

GERALD OF WALES' DE PRINCIPIS INSTRUCTIONE:  
A CONTEMPORARY VIEW OF HENRY II,  
ANGEVIN KING OF THE ENGLISH (1154-1189)

by

Edward John Coomes, Jr.  
B.S., Rockhurst College, 1956

Submitted to the Department of  
History and the Faculty of the  
Graduate School of the Univer-  
sity of Kansas in partial ful-  
fillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts.

**Redacted Signature**

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
Instructor in charge

**Redacted Signature**

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~  
For the department

July, 1960

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Beatae Virginis Mariae Honorem

DEDICATION

Carissimis Parentibus

Super omnia caritas est!

Lawrence, Kansas  
July, 1960

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Never is the magnitude of a student's debt clearer to him than when he attempts to thank those whose assistance has been invaluable to him. To mention all who have been helpful in providing material and spiritual aid would necessitate reaching into the past in many directions, and this is impossible. However certain persons have contributed so much to this study that it would be misleading to present it as my own without mentioning them and making some attempt to acknowledge their contributions.

To my many friends at the First National Bank in Kansas City, Missouri, especially Mr. Henry G. Vogrin, Assistant Vice-President, I am grateful for both the encouragement which they gave and for the opportunity to work for and with them during the Summer months throughout my college and graduate school career.

To my friends and teachers at Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Missouri, especially the Reverend Joseph A. McCallin and the Reverend William C. Doyle, both of the Society of Jesus, I owe that immeasurable debt of gratitude which one owes to those men who first introduce him to the world of ideas.

My teachers at the University of Kansas, especially Dr. James E. Seaver, Dr. Oswald P. Backus III, Dr. Robert

G. Colodny, Dr. James C. Malin, Dr. W. Stitt Robinson and Dr. Thomas Gale, have contributed the course work which is of inestimable value for one who aspires to be a historian. These scholars gave freely and generously of both their thought and their time, and they taught me the meaning of dedicated and selfless scholarship.

To Dr. James E. Seaver I am grateful for his invaluable direction and suggestions in the writing of this work, for his calm deliberation and his extraordinary patience. Dr. Seaver not only gave generously of his valuable time in order to analyze and criticize this work, but also he made clear its potentialities. Under his mature and patient tutelage this work became, at last, possible. Without his encouragement and patience, this work would not be.

Dr. Oswald P. Backus III, too, has been extraordinarily encouraging and patient; it is indeed difficult to express accurately the debt which I owe him. Throughout my time at the University of Kansas Dr. Backus has been a source of inspiration. His enthusiasm for things of the mind and the creative imagination is contagious, and to be exposed to his thought, be it in conversation, in writing or in a lecture, is to experience a revitalization of that spirit of wonder and inquiry which is so essential to the learned life. Not only has Dr. Backus spent much of his valuable time in discussing ideas with me, but also he has been a

friend to me and taught me the importance of creativity in the scholarly life.

My greatest debt of gratitude is owed to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. E. J. Coomes, Sr. Their extraordinary generosity has made it possible for me to be unconcerned about financial matters. But even more important than this has been the devoted encouragement which they have always given me. Their remarkable caritas for me has itself been one of the most important lessons in my life. For this reason and for many more it is to my mother and my father that this work is humbly dedicated.

Lawrence, Kansas  
July 12, 1960

Edward J. Coomes, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| DEDICATION . . . . .  | ii   |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .   | iii  |
| <br>  |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND CONCISE PRESENTATION<br>OF RELEVANT BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL . . . . . | 1    |
| PART I. Introduction . . . . .  | 1    |
| PART II. Concise Presentation of Rele-<br>vant Biographical Material . . . . .          | 3    |
| II. THE IDEAL PRINCE AS INDICATED<br>IN DISTINCTIO ONE . . . . .                        | 14   |
| III. AN ANALYSIS OF DISTINCTIO TWO . . . . .  | 28   |
| IV. AN ANALYSIS OF DISTINCTIO THREE . . . . .   | 53   |
| V. EVALUATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .  | 81   |
| <br>  |      |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .  | 101  |
| APPENDIX I . . . . .  | 108  |
| APPENDIX II . . . . .   | 111  |
| APPENDIX III . . . . .  | 115  |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The purposes of this study are three. The first purpose is to present Gerald the Welshman's (Giraldus Cambrensis) views, as contained in the De Principis Instructione,<sup>1</sup> in regard to what the prince ought to be and do. This is done in chapter two of this work. The second purpose is to present Gerald's view of Henry II (1154-1189), king of the English; this is done in chapters three and four. The third purpose is to evaluate Gerald's ideas and views of Henry II, to suggest possible grounds for a re-evaluation of the historical significance of the De Principis Instructione, and to suggest further work to be done on Gerald's treatise Concerning the Instruction of a Prince.

One of the terms used in this paper perhaps needs an explanation. Gerald of Wales' De Principis Instructione was written in three distinctios or books. Since Gerald himself uses the term distinctio, it seems appropriate to use it in this work when referring to a specific book or books in the De Principis Instructione.

A brief note on the printed edition,<sup>1</sup> the manuscript and the history of the De Principis Instructione also seems proper here. The editor of the printed edition, George F. Warner, assistant keeper of manuscripts in the British Museum, has presented the history of the text and manuscript and some comments about various partial editions of the

work.<sup>2</sup> A resume of Warner's comments should be useful. Only a single copy of the manuscript of the De Principis Instructione has survived, and it is written in a rough hand of about the middle of the fourteenth century. It is contained in a vellum folio<sup>3</sup> in the British Museum. The scribe committed some serious mistakes, but Warner thinks that he was able to restore the correct reading in most cases. When the correct reading could not be restored, the passage was put into the printed edition as it occurred in the manuscript. Ranulf Higden (d.—1364) was the only other medieval writer to make direct use of the De Principis Instructione; he cited it, under another title, as one of his authorities,<sup>4</sup> and he also used many extracts from it in his Polychronicon. Extracts from the De Principis Instructione have been printed by Michel Brial, editor of Bouquet,<sup>5</sup> and by J. S. Brewer, under initials.<sup>6</sup> Of the printed editions George F. Warner's is the most nearly complete, but it is not fully complete, for whenever long passages of Biblical texts occur, and often when long classical and other quotations occur, Warner gives only references. Sometimes he indicates the nature of the omitted material.

Though most of Gerald's successors did not refer to his writings, Gerald certainly relied on his predecessors, divine and human. He quotes extensively from the Old and New Testaments, classicists from Plautus to Boëthius, and from



Hildebert of Le Man's (1055-1133) Moralis Philosophia.<sup>7</sup>

Gerald relies very heavily on the second edition of Hugo of Fleury's (c. 1110) Historia Ecclesiastica.<sup>8</sup>

The very nature of Gerald's De Principis Instructione, as it was when complete, made it, as it were, unhealthy for him to issue it. For this reason the work was issued in two parts. Distinctio one was innocuous enough, and thus Gerald could publish it sometime before Distinctio two and three, though how long before is not known.<sup>9</sup> Internal evidence seems to indicate that Distinctio one was published independently, for Gerald, in the final sentence of Distinctio one tells the reader that the other two distinctios await a safer and more secure time for going out to the public.<sup>10</sup> More is known about the publication date of the complete work, and Warner concludes that it was issued in 1217 or shortly thereafter.<sup>11</sup>

#### CONCISE PRESENTATION OF RELEVANT BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIAL

What sort of an author was this who thought himself compelled to delay publishing his work? Was there a hint of the Procopian in both his book and in his fear of making the work public?

Gerald of Wales' full name was Gerald de Barri; he was sometimes called Sylvester or savage. He was born about 1147,<sup>12</sup> at Manorbier Castle in Pembrokeshire, Wales. He

was the youngest son of William de Barri by his second wife, Angareth, daughter of the famous Nesta, who was the daughter of the last Welsh king, Rhys ap Tewdwr, and a mistress of King Henry I (1100-1135) of England. She married Gerald of Windsor, Gerald the Welshman's maternal grandfather, after the termination of her relationship with Henry I. Thus, Gerald's ancestry was Norman on his father's side and Norman-Welsh on his mother's side. From an early age Gerald de Barri was trained for the clerical life, and was taught proficiency in Latin and a copious knowledge of the better Roman authors, such as Terence, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Cicero and Seneca, to name a few. He received his higher education at Paris from 1165 to 1172; the studies to which he devoted himself were theology, philosophy and canon law. He returned to England in 1172, shortly after the martyrdom of St. Thomas a'Becket (1170) — an event which apparently made a lasting impression on him as it did on his age. In 1175 in virtue of his familial connection with David de Barri, his paternal uncle, bishop of St. David's in Pembrokeshire, Gerald was appointed archdeacon of Brecknock. In 1176 his uncle died. Gerald was nominated to succeed him, but King Henry II opposed Gerald's election, and the Welshman lost to Peter de Leia, one of the four candidates, even though Gerald was the unanimous choice of the canons of St. David's.<sup>13</sup>

Gerald's great ambitions in life were to be bishop of St. David's and to obtain metropolitan dignity for that see. His hopes were frustrated three times, once in 1176, again in a long struggle between 1198 and 1203, and finally in 1214. It was during the long and bitter conflict between Gerald and the Angevin kings over St. David's that Gerald conceived his dislike for that royal family.

The conflict over St. David's was one manifestation of the kinds of problems which Henry encountered in his attempts to resolve two of the major issues of his day, namely, centralization versus decentralization, and the state versus the church. When Gerald tried to obtain St. David's and desired to make it an independent archbishopric, he sought goals which were incompatible with two great trends of his day, the tendency toward centralization of the state, and the growth of state power at the expense of the power of the church.

Gerald's goals could not be reconciled with centralization for two major reasons, namely, because he was a Welshman, and because he advocated the metropolitan dignity for St. David's. Though the Welsh were somewhat tenuously controlled by Henry, they did not entirely favor centralization. Welshmen had always chafed under English control, and risings among them were frequent. Gerald was not only a Welshman but also one who was respected by the Welsh, at a time when

there was some anti-Norman and anti-Angevin feeling among them. Though in his acts Gerald was always loyal to the king, Henry had no way of knowing whether or not the archdeacon might one day serve as a nucleus around which restive Welshmen might gather for the purpose of gaining political independence. Secondly, if Gerald obtained ecclesiastical independence for St. David's, authority in the church in England would be fragmented. During the struggle with St. Thomas a'Becket Henry had made it quite clear that he would not, willingly, tolerate a free and independent church. But Henry had failed in many respects to control the church, to make the church in England subservient to the centralized state, even when the church in England was itself centralized under the authority of the archbishop of Canterbury. If it was difficult to control one independent archbishop, it would be even more difficult to control two of them. To be sure, if the suffragan were to obtain the metropolitan dignity for St. David's, he might even manifest tendencies toward ultra-independence, especially if he felt that St. David's ought to have been an archbishopric all the while. If Henry wanted to centralize the state and increase its power, he needed an archbishop and bishops who would do his will. He needed a man in St. David's whom he could control.

There were some indications that Gerald was not such a man. In the first place, he openly admired St. Thomas a' Becket. Secondly, despite heavy opposition, as archdeacon

of Brecknock, he had attempted to win a recalcitrant clergy back to celibacy. Under similar conditions he had tried to reform tithe collection. Gerald would not be deterred from these activities. Indeed the archdeacon's passionate devotion to reform could cause much unrest in Wales even if he did remain loyal to the king.

Thus, political tensions between the English and the Welsh, political and religious tensions between the church and the state, Gerald's Welsh blood, and even his personality operated against his election. As bishop of St. David's he would be potentially dangerous; as an unsuccessful candidate for the bishopric, he would be just another disgruntled subject. It was not difficult for Henry to turn his back on Gerald's desires. Even from Rome Gerald received little support for his cause. The church in Europe was under heavy pressures, and the popes tended to act in such way as to not add the king of the English to a growing number of lay rulers who were intensely discontented with the power of the church.

If the struggle over St. David's adversely affected Gerald's view of Henry, another event intensified the archdeacon's dislike for the king. In 1152 King Henry II married Eleanor of Aquitaine, the former wife of his own lord (suo domino Lodowico Francorum regi), Louis VII (1137-1180), king of the French. Gerald saw this as a very great crime.<sup>14</sup> In Gerald's view, indeed, the crime was one that was to have

long range implications for the governance of the realm, and the Welshman suggested that the progeny of such a union could hardly become good rulers.<sup>15</sup> But what was the exact basis of the crime with which Gerald accused Henry and Eleanor? According to church law Henry and Eleanor had married validly enough. In 1152 Pope Eugenius III (1145-1153) had annulled the marriage between Louis and Eleanor by a declaration of consanguinity — a declaration that the two were related within forbidden degrees of blood kinship. This left Eleanor not only free from Louis but also free to marry, since consanguinity within forbidden degrees was ground enough for declaring that, what had appeared to have been a marriage, had, in fact, been no marriage at all. Thus from the point of view of church law Henry and Eleanor were validly and licitly married, for neither had previously been involved in a true marriage. The real basis for Gerald's accusation was not to be found, therefore, in canon law. The foundation for Gerald's charge was that Louis VII declared the marriage illegal, since it had been concluded without the consent of Louis VII as Henry's feudal lord.<sup>16</sup> The Welshman was a very great admirer of Louis VII, the gentle and pious king of France, and such a breach of the feudal contract was seen by the archdeacon as a grave crime.

The struggle over St. David's and Henry's breach of faith gave birth to the intense bitterness which the Welsh-

man bore to Henry. It is particularly that bitterness which strongly colors Gerald's view of Henry II, and which pervades the pages of the De Principis Instructione.

Gerald was close to the principal character in the work. He was called to the king's court as a chaplain in 1184, and, according to Gerald, held that office for almost ten years (duo fere lustra).<sup>17</sup> He was well acquainted with Henry's family and with great men of his own time such as Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury, and Ranulf de Glanville, justiciar of England.

After his failure to obtain the see of St. David's in 1214, nothing more is heard of Gerald. He died about 1222 and was buried in St. David's Church, for which he had worked so long.

It is clear that Gerald is not an objective historian in any sense of that term as understood in modern times. The fiery Welshman was a rigorous moralist and a passionate reformer. He was very much involved in the political, religious, social and cultural life of his time, and, so involved, so committed was he to the positions that he took, that he made few attempts to be objective. He was not a man who removed himself from his ideas in order to examine them. He was rather the sort of man who commits himself to a position, and then fights for it long and hard without much reflection. In addition to these things, Gerald was a creative artist

and intensely individualistic. Indeed, while thinking about the personality of Gerald the Welshman, one can understand, to some extent, the dangers involved in speaking of men as though they could be pressed into stereotyped categories; when thinking about Gerald, the term "medieval man" becomes increasingly difficult to understand. The Welshman's book Topographia Hibernica (c. 1187) is a clear instance of his individualism and creativity. This little travel sketch and descriptive topography is a unique effort, and from it much of that which is known about the topography of Ireland in the twelfth century has been gleaned.<sup>18</sup> Custom frowned upon the production of light reading material, because such work was considered beneath the dignity of canonists, theologians and philosophers, and because writing materials were expensive. But Gerald was not a man who would allow custom to stifle his creativity. To be sure, he not only wrote the Topographia Hibernica, but also he read it publicly to the Oxford scholars in 1188, thus drawing attention to his disregard for a habit of mind which might interfere with creative thought.

It was this passionate man, himself given to invective, this moralist who thought that the issues were so clear cut, this intensely individualistic, creative artist who presented his view of Henry II in the De Principis Instructione.

Since Henry II is such an important ruler, perhaps the



most influential of all the medieval English kings, and, since today most historians write about him in only the most laudatory terms, this diatribe against Henry, this attack upon him deserves to be better known, if only that King Henry II be put in better perspective by historians of the twentieth century.

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. VIII, De Principis Instructione Liber, edited and with an introduction by George F. Warner (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891). The works of Gerald of Wales, considered as a whole divided into eight parts, themselves constitute volume twenty-one of the Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores. This large series is referred to by some authors as the English Rolls Series or simply the Rolls Series.
2. De Principis Instructione, Introduction, pp. i-xxi.
3. Cotton MS., Julius B. 13. This folio has 173 leaves, 126 of which (ff. 48-173) contain the De Principis Instructione. The others (ff. 1-47) have nothing to do with Gerald's treatise.
4. Higden called Gerald's work Vita Regis Henrici Secundi sub triplici Distinctione. "Rolls ed., vol. i, p. 24." is the location of Higden's citation according to De Principis Instructione, Introduction, n. 1, p. x.
5. Michel Brial, editor, Bouquet's, Recueil des Historiens (1822), Vol. XVIII, pp. 121-163.
6. J.S.B. (J. S. Brewer), Giraldus Cambrensis de Instructione Principum (London: Anglia-Christiana Society, 1846). This publication contained Distinctios two and three with a short appendix of extracts of Distinctio one. Brewer uses the plural "principum" but, since Gerald himself, and Warner with him, use the singular "principis", "principis" is used in this paper.
7. This work is in Migne, Patrologia Latina, Vol. CLXXI.
8. See De Principis Instructione, Introduction, n. 2, p. xiii. "...I [Warner] have used Rottendorffs edition, Hugonis Floriacensis...Chronicon, etc., Münster, 1638...."
9. De Principis Instructione, Introduction, p. xx.
10. Ibid., Distinctio I, Cap. XXI, p. 149. Duae vero Distinctiones...securius simul atque serenius in publicum prodeundi tempus exspectent.
11. Ibid., Introduction, p. xv.

12. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. I, De rebus a se gestis, Libri III, et alii...., edited with an introduction by J. S. Brewer (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1861), Introduction, p. x. H. E. Butler has done an English translation of the De rebus a se gestis. See H. E. Butler, editor and translator, The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis (London: Jonathan Cape, 1937). There is one biography of Gerald; it is a popularization. See Henry Owen, Gerald the Welshman (London: David Nutt, 1904).
13. "Henry controlled elections to bishoprics and abbeys in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Constitutions of Clarendon [1164] (cl. 12).," according to Austin Lane Poole in his From Domesday Book to Magna Carta (1087-1216) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 219. Poole quotes a writ which the young King Henry (III) quoted in a memorandum sent to Pope Alexander III in 1173. "Henry, king of the English &c. to his faithful monks of the church of Winchester, greeting. I order you to hold a free election, but, nevertheless, I forbid you to elect anyone except Richard my clerk, the archdeacon of Poitiers." See Austin Lane Poole, op. cit., p. 220.
14. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. III, p. 160.
15. Ibid., Distinctio III, Cap. XXVII, pp. 300-301.
16. Sidney Painter, A History of the Middle Ages (284-1500) (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958), p. 251.
17. De Principis Instructione, Praefatio, p. lvii.
18. Cf. John Kirtland Wright, The Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades (New York: American Geographical Society, 1925). Wright discusses Gerald's contributions in several places at some length. For an English translation of one recension of the Topographia Hibernica, see John J. O'Meara, translator, The First Version of the Topography of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press (W. Tempest) Ltd., 1951).

## CHAPTER II

### THE IDEAL PRINCE AS INDICATED IN DISTINCTIO ONE

In the preface to *Distinctio one* Gerald tells the reader that he published the De Principis Instructione because he found more that was reprehensible in the lives of princes and prelates than that which was commendable. Princes and prelates, according to Gerald, live sensuously and tyrannically, not fulfilling the duties of their secular and ecclesiastical positions. He tells of the division of the De Principis Instructione into three distinctios, and he comments that he has received only hate and enmity for his efforts as a writer, rather than recompense and favor. Gerald attributes this to the wickedness of his time, and says that he will, nevertheless, continue to present his writings to posterity, since future men at least will appreciate them. The Welshman dedicates his work to King Louis VII of France, and, in closing, praises such rulers as Alexander of Macedon, Julius Caesar and Charles the Great for their devotion to literature.<sup>1</sup>

Having concluded his opening statement, Gerald addresses himself to the task of *Distinctio one* — a presentation of his ideas as to the virtues which a prince ought to have, his ideas as to what the ideal prince should be and do. Lester Kruger Born in an article in Speculum<sup>2</sup> has done an analysis of *Distinctio one*. In this article Born, following Gerald to some extent, has presented the names of the virtues,

has indicated which virtues Gerald thought the ideal ruler ought to have. The adequacy of Born's analysis depends, in large measure, on the precise way in which the reader views *Distinctio one*.

The first *distinctio* can be viewed in at least two ways. Firstly, it can be seen as a work complete in itself and separate from *Distinctios two* and *three*, and, indeed, there is some justification for this. Gerald's words themselves seem to indicate that this first *distinctio* was made public separately<sup>3</sup> at some indeterminate time before the work as a whole was issued.<sup>4</sup> If one views *Distinctio one* as a work complete in itself, then Born's analysis of the work has certain limitations.

