contents, which denote his scholarly status and interests, included Solinus’ Collectanea, Ethicus Ister’s Cosmographia, Macrobius’ Saturnalia, John of Salisbury’s

39 Indeed the aspect could suggest speedy note-taking in the margins of Peter Lombard’s Sentences. The other contents are fairly typical of what could be expected within a scholar’s library, could the placement of the excerpts of the TH here suggest the possibility of informal cursory lectures on Gerald’s TH. This could perhaps help explain Geoffrey Wighton’s interest below – and may reflect the preachers’ interest and awareness in the mirabilia as discussed above, pp.119-121. Due to time constraints this line of investigation has not as yet been pursued, for a brief exploration see p.252.
Metalogicon and Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum, Julius Frontinus’ Strategemata, Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Boethius’ De consolatione philosophiae, Valerius Maximus, Factorum ac dictorum memorabilium and excerpts from Martial’s Epigrammata. Slightly more unusual is the mathematical selection which opens the collection. It is mainly drawn from Arabic and classical sources such as the commentary on Euclid in Liber de Numeris et Lineis Rationalibus, Pulcher et Magnus, or Mohammed Ben Musa Khayrezmita, De Algebra et Almuchabala translated perhaps by Gerard of Cremona; Gerald of Cremona’s other translations such as Abû Bekr’s Liber in quo Terrarum et Corporum continentur Mensurationes, and Saydi Abuothmi’s De Mensuratione Figurarum Superficialium et Corporearum or Aderameti De Mensuratione and finally Liber Augmenti et Diminucionis. The selection from the TH, discussed above in ch.I, is sandwiched between excerpts from Macrobius’ Saturnalia and the De vita sancto Zozime, and its selection bears some resemblance to the excerpts chosen in G with its focus on the mirabilia in the TH.

BL, Royal 13 B XVIII [Rb2]

This manuscript, like Hb, was another compilation of historical matter. However, as it is presently incomplete, the coherence of its collection cannot be determined. The codex begins with two summarised metrical narratives about the kings of England: the first, from Egbert to Henry III and the second from Alfred to Henry III, followed by the complete text of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum (HE). With his HE Bede became the unquestioned authority of English history. He reinforced the message of Christianity in England, England’s initial reliance on Ireland, as well as England’s subsequent superiority with regards to religious practices. It helped create and consolidate a concept of an ‘England’ and the ‘English’ which had no real existence in his time. Andrew Merrill has interpreted the HE as a microcosmic universal history, in which England or perhaps Britain (and here including Ireland) represented the world. The fourth item is a letter from the papal legate Otto relating to his appointment to England, Ireland and Wales, drawn from a bull of Pope Gregory IX in 1237 and addressed to


\[41\] Merrill, History and Geography, pp.268-273.
the archbishops and bishops. On the verso of the next folio, was the opening page of the *TH* and to what may have once been a much larger manuscript. However, not only are the remaining folios lost, the last remaining folio is torn and partly mutilated.

**Paris, BNF, Lat. 4126 [BN41]**

Like *Hb*, this is also a manuscript later owned by William Cecil, Lord Burghley. As mentioned above, this manuscript bears the name of Robert of Popoulton, who was, perhaps, the same Rober of Popoulton who was prior of the Carmelite abbey of Hulne in 1364. It was a pre-existing collection to which he added further texts. The section within which the *TH* was written included the *Disciplina Clericalis*, the ps. Methodius *Revelationes*, Alexander’s *de situ Indiae* and the *HRB*. It thus showed a preoccupation with origin myths, the unknown ‘East’; and an interest in apocalyptic expectations in the form of *mirabilia* and Alexander-related legends. The ps. Methodius, *Revelationes* enjoyed a renewed popularity and a greater contemporary resonance in the thirteenth century; its revival was closely linked to the advent of the Mongols. Most importantly, the text, which was possibly of seventh-century Syrian origin, prophesied the eventuality of a Christian victory. Furthermore it too confirmed that the people behind Alexander’s Gates were Gog/Magog.

It has been suggested that Robert made his additions to this collection from copies of texts found within the collection of the Austin friars at York – and indeed a number of items within this manuscript can be found amongst the catalogue entries for John Erghome’s bequest to the Austin friars, particularly from within the category *Historiae Gencium*. Once a part of the larger Popoulton manuscript, the material found in the *TH* is further contextualised by other material relating to Ireland and Scotland such as *De Mirabilibus Hibernie* by Patrick, an

---

45 Friedman, *Northern Owners*, p.41.
46 See below, pp.279-286.
eleventh-century bishop of Dublin, and treatises on Scottish history titled: ‘Cronica de origine antiquorum Pictorum’ and ‘Cronica regum Scottorum ccc.x.iii annorum’. Similarly Robert was interested in the Trojan-related myths which were discussed by Geoffrey of Monmouth, Gerald of Wales and within the other inserted texts such as Hildebert’s Versus de excidio Troiano, Simon Chèvre d’Or’ Ylias and Dares Phrygius’ Historia Troiana. Alongside Alfred of Beverley’s Annales compendium of English history from Brutus to the mid-twelfth century, Robert also adds information relating to England by including Higden’s chapters on England from Bk.I of the Polychronicon.

BL Royal 14 C VI [R14]/ Bodleian, Fairfax 20 [Fb] / BL, Cotton Claudius E VIII

‘Matthew of Westminster’’s Flores Historiarum47, a selective continuation of Roger of Wendover and Matthew Paris’ chronicle, gained its name only in the sixteenth century, partly due to the book-list of Simon Bozoun discussed above. John Taylor and Antonia Gransden suggest that the Westminster-based continuations of the Flores Historiarum should be seen as a quasi-official royalist history.48 As discussed in ch.II the selection of excerpts from the TH and EH in these manuscript are found alongside other short historical and geographical treatises, regnal and papal lists, and prophecies which offer a setting for the Flores Historiarum. The inclusion of treatises on weights, measures and legal terms emphasises the very practical nature of these ‘settings’. This would suggest that topographical knowledge of Rome and England as well as knowledge about England’s right to Ireland and the successive invasions faced by Ireland were considered to be integral to the reader’s basic understanding.

*****

Like Sc with its structured reading of the core of Christianity and the world’s peripheries, Cl too offers a similar scope for a similar spatial meandering through the pages of the manuscript. However, here the focus is entirely on this peripheral portion of the world. Unlike the Sc it begins in the west through the reading of the TH. The interests in these two

manuscripts, in particular Cl, can be paralleled in another fourteenth-century manuscript, F/D*, which will be discussed below.

CM2 and G represent two different examples of florilegia. While both were of a scholarly nature they were perhaps the result of different stages during the pursuit of a degree. The study of theology at Oxford and Cambridge was largely centred on the Bible and Peter Lombard’s Sentences, the main text in G. The surrounding material of quaestiones, theological treatises, biblical commentary and sermon exempla as perhaps exemplified by the excerpts from the TH would be of the type that would be of interest to someone pursuing such a degree. This manuscript was already at Gonville Hall by the late fourteenth-century, although the identity of the scribe cannot be conclusively determined. The excerpts may have been written out by Adam de Lakenheath or may have been added later once it became part of the college college. In Oxford, in the third and fourth years, students studying for a BA were required by the statutes of the university to study a number of unspecified texts relating to the quadrivium, i.e. texts relating to arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy as well as natural philosophy.49 It is perhaps as a result of this particular portion of his studies that Geoffrey Wighton produced the compilation of information that is in CM2.50 Looking at these two examples, particularly within the context of the other items in their respective manuscripts and the excerpts chosen, it is tempting to wonder if Gerald’s TH was the subject of a cursory lecture.

Rb2 and BN41 represent collections of a broad interest in the past as already seen in some previous collections. The main difference is in their geographical focus. Rb2 is firmly fixed on an English past. However, it must be remembered that the mutilated state of the TH suggests that a substantial portion of this manuscript may be lost, thus giving a somewhat skewed view of its internal organisation. Robert Popoulton’s anthology of material reflects his location’s close proximity to Scotland at either Hulne or York. His focus is equally divided between the distant past as seen by the inclusion of the TH, HRB, material on Alexander and Troy, as well as tracts on ‘De situ Albanie’ and the origins of the Picts. Universal history is represented by Orosius’ Adversus Paganos as well as the Polychronicon. There is also the wider interest in marvels and

50 Geoffrey had gained his Bachelor of Theology by 1358 and perhaps his D.Th sometime after 7th May 1365; see above p.101.
geographical tracts as well as more recent accounts of the English past through the continuation of the *Polychronicon* and Alfred of Beverley’s account. The interest in prophetic history and apocalyptic material is also well represented here. Even if we were unaware of the identity of its owner/reader, the initial material regarding mendicant privileges suggests ownership by a friar. This is a volume that is clearly multi-faceted in its purpose.

The balance between treatises relating to pastoral care and material from which sermon *exempla* can be culled makes *Ra* the ideal mendicant preaching tool both in its possible ‘original’ state as well as with its later additions.

**The Fifteenth-Century Collections**

1. Rd [xiv/xv – after 1385]
2. P [xv – before 1418]
3. MJ [xv. – 1431]
4. V [xv.- after 1447]
5. E [ xv. – 1482]

**BL, Royal 13 D I [Rd]**

The excerpt drawn from the *TH* forms a small portion of this extensive compilation. The opening texts of the codex were the *Polychronicon* followed by the *HRB*. This interest in the past was further magnified by the inclusion of the *Historia Turpini* and two short anonymous chronicles, one dating from AD 1 to 1208 and the other from 1140 to 1385. The *Historia Turpini* was a moralizing narrative relating to Charlemagne at the battle of Roncevalles.\(^{51}\) It was amongst those texts which Humbert of Romans recommended to preachers in his preaching manual *De Praedicatione Sanctae Crucis contra Saracenos*. The

\(^{51}\) *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi ou Chronique du Pseudo-Turpin. textes revus et publiés d'après 49 manuscrits* ed. C. Meredith-Jones, (Paris, 1936)
ps. Turpin text, in addition to Walter the Chancellor’s *Historia Anthiocena* and Jacques de Vitry’s *Historia Orientalis* listed as *Historia transmarina*, was necessary to those who wished ‘to acquaint themselves with the history of Islamic progress against Christendom’. 52

Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon* was, he claimed, written at the request of his fellow monks at St. Werburghs in Chester in order to understand and learn from the past. Initially, the events it related ended in 1327. 53 A subsequent revision by Higden, which also circulated, saw the narrative extended in different manuscripts to between 1344 and 1352. Divided into seven books, it drew heavily on the structure and content from the works of Orosius, Eusebius, Bede, William of Malmesbury and Gerald of Wales amongst others. 54 It swiftly became a popular work spawning a number of continuations. In its first book, it provided a geographical exploration of the known world within which, as discussed above in ch.II, the *TH* was heavily used. This first book epitomised Orosius’ own geographical framework, which charted the movement of the great civilisations from East and West, by offering descriptions which moved westwards from the east.

This excerpt of the *TH* is within a self-contained quire of seventeen short treatises on a variety of subjects. It appears to be for an interest in miracles and marvels that the compiler has collected together various extracts on marvels in England, Ireland (for which the *TH* is used) and the ‘East’; with additional interests in wells, mountains and pilgrimages in particular between England and Rome. The compiler then added a short Latin tract titled ‘libellus de tribus partibus mundi’ which is followed by a Middle English translation of the same text, alongside others treatises on, for example, the measure of weights and the interpretation of dreams. In a similar manner to the selections of short treatises in *R14, Fb* and *Ce*, these tracts form an explanatory ‘setting’ to the primary texts in the manuscript. This use of the *Polychronicon* as a core text, surrounded by other shorter treatises was not uncommon. 55

54 Higden included a list of his ‘sources’ at the start of his text, *Poly.* I. ch.2 pp.20-25.
Cambridge, Peterhouse, 1.8.1 [P]

P was gifted to the Peterhouse library by its Master, Thomas Lane. From Item.4 onwards, the texts are written in a different but contemporary hand. However the TH, the Polychronicon and its index all share the same hand. The Old Register of the Peterhouse library suggests that when it was donated the manuscript may have only contained the TH, Polychronicon and Prophetia Merlini. Thus, the text relating the meeting of King Edward and the Pope at Avignon, John of Hildesheim’s narrative of the three kings at Cologne, and the accounts of Kings John, Edward I and Edward III were later additions. There is little certainty as to when they came to be bound together as the current binding dates from the eighteenth century.

The separate circulation of the Prophetie Merlini further reflects the abiding interest in prophetic history. Prophecy was seen as a key to understanding the future. Expectations were primarily centred on the prospect of the apocalypse. However, not all prophecies were approached within this eschatological framework. Southern offered John of Salisbury as an example of a scholar who studied prophecies to understand more contemporary events, which may be more consistent with the interest in the Prophetie Merlini. To understand the ambiguity of the prophetical wording it was necessary to understand the events of the past and present, found in texts like the Polychronicon and the TH, in order to dismiss events which had already come to pass as well as to predict the political events which were locally relevant.

Manchester, JRUL 217 [MJ]

The main text within MJ is Ranulf Higden’s Polychronicon, written in Dublin in 1436 for Stephen Lawless. The excerpts of the TH are the only additional item found in this manuscript. They relate to the various invasions of Ireland and was completed by an inclusion

56 CBLMC:X, p.534.
of the papal privileges of Adrian IV & Alexander III in Bk.II ch.5 of the *EH*. Although much of this information, bar the papal privileges, had been repeated in Higden’s *Polychronicon* as a separate selection of extracts regarding Ireland and England’s ecclesiastical and political right to Ireland, this would have been more emphatic, particularly at a time when crown authority, even in Dublin may have been on the wane.

**London, College of Arms Vincent 418 [V]**

*V* offers a combination of chronicle-material such as Peter of Ickham’s *De Gesti Britonum et Anglorum* and Henry of Huntingdon’s *HGA* as well as three different anonymous chronicles: a Cistercian chronicle with entries to 1283 [Item.8], a chronicle which ended at the death of James I of Scotland in 1437 [Item.11] and an English chronicle with entries to 1340 [Item.15]. The topographical information in the *TH* was further complemented by Item.9 ‘De orbis divisione’. In addition were other short treatises on intelligence by Robert Grosseteste and short treatises against Henry IV, as well as regnal [Item.12&14] and papal lists [Item.12].

**Camb. Emmanuel College 1.1.3 [E]**

Of the manuscripts surveyed here, John Gunthorpe’s codex containing Bede’s *HE* with Gerald’s *TH* bearing a date of 1482 is by far the latest of these manuscripts. This manuscript will be discussed below in relation to the reading interests of John Gunthorpe.58

* **** *

There appear to be two different types of collections within this category. The first, which includes the earliest of these manuscripts, *Rd* and *V* are extensive collections which deal primarily with historical narratives. They also include a variety of short highly informative and useful treatises.

58 See pp.286-291.
Indeed A.S.G. Edwards argues that much of the interest in the *Polychronicon* may have been due to the content of its first book as seen in the number of manuscripts which contain Bk.I or excerpts alone in Latin or in translation.\(^{59}\) In the second group, the collections all consist, in their original form, of a key text accompanied by a shorter explanatory text or excerpts; or in the case of *P*, two such texts. The *TH* is envisaged as a useful counterpart to the more authoritative texts of the *Polychronicon* and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, despite its pre-existing prominence within the *Polychronicon*.

**ASSOCIATED CONTENTS/TEXTS OF THE *ITINERARY*\(^{60}\)**

The pool of texts associated with manuscripts of the *Itinerary* is considerably smaller than that of the *TH*. Of course, with only six extant manuscripts compared to the 38/39 of the *TH*, this is reasonable. As the contents of *C*\(^*\) & *F*\(^*\) are virtually identical and are more likely to have shared all their contents due to copying practices rather than design, they will be considered as one for the purpose of the list below. The list contains the four texts which occur more than once within these manuscripts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerald of Wales</td>
<td><em>Expugnatio Hibernica</em></td>
<td>F/D(^*) [xiv.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L(^*) [xiv. – before 1352]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques de Vitry</td>
<td><em>Historia Orientalis</em></td>
<td>F/D(^*) [xiv.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L(^*) [xiv. – before 1352]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordoric of Pordenone</td>
<td><em>Relatio</em></td>
<td>S(^*) [xiv. – before 1352]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L(^*) [xiv. – before 1352]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethicus Ister</td>
<td><em>Cosmographia</em></td>
<td>F(^<em>), C(^</em>) [xiii/xiv –after 1282]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y(^*) [c.1400]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{60}\) This discussion has not listed the recorded contents of the two Peterborough manuscripts, primarily because there is no certainty that it conclusively refers to William of Rubruck’s Itinerary; for their contents as listed in the catalogues see pp.175-176. Y\(^*\) has been considered here, but of course only through the information provided in the Beinecke Library catalogue and the Sotheby’s sale catalogue.
The Manuscript Collections

Leiden Voss. Lat. F.77 [F*] & Cambridge, CCC 181 [C*]

Except for four items, the contents of F* and C* are identical. Of the exceptions, the first and most substantial is the exclusion of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* in C*. However, a codicological examination of C* suggests that this item may have once belonged to it. In C* the contents prior to the corresponding point at which Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae* can be found in F* form ten quires. Hence, if the manuscript had contained Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB* it would have begun on a new collection of quires, thus making that text easy to remove. The manuscript also lacks the ‘Prophetia Aquila’ which follows the *HRB* in the Leiden manuscript. The other items not found in both manuscripts are a 1326 bull of Pope John XXII, the ‘pro pace concilianda inter reges Franciae et Angliae’, and a fragment from Ezekiel’s *Prognostics*. The papal bull was written in a fourteenth-century hand on what was previously a blank verso of a folio of C*. The fragment from Ezekiel was also written in a late fourteenth-century hand and tacked on to the end of F*.

The *Itinerary* is here paired with the second version of John of Plano Carpini’s *HM*. These two manuscripts are the only witnesses to the second version of the *HM*; the version used by Vincent of Beauvais for his *Speculum Historiale*. The excerpt from Ethicus Ister’s *Cosmographia* regarding Alexander’s gate and Gog and Magog returns the reader once again to the interest in the east and the Mongols within an apocalyptic context, which as discussed in ch.II, was not explicitly considered in the *Itinerary*. The compiler who chose to add this item to the *HM* and the *Itinerary* may have been of a similar mindset to Roger Bacon. He, too, may have been eager to understand the eschatological dimensions of the friars’ narratives about the East. Thus, of further interest is the inclusion of two of the prophecies which Roger Bacon

---

61 For the contents of the two manuscripts see Appendix I.
62 *Cat. CCC*, p.425
believed would be key to understanding the impending apocalypse: the prophecies of Merlin and the *Prophétia Aquila*.

