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Abstract

This work represents an exploration into the historiography of a hotly debated historical document known as *Laudabiliter*. In 1155 Pope Hadrian IV (most often styled Adrian and sometimes Adrien) issued *Laudabiliter* to King Henry II of England. *Laudabiliter* states that King Henry could invade Ireland to root out the weeds of vice amongst the Irish people, who had supposedly steered away from the Catholic faith, and rule Ireland as its lord. Hadrian IV claimed the right to do this because the Donation of Constantine granted successors of St. Peter, i.e. the pope, dominion over any and all islands.

Any normal letter from the pope would be accepted as real and authentic, but, to our current knowledge, no such copy of this document exists within papal archives. The text of the *Laudabiliter* comes from Gerald of Wales who, in the *Conquest of Ireland*, provided a transcription of the document. The other source is John of Salisbury, who, as he himself claims, met with Pope Hadrian IV as a friend and received the document *Laudabiliter* and brought it back to England.

Naturally, the document became tied up with national identity of both Irish and British scholars alike who generally contested *Laudabiliter*’s inauthenticity or authenticity, respectively. The debate began during the 1600s when England began to send plantations of Protestants to Ireland. The debate over the document grew during the 1800s as more scholars added their arguments against the document’s authenticity. The cause for the increase in the debate likely stems from the gradual Catholic Emancipation reforms and the desire among the Irish to govern themselves. Underlying the national identity sits also a confessional bias. Irish Catholics refute *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity and English Catholics and Protestants alike endorse its authenticity. The arguments for its inauthenticity vary as the scholars argue against the Donation of Constantine, label both Gerald and John’s works as forgeries, discount relevant papal bulls from Hadrian’s successors, and question why Henry waited so long to invade Ireland when he held an endorsement from the pope himself.
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Introduction

Though he was not as famous as other popes of the twelfth century, many scholars have paid Hadrian IV attention on account of his nationality - being the only Englishman amongst all the men to ever sit on the papal throne. Because Hadrian IV’s pontificate lasted only five years (1154-1159), historians have tended to provide detailed histories of the entirety of his pontificate and thus often touch on the same topics as one another. Some historians have focussed on Hadrian’s dealings with the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa. Many historians of Hadrian IV, however, have examined a papal document allegedly issued by Hadrian IV, *Laudabiliter et satis*, which endorsed King Henry II of England and his desire to invade Ireland for the purpose of bringing the latest Christian reforms to the island on behalf of the Holy See.¹

Most recently, some works regarding *Laudabiliter* do not discuss its authenticity and the authors tend to imply their acceptance of its veracity.² Moreover, at the beginning of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century, the historical debate shifted toward the circumstances of the document and less about its authenticity or inauthenticity. Most of the debate, however, took place in the eighteenth century when many of the works reject the document’s authenticity, doubting its circumstances, authorship, and the historical context of the document. This debate stands at the focal point of this present work. This paper discusses and reviews the debates surrounding *Laudabiliter* since its was issued and brings an end to the debates by carefully addressing each argument used against the authenticity of the document. In doing so, the lid on the debate shall be sealed firmly in favour of *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity. Along the way, this

¹ The document is often referred to by other scholars in its longer form “*Laudabiliter et satis*” but will hereafter be referred to simply as “*Laudabiliter*”. NB: Some editions of Gerald of Wales’s text offer different word orders, e.g. “*Laudabiliter satis et*”, though Gerald’s original transcription is the former.

² Patricia Fagan, ‘Pope Adrian IV, the Clear-Eyed Chief Executive, and His Papaey (1154-1159)’ (Doctoral Thesis, University of California, 2006). 65
paper offers a glimpse into the political circumstances and national identities affecting Ireland (and the shared animosity between Ireland and England) as Laudabiliter represents a small piece in the puzzle of documents and works that contribute to this historically poor and contentious relationship. This controversy over this document peaked in the nineteenth century as the greatest number of works were published, especially in the latter half of the century as the topic seemingly began to permeate popular culture and public discourse. Additionally, this paper illustrates power relationships between secular leaders and the head of the Catholic Church in Rome as they carefully vied for more power.

In order to achieve these objectives, I endeavour to proceed through each work about Laudabiliter in chronological order. This shall serve as the backbone to this paper as it facilitates the gradual development in the study of this document. For primary sources, I have sought out critical editions of primary sources where possible – especially where translations or transcriptions of the documents are debated by the historians. I have not included original manuscript work for Laudabiliter itself because Maurice Sheehy’s critical edition of Laudabiliter is complete and comprehensive.³ For other sources I have looked across various editions for particular differences. Generally speaking (with only a few exceptions) historians agree on the transcriptions and translations of the documents discussed in this paper.

In discussing Laudabiliter, some historians have blamed Hadrian for acting upon a bias that favours his homeland, England. Of course, beyond Laudabiliter and Ireland, Hadrian perhaps acted favourably toward England and seemingly sought to bolster the power of King Henry II by promoting England’s influence over Scotland. Due to his curtailing the independence of the Scottish Church, however, some scholars have identified Hadrian’s potential

---

favouritism toward England, at least in the case of Ireland and *Laudabiliter*, as the *status quo* of the mid-twelfth century and nothing out of the norm for the time.\(^4\)

The debate surrounding *Laudabiliter* extends as far back as the Reformation period, when the Irish Catholics began questioning the document’s authenticity on account of their desire to not be ruled by the English – a desire that was exacerbated since England had become a Protestant kingdom at that time. Since then, however, historians began to weigh in on the veracity and authenticity of the document with various arguments against its authenticity that other historians then attempted to refute. The greatest problem of the debate lies to this day in the sparse availability of sources for *Laudabiliter*. In fact, the two most tangible pieces of evidence come from two of Hadrian’s contemporaries, Gerald of Wales and John of Salisbury – the latter being a close friend of the pope himself.

In the interest of narrowing the scope of this work, I intend to only address Hadrian’s involvement within the British Isles, namely England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, during his pontificate. The central focus shall be an attempt to unravel the historical and historiographical record that surrounds *Laudabiliter*. Of course, Hadrian was heavily involved with more immediate concerns during his pontificate, such as Arnold of Brescia, a fiery preacher whose actions against a cardinal caused Hadrian to place the see of Rome under interdict.\(^5\) He also had a strained relationship with Frederick Barbarossa, the Holy Roman Emperor, and, early in his pontificate, excommunicated King William of Sicily.\(^6\) But, what follows is a historiography of *Laudabiliter* and its treatment since the time of Hadrian IV.

\(^5\) Bolton and Duggan, ‘Narrative Sources’. 217
\(^6\) Ibid. 217, 231
Historical Context for Hadrian IV, *Laudabiliter*, and Henry II’s Reign

Henry’s designs upon Ireland started during the first few years of his reign and those designs perhaps grew from England’s previous ecclesiastical ties to the neighbouring island. It was only in the eleventh century that the Ostmen of Dublin’s ecclesiastical ties to England developed again when they opted to send their leader, Patrick of Dublin, for consecration in Canterbury. From here the see of Canterbury sought (in addition) the friendship of Irish princes within the land so as to add more territory into the fold of the see of Canterbury. A series of archbishops of Canterbury, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Theobald, advocated for the Irish prelates, particularly those in Leinster, to obey the see of Canterbury rather than have it gain its own metropolitan within Ireland itself. Though the bishops of Armagh ought to have held sway in Ireland as successors of Saint Patrick, that land and the see itself remained under the control of local chieftains who held the position in name only. According to Norgate, the condition of Ireland at this time was unknown to anyone not directly or partially involved in Ireland’s affairs; Rome’s knowledge of the state of the Church within Ireland came from Cardinal John Paparo who presided over the Synod of Kells in 1152. It was only when the Archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm, made complaints to Rome about the condition of Ireland that a papal legate, Gilbert, was appointed to Ireland for the first time. Melachi, a famous prelate in his own right, succeeded Gilbert and advocated for Ireland to gain its own metropolitan that would be

---

8 Ibid. 89
9 Ibid. 91
10 Ibid. 91
independent from England. The effort came to fruition in 1152 with the Synod of Kells where the dioceses within Ireland were set and four archbishoprics were formed: Armagh as the metropolitan for the regions of Ulster and Meath, Tuam for Connaught, Cashel for Munster, and Dublin for Leinster. The English prelates, particularly those in Canterbury, responded to Ireland’s newly-found autonomy by hatching plans for the new King of England, Henry II, to conquer Ireland. Regardless of the actual state of Ireland’s ecclesiastical affairs and its political circumstances, the reported state of Ireland – per Cardinal John Paparo’s report to Rome from Ireland in 1152 and English chroniclers’ descriptions – was one that indicated a need for intervention. And so, when Henry II proposed to Hadrian that he intended to invade Ireland, Hadrian of course gladly accepted and issued Laudabiliter so that Henry might make that people obedient to the laws, and to root out from there the weeds of vices, that you are willing to pay St. Peter the annual tax of one penny from each household, and to preserve the rights of the churches of that land intact and unimpaired. We therefore support your pious and praiseworthy intention with favour which it deserves and, granting our benevolent consent, we consider it pleasing and acceptable that you should enter that island for the purpose of enlarging the boundaries of the church, checking the descent of wickedness, correcting morals and implanting virtues, and encouraging the growth of the faith in Christ.

Henry II did not immediately act upon the bull that sanctioned his entry into Ireland; in a meeting at Winchester in 1155, his mother, the empress Matilda, objected to the immediate invasion at the time for an unspecified reason.
There is still debate surrounding Henry II’s motive for invading Ireland in the first place. Some scholars consider it a plot by the see of Canterbury to gain back territory taken from its jurisdiction by the Synod of Kells; others suggest Henry wanted to give his brother, William, a kingdom of his own; and others suggest a hybrid and that his eventual invasion was motivated by a baron who might challenge his rights. W.L. Warren, an expert on Henry II, reasons that Henry’s designs upon Ireland stemmed from a “Canterbury plot” hatched by Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury and the bishops of England and not from Henry’s desire to conquer it from the beginning of his reign to give to his brother, William. Generally, the theory goes that the Archbishop and bishops of England played on the young King Henry’s desire to conquer Ireland in order to bring Ireland back into the fold of Canterbury and restore the island to the jurisdiction of Canterbury.\(^\text{19}\) However, other scholars, such as Anne Duggan, later in the historiographical record, disagree on Henry’s motive and argue against Warren. Warren believes that Henry sent a letter at the beginning of his and Hadrian’s reigns wherein he “applied” for consent to invade Ireland, per Theobald’s recommendation, and argues that such a letter is referenced in *Laudabiliter*.\(^\text{20}\) Furthermore, Warren believes that the tumultuous condition of Ireland made the invasion of Ireland itself much easier for the king as he had made an ally out of the exiled king of Leinster, Diarmait Mac Murchada.\(^\text{21}\) Warren mentions that Henry’s own reason for invading Ireland was that he was later invited into Ireland by Strongbow (Earl Richard FitzGilbert de Clare of Pembroke and Lord of Striguil) and Diarmait.\(^\text{22}\) He speculates, however, that (during the Winchester meeting) Henry likely agreed not to invade Ireland immediately.

---


\(^{21}\) Ibid. 194

\(^{22}\) Ibid. 194
because it was not in his interest to do so when he received *Laudabiliter* from Hadrian via John of Salisbury.²³ However, others, such as Oliver Thatcher, suggest that *Laudabiliter* did not confer the power that Henry wanted when he requested papal support to invade Ireland. Instead, as previously mentioned, he supports the idea that Archbishop Theobald suggested the invasion in order that the see of Canterbury would regain jurisdiction over Ireland.²⁴ Indeed, this desire to invade Ireland was in the best interest of both Rome and Canterbury as it was all a part of Hadrian’s Gregorian-style reforms that sought to put Church authority and direction back into the hands of priests and bishops and not Cistercian monks.²⁵ And, as Warren argues, the letters from Hadrian IV and Alexander III had little effect on Henry’s policy in Ireland, despite appreciating the approval from Rome.²⁶ Though this plot was largely unsuccessful in 1155 as the Empress Matilda shut down the idea of invading at that time, the true motive of Henry was always in preventing another Anglo-Norman king within the British Isles; he feared that Strongbow could be that king.²⁷

Ireland’s political situation in some ways facilitated Henry’s invasion. Its condition worsened as the kings of each region began warring more in the 1160s. The conflict began when in 1152 King Diarmait Mac Murchada of Leinster took the wife of a chieftain whose lands in Connaught bordered Meath and Ulster; Diarmait did this whilst the chieftain, Tighernan O’Ruark, was absent.²⁸ In doing so Diarmait began a fourteen-year conflict with Tighernan O’Ruark and

---

²³ As far as *Laudabiliter* is concerned, Warren accepts its authenticity and considers it an attempt by Hadrian “to encourage a hesitant king.” Ibid. 196


²⁵ Warren, *Henry II*. 197

²⁶ Ibid. 198

²⁷ Ibid. 199

with Diarmait’s only ally dead, he stood no chance against Tighernan’s coalition with support
also from the king of Connaught, Roderic O’Conor.29 Diarmait lost and the people of Leinster
recognised Tighernan’s king, Roderic O’Conor, as theirs but Diarmait was forced into exile in
1167.30

Diarmait fled to England and later went to Aquitaine where he met with Henry II to plead
for support to return to Ireland. Henry assented on the condition of Diarmait’s fealty to Henry
and, per the wording in Laudabiliter, gave permission to Diarmait to recruit any barons (and
their respective forces) willing to assist the Irishman.31 Diarmait found success in gaining
support from Earl Richard FitzGilbert de Clare of Pembroke and Lord of Striguil, also known by
the cognomen “Strongbow,” having offered his new Welsh ally his eldest daughter in marriage.32
Diarmait soon landed back in Ireland and though defeated again by Tighernan, he remained in
Ireland and gained more support from Welsh-Normans such as Robert Fitz-Stephen, and
Strongbow himself pledged to join the cause on new promises made to him by Diarmait.33
Diarmait and his forces found success in the region of Leinster and Dublin. Diarmait and
Strongbow captured Dublin and, following Diarmait’s death, Dublin was placed under siege by
Roderic O’Conor. Strongbow’s forces repelled the attackers on two occasions and Strongbow
ultimately won the title of king of Leinster in May 1171.34

29 Norgate, England Under the Angevin Kings. 97-98; Giraldus, Expugnatio Hibernica. 25-26 (chapter 1).
30 Norgate, England Under the Angevin Kings. 98; Giraldus, Expugnatio Hibernica. 25 (chapter 1).
31 Giraldus, Expugnatio Hibernica. 289; See Appendix A “Therefore if you wish to bring to a successful conclusion
the design which you have thus conceived, take particular care to instruct that people in right behaviour and, both in
person, and acting through those whom you consider well-suited for this purpose by reason of their strong faith,
eloquence and Christian religion may be planted and grow”
32 Norgate, England Under the Angevin Kings. 100; Giraldus, Expugnatio Hibernica. 25 (chapter 1). 29
33 Sheehy, When the Normans Came to Ireland. 12
34 Ibid. 14
Richard FitzGilbert de Clare’s new kingship spurred King Henry II into action against his vassal as he had no desire for there to be a second Norman king within the British Isles.\(^{35}\) Henry landed in Waterford on the southern coast of Ireland in the region of Leinster and began to consolidate the land which his barons had conquered.\(^{36}\) He stripped Strongbow of the towns of Dublin, Waterford, and Wexford, but granted him Leinster as a fief; by Henry’s order, those towns belonged to the crown.\(^{37}\) Henry found great success in Ireland as many of the Irish princes submitted to Henry, excepting Roderic O’Conor and those remaining chieftains close to the high king.\(^{38}\)

At no point, however, did Henry II cite \textit{Laudabiliter} in justifying his invasion of Ireland, nor did he cite it during his rulership over Ireland. Norgate suspects that its “existence and its contents were in some way or other certified to the Irish prelates” before they met at the Council of Cashel where the Irish prelates, excepting the Bishop of Armagh, pledged to conform to the ways of the English Catholic Church.\(^{39}\) The fact that Henry did not promulgate \textit{Laudabiliter} was itself cause for doubt amongst later scholars regarding the document’s authenticity. This seemingly detracts from the document’s authenticity as later scholars speculate that if it were real then, as they hypothesise, surely Henry would have openly proclaimed the document to the Irish and have its authenticity acknowledged by all.\(^{40}\)

England’s treatment of Ireland prior to its invasion by Henry or the barons of England was not unique either; in fact, Scotland faced similar troubles. Like Ireland, Scotland also struggled with the primacy of its bishops and its desire to become independent from England’s

\(^{35}\) Sheehy, \textit{When the Normans Came to Ireland}. 14; Norgate, \textit{England Under the Angevin Kings}. 107
\(^{36}\) Sheehy, \textit{When the Normans Came to Ireland}. 15
\(^{37}\) Ibid. 15
\(^{38}\) Ibid. 15
\(^{39}\) Norgate, \textit{England Under the Angevin Kings}. 107
\(^{40}\) Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 44
archdiocese of York. Scotland, however, was far less successful than Ireland as Scotland did not receive its own metropolitan until 1472. Scotland did earn its ecclesiastical independence from England during the twelfth century, however. In Scotland during the twelfth century the bishops sought their own metropolitan and faced a similar problem of distinguishing themselves from an archdiocese in England – except in Scotland’s case the bishops bowed to York, not Canterbury. Prior to the reign of Malcolm III (r. 1058-1091) and Margaret, Scotland followed the traditions of the Celtic Church (Culdee as some scholars call it).\(^{41}\) Margaret, who was a royal exile in Hungary and moved to England following the Norman Conquest of England, often receives credit for having brought Roman Catholicism into Scotland, thus displacing the Celtic Church from the royal family of Scotland and thereby the kingdom (supposedly).\(^{42}\) David, the son of Malcolm III and Margaret, solidified Catholicism in Scotland and by the end of his reign the Catholic Church had time to become well established in Scotland. Yet, by the twelfth century, Rome kept sending letters addressed to the bishops of Scotland that commanded those bishops to obey the archbishop of York, thus indicating that the bishops had ignored those orders. By the time of Hadrian’s pontificate, however, nothing had changed from his predecessors. Whilst it might be plausible for Hadrian’s successors to have been ignorant of Scotland’s independence from England, Hadrian had no such excuse, especially given the context of the Synod of Kells in Ireland two years before Hadrian’s pontificate began. Indeed, Hadrian supported the displacement of the remaining vestiges of the Celtic Church by insisting that Catholic canons replace the Culdee canons.\(^{43}\) Moreover, Hadrian even threatened the bishops of Scotland upon


\(^{42}\) Alan MacQuarrie, *The Saints of Scotland: Essays in Scottish Church History, AD 450-1093* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1997). 212-213; MacQuarrie’s primary source which details Margaret’s arrival to Scotland describes the affair as though King Malcolm III rescued a damsel in distress in a rather fairy tale like manner. Such is common in hagiographies.

the consecration of a new Archbishop of York: “If you do not do this [i.e. accept the Archbishop of York] and you will not obey him, we want you to know that we have established our opinion which our same brother [the Archbishop of York], regarding this, would promulgate canonically with authority from God.”