In order to understand the limitations of Born's analysis, it is important first to understand Gerald's approach in discussing the virtues, his method in presenting his theory of virtue. To draw a tenuous distinction for a moment, Gerald's approach can be called literary rather than logical (in the strict and formal sense of the latter term). The Welshman, when presenting a particular virtue, such as chastity, clemency, courage, and the like, first names the virtue, tells what it is, and then teaches the content, the meaning of that virtue by drawing examples from literature or from the lives of great men of the past. Gerald habitually and frequently draws his examples from the Old and New

Testaments, from the works of classicists such as Cicero, Ovid and Seneca, and from the writings of the Church Fathers, such as St. Augustine and St. Jerome, and from the lives of great men of the past, such as Alexander, Julius Caesar and Charlemagne. Gerald does not use formal logic to explain the virtues, does not elucidate their content by logical analysis in the formal sense of that term. There are no rigorous definitions, no syllogistic structures, no definitions of terms used in previous definitions. This is not to say that Gerald is illogical; he is not. His method seen in itself is not self-contradictory, and in this sense his method is quite logical. Of course, one of the disadvantages of Gerald's approach, and it is a serious one, is that his ideas of the virtues are quite often vague and sometimes opaque. But Gerald's thought is pre-Aristotelian.<sup>5</sup> In the twelfth century conflict between Platonist literateurs and Aristotelian logicians, Gerald, no man to avoid an argument, aligned himself on the side of the literateurs, and thus, it is not surprising to find in his work an approach to virtue which is not committed to the rigors of formal logic. Perhaps implicit in Gerald's method is the notion that virtue is and ought to be an object of the dynamism of thought, and not the object of a static knowledge. Perhaps Gerald is suggesting that his method of teaching by examples stimulates thought better than definition, because examples can concret-

ize virtue, whereas definitions run the danger of rendering virtue abstract. If virtue needs to be concrete in order to exist at all, and, if virtue in abstracto does not exist, then, perhaps, Gerald's approach is quite sound. Furthermore, it is possible that Gerald avoids definition of virtue because he thinks that definition, for a moment, staticizes that which of its very nature is in flux, either increasing or decreasing.

Now when a reader sees *Distinctio* one as a work complete in itself, and in the way indicated above, then Born's analysis is very limited indeed. Like Gerald, Born tells the reader the names of the virtues and, to about the same extent that Gerald does, a little about them. Unlike Gerald, Born does not present the examples. Born does not present an analysis of the exemplars themselves, and he does not cite the writers, evangelical, patristic and classical whom Gerald has used to reveal the content, the meaning of the virtues. Perhaps some of the vagueness which appears to be in Gerald's theory of the princely virtues could be removed if 1) Gerald's examples and quotations from other writers were thoroughly analyzed and criticized, and 2) the results of those analyses and criticisms were published.

An adequate explication of such analyses and criticisms would demand a very large paper. Furthermore, the author would need a great knowledge of Biblical, patristic and

ancient literature as well as philosophical and perhaps theological training, in order to present the various possible meanings of Gerald's examples. The number of possible meanings might be very large indeed, since examples drawn from literature can be, and often are, highly ambiguous. Nevertheless, it seems to this writer that an exhaustive analysis of *Distinctio* one, seen precisely qua separate and distinct from *Distinctio*s two and three, might shed some light on twelfth century political and ethical theory, even if it did not clear up the vagueness of Gerald's first *distinctio*.

The limitations of Born's work need not entirely vitiate his contribution. He has given the reader a highly suggestive, thought-provoking survey of princely ideals which obtained for two centuries. Such a survey is very useful, and, after all, the first *distinctio* of Gerald's De Principis Instructione was only one of a number of sources considered by Born.

But there is a second way in which one can view *Distinctio* one; it can be seen as simply a part of a whole work. Certainly one can argue that this also is a correct way to view *Distinctio* one, because, when the work as a whole was made public in 1217, *Distinctio* one was, in fact, only a part of the whole. If one sees *Distinctio* one as part of a whole, and, if the purpose of the whole book is to present Gerald's



view of Henry, then Born's analysis is much more nearly sufficient, because *Distinctio* one then takes on a much more limited purpose than the lucid presentation of a fully developed theory of princely virtue. As the first part of the De Principis Instructione, *Distinctio* one seems to have an almost polemical purpose. Seen this way, *Distinctio* one is a presentation of the virtues which will serve the function of norms whereby Gerald will, in *Distinctio* two and three, make his judgments about Henry. In other words Gerald will judge Henry II according to the degree that Henry conforms or fails to conform to the norms — the virtues indicated in *Distinctio* one.

If Born's analysis is seen as the analysis of a *distinctio* which has a polemical purpose, then his analysis approaches adequacy because it more nearly reflects the way in which Gerald really used *Distinctio* one when the Welshman published the three *distinctio*s as one work, the De Principis Instructione. Gerald could indicate the norms by which he would judge Henry II by simply mentioning the names of the virtues. The Welsh archdeacon, in his own time, could reasonably suppose that most of his readers would agree with him that temperance, chastity, courage and the like were indeed virtues. They might disagree as to the content of these virtues, but there would be a basic agreement, namely, that they were certainly virtues. The reason for

that agreement was that people received their ideas about virtue from a similar source — the Church. If there was essential agreement that a particular virtue was indeed a virtue, then Gerald could simply mention Henry's virtue or the lack thereof, and the reader would be able to discern that Gerald thought that Henry was good or bad in regard to the particular virtue. For instance, if Gerald said that Henry was not temperate, the reader could immediately see that Gerald thought that Henry was a bad man in regard to temperance. Born, true enough, just mentions the names of the virtues and says a few things about them, but that is adequate because, in the light of the specific kind of common agreement indicated above, a mention of the names of the virtues would be sufficient to communicate Gerald's views of Henry. If Gerald's intention in the De Principis Instructione is to present his view of Henry, then one can argue that Born, by simply mentioning the names of the virtues and saying a few things about them, has seen *Distinctio* one as Gerald saw it, and, thus, has reasonably correctly presented Gerald's view.

This writer thinks that the second way of viewing the first *distinctio*, as discussed in the two paragraphs above, is sufficient for the purpose of indicating Gerald's view of Henry. Thus, this writer will follow Born's analysis. An exhaustive critical analysis of *Distinctio* one would not

shed much, if any, more light on Gerald's view of Henry precisely as such, for, when Gerald does attribute a vice to Henry II, he gives examples of Henry's acts. Though a lengthy analysis of *Distinctio* one would do little to clarify the image of Henry which emerges in *Distinctio* two and three, some mention of Gerald's ideas as to the princely virtues seems appropriate, because a short discussion of them will suggest the kinds of norms by which Gerald judges Henry II in *Distinctio* two and three of the De Principis Instructione.

Gerald begins his discussion of the princely virtues by pointing out that the princely power is from nature and is necessary. According to Gerald, man needs the princely power even as the animals do. To be sure, not only man and the animals have a need for the princely power, but also the very kingdom of heaven with its hierarchical structure which orders the choirs of angels has need of the princely power. Moral beauty is especially useful and necessary for the man who rules over others, and the ruler will find it useful not to offend anyone, so that conditions in the realm will remain such that he can carry out his duties and responsibilities.<sup>6</sup>

Christian ideals pervade Gerald's *distinctio* on the princely virtues. The prime duty of the prince is to be an exemplary man in regard to virtue, for his lofty station places him in the sight of his people. Since the people will follow his example, he ought to keep himself free from

immorality and lust.<sup>7</sup> He ought to be a model of faith, religion and devotion, and, thus, aid in the salvation of his subjects.<sup>8</sup> The prince should be a chaste man; if impurity is dishonorable in any man, it is most dishonorable in a prince.<sup>9</sup> The prince ought to be modest in the motions of his body and his gestures, for this is a part of temperance.<sup>10</sup> Temperance is a kind of seasoning for the other virtues, and the prince should develop it so that he may moderate his anger. The anger of the prince should be controlled, and he should not punish in anger.<sup>11</sup>

The prince ought always to seek justice, for it is justice that maintains both external and internal security. Justice, indeed, is the binding substance of society.<sup>12</sup> New laws should be carried out more rigorously than old ones.<sup>13</sup> Capital punishment should not be the first resort when a man commits a crime, and, according to Gerald, the gradation of punishments which is used in France is laudable. As is done in France, a first offense should bring a public flogging, a second offense a burning of the face or forehead, or a cutting of the ear lobe, and a third offense death or blinding.<sup>14</sup> It is interesting to note that in Chapter X of *Distinctio* one, the one on justice, Gerald breaks his general rule of not defining. He presents several definitions of justice, such as those of Plato, Thrasymachus, Ovid, and Juvenal. But Gerald does not subject the definitions to a

logical analysis; he merely states them.<sup>15</sup>

Gerald next takes up the virtue of prudence. Prudence is the polish of all the other virtues, and the prince should develop the virtue of prudence so that he can make decisions in times of emergency. Prudence is the virtue by which the other virtues are ordered, and unless a man has prudence, he has no other virtue.<sup>17</sup> The prince can learn prudence in war by studying great warriors of the past, such as Hannibal; foresight should teach the prince the wisdom of preparing for war in time of peace.<sup>18</sup>

Though Gerald mentions virtues which might be called Christian ones, he nevertheless draws his examples from ancient and classical as well as from Judaeo-Christian sources. He seems to have understood that virtue, in some way or another, has been sought by men from time immemorial. By his choice of examples, Gerald seems to suggest that, just as chastity, modesty, temperance, justice, prudence, fortitude and the like are Christian virtues, so they are pagan virtues.

Gerald lists other virtues which the prince ought to have. The prince should be mild. He ought, like the Roman Emperors, to be liable to the laws. He should be dignified when in public, and natural, at ease, in private. Like David he should be loved rather than feared.<sup>19</sup> In accordance with the example of the Savior, the prince should be merciful.

Like Christ, he should be patient. The good prince should forgive many offenses and mitigate punishments. The prince should not desire the blood of his enemies domestic or foreign, and capital punishment should be a last resort.<sup>20</sup>

The good prince should be munificent, but he should show some restraint lest he be guilty of prodigality. He should especially avoid giving that which is not his to give. He should develop the habits of liberality and thrift and avoid the vices of prodigality and avarice.<sup>21</sup>

The prince should be a man of fortitude and of great soul. The parts of fortitude are high-mindedness, self-reliance, peace of mind, perseverance and patience, and the prince ought to develop these.<sup>22</sup> The prince should be a man who is bold and high-spirited, even as Julius Caesar was bold when he subjugated the whole of Germany, Gaul and Britain.<sup>23</sup> But the glory of a prince is the peace and tranquility of his subjects, and the good prince should seek glory so that his virtue will be made known to others.<sup>24</sup>

The king ought not to be tyrannical. He should rule by arms in time of war, and by law in time of peace. The tyrant seeks not to support the people, but to be abundant, he desires not to defend them, but to confound them, he does not take care to bring them together, but to destroy them, he does not prepare to progress and he does not truly change his nature to defend them.<sup>25</sup> According to Gerald, if a

prince is tyrannical in carrying out his duties, his fate will be a hard one. Tyrants may indeed flourish for awhile, but in the end they will die a bloody death.<sup>26</sup> Among his many examples, Gerald points out no disconfirming cases of the foregoing proposition. On the other hand, princes who live laudable lives will have a good end.<sup>27</sup> But if a prince turns to tyranny, Gerald seems to offer no concrete remedy for a people exposed to that tyranny. Perhaps there is the merest suggestion of a remedy when Gerald says, "To be sure the murderer of a tyrant is promised not indeed a punishment but a reward."<sup>28</sup> But this statement alone is not sufficient to attribute an idea of justifiable tyrannicide to Gerald. Indeed despite Gerald's many comments on tyranny and tyrants, there seems to be no suggestion of even a right to revolution.

Gerald closes this curious treatise with a chapter on the final end of princes. He declares that the chief intention of the prince should be to hold to Christ, to fear and love God, to place God above any other person or thing. Gerald observes that a long life is not desirable, and that only the wicked want to prolong their lives in order to defer punishment. Exhorting all men as well as princes and prelates to prepare for death and leave the rest to God, and mentioning his delay of the next two distinctios, Gerald closes *Distinctio* one.

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio I, Praefatio, pp. 5-8.
2. Lester Kruger Born, "The Perfect Prince: A Study in Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century Ideals," Speculum, Volume III (October, 1928), pp. 470-504.
3. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio I, Cap. XXI, p. 149. *Duae vero Distinctiones consecutivae... securius simul atque serenius in publicum prodeundi tempus expectent.* This is the last sentence, save "Deo gratias," in Distinctio one.
4. See also Chapter I, p. 3 of this paper.
5. Born, op. cit., p. 502.
6. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio I, Cap. I, pp. 8-9.
7. Ibid., Cap. IV, p. 13; Ibid., Cap. XX, p. 114.
8. Ibid., Cap. XX, pp. 114-117.
9. Ibid., Cap. IV, p. 14.
10. Ibid., Cap. XIII, p. 46.
11. Ibid., Cap. VI, pp. 18-19; Ibid., Cap. X, p. 35.
12. Ibid., Cap. X, p. 33.
13. Ibid., Cap. X, p. 33.
14. Ibid., Cap. X, p. 37.
15. Ibid., Cap. X, pp. 37-38.
16. Ibid., Cap. XI, pp. 39-40.
17. Ibid., Cap. XI, p. 39.
18. Ibid., Cap. XI, p. 41; Ibid., Cap. XII, pp. 42-43.
19. Ibid., Cap. II, pp. 9-12. It is interesting to notice that Machiavelli disagrees with these ideals point for



19. Ibid., Cont'd. point. Passim., Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince (New York: Mentor Books, 1952).
20. Ibid., Cap. VII, pp. 21-27; Ibid., Cap. V, p. 15.
21. Ibid., Cap. VIII, pp. 27-30.
22. Ibid., Cap. IX, pp. 30-32.
23. Ibid., Cap. XIV, pp. 48-49. Evidently Gerald thought Caesar had actually conquered Germany.
24. Ibid., Cap. XV, pp. 51-52.
25. Ibid., Cap. XVI, pp. 55-56.
26. Ibid., Cap. XVII, p. 57.
27. Ibid., Cap. XVIII, p. 76.
28. Ibid., Cap. XVI, p. 56. "Percussori vero tyranni non quidem poena, sed palma promittitur."

## CHAPTER III

### AN ANALYSIS OF DISTINCTIO II

Having presented his ideas as to which virtues the prince ought to have in *Distinctio* one, Gerald presents his view of Henry II and his reign in the next two *distinctios*. Gerald does not adhere to a chronological development, and his views will be presented here as they occur in the De Principis Instructione.

At the beginning of *Distinctio* two, Gerald announces that he will deal therein with the portion of Henry's reign which was glorious,<sup>1</sup> but as early as Chapter 3 of this *distinctio* Gerald begins to deal with the crimes of the king. The Welshman devotes little time to Henry's early youth saying only that the young king was favored with good fortune. Gerald then records the death of King Stephen (1135-1154), the former count of Blois, a nephew of Henry I (1100-1135) and a son of Henry I's sister Adela and Stephen, count of Blois. Stephen's death only a little time after that of Eustace (August 1153), Stephen's son and heir, cleared the way for Henry's accession.<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to note that Gerald does not at this point record Henry II's marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine which had occurred on May 18, 1152 and which had to such an extent added to his power — a marriage which Gerald will attack vigorously later in his treatise. Gerald rejoices over the conquest of Ireland in 1171-2, and the de-

feat of Scotland in 1174 when King William the Lion fell to Henry's might. The Welshman then is sorrowful as he mentions that the successors of Henry subsequently lost Scotland. According to Gerald Henry was not satisfied with his enormous holdings in England and France, but also had designs on the lands of Louis VII (1137-1180) and Frederick I Barbarossa (1152-1190), the Holy Roman Emperor.<sup>3</sup> This ambition was not to be realized.

The Welsh historian begins his second chapter by listing the great lay and ecclesiastical princes who visited England during Henry II's reign. Gerald includes many marquises (marchiones) and counts from Germany, the archbishops of Cologne, Reginald of Dassels and Godfrey,<sup>4</sup> the count of Dreux who was the brother of King Louis VII, Robert, Theobald of Blois and his brother William, the archbishop of Sens from France; Philip, an uncle of Philip of France on his mother's side, Count Palatine of Flanders and a cousin of Henry on his mother's side. In 1179 Louis VII (1137-1180) of France came devoutly to the tomb of the martyr Thomas of Canterbury. In 1175 Cardinal Uguccione Pier Leoni came to England as papal legate, and other cardinals and legates came at various times. From January to April 1185 Heraclius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, was in England. Also certain judicial representatives came to England as emissaries of the kings of Castile and Navarre for the purpose of having disputes between the two

Spanish kings settled by Henry. In 1177 Henry effected a compromise, apparently to the satisfaction of the two kings, for Gerald simply mentions that the emissaries brought back the judgment of Henry.<sup>5</sup> Gerald next indicates the marriages of Henry's and Eleanor's daughters, Matilda to Henry, duke of Saxony in 1168, Eleanor to Alfonso IX, king of Toledo and Castile in 1170, and Joan to William, king of the Sicilians in 1177.<sup>6</sup> Eleanor of Aquitaine also bore Henry II six sons, who in one way or another, according to Gerald, acted as punishment on Henry sent from God.<sup>7</sup>

In Chapter III Gerald begins to relate those actions of Henry which he deems great crimes (enormibus delictis). First of all he takes up the marriage of Henry to Eleanor of Aquitaine, the former wife of Henry's own lord, Louis VII. This taking of his lord's wife by Henry is seen as a very great crime for which Henry is to suffer punishment.<sup>8</sup> Gerald goes on to accuse Henry of being an oppressor of the nobility, a seller and a delayer of justice, of weighing civil and religious custom, justice and injustice for his own convenience, of not keeping his word, of transgressing the faith and the sacraments, of being a public adulterer and of being ungrateful to God and a hammer to the Church. Gerald does not support these charges except to go on to describe the exile, proscription of Thomas' family and murder of St. Thomas a' Becket, archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>9</sup> Gerald labels the four

murderers of St. Thomas — Reginald Fitz Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Morville and Richard le Breton — as four princely dogs.<sup>10</sup> Gerald then compares Thomas a'Becket with St. Thomas the Apostle. Just as St. Thomas the Apostle received the crown of martyrdom in the month of the birth of Christ (December 21), so did St. Thomas of Canterbury (December 29). Just as the Apostle Thomas was the light of the East, (Orientalis), so was the Martyr of Canterbury the light of the West (Occidentis). The one was a light of the nascent Church, and the other of the Church grown older. Just as the Apostle cemented the foundations of the Church with his Blood, so did a'Becket reform them with his blood. Just as the one was passionate with a fervent faith, so the other, while almost as passionate, had even more passion, though now cold in death. Just as the one in order to raise up the substance of the Church exposed himself to bloody torturers, so the other, that he might conserve its form unharmed, was not afraid to die by the sword.<sup>11</sup>

In Chapter IV Gerald sees the wheel of fortune as turning against Henry II because of his sacrilegious murder of St. Thomas. The instruments of punishment were Henry's sons, Henry, the young king, and Richard, count of Poitou and Geoffrey, count of Brittany. In 1173 they raised a rebellion against the Angevin king and enlisted the aid of Louis VII of France. Even many of the king's own household deserted him.

According to Gerald, Henry was able to put this rebellion down successfully because he repented of his murder of St. Thomas by standing before his tomb with naked feet and kept a prayerful vigil in the Church of the Holy Trinity throughout the night. Henry's penitential acts occurred on July 12, 1174, and, on the next day, William, king of the Scots, who had taken advantage of the rebellion to invade England, was captured at Alnwick. Shortly after this, England and Angevin lands across the sea settled down once again to peace.

Henry's other successes were at Dol in Brittany on August 26, 1173, and the Battle of Fornham St. Genevieve, near Bury St. Edmunds on October 17, 1173.<sup>12</sup> Many dukes and counts were taken captive, including the counts of Chester and Leicester. Ranulf de Glanville is credited with helping Henry. Henry was not harsh to the defeated rebels, and indeed the king's sons were reconciled to him (on September 30, 1174). Hardly had the rebellion been settled when Henry incarcerated Queen Eleanor, and, whereas he had concealed his adultery before, now he publicly lived with Rosamond (Clifford) — '*non mundi quidem rosa juxta falsam et frivolum nominis impositionem, sed immundi verius rosa palam et impudenter abutendo.*' In addition to these things, Henry did not keep his promise to go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem with Louis VII.<sup>13</sup>

Chapter V consists of a letter<sup>14</sup> attesting to an agreement between the king of the French, Louis VII, and the king

of the English, Henry II, stating that they would go abroad to Jerusalem at the same time. This treaty of Ivry of September 21, 1177, signed by Louis and Henry, and the promises therein contained were sworn to in the presence of Cardinal Peter, the apostolic legate, various bishops, Henry's sons, various counts and many other laymen and clerics. By this treaty of 1177 Henry and Louis agreed to take the Cross, to defend each other, and neither to protect each other's enemies nor to lay claim to each other's lands. In addition to these things they swore to submit current territorial disputes, such as the one over Auvergne, to arbitration, and to safeguard each other's rights while on the Crusade.<sup>15</sup> It is Henry's failure to keep the terms of this agreement which the Welshman criticizes in Chapter IV.