The composition of this manuscript also suggests a deep interest in Norman and French history. It includes the *GND* with the Robert of Torigni continuation, a French royal genealogy, Einhard’s *Vita Karoli* and a copy of the 1259 peace treaty between the kings of England and France. The ‘Treaty of Paris’ between Louis IX and Henry III saw the renunciation of the English king’s, and his family’s, rights to Normandy, Anjou, Touraine, Poitou and Maine. Indeed, the process had initially been held up by Eleanor and Simon de Montfort’s reluctance to agree to this.\(^{63}\) The origin of the de Montfort family at Montfort l’Amaury with its close proximity to Normandy may also explain the interest in the misdeeds of Simon de Montfort’s sons in 1271 and their subsequent papal condemnation. Perhaps the items of Anglo-French interest were included as examples of a certain French pride, for example William’s conquest of England as seen in the *GND* followed by Louis’ successful negotiations within the ‘Treaty of Paris’. Within this context it is unsurprising that John XXII’s attempts at peace between France and England were later added to this collection of Anglo-French material in C*.

The inclusion of Martin IV’s privileges to the Franciscan and Dominican orders of 1281 is also noteworthy. This renewal of the mendicant right to preach and hear confessions, which ensured that the mendicant orders were answerable solely to the Pope and not to other secular clergy, was particularly controversial. The opposition in France of the secular clergy to this aspect of the privilege was such that in the ecclesiastical province of Rouen the archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Amiens wrote to the archbishops of France asking them to convene councils in order to protest this.\(^{64}\) Our lack of knowledge regarding the provenance of F*, thought likely to have been C*’s exemplar, means that it is difficult to tell if the privilege was recorded in the manuscript as an affirmation of this right by a mendicant house or if it was as a point of interest with regards to the controversy.

---


Indeed $F^*$, with its interests in French regnal history, Mongol descriptions, prophecies and even mendicant rights is the sort of manuscript one could expect the Franciscan Roger Bacon or the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais to have had in their possession. As $F^*$ itself can only be dated to after 1281, this manuscript cannot be linked, even speculatively, to Vincent of Beauvais who died c.1264. However, this manuscript was produced at a time when both the kings of England and France were continuing to send envoys and receive embassies from the Mongol Il-khans in hopes of an alliance with the Mongols. The information about the Mongols would have remained topical.

What may also be purely of coincidental interest is Amaury de Montfort’s care of his father’s books. Amaury, as mentioned in ch.II was a canon of Rouen Cathedral who eventually bequeathed his father’s books to the Dominicans of St. Jacques in Paris. In size, the manuscript containing the ‘de vita et moribus tartarorum’ belonging to Simon de Montfort would certainly have resembled $F^*$ or $C^*$.

**Ff.1.27/CCC66a [F/D*]**

Viewed as a whole, the contents of this previously composite and now separate manuscript essentially offer a medieval world-view. The very order of the texts suggests insights into why and how these texts may have been combined. The first section explores the east through contemporary accounts such Jacques de Vitry’s *Historia Orientalis* (*HO*) and William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*. The *HO* written in the 1220s was part of a larger text entitled *Historia hierosolymitana abbreviate*. The common interests within the *HO* and the *Itinerary* in eastern Christianity, conversions and generally all things eastern, helps explain the potential common interest to the reader. As discussed in ch.II, Jacques’ *HO* gave tantalising glimpses of the East with allusions to the mythical Christian prince, Prester John. In addition, it offered considerable information about other eastern Christian groups in the Levant (a further topic

---

65 For a brief mention of Louis IX’s support for Vincent of Beauvais and encouragement to examine the French royal lineages, see Voobij, ‘Bower and Vincent of Beauvais’, p.263.

66 see pp.156-162.
which William also touched upon, albeit for the far east) and as Humbert of Romans stated was a vital text with which to gain an understanding of the ‘Saracens’.

This is followed by the *Vita sancti Macarii Romani*, also known as the ‘Itinerarium usque ad paradisum terrestrem’, a text which examines the journey of three monks, Theophilus, Sergius and Hyginus who travel ‘east’ but in this instance to Paradise, where they come upon St. Macarius. This examination of the Holy Land, central and east Asia and Paradise is followed by the ‘letter of Prester John’ which embodied the crusading appeal of the *HO* and the *Itinerary* while embracing the eschatological implications of a journey to Paradise. Honorius Augustodunensis’ *Imago mundi* composed before 1140 (the year of Honorius’ death) is included in two separate parts, the first of which was placed between the *Vita sancti Macarii* and the ‘Letter of Prester John’. Bk.I of the *Imago Mundi*, alongside the later attempts of Higden’s *Polychronicon* and Bartholomew the Englishman’s DPR, offered a brief but encyclopaedic venture into ethnographic and topographic information regarding the known world. It conflated the information of the day and enjoyed a wide dissemination.67

The next two texts reinforce the interests found in the texts above. In John of Sacrobosco’s *De Sphera* the most recent scholarly theoretical exposition on the nature of the inhabitable world could be found, albeit in mathematical terms, rather than topographical or ethnographical. ‘Barlaam and Josaphat’ offered the corruption of a hagiography of Gautama Buddha, a story of conversions, tribulations and the solace of the ascetic life. Most importantly it offered, once again, a story of a princely conversion in India. It not only offered a narrative of the events but a reasoned argument for conversion, advice for maintaining faith after baptism and a number of other parables. Of particular interest in this text is that, following a dispute between Josaphat and his father, the king, about Christianity, the king requests a debate in front of him between the Christians and the pagans, reminiscent of the debate held before the Great Khan in the *Itinerary*.68 The second half of this section of the manuscript begins with Bk.II of the *Imago mundi* which focused on the celestial spheres, dating, cycles and time.

67 PL 172.115-188.
Bk.III, which offered a number of regnal lists of the different great empires of the ancient kingdoms and select portions of biblical history was not included.

The focus then shifts to biblical history with excerpts from Jacobus de Voragine’s *Legenda Aurea*, a French poem on the infancy of Christ, descriptions of location in the Holy Land by Bede, the Pseudo-Methodius commentary on the Book of Revelation followed by an anonymous ‘Descriptio terrae sancte’.

In the second half of the manuscript (now separate as F) the attention moved from the far east and the biblical lands to the far west; in particular Ireland and Wales. Furthermore, a *vita* of a saint important to each area was also included. For example, after the *TH* and *EH* is placed the *Life of St. Patrick*. Similarly, complementing the *IK* is Rhigyfarch ap Sulien’s *Life of St. David*. David was a predominantly Welsh saint, yet Michael Lapidge suggests that Rhigyfarch ap Sulien had also been keen to promote David’s influence in Ireland.69 Similarly, Patrick’s associations with Wales were also strong, even if not on the same scale as Ireland. The inclusion of the ‘Prophecies of Merlin’ which travelled both independently and as a part of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB* may be two-fold. First, as matter which could illuminate the past and future of the Welsh, and the Irish to a lesser degree. Second, as a complementary text to the *EH*: it may have been noticed that the proposed third book of the *EH* on prophecies was not included and this was a measure to rectify this. Likewise, the inclusion of the prophecy, ‘Arbor fertilis’ which also transmitted political implications of overlordship throughout the British Isles.

The Irish based ‘Purgatory of St. Patrick’ by Henry of Saltrey mirrored the focus of the *Vita Sancti Macarii Romani* of the first section. Hence here we find the juxtaposition of the earthly heaven in the east with the earthly hell and place of redemption in the west of the known inhabited world. The excerpts from Eusebius’ *Chronicle* appear misplaced within this seemingly minutely constructed codex, but in relation to F’s relationship with R this may instead be solely due to the genealogical relationship between the two manuscripts. F in its

---

present state also holds Geoffrey de Fontibus’ *Liber de infantia S. Edmundi*; however, this was a fifteenth-century addition. The association of the material regarding the Irish with the Mongols can also be found in other comparable manuscripts, albeit with different texts. The contents of *Ra* contained a copy of John of Plano Carpini’s *Historia Tartarorum* alongside the *TH*. Similarly Gerald’s *TH* appeared in the continental manuscript *A19* alongside the texts of Jacques de Vitry, Marco Polo and Jordan of Severac.

If this manuscript reflects a medieval world view, noticeably absent is any description of continental Europe. It offers a geographical breadth which includes Paradise, an earthly Purgatory, the religious core in the Holy land and examples of the Christianised extremes of the world through the inclusion of the *Itinerary* and Gerald’s three texts. In effect, this collection offers an optimistic view of past, contemporary and future successes relating to the spread of Christianity.

The inclusion of the prophecies has led Lesley Coote to suggest that ‘the idea of the Britain-ruler [i.e a second Arthur] lies behind the contents of Cambridge Ff.1.27 (2)’. Furthermore, based on this and the inclusion of two historiated initials in *F*, she has suggested that this manuscript, ‘appears to have been made for presentation to a king… It could be for Edward I, although it could also be Edward II.’ With regards to the initials, her argument centres on the two initials at the beginnings of Bk.I and Bk.II of the *TH*. The first she states is of a monk writing a text and the second of it being offered to a king on a throne. While not improbable, there are some problems with this. Certainly the second half of *F* is focused on the British Isles, but this cohesion was artificially created by Parker’s interference with the manuscript. Nor can the historiated initials be offered as conclusive proof that this manuscript was meant to be offered to a king. The style of the historiated initials in *D* and in *F* are similar. In *D* it is evident that these initials are contextually based as can be seen on p.129 where two monks, representing William and his *socius* are seen travelling in the bottomhalf of the letter, and are seen presenting a book, the *Itinerary*, to a king, whom we can reasonably suppose to be Louis IX. Indeed these historiated initials are seen in other texts within these two

---

manuscripts, all of which have images based on some aspect of the text. As the TH would not have been the opening text of the original manuscript, for it is clear from the foliation listed in the contents page of D* that the contents of D* preceded those of F, any king receiving such a book would have had to wait till mid-way through this lengthy codex to see this presentational attempt at gaining favour.

Cambridge, CCC 407 [S*]

*Liber Itinerarium*, the title of this codex as listed in Simon Bozoun’s book-list, is suggestive of its contents. The interests here are centred on travel accounts, particularly journeys to the east. The codex opens with Simon FitzSimon’s narrative, an Irish Franciscan’s journey to Jerusalem, followed by the *Itinerary* and Ordoric of Pordenone’s *Relatio*. The *Relatio* was narrated to William of Solanges sometime before Ordoric’s death in 1331. The comparable scope of these two last texts also helps explain their placement together: both texts described the travels of a friar to the East. However, this is perhaps where the comparison ends, as Ordoric’s travels took him much further and his narrative was crammed with vividly embellished descriptions of his journeys.

This interest in the east is augmented by the pseudo-Aristotle *Secreta Secretorum* [Item.5] and its fascination with the supposed mystical alchemical secrets of the east, as well as Bk. XV of Bartholomew the Enlishman’s *DPR* which discussed topographical and ethnographical attributes and the *mirabilia* of the known world. The final items may not have been part of the manuscript at the time of its construction but with the subsequent additional

---

71 For some examples which demonstrate that they were contextualized historiated initials see, in D*: f.67r the abovementioned illuminated capital of the two friars and Louis IX; f.110r at the beginning of Ordoric of Pordenone’s *Relatio* are three friars traveling or standing; f.123r at the beginning of the *Letter of Prester John* is a historiated capital depicting a king, presumably Prester John; f.139r at the beginning of ‘Baarlam and Josaphat’ is depiction of a wise man talking to a king, which could represent Josaphat talking to his father persuading him to convert to Christianity. In F: there are four historiated initials in the TH, first a monk writing, which is placed beside the recitational introduction, second, at the beginning of the dedication to Henry II the image of seated king surrounded by men who seem to be warriors and third at the beginning of Bk.II a monk handing an opened book to a king and lastly at the beginning of Bk.III the depiction of a warrior (king?) surrounded by other soldiers; at the beginning of the *vita Patricii* is the depiction of a bishop blessing people; at the beginning of the *IK* is the depiction of a seated monk handing a book to a bishop (presumably Gerald handing the book to Archbishop Baldwin); at the beginning of the *Purgatory of St. Patrick* is a depiction of several religious men, led by a bishop blessing a man who is about to enter a cave; or at the beginning of the *Life of St. David* a further image of a bishop preaching to a group of people.
discussion of physiognomic characteristics, such as the complexion, it corresponds with this interest in the peoples and places of the world.

**BL, Royal 14 C XIII [L]**

The scope of this mid-fourteenth century collection is somewhat similar to that of F/D in that it offers another world view, albeit with a slightly different emphasis. It will be discussed below, in relation to a case-study of the manuscript’s owner Simon Bozoun.

**Yale, Beinecke Library 406 [Y]**

The contents of Y may represent a further strand of interest in the *Itinerary*. In its current form, the manuscript is made up of two parts. The first part contains a copy of the fourteenth century poet, William of Deguilleville’s, *Le Pelerinage de vie humaine*, written in one hand with a number of illuminations. On the verso of the last folio of this section, is an additional French poem about the differences in the life of a master and servant added in a fifteenth-century hand. The second part begins with William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary* and is followed by the same excerpt from Ethicus Ister’s *Cosmographia* on Gog and Magog as found in F and C. The last item in this text is Jean Chapuis’ *Sept articles de la foi* which is often attributed to Jean le Meun. It is suggested that this second section was copied by a number of scribes but it is unclear if there is scribal uniformity within each text. The manuscript’s collation suggests that these texts were not written as booklets. Certainly the contents of this section show some similar themes of interest particular in relation to conversion, baptism and redemption. With little known of the manuscripts early provenance, it is unclear as to when the first section was combined. However, the contents *Le Pelerinage de vie humaine* in which an allegorical journey to Jerusalem is offered, may have complemented the themes evident in the second section.72

---

72 For the full description from the Beinecke library, see [http://webtext.library.yale.edu/beinfla/pre1600.MS406.htm] It is interesting to note that in a late-fourteenth century manuscript, now Arras, BM 532 William of Digulleville *Le Pelerinage de vie humaine* is found immediately before Jean Chapuis, *Sept articles de la foi.*
The collections discussed above fall into two identifiable patterns. The two Normandy-based collections of F* and C* may not have an overarching pattern to their content or organisation yet they have the sense of being items of practical and immediate interest. The earliest possible date for the two manuscripts is after 1281 and should the date of it or its exemplar’s production be close to this early estimate it coincides with the flurry of renewed interest in strengthening diplomatic ties with the Mongols.

Although the contents of Y* have only been examined through a library catalogue, it is striking that Y* contains the same excerpt from Ethicus Ister’s *Cosmographia* as found in C* and F*. This excerpt is particularly remarkable as, through its discussion of Gog and Magog and their location, it highlights the eschatological implications of the Mongols and their location. As such, it appears almost like explanatory glossing, especially relevant considering William of Rubruck’s reticence in drawing similar conclusions.

In contrast, the three fourteenth-century collections are notable for their careful organisation and choice. Interest in the possibility of Mongol alliances was certainly fading, although Edward II was certainly in contact with the Mongol Il-khans. Yet, the Mongol Empire had moved figuratively closer to western Christendom with the establishment of an archdiocese at Khanbaliq in 1307. The collections appear to reflect a more general interest in the *historia* of the world; conspicuously of the peripheries of the known world rather than continental Europe. In L*, however, which will be discussed below, the inclusion of the *Polychronicon* fulfils any interest in the known world in its entirety. In F/D*, it appears to be intentionally omitted, yet of course as in L* alongside the coverage of the geographical extremes is the information on the theological and symbolic centre of the medieval world: Jerusalem.

73 For the chequered history of this diocesan see, which seems to have collapsed by c.1410 see Jackson, *Mongols*, pp.258-260.
This was also a time when the information given in the Itinerary was in danger of being superseded. Het’um Flos Orientum was available in Europe from 1307, by c.1310 Pippino of Bologna made his Latin translation of Marco Polo’s Le divisament dou monde, Ordoric of Pordenone’s Relatio was available from c.1330 and by the 1350s the spurious Mandeville-text was also in circulation. Indeed, at least one of these newer offerings on the East are available in each of the three fourteenth-century collections.

CONCLUSIONS

In this analysis of the manuscript collections in which the TH and Itinerary are found, the chronological variance in the organisation, scope and choice of content is marked. As discussed above, the early collections in which the TH were found contained copies of the TH (and sometime the EH) which lent itself to being added to and removed from collections. The problem with assessing many of these examples stems from the difficulties in judging when the texts were combined or removed from the codes. Alternatively, many of these early collections were combined with other Giraldian texts and have remained unchanged as single-author codices. Remarkably, none of the medieval texts of the TH contain a copy of the DK.

This is not a feature of the structure of the manuscripts of the Itinerary. Perhaps this is merely indicative of the nature of most mid to late thirteenth-century manuscripts which appear to consist of a number of different items. If the two late thirteenth-century manuscripts of the Itinerary are vast compilations with perhaps specific and practical interests, the late thirteenth-century compilations which included the TH may have also had a practical purpose in their possible roles as historical aides. If the contents of Ba, Hb and the untraced Phillips manuscripts can be determined for this time period, they are certainly emphatic examples of an interest in the history of the various component parts of the British isles and the origins of its people.