Hadrian intended here to confer more power to the Archbishop of York against the Scottish bishops, which no pope decreed before, thus pulling power from Scottish Church’s authority and giving it to the English. Hadrian continued to press the matter and in his final years (the exact date remains uncertain) of his pontificate, he sent a letter abjectly threatening the souls and offices of those Scots who refused to obey Archbishop Roger of York. He does, however, invite the bishops of Scotland to come to Rome to present their arguments on the matter in person. At that time, however, Hadrian still insisted that the bishops obey Archbishop Roger of York.

Unsurprisingly, and perhaps for good reason, some scholars point to this as a distinct bias from Hadrian in favouring the authority of English prelates over Scotland on account of his own origins as an Englishman. However, others, such as William Morris, believe that Hadrian actually acted against England’s interests. Similar arguments were lodged against Hadrian from some scholars, such as John Lanigan, as they attempt to show that Hadrian issued Laudabiliter for the benefit of King Henry II as his fellow countryman.

---


“Quod si non feceritis, et ei nolueritis obedire, scire vos volumus quod nos sententiam quam idem frater noster in aliquem vestrum propter hoc, canonice promulgaverit, nos auctore Deo, ratam habebimus.”

45 Somerville, *Scotia Pontificia*. 47. Unfortunately, according to Somerville, no Latin script exists outside of the manuscript kept in the British Library. Only calendar entries such as Somerville’s are readily available in Canada.

46 Somerville, *Scotia Pontificia*. 47


Historians Contemporary to Hadrian IV

Hadrian’s early history remains largely unknown and, at best, uncertain. This is largely on account of Hadrian’s short tenure in combination with his rather unimpactful pontificate – at least in terms of Church reform. He dealt with the European political landscape rather than making any kind of reform efforts. Records vary from author to author, but the historians contemporary to Hadrian IV agree on a handful of general details. Two historians, William of Newburgh and Matthew of Paris, from the twelfth and thirteenth century, respectively, offer only a few details regarding Hadrian’s early life. Hadrian was born in England with the name “Nicholas Breakspear” (with various spellings) in or near the see of St. Albans c.1100 and pursued ecclesiastical life in France at Saint-Ruf. Hadrian’s parentage remains uncertain and details prior to his joining the Cistercian order of Saint Ruf in Avignon also remain largely unknown. William of Newburgh and Matthew of Paris, historians contemporaneous to Hadrian himself, unfortunately, sought to craft and weave generous exaggerations and outright falsities into their histories in order to inflate Hadrian’s popularity. As such, many details about his early life are fabricated, incorrect, or only plausible at best.

Additionally, these early accounts of Hadrian’s life – early or late – either fail to mention Laudabiliter or they accept its authenticity without raising questions about its authenticity. The first and original transcript of Laudabiliter itself comes from Gerald of Wales’s work Expugnatio Hibernica (c. 1188-1189), an account of England’s conquest of Ireland as it related to Henry II and the barons who invaded Ireland. It is worth noting, however, that no such copy of

---


51 Cambrensis Giraldus and Thomas Wright, The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis (London: George Bell and Sons, 1894), http://archive.org/details/historicalworkso00girauoft. viii. The exact date of publication is unknown, but Giraldus’s first edition of Expugnatio Hibernica was dedicated to Richard of Poiters, i.e. Richard I of England, around the time of coronation, hence c.1188-1189.
*Laudabiliter* apparently exists in the papal archives in Rome, nor does it earn a mention in Cardinal Boso’s history of Hadrian as reproduced by Louis Marie Olivier Duchesne in the *Liber Pontificalis*. Indeed, Gerald’s transcription (and potentially RalphDiceto’s) remains the only extant version of the document, which would contribute to the debate over its authenticity.\(^{52}\) Other historians during the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries accept Gerald’s transcription and some even quote it in their own works. The second source for *Laudabiliter* comes from John of Salisbury, a renowned scholar and later Bishop of Chartres, who, in the final chapter of his book *Metalogicon*, discusses his friendship with Hadrian and his deeds in the context of the pontiff’s death.\(^{53}\) John does not specifically refer to the document, but he mentions how Hadrian entrusted a letter regarding the privilege of Ireland that John was to deliver to Henry II.\(^{54}\) Much of the scholarly debate regarding the authenticity and veracity of *Laudabiliter* revolves then around John’s forty-second chapter of *Metalogicon* and Gerald’s sixth chapter of *Expugnatio Hibernica*.

### John of Salisbury & Gerald of Wales: The Contested Sources for *Laudabiliter*

John of Salisbury and Gerald of Wales offer the only two extant and available records and unique mentions of *Laudabiliter* that are roughly contemporaneous to Hadrian IV himself. John seems to refer to *Laudabiliter* – though not by its incipit – in the forty-second (and final) chapter of *Metalogicon*. John mentions the letter as he discusses and mourns over the death of the pontiff, whom he considered a close friend. In this chapter, John mentions how he and the pope dined together, and, most interestingly, how a letter to Henry II thought to be the infamous document, *Laudabiliter*, came into John’s hands. Some scholars of this document have argued that John’s last chapter is itself a forgery on account of its tone and how the chapter differs from

---

\(^{52}\) Sheehy, *Pontificia Hibernica*. 15  
\(^{54}\) Ibid. 274
the rest of the more philosophical book, suggesting that somebody else appended the chapter about John’s friendship with Hadrian. However, others argue that John himself wrote the final chapter and added it to the end of his book at a later date. The other source is Gerald of Wales’s *Expugnatio Hibernica* which includes a purported transcription of the infamous papal bull itself. Many scholars reject its authenticity on the grounds that they consider Gerald as rather untrustworthy since he was prone to making mistakes in his works. Others dismiss him entirely on account of his association with King Henry II and his bias in favour of England and Wales.

By the time John met with the pontiff he was a renowned scholar in Europe. John discusses his close friendship with the late Hadrian IV, seemingly shortly after the pontiff’s death on August 31st, 1159. In only a few sentences, John of Salisbury details his close friendship with Hadrian, recounting how they each shared their “inmost conscience[s]” and dined together. John then, in only a few sentences, mentions the matter most pressing to this study:

> It was in acquiescence to my petitions that Hadrian granted and entrusted Ireland to the illustrious king of the English, Henry II, to be possessed by him and his heirs, as the papal letters still give evidence. This was by virtue of the fact that all islands are said to belong to the Roman Church, by ancient right, based on the Donation of Constantine, who established and conceded this privilege. By me [Pope] Hadrian dispatched a golden ring set with a magnificent emerald, whereby he invested [our] Henry II with the authority to rule Ireland. It was subsequently ordered that this ring be kept in the public treasure, where it is still to be found.

John then proceeds to discuss the schism that occurred after Hadrian’s death. Beyond his friendship with Hadrian, John explains that because Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury had

---

56 Sheehy, ‘The Bull “Laudabiliter”’. 59
57 Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 29
59 Ibid. 274-275
fallen ill, he endeavoured to take on additional duties on the archbishop’s behalf – including visiting the Roman Curia to meet with Hadrian when required. Like Gerald, John of Salisbury claims that the papal bull Hadrian gave to him came in the form of a grant – something that later scholars would use as evidence against the authenticity of both Gerald and John’s claims. The editor and translator of this particular translation and edition of *Metalogicon*, Daniel McGarry, cites Henry William Carless Davis’s *England Under the Normans and Angevins* for his source of *Laudabiliter*. Some scholars, such as John Lynch, author/editor of *Cambrensis Eversus*, and Cardinal Moran, author of “The Bull and Adrian the Fourth”, cast doubt on the final chapter of *Metalogicon*, arguing that it does not fit with the rest of the book and that a forger may have added the Hadrian passages. In fact, nearly all of those who refute *Laudabiliter’s* authenticity hold this viewpoint.

Gerald of Wales has attracted the most criticism from scholars of *Laudabiliter*. Gerald, like many of his contemporaries, tended to embellish and exaggerate details of his account of events and arguably served as a propagandist for the Plantagenet family. However, modern scholars concede that Gerald did not like Henry or his policies. In his *Expugnatio Hibernica*, he recounts the invasion of Ireland by the Anglo-Norman barons alongside Diarmait and later by
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Davis himself does not put it beyond Gerald to have possibly forged *Laudabiliter*. Despite this, he does believe that Hadrian granted Henry II an equivalent papal privilege and that Alexander III, Hadrian’s successor, most certainly conferred the same kind of privilege to Henry in three separate letters to various recipients including King Henry himself.

63 Duggan, ‘Chapter 7: Totius Christianitatis Caput. The Popes and the Princes’. 139
King Henry II himself. In the sixth chapter of *Expugnatio Hibernica*, Gerald discusses a letter that Hadrian IV sent to Henry II. This letter detailed express permission from Pope Hadrian for King Henry of England to invade Ireland for the purpose of spreading ecclesiastical reforms on the grounds that “Ireland and all the other islands on which the light of the gospel of Christ has dawned, and which have received the knowledge of the Christian faith, do of right belong and appertain to St. Peter and the holy Roman church.” Gerald claims that the letter he transcribes into *Expugnatio Hibernica* is a copy of the letter that John of Salisbury carried back to England with a “gold ring” after he met with Hadrian c. 1155-1156. Gerald claims that John of Salisbury deposited the “gold ring” (John specifies a gold ring set with an emerald) in the treasury at Winchester. However, Gerald incorrectly describes the document as a “bull of privileges” when the document, based on Maurice Sheehy’s philological analysis, is just a “commendatory letter” and does not bear the formulae typically found in a papal document granting privileges. Sheehy does, however, speculate that the letter known as *Laudabiliter* would have been accompanied by an actual papal bull that granted privileges to Henry II in a more official way. Gerald also claims that copies of *Laudabiliter* were brought over to Ireland by three different people and then read publicly at a synod held at Waterford, but there is no supporting evidence that it was proclaimed in this way – a fact that some scholars use to discredit the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. Indeed, Norgate suggests that Gerald likely invented the idea that three individuals brought copies of *Laudabiliter* to Ireland on account of the lack of evidence for such
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a document appearing there and the fact that Laudabiliter’s next appearance is in another one of Gerald’s works and nowhere else except by those who copied Gerald’s transcription.69

Among the things that Gerald seems to have correctly portrayed is the fact that Henry II could not immediately act upon the bull because he was at war with France. In the subsequent chapter of Expugnatio Hibernica, Gerald adds that when Henry finally invaded twenty years after Hadrian issued Laudabiliter the Irish accepted Henry’s invading Anglo-Norman force and swore fealty to him.70 Gerald omits to explain why they so willingly accepted the king’s invading force; the Irish preferred Henry to the English barons who had wreaked havoc in southern Ireland for decades and whose presence demanded Henry’s invasion as he suspected and feared that the barons, especially Strongbow, intended to challenge his own desire to rule in Ireland as its lord.71

The letter from Hadrian known as Laudabiliter can be summarised in the following way: Henry II, having contacted the Apostolic See about this matter, shall enter Ireland and conquer the people to make them obedient to laws and rid them of sin. He will, as he indicated, enforce upon the people a yearly tax of one penny per house (i.e. Peter’s pence) and maintain and preserve the churches already within Ireland. The Apostolic See, for the purpose of expanding the borders of the Church and preventing the spread of sin, grants the right for Henry to invade Ireland on the grounds that (based on the Donation of Constantine) all islands belong in especial right to St. Peter. Of the people of Ireland, the Apostolic See demands that all those dwelling in

69 Ibid. 44. She does, however, object to the argument against Laudabiliter’s authenticity on the grounds that it was not published in Ireland and Giraldus’s lie about it.
70 Giraldus and Wright, The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis. 263
71 Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 47
Ireland accept Henry as their lord, barring the churches. Henry reserves the right to personally invade Ireland or send others to do so as he deems fit.72

The Donation of Constantine, in brief, was a document supposedly issued by Constantine the Great (d. 337) that granted all the lands of the Western Roman Empire to Pope Sylvester I (r. 314-335) and future successors of St. Peter. The donation stated that all islands within the bounds of the Western Empire would, per this document, belong to the successors of St. Peter.73 Of course, this did not technically include Ireland as it was not a part of the Western Roman Empire, and the language within the Donation of Constantine is vague about including islands.74 The Donation of Constantine, however, was proved to be a forgery by Lorenzo Valla, a humanist scholar, in the middle of the fifteenth century.75 Of course, it is important to note that to Hadrian IV and Henry II (and the other European rulers), the Donation of Constantine was a very real document in the twelfth century and its authenticity was not questioned in their time. Whether Hadrian IV suspected that it was a forgery is a different matter that is far beyond the scope of this paper. None of these caveats stopped Hadrian from citing the Donation of Constantine in Laudabiliter. For all intents and purposes, however, in the context of the twelfth century, the Donation of Constantine was not questioned because there was consensus, at the time, of its authenticity.76
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76 Moran, ‘Bull of Adrian the Fourth’. 52
Though the general synopsis of the letter remains the same, one scholar, Cardinal Patrick Francis Moran (see below), contests one of the prevailing English translations of *Laudabiliter*. Moran’s qualms, however, are not of great import as he mostly argues over the semantics, beyond further illustrating, perhaps, his position in the debate on *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity. It is worth noting, however, that Bolton’s and Duggan’s edition of the translation, which they take from A.B. Scott’s and F.X. Martin’s 1978 translation of *Expugnatio Hibernica*, uses the same language as Cardinal Moran’s translation – if in differently ordered English phrasing.

After providing the text of *Laudabiliter* itself, Gerald begins to detail the number of ways in which Henry held the right to rule Ireland. Gerald lists five ways in total: Hadrian’s papal “bull,” permitting him to invade Ireland for Christendom’s sake; Henry’s alleged lineage back to King Arthur, to whom the Irish kings also surrendered; Henry’s supposed ancestor Gurguntius, king of Britain and Ireland; the voluntary submission of the Irish lords following Henry’s invasion; and the claim that, because the Irish (according to Gerald) originally migrated from Bayonne in Gascony, the Irish were originally within Henry’s kingdoms. It stands as no surprise then that many scholars challenge Gerald’s “transcription” of *Laudabiliter* considering his obviously false claims regarding Henry’s rights over Ireland.

Additionally, many scholars challenge Gerald’s claims on account of his relationship to the crown and to the positions of authority. Some scholars, such as James MacGeoghegan, who wrote in the eighteenth century, and Stephen McCormick, who wrote in the late nineteenth century, believe that Gerald forged *Laudabiliter* for Henry and Henry’s benefit. These scholars...
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looked to his relationship to the crown and found that Gerald of Wales served as secretary and diplomat to Wales by special appointment of King Henry II (no doubt causing some bias) and even accompanied Henry’s son, John, to Ireland as preceptor. Thus, scholars who argue against Laudabiliter’s authenticity point to Gerald’s close relationship with the crown as a reason for him to forge the document and curry favour with King Henry. On the contrary, however, some proponents of the authenticity of Laudabiliter suggest that, despite becoming secretary, Gerald had a poor relationship with Henry II and that he did not like the king at all. Some suggest that as someone closely involved with the family, Gerald would have forged Laudabiliter to further receive benefits from the royal family. The problem, as Maurice Sheehy & J.F. O’Doherty address, is that the transcription that Gerald includes in Expugnatio Hibernica is so convincingly authentic on account of its style and formulae that it is hard to come to terms with such an argument. Why would Gerald have to produce an incredibly convincing forgery for a king who would not doubt its authenticity regardless of the quality of the forgery? Henry had his eye on Ireland for some time and had wanted to invade Ireland – Laudabiliter itself attests this as Hadrian’s court issued Laudabiliter in response to an initial letter sent by Henry. Despite this, whether Laudabiliter was forged – it was not –, Henry likely would have accepted Gerald’s transcription regardless of the quality of its alleged forgery.
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Further complications arise on the matter as Gerald of Wales’s transcription, as previously mentioned, because it is the only extant transcription of the alleged original document. This, of course, raises further suspicion regarding the document. All other transcriptions of *Laudabiliter* are based on Gerald’s transcription and not the original. In *Pontificia Hibernica; Medieval Papal Documents Concerning Ireland, 640-1261*, the editors, Maurice Sheehy and William Stubbs, speculate that Ralph Diceto may have also provided an original transcription of *Laudabiliter*, but he may have simply copied it from Gerald of Wales.\(^8^6\) Ralph’s text, however, does not differ from Gerald of Wales’s text.\(^8^7\)

**Chroniclers and Other Historians During the Middle Ages**

The first sources for the life of Hadrian IV came from two monks from the monastery at St. Albans, Roger of Wendover and Matthew of Paris. Following Wendover’s death in 1236, Matthew of Paris assumed the role of historian and continued the *Flores Historiarum*.