Returning once more to the year 1172, Gerald next tells about the inquiry into the death of St. Thomas a' Becket conducted by the papal legates, Albert and Theodine. The two emissaries of the Pope had absolved Henry on the condition that he make a pilgrimage (peregrinatione) to Jerusalem within three years.<sup>16</sup> However, when the three year period had elapsed, and Henry had not gone to Jerusalem, he promised instead to found three monasteries. Instead of establishing new monasteries, in 1177 he confiscated the ones at Waltham and Amesbury, and, having cast out the canons at Waltham, he brought in monks, and, having cast nuns out of Amesbury, thrust

in new ones from Fontevrault (Fonte Efrardi) across the sea. Thus Henry was spared the expense of building and furnishing completely new monasteries. At Witham, Henry founded a Carthusian Monastery.

Of the three, the one at Witham, of course, was the only one really founded by Henry,<sup>17</sup> though Henry did spend more than £ 1,400 in the rebuilding of Waltham and £ 880 at Amesbury.<sup>18</sup> Gerald does not allow the possibility that Henry may not have been entirely in the wrong in his dealings with these monasteries. The Welsh critic sees Henry as acting in an entirely sophistical manner, and quotes from the Old and New Testaments, St. Augustine and Cassidorus to show the folly of a worldly wisdom which is opposed to God's wisdom.<sup>19</sup>

The Welsh critic turns next to the rebellion of 1183 led by the young king, Henry II's namesake. The young Henry is seen by Gerald as a scourge sent from God to the monarch, for the heir apparent, who indeed had been crowned once in 1170 and again in 1172 at the behest of Henry II, led a rebellion of barons in which he was joined by Geoffrey, count of Brittany, another son of Henry II. This rebellion began as a result of a dispute between the young king and his brother, Richard, count of Poitou. The young king's forces occupied a great part of Poitou, and threatened Normandy and Anjou. Henry II came to Limoges to help Richard, and they prepared to put down the rebellion. But the young Henry died on June 11, 1183, and the rebellion came to an end. Gerald's atti-



tude toward the death of the young king is one of sorrow, and he points out that Henry II also was deeply grieved by the death of the young king.<sup>20</sup> In the next Chapter, Gerald praises the character of the young king, who might have reformed the monarchy.<sup>21</sup> But the death of young Henry did not end Henry II's familial difficulties, for in 1186 another son, Geoffrey, count of Brittany, again as a result of a dispute with Count Richard of Poitou, went over to Philip (II) Augustus of France (1180-1223) and Philip made him seneschal of France. But Geoffrey became ill and died at Paris on August 19, 1186, and both Philip and Henry grieved sorely.<sup>22</sup> Gerald then delineates the characters of Geoffrey and his younger brother John.<sup>23</sup>

In the next two chapters the Welsh archdeacon discusses various revelations which he says were from God and which were to act as divine warnings to Henry. On 23 April 1172, after the death of Thomas a' Becket, one of Henry's subjects had a dream warning Henry of forthcoming disturbances; according to Gerald, before a year had passed, the warning was fulfilled when Henry's sons went over to Louis VII in 1173. Another warning came to a simple and just Englishman in Ireland who in 1175 heard a voice in his sleep maintaining that the king of English had incurred the wrath of God. A messenger was sent to Henry, but the king, according to Gerald, was neither moved nor corrected by the message.<sup>24</sup> Another revelation was sent to Henry through a certain knight called Roger

de Estreby, but this too was ignored ultimately, though Henry at first promised to carry out the mandates of the voice heard by de Estreby.<sup>25</sup> Gerald then moralizes that God tried to move Henry to conversion by punishments and by private revelations, and even by favors and quasi-blandishments,<sup>26</sup> and to show that Henry had received favors, the Welshman inserts a letter of King Henry attesting to harmony with Philip (II) Augustus of France and the count of Flanders in 1180;<sup>27</sup> he also includes one of Henry's letters to Ranulf de Glanville, announcing the peace brought about between the king of France and the count of Flanders on April 4, 1182,<sup>28</sup> and the will of Henry II made at Waltham on February 22, 1182. In this will, Henry leaves five thousand marks of silver to the Templars in Jerusalem, five thousand marks of silver to the Hospitallers in Jerusalem, five thousand marks for strengthening the defense of Jerusalem, five thousand marks to other religious houses in Jerusalem and to lepers, shut-ins and hermits, these to be divided up by the patriarch of Jerusalem, the bishops of the land and the masters of the Templars and Hospitallers. In his will, Henry goes on to grant many thousands of marks to regular and secular religious groups in England, Normandy, and Anjou. Henry even provides gold to be used as marriage portions for free women in England, Normandy, and Anjou who are destitute. Henry ends this will with an exhortation to strict obedience to his wishes as expressed in the will.<sup>29</sup> Gerald seems to imply

here that a man who can dispose of that much money has been favored indeed.

But these are not the only favors and benefits enjoyed by Henry. According to Gerald, Pope Alexander III granted Henry the privilege of maintaining the integrity and tranquility of his kingdom, a grant that operated against the Welsh (Galenses),<sup>30</sup> Still another privilege allegedly obtained in 1155 from Pope Adrian IV, (1154-1159) — an Englishman who was named Nicholas Brakespear before his accession to the papal throne — and later allegedly confirmed by Alexander III (1159-1181), gave papal sanction to the conquest of Ireland in 1171-2. This was the famous Bull Laudabiliter of Adrian IV as confirmed by Alexander III.

Much controversy has grown up about the documents and its confirmation. The main difficulty is that the originals of the Bull and its confirmation have been lost to historians; they are known only by reason of their insertion in Gerald's Expugnatio Hibernica;<sup>31</sup> they are recopied in the De Principis Instructione.<sup>32</sup> Among modern medieval historians Gerald does not enjoy a reputation for reliability,<sup>33</sup> and because of this, many have questioned the authenticity of the two documents, especially since it is Gerald and Gerald alone who records them. J. H. Round maintains that the Expugnatio Hibernica was written in order to praise Gerald's relatives, and that the author wanted to support the position that the English took Ireland by request rather than conquest.<sup>34</sup> Round con-

cludes "Everything, then, it seems to me, points to the conclusion that Gerald substituted for the genuine letters from the Pope, in the 'Liber Niger', a concocted confirmation of an equally concocted 'Bull' from his predecessor Adrian."<sup>35</sup> The suggestion of Round here seems to be that Alexander's confirmation as contained in the Liber Niger is reliable, while the Bull and its confirmation contained in Gerald's works are not. In coming to his conclusions, Round disagrees with Kate Norgate who defends Laudabiliter,<sup>36</sup> and his objection is that Miss Norgate did not discuss the "Privilegium" of Alexander III.<sup>37</sup> Round dismisses another disputant, who ignored the letters in the Liber Niger, a certain Father Morris, as a careless or reckless controversialist.<sup>38</sup> Austin Lane Poole, on the other hand, accepts the authenticity of both Laudabiliter and its confirmation as contained in Gerald's Expugnatio Hibernica, and finds "no good reason to impugn their genuineness."<sup>39</sup> Poole discusses the Bull, its confirmation, and three letters, one of September 20, 1172,<sup>40</sup> from Alexander III to the king of the English, one to the bishops, and a third to the kings and princes of Ireland. Poole accepts the documents as genuine, and sees some significance in that they express the pope's joy over the beginning of reform in the Irish Church, but attributes more significance to the fact that they contain a solemn exhortation to the bishops and native princes to be loyal to King Henry II. "These letters in the most authoritative fashion pro-

nounce the Pope's recognition of Henry's title to the lordship of Ireland,"<sup>41</sup>

This writer has not done an analysis of the various arguments for and against the authenticity of Laudabiliter and its confirmation by Alexander III. It seems that such an analysis would be more properly done in a work concerned with the Expugnatio Hibernica. The documents were first recorded by Gerald in the Expugnatio Hibernica — a work written in 1188 — and were only copied into the De Principis Instructione (c. 1217). Furthermore the genuineness or lack thereof of the documents in question have little to do with Gerald's view of Henry II or with the content of Gerald's view. What is important is that Gerald approves of Henry's conquest of Ireland, and indeed considers that conquest one of the king's early "glories".<sup>42</sup> It seems to this writer that an exhaustive analysis and synthesis of the arguments revolving about Laudabiliter and its confirming documents might well require a thesis in itself, and, indeed, this would be a most interesting endeavor and one that needs to be done. But whether the documents are authentic or not, in the De Principis Instructione Gerald treats them as such, and it is precisely qua authentic that they reflect the Welshman's view of Henry in regard to the Conquest of Ireland.

In Chapter XX of the De Principis Instructione, Gerald goes on to tell about the Council of Cashel convened in Ireland by the king in the Winter of 1171-1172. At this Council,

presided over by the papal legate, the bishop of Lismore, the Irish Church was brought into conformity with the forms of the English Church in regard to marriage, the giving of tithes and various devotional practices.<sup>43</sup> In the following Chapter, Gerald elaborately and at length praises Henry for his conquest of Ireland, since by that action Henry had extended the faith.<sup>44</sup>

Having shown the various privileges and benefits both human and divine, which Henry had enjoyed, Gerald returns to his history, and records that Saladin, the Saracen king, had had such success that he began to reduce to small compass the territory held by the Norman king of Jerusalem, Baldwin IV. Not only was this the case, but also the great men of the Holy Land, the king of Jerusalem and Vido, the count of Tripoli, were at enmity with one another.<sup>45</sup> With conditions in this state, Pope Urban III (1185-1187) wrote a letter on September 3, 1186 to the ecclesiastical princes in England in which he urged that, since the Master of the Hospitaliers, Robert Frennellus, the marshall (mareschallus) of the Templars, and Jaquelinus, as well as others, have given up their spirits to the Lord, princes, barons and others of the faithful should come to the aid of the Christians and the brothers of the Temple in the Holy Land.<sup>46</sup>

As early as 1185, the Templars had sent Heraclius, the patriarch of Jerusalem to England to seek help. He sailed to England, and arrived there in February of 1185. He pre-

sented the keys to the Holy Sepulchre to Henry, and besought him to become the king of Jerusalem.<sup>47</sup> In 1184, Pope Lucius III (1181-1185), Urban's predecessor had written a letter recommending Heraclius' cause to Henry. Despite this Henry delayed his answer to the request of Heraclius and ordered the great council to be called together at London.<sup>48</sup> Gerald's attitude toward Henry's delay is reflected well in a conversation at Clarendon between himself and the king, when Henry's kinsman Henry Duke of Saxony was with him, which the Welsh critic records. Gerald opens by asserting that we (Englishmen) have seen many great men of the time come into England, but greater than all was the coming of the patriarch, because such a great man from such a far-away place, having omitted emperors and the whole of the kings of the earth, brought such a great message and so great an honor to the King Henry II. To this Henry replied, "If the Patriarch or others come to us, they are looking here the more for their own advantage than for ours". With typical English (Britannica) temerity Gerald replied, "For the sake of the greatest advantage and honor for you, King, you ought to reconsider, that you alone, before all the kings of the earth, have merited to be chosen for such honors from Christ (ad tanta Christi obsequia).". The king turning himself then from serious matters as if to jokes said to Gerald, "Clerks can rouse us rashly to arms and to dangers because they receive

no blows in the time of danger, nor will they take upon themselves anything burdensome which they can avoid." After this Gerald abandoned hope that Henry would succor the Holy Land.<sup>49</sup> It is interesting to note that Gerald seemed to show little hesitation in speaking up to the king. That the king had such ready replies on his lips is perhaps indicative that Henry had a well developed intelligence, but of course, a great deal depends on whether or not Gerald recorded the conversation correctly. Another interesting observation which Gerald makes, is that the whole of the English people longed for Henry to save the Holy Land.<sup>50</sup>

On March 18, 1185 the patriarch received his answer from Henry. The king held that he could not forsake his own realm, for a great hate had arisen in his lands across the sea, but Henry did promise money to help the cause of Jerusalem. The patriarch replied to him that he had come to seek a prince not money, and that money would not save the patrimony of Christ. The king did not answer; the patriarch then asked for his son John so that one of the seed of the Angevin Kings could be raised up for them. John, though he was about to be sent to Ireland, fell at his father's feet, and asked to be sent to Jerusalem. But Henry did not grant his wish. Gerald, quoting New Testament and Old, attacks the character of Henry.<sup>51</sup> The Welshman then records the warnings of the patriarch to the king. The king indeed has been glorious, but, since he has been derelict in his duty to the Lord, and,



since he is almost entirely destitute of grace, at Henry's final breath his glory will be changed to ignominy, according to the patriarch. In a personal exchange with Henry the patriarch attacked Henry, and told him that he was without a doubt more evil than the Saracens. Henry again protested that he could not go to Jerusalem because his sons would defect and occupy his lands. The patriarch responded "No wonder, since they have come out of the devil, and to the devil they will go." The patriarch warned Henry at London, Dover and Chinon, and, according to Gerald, the prophetic warnings of the patriarch were fulfilled. Henry, as Gerald puts it, had seven lustra (lustrum = period of five years), six for earthly glory, but the seventh for his fall.

Henry's son John did not effect much in Ireland. Henry lost Auvergne to Philip Augustus, the Castle of Radulph and Berri, the cities of Genomannensis and Tours (Turonensem), and in these losses Gerald saw the fulfillment of the patriarch's warnings.<sup>52</sup>

In Chapter XXIX Gerald gives the reader his description of Henry II. Before he presents his picture of the Angevin king, he comments on the danger of offering his little book which contains some unflattering comments on Henry. It would seem fitting that a translation of this passage be included here, since it tends to speak for itself regarding Gerald's view of Henry, and speaks eloquently. This trans-

lation may have lost something in trying to put it into literary form. Therefore, the reader may find, in appendices I and II, the Latin text and a literal translation respectively.

"We have considered it fitting to depict for all time the evident nature of the king and that which is proper (proprietatem) to both the inner and the outer man, so that those who might be eager to hear his notable deeds in the future, may also hold before their eyes his image. Indeed, the present history does not allow such a great ornament (decus) of our time to disappear transitorily, since I have obtained the privilege (venia) of unfolding the truth, and [it is only] because of the truth that every history is worthy of either the authority or the name of history. For, having professed that nature is not to be changed by art, the painter (pictor) loses authority, if, while drawing forth more diligently those deeds which are quite proper (apta), he omits those which are less worthy of respect (verecundiae). Wherefore, since 'no man is born without faults (vitiis), he is best who is burdened the least,' (Horace; Sat. I. iii. 68) let the wise man think that nothing of humanity is alien to him. For always in matters of this world (mundanis), evil things are the neighbors of good things, and the vices are pointed up (distinguuntur) by the virtues, since nothing under under heaven is perfect. And so, just as the good things either of nature or of industry, when heard of, may delight the well disposed mind, so evil things, when read about, may not offend. But, since, according to (juxta) the philosopher, 'it is necessary to cultivate opportunity (potestatem) by duty, not to irritate by words,' and according to that comic, 'obedience brings friends, the truth brings forth hatred,' (Ter., And. i. 1. 41), undoubtedly it is a fearful thing, no matter how great the occasion, to antagonize him who can banish a man. I have zealously taken on this difficult work, one which is more dangerous than fruitful, to describe him with many words who can proscribe with one word. Indeed I would be fortunate, exceeding my powers by far, if I did not suppress the truth in some particulars, and yet in no way irritate the prince's mind.

Accordingly, Henry the second, king of the English, was a reddish man, bluish-gray [when sluggish], with a large (amplo) and round head, with bluish-gray eyes, wild and suffused with redness for anger (ad iram); [he was a man] with a fiery face, a shattering voice, a

neck bent down a little from the shoulders, a square chest, powerful arms, and a fleshy body, more from the fault of nature than of the gullet, and except for an immense tumor and much numbness, with a moderate [though] somewhat immoderate belly walking before him. For in regard to food and drink he was temperate and sober, and he was given to parsimony, as far as it was allowed to a prince. And, as work would repress this defect of nature, and mitigate vice of the flesh, and alleviate it by virtue of the soul, conspiring in war the more intestine (i.e., against his family) than against himself, he tormented his immoderate body with hardship. Besides in time of war, which was of frequent occasion, and in which it was superfluous to do these things, he hardly gave his stomach (it) even a small bit of peace, and in peace he allowed himself neither peace nor rest. He was devoted to the hunt and, in this respect, even transgressed temperance. At the first break of day he took to his horse. Now he traversed a ravine, then he penetrated a forest, now he went across mountain ridges; he led restless days; in the evening, having retired home, either before dinner or after, you would see him sitting very rarely. For after such great and fatiguing activities, he was accustomed to exhaust the whole court (curiam) by continually standing. But since this, 'it is exceedingly useful in life, that a man do nothing in excess,' (Ter. And. i. 1. 34), is no simple good remedy, with frequent excited motions of the shins and feet, with increased attacks by blows on recalcitrant beasts of burden, these things themselves (id ipsum) increased the other difficulties of his body, and, if they did not accelerate any other mother and minister of many evils, they did accelerate that worst of all evils — old age.

He was a man in stature among those of middle height — a stature passed on to none of his sons, the older two exceeding the middle a little, the younger two remaining below.

Except when disturbed in spirit and moved with violence, the prince was very eloquent, and, what was conspicuous in these times, he was learned in letters, and so forth."<sup>53</sup>

Gerald's analysis of Henry is an interesting one. Notice that, if the Welshman thinks that Henry's physical difficulties gave rise to many of the evils of the time, he, in effect, shrives Henry of much responsibility for those evils.

And it is interesting to notice the selection which Gerald makes in depicting Henry. The reader is faced with a reasonably clear image of an intensely masculine man, tall, strong, and quick to become angry. The reader sees a fiery and restless warrior, a lover of horses and battlefields, a vigorous, powerful man whose physical prowess by far outweighs that of either his sons or those who attend his court. All in all the image is that of a man who, indeed, is to be feared rather than loved, but a man who is fit to rule a kingdom when it is threatened both internally and externally. Perhaps one could argue that Gerald, in this chapter, was making some attempt to inject a note of objectivity into his work, not indeed in the sense of presenting a fully developed image of Henry, but in the sense of showing those aspects of Henry's countenance and character which might suggest subtly to the reader that Henry II, after all, was an excellent man to have around in the Angevin Empire of the second half of the twelfth century. On the other hand it is clear from the passage itself that objectivity in the modern sense of the term cannot be attributed to this chapter of Gerald's work. Still another interesting aspect of this passage is the satirical tone which obtains in it. A good example of this is Gerald's suggestion that Henry would be irritated at him no matter how he depicted the king — Gratiosum quippe foret, et nostras longe vires excedens,

veritatem in singulis non supprimere, et in nullo tamen principis animum exasperare.<sup>54</sup> Gerald's picture is incomplete in many respects, and the passage gives rise to many questions, but perhaps the most exasperating are the words "et caetera" which are the last words in the chapter. They occur immediately after the Welshman has told the reader that Henry was learned in letters. Does Gerald mean to imply that Henry was learned in other disciplines as well as in literature, or does he mean that he (Gerald) could say some other things about the king which he has chosen to leave out?

In Chapter XXX, Gerald recapitulates those events which he considers notable in his own time. The events which he lists there have been discussed in previous parts of the De Principis Instructione with the exception of the siege of a castle in Burgensis above the Sabrinum river and the surrender of Hugh of Mortuus Mare in 1155, the incitation of a certain Prince Oeneus, a Welsh prince in 1157, the surrender of Prince Rhys of Wales in 1163 — a suggestion of the success of Henry's attempts to keep the Welsh in hand —, and a mention of the king's return from Ireland in 1172.<sup>55</sup> The other events listed have been taken into account, in the analysis of this distinctio.