The fourteenth-century collections appear to be a mix of either intensely organised codices or ‘notebooks’ of seemingly random collections of material. A multiplicity of
purposes are evident from these manuscripts with examples of interest in these texts as scholarly anthologies, sources for preaching *exempla*, geographical anthologies and histories, concentrating largely on the origins of the people within the British Isles. Furthermore, as also evident in some fourteenth-century collections, the use of excerpts of the *TH* within the short ‘explanatory notes’ which accompany larger chroniclers is particularly interesting. This interest in these collections as a means of understanding the past and the origins of people is further reinforced in the fifteenth-century collections of the *TH*.
Fig.IV 1 Simon Bozoun’s book list: a facsimile of BL, Royal 14 C XIII f.15v
IV. CASE STUDIES: INDIVIDUAL COLLECTIONS

It is an infrequent occurrence when amongst a possible audience for a text, an individual as a collector, reader, borrower or owner can be identified, but here are three such individuals: Simon Bozoun, prior of Norwich Cathedral, John Erghome, Augustinian friar at York, and John Gunthorpe, dean of Wells Cathedral. Ownership evidence relating to these texts has been ascertained. However, obtaining evidence of these three men being intimately familiar with the texts is not as straightforward. In each case their awareness of the text is shown in different ways. For Simon Bozoun it relies on a surviving inscription and the hypothesis that his manuscript, \( L^* \), was specifically commissioned and arranged by him. For John Erghome it is based on the extant catalogue of the Austin friars of York where he deposited his substantial collection of books. His personal interest in the \( TH \) is highlighted by the deliberate categorisation of the text within this subject-based library catalogue. John Gunthorpe’s awareness of the text is more clear-cut; it is evident from the manuscript colophon that he commissioned the writing of \( E \).

Simon Bozoun

Simon Bozoun’s career is traced from isolated entries in the Norwich Cathedral priory’s records. In 1327 and 1334 he was listed as hostiller, and his name reemerges when he was appointed prior in 1344 and when he subsequently retired in 1352. His name indicates that he was likely to have been a native of Norfolk; there were Bozouns in Taverham, near Norwich, in 1349/50 and less than a century later a Thomas Bozoun became prior of Norwich Cathedral. Knowledge of any possible scholarly credentials for him is even less certain.\(^1\) The

---

extant records of Norwich monks studying in Oxford and Cambridge suggests that he was unlikely to have been a scholar there.² Following his retirement due to ill health, Simon became prior of a Norwich Cathedral cell, St. Leonards, also in Norwich. His legacy is his surviving book-list of thirty-one items of which there are four extant manuscripts.

Simon Bozoun’s active engagement in the creation of $L^*$ is an example of a very personal interest in these texts. Amongst the recorded benefactors of the book-collection of Norwich Cathedral, Simon Bozoun’s booklist in $L^*$ shows him to be its second largest contributor. Although composed predominantly of theological and legal texts, the book-list suggests a man of deep and diverse interests (see Fig.IV.1 and Fig.IV.2). As discussed in ch.II, the extant manuscripts, Items.26, 27, 29 & 30 of the book list are $S^*$, $Fb$, $R14$ and Cambridge, CCC 264 respectively. The inclusion of John of Bromyard’s *Summa predicantium* [item 25] which is dated to 1350 suggests that the list itself could only have been written after 1350.³ It could possibly be an inventory of his books after his death, which may have occurred late in 1352, thus explaining the values placed alongside the list.⁴

---


⁴ For a facsimile of the book list see p.269.
### Fig.IV 2 The book list of Simon Bozoun, Prior of Norwich Cathedral (1344-1352)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libri fratris Symonis Bozoun</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Decreta [Gratian’s Decretem]</td>
<td>60s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Directorium iuris [Petrus Quesnel's Directorium iuris in foro conscientiae]</td>
<td>60s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summa Summarum [Willelmus de Pagula or William of Paull’s Summa summaram de iure canonico]</td>
<td>40s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alphabetum theologicum [A collection of distinctiones or John of Wales Alphabetum, uitae religiosae]</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tabula originalium</td>
<td>100s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Historia ecclesiastica et tripartita [Eusebius’ Historia Ecclesiastica and Cassiodorus’ Historia Tripartita]</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Crisostomus super Matthium [Either John Chrysostom’s Homiliae in Mattheum or the pseudo-Chrysostom’s Opus imperfectum in Matheum.]</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gydo super Sextum [Guido de Baysio’s Apparatus ad Sextum]</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Alchoran Machometi [probably the Latin translation by Robert of Ketton]</td>
<td>13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Liber gregoriensis [Either Gregory’s De cura pastorali or Garnier of Saint-Victor’s Gregorianum]</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Casus Bernardi [Bernard of Parma, Casus longi super Decretales]</td>
<td>8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Expositio regule sancti Benedicti [perhaps Bernard of Monte Cassino’s commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict.]</td>
<td>8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Innocentius super Decretalium [Innocent IV’s Apparatus in quinque libros Decretalium]</td>
<td>35s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Henricus Huntodonensis super Beati immaculati [not surviving copy of the work]</td>
<td>8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Veritates theologicae [Hugo Ripelinus Compendium theologiae veritatis]</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Speculum monachorum cum multis aliis [perhaps Bernard of Monte Cassino’s Speculum monachorum or Arnulfus de Boeriis’ Speculum monasticum]</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Flores Casciani cum aliis</td>
<td>4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tabula libri Moralphum cum aliis [Tabula to Gregory the Great’s Moralia in Iob]</td>
<td>13s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tabula super Speculum historiale [Tabula to Vincent of Beauvais’ Speculum historiale]</td>
<td>8s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tabula super Decretem [Tabula to the Gratian’s Decretum]</td>
<td>5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Prima pars Catholicon [John of Genoa’s Catholicon]</td>
<td>6s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ieronimus, Ysidorys, Genadius, de viris illustribus [Jerome’s De viris illustribus, Gennadius’ De viris illustribus and Isidore’s De viris illustribus]</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Frater Tho. Waleys de operibus papae Iohannis [Thomas of Waleys, no surviving copy]</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Postille super Apocalipsum</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Summa predicantum [John of Bromyard’s Summa praedicantum]</td>
<td>100s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Liber itinerarium [Corpus Christi College, 407]</td>
<td>40d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Cronica Westmonasteris [Bodleian, Fairfax 20]</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willelmus Malmesbiriensis [Perhaps the Gesta pontificum rather than the Gesta Regum as Bale saw a copy amongst the books of Robert Talbot.]</td>
<td>12s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Cronica monachi cestrensis cum aliis [BL, Royal 14 C XIII]</td>
<td>20s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Quidam de gestis Anglorum [Corpus Christi College 264]</td>
<td>10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Constitutiones provinciales.</td>
<td>6s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 A transcription of this list has been printed in GW, Opera, V, p.xxxix; the identification of the texts as shown in the list above are taken from CBMLC:IV, pp.300-304. This texts found within this list have also been listed in N. Ker, ‘Medieval Manuscripts from Norwich Cathedral Priory’ Books, Collectors and Libraries (London, 1985) pp.243-272 and in H. Beeching, ‘The Library of the Cathedral Church of Norwich’ with M.R. James ‘Priory Manuscripts now in English libraries’, Norfolk Archeology 19 (1915-1917) pp.67-116 (this article also contains a facsimile of the list).
The content within the four extant manuscripts shown below suggest a man with a keen interest in the past of his own kingdom and others, travel and the world around him.

i.] Oxford, Bodl. Bodley 264

This is the earliest of the surviving manuscripts. The attempted erasure of the word monachi within the inscription, ‘Liber fratrîs Symonis Bozoun’, suggests it was in his possession before his appointment as prior. The contents of the manuscript are:

1. Roger of Wendover, ‘De gestis tempore regis Iohannis fratrîs Ricardi regis scilicet ab anno gratie M.CXCIX ad annum regni regis Henrici filii ejusdem secundum’
2. Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum.

A quire, consisting of seven items relating to charters and indulgences granted to Norwich, precedes these two texts. However, they are written in a later hand and appear to have been combined together later. Furthermore, the inscription is written at the top of the excerpt from Roger of Wendover’s chronicle demarcating more clearly what may have belonged to Simon Bozoun.

ii.] Oxford, Bodl. Bodley, Fairfax 20[Fb]

This was a manuscript of ‘Matthew of Westminster’s’ Flores Historiarum with an index and setting as discussed in ch.II. The contents are:

1. Description of Rome
2. Description of England
3. Castles in Armenia
4. The seven miracles of the world
5. Miracles of England
6. ‘De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt’
7. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ About Bishop Gregory
8. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms
9. On the coronation of King Richard from Howden’s chronica
10. Henry of Huntingdon's prophecy of the Norman conquest
11. letter of Hugh bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely
12. 'De primo adventu in Yberniam'; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Howden.
13. fragment of the Flores Historiarum (from creation to 635)
14. letters patent of Edward III to Yarmouth dated 10 July 03 1333
15. Domesday extract relating to Yarmouth
16. A fragment from Roger of Wendover
17. List of the priors of Norwich until 1344
18. Incomplete index to the Flores Historiarium
19. A passage on early English history and some historical prophecies in rhyming Latin

However, it is possible as argued above that it was organised differently once and contained a number of other short treatises now found in Ce.  

iii.] Cambridge, CCC 407 [S*]

This manuscript, the Liber Itinerarium, with its unique witness account of Simon fitzSimon’s journey to Jerusalem alongside the Itinerary and the Relatio, has also been discussed above.  

iv.] London, BL, Royal 14 C XIII [L*]

The contents of this last manuscript are:

1. Ranulf Higden, Polychronicon
2. a selection of historical prefaces
3. Gerald of Wales' Expugnatio Hibernica
4. Jacques de Vitry, Historia Orientalis
5. Ordoric of Pordenone, Relatio
6. William of Rubruck, Itinerary

---

6 See pp.95-102.
7 See pp.264-265.
7. Pippino of Bologna’s c.1320 translation of Marco Polo, *De mirabilibus orientalium regionum*
8. Michael of Cornwall, *Invectiva contra magistrum Henricum Abrincensem*
9. Nicholas Trivet, *Commentary on St. Augustine’s De civitate Dei.*

The booklist and the contents of the extant manuscripts demonstrates that Simon Bozoun evidently liked the authority of the old and the new. The inclusion of canonical legal texts within a prior’s book-collection is unsurprising. The late-thirteenth-century obedientiary rolls from Norwich cathedral show the frequent copying of such texts for their various priors. In relation to these legal texts, his choices are mainly conservative; he had all the ‘old favourites’ such as Gratian’s *Decretum*, William of Pagula’s *Summa summarum de iure canonico* and Innocent IV’s *Apparatus in quinque libros Decretalium.* He also had in his possession the works of Guido de Baysio and Bernard of Parma.

In amongst the theological and preaching works, alongside more staple reading material such as, for example, John Chrysostom’s *Homilies on Matthew*, he was happy to include the works of his contemporaries such as Thomas Waleys and John of Bromyard. Furthermore, his collection lists some more unusual works, such as Henry of Huntingdon’s treatise on the Immaculate Conception, (Item.14) which, like Item.23 by Thomas of Waleys, has not survived. He was also the possessor of the sole witness of Simon fitzSimon’s pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

Simon Bozoun’s interest in the past also embraced the old and the new. He had the combined universal histories of Eusebius and Cassiodorus [Item.6], the biographical encyclopaedia of the church fathers as provided by Jerome and others in the *de viris illustribus* [Item.22] as well as a copy of Bede’s *HE*, and either William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Pontificum* or his *GRA*. Yet he also had the more recent *Flores Historiarum* with entries to 1307, as well as a copy of the first recension of Higden’s *Polychronicon* which had been completed in 1327.

---

8 See p.13 n.27.
Richard Southern listed a number of books which from the mid-twelfth century found themselves a permanent spot in any scholar’s collection: amongst these he listed Peter Lombard’s Sentences for theology, Gratian’s Decretum for Canon Law, the Glossa Ordinaria and Peter Comestor’s Historia Scholastica for studying the Bible, for grammar Peter Helias’ Summa and other Summae or Summulae for the study of rhetoric.¹⁰ This type of scholarly collection is certainly evident amongst the works of Simon Bozoun.

Roger Bacon, a century earlier, had called for education as a means to combat the antichrist, to approach the impending apocalypse prepared. He pleaded in his Opus Majus,

I know that if the Church should be willing to consider the sacred text and prophecies moreover the histories and the books of philosophers... it would gain some idea of greater certainty regarding the time of Antichrist.¹¹

He urged contemporary up-to-date information, and that the acquisition of a variety of languages was key to any possible success. Roger Bacon had led by example in his use of William of Rubruck and John of Plano Carpini’s contemporary accounts of the east. The other items in Simon Bozoun’s possession suggest that this was not a man with idle curiosity but one that would truly have been lauded by Roger Bacon as a man whose purpose was to understand this ultimate goal for any Christian: the impending doom of the apocalypse. For example, the inclusion of a Latin translation of the Qu’ran [Item.9] can be seen within this framework. Similarly, the inclusion of Nicholas Trevet’s commentary on Augustine’s De Civitate Dei in L* could offer an interesting insight into reading the unknown, especially in parts of the world that were deemed to have a more monstrous kind of people, particularly as Augustine espoused an inclusivity for all who were thought to be human, monstrous or not. This inclusivity within mankind would suggest that there was even greater possibility of conversion, in which case the

¹⁰ Southern, Making of the Middle Ages, p.196.
¹¹ Burke, OM, p.290
enemies of the apocalypse were as likely to be from within as outwith the accepted peoples of the world.

Simon Bozoun’s unmistakable interest in the East is seen not only in the contents of S* or Jacques de Vitry’s HO and Marco Polo’s account in L*, but also in the short extract on castles in Armenia. This is found in Fb (Item.27 of the book-list) and it has also been copied out again in the lower margin of f.19 of L* at the appropriate corresponding point in the geographical section of Ranulf Higden’s *Polychronicon*.

Aspects of the creation of L* and its relationship to S* further demonstrate Simon Bozoun’s active interest in these texts. If L* is considered to be a carefully choreographed codex, it offers a greater understanding of the manner in which the *Itinerary* was understood. The manuscript begins with Higden’s *Polychronicon*, the all encompassing popular universal history with its extensive topographical exploration to which the scribe of this codex added further excerpts concerning the ‘castles in Armenia’. Gerald of Wales’s *EH* was an exploration of the invasion of twelfth-century Ireland, the land believed to be the furthest west. It was counterbalanced by the abbreviated form of Jacques de Vitry’s HO, which also discussed conquest, albeit of the East. In this instance history, ethnography and topography, travel and exploration, as seen in all three of these texts, could be interpreted as being seen within a framework of expansion: Christian expansion. These are also the areas for which the main item in the codex, the *Polychronicon* was particularly deficient. For more recent events, Higden’s main strength was as a source for the English past. By adding William of Rubruck’s *Itinerary*, Ordoric of Pordenone’s *Relatio* and Marco Polo’s *De mirabilibus orientalium regionum* Simon Bozoun included the most current material available to him about the east, complementing what Higden had made available.

This codex must be understood as a whole. Robert Bartlett has suggested a European medieval world-view, as exemplified in the writings of Adam of Bremen of three concentric circles; certainly this idea can be juxtaposed quite neatly in relation to this codex.  

---

12 See pp.182-184 for argument regarding Simon Bozoun’s active interest in the creation of L*.  
13 Bartlett, Gerald, p.144.
Jerusalem the core centre, with its inclusion of England as equally central to any narrative created in England, together epitomising the known world; both of which would be fulfilled by the inclusion of *HO* and the *Polychronicon*. Second, a consideration of the peripheries of the known world, which two ‘reconnaissance’ texts such as Gerald of Wales’ examination of the first wave of English settlers in twelfth-century Ireland in the *EH* and the *Itinerary* in relation to the Mongols could seemingly fulfil. Finally, on the outer peripheries, verging on the unknown were Ordoric of Pordenone’s *Relatio* and Marco Polo’s *De mirabilibus* which not only offered realistic observations of the East but also fuelled views of the fantastic and mythical, further glorifying the ‘wonders of the East’ and the unknown.

Although the extent of Simon Bozoun’s engagement with the texts is unknown, with regards to his location he was well placed to receive such types of information. There appears to have been a tradition of interest in things eastern in the south east of England, from Matthew Paris in St. Albans collecting letters about the Mongols a century earlier, to a previous monk of Norwich, Bartholomew Cotton’s, interest in Armenia. Of course, this could also merely be a reflection of the wealth of the monastic houses in south-eastern England, which in general, had greater access to any sort of text.

Apart from the theological, and indeed eschatological, implications of such an interest, or the significance of these areas with regards to the possibility of conversion, other possible reasons for his interest in this material can also be considered. Was this an example of the pursuit of knowledge a practical purpose? Except for the travel account of Marco Polo, these accounts are all those of religious undertakings, missionary zeal or pilgrimages, or elucidations by churchmen for a very religious and sometimes political purpose, which could all be justified within a religious framework. There is no evidence that Simon himself was preparing for a journey, pilgrimage or otherwise, which could account for a more pragmatic reason for a collection of these texts. But then not only is our knowledge of his life scant, he was also prior of Norwich Cathedral during the highly devastating first wave of the plague. This could account for the scarcity of recorded information; there are virtually no obedientiary rolls during his time as prior.
Christian Zacher has argued for a changing notion of *curiositas* in fourteenth-century England, where gradual growing acceptance or perhaps even indulgence in *curiositas* was tolerated? Idle curiosity was not a matter to be indulged, yet was this a changing time when interest for interest’s sake could be allowed?\(^{14}\) Although Zacher’s ambiguous use of the word, and indeed the concept, does not make his a convincing argument, his examples of the growing general interest in the surrounding are useful to contextualise Simon Bozoun’s interest.

Possession is little guarantee of reading and interaction with the text, yet the close relationship of \(^{1}\) and \(^{2}\) show a greater awareness of these texts than mere possession. This fourteenth-century prior’s interests may have been unusual but were far from wholly unique. In fact, we do not need to look far to discover the somewhat similar interests of the anonymous author of the spurious *Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, written at around the same time.\(^{15}\) This is not an attempt to claim that dubious honour for Simon Bozoun – but if the key themes and concepts which arise from that text are examined, such as theology, pilgrimage, accounts of Jerusalem and the Mongols drawn heavily from Ordoric of Pordenone and Marco Polo, it offers a greater idea of the intellectual climate for reading such material at this time.