Wendover, however, wrote much of the volume prior to the thirteenth century. His history, though helpful, contains a number of verified inaccuracies that bring into question the veracity of a number of additional claims made by Wendover. For instance, Wendover includes a copy of the text of *Laudabiliter*. Indeed, Wendover’s reproduction of the document was likely derived not from an original document, but from another contemporary chronicler, probably Gerald of Wales. Before he offers his reproduction of the text, however, he claims that Henry sent embassies to Hadrian to request that Henry be given permission to invade Ireland. Additionally,
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he claims that Henry did this so that he, as king, might “bring into the way of truth its bestial inhabitants, by extirpating the seeds of vice among them.”\textsuperscript{88} What is more, Roger of Wendover, like Gerald, calls Hadrian’s letter a “privilege,” which does not describe the document as we know it.\textsuperscript{89} Wendover also famously harboured certain biases and played favourites with historical figures.\textsuperscript{90} Wendover likely favoured Hadrian on account of Hadrian’s connection to St. Albans – where Wendover also resided and wrote \textit{Flores Historiarum}. Additionally, Hadrian also famously showered the monastery of St. Albans with privileges.\textsuperscript{91} In one such privilege, Hadrian, in 1156, granted the monastery of St. Albans immunity from paying tribute to kings and lords and bishops.\textsuperscript{92} The same document bestowing privileges also granted the monastery special protection from any Church authority, with the sole exception of the pope or his legate; in addition, it provided that all requests made by the abbot would be fulfilled by superiors such as the archbishop.\textsuperscript{93} It is worth noting, however, that Hadrian’s predecessors had bestowed similar privileges upon St. Albans.\textsuperscript{94} In the following year, Hadrian issued another privilege that freed the clergy in the region of St. Albans from bishops’ jurisdiction; according to this privilege, only the pope could make such commands to the clergy in St. Albans (and the surrounding churches).\textsuperscript{95} Together, these factors make Wendover rather unreliable, though his overall narrative seems to agree with others, including Cardinal Boso.

\textsuperscript{88} Roger of Wendover, \textit{Flores Historiarum}, ed. Henry Richards Luard Matthew (H. M. Stat. Off., 1890), \url{http://archive.org/details/floreshistoriar00readgoog}. 72. It is worth noting that some English translations call it a charter, which also does not describe it well.\textsuperscript{89} Ibid. 529\textsuperscript{90} See Wendover’s later discussion of Henry II’s son, King John.\textsuperscript{91} Brenda Bolton and Anne J. Duggan, eds., “Introduction”, in \textit{Adrian IV The English Pope (1154–1159): Studies and Texts}, 1 edition (Aldershot, Hampshire, England; Burlington, VT: Routledge, 2003). i\textsuperscript{92} Bolton and Duggan, ‘Narrative Sources’. 315\textsuperscript{93} Ibid. 315\textsuperscript{94} Ibid. 313\textsuperscript{95} Ibid. 323. The other regions included: “the church of St. Peter in the town of St. Albans, the church of St Stephen, the churches of Kingsbury, Watford, Rickmansworth, Langley, Redbourn, Codicote, Walden, Hecstanestuna, Norton, Newnham, Wimslow, Easton, Barnet.”
William of Newburgh’s *Historia Rerum Anglicarum* features the most complete chronology of Hadrian’s early life. Unfortunately, however, many of his claims are demonstrably false or inaccurate as the more reliable Cardinal Boso indicates otherwise. For example, William of Newburgh claims that Hadrian’s father abandoned Hadrian, leaving him to accept handouts from the monastery of St. Albans where he eventually became a monk. However, his claims about Hadrian’s early life are not included in the more reliable Cardinal Boso’s biography from the *Liber Pontificalis*. Newburgh’s version of Hadrian’s early life offers a narrative more akin to a fairy-tale than anything. Newburgh introduces his history of Hadrian with a rags-to-riches narrative that is consistent with the Church’s ideal of a merit-based hierarchy: “It should be explained that he was raised as if from the dust to sit in the midst of princes and to occupy the throne of apostolic glory.”

Matthew of Paris continued *Historia Anglorum* and also wrote *Gesta Abbatum* and *Historia Anglorum*. Paris’s *Historia Anglorum* comes from a segment of his *Chronica Majora*, which itself drew largely from Wendover’s *Flores Historiarum* and thus suffers from many of the same problems as Wendover’s account of Hadrian’s life. Matthew of Paris does recognise that Hadrian bestowed a great number of privileges on St. Albans, but he does not suggest or imply that this fact may colour his history. Like Wendover, he also discusses *Laudabiliter* and
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mentions it in much the same light as Wendover in claiming that it granted Henry II the right to invade Ireland. Indeed, Matthew’s text greatly resembles Roger’s; Matthew describes Ireland as “a place of dread and desolate deprivation, on the very edge of the world” and explains Henry’s goal of bringing “those bestial men back to the faith and lead them to the path of truth and obedience to the Roman church.” Matthew then reproduces the text of Laudabiliter itself. Of course, both Matthew and Roger share the same source: Gerald of Wales. Though the document itself had no bearing on Henry’s invasion (see discussion of Norgate and Sheehy’s article below), it seems that Laudabiliter was important enough to Roger and Matthew alike for them both to include the text itself and a description of how Laudabiliter came about.

In discussing Hadrian’s early life, Matthew of Paris proves himself prone to mistakes as he claims that Abbot Robert of St. Albans deemed Nicholas inadequate to become a monk there, causing Nicholas to go instead to Saint-Ruf where he became an Augustinian canon regular. Both William of Newburgh and Matthew of Paris make a claim of sorts wherein they assert Nicholas’s origins with the Church at St. Albans. In doing so, the two English historians contradict the account of the considerably more reliable Cardinal Boso (discussed below) as well as presenting a chronological problem. Matthew of Paris includes chronological inconsistencies in Gesta Abbatum. For example, Matthew of Paris states that Abbot Robert de Ghoram turned Nicholas away from St. Albans, but according to the Gesta Abbatum, Robert did not become the abbot until 1151 – by which time Eugenius III had already made Nicholas (later Hadrian IV) a
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103 Brooke, ‘Chapter 1: Adrian IV and John of Salisbury’. 5
Scholars agree, however, that some of Matthew of Paris’s claims about Hadrian IV’s early career carry some merit. For instance, he states that Hadrian’s family came from Abbot’s Langley (not far from St. Albans) and this fits with previous notions that Nicholas’s father served as a clerk and later as a monk at St. Albans, which would explain why Hadrian showered the monastery with privileges.

Cardinal Boso’s history of Hadrian IV seems more reliable and includes fewer embellishments or outright incorrect details compared to the St. Albans chroniclers. First, Cardinal Boso himself was a close confidant, though not relative, of Hadrian during his pontificate; for this reason, Boso’s account seems to be the most reliable amongst the early historians (certainly in comparison to William of Newburgh and Matthew of Paris). Boso himself held the office of *Scriptor Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae* (Writer of the Holy Roman Church) prior to Hadrian’s pontificate, starting in 1149. When Hadrian rose to the Papal See, he promoted Boso to the office of Papal Chamberlain. This, no doubt, colours Boso’s biography of Hadrian, but such a biography about a pope would have never been negative either. Boso’s biography includes details of Hadrian’s personal qualities, such as his excellent singing voice and preaching ability – though none of Hadrian’s sermons apparently survive. Boso makes no mention of Hadrian’s changes or reforms to the Church as a whole and almost exclusively details his political exploits and emphasises the pope overcoming the adversaries who encroached upon
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Rome’s and the pope’s authority. In a brief break from discussing Hadrian’s dealings with the king of Sicily and Frederick Barbarossa, Boso describes the construction of a number of buildings as well as some reparations that Hadrian undertook during his pontificate. Unlike any of the other early historians, however, Cardinal Boso does not make any mention of *Laudabiliter* or the visit of John of Salisbury on behalf of King Henry II. Cardinal Boso’s biography of Hadrian centres entirely on the perspective of Rome and Hadrian’s movements and his dealings with Frederick Barbarossa, Arnold of Brescia, and King William of Sicily. Boso not including *Laudabiliter* in his history suggests its lack of importance.

These early works about the life of Hadrian IV hazard caution to historians as they present some falsehoods regarding Hadrian. Of these works, Cardinal Boso’s biography is the most valuable if (obviously) one-sided in favour of the papacy and provides no new information about *Laudabiliter*. Its weakness, however, lies in its lack of information regarding Hadrian’s early life in England and details regarding *Laudabiliter*. Matthew of Paris and William of Newburgh’s histories offer much the same detail as Cardinal Boso’s only with more embellishing details and fabrication of information.

Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Scholars

The two authors, John Lynch and James MacGeoghegan, treated in this section were both Irish Catholics and they discuss *Laudabiliter* in the context of contemporary Protestant plantations in Ireland as well as wars with the English. It stands as no surprise then that they both thoroughly refute *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity as it granted the King of England the right to invade Ireland. Lynch and MacGeoghegan base many of their objections to *Laudabiliter* in the Donation of Constantine as they question and investigate the temporal authority of the pope.

108 Bolton and Duggan, ‘Narrative Sources’. 231-233
John Lynch wrote *Cambrensis Eversus* (1652) based on the works of Gerald of Wales and sought to criticize the Welsh writer over several of his works. Because Lynch wrote in Latin, Matthew Kelly’s edition provides a parallel English translation as well as Kelly’s comments. John Lynch most notably serves as one of the first scholars to argue the case for *Laudabiliter*’s inauthenticity. Indeed, Lynch wrote his critique of *Laudabiliter* based on many of the same qualms that Stephen White had taken against the document in 1615 – though Norgate mentions that Lynch absorbed and expanded White’s arguments. Lynch is all too happy to openly criticise Hadrian’s character, Gerald of Wales’s work, and any other likely forger for concocting the document known as *Laudabiliter*. Kate Norgate, however, easily and quickly refutes his arguments as some of them are predicated on clumsy assumptions and she insists that it is nearly impossible to build a character profile of a historical figure without substantially more historical material.

Lynch draws on a number of ideas to argue against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. He first looks at the Donation of Constantine as it is referenced in *Laudabiliter*; seemingly unaware that the Donation of Constantine had been proven a forgery by Lorenzo Valla, Lynch argues that the pope did not have dominion over islands of any kind. The editor and translator of *Cambrensis Eversus*, Matthew Kelly, points out that in a letter to Hadrian, dated October 1154 – a year before *Laudabiliter* was issued –, Henry II acknowledged the pope’s claim to dominion over “Ireland and all islands, which the sun of justice, Christ, illuminated, and they accept the
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proof of Christian faith, to the law of blessed St. Peter and the holy Roman Church.” Lynch continues in arguing that Ireland was never under the dominion of Constantine and thus could not possibly be considered to belong to the pope following the Donation of Constantine and thus claims Laudabiliter’s inauthenticity. His reasoning, however, lines up more with a notion of Hadrian making an illegitimate claim within the document rather than making a case for Laudabiliter’s inauthenticity. Thus, regardless of whether the document is authentic, it could also be viewed as illegitimate because of the claims regarding the Donation of Constantine. Of course, the letter quoted above indicates that there was consensus, at least in the mind of Henry II, that all islands, including Britain and Ireland, belonged to the pope via the Donation of Constantine, which at that time was believed to be a real and authentic document. Lynch dwells on this point for some time, arguing that Innocent III illegally received England as its lord and gave it back to King John as a fief on account of the violation against the barons. Additionally, Lynch claims that because the records of Irish kings do not mention a pope ever acting as sovereign of Ireland that it could not possibly be true. His reasoning is faulty on the claims regarding the Donation of Constantine; per the letter quoted above, medieval kings understood the relationship between pope and king and they certainly regarded the Donation of Constantine as authentic.

Among other arguments Lynch posits against the authenticity of the document, he draws upon what Kate Norgate fittingly describes as “arguments from silence.” Lynch reasons that
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Hadrian’s bull cannot be trusted because it was issued in 1155 but it was not published for another seventeen years in 1172. The lack of immediate publication is not grounds for its inauthenticity and nor is its lack of presence in papal records. Matthew Kelly, the editor, and Cardinal Caesar Baronius even attest this despite the latter believing that the document’s authenticity is questionable. Later scholars, as explained below, speculate that Henry did not promulgate Laudabiliter because it did not confer the rights that he hoped to receive from Hadrian, namely kingship over the Irish.

Lynch then launches into an attack on John of Salisbury’s last chapter in Metalogicon. He believes that a forger appended the whole chapter to the end of John’s work to further support Laudabiliter’s authenticity. Lynch seems to speak arbitrarily against the reliability of John of Salisbury in favour of Peter of Blois, a secretary to King Henry, who wrote only after Henry was lord over Ireland. He reasons that if the bull were real and the matter important to Henry, he would have sent Peter of Blois to meet with Hadrian and not John. Laudabiliter is not a grant of land to Henry and it did not make him king of Ireland. Yet Lynch neglects to mention that John, at this time, was secretary to Archbishop Theobald and often went to Rome on Theobald’s behalf and did so when he was receiving the ring and the letters from Hadrian per his own description in chapter forty-two of Metalogicon. The strongest point Lynch makes in arguing that John of Salisbury’s final chapter of Metalogicon is a forgery is the fact that it does not connect well with the rest of the book, but scholars of John of Salisbury’s work fail to find evidence of forgery in either his “graceful diction [or] his unrivalled Latinity.”
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In *Cambrensis Eversus* Lynch jumps between arguments against *Laudabiliter* and in some cases makes outright false claims about the conditions of medieval Europe, England, and Ireland. Lynch, for instance, criticises Matthew of Paris’s (though he mistakenly refers to him as Matthew of Westminster) rendering of *Laudabiliter*. Lynch rightly criticises Matthew of Paris’s account about *Laudabiliter*, but the St. Albans chronicler put words into Hadrian’s mouth about the Irish and Lynch all too willingly believes Matthew’s claims. Lynch does not recognise that Matthew often embellished his version of events; moreover, Matthew of Paris was not a close contemporary of Hadrian, unlike Gerald of Wales or John of Salisbury, thus making his account less believable. Lynch also draws upon the number of verbal attacks that Matthew of Paris made against the Irish as cause to doubt the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. Specifically, he takes issue with Matthew’s rendering of the text of *Laudabiliter*. In a preamble to the text of *Laudabiliter*, Matthew says that “At this time Henry sent a solemn embassy to solicit pope Hadrian’s permission that he might invade and subdue Ireland, and bring into the way of truth its bestial inhabitants, by extirpating seeds of vice among them.” Lynch takes issue with Matthew’s phrasing as he believes that the text of *Laudabiliter* does not permit Henry to “subdue” Ireland. Lynch is not the only scholar to take issue with translation or paraphrasing of *Laudabiliter*; centuries later, Cardinal Moran raised similar qualms about the translation of the text and even questioned the Latinity of the previous translators.
John Lynch also addresses his problems with the letter of Alexander III that supports the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. Lynch correctly argues that the letter he refers to, *Quoniam ea*, was forged. This document is undoubtedly false, and Maurice Sheehy points out that even Gerald of Wales’s contemporaries, and perhaps Gerald himself, knew that *Quoniam ea* was a forgery. Sheehy even suggests that the fact that *Quoniam ea* was crossed out in some of the manuscripts that feature *Expugnatio Hibernica* (with dates indicating when it was crossed out) lends further support to the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. This suggests that authorities in the Church saw the need to expunge it, yet left *Laudabiliter* intact despite it being directly next to *Quoniam ea*. Lynch does not make much mention of the other three letters from Alexander III in his work; he only mentions *Laudabiliter* and *Quoniam ea* at length.

While Lynch does not strictly exhibit a confessional bias, it seems that he holds a prejudice against the English for justifying and even conceiving of the invasion of Ireland. Shortly after providing his translation of *Laudabiliter* he says:

> It is not evident to everyone, that the person, who whispered such things into Hadrian’s ear, must have been either grossly ignorant, or intolerably malignant? Or rather that he used Adrian’s name as a cover for his malignant and calumnious fabrications? But the words attributed to Hadrian are varnished with a blacker hue of falsehood by Matthew of [Paris].

Yet, Matthew of Paris’s words, though embellished and exaggerated, only extend to two pages of writing regarding the circumstances of *Laudabiliter*. Because of Matthew’s generalisations about Irish people, Lynch launches into a description of great virtuous kings in an effort to show that the descriptions of the Irish in *Laudabiliter* are false. Indeed, to enforce his point, he specifically chose non-Irish chroniclers to show that the Irish kings were respectable, and that the
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irreligiousness implied in *Laudabiliter* was nowhere to be found, and the Irish people were not “bestial” as Matthew describes them.¹³¹

John Lynch published *Cambrensis Eversus* during a period of Protestant plantation movements into Ireland during the seventeenth century. The plantation of Ulster, a predominantly Gaelic part of Ireland at the time, was promoted by James I of England, who planted Scots and Englishman in Ulster.¹³² Those Protestant immigrants later led the Irish Parliament during MacGeoghegan’s time. Lynch’s stance, according to Matthew Kelly, revolved around a mutual religious toleration for both Anglo-Irishmen and Irishmen.¹³³ However, his hopes were far from met. Following a dispute with the papal nuncio, Giovanni Battista Rinuccini, who was directed by Pope Innocent X to act in the best interest of the Church, Lynch and his cohort were amongst a minority of Irishmen.¹³⁴ Lynch later found himself involved in fighting Cromwell’s army during the Siege of Galway in 1651 and afterward he fled Ireland to exile in France.¹³⁵ Lynch spent the rest of his life in France, where he wrote *Cambrensis Eversus* against “perceived anti-Irish slanders of the twelfth-century Cambro-Norman ecclesiastic propagandist Gerald of Wales.”¹³⁶ John Lynch thus had a personal stake in writing *Cambrensis Eversus*.