In a final chapter Gerald closes this distinctio with further reflections on the shift in Henry's fortune, on the

transitory character of earthly fortune, drawing on the lives of Pompey, Caesar and Alexander for examples. He makes the observation that Henry's failure to succor the Holy Land, which is now profaned by the Saracen dogs, was the cause of the ignominy of John's mission in Ireland. Promising to elucidate Henry's ruin in the next book, the Welshman terminates this second distinctio.<sup>56</sup>

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Praefatio, p. 153.
2. Ibid., Cap. I, p. 155.
3. Ibid., Cap. I, p. 157.
4. Ibid., Cap. II, p. 158. Warner points out that no occupant of the See of Cologne in Henry's time had the name of Godfrey, and that the successor of Reginald, who indeed made a pilgrimage to Canterbury in 1184 was Philip of Heinsberg. See Ibid., Cap. II, n. 3, p. 158.
5. Ibid., Cap. II, p. 159.
6. Ibid., Cap. II, p. 159 and n. 5., p. 159. Dates corrected as per Austin Lane Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta (1087-1216), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 330; p. 331.
7. Ibid., Cap. II, pp. 159-160.
8. Ibid., Cap. III, p. 160.
9. Gerald was apparently very much impressed by the murder of St. Thomas for he describes it in other places in his writings, i.e., Expugnatio Hibernica, Liber I, Cap. XX (Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. V. p. 259, Vita S. Remigii, Cap. XXVII, Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. VII, p. 50; Symbolum Electorum, Cap. XXVI, (Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. I, p. 393).
10. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. III, p. 161.
11. Ibid., Cap. III, pp. 161-162.
12. Ibid., Cap. IV, pp. 163-164 and n. 4 and 5, p. 164.
13. Ibid., Cap. IV, pp. 165-166.
14. Also in Hoveden, Vol. II, p. 144 and Gervase of Canterbury, Vol. I, p. 272.
15. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. V, pp. 166-169. This edition of the De Principis Instructione lists September 25, 1177 as the date of the Treaty of Ivry. The date indicated in this paper is from Austin Lane Poole, op. cit., p. 340.

16. Ibid., Distinctio II, Cap. VI, p. 169.
17. Ibid., Cap. VII, p. 170.
18. Austin Lane Poole, op. cit., p. 229 and n. 2, p. 229.
19. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. VII, pp. 170-172.
20. Ibid., Cap. VIII, pp. 172-173.
21. Ibid., Cap. IX, pp. 173-175.
22. Ibid., Cap. X, pp. 175-177. The author of another account of his death maintains that Geoffrey was killed in a tournament (Benedict of Peterborough, Vol. I, p. 350); See Ibid., Cap. X, n. 2, p. 176.
23. Ibid., Cap. XI, pp. 177-179.
24. Ibid., Cap. XII, pp. 180-182.
25. Ibid., Cap. XIII, pp. 183-186.
26. Ibid., Cap. XIV, pp. 187-188.
27. Ibid., Cap. XV, pp. 188-189.
28. Ibid., Cap. XVI, pp. 189-190.
29. Ibid., Cap. XVII, pp. 191-193.
30. Ibid., Cap. XVIII, p. 194.
31. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Expugnatio Hibernica, Vol. V, p. 317.
32. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. XIX, pp. 195-197.
33. See Chapter V of this work for a list of historians who do not respect Gerald as a historian.
34. John Horace Round, The Commune of London and Other Studies (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Company, 1899), p. 159.
35. Ibid., pp. 194-195.
36. Kate Norgate, "The Bull Laudabiliter," English Historical Review, Vol. VIII, No. xxix, (January, 1893), pp. 18-52.



37. Round, op. cit., p. 176.
38. Ibid., p. 177.
39. A. L. Poole, op. cit., n. 1, p. 303. Poole further observes, "For the whole subject see Orpen, op. cit., cit. i, Ch. ix." He also refers to R. L. Poole, Studies in Chronology and History, p. 267. The Orpen work to which he refers is G. H. Orpen, Ireland Under the Normans, 1169-1216 (Oxford, 1911).
40. Note 2 in Poole, op. cit., p. 309 describes the location of the letters. "The letters preserved in the Black Book of the Exchequer, are printed in Hearne's edition of the Liber Niger, i, 42 and in the Foedara, i. 45. They are summarized by Orpen, i. 301."
41. A. L. Poole, op. cit., p. 309.
42. "Hiberniam quippe transmeato pelagi profundo classe petiit et magnifice subjugavit . . . ." De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. I, p. 156. The emphasis of magnifice is my own. See also De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. XXI, pp. 198-200.
43. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. XX, p. 198.
44. Ibid., Cap. XXI, pp. 198-200 . . . , et fidem Christi egregie dilatare animoque excelso jam conceperas. And already you had conceived with a lofty spirit excellently to extend the faith of Christ. Ibid., Cap. XXI, p. 199.
45. Ibid., Cap. XXII, p. 200.
46. Ibid., Cap. XXIII, p. 201-202.
47. Ibid., Cap. XXIV, pp. 202-204.
48. Ibid., Cap. XXV, pp. 204-206.
49. Ibid., Cap. XXVI, pp. 207-208.
50. Ibid., Cap. XXVI, p. 208. Id ipsum (quod ipse diebus nostris redempturus esset Israel) quoque totus Anglorum populus cum summa voluntate desiderabat.
51. Ibid., Cap. XXVII, pp. 208-209.

52. Ibid., Cap. XXVIII, pp. 210-212.
53. Ibid., Cap. XXIX, pp. 213-215.
54. Ibid., Cap. XXIX, p. 214.
55. Ibid., Cap. XXX, pp. 215-219.
56. Ibid., Cap. XXXI, pp. 219-221.

## CHAPTER IV

### AN ANALYSIS OF DISTINCTIO III.

In the preface to his third distinctio, Gerald tells the purpose of the last part of his treatise. Having told of the good fortune of the king, he will now tell of the descent of the wheel of fortune and Henry's ignominious end.<sup>1</sup>

The author begins by describing a last meeting between Henry II and Louis VII of France in November of 1177 in the presence of William, Archbishop of Reims, and his two brothers, Count Theobald and Count Philip of Flanders.<sup>2</sup> Louis charged Henry with many injuries, but greater by far than any other injury was Henry's presumption in occupying Auvergne illegally against the Crown of France. Publicly calling upon God, his barons and men faithful to the Crown, and saying that he cannot revoke his rights in regard to Auvergne, Berri and Gisors, he grants them to his heir, and commits the cause to God, his heir and barons of the Crown. Immediately after this, Gerald records one of Louis' visions in which Louis saw his son and heir Philip Augustus drinking human blood in a golden cup and passing the cup to his enemies among whom was Henry. Shortly after the death of Louis, Philip Augustus attacked his father's enemies because of that vision, according to Gerald.<sup>3</sup>

In 1180 shortly after Louis VII's death, Philip (II) Augustus (1180-1223), trying to make Louis' vision a reality,

attacked and seized the territories of Queen Ala, his mother, and the lands of the Blois family, many castles of Alexander,<sup>4</sup> duke of Burgundy, and the lands and fortifications of Count Theobald, and indeed took away Theobald's position as seneschal of France. He then had an argument with Philip, count of Flanders over Vermandois, and Henry was asked by the young French king to help settle the dispute. But the count of Flanders had already occupied Vermandois, and refused to relinquish the land. The count of Flanders, using blood relationship to persuade Henry, appealed to the English king, his cousin, to not esteem it of little consequence to help him against the king of France. Henry refused, and the count of Flanders yielded Vermandois. In 1187, Philip Augustus occupied Auvergne, and Henry II tried to undermine the French king's occupation by using the count of Flanders and the French barons. In this, he failed. Next Gerald accuses Henry of trying to purchase peace from Philip at the expense of depriving the heir, Richard of his rightful inheritance. For Henry proposed that John marry Philip Augustus' sister, the daughter of Louis VII, and that he be given the counties of Poitou and Anjou as part of the marriage terms. John would get in addition to this only Normandy, and not all the lands which Henry then held in the kingdom of France. A major difficulty with this proposition was that Richard was not only betrothed to the French king's sister, but also was the count of Poitou. Thus, Richard, who was the rightful

heir since the death of the young king, would have been deprived not only of the kingship, but also of his county and his betrothed. Philip informed Richard of Henry's proposition, and from that moment Richard bore a great hate toward his father, angered because Henry had conspired to disinherit him in favor of the younger John. Gerald also alleges that Henry had deflowered the French king's sister after his mistress Rosamund had died, and that he had done this while the lady was in his protection as the betrothed of Richard. Furthermore, Gerald says that Henry was trying to divorce Eleanor and to be remarried, and for that reason, Gerald alleges, Henry managed to have Uguccione, the Cardinal legate, sent from the Roman Curia into England. Henry's purpose in seeking this divorce was, according to Gerald, to be able to disinherit the first (priores filios) sons of Eleanor. Gerald closes this chapter with an observation that on June 23, 1187, a truce was made between Philip and Henry, and that Philip kept Auvergne. The truce was to last a year.<sup>5</sup>

The Welsh historian next turns to the loss of the Holy Land to the pagans in 1187, a subject which is one of Gerald's favorites. The Holy Land fell to the lamentable Saracen plague because the Christian force was too small to hold out against such a great multitude of pagans. Gerald blames Henry and other princes for allowing this to happen by not keeping their promises. It is interesting to note that Ger-

ald in placing the responsibility, points to Henry specifically (Anglorum regis) but to others (aliorum principum)<sup>6</sup> only vaguely. Gerald encloses a letter sent from Pope Clement III (1187-1191) to the archbishop of Canterbury and his suffragans on February 10, 1188.<sup>7</sup> The pope asks that the archbishop and his suffragans send both persons and things (rerum) so that others seeing their example, will be urged to imitate them. Clement furthermore promises remission of all sins to any penitent who goes to the Holy Land in person, and allows the bishops to exercise judgment in the partial remission of sins for those who contribute in other ways.<sup>8</sup> Richard had heard about events in Jerusalem from the archbishop of Tours, and as early as September, 1187, distinguished himself by being the first to vindicate the injury to the Cross of Christ. Henry of England and Philip of France, having the example of Richard before them, took the Cross together at Gisors in January, 1188. In addition to this they collected a tithe, a tenth of all of one's possessions, from those who did not eagerly seize the opportunity to go on the Crusade.<sup>9</sup> It is interesting to notice that Gerald does not suppress the fact that Henry took the Cross before<sup>10</sup> Clement III wrote his letter of appeal to the bishops and archbishop of England. But Henry did not actually go to the Holy Land, despite repeated promises to do so; thus, Gerald does not mitigate his judgments about the king.

On the fourth Sunday of Lent, 1188, the Roman Emperor Frederick took the Cross, and Gerald records this event. But despite early enthusiasm for the Crusade, the venture was to prove abortive because of the ill will and disputes of the leaders and the pride and arrogance of others. Gerald sees the people who fought the Crusade as weaponless because they went armed, but without God.<sup>11</sup>

Gerald next writes that certain predictions of astronomers concerning these dire events had been falsified, and he includes a letter from an unnamed philosopher on the topic.<sup>12</sup> These speculations tell the reader nothing about Henry. The Welsh clerk goes on to tell how Richard sought a loan from his father in order to go to the Holy Land. Henry heard but did not grant this request, and thus prevented Richard from embarking on the Crusade. But Richard continued to press for the loan, and finally Henry sent the money. Henry did not let the matter rest there; he incited Count Raymond of St. Egidius<sup>13</sup> against his son, whereupon Richard surrounded and confined Castle Taillebourg in Raymond's County. Having taken that town, Richard invested Toulouse. At the request of Raymond, King Philip of France commanded Richard to cease the attack on Toulouse, but Richard would not, even though he was asked also by the seneschals of Normandy and Anjou. According to Gerald, just as Richard was fierce and audacious in an attack, so he was

pertinacious and persevering in completing it.<sup>14</sup> Gerald then gives a description of Richard's character in which Richard fares quite well. He was a man of extraordinary activity and courage, of great sumptuousness (dapsilitas) and liberality, above these, and adorning the other virtues which are laudable in a prince was his strong perseverance both of the soul and of the word.<sup>15</sup> Gerald criticizes Richard for not referring all things to God and for not doing all things humbly with a pure spirit and with a simple pure intention.<sup>16</sup> The Welshman records some of Richard's deeds in the East, and holds that these would have been perfected had Richard honored God in all things. Despite this criticism, the tone of the description is somewhat favorable to the count of Poitou.<sup>17</sup>

Returning to his history, Gerald comments on the fact that Henry collected money for the sake of the forests in England<sup>18</sup> (forestarum in Anglia causis), and by various other robberies, and in addition to this, Gerald accuses Henry of being insincere concerning the Crusade. According to the Welshman, Henry was believed to have taken the Cross only as a deceit. Gerald compares him to a dog in a manger (tanquam cani comparandus in foenili), and maintains that Henry did not have it in his mind to attack the Holy Land, and that Henry was not even moderately envious of anyone, even his own son, who did attack it.



Gerald adds two more warning visions, one by a certain Walter Daumartin in June of 1188, another by a man of letters. In the first vision, Daumartin saw a sword which was to pierce the lord King Henry through. Henry, according to Gerald, recognized as the predicted sword his loss of Chateauroux to the French king. The second vision referred to Henry's tortured end, and the one who saw the vision in his sleep saw this written on the ground, "...for the womb of his wife will swell up against him,"<sup>19</sup> a reference to the fact that Henry's sons turned against him near the end of his life. Promising that later these things will be made public, Gerald closes the chapter.<sup>20</sup>

Gerald next presents another warning presented to Henry by a noble woman, one Margaret Bohun, at Portsmouth in July, 1188. She said that some blessing has always followed upon Henry's successes, but that now the contrary is happening. Henry replied that the people speak ill of him uselessly without cause, but will speak ill of him not without cause if he should conquer and be strong enough to return.<sup>21</sup> Henry then went across the sea to Normandy, crossed Normandy, and moved toward Chateauroux. Henry met Richard there. Later he and Richard met with the king of the French between Bonmoulins and Soligny on November 18, 1188. After attempts to make peace failed, Richard went over to the side of Philip because Henry was trying to put the hereditary interests

of a younger son (John) before Richard's own interests. Richard performed this transfer of loyalty before the very eyes of his father.<sup>22</sup> Gerald sees this as partial punishment for Henry's failure to keep his promises to save the Cross. Nevertheless, a truce was made until Easter 1189, and the king of the French kept the lands and castles until then.<sup>23</sup>

Next Gerald writes a chapter in which he presents certain incidents which the Welshman thinks shed light on the king's character. Henry, since he habitually surrounded himself with men of religion as his counsellors, called two prelates, Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury and Hugh of Lincoln, former Carthusians. In their presence Henry questioned why he should venerate Christ, why he should honor Him Who bears away honor in his lands and lets the king be confounded by a boy, the king of the French. Gerald alleges that these questions were blasphemous, and he alleges that Henry committed other blasphemies which he does not record. Gerald then marks Henry as a man whose heart was far removed from the Lord and dissimilar to Job, the exemplar of patience.<sup>24</sup>

Next the Welsh critic describes an interesting talk that he had had with Ranulf de Glanville, the seneschal and justiciar of England. Gerald asked Ranulf why Normandy no longer defends itself against the French as well as it once did. Ranulf's answer was that in two wars a little before

the coming of the Normans, the first at Pontiacensis between King Louis, the son of Charles the Great and Gurmundus, and the second long after at Kameracensis, the youth of France had been so much destroyed and all but extinguished, that before the time of Gerald and Ranulf, France had been restored too little to be effective against the Normans.<sup>25</sup> Gerald then inserts his own answer to the question. He thinks that Normandy is less well defended because the kings have oppressed both Englishmen and Normans. This caused brother to be against brother and fathers against their sons, and the kingdom, so divided, became weak. For this reason, Normandy cannot defend itself as well as it once did, especially since zeal flourishes in the kingdom of the French.<sup>26</sup>

After this oblique criticism of the Norman kings of England, Gerald returns to his discussion of Henry II. In March, 1189, Henry, surrounded by his court, was at Le Mans. Here Henry became ill, so ill indeed that he was even induced to confess his sins, though, according to Gerald, he did even this sophistically. Nevertheless, Henry did not die but recovered. In the months of April and May, 1189, he met Richard on the boundaries of the Marks, (Marchiae) but Gerald does not tell the reader of the outcome of these meetings.

In his next chapter, Gerald describes a portent experienced by Richard Redvers, a cousin of the king. While

suffering from a fever, Richard Redvers says that he is dying and predicts that the king will follow him in death in less than two months and a half. This prediction was not taken seriously.<sup>28</sup>

Gerald next makes a rather lengthy digression on the Crusade. He first turns to the Roman Emperor Frederick, and holds that Frederick, having taken the vow to make the journey to the Holy Land, in a manly way, went without delay on the business of the Cross. Gerald praises Frederick for not delaying and for laying up treasure in heaven.<sup>29</sup> The Welsh cleric then records one of his own visions concerning the task of the Cross. The alleged vision praises those who undertake this worthy endeavor.<sup>30</sup> The vision is followed immediately by Gerald's account of Emperor Frederick's Crusade. In 1189, Frederick went through the kingdom of the Hungarians and the territory of the Greeks to get to the Holy Land. Gerald seems to admire Frederick's enthusiasm and encloses a letter which Frederick sent to Saladin challenging him to battle.<sup>31</sup> Not to be outdone, the Saracen ruler replies to Frederick's challenge, pointing out especially the past successes of his troops against the Christians. Saladin offers peace, but this only angers the Roman Emperor, and inflames him the more to wage war.<sup>32</sup> Gerald refers back to an Imperial assembly held at Mentz on March 27, 1188. He says that the emperor and the magnates of the whole empire one and all unanimously had proclaimed

the Crusade. Returning to Frederick's deeds, Gerald states that Frederick crossed the Danube, proceeded through Bulgaria and came into Macedonia.<sup>33</sup>

An ancient tension manifested itself when the Latins first came into the territory of the Greeks. The Roman Emperor had sent a monastic bishop and certain other princes to Constantinople as emissaries, and the Greek Emperor Isaac Angelus (1185-1195) incarcerated them. However, he began to fear that the royal city would be annihilated, so he released them. Frederick spent the winter at Adrianople. One of Frederick's sons, the duke of Swabia, attacked and captured a fortress, and once more the Greeks feared the destruction of their empire. Isaac offered hostages, victuals, and ships. Frederick accepted these terms, gave the Greeks peace, and then moved across Dardanelles in March of 1190.<sup>34</sup>

Having arrived in Asia Minor, the emperor and his forces faced those of the sultan of Iconium, led by the sultan's son, Melkinus. But the Turkish warriors were no match for the Christian knights when they met in the battle of Iconium on May 18, 1190, and the Christians won a victory. When the city had been taken, the sultan who had simulated friendship for the Christians but who really planned their downfall, placed the blame for that treachery on Melkinus. The emperor was swayed by the sultan's argument, and having obtained hostages and having formed an agreement of a league with him,

the Roman emperor and his army entered Lesser Armenia on May 30, 1190.<sup>35</sup> On June 10, 1190, they arrived at the river Selef, and while crossing that river Frederick Barbarossa was drowned. Gerald sees the death of Frederick as a great blow to the Empire the glory of which had reflowered under the tutelage of the great emperor. He also sees the drowning of Frederick as a great loss to the Christian cause. The army under Frederick's son, the duke of Swabia, nevertheless, pressed on to Antioch, and on June 21, 1190, the prince of Antioch handed over the whole city to him.<sup>36</sup> The duke of Swabia went through Tyre and then proceeded to Acre. But there his army, wasted by disease and excess, was dispersed, and the duke himself died on January 20, 1191. The crusade, of course, was a failure, and Gerald sees this as a divine judgment.<sup>37</sup>

One wonders about the purposes of Gerald's long digression on Frederick's campaign of 1189-1190. The Welshman praises the Roman Emperor very highly, attributing to him constancy, perseverance, good disposition, temperance, and the qualities of a man who brought honor and glory to the Roman Empire.<sup>38</sup> Gerald's attitude toward Frederick's enthusiasm and prompt action in the matter of the crusade is also very favorable.<sup>39</sup> If one argues that Gerald keeps to the declared purpose of *Distinctio* three and describes the downfall of Henry II, and, if one argues that the apparent

digression is a device to elucidate that downfall, the digression becomes, perhaps, somewhat more meaningful. Indeed Gerald strongly suggests in *Distinctio* two that he will often compare and contrast good men with the bad.<sup>40</sup> Frederick's deeds, words and attitudes in regard to helping the Christian cause in the Holy Land may be seen in sharp contrast to the actions, words and attitudes of Henry II, as recorded by Gerald. Is this not what Gerald implies by the digression: that Henry is even more reprehensible and deserving of punishment when seen in contrast to Frederick, an honorable and glorious ruler who is quick to see his duty and to do it? If Gerald means to contrast the dilatory character of Henry's attitudes and acts with Frederick's prompt reaction to the Christian need for help in Asia Minor, the long passages about the crusade take on more meaning, and the Welsh author maintains a general unity in the De Principis Instructione. Furthermore, Gerald's repeated allegations that Henry was responsible for the failure of the crusade seem to lend some credence to the above interpretation. On the other hand, one could argue that Gerald was simply impressed by the glories of the Roman Emperor and inserted a discussion of his exploits in order to praise him. One might wish to assert that Gerald was not enough concerned with unity to make every portion of the De Principis Instructione relevant to the book's declared purpose. If one

argues that every portion of the work is relevant to Gerald's stated purpose, he attributes a sort of medieval impressionism to the Welsh author. Is the purpose of each one of Gerald's apparent digressions to sow the seeds of an impression of Henry II, an impression that is built up largely by the literary devices of comparison and contrast? Notice that the very language in which Gerald wrote, a language committed to the periodic style and to parallelism from of old, lends itself beautifully to an impressionism based in the main on comparison and contrast.<sup>41</sup>