**John Erghome**

John Erghome, born in Yorkshire to a family in the East Riding, was an Italian-educated fourteenth-century scholar. He had been ordained acolyte at Gateshead by the bishop of Durham’s suffragan in 1353 and was likely to have been based initially at the Augustinian convent at Newcastle. He studied in Oxford, presumably at the Austin convent, and was at the York convent by 1372 when he witnessed the writing of the library catalogue. It is thought that he may have been the same ‘Johannes de Anglia’ who, in 1380, was admitted to the Faculty of Theology at Bologna. In 1385, it appears he became the master regent and prior of

---


the Augustinian friars at York. However, also in 1386, he became a regent, and *magister antiquus* (‘senior master’), at the studium of the Roman curia which was at the point based in Naples.\(^{16}\) As befitting his scholarly credentials, he is believed to have written a commentary on the prophetic verses attributed to John Thwing of Bridlington. It has also been suggested tentatively, that he may in fact have been the author of the prophecies themselves.\(^ {17}\)

On 8th September, 1372 a library catalogue was drawn up by the Augustinian Friars at York, now found in MS D.1.17 359 at Trinity College, Dublin. It was written in the presence of John Erghome, John Ketilwell, Richard Thorpe, John Appleby, and the prior, William Staynton. A part chained-library, the Austin friars’ collection as a whole demonstrates the vast transmission of knowledge from within England and elsewhere in Europe. Although, the library catalogue confirms the extensive nature of their book collection, sadly only nine of the 647 codices listed survive. A distinctive feature within this catalogue is its organisation by subject, denoted by the various subheadings (see Fig.IV.3). Within each category space was left for later additions. Our knowledge of John Erghome’s collection stems from the wide array of books he gave to the convent at York on his return from Italy. Indeed, Aubrey Gwynn suggests that the catalogue was created under John Erghome’s influence, which may perhaps explain the ease with which he added his own collection to it.\(^ {18}\)

A further distinctive feature of this catalogue is the inclusion of every text within a codex rather than a list constituted solely of the first text or the most important text within a manuscript. A distinguishing system was used with a different capital letter for each subsection – however, this does not seem to have corresponded with a similar pressmark system. Furthermore, although all the contents of the codex are mentioned, it is clear that the


\(^{17}\) Sharpe, *Latin Authors*, p.220, p.242, Humphrey disagrees with this p.xxix; see P. Meyvaert, ‘John Erghome and the Vaticinium Roberti Bridlington’, *Speculum*, Vol. 41, No. 4. (Oct., 1966), pp. 656-664, who also refutes the argument that John Erghome may have been the author of the prophecies as suggested by Tanner and Wright.

categorization was not always made from the first item of the manuscript, although this could be the case, but from the text considered significantly important.

The key donors to this collection were John Erghome and John Bukwode due to the sheer size of their donations.¹⁹ John Erghome has entries under all but four of the category headings.²⁰ The Erghome entries were written, for the main part, in a separate hand, perhaps John Erghome’s own. However, it is possible that it was added contemporaneously with the catalogue. Of the nine extant manuscripts, five bear inscriptions with his name. A sixth, Bodleian MS Bodley 842 may have belonged to Erghome although it does not bear an inscription with his name and was later in the possession of John Gylling from the Cistercian monastery at Byland in 1477.

¹⁹ Other listed donors or owners of book in this collection are A. Bossal, Gysburne, I. Byrkwood, Henry Teesdale and Thomas Grove.
²⁰ The categories under which there are no Erghome entries are: ‘Hystorie Scolastice’ ‘Concordancie et interpretaciones nominum Hebreorum’, ‘Logicalia et philosophia cum scriptis et commentis’ ‘Hystorie et cronice’: however these omissions can be explained. The ‘Hystorie Scolastice’ sub-heading referred to one text, Peter Comestor’s Historia Scholastica of which the house already had three copies. The lack of entries under ‘Hystorie et cronice’ can be explained by the additional category of ‘Historia Gencium’ of which almost all entries were Erghome-derived texts. The lack of Erghome contributing a Biblical concordance when the convent already had four is unremarkable and similarly the lack of entries under ‘Logicalia et philosophia cum scriptis et commentis’ may simply be because all thirty-eight of his works on philosophy were entered under the sub-heading ‘philosophia’.

John Erghome evidently had a vast and varied collection of reading material available to him. For this study it is the category of ‘Historie gentium’ that is of paramount interest. His

---

nineteen books in the ‘Historia gencium’ categories were surpassed quantitatively only in the
categories of canon law, sermons and sermon material, grammar, works of Philosophy,
astronomy, medicine and the patristic texts or ‘originalia.’

Evidence of his possession of a copy of the *TH* is found within the *Historia Gencium*
category. John Erghome’s decision to create a separate sub-heading instead of amalgamating
these nineteen texts under the ‘Hystorie et cronice’ subheading is marked. This is particularly
so because of the duplication of titles within the two categories. Amongst the texts listed in the
later category were Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum Historiale*, Higden’s *Polychronicon*,
Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB*, the *Chronica Pontificum* of Martinus Polonus, Eusebius’
*Chronicon*, Gildas or perhaps Nennius’ *De gestis Brittonum*. His books found within his
‘historia gencium’ category (see table below) would not have been out of place here.

![Fig.IV 4 John Erghome's books: the ‘Historia Gentium’ category]{22}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position in list (James nos.)</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Entry as listed in the catalogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HG no.154</td>
<td>Ranulf Higden</td>
<td><em>Polychronicon</em></td>
<td>‘Policronica Radulphi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.155</td>
<td>Valerius Maximus</td>
<td><em>Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri</em></td>
<td>‘Valerius Maximus’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 i</td>
<td>Geoffrey of Monmouth</td>
<td><em>Historia Regum Britanniae</em></td>
<td>‘Hystoria Britonum Galfridi Manamutensis’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 ii</td>
<td>?Bede</td>
<td>?'De locis sanctis'</td>
<td>‘distinciones regnorum anglie’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 iii</td>
<td>?Bede</td>
<td>?'De locis sanctis'</td>
<td>‘de situ terrae hierosolimitana et habitantibus in ea’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 iv</td>
<td>Nennius</td>
<td><em>Gesta Britonum</em></td>
<td>‘Gesta britonum a Gylda sapiente composita’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 v</td>
<td>Geoffrey of Monmouth</td>
<td><em>Propheita Merlyni</em></td>
<td>‘quedam prophetic Merlyni’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 vi</td>
<td>Robert Grosseteste,</td>
<td><em>Testamenta xii patriarcharum</em></td>
<td>‘Testamenta xii patriarcharum a Roberto Lincol’ translata’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop of Lincoln trans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 vii</td>
<td>Petrus Alfonsi</td>
<td><em>Disciplina clericalis</em></td>
<td>‘petrus alfonsi de suis fabulis’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 viii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘de morte nobillissimi regis arthuri’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 ix</td>
<td>Helinand of Froidmant</td>
<td><em>Chronicon</em></td>
<td>‘flores elynandi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘distinccio regionum’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG no.156 xi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘quedam narraciones’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 The items in bold denote the start of a new grouping of texts. The identification of texts is based on the article by M.R. James listed above and *CBMLC:1*, pp.11-154.
| HG no. 156 xii | Dictys Cretensis | De Bello Troiano | ‘Expositio diccionum de historia Britonum’ |
| HG no. 157 i  | ?Cicero         | Synonima         | ‘dictis effymeides de bello troiano libri 6’ |
| HG no. 157 ii |                |                | ‘synonima chitheronis’ |
| HG no. 158    | Julius Celsus  | Vita Julii Caesaris | ‘Julius celsus de gestis caesaris libri 8’ |
| HG no. 159 i  | Solinus        | Collectanea rerum mirabilium | ‘SOLON GAIUS IULIUS DE MIRABILIBUS’ |
| HG no. 159 ii | ?Albertus Magnus | speculum astronomie | ‘speculum astronomie’ |
| HG no. 159 iii| ?Elpryisius    | ?Helperic of Grandval | ‘Elprysius de astronomia’ |
| HG no. 159 iv |                |                | ‘argaphalon chaldeus’ |
| HG no. 159 v  |                |                | ‘breviarium alhandrei’ |
| HG no. 159 vi | ?Cicero        | De Rhetorica    | ‘tractatus de rethorica’ |
| HG no. 159 vii|                |                | ‘expositio super epistolam Jeronimi ad Paulinam’ |
| HG no. 160    | Justinus       | Epitoma historiarum Pompei Trogi | ‘Justinus in abbreviacion trogi pompeibili’ |
| HG no. 161 i  | Severus Sulpicius | Chronica      | ‘chronica severa sulpicii libro 2’ |
| HG no. 161 ii | Paul the Deacon | Historia Langobardorum | ‘paulus de Gestis longbardum libri 6’ |
| HG no. 161 iii| ?Bernard      | Itinera Hierosolymitana | ‘Itinerarium Bernardi de locis sanctis’ |
| HG no. 161 iv | Bede            | De locis sanctis | ‘Epitoma bede de locis sanctis’ |
| HG no. 162 i  | Vegetius       | De re militari  | ‘Vegecius de re militari libri 4’ |
| HG no. 162 ii | Livy            | Epitoma de Tito Livio | ‘Liber agni flor’ |
| HG no. 162 iii|                | Gariopontus or attr. Galen Dynamdiarium | ‘Galeni diameiarum libri tres’ |
| HG no. 163 i  | Dares Phrygius | Historia de excidio Troie | ‘Dares frigius de bello troiano’ |
| HG no. 163 ii | Bernard de Gordon | De Flebotima | ‘Bernardus de Gordonia de fleobitoma’ |
| HG no. 163 iii| Rufinus of Aquileia | Historia Monachorum | Historia Monachorum |
| HG no. 163 iv | Gildas          | De excidio britanniae | ‘Gildas de excidio britannie’ |
| HG no. 163 v  | Joachim of Fiore | Super apocalypsim | ‘Joachim super apocalypsim’ |
| HG no. 163 vi | Joachim of Fiore |                | ‘de concordencia(?) testamentorum’ |
| HG no. 163 vii| Joseph Iscarius of Exeter |        | ‘Dares frugius versificatus’ |
| HG no. 164    | Bede            | Historia Ecclesiastica de gentis Anglorum | ‘Beda de gestis anglorum libri 5’ |
| HG no. 165 i  | Feculph        | Hystoria frethulphi | ‘Hystoria frethulphi episcopie usque christium libri 7 eiusdem post Christium libri 5’ |
| HG no. 165 ii |                |                | ‘Hystoria abbreviata a principio mundi usque ad annum Christi 1287’ |
| HG no. 165 iii|                |                | ‘hystoria ab adventu anglorum usque christi 1357’ |
| HG no. 166 i  | Sallust        | de bello Catilinario | ‘Salustius in cathelinanio’ |
| HG no. 166 ii | Sallust        | de bello Jugurthinum | ‘Sallust de bello Jugurtino’ |
| HG no. 166 iii| Lucan          |                | ‘Lucasius de bello civili in 10 li (?)’ |
| HG no. 166 iv | Cicero | Somnium Scipionis | ‘Tullius in sompnum sipionis’ |
| HG no. 166 v | Macrobius | Commentary on the Somnium Scipionis | ‘Macrobius super sompnum sipionis’ |
| HG no. 167 i | Paulus Orosius | Historiae adversum paganos | ‘Orosius de ormente mundi libri 7’ |
| HG no. 167 ii | Antoninus Placentinus attr. | Itinerarium | ‘Libellus de locis quos ambulavit S. Antonii’ |
| HG no. 168 | Hugh of Fleury attr. Ivo of Chartres | Historia | ‘Hystoria hugonis floriacensis sive yuonis carnotensis’ |
| HG no. 169 i | Anon. | Speculum cronicon | ‘Speculum cronicon’ |
| HG no. 169 ii | | | ‘expositio Bede quondam nominum de temporibus’ |
| HG no. 169 iii | Bede | | ‘Kalendarium Bede cum quibusdam tabulis’ |
| HG no. 169 iv | Bede | De Temporibus | ‘Liber Bede de temporibus in cronica sua’ |
| HG no. 170 i | Gerald of Wales | Topographia Hibernia | ‘Topographia hybernie Geraldi’ |
| HG no. 170 ii | | | ‘vocabularium super alphabetu, cum 14 alii tractatibus’ |
| HG no. 171 i | Sallust | de bello Catilinario | ‘Liber Saluste in Catelinam’ |
| HG no. 171 ii | Cicero | Invectivarum | ‘Tullie invectivarum cum alii libri quator’ |
| HG no. 172 | Pseudo-Hegesippus | De excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae | Egesippus |

The other contents of the manuscript of the TH appear to be a theological alphabet (something similar perhaps to John of Wales, Ordinarium sive Alphabetum vitae religiosae) and a set of fourteen short treatises. Evidently none of these treatises appear adequately distinctive to be listed individually. Overall, of the items listed here, at least the first items which appear to have been the main reason for inclusion in this section share the following characteristic: none offer portrayals of recent events. Although the Polychronicon is an exception, its ultimate role as a universal history in a form similar to Eusebius’ Chronicon, Orosius’ Historia and Freculph’s Historia allows it a place in the understanding of the origins and ways of people. The inclusion of no.170, a work relating to chronology and time is a theme shared by the subsequent treatises by Bede. There is a showing of classical texts by Cicero, Sallust and Vegetius, which present a combined message on the art of warfare, rhetoric and a wealth of ethnographic observations and events. Furthermore, substantial attention is paid to Trojan origin myths in the form of the texts of Dictys Cretensis, Dares Phrygus and Justinus, which is relatively updated by the introduction of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s HRB and what may be considered as Geoffrey’s continental French counterpart in Hugh of Fleury’s Historia. For more home-grown items Bede’s HE was available. For the more general overviews,
particularly of marvels and wonders, the encyclopaedic works of Valerius Maximus and Solinus’ *Collectanea* was accessible.

The *TH* fits easily within this category. It shared the ethnographical, topographical and martial observations of the earlier classical texts. It attempted to fit the Irish into the universal Christian chronology in Bk. III of the *TH* when it began with the first settlers of Ireland led by Caesarea. It paid lip service to the Trojan origin myth within which framed one of the key points of the *TH*, the superiority and claim of the English. Furthermore, like Bede’s *HE*, its focus was more local and like the *Polychronicon* it was both relatively local and relatively contemporary. Albeit on a smaller scale, like the *Collectanea* and *Factorum* it offered a selection of anecdotes of natural history, allegories and examples of vice and virtue by which to learn.

Most significantly, the *TH* was not placed in the two other category available to it – that of possible sermon material or ‘Hystorie et cronice’. Not having the extant manuscript is a great disadvantage, for perhaps if it were the first recension of the *TH*, with fewer digressions it perhaps would not, and could not, be considered for anything else but the category *historiae gencium*.

**John Gunthorpe**

Exploring the reading interests of John Gunthorpe is, in part, an exercise in understanding the impact of the *studia humanitatis* in fifteenth-century England. Gunthorpe has been cited as one who saw the advantages of the *studia humanitatis* and whose career was helped by this interest in humanistic learning. Certainly as a term, ‘humanism’ is a later concept; but the *studia humanitatis* was led by the idea of studying grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry and moral philosophy through the classical Greek and Latin texts. What perhaps was different from similar medieval approaches was the self-conscious manner in which it was
done, made possible because of the increased number of available classical Greek and Latin texts.\textsuperscript{23}

Cecil Clough has suggested that his surname, Gunthorpe, originates as a toponym of Lincolnshire origin, however little is known of John’s early years.\textsuperscript{24} The record of his academic achievements begins with his M.A from Cambridge which he gained in 1452. By 1454-1455 he had become a junior proctor at Cambridge. A note in a copy of Seneca’s \textit{tragediae}, which Gunthorpe himself completed copying in August 1460, using a newer humanistic script, suggests that he was studying poetry in a ‘studio’ in Ferrara. There he studied under a prominent scholar Gaurino de Verona until Gaurino’s death in 1460. His attendance at Guarino’s lectures was for the study of Greek and Rhetoric, during which time he met John Free. Free, another prominent English scholar, shared with Gunthorpe the patronage of William Grey, bishop of Ely (1454-1478), who had been one of the earliest Englishmen to study with Gaurino.\textsuperscript{25} John Gunthorpe’s subsequent move to Rome, where he became minor penitentiary for the English nation and then a papal chaplain on 28 January 1462, is thought to have been at Free’s instigation. Indeed, when Free died young in October 1465, a number of his books are said to have been passed to Gunthorpe. Clough also proposes that Gunthorpe’s appointment as a penitentiary indicates that he may have had a degree in Canon law, perhaps from Bologna.\textsuperscript{26}

It was also in 1465 that John Gunthorpe returned to England, and became the warden of King’s Hall in Cambridge.\textsuperscript{27} Having gained favour within royal circles, his next positions were within the king’s household as chaplain and secretary to the queen, Elizabeth Woodville, after which he was made a clerk of parliament. On Richard III’s ascension to the throne in 1483 Gunthorpe was made keeper of the Privy Seal, a post which he held until 1485. Under

\textsuperscript{26} Clough, ‘Late fifteenth-century’, pp. 310-312; Weiss, \textit{Humanism}, pp.109-11
Richard, John Gunthorpe was also made the Dean of the King’s Chapel of the Household on February 28th 1483.28

Despite the changing tides in political allegiances, throughout those turbulent years Gunthorpe continued in prominent service. Henry VII pardoned him and sent him on a number of diplomatic missions. This was not a new responsibility; he had undertaken such assignments for Henry VI and Richard III. For example, in 1468 he travelled as a royal envoy, declaiming at the marriage of Charles the Bold of Burgundy to the English princess, Margaret of York.29 His study of such works as Agostino Dati’s *Elegantoliae*, of which his Louvain printed edition is selectively marked, had kept him in good stead for his official duties. However, like other Englishmen interested in the *studia humanistica* in the fifteenth century he has been criticised for having done little to spread the more ‘modern’ approach’.30

Did this humanist approach offer a difference in attitude to the *TH* from other earlier owners/readers of this text? In the absence of a record of his thoughts, can his literary interests as seen in his extant book collection offer an indication of his interest in the *TH*? Even though Clough claims that there are twenty-three manuscripts and nine incunables extant, in the absence of a list I have only been able to locate eight of the incunabula. Furthermore, although twenty-three manuscripts have been identified, I can only presume these are the same manuscripts that Clough had located. These identifications and provenance information have been gathered together from library catalogues, primarily those of the Cambridge colleges and through internet searches of library catalogues. However, as a systematic search of catalogues has not been undertaken, one which would include all known catalogues of medieval manuscripts, it is likely that there are as yet more of John Gunthorpe’s manuscripts to be identified.