¹³¹ Ibid. 415-431
¹³² John Sherry, “‘Weaklynges’ Sucking at England: Reassessing the Scottish Plantation of Ulster”, *International Review of Scottish Studies* 35 (23 July 2010), https://doi.org/10.21083/irss.v35i0.1227. 37
¹³⁵ Ibid.
¹³⁶ Ibid.
In the middle of the eighteenth century, Abbot James MacGeoghegan published *Histoire de l’Irelande, Ancienne et Moderne*. Roughly ninety years later, Patrick O’Kelly provided a translation of MacGeoghegan’s original French work. MacGeoghegan, a Catholic born in Ireland, received his education in Paris where he also wrote *History of Ireland*. He became an abbot in France and published the first volume of his *History of Ireland* in 1758, followed by the second volume in 1763. He begins with a dedication to the Irish troops who fought against the British and their allies in France at the Battle of Fontenoy in 1745. Indeed, in this dedication, MacGeoghegan makes it clear that he seeks to appeal to his native Ireland and its people with a nationalist and religious narrative to explain the ebb and flow of Irish history and its desire to remain independent of England. Additionally, MacGeoghegan published his work at a time when Catholic rebellions were rising within Ireland against the Protestant Irish parliament.

Like Lynch and many Irish authors to come, MacGeoghegan also refutes the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* and does so on similar grounds to Lynch. He believes the bull to be fictitious for several reasons, the first being that Cardinal Caesar Baronius, a reliable source, provides no date for it; the second that the popes did not have the right to give Ireland to another king; thirdly, that John of Salisbury’s chapter in *Metalogicon* was forged “by a strange hand”; fourth, that Peter of Blois makes no record of Henry’s title as king of Ireland.

Many scholars later reiterated MacGeoghegan’s first argument, though brief, which boils down to an attack on the reliability of Gerald of Wales and why the text of *Laudabiliter* does not appear anywhere else in an original form. MacGeoghegan remarks that Cardinal Caesar
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Baronius, who compiled a number of papal documents, categorised *Laudabiliter* without a date, which MacGeoghegan finds suspicious. However, Norgate argues that the lack of a date is due to the fact that Gerald of Wales omitted any typical apparatus from the original document because its presence would be assumed by his contemporary audience – only the content, i.e. the transcript, of the letter mattered.

Additionally, in an attempt to disprove its authenticity, much like Lynch, MacGeoghegan argues that the popes never wielded the power to grant Ireland to the King of England or any kingdom to another king. Additionally, MacGeoghegan challenges the power that the popes presumed that the Donation of Constantine imbued them with and does not question the authenticity of the document itself – perhaps knowing that twelfth-century rulers knew it only as authentic. Instead, he insists that the Romans never conquered Ireland and the pope could thus not possibly rule it under the terms of the Donation of Constantine. He argues that because kings consistently ruled Ireland throughout its history, the successors of St. Peter could not rule it in their stead. Both Cardinal Moran, who argued against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*, and Norgate agree that Lynch’s and MacGeohegan’s arguments regarding the pope’s claim to rule islands are “beside the point.” Norgate continues criticising Lynch and MacGeohegan’s argument in pointing out that “If [the pope’s authority over islands] had not been recognised, a forger would have had no motive for putting it into either *Laudabiliter* or *Metalogicon.*”
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Early Nineteenth-Century Scholars

Biographical works about Hadrian IV written by modern historians began in the nineteenth century, wherein Richard Raby serves as a starting point for modern biographical works regarding his life. The historiographical trend following the early works favours a standard change-over-time trend; the closer to the present a history about Hadrian IV was written, the more it adheres to the principles of social history and the less it follows the principles of the “great man” theory that Carlyle posited in the 1840s.\textsuperscript{147} Of course, the primary focus of this paper remains the examination of the great debate over the authenticity of Laudabiliter. The trend within the debate of Laudabiliter’s authenticity remains the same: Irish Catholic scholars generally refute its authenticity and English Protestant and English Catholic scholars generally endorse its authenticity. Moreover, the biographers of Hadrian discussed in this paper universally accept Laudabiliter as authentic – though they are all English and not Irish.

The nineteenth century represents a hotbed for the debate surrounding Laudabiliter as the scholarship about the document was and is still interwoven with notions of Irish identity and calls for Irish independence following the Act of Union with Great Britain in 1801. Also relevant is the influence of a series of acts that emancipated Catholics and eventually granted them equal status to Anglicans in the United Kingdom. The series of acts, known as the “papists acts”, began at the end of the eighteenth century and culminated in the Act of Emancipation of 1829 which allowed Catholics to serve in Parliament. The scholarship thus exhibits a distinct bias that separates along both a national level – English and Irish – and also, to a similar extent, a confessional bias – Anglican and Catholic. As one might expect, the former, English and/or Anglican, tend to favour the authenticity of Laudabiliter, and the latter, Irish and/or Catholic, see

it as a forgery. There are a number of partial exceptions because some English Catholic scholars favoured its authenticity. In the nineteenth century, however, Irish Catholic scholars almost universally argued for its inauthenticity and vice versa for the British scholars.

John Lanigan published the fourth volume of *An Ecclesiastical History of Ireland: From the first introduction of Christianity among the Irish to the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century* in 1822 wherein he denounced *Laudabiliter* and Hadrian IV for “hatching a plot against [Ireland] and in laying the foundation of the destruction of the independence of Ireland.”148 Lanigan, an Irish Doctor of Divinity, wrote against *Laudabiliter* not on grounds of its inauthenticity, but instead on grounds of its immorality and discrimination against the Irish.149 He disputes Hadrian’s claim over all islands via the Donation of Constantine, stating that the document never could have given the successors of St. Peter claim over Ireland.150 As previously mentioned, such arguments are fruitless as the Donation of Constantine was presumed very real during Hadrian’s time and its claims were embedded in the international law that was understood by the rulers of the kingdoms of Europe. Additionally, Lanigan, citing a letter by the thirteenth-century Irishman Domhnall Ó Neill, speaks against Hadrian IV for allegedly granting Henry II the right to invade Ireland and gain the territory as its lord. Like many other later scholars such as Moran, Chaillot, and McCormick, their acknowledgement of the authenticity of this letter and the pope’s response comes across as rather damning to their argument; the plaintiffs clearly seem to have recognised that *Laudabiliter* was authentic and Pope John XXII’s response lends further support to this conclusion. In his letter to John XXII, Domhnall Ó Neill argues that Hadrian issued *Laudabiliter*
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not out of his love of the Church but out of his love of England and its king. Domhnall Ó Neill’s letter to Pope John XXII reads:

And after the faith had been preached and received, 61 kings of the same blood, without intervention of alien blood, kings admirably in the faith of Christ and filled with works of charity, kings that in temporal things acknowledged no superior, ruled here uninterruptedly in humble obedience to the Church of Rome until the year 1170… And it was they, not the English nor others of any nation who eminently endowed the Irish Church with lands, ample liberties and many possessions, although at the present time she is, for the most part, sadly despoiled of those lands and liberties by the English. And although for so long a time those [Irish] kings with their own power had stoutly defended against tyrants and kings of divers countries the inheritance that God had given them and had always kept their birthright of freedom unimpaired, yet at last, in the year of the Lord 1155, at the false and wicked representation of King Henry of England, under whom and perhaps by whom St. Thomas of Canterbury, as you know, in that very year [of 1170 he] suffered death for justice and defence of the church, Pope Adrian, your predecessor, an Englishman not so much by birth as by feeling and character, did in fact, but unfairly, confer upon that same Henry (whom for his said offence he should rather have deprived of his own kingdom) this lordship of ours by a certain form of words, the course of justice entirely disregarded and the moral vision of that great pontiff blinded, alas! by his English proclivities. And thus, without fault of ours and without reasonable cause, he stripped us of our royal honour and gave us over to be rent by teeth more cruel than any beast's; and those of us that escaped half-alive and woefully from the deadly teeth of crafty foxes and greedy wolves were thrown by violence into a gulf of doleful slavery.¹⁵¹

Lanigan’s position is unique among his contemporaries because his position on Laudabiliter does not relate to its authenticity – quite the opposite in fact – as he instead attacks the bias of the English pope, whom Lanigan believes to have acted greatly in favour of Henry II of England.¹⁵² Lanigan clearly states his position regarding Laudabiliter: “Adrian’s bull is so unwarrantable and unjustifiable a nature, that some writers could not bring themselves to believe he issued it, and have endeavoured to prove it a forgery; but their efforts were of no avail, and never did there exist a more real or authentic document.”¹⁵³ Indeed, in a footnote he questions Lynch’s and

¹⁵² John Lanigan, An Ecclesiastical History of Ireland: From the First Introduction of Christianity among the Irish to the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century. 164 “quas felicis recordationis Adrianus papa, predecessor noster, clare memorie Henrico Regi Anglie de terra Ybernie concessisse dicitur, continente,”
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MacGeoghegan’s arguments and even cites a letter from Pope John XXII to King Edward II of England written in 1318 that acknowledges *Laudabiliter*’s claims but condemns Edward and the kings of England for not fulfilling the parameters set by Hadrian in *Laudabiliter*. John XXII’s letter to Edward II reads:

> Our predecessor Adrian conceded, under certain particular conditions, publicly in an apostolic letter, dominion over Ireland to King Henry of England, your predecessor of famous memory [yet] that king and his successors, kings of England, not fulfilling those conditions up until the present times, indeed improperly violating them, have long oppressed [the Irish] with afflictions and unheard of burdens of unsupportable servitude.

No doubt John XXII was scolding Edward for his and his ancestors’ transgressions against the Irish but nevertheless he acknowledges Hadrian’s *Laudabiliter* at a time far beyond the lifetimes of Gerald of Wales or John of Salisbury or Henry. Of course, there are objections still to this letter. Stephen McCormick posits that the transcription of the letter reads “*concessisse dicitur*” and not “*concessit*.” As it turns out, Cardinal Caesar Baronius’s transcription reads the former while Cherubini’s (quoted above) reads the latter. The difference in translation appears slight but could mean a lot, i.e. “Hadrian…was said to concede the king himself the ownership of Ireland.”

However, the meaning of the translation is up to interpretation; even if the actual letter reads “*concessisse dicitur*”, it could still be interpreted, in English, as confirmation of *Laudabiliter* by Pope John XXII. McCormick blames the “mistranslation” on the bias of English writers, seeking
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to alter history, but it seems fairer to provide the benefit of the doubt and assume they used a different source, probably Cherubini’s *Bullarium Romanum*. Pope John XXII’s letter came as a response to the remonstrance made by Domhnall Ó Neill and other Irish princes, who seem to firmly believe in the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*, but the Irish Lords argue in the remonstrance that *Laudabiliter*’s contents are unjust and a slight against them. Most importantly, though, the lords of Ireland do not question the authenticity of the document; they considered it real at the time. Of course, one might argue in turn that this may be a similar case to the Donation of Constantine, where the people presumed and treated a document as authentic despite scholars later discovering it to be a forgery. This, however, is not the case as the twentieth-century scholars would later reveal.

In 1823 Dr John Lingard published the second volume of the *History of England* wherein he serves as one of the first of the modern scholars to comment on *Laudabiliter* (though he does not refer to it by its incipit) and its implications. He believes the document to be authentic but does not address any kind of debate about its authenticity; rather, the debates would arise from other scholars in decades to follow Lingard’s publication. That is to say, the debate over authenticity was not especially strong or heated at that time.

Lingard cites both John of Salisbury and Gerald of Wales for *Laudabiliter* and, as Lingard tells it, Henry II sent John to meet with Hadrian for the explicit purpose of requesting support for Henry to invade Ireland. Lingard includes the detail that Henry specifically sent John of Salisbury to meet with Hadrian but no other scholar includes such a detail. This detail cannot be ascertained, but it is generally presumed true that John was sent specially to meet
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Hadrian. It seems that, much like the chroniclers contemporary to Hadrian, Lingard embellished his history with details that could not possibly be confirmed. For example, he details Hadrian’s reaction upon receipt of Henry’s intentions regarding Ireland: “The pontiff, who must have smiled at the hypocrisy of this address, praised in reply of his pitiful son.” These suppositions make his history a little less trustworthy. Nevertheless, Lingard’s discussion of Laudabiliter, despite its brevity, is relatively sound. No doubt, however, his willingness to accept the document’s authenticity was influenced by his bias as an English Catholic Doctor of Divinity.

As far as criticising the veracity of his sources, Lingard, like many later scholars, paid close attention to the formulae in the transcript of the letter reproduced by Gerald of Wales, who, like John of Salisbury, called the document a letter of privilege. Lingard, however, noticed that Hadrian’s letter does not adhere to the format typically found in a letter that granted feudal privileges, despite John of Salisbury and Gerald of Wales describing it as such. Lingard supposes that Hadrian deliberately wrote a document resembling a feudal grant, but did not mean to provide such an official document. Lingard does, however, point out that Laudabiliter draws upon the Donation of Constantine, which he knew to be a forgery but recognizes that Hadrian and his contemporaries regarded as only a real document. This is likely a correction on Lingard’s part regarding Lynch’s and MacGeoghegan’s comments about the Donation of Constantine. All in all, however, Lingard’s discussion of Laudabiliter and Hadrian IV is rather limited in his book – undoubtedly because of the scope of his work.
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Richard Raby was first to publish a biographical work specifically about the life of Hadrian IV in 1849, providing a chronological narrative of the life of Nicholas Breakspear and his reign as Hadrian IV. The author confesses within his preface that at the time of writing he had very little information available to him and describes his own work as a “sketch” that “was written to supply what its author felt persuaded could not fail to interest his fellow Catholics in England.”\footnote{Richard Raby, \textit{Pope Adrian IV: An Historical Sketch} (London: Thomas Richardson & Son, 1849), \url{https://ia600504.us.archive.org/3/items/popeadriannivanhi30880gut/30880.txt}. Preface. Unfortunately, the publicly available versions of this book do not provide exact pagination. I will cite the chapter numbers. By and large, I will cite chapter six, which deals with \textit{Laudabiliter}.} Raby’s own description fits the narrative he tells quite well. His collation of events in some places of his work reveals a certain amount of bias – which is unsurprising since he sought to pique the interest of an English Catholic readership.\footnote{Ibid. preface} Moreover, in describing the first year of Hadrian IV’s pontificate, Raby generously describes it as follows:

At the moment Adrian IV took his seat behind the helm of Peter’s bark, the winds and waves raged furiously against her, nor ceased to do so, during the whole time that he steered her course. That time, though short, was yet long enough to prove him a skilful and fearless pilot.\footnote{Ibid. Chapter 2, paragraph 1}

In this way, Raby casts onto Hadrian IV the archetypes of heroes offered by Thomas Carlyle in \textit{On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History}.\footnote{Carlyle, \textit{On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History}. 3} In the typical fashion of this historiographical approach, Raby has placed Hadrian at the centre of his historical sketch (as one would expect from a biography) but, to an extent, glorifies his actions and suggests to his readers that Hadrian was able to conduct his affairs as pope by his own actions with little assistance. Helpfully, Raby briefly addresses and describes the sequence of events which led to Hadrian IV’s election to the papal see.
Raby also mentions Hadrian’s letter, *Laudabiliter*, and even addresses the debate surrounding the document. Raby draws on a few pieces of evidence to make his claim in favour of *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity; he begins by contextualising the document with a letter first sent in 1154 by Henry II to pope Hadrian. The letter comes from the *Annales Ecclesiae* (vol. 19) compiled by Cardinal Caesar Baronius in the seventeenth century.\(^{168}\) Henry’s letter to Hadrian is congratulatory and full of praise for the new pontiff and the end of the letter emphasises, in part, their shared native land:

> after your death you will leave behind so great vestiges of sanctity that the land of your birth, which from your blessed beginning, will be able to find glory in the lord from your happy ending. Finally, we ask and seek your paternity and special confidence, and so that you deem us and our families and our kingdom’s position in your prayers and speeches in particular.\(^{169}\)

Raby uses this letter as a platform to explain, at least in part, why Hadrian so willingly endorsed Henry II’s invasion of Ireland.\(^{170}\) Additionally, he posits that the Christian people of the twelfth century would not have doubted the veracity of the document – though it is unlikely that the common people would ever have seen it.\(^{171}\) Raby even notes that many writers disapprove of the infamous document:

> This famous brief, by which Henry II of England held himself divinely authorized to conquer Ireland, is strongly disapproved of by many writers, especially by Irish ones; who will not allow it the least excuse but overwhelm it with abusive censure. And yet the plain truth is, Adrian meant it, as he worded it, for Ireland’s good.\(^{172}\)

Raby recognised the strife caused by the letter, but it is perhaps his background as a proud Englishman and also a Catholic that causes him to not sympathise with those who call
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Laudabiliter a forgery. Indeed, Raby seems all too happy to believe the words of Gerald of Wales, who vastly exaggerated the condition and state of Ireland (along with other English chroniclers). Raby does not draw the connection between the information Hadrian received through chroniclers and the actual state of Ireland at the time. Raby, however, seems more concerned with dispelling arguments against Hadrian that attempted to establish the pontiff not as the head of the Church, but as a servant of the English crown. He then makes mention of several letters of Alexander III (Hadrian’s successor) which confirmed Henry’s right to invade Ireland. He doubles down in defending Hadrian as a religious proponent in saying:

If then it can appear that Adrian might have acted, in his brief to Henry, just as well out of motives of religious duty, as out of those of court policy, it is a perverse thing to award him the latter rather than the former; because to do so is to make him not less absurdly than wickedly inconsistent with his previous and subsequent career.