Returning to his direct discussion of Henry, Gerald tells about a conference at Le Ferte. Between June 4 and June 9, 1189, Henry, Philip and Richard met there to discuss peace, but only became the more angry. Henry withdrew to Le Mans, and Richard and Philip reached the city too. On June 12, 1189, a fire accidentally destroyed Le Mans, and Henry had to withdraw. Henry became very angry that the city in which he was born and nourished, the city in which the tomb of his father and the body of St. Julian were located, the city which he loved more than any in his territories had been taken away from him. According to Gerald, Henry blamed this on God, and said that he would retaliate by taking away from God that which God loved the more in him.<sup>42</sup> Gerald harshly criticizes Henry at great length for this alleged blasphemy.<sup>43</sup> Henry went to La Frenaye (Frenel-



las),<sup>44</sup> and then to Anjou on the next day, June 13, 1189. Philip, meanwhile, attacked the city of Tours and conquered it. A new conference to discuss a peace was scheduled for Azai on June 30, 1189. Henry said that he was sick with a fever, but Philip and Richard did not believe him and so the French king gathered together William, archbishop of Reims, Count Philip of Flanders, Theobald of Blois, and others and went into Henry's camp. Having arrived there, Philip refused to speak one word of peace until Henry should put himself entirely at the mercy of Philip in every respect. Henry promised that he would do that. Gerald sees this ignominious subjection as a divine punishment for Henry's treatment of St. Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>45</sup>

Gerald then goes on to praise Philip, again perhaps, in contrast to Henry. Gerald alleges that at Montmartre in 1169, when Philip was only a boy of seven years,<sup>46</sup> the young heir was present at a conference between Henry and Louis, in which Henry confounded Louis' efforts toward peace. Philip, though only a child, said that his father would establish him as a very grave avenger against him who presumed to molest his father in his old age.<sup>47</sup> Gerald records at some length similar occasions, once at Gisors and once at Andely, in which Philip made comments which indicated Philip's desire to subject the Angevins to himself.<sup>48</sup> The Welshman records ominous pronouncements made by such diverse people as Saracen envoys

from Spain, a monk of Vincennes, and a pauper woman who spoke to Gerald in Paris on the night of Philip's birth — all alleging the expected greatness of Philip. The pauper woman even said to Gerald that Philip would be a hammer of God to Henry II.<sup>49</sup>

Having praised Philip, the Welshman says that a peace was formed which honored the king of the French and the count of Poitou, and shamed the king of the English in every way. When Henry heard the names of the signers read, he was thrown into despair, for at the head of the list was the name of John, the son whom he loved more than all the others and for whose sake he had sustained all the evils which had befallen him.<sup>50</sup>

Gerald next tells his reader about a certain picture in the royal chamber at Winchester. Four eagles are shown preying on the parent eagle; one of them, the fourth, is waiting to gouge out the parent's eyes. Henry says of the picture, "The four grayish-black eagles are my four sons who will never stop persecuting me even to the death. The youngest of these, whom I now love with such a great love, will finally insult me more gravely and more dangerously by far than all the others."<sup>51</sup> Gerald also tells a tale, one which, by his own admission, is more fiction than fact; according to this story, Henry is said of have whispered these words into Count Richard's ears even while he was giving his son

the kiss of peace, "May the Lord never permit me to die, until I shall have received from you a vengeance fitting to me."<sup>52</sup> Having done this, Henry had himself borne to Chinon; there he lay ill for a time, and on July 6, 1189, he died. The scriptural quotes which Gerald chooses to insert into his work on the occasion of Henry's death seem to indicate that Gerald thought that the king's ignoble end was suitable for a man who had contemned God, had taken evil counsel, had been malicious, iniquitous, and unjust.<sup>53</sup>

After he records Henry's death, Gerald is not yet finished with the Angevin. The Welshman next turns to Henry's wife, Eleanor, and their offspring. He accuses Eleanor's father of having seized by force (vi rapuit), abducted and married one Mauberius, the wife of the viscount of Chatelherault.<sup>54</sup> Gerald points out that this was the wife of his own man (hominis sui).<sup>55</sup> A saintly hermit went to the abductor, and, claiming that he was a messenger of God, told him not to marry Mauberius, especially since she was the wife of his own man. The hermit said that such a marriage would be no marriage at all but rather adultery. The duke said that he did not believe that the man was from God, and would not listen, whereupon the hermit told the duke that, if he (the hermit) was in fact a messenger from God, the duke's descendants would not be able to bear happy fruit.<sup>56</sup> Having related some of the sins of Eleanor's ancestors, Gerald then

accuses her of conducting herself in her second marriage to Henry as she had conducted herself in Palestine when married to Louis. And, according to the Welshman, her sons and daughters were of little use. Gerald then attacks Henry's mother, Matilda, who was married to the Roman Emperor Henry V (1106-1125) until his death. The accusation which the Welshman brings against her is that her marriage to Count Geoffrey of Anjou was a bigamous one, since, according to Gerald, Henry V was not really dead. He also accuses Henry of an adulterous union with Eleanor. Having said these things, the Welsh critic next compares the actions of Henry's father, Count Geoffrey of Anjou, with Henry's own actions in regard to dealing with saintly members of the hierarchy of the church. Gerald says that just as Count Geoffrey of Anjou raged so violently that he rendered St. Gerard, the bishop of Seez, a eunuch, and put his bloody hands onto the Christ of the Lord, so King Henry presumed to rave madly against the blessed martyr Thomas. Gerald alleges also that the Angevin family had among its numbers a demoniac countess, who never remained at Mass for the canon, but left right after the Gospel (Evangelium). However, the count noticed this habit, and, Gerald states that when the count tried to have her held in the church by four soldiers past her accustomed departure time, she used her cloak as wings and flew out of the window.<sup>57</sup> Gerald then closes this particular

attack on Henry's family and that of his wife with the observation that the Norman tyrants ruled in the occupied lands neither legitimately nor naturally, and that none of them departed this life laudably.<sup>58</sup>

Gerald next turns to curious events which happened, according to him, after the death of Henry. He notes that, though Henry as a matter of habit usually had two or three bishops around him, and five or six bishops in his court, he had no bishop with him at the end. Henry's body was left naked and exposed until a boy came and covered the remains with his own not very large cloak, and, since it was only a boy's cloak, it could not cover the nude body completely. Thus, according to Gerald, even in death Henry kept the name which had been given to him in his younger years when he was a duke — a name which the commoners still called him — Henry Short Mantel (Henricus...Cum curto mantello). The body was carried from Chinon to Fontevraud and placed in the great church of the nuns there. Gerald says that when Richard came into the church the corpse bled at the nostrils. Henry was buried at Fontevraud on July 8, 1189. The rest of this portion of Gerald's work is filled with alleged portents, prophecies and visions having to do with the death and ignoble end of Henry and his sons. Gerald closes with the observation that John, another of Henry's progeny, was the greatest tyrant of the whole family, and

that he ruled badly and precipitated trouble with the church.<sup>59</sup>

Gerald next records seven more visions which indicated difficulties for Henry.<sup>60</sup> The Welshman then comments on the ability of Henry and his sons to fill their treasuries, but points out that other places, such as the city of Palermo in Sicily, sent more revenues to the king of Sicily than the whole of England sent to the king of the English.<sup>61</sup> When Gerald finishes commenting on the wealth of various kingdoms, he addresses himself to an extended praise for the French kings. They are not tyrannical, according to him. They are noted for their prompt justice, for they are not venal. Other princes swear oaths too much on the death of God, on His eyes, teeth, and small growths on His body, while the French kings take few oaths and those simply on the saints of France. The French kings do not act like bears and lions, but are affable and amiable. They know that since they are men they should humble themselves no matter how great they are. They praise modesty exceedingly, and they give power, glory and thanks to God alone. They are chaste and pure. They live good lives, and pass down their kingdoms to their sons and heirs happily. Their symbol is a little flower, and yet that symbol has conquered panthers and lions. They treat the things of God and church well. Since the lands of tyrants, the depraved and the perverse are placed into the hands of pious and benign princes, these territories would

have come into the hands of England, had England, like France, shown faith and peace and reverence to the church.<sup>62</sup>

Again it is possible that Gerald is using a device of contrast to cast the Norman rulers into sharp relief. This is quite likely, for, immediately after his praise for the kings of the French, he returns to a tale about a new forest established by King William II, called William Rufus (1087-1100). According to Gerald, William II established the new forest at the expense of the church. He asserts that William had a vision, as did a prior of Dunstable, warning William of disaster. But the king ignored these warnings, and was killed by a chance arrow fired by a knight named Ralph de Aquis. Gerald also compares William Rufus' death to that of Richard, for the latter too was killed by an arrow.<sup>63</sup>

Gerald closes the De Principis Instructione with a final chapter in which he, for the most part, comments on tyrants and tyranny. In the beginning they flourish, but in the end they succumb to misery; like the flowers of spring, which the good will of the West Wind raises up for a time, they are erased suddenly by the blasts of the North Wind. According to Gerald, no Norman king terminated his life laudably, and, just as the life of the good ought to be read publicly to be imitated by good men, so occasionally should the life of the evil be read publicly so that it may be shunned by both the evil and the good. Gerald thinks that the

examples in his work pertain not only to princes but also to prelates, and that they ought to follow, or avoid, the examples, as the case may be. He thinks that the time at which he finished the book was a very disturbed one. According to Gerald, great men strike their breasts and pontiffs sigh, since the church of God has been deprived of the Holy Land as well as books, sacred vessels and the like by the pagan fury. Other men can carry on histories of the Norman kings, according to Gerald. Again he distinguishes France as having a just, moderate, and pious government enjoying the tranquility of peace and liberty, while England is touched by clouds and oppressed by tyranny. On a rather dark note, he closes, saying that we cannot do everything.<sup>64</sup>



## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Preface, p. 225.
2. According to the editors, G. F. Warner, "There is a difficulty here, as Philip, Count of Flanders, was not a brother of the archbishop. The last recorded interview between the two kings (exclusive of Henry's attendance upon Louis during his visit to Canterbury in 1179) was at Gracay, in November, 1177. If this is the occasion referred to, Philip of Flanders could not have been present, as he was then in the Holy Land. It is suggested in Bouquet that the name of Henry, Count of Champagne, has dropped out (above, p. 137, n. 2)." This latter refers to a passage in Distinctio I in which William was mentioned.
3. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Cap. I. pp. 226-228.
4. The duke meant is Hugh III, according to the editor. See Ibid., Cap. II, n. 4, p. 228.
5. Ibid., Cap. II, pp. 228-233.
6. Ibid., Cap. III, bottom of page 235, top of page 236.
7. Ibid., Cap. IV, pp. 236-239.
8. Ibid., Cap. IV, p. 238.
9. Ibid., Cap. V, p. 240. "Decimas quoque rerum omnium ac possessionum eorum qui iter (MS., inter) hoc non arripent ad peregrinantium sustentationem dandas ubique decreverunt." This is a reference to the famous Ordinance of the Saladin Tithe. For an English translation of the document, see Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham, editors and translators, Sources of English Constitutional History (New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1937), pp. 95-96. The Saladin Tithe is an early instance, and among precedent establishing ones, of a direct personal property tax. See Austin Lane Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta (1087-1216). (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. 419-420. A. B. White calls the tax new. See Albert Beebe White, The Making of the English Constitution, (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925), p. 352. Henry II used the inquest by the oath of local jurors to assess the correct

9. Ibid., Con't. amounts due, whenever an individual was thought to have made a false self-assessment. H. Taylor holds that it was by Henry's use of the inquest to assess properly the amount owed to the Saladin Tithe that the representative principle was first brought into contact with the system of taxation. See Hannis Taylor, The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1889) Vol. I, p. 359. Pollock and Maitland list the ordinance of the Saladin Tithe as one of among only ten ordinances which have come down to this time from the reign of Henry II. See Sir Frederick Pollock and Frederic William Maitland, The History of English Law (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1895), Vol. I, p. 117. A Latin text is in William Stubbs' Select Charters (8th Edition, 1905), pp. 159-160.
10. Notice that the accuracy of this judgment depends upon the accuracy of the dates placed in the margins of this edition of the De Principis Instructione by George F. Warner.
11. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Cap. V, pp. 239-241.
12. Ibid., Cap. VI, pp. 242-243.
13. Ibid., Cap. VII, n. 2, p. 245. Raymond V, count of Toulouse and St. Gilles.
14. Ibid., Cap. VII, pp. 244-245.
15. Ibid., Cap. VIII, p. 248.
16. Ibid., Cap. VIII, p. 249.
17. Ibid., Cap. VIII, pp. 246-250.
18. Perhaps this is a reference to the collection of some tithe which was an effect of Henry's Assize of the forest (1184). For an English translation of Henry's Assize of the Forest (1184), see Stephenson and Marchamm op. cit., pp. 87-89. Perhaps the tithe to which Gerald refers was levied to provide for foresters called for in article 4 or as a substitute for the Knight service in the guarding of the kings vert (green wood or growing timber) and venison called for in article 7. For a Latin text, see William Stubbs', Select Charters (8th Edition, 1905), pp. 156-159.

19. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Cap. IX, p. 253. "...venter enim uxoris ejus intumescet contra eum."
20. Ibid., Cap. IX, pp. 250-253.
21. Ibid., Cap. X, p. 253. "Sine causa populus iste nequam maledicit." De Caetero vero non sine causa, si vixero et redire valuerō, me maledicet."
22. Ibid., Cap. X, p. 254.
23. Ibid., Cap. X, p. 255.
24. Ibid., Cap. XI, pp. 255-257.
25. Ibid., Cap. XII, p. 258.
26. Ibid., Cap. XII, pp. 258-259.
27. Ibid., Cap. XIII, pp. 259-260.
28. Ibid., Cap. XIV, pp. 261-262.
29. Ibid., Cap. XV, pp. 263-264.
30. Ibid., Cap. XVI, pp. 264-267.
31. Ibid., Cap. XVII, pp. 267-269. This letter seems to be authentic for it appears in many sources of this period. See Ibid., Cap. XVII, n. 2, p. 267.
32. Ibid., Cap. XVIII, pp. 269-272. This reply is only in one other independent source, i.e., the writings of Ralph de Coggeshale; see Ibid., Cap. XVIII, p. 269.
33. Ibid., Cap. XIX, pp. 273-274.
34. Ibid., Cap. XX, pp. 274-275.
35. Ibid., Cap. XXI, pp. 275-279.
36. Ibid., Cap. XXII, pp. 279-281.
37. Ibid., Cap. XXIII, pp. 281-282.
38. Ibid., Cap. XXII, pp. 279-280.
39. Ibid., Cap. XVI, p. 267; Ibid., Cap. XVIII, p. 272.
40. Ibid., Distinctio II, Cap. XXIX, pp. 213-214. See also Appendices I and II of this paper.

41. Three of Gerald's works which have been translated into English contain many instances of Gerald's use of comparison and/or contrast in order to construct an impression. See John J. O'Meara, translator, The First Version of the Topography of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis (Dundalk: Dundalgon Press (W. Tempest) Ltd., 1951), pp. 108-110. This passage is especially interesting because Gerald eulogizes Henry, comparing him to Alexander of Macedon. Gerald attributes many virtues to Henry, and he suggests in the passage that Henry was a man of some sagacity, since Henry listened to the advice of Gaius Caesar and Seneca. This very favorable view of Henry presented in the Topographia Hibernica (c. 1187) clashes sharply with the very unfavorable view of Henry presented in the De Principis Instructione (c. 1217). For another example of Gerald's use of comparison and contrast to give an impression, this time of monks and clerics, to the benefit of the latter, see J. J. O'Meara, op. cit., pp. 98-99. Two more of Gerald's works, in which the reader can find many examples of the Welshman's impressionism, are translated into English and are bound into one volume. See Richard Colt Hoare, translator, The Itinerary Through Wales and the Description of Wales (London: J. M. Dent and Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1908). This work has an introduction by W. Llewelyn Williams, and Hoare's translation has received some editing. The Itinerary is included in pages 3 through 141; the Description is included in pages 145 through 205. For examples of Gerald's impressionism in the Itinerary, see R. C. Hoare, op. cit., pp. 42-44 and p. 94. This latter is interesting; in it Gerald compares the see of St. David's, a see for which Gerald desired the metropolitan dignity, to a half-buried matron. In forbearing to mourn for his ancient mother, St. David's, the author sighs poignantly. For examples of Gerald's impressionism in the Description, see R. C. Hoare, op. cit., pp. 177-178 and pp. 192-193. This list is by no means exhaustive.
42. Ibid., Cap. XXIV, p. 283. Gerald quotes Henry: "... Deus...et tibi quam potero talionem reddam, rem quam in me plus diligeres, tibi proculdubio subtrahendo."
43. Ibid., Cap. XXIV, pp. 283-286.
44. See Ibid., Cap. XXV, n. 2, p. 286.
45. Ibid., Cap. XXV, pp. 286-288.

46. Actually Philip was only four years old, having been born in August, 1165.
47. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Cap. XXV, p. 288.
48. Ibid., Cap. XXV, pp. 289-290.
49. Ibid., Cap. XXV, pp. 291-293.
50. Ibid., Cap. XXV, pp. 294-295.
51. Ibid., Cap. XXVI, pp. 295-296. "Quatuor," inquit, "aquilae pulli quatuor filii mei sunt, qui me usque ad mortem persequi non cessabunt. Quorum minor natu, quem tanta dilectione nunc amplector, mihi denique longe gravius aliis omnibus et periculosius nonnunquam insultabit."
52. Ibid., Cap. XXVI, p. 296. "Nunquam me Dominus mori permittat, donec dignam mihi de te vindictam accepero!"
53. Ibid., Cap. XXVI, pp. 296-298.
54. See Ibid., Cap. XXVII, n. 5, p. 298. The man accused was not Eleanor's father, but her grandfather, William IX (VII), duke of Aquitaine and count of Poitou.
55. Adultery of a lord with "his man's" wife constituted a most serious breach of the feudal contract.
56. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Cap. XXVII, pp. 298-299.
57. Ibid., Cap. XXVII, p. 301. For a similar comment about Geoffrey's treatment of St. Gerard and Henry's treatment of St. Thomas of Canterbury, see Ibid., Distinctio II, Cap. III, pp. 160-161.
58. Ibid., Cap. XXVII, pp. 298-303.
59. Ibid., Cap. XXVIII, pp. 304-311.
60. Ibid., Cap. XXIX, pp. 312-315; Ibid., Cap. XXX, pp. 315-316.
61. Ibid., Cap. XXX, pp. 316-317.
62. Ibid., Cap. XXX, pp. 318-322.

63. Ibid., Cap. XXX, pp. 322-326.

64. Ibid., Cap. XXXI, pp. 326-329.

## CHAPTER V

### EVALUATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Gerald the Welshman, as a historian, does not enjoy an enviable reputation among modern historians. He is called vain and amusing by Charles Homer Haskins.<sup>1</sup> Amy Kelly accuses him of dipping his pen in venom.<sup>2</sup> David Knowles accuses him of irresponsibility and a lack of sobriety.<sup>3</sup> Louis F. Salzman calls him utterly unscrupulous in the abuse of his enemies.<sup>4</sup> Austin Lane Poole states that Gerald indulged in violent invectives against Henry II.<sup>5</sup> John Horace Round states that Gerald inserted a concocted papal Bull, Laudabiliter, and equally concocted letters of confirmation into De Principis Instructione.<sup>6</sup> These accusations are typical of those with which Gerald of Wales is charged by modern historians. Many of the latter will allow that Gerald is an interesting and witty writer, but they avoid taking him seriously.