28 W.H.Flood, ‘Gilbert Banaster, Master of the Children of the English Chapel Royal (1478-1490)’, Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft Musikgesellschaft (1913) p. 64; W.H. Flood, ‘Henry Abyndon, Mus. Bac., CHirmaster of the King’s Chapel, in 1455’ *The Musical Times*, vol. 52 n. 82 (1911), p. 378; Flood wrongly assumed that because he was replaced on 14th May 1483 that this was also the year of his death; For citations to John Gunthorpe in the Parliament Rolls see, *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England 1275-1504*, vol. 14 ed. C. Given-Wilson et al. (Woodbridge, London; 2005) pp. 12, 349, 405, 409, 420.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
<th>Date/Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 164</td>
<td>Polychronicon, Biblia Pauperum</td>
<td>bought for 4s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Jesus College, 49 (Q.G.1)</td>
<td>Selections from Augustine</td>
<td>bought by J.G. in 1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Sidney Sussex 46</td>
<td>Albertus Magnus, De animalibus libri xvi</td>
<td>c. xv late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, St. John’s College C.11</td>
<td>Socrates, Nicholas Perotti and Plutarch</td>
<td>c. xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, St. John’s College 60 (C.10)</td>
<td>T. Livius Frulovisiensis etc.,</td>
<td>c. xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College 824 (R.9.23)</td>
<td>Macrobius, De Somno Scipionis etc.,</td>
<td>c. xii; bought in London in 1469 for 5s 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Univ. Library Dd.10.29</td>
<td>Vulgate Bible</td>
<td>who listed this with J.G?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Univ. Library Dd.7.1</td>
<td>Jerome Opera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Univ. Library Dd.7.2</td>
<td>Jerome Opera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Univ. Library Ff.6.20</td>
<td>Vulgate Bible</td>
<td>Originally given by J.G. to Jesus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Univ. Library Mm.3.4</td>
<td>Homer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Emmanuel 1.1.3</td>
<td>Bede, Historia Ecclesiastica, Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica</td>
<td>copied for J.G. in 1481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Library, Ellesmere 34 B 6</td>
<td>Persius and Juvenal</td>
<td>c. xv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. IX</td>
<td>prophetiae Merlin, Ralph de Diceto, Opuscula,</td>
<td>c. xiv; bought c.14*3 (1483? 1493?) for 10s at Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 2485</td>
<td>Seneca, Tragediae</td>
<td>Copied from Guarino's own manuscript by J.G. scribe in 1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 654</td>
<td>Orosius, Paul the deacon, Historia Romana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 9.E.1</td>
<td>Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics; Commentary by Thomas Aquinas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Lambeth Palace 425</td>
<td>Horace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian, Bodl. 587</td>
<td>Ps.Cicero, Sinonima, 'Dialectica', 'Rhetorica' and 'Orationes Legatines'</td>
<td>Manuscript includes J.G's own writings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, B. N. lat. 6729</td>
<td>a 'Renaissance' miscellany</td>
<td>1473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sion College, London Arc.L.40.2/L.21</td>
<td>Suetonius, de XII Caesarius, 'geneologia regnum Francorum', Einhard, Vita Karoli, a genealogy to Lothar, Visio Karoli, Carolingian and Capetian regnal lists to 1017, extracts from Aulus Gellius.</td>
<td>c. xii; bought from the Dominicans at Northampton in 1484 for 20s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sion College, London Arc.L.40.2/L.23</td>
<td>Johannes Damascenus, De Fide orthodoxa (the version corrected by Robert Grosseteste), collection of short theological tracts some anonymous, others attributable to Augustine, Gennadius and Ambrose.</td>
<td>c.xiv; acquired in 1484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale, Beinecke Library, Marston MS4</td>
<td>Cicero, De officiiis, De oratore, etc.</td>
<td>c. xv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: John Gunthorpe's Printed Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed books</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Place of publication/ date of purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wells, Dean and Chapter of Wells, B.I.20</td>
<td>Pliny, <em>Natural History</em></td>
<td>printed in Strasbourg, bought in London 7th February 1475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Inc. 3709</td>
<td>Cicero, <em>De paradoxa</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Inc. 3710</td>
<td>Cicero, <em>De amicitie</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Inc. 3711</td>
<td>Cicero, <em>De officiis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library 3.F.2.2 (3184)</td>
<td><em>De officiis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library 3.F.2.2 (3180)</td>
<td><em>De amicitia</em>, <em>De senectute</em></td>
<td>Louvain, 1483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intriguingly, of the non-classical texts, most were contained in twelfth- to fourteenth-century manuscripts bought second-hand. 1484 appears to have been a significant year for such purchases. He bought: Sion College, London Arc.L.40.2/L.23, a selection of theological treatises; Sion College, London Arc.L.40.2/L.21, a twelfth-century manuscript relating to Charlemagne and regnal lists of Carolingian and Capetian kings bought from the Dominicans at Northampton for 20s, as well as; Cambridge, Jesus College, 49 (Q.G.1) which was a selection of treatises by Augustine. The other non-classical items also enter into his possession around this time. Cambridge, Sidney Sussex 46 which is Albertus Magnus’ *De Animalibus* is a late manuscript which may have been purchased or commissioned by him. Similarly, he also owned another selection of histories, that of Orosius’ *Adversus Paganos*, Paul the Deacon’s *Historia Romana*. As well as the two-part *Opera* of Jerome in Dd.7.1 & Dd.7.2, he also bought a copy of the *Polychronicon*, at what could only have been a bargain price of 4s 4d. He bought another manuscript, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. IX, for 10s at Westminster. The date for this purchase has been suggested as 1493, however the last two numbers are obscured and therefore it remains undated. This too contained works of history and also included the *Prophetiae Merlini* and Ralph de Diceto’s *Opuscula*. This manuscript, as it stands today, is
considerably larger as it includes the chronicle of Thomas Sprott. This was however a
sixteenth-century amalgamation of texts. Therefore, \( E \) by the very fact that it was
commissioned by him is fairly unique.

Eight incunabula and eleven of his manuscripts demonstrate his interests in the classical
texts. It must be stressed that not all of these had been previously unavailable. In an attempt to
bolster his humanistic credentials the continued interest in the medieval texts in his possession
appear to be largely ignored by scholars.

Although there is a copy of Orosius’ universal history, *Adversus paganos*, there is no
over-arching implicit apocalyptic dimension to his reading interest, apart perhaps from the
collection of Merlin-related prophecies. However, these were prophecies that had a more local
slant which the accompanying contemporary narrative accounts of Ralph de Diceto may have
helped to explain.

From the works he was amassing, it is evident that he was attempting to gain an
understanding of the past of different regions and even different time periods. He was
interested in the Carolingian empire and Capetian France, Lombardy, England through the
accepted staples of Bede and the *Polychronicon* and the *TH* for Ireland. His interest in natural
history as manifested by his ownership of a copy of Pliny’s *Natural History* and the *de
animalibus* of Albertus Magnus must be considered in relation to the *TH* and the similar sort of
material which would have been available to him within its covers. It is needless to stay that
Gerald would have been overjoyed by the value placed on his text by John Gunthorpe,
particularly being placed alongside some of the classical authors whom Gerald himself had
revered. Gerald’s boastful prophecy to William of Montibus with regards to the *Topographia
Hibernica* had certainly rung true.

****

Simon Bozoun, John Gunthorpe and John Erghome, belonged to a privileged educated
elite. These three men also were also respectively a monk, mendicant and cleric, yet, despite
their different affiliations, there was a place for the TH (in whatever form) in amongst all their collections and interest. All three men were interested in the origins of people as seen by the various works in their possession. Indeed, for John Erghome, this may have been the primary reason for his interest in the TH. For Simon Bozoun, owning two copies of the Itinerary fitted into the wider framework of his interests and collection.

It is striking how small a percentage of the recorded texts belonging to Simon Bozoun and John Erghome have survived. In the absence of a similar medieval list for John Gunthorpe, it is tempting to wonder if the known extant manuscripts and early-printed books were but a fraction of a much greater collection. Although the examination of the wider interests of a medieval book-owner is key to understanding the various aspects of a text’s reception – it is neither conclusive nor is ever likely to offer a comprehensive view of the text’s reception. Nevertheless, it offers scope towards contextualising possible interests in a text.
CONCLUSION

Examining the medieval textual afterlives of the *TH* and *Itinerary* offers one of the many contributory ways in which English interest and attitudes to the peripheries of their known world can be assessed. The two texts were found in similar surroundings, almost always within religious institutions, but were of interest for a variety of reasons. Those who offered responses to these texts, by using the texts within their own narratives, by commenting on the text or acknowledging their familiarity with the text, or even simply by combining the text with others in their possession, were likely to have been people who had had similar experiences and expectations. The reliance on relatively few known reactions to each text has certainly been restrictive, as has the poor survival rates of medieval manuscripts. Thus, a study such as this can only ever claim to be a partial examination of the transmission, dissemination and reception. Nevertheless, some interesting patterns emerge regarding the reasons for the copying or possession of these texts, as detected by their use or the texts with which they are found.

The medieval transmission, dissemination and reception of the *TH* and the *Itinerary* have long deserved serious study. While the findings here have been largely unsurprising, it has been a valuable exercise as much of the perceived dissemination and reception of both texts has been based on assumption. The proximity of Ireland and the fluctuating political relationship between the English crown and Ireland perhaps guaranteed for Gerald’s *TH* a continued interest well beyond his lifetime. However, the nature of that interest within medieval England has in part been presumed through the well-documented influence and use of the *TH* in the sixteenth-century which provided such stark negative stereotypes of the Irish.

For the *Itinerary*, this study reclaims it from relegation to a mere repository of facts about the Mongols or even European attitudes to the Mongols and, instead, allows it to be examined within its own time. This was a text of interest whose dissemination while not extensive was certainly lively. There has often been a sly conceit within scholarly observations relating to its reception. On one hand it is praised for being the most vivid self-conscious medieval portrayal of an unknown group of people, more similar to how ‘we’ would go about appraising a community of people in terms of detail and organisation of subject matter. Yet, this apparent ‘modernity’ of
thought is then blamed for the supposed lack of interest in the *Itinerary* during the Middle Ages, suggesting implicitly that it was perhaps too ‘advanced’ for the medieval mind to grasp. However, examining the actual manuscript dissemination, particularly the newly identified Yale manuscript, strips away at these notions that the transmission of the *Itinerary* was virtually non-existent, primarily English, and only within a century of the author’s lifetime.

The pattern of manuscript transmission was certainly different for both texts. There were a number of versions of the *TH* available, including the odd example transcribed during Gerald’s lifetime that appears to have been copied from a combination of two of the different versions. Yet, it is also clear that two versions, *Rec. A*, the earliest and most concise, and *Rec. D* survive in greater numbers of manuscripts from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The intermediary *Rec.BC* appears to have been often the source version for those extrapolating portions of the text for the collections of excerpts. The lack of textual variation in the manuscripts of the *Itinerary* could suggest that it did indeed have a very limited circulation. This still does not negate the value of examining the influence of the *Itinerary* through the study of its dissemination and reception.

An important aspect of this study has been to establish a geography of textual availability. Despite an international reputation, the surviving manuscripts confirm that Gerald’s *TH* was best known in England. Although available throughout the country, certain clusters of interest in York, East Anglia and the south are conspicuous. The dissemination of both texts, despite the disparity in the numbers of extant manuscripts, highlights the geographical dominance of the religious institutions in East Anglia and the southeast in collecting diverse books. This reflects both the wealth of these institutions and their ability to indulge a variety of interests, as well as the easy access to these texts accorded to the antiquarian collectors of the sixteenth century thus ensuring their subsequent survival. During the authors’ lifetimes and the successive two centuries the two texts were primarily available to people of high social standing. Popes, kings, bishops, priors and scholars numbered amongst those who were aware of these texts, even if not necessarily always intricately familiar with them.
In comparing the two texts, immediately noticeable is the impact of self-promotion on the dissemination of the *TH*. Although numerous changes were made to the *TH*, many of these appear to have been finalised within little more than a decade of it first being finished, unlike the thirty years or so suggested by Dimmock. The early collections in which the *TH* are found, such as *A33, Do, C, Bb*, and *A44*, demonstrate the ease with which the *TH* was added and removed from manuscript collections. Much of the early transmission of the *TH* was on loosely bound, easily portable booklets. As many of these late-twelfth/early-thirteenth manuscripts are suspected to have been closely associated with Gerald, this reinforces the view as suggested by Brian Scott and Catherine Rooney that their dispersal in that form at Gerald’s own initiative cannot be discounted. William of Rubruck’s apparent lack of ambition could be one underlying explanation for the relatively fewer extant manuscripts of the *Itinerary*. Perhaps in William of Rubruck we find a medieval author who truly embodied the humility which so many others falsely claimed. This should not, however, be overemphasised for we do not know of a similar element of self-promoted propagation for the *Relatio* of Odoric of Pordenone which survives in a vast number of medieval manuscripts. Yet, like Marco Polo’s account, Odoric of Pordenone’s was narrated and written by another. And, like John of Plano Carpini, Odoric was already famous within the Franciscan order, gaining an audience with the Pope to discuss his journey on his return, which may explain the wider dissemination of the *Relatio*.

This study demonstrates that there were specific strands of interest relating to the use of, and interest in, the *TH* and *Itinerary*. Both texts’ had immense political, eschatological, educational, geographical and ethnographical significance. Reading the *TH* and/or the *Itinerary* allowed the reader to delineate the Christian world or perhaps understand the geographical limits of an expanding Christianizing world, to interpret marvels, cull exempla for sermons, understand the past and pertinent origin myths, gain a political or military advantage over a possible enemy or ally, or to explore the social norms of a different people. These, therefore, were all reasons to turn to either the *TH* or the *Itinerary*.

The political significance of the *TH* was in its origin myths and its justification of Henry II’s right to Ireland. Philip of Slane’s use of the *TH* as a form of defence for Edward II against the Irish princes is the best example of this type of use. However, the combined extracts of the
TH and EH which circulated independently, and Ranulf Higden’s manipulation of the order of the TH within Bk.I of his Polychronicon which also stress English superiority and claim to Ireland further this message. It may therefore be of little surprise that Stephen Lawless, the Anglo-Irish subprior of St. Mary’s Dublin would have a combination of excerpts, which stressed this English legitimacy to rule, written immediately before his copy of the Polychronicon.

The changing approach to the Mongols may have played a role in determining the readership of the Itinerary. The mid-thirteenth-century dissemination of information regarding the Mongols was swift and wide reaching. The early manuscripts coincide with a time of practical need for information about the Mongols, and this is clearly established in Roger Bacon’s use of the Itinerary, Simon de Montfort’s possible interest in it, and of course Louis IX’s initial desire for such knowledge. It is tempting to see the extant late-thirteenth century copies as representative of the interest in Mongol alliances at the time. Roger Bacon’s use of the Itinerary to offer a political and religious warning in the Opus Majus was also evident, but so too were the eschatological implications of his use of the Itinerary.

Examining the TH’s medieval reception highlights that the greatest interest was in its descriptions of marvels. It was for its marvels that it was used by fourteenth-century scholars in CM2 and G and for which it was recommend within preaching guides. Yet this aspect of the text was also important to Bartholomew the Englishman, Ranulf Higden and Walter Bower. The content of the Itinerary while erudite may have lacked in more sensationalised appeal because of the lack of such descriptions. The Mongols were depicted as well organised and fearsome and an ever-present threat. Pierre Chanau comparing John of Plano Carpini’s Histora Mongalorum and the Itinerary calls the Itinerary ‘a similarly disturbing account’ in its ‘realistic’ approach and suggests that the success of Marco Polo’s account, and others of a similar ilk like Odoric of Pordenone’s Relatio and the Travels of Sir John Mandeville, was because it ‘presented an outdated picture of the Far East which comforted the worried Europe of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries’.

An explanation of the influence of these texts on contemporary ethnographic perceptions of the Irish and Mongols is more problematic. For the Itinerary the responses are few and highly

---

1 P. Chaunu, European Expansion in the later Middle Ages (Amsterdam, 1979) pp.75,77.
individualistic. This is compounded by the confusion relating to the ambiguous use of titles for similar texts about the Mongols, and the availability of other contemporary texts about the Mongols such as the Historia Mongalorum or the use of John of Plano Carpini’s Historia Mongalorum in Vincent of Beauvais’ Speculum Historiale. If the known responses can be projected on to a wider audience, then it is likely to have had an impact with regards to alerting medieval Europe to the dangers of Mongol hegemony, offering information about the diversity of religious thought and the possibilities of alliances and the expansion of Christendom. For the TH, it is equally problematic, albeit for different reasons. For example, in Walter Bower’s Scottichronicon the TH is used to describe Ireland but here its more positive ethnographic descriptions were appropriated for the Scots, due to their perceived affinity with the Irish. There were certainly fewer extensive texts written about the Irish in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries from which impressions could be gleaned, yet actual experience or knowledge of the Irish people and Ireland was more likely. This may perhaps explain why although positive and negative aspects of the Irish people could be discussed in the works of Ranulf Higden and Walter Bower, Gerald’s examples of bestial activity and their offspring is largely expunged.

Furthermore, in chapter III, certain manuscripts have highlighted the importance of organisation within the codex itself. An interesting feature of some of the fourteenth-century collections is the paradigm of the medieval world-view as seen in the structure and choice of content. F/D*, Sc, L* and Cl, reflects an intellectual interest in the world and places and people of the world. Textually, they move their readers through the medieval world, from one geographical extreme to another, thus symbolically offering the armchair traveller their very own pilgrimage through the pages of the manuscript. Similarly noteworthy is that these texts pay scant attention to continental Europe. In F/D* and Cl it is the peripheries of the known world which are of utmost importance. In Sc and L*, alongside these more peripheral portions of the world are also two additional prominent locations: England and Jerusalem. Also evident is the clear attempt made to weave in newer material about the east within the existing literary tradition of geographical/ethnographical knowledge. In S, three contemporary accounts of the East are joined together with Bk. XV of Bartholomew the Englishman’s DPR which offered the more established view of the world and its people.
Some collections indicate the use of the *TH* as a means of understanding the past and the origins of people, not only of the Irish but also of the Scots. This is particularly seen in the late-fourteenth-century northern collection of Robert Popoulton. The recognition of *TH* as an ideal source for origin myths was also emphasised by its circulation with Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *HRB*, the ultimate source of ‘British’ origin myths. Codices like *Ba, V, E*, which belonged to John Gunthrope and *MJ*, which belonged to Stephen Lawless, highlight the interest in the *TH* in codices which attempt to offer an Irish past in conjunction with that of an English historical overview.