Raby comes across as quite defensive of this point and his reneging may perhaps mean he is responding to other scholars who actively deny Laudabiliter, or at least consider the document a farce and stand-in for the English pope playing favourites with the King of England.

Raby also comments on the Donation of Constantine, which many scholars previous to him drew upon in order to refute Hadrian’s power to grant Ireland and thus Laudabiliter itself. Raby knew that the Donation of Constantine was a forgery, but also recognised that in Hadrian and Henry’s time it would have only been known as a real document. In a similar vein, Raby finds himself believing the conditions of Ireland as described by Gerald of Wales and St. Bernard. Unfortunately, Gerald of Wales exaggerated and lied about the condition of Ireland at this time in claiming that the Irish “is indeed a most filthy race, a race sunk in vice, a race
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more ignorant than all other nations of the first principles of the faith.” 177 Despite believing Gerald of Wales’s false and exaggerated claims about Ireland, Raby draws a reasonable conclusion in reading Hadrian’s *Laudabiliter*. He suggests that upon hearing about the state of the faith in Ireland – true or not –, Hadrian would have seen it fit for Henry II to invade Ireland on the basis that he would “weed out vices.” 178 It is for this reason that many other scholars choose to cite Hadrian denying a similar invasion request by King Louis VII of France, who wanted to invade Spain. 179 Hadrian denied Louis VII because Spain did not have the vices or lack of faith that had been claimed about Ireland.

In discussing the outcome of Henry’s eventual invasion of Ireland in 1172, Raby jumps to defend Hadrian’s decision to issue *Laudabiliter* in saying that the result “That the English sway turned out so unjust and disastrous to Ireland, reflects no blame on Adrian” and hypothesizes what Hadrian’s reaction to England’s invasion of Ireland would have been:

No doubt Pope Adrian, a man of the most shrewd practical intellect, and from the circumstances of his life, of the deepest experience in human nature, saw clearly enough then…that Ireland could never truly prosper, so long as left to her own management, by reason of the incurable defect mentioned above; and that, therefore, to sanction her sisterly, not her slavish connection, with a nation like the English, so eminent for those very qualities of order and self maintenance, in which she is so wanting, would be a work of as great charity in itself, as of mutual advantage to the parties concerned. 180

In this way, Raby acts as a corrector for any Irish Nationalist perspectives that preceded him – especially since he specifically criticizes “Irish writers” early in his discussion. His analysis, however, veers towards over-correction as he shows his own bias as an English Catholic writer.
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It seems that Raby set out to redeem Hadrian’s character in light of some of the criticism lodged against him by Irish scholars.

**Late Nineteenth-Century Scholars**

At this time, the debate surrounding *Laudabiliter* reached its greatest. Beginning with Henry Milman’s brief discussion of *Laudabiliter* in the *History of Latin Christianity* and leading into Cardinal Moran’s publication in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, more and more scholars began to weigh in on the debate regarding *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity. The debate swelled and culminated in Kate Norgate’s 1893 article in the *English Historical Review* wherein she carefully analysed many of the most important arguments put forward by those who endorsed its inauthenticity. Afterward, the number of works published specifically about *Laudabiliter* declined before the matter was, again, revisited by twentieth-century scholars such as O’Doherty and Sheehy. Indeed, it was at this time that the debate over *Laudabiliter* began to permeate popular culture and extend beyond the bounds of scholarly historical debate.

In similar fashion to Raby, Henry Hart Milman, in 1867, wrote about Hadrian IV in *The History of Latin Christianity: Including That of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V* in a brief biographical fashion. Milman draws upon Cardinal Boso’s biography as he does not follow or reproduce the early life of Hadrian in accordance with either Matthew of Paris or William of Newburgh.\(^{181}\) Milman largely relies on Cardinal Aragon’s works regarding Hadrian but provides no source for his information on *Laudabiliter*. It seems he may have drawn upon the brief information provided by the St. Albans chroniclers, but he may have equally relied on any number of secondary sources contemporary to him. Regardless, Milman is informed by the same

historiographical principle as Raby and other historians of this period, namely Thomas Carlyle’s “great man” theory. Milman describes Hadrian with the similar grandeur as Raby does, further eliciting the “great man theory.” Milman begins his discussion of Hadrian by quite proudly exhibiting his national pride for Hadrian. Regarding the papal document itself, Milman even suggests and offers an analysis of Hadrian’s motives for the publication of the document. Milman theorises that Hadrian published *Laudabiliter* as the pontiff was finding his footing as the head of the universal church and was thus discovering and feeling out the extent of his power as pope. Additionally, he adopts a strong power narrative to explain why Hadrian issued *Laudabiliter*. In explaining Hadrian’s motive, Milman says:

> Nor did Hadrian yield to any of his predecessors in his assertion of the papal dignity; he was surpassed by few in boldness and courage with which he maintained it. The views of unlimited power which opened before the new pontiff appear most manifestly in his grant of Ireland to Henry II of England. English pride might mingle with sacerdotal ambition in this boon of a new kingdom to his native sovereign. The language of the grant developed principles as yet unheard in Christendom…. The prophetic ambition of Hadrian might seem to have anticipated the time, when on such principles the Popes should assume the power of granting away new worlds.

This power narrative is unique to Milman. Of course, Milman exaggerates the authority Hadrian actually bestowed upon Henry II; it was very little authority, if any. As Moran and others argue, the extant record of *Laudabiliter*, i.e. the transcription Gerald of Wales provides, was not a grant and is much better described as a “commendatory letter.” Additionally, though Milman does not state outright his position on the authenticity of the document, he does not deny its authenticity and does heavily imply his belief in its authenticity; he also does not acknowledge the debate surrounding the document but does make false claims about the nature of the document and its
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circumstances.\textsuperscript{186} Moreover, he indicates that Hadrian issued \textit{Laudabiliter} to aid his countryman and king, Henry II, and believes that doing so was in the purview of Hadrian’s power.\textsuperscript{187}

At this time the hotly contested document gained traction within more popular spaces outside the scholarly sphere. Cardinal Moran, though at the time of publication he was merely Reverend Patrick Francis Moran, wrote the “first indictment” of \textit{Laudabiliter} in response to an article by J.C. O’Callaghan in the \textit{Irishman} newspaper that promoted the authenticity of \textit{Laudabiliter}.\textsuperscript{188} Moran posits a number of objections to O’Callaghan’s arguments as well as to the document itself. Moran presents perhaps the most valid and reasonable objections to the authenticity of \textit{Laudabiliter} as many scholars after him would adopt his arguments and then extend and expand upon them (occasionally to absurd extent). In his article, Moran offers little criticism of other opponents of \textit{Laudabiliter}, such as Lynch, White, and MacGeoghegan; instead, he offers more against J.C. O’Callaghan. Overall, Moran’s indictment is the least far-reaching compared to others who argue for \textit{Laudabiliter}’s inauthenticity and stands as the most plausible in its arguments.\textsuperscript{189}

First, Moran criticises a translation of the document made by O’Callaghan, which is also distinctly similar to Thomas Wright’s translation of \textit{Laudabiliter}.\textsuperscript{190} Moran vehemently insists that \textit{Laudabiliter} (in English translation) reads “you have signified to us that you propose to enter the island of Ireland to establish the observance of law amongst its people” and not, per Wright’s and O’Callaghan’s rendering, “…that you propose to enter the island of Ireland in order to subdue the people.”\textsuperscript{191} Moran raises additional objections with other translations and takes to
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mocking other scholars’ Latinity in the process.\textsuperscript{192} As for the content of the document, Moran insists that upon close reading of \textit{Laudabiliter}, it “prescinds from all title of conquest, whilst at the same time makes no gift or transfer of dominion to Henry the Second.”\textsuperscript{193} Indeed he believes that the document does not meet the conditions for \textit{ex cathedra}, and so, for these reasons, like later scholars, he adopts the view that scholars should not describe \textit{Laudabiliter} as a “papal bull”, or a “grant,” but instead describe it as a “commendatory letter.”\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Ex Cathedra} (literally “from the teacher’s chair”) in this context refers to the dogmatic authority of a document. In this case, \textit{Laudabiliter}, according to Moran, does not bear any indication that the document was made to propound a new doctrine within the Church.\textsuperscript{195} Moran’s assessment of \textit{Laudabiliter} as a “commendatory letter” carries through the historiography to the present. He is the first to consider it merely a “commendatory letter” and that description is even adopted by those who endorse \textit{Laudabiliter’s} authenticity, such as Norgate, Sheehy, and Duggan.\textsuperscript{196} That is to say, \textit{Laudabiliter} does not do anything other than endorse Henry’s desire to invade Ireland. Moran lodges plenty of other criticisms. For instance, it does not address the Universal Church or the children of Christ.\textsuperscript{197} This argument itself is new in the historiography of \textit{Laudabiliter} amongst the scholars who consider \textit{Laudabiliter} a forgery or inauthentic; Chaillot would echo this argument ten years later.

Unlike earlier scholars Moran examines the text and the substance of \textit{Laudabiliter} in order to show its inauthenticity. He looks only at the final words of the document “\textit{Datum Romae}” (dated at Rome). At this time, due to strife caused by Arnold of Brescia within the city
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of Rome, Hadrian fled to Beneventum where John of Salisbury says he met the pontiff in the final chapter of *Metalogicon*. Moran reasons that because *Laudabiliter* reads “dated at Rome” when it was most certainly dated in Beneventum that the document is a forgery and goes so far as to argue that this error in *Laudabiliter* is enough to prove the whole thing a forgery.\(^{198}\)

Norgate, however, retorts that if a “false or unauthorised addition to any piece of writing suffices to prove the whole composition a forgery” then, per Moran’s logic, surely such reasoning applies equally to the entirety of John of Salisbury’s *Metalogicon*.\(^{199}\) Later scholars such as Gasquet and Morris adopt this argument and also review the document’s various formulae and make other arguments against *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity.

Of course, with refuting *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity comes the need to discredit John of Salisbury’s and Gerald of Wales’s works that mention *Laudabiliter*, to which Cardinal Moran is no exception. Regarding the former, Moran argues that the final chapter of *Metalogicon* reads more smoothly when omitting the passage about Hadrian IV.\(^{200}\) He argues the same for John’s other work, *Policraticus*.\(^{201}\) Additionally, Moran notes that John makes no mention of *Laudabiliter* or any kind of meeting wherein John received from Hadrian a gold ring adorned with an emerald anywhere in *Policraticus*.\(^{202}\) Moran suggests that such an event should have been significant enough for John to note it in both works. To these points, however, Norgate argues that none of John of Salisbury’s biographers note a change in tone or style in those sections of *Metalogicon* as she describes John’s Latinity as “unrivalled” and his diction as “graceful.”\(^{203}\)

\(^{198}\) Ibid. 63  
\(^{199}\) Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 32  
\(^{200}\) Moran, ‘Bull of Adrian the Fourth’. 54  
\(^{201}\) Ibid. 54  
\(^{202}\) Ibid. 54  
Moran also posits that Henry II’s seventeen years delay in invading Ireland after receiving *Laudabiliter* in 1155 does not lend favour to the document’s authenticity. There are a number of reasons that Henry might have postponed acting upon the document once he received it. Some of Moran’s reasoning comes across as self-contradictory. He says:

> It is extremely difficult, in any hypothesis, to explain in a satisfactory way this mysterious silence of Henry the Second, nor is it easy to understand how a fact so important, so vital to the interests of Ireland, could remain so many years concealed from those who ruled the destinies of the Irish Church.  

Yet, he states only a few pages earlier that the document “presents no doctrine whatever to be believed by the faithful, and is nothing more than a commendatory letter addressed to Henry, resting on the good intentions set forth by that monarch himself.” So, if it were merely a commendatory letter, which Henry seemingly knew, then why would he publish it if it conferred no real authority? His argument does not necessarily support inauthenticity and seems a little self-contradictory. Despite a few problems, Moran’s conclusion regarding the nature of *Laudabiliter*, i.e. a commendatory letter, is one that carries through to the twenty-first century.

Indeed, Moran notes on the same page that “The supposed bull of Adrian had no part whatever in the submission of the Irish chieftains to Henry II.” Norgate responds more generally to a number of the arguments from various scholars, including Moran, that ask why Henry waited so long to act upon *Laudabiliter*; both Moran and Norgate call them “arguments from silence.” Norgate argues that if somebody forged *Laudabiliter*, then surely one of Hadrian’s successors would have defended Hadrian’s memory in what was essentially an attack
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against the papacy by the English crown. But Henry’s most likely reason for not acting upon *Laudabiliter* upon receipt of the infamous document was that he was preoccupied with the Church, i.e. Becket, and with France and thus Henry consigned to Diarmait of Leinster the ability to take on any faction willing to invade Ireland with Diarmait, such as Strongbow and the Geraldines.

In his refutation of J.C. O’Callaghan’s points, Moran looks to the manuscripts containing *Laudabiliter*. He rightly shows that the inclusion of *Laudabiliter* in the *Bullarium Romanum* and *Annales Ecclesiastici* does not lend much weight to the authenticity of the document on several grounds. First, the inclusion of *Laudabiliter* in these works, if it were false and a forgery, would be a fault of the editors of those works and does not lend much to the authenticity of the document. This is something that later opponents and proponents of *Laudabiliter* fail to recognise. More important, however, is the fact that all transcriptions of *Laudabiliter* lead back to Gerald and Wales, and possibly also Ralph Diceto, as no other early version of the document exists. Indeed, as previously mentioned, *Laudabiliter* was never published in Ireland and, in fact, the extant records indicate that the next time that *Laudabiliter* was published again was in another of Gerald of Wales’s works and supposedly also at Waterford in 1175. Moran’s point is entirely valid as the lack of replication of the document beyond the English chroniclers does not lend any favour to the authenticity of the document; however, Maurice Sheehy would later provide an answer to this in his critical edition of the document.
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In 1906 William McLoughlin produced an English translation of a portion of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, written by Louis Chaillot in 1882. Chaillot left the section untitled and McLoughlin chose to name it “Adrian IV, A Friend of Ireland” (a sentiment that earlier scholars would have strongly rejected), echoing a work already existing by the name of “Adrian IV and Ireland” by Stephen McCormick. In his preface, McLoughlin notes a number of valuable pieces of information pertinent to this present study. The first is that Chaillot drew on material from Cardinal Moran, who previously wrote an article on *Laudabiliter* in 1872. The second is that Chaillot also based his research on Dr Lingard’s work, who wrote on *Laudabiliter* in his *History of England*. In the preface to the translation, *Adrian IV a Friend of Ireland*, McGloughlin states that he agrees with Chaillot on *Laudabiliter* being a forgery.

Chaillot examines the issue of *Laudabiliter* from a number of perspectives and offers arguments against the document’s authenticity. Indeed, this piece of the *Analecta* focuses and revolves almost entirely on and around *Laudabiliter* as Chaillot attempts to prove that it is a forgery. For instance, Chaillot argues for *Laudabiliter*’s inauthenticity on the grounds that the document was out of Hadrian’s character and that such a document could have been easily forged by the facilities available to King Henry II. However, to judge a historical figure’s character requires substantially more material than there exists pertaining to Hadrian – especially regarding Ireland and England. Generally speaking, such an argument is ineffectual and fruitless.
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Additionally, Chaillot uses another letter issued to King Louis VII of France in 1159 in an attempt to show that Hadrian actually denied both Henry II and Louis VII permission to invade Ireland – though many scholars and editors challenged and refuted this claim from Chaillot.\textsuperscript{218} Indeed, Chaillot predicates his arguments on the assumption of a connection between the 1159 letter and the 1155 letter, \textit{Laudabiliter}, and asserts that the latter was a forgery and that the 1159 letter was the true letter of Hadrian IV.\textsuperscript{219} This is Chaillot’s downfall as later scholars would show and prove that the two are not connected in the direct sense that Chaillot believed them to be.\textsuperscript{220}

Chaillot suggests that the letter resembles \textit{Laudabiliter} in that it requests permission to invade another country. Chaillot argues that the country in this letter was also Ireland, signified by the initial “H.” and nothing more.\textsuperscript{221} Naturally, one might suggest that the “H.” initial could refer to \textit{Hispania} and not \textit{Hibernia}. Thus, Chaillot attempts to defend his position that the “H.” initial refers to Ireland and not Spain. He believes that because the letter from Hadrian reads “land” not “kingdom” that it must refer to Ireland and not Spain because of Ireland’s lack of a unified kingdom.\textsuperscript{222} Additionally, he argues that if the letter truly referred to Spain, then Hadrian would have mentioned any one of the leaders of the regions of Spain, such as the kings of Aragon, Castile, Navarre, or Galicia.\textsuperscript{223} However, scholars after Chaillot, namely Norgate, Sylvester Malone, and William Morris, have argued and shown that it was not Ireland that the letter references but Spain, i.e. \textit{Hispania}.\textsuperscript{224} Moreover, the editors of papal archival documents,
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such as Louie Marie Olivier Duchesne, Cardinal Saenz de Aguirre, Jaffe Migne, and the editor of *Rerum Gallicarum Scriptores* did not draw the same conclusion as Chaillot and so interpreted the letter “H.” as pertaining to *Hispania* and not *Hibernia*. It is worth stating that the authenticity of the entirety of *Laudabiliter* does not rest upon the opinions of editors.