Gerald was a fiery and passionate man and was apparently quite vain and boastful. He seems to have enjoyed scandalous stories, and he recorded them with some prejudice. On the other hand, the Welsh archdeacon had some virtues. He was one of the earliest men to write in the light and interesting way which is sometimes called the journalistic style, and for this he is famous. Salzman calls Gerald the proto-journalist.<sup>7</sup> The Topographia Hibernica (c. 1187)

is an instance of Gerald's creative ability in this new medium, and it is an instance of his creativity in scientific knowledge -- an addition to the body of topographical knowledge. The Topographia Hibernica, the Itinerarium Kambriae and the Descriptio Kambriae attest to his extraordinary ability to observe natural phenomena and to describe them accurately and interestingly. Furthermore, Urban T. Holmes holds that, besides his abilities as a topographer, Gerald also did exceptionally well with regard to observing fauna: fish, reptiles, birds and mammals.<sup>8</sup> If Gerald had limitations as a historian, it is also true that he was a man in whom lay the creative spark. Gerald did not let the spark of creativity die, he kindled it often whether from anger, from satirical wit or from intellectual curiosity untouched by any desire or need to use the results.

Though the De Principis Instructione has limited value as a historical source, it does seem to have more value than has been generally accorded to it. In the first place, Distinctio one, considered as a handbook of instruction for a prince who desires to rule well, has a place in a long history of such manuals. Many works have been written since classical antiquity which deal with the perfect prince or with useful and good modes of rule. Some of the discussions which deal with the subject of the good ruler or the ideal rule are portions of larger works, and sometimes they are units in themselves. Plato (427-347 B.C.) discussed the



ideal ruler in his Republic. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) treated the modes of rule in his Politics. Cicero (106-43 B.C.) discussed problems of rule in his De Officiis. St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430 A.D.) was concerned with just rule in his City of God. From the time of St. Augustine down through the twelfth century there was a long line of writers who discussed the ideal ruler. Some writers and their works which are representative of such discussions are Cassianus (?360-435?), Liber de Principatibus; St. Isidore of Seville (c. 570-636), De Principis Honestate; Jonas of Orleans (d. 843), De Institutione Regia; Hincmar of Rheims (c. 806-882), De Regis Persona et Regio Ministerio; Sedulius Scotus (fl. c. 840), De Rectoribus Christianis; Peter Damianus (c. 1000-1072), De Principis Officiis; Theophylactus Bulgar (d. c. 1110), Institutio Regia; Hugo of Fleury (d. 1120), De Potestate Regia. Though these works vary in importance, a central figure, the prince, is discussed in all.<sup>9</sup>

The twelfth and succeeding centuries were especially productive of this type of literature. Some writers and their works are John of Salisbury (c. 1110-1180), Politicus; Gerald of Wales (1147-1222), De Principis Instructione; Gilbert of Tournai (d. 1270), Eruditio Regum et Principum; St. Thomas Aquinas (1226-1274), De Regimine Principum (c. 1265); William Ferrault (d. c. 1275), De Eruditione Principum; Aegidius Romanus (1247-1316), De

Regimine Principum (c. 1287); Jaques de Cessoles (dates unknown), De Moribus Hominum et Officiis Nobilium super Ludo Scaccorum (c. 1300); Pierre du Bois (c. 1255-c. 1321), De Recuperatione Terrae Sanctae; Marsiglio of Padua (c. 1270-1342?), Defensor Pacis; Thomas Occleve (1370? - 1450?), De Regimine Principis (1411-1412).<sup>10</sup> Niccolo Machiavelli's Prince both finds a place in this tradition, and is a radical break with it. The Prince finds a place in this tradition because it is a manual for the instruction of a prince. It breaks with the tradition because its point of reference is power and power alone, whereas the point of reference of the earlier documents tended to be God or justice.

It is interesting to notice that Lester Kruger Born includes Gerald's work in the tradition of handbooks for princes. In doing that, Born seems to understand the significance of the De Principis Instructione better than Henry Osborn Taylor, the great historian of medieval ideas, who dismisses Gerald's work with the observation that the De Principis Instructione was written partially to show in how evil a way Henry II carried out his functions as king.<sup>11</sup>

It is true that Gerald could have made his exposition of the princely virtues much clearer had he given definitions and rigorous logical analyses of the princely virtues as well as examples and quotations. Such an approach would have made the work less vague. Furthermore, the Welsh archdeacon severely limited his contribution by not describing or mak-

ing some attempt to describe, the ways in which the virtues of the ruler were to be attained and cultivated. Gerald seems to have assumed that his readers would know the particular acts which are the means of obtaining and nourishing habits of virtue. On the other hand, it might be a bit unfair to ask that an author tell how to attain virtue. What ethician has done an exhaustive analysis of the means to virtue?

Though the aforesaid limitations must be taken into account, the first distinctio of the De Principis Instructione has some value for the modern historian. The treatise stands in a long tradition of similar documents, and from it the historian can discern much of what a twelfth century cleric, scholar and artist thought about princely virtue. Furthermore, a study of the examples and quotations which Gerald used can teach the historian much about the status of learning among educated men of the twelfth century. Gerald was familiar with a great many ancient Roman writers as well as scriptural and patristic authors, a fact which indicates a high state of learning. But even more important than this, as far as the history of the twelfth century is concerned, is Gerald's attitude toward the various writers he cites. Furthermore, Gerald's observations on the virtues can give much insight into political, social, ethical and religious mores and customs of the time, for ethical ideas and ideals have far reaching

effects on human thought. This important and detailed undertaking the author hopes to attempt at some future date.

When the modern historian considers the first distinctio of the De Principis Instructione as a separate work, it is more valuable to him as a document from which he can learn about twelfth century political, social, ethical and religious ideas than as a document from which he can learn historical events and occurrences. This is especially true when Distinctio one is seen as having a polemical purpose. In the cases of Distinctios two and three, on the other hand, the historian can learn more about events and occurrences than about ideas, though, obviously, all three distinctios contain some of each.

Distinctios two and three are historical documents which have notable limitations. In the first place, Gerald of Wales tells the reader nothing of the early days of King Henry. The years from Henry's birth in 1133 to the death of King Stephen's son Eustace and King Stephen himself in 1153 and 1154 respectively<sup>12</sup> are not mentioned, and these were the formative years of Henry's life. Gerald is often attacked for his lack of objectivity, but it is interesting to note that the Welshman suggests that his own view of Henry had undergone a radical change since he had dedicated the Topographia Hibernica to Henry (c. 1187). Indeed in the Topographia Hibernica, Gerald had gone so far as to

eulogize the Angevin king, and even in the De Principis Instructione Gerald does not fail to indicate that he had thought very highly of the king at one time.<sup>13</sup> Was this perhaps an indirect method of injecting an attempt at objectivity into the work?

Gerald's attack on Queen Eleanor is not a little distorted. The king may indeed have been guilty of an infraction against his feudal contract with King Louis VII, his suzerain lord, but the ferocity of Gerald's attack on the lady from Aquitaine seems to have not a little personal bitterness in it. Gerald dedicated the work to King Louis VII of France,<sup>14</sup> for he admired the ruler of the French. Eleanor's alleged extra-marital activities in Palestine and Louis' declaration of the illegality of the marriage to Henry were enough to push Gerald into a diatribe against Eleanor and her family.<sup>15</sup> Gerald did not personally witness Eleanor's deeds in the Holy Land, and he does not indicate any sources for his comments against her Eastern ventures. Thus, he could not have known the truth or falsity of the accusations against her, although he did not hesitate to assume her guilt.

Gerald takes a monistic view of the power struggle between Henry and the church in England. For him the man who opposed the church was a bad man. Of course, it is not surprising that a twelfth century archdeacon should hold such a position. But what is a bit surprising is to see

that the Welshman fails to draw distinctions. In the struggle between church and state it seems that Gerald should have wondered which actions would really benefit the church, but in the De Principis Instructione there is no indication that Gerald asked such questions. On the other hand, perhaps it is unfair to demand that a twelfth century man challenge his most basic assumptions. The church in the twelfth century was very powerful and had been for centuries. How could Gerald know that centuries later the twelfth century would be but another time in the slow shift of power which ultimately resulted in a consolidation of power in the hands of the state? Furthermore can the modern reader expect a twelfth century cleric to consider the possibility that it is better to have power consolidated in the hands of a great leviathan, than to be split between two great institutions which have distinct but related goals? Twelfth century men, both lay and cleric, believed that power should be shared by church and state. If later centuries were to see the generation and nourishment of an embryonic monolith which would one day transcend all beings and values, human and divine, twelfth century men were unaware of it. They questioned the power of the state; they wanted to know the proper methods for dividing power; they wanted to know the degree of power which each should have. The questions were timely ones. Men of later times saw the embryonic state grow into

a titan which stood at the apex of temporal being, and, for many men, all that existed was the temporal. But for those who could not or would not so circumscribe the existent, the question of church and state power was even more timely.

Just as his position in regard to the church was a monistic one, so was the Welsh cleric's position in regard to St. Thomas of Canterbury. Again it is difficult to say that Gerald ought to have seen more implications. Gerald's full support for the murdered archbishop was no more exaggerated than that of most of his clerical colleagues in England. Some members of the hierarchy indeed had sided with Henry in the dispute over the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164), but they did not think that the murder of St. Thomas a' Becket was appropriate.

The murder of St. Thomas was a great mistake even from the point of view of political expediency, but then it is hardly correct to blame Henry fully either for the murder or for an error in judgment, since the words which brought about the archbishop's death were, after all, said in anger. Certainly, it was an error in judgment to speak in anger, but more is involved. Austin Lane Poole strongly implies that Henry may not have fully intended the death of St. Thomas a' Becket.<sup>16</sup> If that is true, Henry cannot be charged fully with either the responsibility of the

murder or an error of political judgment. His rashness was certainly a mistake. But as Gerald saw it, uncontrolled anger was a vice,<sup>17</sup> and one which Henry had.<sup>18</sup> Thus, Henry was guilty of St. Thomas' murder, according to the Welshman.

In the De Principis Instructione, Gerald is consistent for the most part<sup>19</sup> with regard to criticizing Henry, but he sometimes mitigates his criticism of other persons whom he attacks, if in so doing he can deal Henry a blow. For instance, though Gerald disliked Eleanor, he seems to disapprove of the fact that Henry put Eleanor in prison after the revolt of his sons in 1173-1174.<sup>20</sup> Gerald also takes delight in the fact that Henry was buried at the convent of Fontevraud -- a place in which he had tried to force Queen Eleanor to become a nun.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, Gerald was not even particularly consistent with regard to supporting the church, for, in an implied comparison between Henry II and Frederick Barbarossa, the Holy Roman Emperor, Gerald decides greatly in favor of the emperor.<sup>22</sup> Though Frederick had been a schismatic and a supporter of anti-popes such as Paschal III (c. 1165),<sup>23</sup> Gerald, nevertheless, compares the emperor favorably to Henry II. Of course, Henry used the threat of recognizing the anti-pope as a weapon to prevent Pope Alexander III from taking the side of St. Thomas a' Becket when the archbishop was in exile,<sup>24</sup> and Gerald may well have been aware of Henry's threat since the Welsh-



man was so interested in the martyr's cause.

Though Gerald the Welshman is noted for neither his objectivity nor his consistency, he has not been guilty of one error of which some modern historians are guilty -- the mistake of viewing Henry II as an English king and only an English king.<sup>25</sup> It is indeed the case that Henry ruled in England, but many of his concerns and the territories over which he ruled were outside of England. They were on the Continent. Though Henry was born and educated on the Continent, though he spent a large part of his later life on the Continent, he nevertheless has been treated too often as exclusively an English king. But he was neither simply English nor simply French; he was an international ruler.<sup>26</sup> In the De Principis Instructione, Gerald does treat Henry as both the king of England and as the vassal of Louis VII and Philip Augustus in France.

Gerald's treatise reflects little awareness of Henry II's attempts to centralize his government, though he does allude to the king as an oppressor of the nobility<sup>27</sup> -- perhaps a reference to the king's centralizing tendencies. But Gerald, in any case, does not give an extended discussion or criticism of centralization. Though Henry by no means extinguished the elements of discord in his holdings in the British Isles or on the Continent, he nevertheless was, in the main, successful in centralizing his English holdings. He left to his successors the germ of a uniform

administration of justice and system of revenues. His ministers at the beginning of his reign were little more than officers of his household; by the end of it they were the administrators of the country.<sup>28</sup> The Curia Regis had changed; before Henry's reign it was a Common Council, and on some occasions acted as a court of justice, but during Henry's reign the name Curia Regis came to be shared with that small part of the Council which remained continuously about the king's person -- the great officers of the household, the justiciar, the chancellor, treasurer, and barons of the Exchequer, with such of his clerks, and stewards and constables of the king's castles and demesne as Henry desired.<sup>29</sup> In 1178 the Court of King's Bench originated when Henry chose from among the permanent Curia Regis a tribunal of five judges. This tribunal was to act as a judicial committee of the king's judicial council.<sup>30</sup> Of none of these tendencies and events does Gerald speak. Gerald does mention a forest which William Rufus allegedly set aside for himself at the expense of the church, and of this Gerald disapproves.<sup>31</sup> If Henry's own administration of the forests was another manifestation of centralization,<sup>32</sup> then Gerald's disapproval of William Rufus' act may be an oblique criticism of Henry's acts of centralization in the matter of forests. In any event, Gerald's criticism in the matter of forests is neither directly against Henry nor directly against centralization .

Though Gerald shows little awareness of many of Henry's important acts and tendencies, Distinctios two and three are not without their value. Their real importance lies in the fact that in them the author was extremely critical of Henry. Modern historians such as William Stubbs, John Horace Round, Kate Norgate and Louis F. Salzman have a strong tendency to almost apotheosize Henry II. In doing this there is a set of assumptions which they generally seem to hold. The assumptions are 1) that centralization is good and decentralization is bad; 2) that the growth in power of the state at the expense of the church is good; 3) that it is especially bad for the church to have great power, if the church has a tendency to be multi-national or international. Modern historians live in a period of intense nationalism, and they live under the influence of the ideals of German higher education -- a set of ideals which emerged during and after German national unification. Among many modern historians such as Amy Kelly there is a strong anti-clerical bias. The church is seen as an instrument of oppression, as a promoter of obscurantism, as a tool of reaction, as a stifler of joy, and a preventer of progress, and the priests and hierarchy are seen as willing tools dedicated to the ruthless use of these dark means for a darker end -- power over man's spiritual and material existence. One thing is certain. The historian who, in writing about Henry,

considers Gerald's De Principis Instructione will not change his assumptions. But if he takes that work into account, he will make his assumptions clear, and perhaps challenge them a bit. Gerald's extreme views against Henry may counter somewhat the modern tendency to make Henry II the conquering national hero who did much to cast down the idolatrous power of an equally idolatrous church.

In the opinion of this writer certain work remains to be done on the De Principis Instructione, and the work, when done should make contributions to current knowledge of the twelfth century. A synthesis of the arguments about the existence and validity of the Bull Laudabiliter<sup>33</sup> should be useful, and perhaps the argument can be settled. A critical translation of the De Principis Instructione together with editorial comments should be useful for those students of Henry II who do not read Latin. A highly detailed, exhaustive critical analysis of Distinctio one would be a more than minor contribution to the history of political theory, the history of education, and perhaps the history of ethical theory. Furthermore another task needs to be performed. It seems that many modern historians do not take visions into account when they write about the middle ages, and this may be a mistake. Visions could be vehicles of political and social criticism. During the

middle ages the king was both powerful and respected; a man who had some criticisms to make of the king or his government could hardly approach the king and revile him. The critic might be long distances from the king; a king such as Henry II moved about rapidly trying to keep a careful watch over his dominions in the British Isles and on the Continent. Even if the critic could find the king, he would rarely have the influence needed to obtain the ear of the king. The only mass medium of communication was word of mouth. Since a critic in most cases could not come near to the king, and since ideas could be disseminated to the populace by speech, a vision could have been an excellent vehicle of criticism. The king might object strenuously if one of his subjects made him the object of overt criticism. What could the king do to a man for repeating what he had seen or heard in a dream? And what event would be any more likely to be discussed and passed on from person to person than a vision? To men of the twelfth century, God was a loving, personal God who was near, close at hand, a Being Who helped men. Twelfth century men were interested in God and the things of God; they would not be surprised by a divine intervention, and they would be likely to discuss visions and similar phenomena. Thus a vision was an excellent vehicle for criticism. Analyses of these visions might be fruitful indeed.

The conclusions of this writer with regard to the De

Principis Instructione are as follows. The first distinctio is more valuable as a document which reveals twelfth century ideas, than as one which discusses events and occurrences of the time. Distinctios two and three are less valuable to the history of ideas, but more valuable for the record of events and occurrences of the time. Though Distinctio one, precisely as the first part of the work, probably had a polemical purpose, its value has been underestimated. It stands in a long tradition of similar treatises; from it one can learn something about a twelfth century man's ideas concerning virtue and from it one can learn much about mores and ethical ideas of the twelfth century. For these reasons it is valuable.

The chief value in Distinctios two and three is that these treatises tend to counter the modern tendency to apotheosize Henry II. The reader finds that Gerald has little insight into the issues of centralization versus decentralization and the growth of state power at the expense of church power. The reader sees that Gerald's major principle of consistency seems to be to criticize Henry. The reader sees that the work is quite fragmentary and that Henry's youth is omitted. But the views of Gerald should make the historian aware that Henry was hardly seen in his own time as a hero, and perhaps Gerald's views will stimulate the historian to examine his own assumptions, be

they for or against the church, for or against centralization of the state, be they nationalist or anti-nationalist, be they anti-clerical or pro-clerical.

## FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Charles Homer Haskins, The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), p. 380.
2. Amy Kelly, Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings (New York: Vintage Books, 1957), p. 99.
3. David Knowles, The Monastic Order in England (943-1216) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), p. 668.
4. Louis F. Salzman, Henry II (Boston and New York: Houghton and Mifflin Company, 1914), p. 227.
5. Austin Lane Poole, From Domesday Book to Magna Carta (1087-1216) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 319.
6. John Horace Round, The Commune of London and Other Studies (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Company, 1899), pp. 194-195.
7. Salzman, op. cit., p. 214.
8. Urban T. Holmes, "Gerald the Naturalist," Speculum, Vol. XI (January, 1936), p. 111.
9. Lester Kruger Born, "The Perfect Prince: A Study in Thirteenth - and Fourteenth - Century Ideals," Speculum, Vol. III (October, 1928), pp. 470-471.
10. Born, op. cit., pp. 470-502.
11. Henry Osborn Taylor, The Mediaeval Mind (London: Macmillan and Company, Limited, 1911), Vol. I, p. 135.
12. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. I, p. 155.
13. John J. O'Meara, The First Version of the Topography of Ireland (Dundalk: Dundalgan Press (W. Tempest) Ltd., 1951), pp. 11-12; pp. 108-110. The eulogy is copied into the De Principis Instructione in Distinctio II, Cap. XXI, pp. 198-200.
14. De Principis Instructione, Praefatio, pp. 6-7.
15. Ibid., Distinctio III, Cap. XXVII, pp. 299-300.
16. Austin Lane Poole, op. cit., p. 214.



17. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio I, Cap. VI, pp. 19-21.
18. Ibid., Distinctio II, Cap. XXIX, p. 215.
19. Ibid., Distinctio II, Cap. XXI, pp. 198-200. See this chapter for an eulogy of Henry II which Gerald copies into the De Principis Instructione from the Topographia Hibernica.
20. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. III, p. 165.
21. Ibid., Distinctio III, Cap. XXVIII, p. 306.
22. Ibid., Distinctio III, Cap. V, pp. 240-241.
23. Austin Lane Poole, op. cit., p. 329.
24. Ibid., p. 329.
25. See Louis F. Salzman, Henry II (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914), Chapter IV. Salzman entitles this chapter "Foreign Affairs." In it Salzman discusses Henry's dealings with Louis VII of France. The chapter title suggests that Henry was a king of the English and only a king of the English, and this is a curious distortion. See Charles Homer Haskins, The Normans in European History (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915), p. 91.
26. Charles Homer Haskins, "The Government of Normandy under Henry II, Part I," American Historical Review, Vol. XX, No. 1 (October, 1914), p. 24.
27. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. III, p. 160.
28. Benedict of Peterborough, Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867) edited by William Stubbs, Vol. II, Introduction, p. xxi.
29. Ibid., p. lxxiv.
30. Ibid., pp. lxxiv-lxxv.
31. De Principis Instructione, Distinctio III, Cap. XXX, p. 322.