Engaging with an individual’s interest as seen in chapter IV allows a different image of reception and response to be drawn. It allows us to acknowledge that the influence of any one text is never a solitary action but can only be conceived as part of the sum of that person’s collective knowledge. Thus, the interest and knowledge of other origin myths as evidenced in his collection would allow for John Erghome to categorise the *TH* as an *Origines Gentium* rather than categorise it in terms of marvels or a sermon material, which had evidently been of key interest for Geoffrey of Whighton and Thomas Brinton. Similarly, although Roger Bacon may have been keenly interested in the *Itinerary* as a means of assessing apocalyptic expectations, within the context of the other texts in Simon Bozoun’s large manuscript, Royal 14 C XIII the *Itinerary* is infused with a more positive theme of salvation in Christianity.

In the course of this study further possible avenues of research have been highlighted, which due to time constraints have not been possible to explore here. The vast collections of surviving sermon materials require a systematic overview to understand Gerald’s impact on this type of information. This would perhaps offer a greater impression of the possible role of the *TH* within the scholastic setting. Here, the primary concentration has been on relating the *TH* to other approaches to the Irish during this period. A more thorough examination of medieval English descriptions of the Scots could further highlight the use of the *TH* within medieval England. In relation to *mirabilia* and the *TH*, there are as yet many unstudied vignettes of combined marvels of England, Ireland and the East – this juxtaposition of material, in some ways so similar to the arrangement of manuscript collections described above, require further examination.
Similarly, as these texts are largely ethno-geographic histories, a further aim of this study has also been to explore more generally the English interest in the known and unknown world outside its own peripheries. However, in order to do this and to understand better this phenomenon of the textual mappa mundi and its forms, research into texts comparable by subject and of varying levels of dissemination is certainly required. Some possible complementary texts circulating in England which also focus on past events, particularly origin myths, and also include geographical, topographical and ethnographical observations which would be beneficial to such a study include: the independent circulation of Bk. I of Ranulf Higden’s Polychronicon, Bk. XV of Bartholomew the Englishman’s De Proprietatibus rerum, the ‘Descriptions of England’ in the works of Bede and Henry of Huntingdon, the various anonymous descriptions of the world and combinations of mirabilia focussing on England, Ireland and the ‘East’, Jacques de Vitry’s Historia Orientalis, Marco Polo’s De mirabilibus orientalium regionum, Ordoric of Pordenone’s Relatio, the anonymous Travels of Sir John Mandeville, and Hetoum’s Flor Historiarium. An analysis of these texts both individually and collectively would further improve our understanding of the reasons for the circulation of such ethno-geographic historiae in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. This would then allow us to draw more general conclusions relating to the dissemination and influence of medieval ethnographic/topographic observations through the use of manuscript sources.
APPENDIX A. HANDLIST OF MANUSCRIPTS

Conventions

Each entry will list the manuscript’s location and shelfmark, its collation, dimensions and content. In addition each entry will also list the date of the manuscript, any known information about the codex’s medieval provenance, its subsequent history and then a bibliography. The descriptions are based on the various catalogue entries where found but have been supplemented and/or corrected where necessary.

I have personally examined all manuscripts listed here except for Paris, BNF Latin 4126, Paris BNF Latin 4846, Paris BNF Latin 11111, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 400, Cambridge Emmanuel College 1.1.3, Yale, Beinecke Library 406 and Dublin, National Library of Ireland 700. However, Paris BNF Latin 4126, Paris BNF Latin 4846 and Dublin, National Library of Ireland 700 have been examined through microfilm and digital images.

FRANCE

Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale

Douai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 887 (872) [Do]

Collation: ff.143; I^{10} II^{6} III-V^{8} VI^{6} VII-XIII^{8} XIV^{1} XV^{4} XVI-XIX^{8} XX-XXI^{1}

Dimensions: 2 cols. 30 lines; 15.8cm x 23.3cm

Contents:
1. Excerpts from councils f.2 (f.1 blank).
2. Early-modern contents list f.10v.
3. Alan of Tewkesbury, Sermon on ‘Beati qui lavant stolas sua in sanguine agni’ [Ap. 22 v.14-15], f.11; (f.18v blank).
4. Alan of Tewkesbury, a selection of letters f.19r.
5. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hiberniae f.49r; (f.105v blank).
7. Gerald of Wales, Expugnation Hibernica [incomplete ends on Dist.I.46.38 at the end of a quire] f.110; (ff.141r-143 blank).

Date: c.1200
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Fourteenth-century inscription on the front cover ‘Liber ecclesiæ beate Marie de Merton’. Ker had tentatively suggested the possibility that it belonged to the nuns of Fontrevault at Nuneaton, however, Brian Scott drew attention to the more correct provenance of Merton. Catherine Rooney mistakenly conflates this and attributes the provenance to the nuns of Fontevrault at Merton.

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPT: Also on the flyleaf are the words ‘Collegii Anglorum Duac. Ex dono D.F. Barberi’ establishing the manuscript’s seventeenth-century provenance at the College of the English, Douai.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: MLGB, p.140; Scott & Martin, p.xxxiv; Bartlett, p.175; Rooney, pp.viii, 48-9; Sharpe, HLW pp.33-4. Although Sharpe draws attention to this collection of Alan of Tewkesbury’s letters, item.3 is not listed alongside the only other witness to the sermon ‘Beati qui lavant stolas sua in sanguine agni’ in Bodl. Auct. D.2.9).

Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale

Paris, BNF, Lat.4126 [BN41]

COLLATION: (from Crick) a², I-II⁸ III¹⁰ IV⁸ V⁶ V¹² VIII-XI¹² XII¹²(1-3, 10-12 singletons) XIII⁸ XIV⁶ XV⁸ XVI⁶ XVII¹⁰ XVIII¹² XIX-XII¹², XXIII⁴, XXIV⁶, XXV-XXXII⁸, XXXIII⁸ XXXIV¹⁰ XXXV⁴?

DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 36 lines; 31 x 18.5cm.

CONTENTS:
I.
1. World map f. 1v (ff.1r & 2r blank)
2. late fourteenth-century contents list. f.2v
3. Decretals of Innocent VI against the mendicant friars [25th of August 1357]. f.3r
4. Decretals on privileges of mendicants by Benedict IX f.4v
5. Decretals on privileges of mendicants by Benedict VIII f.7r
6. Prophetical poem about the kingdom of Scotland, ‘Regnum Scotorum fuit inter cetera regna.‘ f.9v
7. ‘Uas electionis’, decretals of JohnXXII against John de Poliaco f.10r
8. ‘Te adoro creatorem...’ f.10v
9. ‘Incipit tractatus magistri Stephani medici Hugonis episcopi Dunelmi de quodam prodigio...’ f.11r
10. Patrick, b. of Dublin, De mirabilibus Hibernie f.12r
11. Ethicus Isther, Cosmographia (fragments?)f.14r
12. Itinerarium maritimum f.19r
13. De tribus mundi partibus et de destrucucione tocius orbis montium et fluvium f.20r
14. ‘Mensura tocius terre...’ f.21v
15. Orosius, Historiae Adversum Paganos (fragment) f.22v
16. ‘De situ Albanie...’ f.26v
17. ‘Cronica de origine antiquorum Pictorum’ f.27r
18. ‘Cronica regum Scotorum ccc.x.iii annorum’ f. 29v
19. ‘Qualiter acciderit que memoria sancti Andree apostoli amplius in regione Pictorum...’ f.31r (f.32 blank)
II.
20. Petrus Alfonsus, *De Disciplina Clericalis* [upto ch.32] f.33r
21. ps.Methodius, *Revelationes* f.45r (f.48v blank)
22. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* f.49r
23. *Epistola Alexandri* f.97v (Dindimus?)
24. Julius Valerius ‘Epithoma de ortu vita et obitu Alexandri’ f.105r

III.
25. Simon Chèvre d’Or or ps.Hildebert, *Ylias* or *De excidio Troiae* f.106v
27. Continuation of *Historia Troiana*, ‘Quis Trojanorum quem Grecorum occidit.’ f. 119v
28. ‘Pergana flere volo’ f.119v.
29.Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* (Excerpts on England from Bk I) f. 120v
30. Hildebert, *Versus de excidio Troiano*

IV.
31. ‘De primis auctoribus sive scriptoribusistoriarum’ f.133 v
32. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae* f.134v

V.
33. Alfred of Beverley *Annales* (fragments) and Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia* f.212v
34. Alfred of Beverley, *Annales* & a continuation f.212v
35. Alfred of Beverley, *De gestis regum Normannorum* f. 242r (excerpts)
36. Continuation to the *Polychronicon* f. 252r
37. ‘Erat Gilbertus Anglicus magnus iste theologus.’ f.282r
38. Cyril, *Oraculum Angelicum*, f.282r
39. ps.Joachim commentary on *Oraculum Angelicum* f. 294
40. Peter Maymet, commentary on the *Oraculum Angelicum?* f. 295
41. Hildegard of Bingen, *De pertubatione clericorum* (?) f.

DATE: xiv/xiv ex.

MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: compiled and partly written by/for Robert de Populton, Yorkshire, Hulne or Carmelites. On f.211v is written ‘Ora pro populton qui me compilavit Eboraci’.

Paris, BNF, Lat. 4846  
[BN48]

COLLATION: Unknown
DIMENSIONS: Unknown
CONTENTS:

1. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernia* f.1

DATE: xiii in.

Paris, BNF Lat. 11111  
[BN1]

COLLATION: Unknown
DIMENSIONS: Unknown
CONTENTS:

1. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernia*.

DATE c.1290?
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Ireland?
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: It was brought from Ireland after the war of 1690 by an ancestor of l’abbé le Prince Savant Modeste of Dijon.
BIBLIOGRAPHY: Rooney, pp.xix, 34.

IRELAND

Dublin, National Library of Ireland:

Dublin, NLI, 700  
[I]

COLLATION: ff. i +99 + i; a1, I-VI8 VII-VIII8 IX9[8+1 (f.69)] X8 XI9[8+1 (f.87)], XII6 XIII1 [or XIII-XV1], b1.
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols 35 lines; 28 x 17 cm
CONTENTS:


Date: c.1200,
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: owned by the Cathedral of St. Ethelbert, Vicars Choral, Hereford. The numbering of the quires suggests that when it was initially copied it may not have been intended as a pair.
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: Previously Phillipps 6914. It was then acquired by Strong, bishop of Bristol; it was subsequently bought by the National Library in 1945.


**The Netherlands**

Leiden, University Library

*Leiden, B.P.L. 13*  

[Le]  

**Collation:** ff. 114; I-VII VIII IX-XIII XV  

**Dimensions:** 2 cols. 32 lines; 26.5 x 18cm.  

**Contents:**  
1. Solinus, De Collectanea rerum, f.1  
2. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica, f.69  

**Date:** xiv  

**Medieval Provenance:** Abbey of Les Dunes - ‘Liber beate de dunens’ f.113v in a fourteenth-century hand. It was given to the library by C. Rekenaer.  

**History of the Manuscript** Although Rooney did not associated this manuscript with Les Dunes. She drew attention to another manuscript (or perhaps the very same?) of Belgian provenance. Rooney listed the catalogue of John Adorne (1444-1511) of Bruges which mentions ‘een ander bouc ghenaempt prefatio prima Topographia Hibernicam’ noting that there are no copies of the *TH* presently in Belgium. John Adorne’s father Anselm Adorne had been closely associated with the Scottish court and claimed to have been James III’s envoy to the Sultan of Morocco.  


*Leiden :104 or Leiden.Voss.Lat.F.77*  

[F*]  

**Collation:** ff.191; I-VII VI VII-XXIV (Foliation skips from 54-56)  

**Dimensions:** 28.6 x 18.5cm, 44 lines.  

**Contents:**  
1. The humiliation of Rollo, some miracles during the time of Rollo f.1  
2. William of Jumiege, *Gesta Normannorum Ducum* f.2  
3. Robert of Torigni version, extract from his continuation, further continuations f.50v.  
4. Geoffrey of Monmouth f.75.  
5. with prophecies of the English f.122.  
7. terms of peace between Louis IX and Henry (1259) III f.138v.
8. Gregory X's papal bull against Simon and Guy de Montfort p.139v.
10. notes on the officials of the Roman Empire, f.144 and the foundations of Aachen f.144.
11. song of the war of the Welsh against the English f.144.
13. excerpts from Cosmographia regarding Alexander and Gog Magog f.190v.
14. privilege of Martin IV 10.01.1282 ‘Ad fructus Uberes’ f.191.
15. a prophecy from Ezekial.... in a later hand c.1400 f.191v.

DATE: after 1282
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Normandy?

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: Pa.. Petavius or Paul Petau had written notes on f.156v and f.159r. [H. 50 pressmark on f. 1 – P. Petau] Owned by P. Petavius, then Alex Petavius, Queen Christina of Sweden, Ger.Vossius a professor in Greek at the University of Leiden in 1624 and then bequeathed to the University of Leiden.


THE UNITED KINGDOM

Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales

NLW 3074 D

COLLATION: ff. 118; I-II12 III10 IV4 V 8 VI 6 VII 8 VIII-XI12 XII10
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 40 lines; 17.5cm x 26.7cm.
CONTENTS:
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica f.1
2. Gerald of Wales, Expugnatio Hibernica f.60; (ff. 114v-118 blank)

DATE: xiii.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: England

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: Formerly belonged to the Mostyn family and was numbered as Mostyn 264.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Handlist of Manuscripts in the National Library of Wales vol.1 (Aberystwyth, 1943) p.263; Bartlett, Gerald, f.95; Rooney, p.54.
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College :

**CCC 66a**

**COLLATION:** ff.238; I^{4} II-VIII^{12(+-16)} IX-XXI^{12(10-12)}

**DIMENSIONS:** 2 cols. 39 lines. 29.7 cm x 20.8 cm

**CONTENTS:**

7. *Liber gestorum Barlaam et Josaphat* f..139.
8. *Imago mundi* Liber. II with a list of Popes to Pope Martin IV (1281-1285) f..208
10. Story of the Cross Poem in French on Christ f.224v.
12. ‘Honorius papa volens scire terra agarenorum contra quos exercitus christianorum preparabatur’ f..228
13. Bede, ‘Description of Bethlehem’ from *Historia Ecclesiastica*, f.230
14. Bede, ‘Description of Mount Olive’ from *Historia Ecclesiastica*, f..230
15. excerpts from Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, f..231
16. miracle about the host seen in human form f.233
17. further miracle f.238

**DATE:** xiv.in.

**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** Bury St.Edmunds; Ff.1.27 (2) was originally the second portion of this manuscript.

**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** Donated to Corpus Christi College Cambridge by Archbishop Matthew Parker.


**CCC 181**

**COLLATION:** ff. 200 +2; a^{2} I-II^{12} III^{8} IV-VI^{12} (lacks 12 in VI) VII-IX^{12} X^{8} (lacks 6-8)

**DIMENSIONS:** 37 lines; 18 x 29.6 cm.
CONTENTS:

1. The humiliation of Rollo, some miracles during the time of Rollo p.1
3. Robert of Torigni version, extract from his continuation, further continuations, p.140
4. Einhard, *Vita Karoli* p.217
5. ‘Antenor et alii profugi…’ p.235
6. Terms of peace between Louis IX and Henry III (1259) p.262
7. Gregory X’s papal bull against Simon and Guy de Montfort p.265
8. French regnal list, notes on the officials of the Roman Empire, and the foundations of Aachen p.276
10. Song of the war of the Welsh against the English fp.277
13. Excerpts from *Cosmographia* regarding Alexander and Gog Magog p.398
14. Privilege of Martin IV 10.01.1282 ‘Ad fructus Uberes’ p.400

DATE: xiv in.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:
It has a pressmark, ‘In.3 J’ on f.1 which is associated with the Abbey of St Mary’s, York. This manuscript has a close affiliation with Leiden Voss. Lat. F.77 (104).

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: This manuscript was donated to Corpus Christi College by Matthew Parker.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: MLGB p.217; *Cat.CCC*, pp.421-5.

*CCC 400* [C]

COLLATION: (according to James) ff. 5+47 + 42+61 +4, a¹ b⁴; I⁶ II-IV⁸ (+1) V-VI⁸; a2-e2⁸ f²; A⁸ B² C⁸-H⁸ f¹; K⁴.
DIMENSIONS: I. 2 cols.36 lines, II. 21 lines, III, 2 cols. 28-29 lines, IV. 2 cols. 41 lines; 22.4 x 15.2 cm

CONTENTS:

I
1. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernia*, f.1

II.
2. Gerald of Wales, *Descriptio Kambriae* (c.16th) f.39

III.
3. Gerald of Wales, *De statu et jure Menevensis Ecclesie*, p.1

IV.
4. The verses inscribed in the windows of Canterbury Cathedral

¹ Potthast, *Regesta II*. p. 1764, no. 21836
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: This manuscript belonged to Archbishop Matthew Parker and it was due to his additions that there is a sixteenth-century transcript of the DK in this codex.
BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Cat.CCC*, pp.263-266.

**CCC 407**

COLLATION: ff.178; I-III^{12} IV-VII^{8} VIII-XVI^{12} XVII^{2}
DIMENSIONS: 28 and 33 lines to a page; 21.2 x 12.7 cm.
CONTENTS:

1. Simon fitzSimon, *Itinerarium ad terram sanctam* f.1 (ff.34-36 blank)
2. William of Rubruck, *Itinerarium* f..37 (f.68 blank)
3. Ordoric of Podernone *Relatio* f.69 (f.92 blank)
4. Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, Bk XV f..93
5. Ps. Aristotle, *Secreta Secretorum*, f..129
6. ‘Aliud documentum de complexione humana’, f.176v

DATE: 1331-1352.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Listed as *Liber Itinerariorum* [Item 26] in Simon Bozoun’s book list. On f.1 it is written 'Liber fratris Symonis Prioris Norwic'. Although the first three items certainly belonged to Simon Bozoun it is possible that the other items were only added later. It also bear a Norwich Cathedral Priory pressmark of ‘S. xxiii’.
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: The manuscript was donated to Corpus Christi College by Matthew Parker.
BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Cat. CCC*,p.291-293; *Cat. DDC*,p.58; MLGB, p.137.