Additionally, Chaillot looks into the Donation of Constantine and repeats the same errors of both previous and later historians. And, like other historians, he calls John of Salisbury’s final chapter of *Metalogicon* a forgery. Many scholars, however, refuse to attribute the forgery to John of Salisbury himself: “it is a grave matter to bring a charge of wilful dishonesty against any man, living or dead…. All who know anything about England in the twelfth century, however, will agree that to bring such a charge against John of Salisbury is a much graver matter than to bring it against Gerald of Wales.” Instead, many scholars in favour of *Laudabiliter*’s inauthenticity insist that someone else appended the information about Hadrian into chapter forty-two, the final chapter of *Metalogicon*, or even appended the entirety of chapter forty-two.

Chaillot also argues that the biography of John of Salisbury does not line up with his meeting with Pope Hadrian in Beneventum where he received *Laudabiliter*. Chaillot’s biography, however, is all too conveniently constructed to make his point, not to mention that some of the information he incorrectly assumes or is outright wrong about. Chaillot suggests that because many of the letters attributed to John’s hand use the abbreviations “Archbishop T.” and “Pope A.”, these could refer to “Thomas [Becket] and Alexander III”, rather than “Theobald” and “Adrian.” Chaillot thus claims that John of Salisbury was secretary to Thomas Becket as chancellor and Theobald as archbishop simultaneously in 1159. He believes on these grounds
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that John of Salisbury would not have been known to King Henry II because he was not in
contact with Thomas until 1159 and Thomas supposedly introduced John to Henry.⁵²⁹ Of course,
this is based on nonsensical conjecture that seems all too elaborate and complex to consider than
the simpler case, per Ockham’s razor, that John had likely met King Henry II during his time as
secretary to the archbishop of Canterbury.⁵³⁰ John wrote letters on Theobald’s behalf to Becket
as chancellor on several occasions prior to John’s meeting with Hadrian in 1155 and later wrote
letters to Henry on Theobald’s behalf.⁵³¹ Moreover, in a letter from John to Abbot Peter of Celle,
John describes his return from the continent following the meeting with Hadrian in 1155, and
King Henry’s dissatisfaction with John’s actions while he was there.⁵³² These letters indicate that
John had a relationship with the king prior to these developments.⁵³³

As for the other main source for Laudabiliter, Gerald of Wales, Chaillot adopts and
adapts the views of Brewer and Dimock, editors of Gerald of Wales’s works, and compares the
reliability of Gerald of Wales to that of Ovid or Homer, “a poetic fiction.”⁵³⁴ The veracity of
Gerald of Wales’s histories is certainly doubtful on some points, per Norgate’s quote above.
However, discrediting all of his works on account of the unreliability of some of it is not
practical or realistic to a historian, especially when Gerald of Wales represents the more
important of two major sources for this topic and this document – not to mention the importance
of his works for Irish history for this period.⁵³⁵
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Regarding the letters of Alexander III, Chaillot rightly discredits the letter that Gerald of Wales included in *Expugnatio Hibernica* known as *Quoniam ea*.\(^{236}\) However, he also considers Alexander III’s three letters to be false as well.\(^{237}\) He offers a number of arguments against the letters’ authenticity, none of which are satisfactory. He believes that Alexander could not possibly have read *Laudabiliter* before issuing the three letters on the grounds that the letters describe Ireland as a “kingdom” to be given to English kings and objects to the plural use of “kings.”\(^{238}\) Additionally, he argues that the clause regarding Peter’s pence in Alexander’s letters is false on several grounds that he believes apply equally to *Laudabiliter*.\(^{239}\) Chaillot suggests that because Peter’s pence was never collected from Ireland that the claims and requests in the letters regarding Peter’s pence were falsified by a forger.\(^{240}\) Additionally, he compares the value of a penny in 1155 to that of the shillings in 1882 and attempts to calculate the income of Ireland without knowing or providing at least an approximation of the population of Ireland at the time.\(^{241}\) Moreover, he argues that because Henry did not establish Peter’s pence in the towns that he captured in the 1170s that the letters which permitted Henry to collect Peter’s pence must be false.\(^{242}\) This is specious reasoning; there could be a myriad of reasons as to why Henry did not enforce and collect Peter’s pence when he captured the South-Eastern coast towns in Ireland, but one of those reasons is not that the letters were forged. That is to say, Henry not enforcing Peter’s pence is evidence of him not obeying the see of Rome and not of *Laudabiliter* being
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inauthentic. More to the point, the text of *Laudabiliter* does not demand that Henry install Peter’s pence in Ireland; the document merely echoes his stated intention to do so.  

Cardinal Aiden Gasquet wrote about *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity in the *Dublin Review* in 1883. His article was later reprinted without any modifications in a book he published thirty-nine years later. His article came as response to both Moran’s and Chaillot’s work, but he also references MacGeoghegan. Gasquet adds onto the works of his predecessors and agrees with them that *Laudabiliter* is inauthentic. Before delving into any of his arguments in favour of inauthenticity, however, he makes brief mention of how the letter has permeated popular culture. He notes that several Irish historians contemporary to him contend that *Laudabiliter* is authentic and even notes that its authenticity is argued in a school textbook (*Student’s manual of Irish History* by Margaret Cusack).

As far as discrediting the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*, beyond what previous scholars had said regarding John of Salisbury, Gasquet adds more arguments against the claims made by the esteemed twelfth-century scholar in *Metalogicon*. Gasquet argues that John of Salisbury was not important enough in Henry’s eye to have him bring such an important request to Pope Hadrian IV. Gasquet believes that, at the time, John of Salisbury was “an unknown and untried man” not fit “to conduct so important and difficult a piece of diplomacy as negotiating with the Pope about the expedition to Ireland.” Norgate, however, argues entirely on the contrary to Gasquet. Whereas Gasquet believes Henry would have sent an embassy of bishops to meet Hadrian over the matter, namely Bishop Rotrodus of Evreux, Bishop Arnold of Mans, and Abbot
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Robert of St. Albans (who has been discussed previously in this paper). Gasquet argues that Henry would have sent these men and not John of Salisbury because they were more qualified and more closely involved with Hadrian’s court in Rome. Norgate counters that John of Salisbury was not an “obscure clerk” (as Gasquet describes him) but a well known man in Europe. Norgate insists, in fact, that John of Salisbury was perhaps the ideal person to meet with Hadrian. Her view of John’s prominence would be supported by the editors of John’s collected letters, who point out that his works reveal themselves as the finest monument of the literacy and the humanistic culture of the school there [Chartres], then at the zenith of its fame, but soon to disappear. John acquired a number of friends at Rome, in particular Nicholas Breakspear, the future Pope Hadrian IV, with whom he was intimate…. Over half the early letters are concerned with appeals to the Pope or correspondence with the Holy See suggests that he was regarded by the archbishop [Theobald] as an expert in affairs relating to Rome. In any case his own statement that he had crossed the Alps ten times before 1159 can only mean that he had been a frequent visitor of the Curia. John of Salisbury’s fame was certainly known within Hadrian’s Curia and for this reason Henry II would have seen fit to send John of Salisbury to meet Hadrian on his behalf. John of Salisbury’s credentials were outstanding: before joining the Archbishop Theobald’s curia in Canterbury he had received personal recommendation from St. Bernard of Clairvaux in approximately 1148. Not only was he known to Hadrian but to the highest prelate in England. Gasquet’s description of John of Salisbury as an “obscure clerk” is far from fitting given John’s achievements by the time he met with Hadrian in 1155 and received Laudabiliter. It is not
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farfetched to assume that through Theobald and Becket, chancellor to Henry at the time, the king would have known who John of Salisbury was, if not for his works as a clergyman but for his assistance to Theobald. What is more, and returning to an earlier point, Gasquet adopts the argument of Chaillot in theorising that the “Archbishop T.” and “Pope A.” could be Thomas and Alexander, but the dates of John’s letters do not line up to support this theory, nor does his biographical record.\footnote{Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 28; Poole, Dictionary of National Biography. 441
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Additionally, Gasquet argues that there is no explanation for the discontinuity between the forty-first chapter and the forty-second chapter of Metalogicon. Gasquet believes that the inconsistency between the two chapters regarding their content is too great for the latter to have been written by John of Salisbury. Yet no experts on John of Salisbury have picked up on the inconsistency suggested by this line of argument. Scholars of John of Salisbury including Reginald Poole, John’s biographer, Norgate, the editors of Letters of John of Salisbury, and the various editors of the various editions of Metalogicon and his other works have not been able to draw the same conclusions – though not explicitly denying this theory – about the forty-second chapter of Metalogicon.\footnote{Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 28; Poole, Dictionary of National Biography. 441
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258 John of Salisbury, The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury. 273-274, fn 516 & 524; Poole, ‘The Correspondence of John of Salisbury’. 36} To this point, the editor of Metalogicon, Daniel McGarry, does not find anything suspicious about the forty-second chapter of Metalogicon and even, in the introduction to Metalogicon, credits John of Salisbury’s Latinity for its flawlessness and gracefulness.\footnote{John of Salisbury, The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury. 273-274, fn 516 & 524; Poole, ‘The Correspondence of John of Salisbury’. 36} Poole even notes that he has grounds to believe that John wrote the forty-
second chapter a few years apart from the rest – in the last few months of the year of 1159.\textsuperscript{259}
The idea that someone else would have be able to convincingly imitate John’s diction and style in the forty-second chapter is far less plausible than simply suggesting that John wrote the chapter himself at a different time.

As for Alexander’s three letters, Gasquet believes, like Louis Chaillot, that each of them are false. He believes that because the letters do not acknowledge \textit{Laudabiliter}, that they too must be false.\textsuperscript{260} Additionally, like Chaillot, he argues that because Peter’s pence was not collected or enforced in Ireland, \textit{Laudabiliter} and Alexander’s letters that do not call for the institution of Peter’s pence must also be false.\textsuperscript{261} Gasquet then attempts to develop a character of Henry II that might help in indicting him for forging \textit{Laudabiliter}. Gasquet suggests that, per Lingard’s history of England, because Henry later forged a letter regarding the primacy of York and Canterbury (he wanted the coronation of his son, Henry, to be conducted by Archbishop Roger of York), that he also forged \textit{Laudabiliter} for his own benefit in 1155.\textsuperscript{262} Of course, being guilty of one forgery does not make Henry inherently guilty of the other, though it certainly does not help Henry’s case. Gasquet’s last argument pertains to the discussion of Louis VII of France and the “Crusade in H.” (which has already been discussed under Chaillot). Gasquet introduces Chaillot’s theory and runs with it and adds a textual comparison of the letter to Louis VII and \textit{Laudabiliter}. He insists that \textit{Laudabiliter} is a poor attempt at replicating the letter that Adrian sent to Louis VII.\textsuperscript{263} Gasquet does not recognise the syllabic pattern in the writing, and though
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the texts are similar, it would require the skill of an accomplished Latinist to recognise the
syllabic pattern employed in both letters and for that person to then mimic it perfectly in a
different letter with different phraseology.\footnote{Gasquet, ‘Adrian IV. and Ireland’. 101-102; cf. Appendix A} This level of textual analysis of \textit{Laudabiliter} would later be conducted by O’Doherty and then, in more depth, by Maurice Sheehy. The letters are similar, certainly, but the similarity is better explained by the writer or dictator of the two letters being the same person in Hadrian’s Papal Chancery.\footnote{See Sheehy, ‘The Bull “Laudabiliter”’ and O’Doherty, ‘Rome and the Anglo-Norman Invasion of Ireland’}. Overall, Gasquet repeats the arguments of Chaillot and attempts to add more evidence to support Chaillot’s case.

Sylvester Malone published his article in the same journal as Aidan Gasquet and only one year after (1884) and also under the same title as Gasquet, “Adrian IV. and Ireland.” Malone wrote directly in response to Chaillot and Gasquet and considers that both Chaillot (whom he refers to as “the writer of the Analecta”) and Gasquet made incorrect judgements regarding the circumstances surrounding \textit{Laudabiliter}.\footnote{Sylvester Malone, ‘Adrian IV. and Ireland’, \textit{Dublin Review}, 3rd, 11, no. 94 (1884): 316–43. 316-317} With his objections to these past two scholars, he offers new arguments not seen before in the context of the historiography. Indeed, he comes across as an apologist for Henry’s cause as he suggests rather generous motives for his actions as he recounts the events.\footnote{Ibid. 318-319} Malone was an Irish Catholic who is unique in supporting \textit{Laudabiliter}, whereas most Irish Catholics involved in this debate vehemently denied and refuted its authenticity.\footnote{Sylvester L. Malone, \textit{Memorial of the Golden Jubilee of the Rev. Sylvester Malone} (Priv. print., 1895). 11} Though Malone addresses some of the points typically brought up in this debate, i.e. Gerald of Wales and John of Salisbury, he spends much of the article discussing and refuting Chaillot’s “Crusade in H.” theory that Gasquet also adopted.\footnote{NB: Malone’s citations are few and far between, which does not help his argument. His most reliable arguments are those that find logical inconsistencies with Chaillot and, by extension, Gasquet.}
Regarding his new arguments, on the words of John of Salisbury, for example, Malone seeks to confirm his account in chapter forty-two of *Metalogicon* by tracking down the gold ring adorned with an emerald that John received from Hadrian IV. Malone vaguely notes that the Norman Chronicles attest to the presence of the ring in the Winchester archives.\(^{270}\) Regarding the knowledge and publication of *Laudabiliter* in Ireland, he suggests that Diarmait MacMurchada knew of *Laudabiliter* and reasons that he fled from Ireland to meet with Henry because he knew that Hadrian granted Henry permission to invade.\(^{271}\) Specifically regarding publication of *Laudabiliter*, he points to the Synod of Cashel in 1172 and argues that the Irish prelates would have strongly objected to the reforms agreed upon, e.g. conforming to the English Church, without consent from the pope himself, i.e. *Laudabiliter*.\(^{272}\) Malone then disappointingly uses the proven false bull of Alexander III, *Quoniam ea*, to support his point that *Laudabiliter* was authentic.\(^{273}\) He then looks to the three authentic letters of Alexander III that his chancery sent to the bishops and legates of Ireland, Henry II, and the princes of Ireland. He argues that the three letters corroborate the contents of *Quoniam ea* and its meaning.\(^{274}\) Whether he believes there was a real *Quoniam ea* is not certain, but it seems he believes that the document is genuine as it appears in *Expugnatio Hibernica*.

Malone also addresses the disinformation regarding the state of Ireland and Hadrian’s justification for endorsing Henry’s invasion of Ireland. Malone argues that Hadrian got his information from Cardinal Paparo, who visited Ireland and reported back to Rome in 1152, three years prior to John of Salisbury’s receipt of *Laudabiliter* in 1155.\(^{275}\) Additionally, he looks to
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John Colgan’s 1645 *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae* which supports his hypothesis regarding the state of Ireland. Malone summarises Colgan’s work as generally agreeing with the pope’s view of Ireland during the twelfth century. Malone further cites the condition of Ireland – insisting on only using Irish annalists – and how Ireland fit into the standards of medieval constitutional law. He describes a war-torn Ireland per the Irish annalists and English, Irish and Roman documents, and argues that the state of Ireland did not fit into the Christian world that the rest of Europe was familiar with and these conditions led Hadrian to issue *Laudabiliter* to Henry II of England. Malone goes so far to describe those who object to the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* and its supporting documents as “Pyrrhonists.”

Malone then spends the remainder of the article specifically criticising Chaillot and those who subscribe to his theories. Malone takes a rather acidic tone with Chaillot:

Though the writer of the ‘Analecta’ affects to be confident that the evidence he has produced will at once destroy all belief in the asserted privilege of Hadrian, still he undertakes to attack it piecemeal. While he is ready to come down with one fell swoop and take the position by storm, he does not disdain the slower method of sapping. Before stating, then, the novel theory in the ‘Analecta,’ I shall briefly notice the principal objections in it against the grant of Hadrian.

Firstly, Malone objects to those, specifically Chaillot, who believe John of Salisbury’s forty-second chapter of *Metalogicon* does not fit with the rest of the work. He notes that Chevalier Artaud, in writing about the life of Pope Innocent III, broke off the discussion of his main topic and interjected it with a brief on the life of Gregory XVI, whose death Artaud had just heard
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about. He cites similar interjections amongst even Irish writers to further illustrate his point. Malone argues that it is not so farfetched to assume that, upon hearing of Hadrian’s death, John of Salisbury might write about his departed friend. Secondly, he objects to those who subscribe to the “Crusade in H.” theory. Malone spends much of the remainder of his article refuting many of Chaillot’s claims regarding the “Crusade in H.” theory. He makes similar arguments, though arguably less succinctly, that Kate Norgate would later make regarding the theory first posited by Chaillot. He reasons that if Ireland were in a “flourishing condition” (per their arguments against the need for Henry II to invade at all), then why would Henry and Louis apply to Hadrian for a crusade, as described in the letter to Louis VII, that involved two of the strongest monarchs in Europe? Malone then describes the condition of Spain in order to explain why Henry and Louis requested crusade in Spain in the first place.