32. Benedict of Peterborough, op. cit., Introduction, p. lxxxiii.
33. See Chapter III of this paper.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. PRIMARY SOURCES:

1. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. I, De rebus a se gestis, Libri III, et alii.... Brewer, J. S., editor. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1861.  
This is the most important single source for Gerald of Wales' biography. All eight volumes of the Giraldi Cambrensis Opera taken together constitute volume twenty-one of the Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aeri Scriptores, or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages. Scholars often refer to this as the English Rolls Series or simply the Rolls Series.
2. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. V, Topographia Hibernica. Dimock, James E., editor. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1867.  
The first work in this volume is important to historical topographers, and to students of Irish history. The second work is a very important account of "Strongbow's" exploits in Ireland.
3. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. VI, Itinernrium Kambriae and Descriptio Kambriae. Dimock, James E., editor. London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1868.  
These works are important because there is suggested therein Gerald's "journalistic" ability.
4. Giraldus Cambrensis de Instructione Principum. J.S.B. (Brewer, J. S.), editor. London: Anglia-Christiana Society, 1846.  
This publication contains Distinctio two and three with a short appendix of extracts of Distinctio one. It was not consulted by this writer, but is included here as one available printed edition of the De Principis Instructione.
5. Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, Vol. VIII, De Principis Instructione Liber. Warner, George F., editor. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891.  
This important source is one of a minute number of sources which criticize Henry II's reign. The document deserves to be understood.

6. Migne, J. P., editor. Patrologia Latina, Vol. CLXXI. Paris: Garnier Brothers, 1893.  
In this volume there is contained (pp. 1015-ff.) Hildebert of Le Mans' (Hildebortus Cenomanensis) Moralis Philosophia — a source on which Gerald relied heavily.
7. Stubbs, William, arranger and editor. Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, 8th edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.  
This is a useful source book for the student of English medieval history. In this collection of sources there is an emphasis on constitutional and legal development.
8. Butler, H. E., editor and translator. The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.  
This very interesting translation of Gerald's De rebus a se gestis and selected other autobiographical material is the best work available on Gerald's autobiography.
9. Hoare, Richard Colt, translator. The Itinerary Through Wales and the Description of Wales. (In one volume). A translation of Giraldus Cambrensis' (c. 1188) Itinerary (Itinerarium Kambriae), pp. 3-141; and Description (Descriptio Kambriae), pp. 145-205. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1908; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1908. (Everyman's Library) With an Introduction by W. Llewelyn Williams.  
The Itinerary and the Description contain many examples of Gerald's impressionism. These works were written after Gerald's trip to Wales in 1188 when he accompanied Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury, in order to aid him in the preaching of the Crusade.
10. O'Meara, John J., translator. The First Version of the Topography of Ireland by Giraldus Cambrensis. Dundalk: Dundalgan Press (W. Tempest) Ltd., 1951.  
This is an English translation of the first recension of the Topography of Ireland. Though it is meant for the ordinary reader, it seems adequate to convey ideas of Gerald's methods and the atmosphere of his works. This work is one excellent book which tends to demonstrate Gerald's gift for story-telling in a rhetorically attractive way.
11. Ricci, Luigi, translator. Revised by E. R. P. Vincent. Niccolò Machiavelli's The Prince. New York: Mentor Books, 1952.  
This late fifteenth century treatise for the ruler, this manual for those who aspire to increase their

11. (Cont'd.) political power is, of course, a classic of modern times. It is interesting to notice how sharply Gerald's ideals clash with the ideals expressed in The Prince.
12. Stephenson, Carl and Marcham, Frederick George, editors and translators. Sources of English Constitutional History. New York and London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1937.

This is a very useful collection of sources of English constitutional history translated into English.

13. Stubbs, William, editor. Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867.

This important source may be seen as presenting a point of view quite opposite to Gerald's view as expressed in the De Principis Instructione.

## II. SECONDARY SOURCES — BOOKS

1. Haskins, Charles Homer. The Normans in European History. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915.

This work is extremely useful for understanding the reign of Henry II. Haskins sees the Norman conquerors and their successors in such way that they are not confined to the British Isles. Haskins sees that the Angevins and their predecessors were men who had interests and problems in many lands. He does not view them in a vacuum as though they were kings of the English alone.

2. Haskins, Charles Homer. The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

This work was first published in 1927. This very provocative work which suggests that the high middle ages experienced its own re-birth of culture is by now a classic in the history of medieval culture. It was done by a scholar who was famous for the depth of his knowledge. Professor Haskins was responsible for sending many scholars and students back to the sources in order to re-examine old assumptions.

3. Kelly, Amy. Eleanor of Aquitaine and the Four Kings. New York: Vintage Books, 1957.

This is a reprint of a work first published by the Harvard University Press in 1950. Miss Kelly presents a very favorable view of Eleanor. Miss Kelly writes beautifully, and she presents lively, clear, word

3. (Cont'd.) pictures. However, some of her assertions seem gratuitous. She dislikes Gerald the Welshman, and she has a strong anti-clerical bias. Though Miss Kelly seems to have studied very many sources, she has not empathized with medieval men. But Miss Kelly's book is useful, because she stimulates the student to examine his assumptions and ideas about medieval persons.

4. Knowles, Dom David. The Monastic Order in England (943-1216). Cambridge at the University Press, 1941.

This work is a large synthetic one. The author has a deep and broad knowledge of the sources, and he presents much evidence to support his statements. He has a tendency to be pro-clerical.

5. Owen, Henry. Gerald the Welshman. New and enlarged edition. London: David Nutt, 1904.

This is the only biography of Gerald available. It is a popularization. Scholarly mechanisms are not employed in order to give references. Though somewhat limited in usefulness, it can give some insight into Gerald's life. The work was done by a man who seems to enjoy Gerald very much.

6. Painter, Sidney. A History of the Middle Ages (284-1500). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.

Though this is a text book, it nevertheless is excellent scholarship. The author of this work is clearly a man who is profoundly involved in the original sources of the middle ages.

7. Pollock, Frederick and Maitland, Frederick William. The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I. 2 volumes. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895; Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1895.

This classic of English legal history is indispensable for the student of the history of English legal development, the history of the English constitution, as well as much of English institutional and administrative history.

8. Poole, Austin Lane. From Domesday Book to Magna Carta (1087-1216). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

This work is an excellent piece of scholarship. Poole's work reflects the analytic and synthetic intellectual power of the mature and balanced scholar. There is some small bit of nationalist bias present in the work, but hardly enough to detract from the value of the book. This work is indispensable for English history from 1087 through 1216.

9. Round, John Horace. The Commune of London and Other Studies. Westminster: A. Constable and Company, 1899.  
This collection of historical essays written by Professor Round is indispensable for the student of medieval English history. Round's thought is incisive and lucid, remarkable for its vigorous logic. Round's thought, rooted so solidly in the sources, is creative and stimulating.
10. Salzman, Louis F. Henry II. Boston and New York: Houghton and Mifflin Company, 1914.  
This is the most recent biography of Henry II. The author is very favorable toward the Angevin king. An alarming fact about this work is that Salzman treats Henry's activities on the continent as "Foreign Affairs" (Chapter IV). Such a distortion might well indicate a nationalist bias on Salzman's part.
11. Taylor, Hannis. The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution. 2 volumes. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1889.  
Taylor's work was useful for seeing the link between the property tax called the Saladin Tithe (1188) and the representative principle as manifested by the inquest used when a man was suspected of having paid less than he ought to have paid.
12. Taylor, Henry Osborn. The Mediaeval Mind. 2 volumes. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1911.  
This classic synthesis of medieval ideas and ideals is informative and provocative. Taylor has captured much of the spirit of the middle ages. He has a broad and deep knowledge of medieval sources.
13. White, Albert Beebe. The Making of the English Constitution, 449-1485. Second edition. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925.  
This work is a useful synthesis. The author treats a long historical development, and is well acquainted with the source material.
14. Wright, John Kirtland. The Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades. New York: American Geographical Society, 1925.  
This large synthetic and analytic work is an excellent piece of scholarship. It contains a summary of geographical knowledge in classical antiquity, in Western Christendom and in Islam before 1100. After summarizing this knowledge, it focuses on the time period from the end of the eleventh century to the middle of the thirteenth-

14. (Cont'd.) th century. The great historian of science, George Sarton, had only one major criticism of the work, i.e., that the notes were in the back of the book. It is an indispensable handbook for students of medieval geography.

### III. SECONDARY SOURCES — ARTICLES

1. Born, Lester Kruger, "The Prince: A Study in Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-Century Ideals," Speculum, Vol. III, (October, 1928), pp. 470-504.

Born has presented the reader with a survey of thirteenth and fourteenth century ideas of the ideal prince. It is useful and provocative as a survey. It is somewhat limited, for Born tends to generalize rather than present details.

2. Haskins, Charles Homer, "The Government of Normandy under Henry II," American Historical Review, Part I, Vol. XX, No. 1, (October, 1914), pp. 24-42; Part II, Vol. XX, No. 2, (January, 1915), pp. 277-291.

This article is important for an understanding of the reign of Henry II. Haskins sees Henry as a man of many lands and many interests; Haskins certainly has a more nearly true view than those who see Henry as an English national ruler and that alone.

3. Holmes, Urban P., "Gerald the Naturalist," Speculum, Vol. XI, (January, 1936), pp. 110-121.

In this interesting article, Holmes praises Gerald of Wales' ability to describe phenomena of the animal world. Holmes has seen an interesting aspect of Gerald's creativity.

4. Norgate, Kate, "The Bull Laudabiliter," English Historical Review, Vol. VIII, No. xxix, (January, 1893), pp. 18-52.

This scholar is a vigorous thinker. Some scholars such as Professor Round, disagree with her, but her arguments are eminently worth reading. She seems rather strongly influenced by nationalism, but she writes in such manner that her bias is not hidden.



A P P E N D I C E S

## APPENDIX I

This is a portion of De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. XXIX, pp. 213-315.

Expressam vero regis naturam, et tam interioris hominis quam exterioris proprietatem, aeternitati depingere non indignum reputavimus, ut, qui insignia ejusdem gesta in posterum audire gestierint, imaginarium quoque vultum ejusdem prae oculis gerant. Tantum quippe temporis nostri decus transitorie perire praesens historia non permittit; impetrata tamen veritatis (MS., veritate) explicandae venia, citra quam omnis historia non solum auctoritatem sed et nomen historiae demeretur. Naturam enim non mutari arte professus, auctoritatem (MS., auctoritate) pictor amittit, si, diligentius apta dum protrahit, minus idonea verecundiae praetermittit. Unde et quoniam

"vitiis nemo sine nascitur, optimus ille est,  
"Qui minimis urgetur,"

(Hor., Sat. I. iii. 68)

nihil humanum a se alienum sapiens putet. Semper enim mundanis in rebus, quia nulla sub coelo perfecta felicitas, et mala sunt vicina bonis et vitia virtutibus distinguuntur. Sicut ergo sive naturae sive industriae bona mentem bene compositam audita delectant, sic recitata bonis contraria non offendant. Sed quoniam, juxta philosophicum illud, "Colere officiis oportet, non exasperare (MS., exasperate) verbis, potestatem," et illud comicum, "Obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit," (Ter., And. i. 1. 41.) meticolosa

nimirum res est quantalibet occasione in illum allegare, qui potest relegare, arduum opus et periculosum magis quam fructuosum arripui, multis illum verbis describere, qui uno potest verbo proscribere. Gratosum quippe foret, et nostras longe vires excedens, veritatem in singulis non suppressere, et in nullo tamen principis animum exasperare.

Erat igitur Anglorum rex Henricus secundus vir sub-rufus, caesius,<sup>1</sup> amplo capite et rotundo, oculis glaucis, ad iram torvis et rubore suffusis, facie ignea, voce quassa, collo ab humeris aliquantulum demisso, pectore quadrato, brachiis validis, corpore carnoso, et, naturae magis quam gulae vitio, citra tumorem enormem et torporem omnem,<sup>2</sup> moderata quadam immoderantia ventre praeambulo. Erat enim cibo potuque modestus ac sobrius, et parcimoniae, quoad principi licuit, per omnia datus; et ut hanc naturae injuriam industria reprimeret ac mitigaret carnisque vitium animi virtute levaret, bello plusquam intestino tanquam in se conjurans, immoderata corpus vexatione torquebat. Nam praeter bellorum tempora, quae frequenter imminebant,<sup>3</sup> quibus, quod rebus agendis supererat, vix id tantillum quieti dabat, pacis quoque tempore sibi nec pacem ullam nec requiem indulgebat. Venationi namque trans modestiam deditus, summo diluculo equo cursore transvectus, nunc saltus lustrans, nunc silvas penetrans, nunc montium juga transcendens, dies ducebat inquietos; vespere vero domi

receptum, vel ante coenam vel post, rarissime sedentem conspexeris. Post tantas namque fatigationes totam statione continua curiam lassare consueverat. Sed quoniam hoc "adprime in vita utile, ut ne quid nimis, " (Ter., And. i. 1. 34.) nullumque remedium simpliciter bonum, cum tibi arum pedumque tumore frequenti, recalcitrantium ad hoc jumentorum ictibus aucta laesione, caeteras id ipsum corporis incommoditates accelerabat et, si non aliam, matrem malorum multorum atque ministram certe vel senectutem.

Staturae vir erat inter mediocres; quod nulli filiorum contingere potuit, primaevus ambobus paulo mediocritatem excedentibus, junioribus vero duobus infra subsistentibus.

Citra animi turbationes et iracundiae motus, princeps eloquentissimus; et, quod his temporibus conspicuum est, litteris eruditus, et caetera.

#### NOTES TO APPENDIX I

1. See note 1, appendix II.
2. See note 2, appendix II.
3. The editor, George F. Warner, has inserted the "n" which is in brackets into *imminebant*.

## APPENDIX II

A literal translation of a portion of Giraldus Cambrensis' De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. XXIX, pp. 213-215.

We have considered it not unfitting to depict for eternity to be sure the evident nature of the king, as much the peculiarity (proprietaem) of the inner man as of the outer, that, those who might be eager to hear his notable deeds in the future, also may hold before their eyes his imaginary appearance. Indeed the present history does not allow such a great ornament of our time to disappear transitorily; nevertheless having indeed obtained the privilege (venia) of unfolding the truth, because of which every history deserves well of not only the authority but also the name of history. For having professed that nature is not to be changed by art, the painter loses authority, if, while he draws forth appropriate things, he omits things less worthy of respect (verecundiae). And whence since, "no man is born without faults (vitiis), he is best, who is burdened the least," (Horace; Sat. I. iii. 68) let the wise man think that nothing human is alien to him. For always in things of the world (mundanis), since nothing under heaven [is] perfect happiness, (or, since under heaven [there is] no perfected happiness,) evils are neighbors to goods, and the vices are pointed up (distinguuntur) by the virtues (or, and vices are distinguished in [in the sense of 'seen in'] the virtues).

Therefore, just as the good things either of nature or of industry, having been heard of, may delight the well composed mind, so when evil things are read, they may not offend. But since, according to (juxta) that philosopher, "It is needful to cultivate opportunity (potestatem) by duties, not to irritate by words," and as that comic said, "obeisance produces friends, the truth brings forth hatred," doubtless it is a fearful thing for however great purpose to instigate (into) him, who is able to banish me. I have taken with zeal to this hard work, one more dangerous than fruitful, to describe him with many words, who can proscribe with one word. Indeed I would be most fortunate, and exceeding my powers by far, not to suppress the truth in [some] singulars, and still in no way to irritate the mind of the prince.

Therefore Henry the second, king of the English, was a reddish man, bluish-gray [when sluggish<sup>1</sup>], with a large (amplo) and round head, with bluish-gray eyes, wild and suffused with redness for anger (ad iram), with a fiery face, with a shattering voice, with a neck bent down a little from the shoulders, with a square breast, with powerful arms, with a fleshy (carnoso) body, and, more by the fault of nature than of the throat, within an immense tumor and every numbness,<sup>2</sup> with a moderate [though] somewhat immoderate belly walking before [him]. For in regard to food and drink he was temperate and sober, and, given to parsimony through all [things],

as far as it was allowed to a prince; and as industry would repress this injury of nature and mitigate the vice of the flesh and alleviate [it] by the virtue of the soul, conspiring in war the more intestine than against himself, he tormented his immoderate body with hardship. For besides the times of wars, which were imminent frequently, in which, it was superfluous to do these things, hardly did he give his stomach (it) even a small bit of peace, and in time of peace he allowed himself neither peace nor rest. For devoted to the hunt beyond temperance, having been transported at the first break of day on a running horse, now traversing a ravine, then passing through a forest, now going across the ridges of mountains, he led restless days; in the evening having retired home, either before dinner or after, you would see him sitting very rarely. For after such great fatigues, he was accustomed to exhaust the whole court (curiam) by continually standing. But since this, 'it is exceedingly useful in life, that a man do nothing in excess,' (Ter. And. i. 1. 34), is no simple good remedy, with frequent excited motions of the shins and feet, with increased attacks by blows on recalcitrant beasts of burden, these things themselves (id ipsum) increased the other difficulties of his body, and, if they did not accelerate any other mother and minister of many evils, they did accelerate that worst of all evils — old age.

He was a man in stature among those of middle height; something which he passed on to none of his sons; the older two, together exceeding the middle a little, the younger two remaining below.

Except for his disturbances of spirit and motions of fury the prince [was] very eloquent; and, what was conspicuous in these times, learned in letters, and so forth.

#### NOTES TO APPENDIX II

1. The Latin word "caesius" has been inserted in the text by the editor, George F. Warner. He observes in a footnote — see De Principis Instructione, Distinctio II, Cap. XXIX, p. 214, n. 3 — "caesius scesius, MS; with the marginal note "Scesii dicuntur legitinosi (sc. lentiginosi), quia faciem habent quasi scesam." Cf. vol. v. p. 302, note 2." Translating the marginal note, if caesius is a legitimate substitute for the manuscript's scesius, we read, "Bluish-gray [ones] are said [to be] sluggish, since they have a bluish-gray countenance." Notice also that the accuracy of this translation depends upon the accuracy of Warner's substitution of lentiginosi for legitinosi. Warner's substitution seems to be justifiable if for no other reason than that the latter word does not seem to make sense.
2. Gerald's choice of words here is very interesting. The word "tumor" can mean a tumor in the sense of an abnormal growth in the human body, or it can mean a commotion or excitement of the mind. By choosing this word was Gerald giving an explanation for the king's fleshy body and, by the use of the same word further emphasizing Henry's irascible disposition? In like manner the word "torpor" can refer to both physical and mental numbness. By choosing this term was Gerald trying to indicate both the effect of the physical tumor on Henry's body, and the effect of the mental excitement on Henry's mind? Was the Welsh cleric exercising his satirical wit in selecting these two terms?



## APPENDIX III

AN OUTLINE OF THE DE PRINCIPIIS INSTRUCTIONE LIBER

This is an outline of Volume Eight of Giraldi Cambrensis Opera, the De Principis Instructione Liber, edited by George F. Warner (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1891). The Giraldi Cambrensis Opera are included in the Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland During the Middle Ages. This great series of original sources is referred to by some authors as the English Rolls Series or simply the Rolls Series.

This outline consists of a translation of the chapter titles, as listed at the beginning of each Distinctio or Book; the sub-headings are those provided in the margins of the text. The editor, George F. Warner, has done the marginal notes. This writer has not included scriptural and other references in this outline.

I A First Preface to the book Concerning the Instruction of a Prince. (Probably this was the original preface to Distinctio One when it was issued alone).

- A. Contrast of court and school.
- B. The author lured to court by royal promises.
- C. But the author is deceived and neglected.
- D. His merits nullified by his Welsh origin.
- E. He retires from court to read theology.
- F. Eulogy of the study of scriptures etc. with extracts.
- G. Having left court he is at rest.
- H. Extracts in praise of study and a quiet life.
- I. He means to produce a great work.

II A First Preface. (Probably this was the preface to the work when it was issued as a whole.) (c. 1217).

- A. Motive of the work.
- B. Character of modern princes.
- C. And prelates.
- D. The work in three parts.
- E. Dedicated to posterity.
- F. If to any great prince, to Louis (VII) of France.
- G. The greatest princes the most devoted to literature.

III Distinctio I - Theory - What the "good" prince ought to be and do. (Warner's sub-headings, with a few exceptions, are not included here. For the most part the sub-headings are references to or extracts from scriptural and classical texts, or references to men whom Gerald considers great. Sub-headings which are included are those which

## III Distinctio I (Continued)

seemed especially important.)

- A. Concerning the means of governing of a prince.
- B. Concerning the clemency of a prince.
- C. Concerning the modesty of a prince.
- D. Concerning the chastity of a prince.
- E. Concerning the patience of a prince.
- F. Concerning the temperance of a prince.
- G. Concerning the mildness of a prince.
- H. Concerning the munificence of a prince.
- I. Concerning the magnanimity of a prince.
- J. Concerning the justice of a prince.
- K. Concerning the prudence of a prince.
- L. Concerning the foresight of a prince.
- M. Concerning the moderation of a prince.
- N. Concerning the courage and high spirit of a prince.
- O. Concerning the glory and nobility of a prince.
- P. Concerning the difference between a king and a tyrant.
- Q. Concerning the downfall and bloody end of tyrants.
  - 1. Mahomet devoured by the pigs.
  - 2. History of Mahomet.
  - 3. Charles Martel, Pipin, Charles the Great.
  - 4. Donation of Constantine.
  - 5. Origin of Picts and Scots.
- R. Concerning both the laudable life and end of elected princes.
- S. Concerning an exposition of the princely titles.
- T. Concerning the religion and devotion of a prince.
  - 1. Imperial laws exhibiting a Christian spirit.
  - 2. References to Code of Justinian.
  - 3. Ancient laws of English as to wrecks.
  - 4. Roman laws as to jetison and wrecks.
  - 5. Discovery of tomb of Arthur and Guinevere at Glastonbury.
  - 6. References to and historical comments about various English and Norman rulers.
  - 7. Wrongful accessions and unhappy ends of Norman kings of England.