**Cambridge, Emmanuel College**

**Emmanuel College 3**

COLLATION: ff.120; I-XII^{10}
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 46 lines; 36.8 x 24.8 cm.
CONTENTS:

1. Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* f.1
2. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* f. 87

DATE: 1481.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Commissioned for John Gunthorpe, dean of Wells.
f.86v ‘Expl. lib. Bede de gestis anglorum scriptus A° D° Millesimo cccc°. lxxj°’ [1481]. On f. 87 are the initials ‘J.G’ and a shield. M.R. James suggests that borders at the beginning of the book may denote the work of a Flemish artist.

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: The manuscript belonged to ‘Jo. White’ in 1613, see f.1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
Cat. Emm. pp.3-4; Cat. DDC, p. 63; Rooney, pp.21, 51-52.

Cambridge, Gonville and Caius

Gonville and Caius 290/682  [G]


Dimensions: 2 cols. 40 lines (71 lines in margins), 34.6 x 32.8 cm.

CONTENTS:

1. Peter Lombard’s Sentences
   a. Questiones super Sententias, p. 1
   b. Jerome, de vita clericorum et nepocianum, p. 31
   c. Petrus Blesensis super Job, p. 34
   d. Questiones theologicae novem, p. 39
   e. Bernard, De conficto viciorum et virtutum, p. 90
   f. Augustine, De conficto viciorum atque virtutum, p. 91
   g. Johannes Chryostomi?, Sermone de cruce et latrone, p. 95
   h. Bernard, De Altercatio quatuor sororum, p. 98
   i. Distinctiones, p. 100
   j. a collection of ‘questiones’ p. 238
   k. Distinctiones, p. 243
   l. a collection of ‘questiones’ p. 363
   m. another collection of ‘distinctiones’ p. 371
   n. a collection of ‘questiones’ p. 304
   o. Nicholas de Gorham, Distinctiones Gorham p. 411
   p. Gerald of Wales, TH (excerpts) p. 684
   q. Bernard, Homiliae Bernardi super Missus est Gabriel, p. 693
   r. Bernard, De precepto et dispensacione p. 702 [pp. 711-712 blank]

DATE: xiv.


HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: Bears two inscriptions, the first on the flyleaf, ‘Liber collegii Annunciationis b. Marie Cantebrig’ exdonon Mag” Ade Lakynngythe doctoris in theologia’ and the other ‘Liber Coll. Annunc. B. Marie Homo quid superbis I.W’. It belonged to Adam de Lakenheath of Norwich diocese, B.Th. by 1363, D.Th. He was elected chancellor of the university in 1372, vacated it by May 1374. He donated this to Gonville and Caius. Emden, pp.346

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A Descriptive Catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Gonville and Caius College, M.R. James (Cambridge, 1907) vol.1 pp.336-338; Rooney, pp. 9, 57, 70.
Cambridge, Peterhouse

**Peterhouse, 1.8.1 (177)**

Collation: ff.227; I-II 8 III-IV 10 V 10 (lacks 1-5) VI-XII 12 XIII 8 XIV-XVIII 12 XIX 12 (lacks f. 12) XX-XXII 8, XXIII 8

Dimensions: 1 & 2 cols, 53 lines; 31.8 x 20.3 cm

Contents:

2. Index to the *Polychronicon* f.17.
4. ‘Rex Edwardus cum navigio suo adiit Britanniam minorem.’ f.192.
7. Notes relating to King John, King Edward I and Scottish relations with the Papacy and the English kings f.218.

Date: before 1418.

Medieval Provenance: The entry in the Old Register of the donations to Peterhouse by Thomas Lane, Master of Peterhouse in 1418 suggests that the codex consisted of only the first three items.

History of the Manuscripts: The manuscript was rebound in the eighteenth century.


Cambridge, St. Catherine’s College

**St. Catherine’s College. L.v.87 (3)**

Collation: (according to James) ff.204; I 8 (lacks f.1 and f.2 is merely a fragment), II-IV 12 V-VIII 12 IX-XVI 12 (lacks ff. 8,9 XVII 12 XVIII 8 (ff.2-8 are fragmentary)

Dimensions: 26 lines, 20.3x 13.3 cm

Contents:

1. Julius Valerius, *Historia Alexandri* [abridged] f. 1
2. Letter from Alexander to Aristotle - *De Situ Indiæ?* f. 22
3. Collatio: letters of Alexander and Dindimus [ff. 45v-47 blank] f.34
5. Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*; extract relating to the description of England (L. I. 1-12; with a list of shires and hides) f. 96
6. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* f. 105v
8. Gregory, *De mirabilibus urbis Romae* f. 190r
DATE: xiii.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: England
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:

Cambridge, University Library

*CUL Ff.1.27*

[C]

COLLATION: pp.390; I-VII 12 IX 2 XI-XV 12 XVI 9
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 39 lines, 46 lines (item.10);
CONTENTS:

I.
From p.253
1. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* p.253
2. Gerald of Wales *Expugnatio Hibernica*, p.359
3. *Vita Sancti Patricii Episcopi*, p.453
5. *Prophetia Aquila*, p.497
10. Rhigyfarch ap Sulien, *Vita S.David*, p.618

DATE: xiv. in.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: The *EH, TH and IK* and *St.Patrick's* agree almost entirely with *R*. Evidence suggests that there was an earlier numbering before the *DK* was inserted.
This MS is the first half of Corpus Christi 66....
The parts of *F* not related to *D* are 12th c and may perhaps have originated in Durham (reel 7)
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:
BIBLIOGRAPHY: MLGB, p.16

*CUL Mm.2.18*

[CM2]

COLLATION: ff.334;
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 63 lines ; 25.4 x 20.3 cm.
CONTENTS:

1. Gerardus Cremonensis, Liber Jeber de Astrogogia habens tractatus novem optimos  f.2
2. Anon., Liber de Numeris et lineis Rationibus; pulcher et magnus f.49
3. Mohammed Ben Musa Khayrezmita, De Algebra et Almuchabala, f. 49
4. Gerardus Cremonensis (?), Liber in quo terrarum et corporum continentur mensurationes Ababuchri qui dicebatur Heus, translatus a Magistro Girardo Cremonensi in Toledo:abreviatus f.69v
5. Anon., Liber Saydi Abuohtim, De Mensurationes Figurarum superficialium et corporearum’, f. 76v
6. Liber Ademea de Mensuratione f.77
7. Liber Augmenti et Diminucionis f.77
8. Solinus, Collectaneae rerum memorabilium f. 83
9. Ethicus Ister, Philosophi libri. f. 103 v
10. Julius Frontini, Strategemata, f. 115
11. Clemens Lantoniensis, Super Evangelia from f.130v
12. Macrobius, Saturnaliaf. 132v [extracts]
13. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hiberniae, f. 144v [extracts]
14. De Vita Sancti Zozime f. 146v [extracts]
15. Martial, Epigrammata f. 147 [extracts]
17. John of Salisbury, De dogmate philosophorum,f.164 [extracts]
18. Ovid, Metamorpheses, f.168
19. Valerius Maximus, Factorum ac dictorum memorabilium
20. Boethius, De consolatione philosophie [includes a commentary which in the table of contents is attributed to Nicholas Trivet.

DATE: 14th century
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Geoffrey of Wighton, an Oxford Franciscan compiled this selection.
Inscription: Iste liber est fratris Galfridi de Wyghtone quem fecit scribi de elemosinis amicorum suorum. Rooney suggests Wighton as the manuscript’s provenance but it is more likely to have been Oxford, Rooney, p.28.
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: Belonged to a Thomas Knyvett who may have bought it for the price of 8s 4d.

CUL Mn.5.30 [M]

COLLATION: ff.31 ; I\² II\³(1) III-IV\¹ V\⁶
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 33 lines; 27 x 17.5cm
CONTENTS:
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hiberniae
DATE: after 1188  
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: probably belonged to the Benedictine abbey of Ramsey in Huntingdonshire, or an individual with affilitations with the abbey- probably in the xiii century as on f.31v is a note of pleas regarding regarding a dispute over land. 
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: 
BIBLIOGRAPHY: Cat.DDC, p.39; MGLB, p.153.

London, British Library

BL, Additional 17920 [A17]

COLLATION: ff.28; I-IIIIVI , [Foliation begins at f.2]  
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 43 lines; 36.8 x 26.2 cm ; 
CONTENTS:  
1.'Dels miracles de Sainhte Maria Vergena f.1  
2. pseudo-Turpin, Historia Turpini, f.5v  
3.Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica, f.18v  

DATE: xiv – after 1327.  
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Gascony or in the Roussillon  
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:  

BL, Additional 19513 [A19]

COLLATION: ff. iii + 189 [foliation begins at f.2]; a3 I10 II-VIIIIX-XIIVII XII XIM XIV-XVIIIXVIIIIX-XIXXXIIXXXII-XXIIIIXXIV9  
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 36 lines ; 24.5 x 8.3 cm.  
CONTENTS:  
1. Jordan of Severaco, Mirabilia in Indiae Maiori f.3  
2. Jacques de Vitry, Historia Orientalis. f.13  
3. Marino Sanudo’s Liber Secretorum fidelium crucis f.67  
4. Marco Polo, De mirabilibus orientalium regionum,f.85  
5. "Provinciale secundum hodiernum stilum Romane ecclesie." f.133  
6. Historia Turpini  f.141  
7.Gerald of Wales, Topographi Hibernica f.65
DATE: xiv. After 1327.
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: When was this bound together? Items 6 and 7 are written in the same chancery hand.- latin version of Philip of Slane, bishop of Cork. This is probably from Avignon
There is a manuscript affiliation to BL 17920

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:


BL, Additional 33991

[ A33 ]

COLLATION: ff. 49; a² I-III ² IV ¹ V-VI ² VII ² VIII ²
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 40 lines ; 18.5x 14.7 cm.

CONTENTS:

I.
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica (+ map) f.3r
2. Petri Alfunsi Disciplina Clericalis - fragment f.27 r
3. Hugh of St. Victor, de libris sacramentorum (excerpts) f.28

II.
4. inscriptions from churches in Dublin ff. 46

DATE: xiii.


BL, Additional 34762

[ A34 ]

COLLATION: ff. 172 ; I ² II-VII ¹0 VIII ¹1 IX-X ¹0 XI ³ XII ² XIII-XIV ¹0 XV ¹1 XVI-XVIII ¹0 XIX-XXVII ¹
DIMENSIONS: 1 col. 24 lines; 12.7x 8.9 cm.

CONTENTS:
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica f.2r
2. Gerald of Wales, Expugnatio Hibernica – incomplete Dist. I.20.49 f.72r
3. Gerald of Wales, Itinerarium Kambriae f. 96
**DATE:** xii/xiii.

**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** England. A pressmark of ‘C XCII’ has suggested a possible provenance of Norwich Cathedral Priory from around the late thirteenth-century onwards.

**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** In 1586 belonged to John Browne and the 'tenauntes of Bury' are mentioned. A Phillips MS. 9338, prior to that it was Thorpe 656 and acquired by Thomas Phillips in 1836. These Thorpe manuscripts, of which he bought approx. 1650, he claims were of the libraries of ‘Lord de Clifford, Sir Rob. Southwell, Sir G. Naylor, Dr. Adam Clark, Earl Stamford, Sir J. Sebright, Lord Guilford, John & Ric. Towneley, J.Bindley, Isaac Reed, Dr. Askew, Lord Longueville &c.’

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** *Cat. Add* vol.16, p.76; Scott & Martin, p.xxxiv, *Cat.Phillip.* p.137,148; Rooney, pp.41-2.

---

**BL, Additional 44922**

*Collation:* ff. ii + 105; I. a² I- VII10 VIII10 (-4 -6-93) II. I-III8 IV8(3)

**Dimensions:** 29 x 18.5 cm; I. 2 cols. 35 lines, II. 2 cols. 46 lines.

**Contents:**

I.
1. Palladius *De Agricultura* f.1
2. Epitome of Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 64v
3. Incipit de multiplicatione numerorum': nine extracts from the opening chapters of the treatise 'De numerorum divisione' by Heriger of Lobbes f. 74v
4. 'De medecina valde utilis scientia' f. 75

II.
5. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*, f. 77

---

**BL, Arundel 14**

*Collation:* ff. 37; I-IV8 V5

**Dimensions:** 2 cols. 46 lines; 27.4 x 19 cm

**Contents:**

2. Walter Map, ‘Dissuasio Valerii philosophi ad Rufinum de uxore ducenda’ f.27v
5. Claudien, *Panegyricus*, Preface lines 1-12: ‘Versus duodecim de somno’ f.31v
6. ‘Versus duodecim de familia B. Mariae V’Inc.’Nuptier fuit.’ f.32.
8. ‘Versus sex de muliere’ f.32.
9. ‘Quedam de regnis, provinciis, et episcopatibus Saxonum’ f.32.

DATE: c.xii/xiii.
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: 1613 belonged to William Howard of Norfolk
BIBLIOGRAPHY:

*BL, Cotton Claudius E VIII* [Ce]

COLLATION: ff.267 ; a², I-XXIX ⁸, XXX⁸⁻¹⁻³ XXI¹⁻⁴ XXXII¹⁶
DIMENSIONS: 2 col. 47 lines; 39.5 x 25.6 cm.

CONTENTS:

1. ‘De fundationibus ecclesiarum per Angliam, vel monasteriorum, antequam regnum sibi subjugassent Normanni’ f.1
2. ‘Propheta quodam spiritu pythonico’ f.1v.
3. ‘Propheta Homerii’ f.2r.
4. ‘Visio facta Thomae Cantuariensi, dum esset in ecclesia S. Columbae in Francia; de rege quodam ungendo, et ejus victoriis’ f.1v
5. Two letters, from Emperor Frederick to Saladin and from Saladin to Emperor Frederick. f.2
6. ‘De jocalibus et vasis pretiosis quae R. Edwardus III. agnoscit se mutuo accepisse, pro expeditione suorum negotiorum, ab abbate de Redyng: et promittit se vel eadem restituere, vel pretium solvere’, f.2b.
7. ‘Ricardus I. rex Angliae, in captione detentus, investivit Hen. VI. imperatorem regno suo per pileum ejus’ f.2v
8. Letter from Pope Clement III to the Scottish church 1188.
9. ‘Praedictiones astrologorum’
10. Brevia historica excerpta de coronatione Johannis, filii Henrici II. in regem Hiberniae; in quem finem Urbanus III. Papa misit coronam de penna pavonis auro contextam f. 3 v
11. Fragment from Roger of Wendover’s *Flores Historiariurn*
12. Domesday book extracts relating to Yarmouth letters patent of Edward III to Yarmouth dated 10 July 1333 f.5
13. *Description of Rome* f.6
14. Description of England f.7v
15. Castles in Armenia f.8v
16. The seven miracles of the world f.8v
17. Miracles of England f.8v
18. ‘De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt ’f.9v
19. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ f.10
20. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.10v
21. Coronation of King Richard from Roger of Howden’s chronica f.10v
22. Henry of Huntingdon's prophecy of the Norman conquest f. 11
23. letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely f.11v
24. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Roger Hovedon, f.12v.
25. Index to the Flores Historiarium, f..14.
26. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344, f.23.
27. A passage on early English history, extract from Roger Bacon’s Opus Minus and a metrical prophecy, f.24.
29. Adam of Muritmuth’s continuation to the Flores Historiarium, excerpts of various chronicles.f.237
30. Quando cessarunt reges Franciae imperare; et de imperii divisione. f.258.

DATE: c.1388
MEDIEVAL PROVANCE: Norwich, Cathedral priory, written for Bishop Henry Despencer.

BL, Cotton Cleopatra D V

COLLATION: ff. 187;I-V^6, VI (8-2 ^4,5) VII-XXII^8
DIMENSIONS: 2 col. 36 lines; 26.3 x 18.2 cm.
CONTENTS:
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica, f.2
2. Gerald of Wales, Expugnatio Hibernica ff.52b
3. Gerald of Wales, Symbolum Electorum ff.98
4. Roger Bacon’s Opus Majus ‘geographia’ ff.133b (title falsely ‘De descriptione Mundi’ and attributed to Gerald of Wales.
5. Julius Valerius, Vita Alexandri Magni f. 165v
6. Collatio: Dindimus, f.177b
6. ‘figura colorata ibicis (sic) et castoris’: coloured figures of ibex and beavers

DATE: xiv

317
**BL, Harley 3724**

**Collation:** ff.59; I-II^{12} III^{8}, IV^{12} (2 <5-6>) V^{13}?

**Dimensions:** 1 col. 27 lines; 22.1 x 14.9 cm.

**Contents:**
1. Girobaldi Whitwhibuansis
2. “Manassis Regis Oratio” - apocryphal
3. Relatio septem Dormientium : Gregory of Tours, ‘Passio ss. martyrum septem dormientium’
4. Versus de Sancto Petri Martiro, singulis vocibus litera p. incipientibus
5. Epigrammata duo
6. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica*
7. Brevis oratio monachi cuisudam ad fratres
8. Hymnus antiquus cum fragmentis brevibus
9. Tractatus brevis de Sacramentis
10. Adriani Episc. Epistola ad regem Anglorum: *Laudabiliter?*
11. creed in English (Hiberno-English)and a metrical Lords Prayer
12. Fridericus imperator ad papam, cum variis versibus plerumque rythmicis

**Date:** XIII.

**Medieval Provenance:** Ireland?


---

**BL, Harley 4003**

**Collation:** ff. ; I-II^{12} III^{14} IV-VI^{12} VII^{4} VIII-IX^{12} X^{9} XI^{10} XII-XIII^{12} XIV^{4}

**Dimensions:** 1 col. 39; 21.8 x 15.1 cm.

**Contents:**

**I.**
1. Diagram with descriptions of the kingdomsof the Heptarchy f. 1r
2. contents list f. 2v
3. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* (abbreviated) f. 3r
4. Geraldof Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica* f. 37r
5. Annals from 1167 to 1279 f. 79v
6. Continuation to annals to 1484.

**II.**
7. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britannie* f.81r
8. Continuation to *HRB* to William Rufus.

**III.**
9. John Major *Historia maioris* Britannie (extract – ‘de gestis Scotorum..’). (16th c)
DATE: xiii (late)
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Ireland?