Malone’s argument against the language used in Hadrian’s letter to Louis VII falters as he attacks Chaillot’s position on the terminology of “kingdom” versus “land” in describing Ireland or Spain. Malone points out that King John I described Ireland as a kingdom, but why would he not as a king of England and, per Laudabiliter and his own father’s invasions, call Ireland a kingdom? He then further refers to Quoniam ea, a known forgery, for which McCormick lambasts Malone for supporting the authenticity of Quoniam ea. With further reference to the letter to Louis VII, Malone embarks upon finding evidence of the use of terra (land) over regnum (kingdom). He posits that the term terra was used in Hadrian’s letter to Louis VII because the form of government in Spain at the time was ambiguous and there was not one

281 Ibid. 328
282 Ibid. 328
283 Ibid. 330
284 Ibid. 330
285 Ibid. 331
286 See below Sheehy, ‘The Bull “Laudabiliter”’. 65; McCormick, The Pope and Ireland. 105
single unified kingdom within Spanish Christendom.\textsuperscript{287} One or two of Malone’s arguments begin to fall flat as he speaks to a couple of Chaillot’s points regarding the “Crusade in H.”; he begins by making assumptions about what Hadrian would have and not have known and it is less convincing than some of the other points he made earlier and later in his article – especially since he does not cite a source.\textsuperscript{288}

Malone takes great issue with Chaillot’s application of the term “infidels” to Ireland as he supposes that if there were pagans or apostates in Ireland in the twelfth century, they would have at least been under the dominion of Christian princes of Ireland.\textsuperscript{289} Malone adds that there is no evidence to indicate a strong pagan movement in Ireland at this time and that the term “infidels” used in Hadrian’s letter to Louis could only realistically apply to Spain at the time, which was home to large communities of Jews and Muslims.\textsuperscript{290} He takes further issue with Chaillot’s claim that there were no apostates in Spain, yet Malone found ample evidence to the contrary of Spanish Christians who converted to Judaism or Islam.\textsuperscript{291} It is quite possible that here Chaillot drew upon some of the more acidic and vitriolic language against the Irish used by Matthew of Paris and other chroniclers in their prefaces to the text of \textit{Laudabiliter}.\textsuperscript{292} Malone then refutes some of Chaillot’s other less important ideas pertaining to the “Crusade in H.” theory and finds inconsistent logic in the theory as well.\textsuperscript{293} The “Crusade in H.” theory is a rather insubstantial idea that required refutation; Malone thankfully puts this part of the debate to rest as few scholars would adopt this argument after Malone’s thorough rebuttal. The other arguments against
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Laudabiliter, largely posited by Moran, retained some strength, however, since Malone promoted the veracity of Quoniam ea, which is known now to be false.

George Stokes did not write much on Laudabiliter, but given the scope of his book, it is worthwhile to include in this study. He published the first edition of his book on the medieval Irish church in 1889. And, regarding Laudabiliter, he addresses each side of the debate presented in the Dublin Review and offers his own input on the matter. After introducing the context of Laudabiliter, he quickly states his position early on in discussion of the infamous document: “I am perfectly prejudiced in this matter, but I am bound, as a historian, to hold that the case of the opponents of the bull is very weak.” Stokes asks the reader to suspend belief and suppose that Hadrian did not issue the letters and that Gerald of Wales or somebody else really did forge Laudabiliter. He suggests that if it were false, then what of the legates and popes who continued to sanction the Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland? Stokes points out as well that the argument regarding Laudabiliter not appearing in papal archives is a moot point and certainly not one that Irish historians would ever want to agree upon as Stokes argues that the papal archives did not keep documents pertaining to Ireland until 1215, the end of Innocent III’s pontificate. Stokes astutely points out that if Laudabiliter must be discounted on the grounds that it does not appear in the papal archives, then so must all other Irish ecclesiastical documents prior to 1215. To further support this idea, Stokes points to two collections of known and authentic bulls prior to the Anglo-Norman invasions that do not appear in the papal archives either, yet scholars accept them as authentic. He also addresses the conditions which Rome and Gerald of Wales and
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contemporary chroniclers perceived in Ireland during the twelfth century, something that has already been discussed at length above as well. Stokes’s contribution is rather minor, but his point regarding the extant documents in the papal archives likely inspired Norgate to include it in her article as she cites Stokes.\(^{298}\)

On the other side of the debate, Stephen McCormick published *The Pope and Ireland* in the same year that Stokes’ book appeared (1889), and he collates and combines a number of arguments against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* and also brings in some new arguments. His work does not stop at *Laudabiliter*, as he spends the entire two-hundred-page work building a case against the authenticity of the document. McCormick’s work includes the arguments of just about every scholar prior to him who had argued against *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity. He goes as far back as the seventeenth century to include Lynch and MacGeoghegan as well as more recent works by Moran and Gasquet – he even quotes their works at great length. He adopts much the same line of reasoning as his predecessors, including the “Crusade in H.” theory that Malone had debunked five years prior to McCormick’s publication. He also looks at Pope John XXII’s letter to Edward II (see above) which also deals with *Laudabiliter*. McCormick states his purpose in the preface to his work and indicates that he intends to only represent the arguments of other scholars and provide citations and footnotes in order to substantiate each argument.\(^{299}\) McCormick makes his position abundantly clear. He comes across as rather dead set on vindicating the Irish and vilifying the English scholars over their support for the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*.\(^{300}\) No doubt some of McCormick’s animosity and irreverence toward the
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arguments asserted by other scholars, particularly English scholars, stems from the Irish independence movements that were taking place throughout the nineteenth century.

McCormick adopts the arguments of many scholars and takes the usual routes to discredit the sources of *Laudabiliter*, Gerald of Wales and John of Salisbury. Additionally, he expands upon the ideas of other scholars in order to produce a more coherent picture and argument against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. Indeed, McCormick quotes – at great length – the works of other scholars within his faction, including the likes of Cardinal Moran and Chaillot. McCormick first addresses Gerald of Wales and from the beginning charges that Henry II commissioned Gerald to fabricate *Laudabiliter*. For this obviously false claim, McCormick cites MacGeoghegan.\(^{301}\) As Norgate would soon argue, Gerald of Wales would have had no motive to aid Henry II in such a deceitful way as he had no particular love for Henry or his house.\(^{302}\) Additionally, he argues that, when Gerald visited Rome, he intentionally did not show *Expugnatio Hibernica* to the court because they would have noticed the supposedly forged *Laudabiliter* attributed to Hadrian.\(^{303}\) McCormick also analyses the character of both Henry II and Hadrian IV to show that Hadrian could not have possibly issued *Laudabiliter* to Henry because it was not in his character to bring such a detriment to the Irish people.\(^{304}\) This kind of argument based on supposed character is far from new in the historiography. McCormick does, however, introduce a letter from Pope Innocent III to the legates in England which indicates that Henry II never sent Peter’s pence for England to Rome, but McCormick points out that Innocent III does not mention the need for Henry to procure Peter’s pence for his dominion over
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Ireland. He uses this as a basis to argue that *Laudabiliter* was forged as he reasons that if it were real, then Innocent would have mentioned England’s dominion over Ireland and would have requested from King John that he collect Peter’s pence from Ireland as well as England. Among other instances of the collection of Peter’s pence, McCormick also cites a time when King Henry III did not explicitly recognise *Laudabiliter*. Norgate considers this a weak argument as she points out that in *Laudabiliter* Hadrian does not make demands for Peter’s pence; instead he restates it as one of the goals which Henry indicated when he “applied” to Hadrian for support for his planned invasion of Ireland: “You have indeed indicated to us, dearly beloved son in Christ, that you wish to enter this island of Ireland, to make that people obedient to the laws, and to root out from there the weeds of vices, that you are willing to pay St. Peter the annual tax of one penny from each household.” Norgate argues that *Laudabiliter* outlines the things that Henry II should endeavour to achieve; thus, the reason that Peter’s pence does not appear in Alexander’s confirmatory letters of Henry’s deeds is because the demand for money is not a relevant matter in letters that simply sought to confirm and indicate the pope’s approval of the Irish bishops’ and lords’ fidelity to the English crown.

Unlike some of his predecessors, McCormick provides a textual analysis of both Hadrian’s *Laudabiliter* and the false document *Quoniam ea* attributed to Alexander III. He first attacks *Laudabiliter* on the grounds that there is no independent evidence of the letter that Henry II reportedly sent to Rome in requesting approval for his planned invasion of Ireland. McCormick asserts that because the extant historical record lacks this letter, it detracts from the
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authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. While it is certainly slightly suspicious, the lack of the existence of this letter in the historical record is far from good evidence to support the inauthenticity of *Laudabiliter*. To an earlier point made by Stokes regarding the extant letters pertaining to Ireland not being kept in the papal archives until 1215, by denying the authenticity of response letters, such as *Laudabiliter*, on the grounds that the original letter of inquiry does not exist or cannot be found would discount a great number of documents – something that could cause responsible historians to hesitate.

Later in his work, McCormick tries to build a character case for the people of Ireland in attempting to show that no pope would “punish” Ireland by subjecting it to a foreign ruler and especially an English one. He argues that Ireland is among the most Catholic of nations, and this is proven by the fact that no pope has ever placed Ireland under interdict.\(^{311}\) He shows through historical precedent that the popes before Hadrian IV’s time would admonish any disobedient children of the Church before inflicting punishment upon them.\(^{312}\) Furthermore, he reasons that if Hadrian IV and Alexander III’s letters were authentic, then there would have been letters of warning regarding Ireland’s behaviour and disobedience. Of course, this kind of reasoning is also specious and ahistorical. As previously mentioned, the actual condition of Ireland was not important – it was more tumultuous than some of the proponents of the inauthenticity of *Laudabiliter* would have readers believe – but only its reported condition to Rome, i.e. the words of Cardinal John Paparo and the chroniclers whose writings reached Rome.\(^{313}\) Moreover, as previously discussed, Rome wanted for there to be a single kingdom of Ireland ruled by a single monarch, not several regional kings. McCormick then makes further attempts to show that
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Ireland was entirely pious and in unison with the Church by citing the saints of Ireland, particularly St. Patrick. Such arguments have little or nothing to do with the authenticity of a document; it seems McCormick is attempting to build a character reference for Ireland and its people in order to prove its innocence.\textsuperscript{314} The testimony is seemingly irrelevant. Following the construction of Ireland’s ecclesiastical history, he begins to detail the already proven false “Crusade in H.” theory which will not be covered any further here.\textsuperscript{315}

McCormick’s work represents a collection of all of the arguments – spurious, reasonable, or otherwise – against the authenticity of \textit{Laudabiliter}; in some ways it is the opposite to this paper. His work may perhaps stem from a desire to further protect Irish identity and even perhaps to respond to a rise in arguments in favour of the authenticity of \textit{Laudabiliter}. For this reason, he attempts to dispel some bias as he quotes a Belgian scholar’s work at length because he has less of a stake in the debate over authenticity.\textsuperscript{316} At around the time of the publication of \textit{The Pope and Ireland}, the English Parliament attempted to pass the “First Home Rule Bill,” which would have granted Ireland the right to govern itself in certain parts of the land. Moreover, the resistance movements to English rule, such as the Fenian Uprising, were fresh in Ireland’s recent memory at the time of publication. His approach includes incorporating all the theories of his predecessors (including those already discussed above in the section on Chaillot) and presenting them to his readers. The arguments addressed above (including the letter from John XXII to Edward II discussed alongside Lanigan) are the most pertinent and powerful arguments in favour of \textit{Laudabiliter}’s inauthenticity, but those same arguments do not stand up well against
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the future counter-arguments in favour of authenticity – particularly those of Norgate, O’Doherty, and Sheehy.

Two years later, William Morris dedicated an entire chapter of his 1891 work *Ireland and Saint Patrick* to discussing Hadrian and Henry II. He quickly positions himself in-between support for and against *Laudabiliter*; he looks to Rome’s interest in having the Anglo-Norman king, Henry II, establish a feudal hierarchy that was already well established in Europe. In the beginning, rather than arguing his case for or against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*, Morris instead presupposes neither *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity or inauthenticity and instead endeavours to discuss the characteristics of those involved in the invasion of Ireland and then how twelfth-century Irishmen perceived the invaders – the problems which have already been discussed. His position shifts gradually as he introduces evidence and arguments and plants himself firmly against *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity.

Morris introduces a few new pieces of evidence and adaptations to the arguments against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* that are worth noting. Before doing so, however, he exhausts roughly thirty pages of ink on the characters of Henry and Hadrian, and the political and religious condition of Ireland. In terms of his contributions and the ways in which he brought change to this debate, Morris discovered that, contrary to Gasquet’s claims that *Expugnatio Hibernica* was published in 1188, Gerald of Wales published *Expugnatio Hibernica* in 1189. Additionally, he gives more care in indicting the final chapter of John of Salisbury’s *Metalogicon* as a forgery; he takes the criticism made by his peers and actually adds claims that hold substance. For instance, he does more than just suppose that the forty-second chapter is a
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forgery; he actually examines the text to try to find proof of foul play. He considers John’s language but not in the context of the rest of John’s book.\(^{320}\) Instead, Morris believes that the use of the sentence “\textit{ad preces meas illustri Regi Anglorum, Henrico Secundo, concessit et dedit Hyberniam iure hereditario posidendum}” is lazy Latin and of poorer quality than John of Salisbury’s writing.\(^{321}\) Morris suggests that one of Henry’s officials appended the Hadrian passage into John of Salisbury’s work and speculates that it may have been the same person who forged \textit{Laudabiliter}.\(^{322}\) Indeed, Morris finds comparable language from chapter forty-two of \textit{Metalogicon} in Henry’s declaration at Avranches in 1172.\(^{323}\) In response to this, Norgate, though she praises Morris’s attempt at textual criticism, points out that it was the cardinal legates who dictated Henry II’s declaration.\(^{324}\) Once again, it must be noted that no expert scholars of John of Salisbury, such as Reginald Poole, have picked up or noticed this alleged discrepancy. Moreover, against some his peers’ claims, Morris posits that Hadrian’s nationality had little bearing on issuing \textit{Laudabiliter} to Henry II.\(^{325}\) Instead, he argues that, if anything, it would serve as less supportive of \textit{Laudabiliter}’s inauthenticity.\(^{326}\) Morris’s contribution to the debate comes in this criticism of John of Salisbury’s \textit{Metalogicon} as he adds little else to the overall debate.

In 1893 Kate Norgate published a lengthy and extremely thorough article that discusses at great length the arguments for and against the veracity of \textit{Laudabiliter}; naturally, it deserves a great deal of attention as it is perhaps the most important work that endorses the document’s
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authenticity. Because her arguments have been covered extensively throughout this paper, her work will be summarised and not repeated *ad nauseam*, though details left undiscussed thus far will be added here. Norgate’s own position is not abundantly obvious, and she does not explicitly state her position but does implicitly give her position, i.e. that *Laudabiliter* was written by Hadrian’s curia. She argues also that the document itself does not carry the weight that some scholars have given it; she adds that it is crucially important to consider the letter (she refrains from calling it a papal bull) in the context of twelfth-century international law. Norgate sets aside her position and addresses the three main groups of arguments against *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity and leaves the reader to reflect on her reasoning and draw their own conclusion on the document’s authenticity.

Norgate puts forward a series of arguments and counterpoints to the proponents to the theory of *Laudabiliter*’s inauthenticity. The first argument she lodges is more so a refutation of some of the claims made against Gerald of Wales by some scholars within this debate. She calls into question and refutes some of the claims they made about Gerald’s reliability and motives. The second series of arguments that Norgate addresses relate to John of Salisbury’s *Metalogicon*. She lists the most common complaints lodged against the forty-second chapter of John’s work and systematically addresses each of those points; mostly, she points out that none of them are experts in John’s work and that their objections regarding the “lack of connection” with the rest of the book are baseless. The third series of arguments is the “Crusade in H.” theory, for which she credits Malone as her inspiration and thus will not be discussed any further here. The fourth series of arguments is much larger and involves what Norgate collectively calls “the
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arguments from silence” wherein scholars question a number of circumstances surrounding
Henry’s invasion of Ireland and the document itself (often relating to the delay between the year
Hadrian issued *Laudabiliter* and the date that Henry invaded).