## IV Distinctio II - The "glory" of Henry II.

- A. Concerning the successive events in the youth of Henry Second, king of the English, and concerning his lands, of their growth to an immense size.
  - 1. The early good fortune of Henry II.
  - 2. Deaths of Stephen and Eustace.
  - 3. Deaths of Henry's brothers.

## IV Distinctio II (Continued)

4. His foreign conquests.
  - a. Ireland 1171-2.
  - b. Scotland 1174.
  - c. Lost by his successor.
  - d. Contention of the Scotch as to the extent of William the Lion's surrender.
  - e. Henry's possessions in France.
  - f. His designs on the empire.
- B. Concerning the coming into England of great men in that same reign.
  1. Archbishops of Cologne.
  2. The counts of Dreux and of Blois, archbishop of Sens; Philip, count of Flanders; Louis VII of France.
  3. Henry's award between the kings of Castile and Navarre, 1177.
  4. Marriages of his daughters.
  5. His six sons.
  6. He is divinely punished through his own offspring.
- C. Concerning his enormous crimes afterwards, and concerning Thomas the martyr.
  1. Henry's unlawful marriage.
  2. His oppressions and wickedness.
  3. His treatment of St. Thomas.
    - a. The archbishop's exile.
    - b. Proscription of all his family.
    - c. His murder.
    - d. Comparison of him with St. Thomas the Apostle.
    - e. Extraordinary character of his miracles.
- D. Concerning the falling wheel of fortune, and concerning his (Henry's) being ever in danger of his hostile sons.
  1. After St. Thomas' murder, Henry's fortune begins to decline.
  2. Rebellion of the younger Henry and his brothers Richard and Geoffrey, 1173.
  3. The king deserted by his household.
  4. His pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Thomas 12 July, 1174.
  5. Capture of the king of the Scots.
  6. War ends triumphantly for Henry.
  7. Various successes 1173-1174.
  8. Clemency of Henry to the conquered.
  9. Henry is reconciled to his sons, 30 Sept., 1174.
  10. Henry hardens his heart and relapses into vice.
  11. Imprisons Queen Eleanor.
  12. Lives in open adultery with Rosamond Clifford.

## IV Distinctio II (Continued)

13. Fails to keep his compact with Louis VII for a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.
- E. Letter attesting an agreement that the king of the French, Louis, and the king of the English, Henry, would go abroad to Jerusalem at the same time.
1. Treaty of Ivry, 25 Sept., 1177.
  2. Henry and Louis agree to take the cross; to defend each other to their utmost; not to harbour each other's enemies; or claim each other's lands; questions as to Auvergne, etc. to be submitted to arbitration.
  3. Elaborate agreement to safeguard each other's rights, pp. 168-169.
- F. Concerning the two cardinals in the meantime sent over to Normandy to make an investigation of the death of the martyr Thomas.
1. Inquiry into Becket's death, 1172.
  2. The king is absolved; but is bound by oath to accomplish his journey to Jerusalem within three years.
- G. Concerning the sophistical establishment of three monasteries in compensation for the long-expected sojourn to Jerusalem.
1. He obtains from Rome a further delay, by the promise to found the three monasteries.
  2. Delusive fulfillment of his promise at Waltham and Amesbury, 1177. Third House at Witham.
  3. Futility of his attempt to fool God. Biblical quotes.
- H. Concerning the scourges given to King Henry by God and the death of the Young King.
1. The younger Henry again in rebellion, 1183.
  2. He collects a large force.
  3. But he is seized with illness and dies, 11 June, 1183.
  4. Grief of his father.
- I. Concerning the character of Henry the Third.
1. Character of the younger Henry.
- J. Concerning Count Geoffrey again divided from his father, and his (Geoffrey's) untimely death a little after.
1. Geoffrey, count of Brittany, leaves his father and joins Phillip of France, 1186.
  2. He is made seneschal of France.
  3. Intrigues; he dies of fever at Paris, 19 Aug. 1186.
  4. Grief of Henry.

## IV Distinctio II (Continued)

- K. Concerning the characters, confusedly mixed together, of Count Geoffrey and his younger brother (John).
1. Characters of Geoffrey and John.
- L. That not only by strokes, but also by repeated revelations and threats King Henry uselessly had been warned and reproved by God.
1. Warning at Cardiff, 23 Apr. 1172.
  2. The prediction fulfilled by the revolt of his sons in Lent, 1173.
  3. A Messenger sent to him from Ireland by a vision, 1173.
- M. The revelation made to a knight, namely Roger de Estreby, concerning the boundaries of Lincoln.
1. Sir Roger de Estreby sent to warn Henry by miraculous voices.
  2. Voices are accredited by miracles.
  3. He (Roger) is punished for his disobedience.
  4. Roger at length obeys; Henry promises to obey commands of voices but changes his mind.
- N. That the Lord moved him (Henry) to conversion by scourges and revelations, as well as, sometimes, by favours and quasi-blandishments.
- O. Letter attesting the harmony of King Henry with King Philip.
- P. Letter attesting the peace and harmony between the king of France and the count of Flanders, made through King Henry.
1. The count resigns his claim to Vermandois and restores Pierrefondes.
- Q. Letter attesting the will of King Henry solemnly made at Waltham, 22 Feb. 1182.
1. Bequests to the Templars and Hospitallers.
  2. Bequests to religious houses in the Holy Land; in England; in Normandy; in Anjou; to religious orders.
  3. Bequests for marriage portions for poor girls in England and Normandy and Anjou.
  4. Injunctions to his sons and others for the strict observance of the will.
- R. Concerning privileges and perquisites from the lord Pope, Alexander III, chiefly against the Welsh.
- S. Concerning the privileges obtained against the Irish.
1. Another privilege obtained from Alexander III.
  2. It is recited with an earlier privilege from Adrian IV in a synod at Waterford, 1174 or 1175.

## IV Distinctio II (Continued)

3. Adrian's privilege of 1155.
  4. Confirmation by Alexander III.
- T. The Council of Cashel — Convened by Henry 1171 or 1172.
- U. The honors of King Henry here transcribed from the (bounds of) Topography of Ireland.
1. Eulogy of Henry.
  2. The Irish free until subjugated by him.
  3. His victories and clemency.
- V. Concerning the kingdom of Jerusalem reduced to an excessively small area and oppressed by the power of Saladin.
- W. Letter of Pope Urban sent to England because of this (oppression).
- X. How the patriarch of Jerusalem was sent over to England to King Henry for his help.
1. Heraclius, patriarch of Jerusalem, comes to England to implore aid, 1185.
  2. Offers Henry the kingdom of Jerusalem.
- Y. Concerning the letter, both reminders and threats, of Pope Lucius then sent to King Henry.
1. Lucius III supports Heraclius.
  2. Henry defers his answer.
- Z. Concerning the words and admonishings of the one who wrote this (i.e., Giraldus Cambrensis) spoken to King Henry in this matter, and his (Henry's) answers.
- A.<sub>1</sub> Concerning the answer made to the patriarch at London, and his (Henry's) deceit in the whole matter.
1. Henry's answer to the patriarch at London, 18 Mar. 1185.
  2. He declines to go but offers money.
  3. The patriarch asks for his sons. (One son).
  4. John vainly begs to be sent.
  5. Reflections on Henry's conduct.
- B.<sub>1</sub> Concerning the warnings and threats of the patriarch brought forth three times, as if in a prophetic spirit, against King Henry.
1. The patriarch's prophetic warnings.
  2. Repeated at Dover.
  3. His altercation with Henry.
  4. Warnings fulfilled; Henry's misfortunes in later years.
- C.<sub>1</sub> A description of Henry the Second, king of the British.
1. Personal appearance.

## IV Distinctio II (Continued)

2. Habits.
  3. Stature.
  4. Eloquence and learning.
- D.<sub>1</sub> Notable events in the England of our times. 1155-1185.
- E.<sub>1</sub> That, if the end of the events had been happy, so would have been (Henry's) history.
1. Author's reflections on the change in Henry's fortunes.
  2. Examples of Pompey, Caesar and Alexander.
  3. John's ill success in Ireland and the result of his father's neglect of the crusade.

## V Distinctio III — Henry's reverses and inglorious end.

- A. Concerning the last conversation between Kings Louis and Henry, and, in that same place, the laudable (tearful) supplication of King Louis to God. Louis has a vision in which he sees the triumph of his son.
- B. Concerning the evocation of lands by Philip, son of Louis, immediately after the supplication and visions of his father, and thence an earlier vision, both in regard to Bley and the Duke of Burgundy, and Philip, count of Flanders, and in regard to King Henry.
1. Philip of France seizes possessions of his mother, his uncles, and the duke of Burgundy, 1180.
  2. His dispute with Philip of Flanders as to Vermandois, 1181-4.
  3. He submits to Henry's counsel.
  4. The count refuses to surrender Vermandois.
  5. He vainly appeals to Henry for help, and is compelled to yield.
  6. Philip, instigated by the count of Flanders occupies Auvergne, 1187.
  7. Henry tries in vain to seduce the count, and the French barons.
  8. Henry proposes terms of peace to the detriment of Richard, his heir.
  9. Henry is said to have debauched Philip's sister, betrothed to Richard.
  10. Philip informs Richard.
  11. Miracle at Chateauroux.
  12. A year's truce is made.
- C. Concerning the land of Jerusalem violently attacked by the Parthians and Pagans, and then almost totally conquered.
1. Invasion by Saladin, 1187.

## V Distinctio III (Continued)

2. The Christians overpowered by numbers.
  3. Henry to blame for these disasters.
- D. The letter of Pope Clement sent to the faithful to provide help.
1. Clement III urges English bishops to succour Holy Land, 10 Feb. 1188.
  2. He bids them give example by sending men and money.
  3. Privileges to be granted to those who serve or contribute.
- E. Concerning the example given to the world and to the nobles of the Cisalpine area by Richard, count of Poitou, the first great man of the Cisalpine area to take the Cross.
1. Richard first to take the Cross, Sept. 1187.
  2. Henry and Philip of France follow his example, Jan. 1188.
  3. Ordinance for the Saladin tithe.
  4. The Emperor Frederick takes the Cross.
  5. Enthusiasm for the crusade.
  6. The discord of princes the cause of its failure.
- F. Concerning the deceits of the astronomers from this so great disturbance, and a consolatory letter sent to them from a certain one (an unnamed philosopher).
- G. How Count Richard when he would have gone on his way (to the Holy Land) was prevented by the malice of his father, and because of this turned courageously to war.
1. Richard hindered by his father.
  2. Henry at length sends him money, but secretly intrigues against him.
  3. Richard takes Taillebourg, and invades the country of Toulouse (April ?) 1188.
  4. Philip orders him to desist, but he refuses.
- H. Concerning the titles of Richard, count of Poitou, opportunely inserted here. Character of Richard.
1. Compared with his brother, Henry.
  2. Richard's exploits in the East.
  3. Deficiencies in his character.
- I. How King Henry meanwhile was intent on exacting the tithes in England, and how many visions, equally admonishing and threatening, revealed themselves fruitlessly.
1. Henry acts as "dog in the manger" on crusades.
  2. Vision of Walter Daumartin, June 1188.



## V Distinctio III (Continued)

3. Tells it to the king, who informs him of loss of Chateauroux.
  4. Another vision.
- J. How Count Richard of Poitou was disassociated from his father and turned to the king of France.
1. Warning to Henry from Margaret de Bohun at Portsmouth, July 1188.
  2. He crosses to Normandy.
  3. Richard deserts to Philip and does him homage.
  4. The crusade made abortive by Henry's conduct.
  5. A truce made until Easter 1189.
- K. How King Henry, confused in everything, and having apostacized his word — which a feeling of shame and rancour extorted — brought himself to light.
1. Blasphemous speeches of Henry to Archbishop Baldwin and Hugh of Lincoln.
  2. His impatient spirit.
- L. By what means the more slothful Norman will defend himself, the question put, and the answer given.
- M. How King Henry seized with a disease of the bowels at length made his confession, more extorted than devoutly offered.
1. Henry lies ill at Le Mans, March 1189.
  2. Is induced to confess, but only incompletely.
  3. Recovers and meets Richard.
- N. The vision revealed to the nobleman, Richard of Redvers, how King Henry was soon to be finished.
- O. How Emperor Frederick, the vow of the sojourn having been taken, in a manly way, went without delay on the business of the Cross.
1. Frederick begins on Feast of St. Gregory, 1189.
- P. The vision which he (Giraldus — at Chinon 10 May, 1189) who wrote this saw concerning the task of the Cross, and an exposition of the vision.
- Q. Concerning the courage of the emperor and the letter of contempt sent to Saladin.
1. His letter to Saladin, 1188.
  2. He challenges him to battle in Nov. 1189.
  3. He boasts of the peoples under his sway.
- R. The answer of Saladin, and the letter sent by him to the emperor.
1. The saracens outnumber the Christians.
  2. They have twice beaten them at Damascus and at Alexandria.

## V Distinctio III (Continued)

3. He offers terms of peace.
  4. Anger of Frederick at receiving this letter.
- S. As the emperor took to the journey through Hungary with zeal, and, having crossed the Danube, he came through Bulgaria into Macedonia.
1. Imperial assembly at Mentz 27 Mar. 1188.
  2. Hatred of the Greeks for the Latins.
  3. Their degeneracy.
- T. How messengers were sent to the Greek emperor, at first captured and detained, then returned out of fear, and how means of food were withdrawn.
1. Greek emperor, (Isaac) for a time confines emissaries.
  2. Frederick winters at Adrianople.
  3. The duke of Swabia takes a fortress.
  4. Isaac offers hostages, provisions, and ships.
  5. Frederick crosses the Dardanelles, 23-28 Mar. 1190.
- U. Concerning the treachery of the sultan of Iconium, and how the whole of his land, in arms and in fasting, in many dangers and almost continuous battles, was thoroughly penetrated within twenty days, and how indeed the way was prepared by weapons and by courage for the grand downfall of the enemy.
1. Treachery of the sultan of Iconium.
  2. Numbers of the army and order of march.
  3. Battle for Iconium 18 May 1190.
  4. Turks led by Sultan's son.
  5. Victory of the Christians.
  6. Iconium taken, 18 May 1190.
  7. Sultan imputes treachery to his son; obtains peace terms.
  8. Army enters (Little) Armenia.
- V. How the emperor was cast into a certain river in Armenia after such great victories, and, Oh Sorrow!, died; and how such a great army having plundered near Antioch, and, having secured supplies after such a long fast, became distemperate and dispersed.
1. Frederick reaches the river Selef, 10 June 1190.
  2. Description of his person.
  3. He tries to cross the river and is drowned.
  4. The army reaches Antioch (21 June 1190) which is given up to the duke of Swabia by its Prince, Boemond III.

## V Distinctio III (Continued)

- W. How the son of the emperor came over courageously with a part of the army, but by far the smaller part, out of Antioch and Acre.
1. The duke of Swabia reaches Acre, but his army wastes from disease and excess, and he himself dies, 20 Jan. 1191.
  2. The failure of the crusade a divino judgment.
- X. As Le Mans had caught fire, King Henry had taken flight, and he brought forth an apostacized word (blasphemy).
1. Failure of the conference at Le Ferte, 4-9 June, 1189.
  2. Philip and Richard appear before Le Mans.
  3. The city is accidentally burned, and Henry is forced to fly.
  4. He blasphemes.
  5. Author's reflections thereupon.
- Y. How the city of Tours was occupied by the French, and how King Henry, confined in the fortress of Azai, through a punishment and a quasi-trick divinely given, was forced into surrender.
1. Henry reaches "Frenellae" and next day (13 June 1189) goes to Anjou.
  2. Philip takes Tours.
  3. A conference is fixed at Azai for Friday (30 June 1189), but Henry is attacked by fever.
  4. He submits himself to Philip's mercy.
  5. Evidence in this of divine vengeance for his treatment of Becket.
  6. Speech of Philip as a child — Montmartre 18 Nov. 1169.
  7. Speech of Philip at a meeting between Henry and Louis near Gisors 1175 ?.
  8. Speech of Philip on seeing Richard's castle at Andely.
  9. Testimony of Arab ambassadors from Spain to the future greatness of Philip.
  10. Expected subjection of the British isles to the French crown.
  11. Vision of a monk of Vincennes before Philip's birth.
  12. Ominous speech made to the author at Paris on the night of Philip's birth.
  13. Another anecdote of Philip's youth.
  14. Terms of peace now formulated by Philip, July 1189.
  15. Despair of Henry at finding his son John's name in the list of Richard's adherents.

## V Distinctio III (Continued)

- Z. Concerning the pictures and fictions, and at last the following ignominious death of King Henry.
1. Picture at Winchester emblematical of Henry and his sons.
  2. Henry gives Richard the kiss of peace, but whispers vengeance.
  3. He is carried to Chinon and dies there July 6, 1189.
- A.1 Concerning the origin of both King Henry and Queen Eleanor, and of their sons, in every root corrupt from (every) part.
1. Henry's offspring of a vicious stock on both sides.
  2. Conduct of Queen Eleanor.
  3. Her daughters by Henry.
  4. Her daughters by Louis.
  5. Henry's race vitiated by the bigamy of his mother.
  6. Scandalous union of Henry and Eleanor.
  7. Treatment of Gerard, bishop of Seez, by count Geoffrey and of St. Thomas by Henry.
  8. The demon-countess of Anjou.
  9. Richard's jest on the subject.
  10. Speech of Geoffrey, count of Brittany, to Godfrey de Lucy.
  11. Henry's sons the instruments of divine vengeance.
- B.1 Concerning the notable events occurring before the death of so great a prince.
1. Circumstances connected with Henry's death.
  2. No bishop with him.
  3. His corpse exposed naked.
  4. Fulfillment of his surname "Court-mantel."
  5. His corpse is taken to Fontevraud.
  6. Richard enters the church, and corpse bleeds at the nostrils.
  7. Burial of Henry. 8 July 1189.
  8. He is interred in the convent where he wished to force Eleanor to take the veil.
  9. A meteor is seen in England.
  10. Portents before his death.
  11. Prophetic voice heard by St. Thomas.
  12. Vision of a monk.
  13. Fulfilled by the untimely end of Henry's three eldest sons.
  14. The fate of the fourth the same.
  15. Another vision.
  16. St. Bernard's prophecy of Henry. "He came from the devil and will go to the devil."

## V Distinctio III (Continued)

17. Prophecy at Henry's coronation.
  18. John the worst of the family.
  19. Vision of one Maurice in Wales. Its fulfillment by the interdict.
  20. The barons of England only saved by the French by destruction.
- C.1 Concerning various visions announced before his fall.
1. Of the author.
  2. Of archbishop Baldwin.
  3. Vision of St. Godric the Hermit.
  4. Three other visions.
- D.1 Concerning the vision of King William Rufus, which he saw, and other visions of William; his own death compared to the death of King Richard which followed thereafter.
1. Vision of William Rufus.
  2. On the fiscal revenue of England compared with foreign countries.
  3. Of the wealth of divers kingdoms.
  4. Modest claim of Louis VII for France.
  5. Virtues of the French kings compared with others.
    - a. Their avoidance of blasphemous oaths.
    - b. Not "bears" or "lions" but courteous and amiable.
    - c. Modest in success.
    - d. Just and immaculate in morals.
    - e. Do not gain power by violence and leave it peaceably to their heirs.
    - f. Their device not a wild beast, but a flower, before which the pard and the lion have turned tail.
    - g. They are rewarded while others have been fitly punished.
  6. The lands of the wicked transferred by God's judgment to the pious.
  7. The new forest made by William Rufus.
    - a. His vision before death.
    - b. A bishop interprets it.
    - c. He neglects the warning, and is killed by a chance bolt.
  8. The prior of Dunstable's vision.
    - a. He tells it to William but without avail.
    - b. The king is shot by Ralph de Aquis.
  9. His death compared with that of Richard I.
- E.1 Concerning certain final additions to the prior evidence.
1. General reflections on the fate of Tyrants.

## V. Distinctio III (Continued)

2. No Norman king had a good end.
3. The author's book at finished in troubled times.
4. He leaves the task of carrying on the history to others.