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:

Provenance: owned by William Cecil (1520-98) Thomas Jett (until 1731)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Crick, pp.102-3

BL, Royal 13 A XIV

[Ra]

COLLATION: ff. 279; I. I-X I² XI² XII²; II. I-III I², IV I², V V¹, VI V¹ I. I-II I² III I², IV-VI I²

DIMENSIONS: 23.5 x 17.1cm.

CONTENTS:

I.
1. First Statute of Westminster (1275) 3.Edw.I f.1
2. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica, f.10
3. Gerald of Wales, Expugnatio Hibernica, f.58 v
4. ps. Ovid (Marbod of Rennes?) Philomela, f.106v
5. Marbod Bishop of Rennes, De gemmis, f.107 v
6. A notice regarding the rental of land adjoining the Abbey of Clare f. 117 – in late fifteenth-century hand
7. Innocent III- De Contemptu Mundi f.117v

II.
8. Richard Wethershed, Summa ‘Qui bene presunt’ f.130
9. Narrative about Joseph of Arimathea f.195
10. Rhyming poem called Golias de coniuge f. 197v – written in 14th century charter hand

III.
11. John de Plano Carpini, Historia Mongalorum f. 198,
12. matyrdom of Thomas Becket, f. 218
13. Philosophy of William of Conches f.217v
14. Sybelline Prophecy f. 244
15. Repition of item 4 in a late 16th century hand f. 247v
16. 'meditations de cognizacione humanae conditionis' attributed to either Hugh of St. Victor or Bernard of Clairveaux. F. 248v
17. oratio de St. Anselm f. 259
18. sermon on charity f. 259v
19. 'de infantis Saluatoris' f. 271v
20. Letter of Prester John to Emperor Manuel Comnenus f. 272v
21. A guide to Jerusalem, in french f. 277

DATE: late 13th to early 14th

MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Provenance: Irish Ms which belonged to the Dominican Friars of Limerick
Perhaps that is only 1-6 items.

**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** It later belonged to Henry FitzAlan Earl of Arundel, and John, Lord Lumley. The name Conor Thomond (perhaps, Conor O’Brien, 3rd Earl of Thomond) is found on f.279.


**BL, Royal 13 B VIII**

**COLLATION:** ff. 147; A. I-II10 III8 IV-X10 XI8 B. XII10 XIII-XIV10

**DIMENSIONS:** I. 2 cols. 36 lines II. 2 cols. 39 lines; 27.6 x 18.4cm.

**CONTENTS:**

I.
1. Topographia Hibernica f.1
2. Expugnatio Hibernica f. 34v
3. Itinerarium Kambriae f. 74v
4. Henry of Sawtry's *St. Patrick's Purgatory* f. 100v
5. ‘Exceptiones de cronicis Eusebii’ f. 113

II.
6. Alanus [de Insulis], Anticlaudianus f.117

**DATE:** c.1200

**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** Canterbury St.Augustines. f. 147 (flyleaf) ‘liber Sancti Augustini extra muros cantuarie’.


**BL, Royal 13 B XVIII**

**COLLATION:** ff.102; I-VI12 VII8 VIII10 IX12

**DIMENSIONS:** 2 col. 37 lines; 30.5 x 20.3cm.

**CONTENTS:**

1. ‘Summula metrica excerpta de libro qui intitulatur De gestis Anglorum’ - summary of English history from Egbert to Henry III f..1r.
2. Summary from Alfred to Henry III f.4r
3. Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* f.4v
3. Letter of Otto, Cardinal-deacon, to the archbishops, bishops, etc., announcing his appointment as legate to England, Ireland, and Wales, and quoting the bull of Pope Gregory IX, 12 Feb. [1237]

4. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernia* -fragments

**DATE:** xiii.

**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** England

**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** Owned by George Forlonge of Wexford and John Theyer

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Rooney, pp.32-33.

**BL Royal 13 D I (+ Otho D VIII ff.174-233) [Rd]**

**COLLATION:** ff.i + 254; a\(^1\), I-III\(^12\) IV\(^8\) V\(^9\) VI-VIII\(^12\) IX\(^10\) X-XV\(^12\) XVI\(^2\) XVII-XVIII\(^12\) XIX\(^8\) XX\(^6\) XXI-XXIII\(^12\) XXIV\(^6\)

**DIMENSIONS:** 2cols. 54lines; 32x24cm

**CONTENTS:**

**I.**
1. Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* f.10
2. Geoffrey of Monmouth, *Historia Regum Britanniae*, f. 175
4. Geneology of Henry from Yvor, f 222.
5. Robert Grosseteste, *Testementa xii patriarcharum* f.225

**II.**
6. Summary chronicle from AD1 to 1208 f.237
7. Chronicle from BC1140 to AD1385 f.242
8. *Epistle of Lentulus* f.243
9. *Descriptio Beate Marie* f.243v
10.a *Mirabilia Hybernie* f.243v
10.b *Mirabilia Anglie* f.244
10.c *Mirabilia Orientes*, list of fontes and montes, notes of the journey from England to the Holy land f.244
11. *Libellus de tribus partibus mundi*, f.245
12. same as above in English, f.246v
13. taxable value of the clergy an laity of England, f.247
14. interpretation of dreams, *Somnia Danielis* f.247v
15. notes on weights and measures f.248
16. of the 15\(^{th}\) signs, fifteen days preceding the day of the Jews f.f.248v

**III.**
17. *Polychronicon continuation from 1341 to 1377* f.249

**DATE:** after 1385

**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** The manuscript belonged to St.Peter's Church, Cornhill, London in the 15\(^{th}\) century

**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** This manuscript is listed in the Westminster inventory of 1542, BL Add. 25469, f.33 and also has a pressmark of the old Royal library of ‘no. 708’.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Source: *Cat. Rom.* I, pp. 248, 572; MLGB, p.221; Crick p110-2; Sandler *Gothic MS*, p.145-6; *Historia Karoli Magni et Rotholandi ou Chronique du Pseudo-Turpin : textes revus et publies d'apres 49 manuscripts*, (Paris, 1936) p.7 ; Robinson, *Dated and Datable manuscript in London*, p. 6; C.F. Bühler, ‘Two Middle English Texts of the *Somnia Danielis*’ *Anglia Zeitschrift für Englische

---

**BL, Royal 14 C VI**  
[R14]

**Collation:** ff. i + 261; a1 I-XXXII⁸, XXXIII⁴, XXXIV⁴ 
**Dimensions:** 34.9 x 22.2 cm. 

**Contents:**
1. Description of Rome f.1 
2. Description of England f.2 v 
3. Castles in Armenia f. 3v 
4. The seven miracles of the World f.3v 
5. Miracles of England f.4 
6. De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt f.5 
7. About Bishop Gregory f.5v 
8. ‘Diversorum nominum interpretationes’: explanations of certain English legal terms f.6 
9. Coronation of King Richard f.7 
10. Henry of Huntingdon's prophecy f.7 
11. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’: a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Hovedon. f.7 
12. *Flores Historiarum* with a continuation from 1304-1323 f.9/11 [prologue begins on f.9 and left incomplete but then begins agains on f. 11. (f.9v-f.10, f. 260rb –f.261 blank)]

**Date:** xiv. 

**Medieval Provenance:** the main portion was probably written c.1304 at Holme St Benets and then moved to Tintern Abbey.; Julian Harrison argues for a Hulme St. Benet provenance; p.90 mentions the grant of a manor at Acle, Tintern by the Earl of Norfolk, Roger Bigod to the priory, vellum tab on f.44. 

**History of the Manuscripts:** The manuscript belonged to John, Lord Lumley and Henry FitzAlan, Earl of Arundel. 

**Bibliography:** J. Harrison, ‘The Tintern Abbey Chronicles’ *Monmouthshire Antiquary* XVI (2000) [BL Pamp. 3995]; MLGB, p.102; Rooney, pp.61-63.

---

**BL, Royal 14 C XIII**  
[L*]

**Collation:** ff.i + 310: I- XXV¹², XXVI¹⁰ 
**Dimensions:** 50 lines; 33.7 x 22.6 cm. 

**Contents:**
1. Alphabetical index to the Polychronicon and preface ff.3-10 
2. Table of chapters of the Expugnatio Hiberniae f.12v 
3. Simon Bozoun’s book list f.14v (f.13 blank)
1. Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon* f.15r [end of f.19v ‘de castello in Armenia’]
2. Prefaces or exordia of historians to their several works: Justinus, Julius Caesar, Solinus, Josephus, Hegesippus, Augustine (De civitate Dei), Orosius, Eusebius (Chronicon), Hugh de S. Victor (Liber de tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum, Robert de Torigni. f. 167r.
3. Gerald of Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica* f.170b
5. Odoric of Pordenone, *Reatio* f.218
7. Marco Polo, *De mirabilibus orientalium regionum* Latin translation by Pipino of Bologna c.1320 f.238
8. Satirical poem by Michael Blaunpayn of Cornwall against Henry of Avranches c.1250 f.271v
9. Commentary by Nicholas Trivet on St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei* f.278

**DATE:** 1344-1352
**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** Simon Bozoun’s list, Cronica monachi Cestr’ cum aliis [Item 29] Norwich Cathedral priory pressmark ‘P lxii’; ‘Liber fratris Symonis Bozoun prioris Norwici’ f.15
**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** This manuscript was owned by John, Lord Lumley and was the source of Richard Hakluyt’s printed version of the *Itinerarium.*
**BIBLIOGRAPHY:** MLGB, p.138.

**London, College of Arms**

**Vincent 418**

[V]

**COLLATION:** ff. 175;
**DIMENSIONS:** 27 x 17cm/ 25 x 16cm; 2 cols.
**CONTENTS:**

I.
1. Request from Robert Winchesley, archbishop of Canterbury to Pope Boniface VIII with regards to the stateof Scotland 8th October 1300 f. 1
2. Boniface VIII papal bull to Edward I f.1v
3. Letter from Edward I to Pope Boniface VIII with regards to Edward’s right to Scotland f. 2v
4. The reply of the barons of England to Pope Boniface VIII 1301 f. 4v

II.
5. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* f. 5
6. Peter of Ickham, *Compilatio de gestis Britonum et Anglorum/ Martin von Troppau, Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum* f. 17
7. articles against Henry IV f. 42v
8. ‘Extractus cronicarum Cistrencium ac cronicarum veteris testamenti’ or *Chronicon de gestis Britonum* to 1283 f. 45
9. ‘De orbis divisione, de paradiso...’ f. 74
10. ‘Anni ab orbe condito ad diluvium’ f. 87
8. ‘De Bruto et diversa regnationes regum in Anglia usque ad mortem regis Scotiae Jacobum I’ f. 96
9. ‘Nomina regum Christianorum, Ordo paparum a S. Petro usque ad Eufenium papam IV’ f. 103v
11. Regnal list from Alfred to Edward II f. 158v
Robert Grosseteste’s letter to Adam Marsh concerning intelligence f.159r
12. Chronicle of England to the year 1340 f.160v
13. 'Speculum cronicorum' A treatise on the meaning of the years Anno Domini in computation of the calendar ff.173r-175v

DATE: after 1437
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: England; ff. 5-42 and ff. 45-175v were all written in the same hand.
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: The manuscript bears the arms of the Sheldon of Beuley stamped.

London, Lambeth Palace

Lambeth Palace 622

[La]

COLLATION: ff.142; I-XVII8 XVIII10
DIMENSIONS: 26 lines ; 19.3 x 14cm.
CONTENTS:
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernia, f.1 (f. 72a blank)
2. ‘Hii sunt qui venerunt cum Dermicio Murcardi filio in hiberniam’ f.72b
3. Gerald of Wales, Expugnatio Hibernica f.73

DATE: xv.
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: Manuscript bears the shield of Georfe Carew (1617). The library was established by the terms of the will of Richard Bancroft in the early seventeenth century.

London, Westminster Abbey

Westminster Abbey 23

[W]

COLLATION: ff.69; I12 [-1] II -V12 VI10
DIMENSIONS: 9x 6 in; 2 col. 28 lines
CONTENTS:
1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernia, f.1

DATE: xii/xiii century
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: England
HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: The flyleaf is from a bestiary and details the contents lists of that codex. This contents list was from Westminster Abbey MS 22 which was previously bound with MS 23. Westminster Abbey MS 22 belonged to the Franciscan convent at York.


Manchester, John Rylands Library

John Rylands University Library Latin 217 [MJ]

COLLATION: ff.230 + iii.
DIMENSIONS: 26.3 x 20.3 cm.
CONTENTS:
1. Ranulf Higden, Polychronicon f.1
2. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica f.

DATE: 1431
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: St. Mary’s Dublin copied by Stephen Lawless, subprior, ‘Compilatus per Ranulphum monachum cestresem et scriptum per fratrem stephanum lawless suppriorem hujus monasterii’

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPT: It was once part of the library of George Dunn of Woolley Hall. A possible provenance of St. Werburg’s Chester was rejected by Neil Ker.


Oxford, Bodleian Library

Bodleian Library, Fairfax 20 [Fb]

COLLATION: i+82 ff.; I-VI12 VI21(27?) VII-IX1 X12(4) XI1
DIMENSIONS: 25.9 x 16.3cm.
CONTENTS:
1. Description of Rome f.1
2. Description of England f.3
3. Castles in Armenia f.4
4. The seven miracles of the world f.4
5. Miracles of England f.4v
6. ‘De viris illustribus quo tempore scripserunt’ f.5v
7. ‘De denario sancti Petri que Romescot dicitur’ About Bishop Gregory f.6v
8. An explanation of weights and measures and Old English legal terms f.7
9. Coronation of King Richard from Hovedon’s *chronica* f.7v
10. Henry of Huntingdon’s prophecy of the Norman conquest f.8
11. Letter of Hugh of Nonant, bishop of Coventry concerning the election of William, Bishop of Ely (f. 8v)
12. ‘De primo adventu in Yberniam’; a compilation of Gerald of Wales and Hovedon. (f. 10)
13. Table of Contents by Charles Fairfax f.12v
14. *Flores Historiarum* from creation to 635. This section is missing a quire with the entries for 443AD to 542AD f.13
15. Letters patent of Edward III to Yarmouth dated 10 July 03 1333 f.71
16. Domesday extract relating to Yarmouth f.72
17. A fragment from Roger of Wendover f.73
18. List of the Priors of Norwich until 1344 f.73v
19. Index of persons and things starting at E f.74
20. A passage on early English history and some historical prophecies in rhyming Latin f.81

Date: XIV

MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Simon Bozoun’s list - *Cronica Westmonaster’ [Item 27]
Inscription on f.13 ‘Liber fr[atr]is Symonis Bozoun p[r{i}]oris Norwic’

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: This manuscript was probably copied from Royal 4 C VI or from a common exemplar. This manuscript was used as the exemplar for Cotton Claudius E VIII.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

**Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B 188**

COLLATION: ff.98; I-IV8, V4 VI8 VII6 VIII8 IX10 X12 XI 4 XII8 XIII1 XIV2
DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 36 lines.

CONTENTS:

1. Gerald of Wales, *Topographia Hibernica* f..1
2. Gerald of Wales, *Expugnatio Hibernica* f..37
3. Gerald of Wales, *Itinerarium Cambriae* f..73

DATE: before c.1194
MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE: Cathedral Priory, Christ Church - Canterbury? On the first folio it is written Liber fratris W.Bonyngton, monachi ecclesie Christi Caantuar. Et per eum reperatus a° d[omi]jni 1483'.

HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: The manuscript contains the name Henry Spelman (d.1581)


**Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B 483**

COLLATION: ff.36; a²(paper)b²(flyleaves, outer covering?) I² II⁴(paper) III⁷(actually 10 but(-3)?) IV-V ¹⁰ VI ¹⁰ VII ²(paper)

DIMENSIONS: 2 cols. 36 lines ; 21.8 x 16cm.

CONTENTS:

1. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica f..1
2. 'ridiculosa petitio' dated 1375 f.36

DATE: xii/xiii


HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: The inscription on f.1 suggests that it was previously bound with Pomponius Mela’s Cosmographia and Honorius Augustodunensis’ Imago Mundi. The manuscript has also belonged to James Ware and Henry, Earl of Clarendon.


**Bodleian Library, Laud. Misc. 720**

COLLATION: (according to Crick) ff.252 ; I², II-VIII⁸, IX¹²(+1) X-XVI⁸, XVII¹(+1) XVIII⁸(+1) XIX-XXIII⁸ XXIV¹⁰(+1) XXV-XXX⁸, XXXI⁶ XXXII-XXXIII⁴

DIMENSIONS: 25 & 26 lines , 20 x 13.5 cm

CONTENTS:

I. 1. Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia Regum Britannie f.1r (f. 133 blank)
2. Gerald of Wales, Topographia Hibernica (illuminated) f.134v (f. 134r - note to readers of the TH)

II. 3. Excerpts relating to Scotland from Roger of Hovedon’s Chronicon and William of Malmesbury Gesta Regum Anglorum, f.245
4. Charter from Richard I to William of Scotland; the Quitclaim f.249v.
5. poem ‘Miles amat lepores’, f.250v.

DATE: I. xiii II. xiv.


HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS: ‘Augustini Lindsell ep. Hereford ex dono Antonii Maxton’: Anthony Maxton or Morton was a prebendary of Durham, Augustin Lindsell was bishop of
Hereford for one year in 1634 when he died in office. Ker rejects the notion of a medieval provenance of Durham.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY:**

---

**THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**Yale, Beinecke Library,**

*Beinecke Library 406*  

**COLLATION:** Unknown.

**DIMENSIONS:** I. 2 cols. 42 lines, 26.5 x 19 cm; II. 2 cols. 39 lines; 26.5 x 19 cm

**CONTENTS:**

**I.**
2. Guillaume de Deguilleville, three Latin poems, f.85v.
3. ‘Vous qui aues pour passer vostre vie..’ anonymous fifteenth-century poem, f. 92r.

**II.**

**DATE:** c.1400.

**MEDIEVAL PROVENANCE:** Perhaps Northeastern France.

**HISTORY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS:** Notes on flyleaves are believed to have been written by Francois Xavier Laire (1738-1801), the librarian of Cardinal Etienne Charles Lomenie de Brienne (b. 1727). It was bought by Sir Thomas Phillipps (no. 6343) from Frederick North, 5th Earl of Guilford (1766-1827). It was subsequently sold at Sotheby's on 25 Nov. 1969, no. 460, by Edwin J. Beinecke for the Beinecke Library.
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