Norgate takes her stride in the “arguments of silence” as she refutes all eight “arguments
from silence”, i.e. the time before any kind of action was made upon the document, in one fell
swoop.331 She credits Moran with making the most valid point about the “silence” regarding
*Laudabiliter*: “The supposed bull of Pope Hadrian had no part whatever in the submission of the
Irish chieftains to Henry II; nor, it may be added, in the submission of the Irish bishops and
clergy.”332 Perhaps the newest viewpoint that Norgate brings is that, like later scholars, she
believes that *Laudabiliter* had little bearing on Henry’s eventual invasion of Ireland and that the
hotly contested document served more as a formality than necessary prerequisite for invasion.333

Regarding the import of *Laudabiliter*

The ‘bull’ which some of its modern critics treat as a state paper of such tremendous
importance was in the eyes of its writer, its recipient, and every other man of their day
simply a ‘commendatory letter,’ whereby Henry had the satisfaction of knowing, not that
he was expressly bidden, or desired, or authorised, or advised by the Father of
Christendom [i.e. the pope] to do a certain thing, but that, if he did do it, the Father of
Christendom, ‘resting on the good intentions set forth by that monarch himself,’ would
have nothing to say against it.334

She goes further to claim that if Henry’s authority within Ireland were questioned, then surely
Alexander III would have sent a letter reprimanding him, to which Henry would have then
perhaps cited *Laudabiliter*.335 The debated document itself held little bearing on the course of
events. Her argument boils down to the logical principle of William of Ockham in suggesting
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that the simplest interpretation offers more than some of the over complicated ideas posited by proponents of inauthenticity:

The last few years have seen the beginnings of a new school of English historians who appear to look upon Henry Fitz-Empress as little better than a fool. To them, perhaps, the theory may commend itself that he went to the trouble of forging a letter in the pope's name, only to keep it buried for twenty or thirty years, or of forging a letter in the name of a dead pope, only to let it ooze out, rather than to publish it, in Ireland and England at a time when it could be of no practical use to him whatever. Students who have been trained masters will prefer to interpret history on simpler and less fantastic principles.336 The primary point here being that some of the theories posited by proponents of inauthenticity border on absurdity and are largely inconsistent with the medieval world. Norgate also, for instance, points out that in paying Peter’s pence to Rome England would have included Ireland within England and not as a separately indicated amount because England viewed Ireland as a fief as it also saw Wales and Scotland.337 Additionally, regarding Pope John XXII’s letter to Edward II, Norgate simply and deftly points out that, regardless of the content of the letter, the Irish lords recognised, as did John XXII that Laudabiliter was authentic and presumed to be real by all during the fourteenth century.338 Among the other arguments Norgate makes, she also follows Stokes in asserting that the lack of records in Rome of Laudabiliter means nothing as records regarding Ireland were not kept or made until Innocent III’s pontificate and to disqualify Laudabiliter for this reason alone is to disqualify any other sources matching this criterium.339

Regarding the first series of arguments, she looks at the claims against lodged against the unofficial format of the letter found in Gerald of Wales’s Expugnatio Hibernica, arguing that the lack of certain apparatus and formulae does not indicate its alleged falseness.340 Moreover, she brings great criticism against the proponents of the inauthenticity of Laudabiliter as they
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haphazardly speculated about details about Gerald of Wales’s works and life. Many of the proponents already discussed venture to suggest that Gerald of Wales was in Henry II’s pocket and at his disposal to write whatever pleased the king. She refutes this because it is well documented by Gerald himself that he was not fond at all of Henry or his policies. Norgate points out that Gasquet, Chaillot, Morris, and the editors of the rolls series, Dimock and Brewer, argue for Gerald’s support for Henry II when quite the opposite was true.

Norgate’s analysis is ultimately the most persuasive on account of its thoroughness and its use of polemics, rhetoric, and good historical methodology to dismantle the arguments that favour Laudabiliter’s inauthenticity. In this way, Norgate does not posit any new evidence that proves Laudabiliter to be provably genuine; in fact, she almost exclusively critiques past scholars’ arguments instead of putting forth any new research. Norgate’s article puts a gentle close on the debate, despite scholars publishing additional works that contradict her findings in support of the proponents of Laudabiliter’s inauthenticity. For the most part, however, Norgate’s article stands as one of the pillars of the whole debate and perhaps as the most important work regarding the debate itself. Her work was later cited, alongside O’Doherty’s, in Scott & Martin’s 1978 renewed translation and edition of Expugnatio Hibernica.

Alfred Tarleton offers one of the few full biographies dedicated to Hadrian IV and covers both the life of Nicholas Breakspear before and during his pontificate. In comparison to Milman and to Raby, however, Tarleton does not quite suffer the same pitfalls. His history of Hadrian IV still subscribes to Carlyle’s “great man” theory and he nearly states this outright in his preface.
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On the topic of *Laudabiliter*, Tarleton not only acknowledges the debate over the genuineness of the papal bull but also positions himself on the fence but leaning toward the bull’s authenticity.\(^346\) It seems that in discussing *Laudabiliter*, Tarleton borrowed Norgate’s phrasing in introducing Henry’s designs upon Ireland.\(^347\) Moreover, although he does not cite her work, it seems likely that Tarleton read Norgate’s article as he draws similar conclusions regarding the import of *Laudabiliter*.\(^348\) Unlike the previous biographers of Hadrian IV, Raby and Milman, Tarleton goes so far as to entertain the debate over *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity.\(^349\) He lists what he believes to be the eight most persuasive arguments regarding *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity – all of which have been discussed at length already. His seventh and eighth points are moot, however: he places too much stock and authority in the opinions of the editors of the papal documents. He believes that simply because *Laudabiliter* appears in the *Bullarium* and in Baronius’s *Annales Ecclesiastici*, the infamous document is more authentic.\(^350\) The problem is that his argument rests on the opinion of two editors who took the text from Gerald of Wales or Ralph Diceto, the two only potential sources of *Laudabiliter*.\(^351\) The fact that the document appears in those collections is, by and large, beside the point of its authenticity (as previously mentioned). Tarleton certainly made himself familiar with the debate as he also cites Malone, Gasquet, and Chaillot in discussing the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*. Interestingly, Tarleton also adopts some of the more moral and character-based arguments used by proponents of inauthenticity, but instead he places himself on the other side of the debate, in favour of
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authenticity. He speculates that Henry II would not have attempted to lay claim over Ireland had he not received support from the Holy See; Tarleton speculates further that such support would have been granted by few popes – Hadrian IV being one such pope.\textsuperscript{352} This, of course, speaks nothing to authenticity or inauthenticity of the document and only indicates some historical speculation as per the conditions by which Henry was able to acquire *Laudabiliter*.

The late nineteenth-century works represent the time in which the authenticity of *Laudabilier* was most hotly debated. It began with Cardinal Patrick Francis Moran’s “first indictment” of the document where he set aside the moral and out of character arguments that Lynch, MacGeohegan, and Lanigan adopted. He also rightly set aside any argument about the Donation of Constantine as neither its authority nor its authenticity had anything to do with the circumstances in which Hadrian issued the document. After Moran, more scholars, mostly Irish, made further attempts to refute the authenticity of the *Laudabiliter* while adopting and echoing the arguments of their predecessors and adding their own twist on the arguments. Central to their reasoning was that both John of Salisbury’s and Gerald of Wales’s works featured forged portions relating to *Laudabiliter*. Additionally, the opponents of *Laudabiliter* argue that Henry never used it in Ireland because it was a forgery and he was afraid to get caught out by Rome with a false document. These were among the most common arguments, though others, such as the “Crusade in H.” theory and John XXII’s letter to Edward II, were interspersed in the historiographical record. The two main authors who endorsed *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity in this period, Norgate and Malone, offered both rhetorical and historical refutations to these arguments. Norgate, however, offered the most to the record as she recognised *Quoniam ea* as false and, unlike Malone, did not cite it for her arguments; instead she cited Alexander III’s three authentic
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letters and used rhetoric and polemics to refute other scholars’ arguments. Norgate was not conclusive, however, as she merely refuted other scholars’ arguments and did not provide new evidence of her own.

Twentieth-Century Scholars

The twentieth-century works put a lid on the debate, and it seems that Norgate’s article played a large part in this as the publication of works that deny *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity trailed off as acceptance of its authenticity increased and the animosity towards it decreased. Of the arguments presented, O’Doherty and Sheehy represent the most important contributions to the debate over *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity. Both scholars provide in-depth textual analyses of *Laudabiliter* and then analyse the circumstances of *Laudabiliter*. O’Doherty provides a reasonable explanation as to the difference between John of Salisbury’s account in the *Metalogicon* and *Laudabiliter* as it appears in Gerald of Wales’s *Expugnatio Hibernica*. Sheehy expands on O’Doherty’s otherwise densely packed article to further emphasise his predecessor’s point. Before them, however, the first sign of nuance emerges in Thatcher’s chapter about *Laudabiliter* wherein he presupposes authenticity and instead looks deeper into the details of *Laudabiliter* and its acquisition. This new trend continues into the twenty-first century.

In one chapter of his book (1903), Oliver Thatcher focuses solely on *Laudabiliter* and in doing so he provides a historiographical overview of the document. Much like Norgate, he provides critical analysis of the scholarship surrounding the document.353 Thatcher positions himself to make a new argument altogether regarding *Laudabiliter* as he says that

Those who were persuaded that the bull is a forgery have, almost without further thought or argument and as a matter of course, concluded that the grant was never made. And on the other hand, those who believed in the existence of the grant have regarded as

necessary the conclusion that *Laudabiliter* is genuine. I believe that this false assumption has been an effectual hindrance to the successful solution of the problem.\(^{354}\)

He attacks both sides of the arguments for too quickly assuming a position in the debate or putting themselves in a position that they feel necessitates a conclusion about the document. Thatcher entertains the idea that the version of *Laudabiliter* as it appears in *Expugnatio Hibernica* may be a forgery, but that King Henry still received a letter from Hadrian that endorsed his invasion of Ireland.\(^{355}\) In this way, Thatcher seeks to separate the document *Laudabiliter* from the letter that Hadrian issued, as if Gerald of Wales’s version were separate from the document delivered to Henry by John of Salisbury.

Thatcher then attempts to construct a coherent chronology based on the available primary sources that corroborate one another in order to explain the existence of Hadrian’s permission and endorsement of and Henry’s receipt of that letter. Again, Thatcher makes a distinction between the endorsement that Henry received and *Laudabiliter* as it appears in Gerald of Wales’s *Expugnatio Hibernica*. Thatcher begins his chronology with the meeting at Winchester in September 1155 per Robert Torigny’s testimony that Henry’s mother did not support Henry invading Ireland at the time.\(^{356}\) He then looks to the *Vitae XXIII. Abbatum S. Albani* to find corroboration with the other sources and found that an embassy was sent to meet Hadrian IV on October 9\(^{\text{th}}\), 1155. He believes that the closeness of the dates of the meeting and the embassy’s mission to meet Hadrian in Benevento were not coincidence. He then speculates that the embassy at that time requested support for Henry’s invasion but that it was declined by Hadrian’s papal court.\(^{357}\) Then, based on the language used by Roger of Wendover and Matthew
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of Paris in their respective works, he suggests that Henry asked for too much temporal authority over Ireland in his first request that the embassy, led by Abbot Robert of St. Albans, presented to Hadrian.\footnote{Ibid. 160} He draws comparison between Ireland’s condition in 1155 and England’s condition in 1066. Thatcher argues that Ireland and England at these separate dates were both already Christian and so William the Conqueror could not request to rule England outright because its people were Christian, just as Henry could not request to rule Ireland outright because the people were already Christian.\footnote{Ibid. 160} Not only this, but Hadrian also considered Ireland to be under the protection of St. Peter and not that of a temporal lord such as Henry II.\footnote{Ibid. 161} He speculates that Abbot Robert spoke with John of Salisbury about his failure regarding Hadrian’s consent for Henry to invade Ireland and John then provided a remedy to the situation given his friendship with the pontiff.\footnote{Ibid. 161}

Thatcher then attacks some of the arguments lodged against the endorsement of Henry’s invasion and the “Crusade in H.” theory as well as dispelling any question of forgery in the \textit{Metalogicon}.\footnote{Ibid. 161-166} He answers Morris’s complaint with the Latin used by John of Salisbury in chapter forty-two by saying that John’s \textit{Metalogicon} implies that “[Henry] is to become the feudal lord of Ireland and Ireland is to become his fief. As a possession, therefore, it still belongs to St. Peter. Secondly, whatever is, by this investiture, given to Henry, is given not simply to him personally and for his lifetime, but also to his heir, \textit{jure hereditario}.”\footnote{Regi Anglorum Henrico secundum concessit et dedit Hiberniam iure hereditario possidendam sicut literae ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem nam omnes insulae, de iure antiquo, ex donacione Constantini, qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam Ecclesia pertinere. Annulum quoque per me transmisit aureum, Smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fieret investitura iuris ingerenda Hibernia. Ioannes Saresberiensis, Metalogicus. Ioannes Saresberiensis: E codice ms. Academiae Cantabrigiensis. 240-241; Thatcher, ‘Studies Concerning Adrian IV’. 166} Thatcher concludes that
Henry was not to become ruler or king of Ireland but its lord and was to have it as a fief and not rule it as a king as he did England.\textsuperscript{364}

Thatcher does not end there because while he agrees with the intention and the existence of the grant to Henry made by Hadrian, he further examines whether Hadrian actually invested Henry with the power that he intended to give him.\textsuperscript{365} He concludes that few documents ever referred to Henry II as “Lord of Ireland” because Hadrian never actually invested the king. Instead, Thatcher reasons that Henry never published nor promulgated \textit{Laudabiliter} (or whatever grant he received) because he wanted to be king of Ireland and not just its lord. He chose to invade and take Ireland by force to have as an absolute possession per the supposed initial request to Pope Hadrian IV.\textsuperscript{366}

Thatcher then begins to emancipate some of the complaints lodged against Hadrian’s nationality as some scholars who oppose \textit{Laudabiliter}’s authenticity argue that Hadrian granted Henry permission because of his patriotism and duty to his king. Thatcher defends Hadrian and suggests that he only defended the papacy’s rights and even reprimanded Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury for prohibiting appeals to Rome on Henry’s orders.\textsuperscript{367}

Finally, Thatcher looks to \textit{Laudabiliter} itself as it appears in \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}. The author posits that Gerald of Wales’s reliability has nothing to do with the authenticity of the document. He looks to the formulae used in \textit{Laudabiliter} and whether it agrees with the usual conventions and whether it matches up the Latin used by John of Salisbury in \textit{Metalogicon}.\textsuperscript{368} He concludes that it is too different from the usual letters of this kind and thus is not genuine.\textsuperscript{369} He
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does not call the document a forgery, though, as he believes it was “not written with the purpose
of deceiving.” Instead, he posits a rather unexpected theory that *Laudabiliter* as it appears in
*Expugnatio Hibernica* was produced as an exercise in Latin for a student who “chose to
impersonate Hadrian IV.” Thatcher, however, argues that the errors in *Laudabiliter* are
understandable errors to make and small ones at that. He notes that writing imaginary letters was
common practice for students in this period and that the student almost certainly had copies of
legitimate letters of Hadrian that he copied and mimicked sentences from to form
*Laudabiliter*. Thatcher’s idea is almost plausible as his research and citations are thorough,
but, with the closer textual analyses later conducted by O’Doherty and Sheehy, Thatcher’s theory
comes across as a little absurd.

Henry Orpen published his work *Ireland Under the Normans* in 1911, in which he
discusses some of the more intricate details of *Laudabiliter* and the circumstances surrounding it
as they relate to Ireland. Orpen presupposes *Laudabiliter* as authentic as he cites Norgate’s
article for her “admirable temper and sound judgement” on the matter. He also includes
synopses to the three letters Alexander sent to the prelates, princes of Ireland, and Henry II.
Unlike Thather, Orpen concerns himself primarily with the substance of *Laudabiliter* and
Alexander’s three letters. He believes that none of these letters granted Henry the kingdom of
Ireland nor did they grant him dominion over Ireland. Regarding *Quoniam ea*, Orpen believes
that though the transcription in *Expugnatio Hibernica* is false, that there may have been some
real version because Roger Hoveden references it in his chronicle. He bases this conclusion on
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a textual analysis and insists that some of the stronger language used to describe the Irish, for example, *enormitates vitiorum* and *spurcitiae*, were simply paradigms of Alexander III’s papal curia at the time.\(^{376}\)

In 1926 Eleanor Hull published her lengthy *History of Ireland and Her People to the Close of the Tudor Period* wherein she provides a short note on *Laudabiliter* and her stance on the document. She references Aidan Gasquet’s work and dismisses his ideas, particularly those surrounding Pope John XXII’s letter, and she herself accepts the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*.\(^{377}\) She adds that up until John Lynch, the document was accepted as authentic and genuine, even by fourteenth-century Irishmen.\(^{378}\) Hull represents a small shift in the scholarship as she is among the first (excepting Malone who moved to America) of Irish scholars to accept *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity.

The Reverend O’Doherty published his brief article about *Laudabiliter* in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* in 1933. His article is succinct and does not get bogged down by the details as Norgate has already achieved this for him; he begins by stating the known and no longer disputed facts following Kate Norgate’s article.\(^{379}\) The arguments he presents are, by and large, entirely new in the context of the historiography of *Laudabiliter*. Not only this, but his arguments were influential enough that the editors and translators of the 1978 edition of *Expugnatio Hibernica*, Martin and Scott, cited O’Doherty along with Sheehy.\(^{380}\)
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O’Doherty first states that “Hadrian issued a document concerning Norman plans on Ireland is incontestable” and John of Salisbury’s word alone on this matter is enough evidence.\textsuperscript{381} His first premise is that \textit{Laudabiliter} is not a grant or a privilege, it is only a commendatory letter – as Norgate and Moran had argued.\textsuperscript{382} His second premise is that the lack of certain formulae, such as an address (\textit{Henrico}) or a date, is not indicative of its authenticity because the version of \textit{Laudabiliter} that appears in \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica} is a copy and not the original, which would have included both.\textsuperscript{383} He then introduces a close textual analysis of \textit{Laudabiliter} as it appears in Gerald of Wales’s work. O’Doherty introduces the \textit{cursus}, a metrical (i.e. rhythmic) pattern in Latin prose that fell out of use until its revival during Pope Urban II’s pontificate and shows that \textit{Laudabiliter} follows the rules of the \textit{cursus} exactly.\textsuperscript{384} O’Doherty, however, is quick to point out that this alone is not enough to prove authenticity, but if \textit{Laudabiliter} lacked this metrical pattern, then it would most certainly demonstrate its inauthenticity.\textsuperscript{385} O’Doherty does not offer any more detail on the \textit{cursus} metric pattern, but Maurice Sheehy would do so and provide a more in-depth explanation of the pattern (see below). Instead, O’Doherty begins explaining the consistencies amongst the letters issued by Hadrian’s papal court and \textit{Laudabiliter}. He points out that it was more than just typical for a dictator to supply the letter writer with words and phrases of their own to fit the letter.\textsuperscript{386} He adds that it is “psychologically inevitable that an individual [the dictator] will frequently use a word or phrase which he has used before in a similar context.”\textsuperscript{387} He proposes then to take a handful of some of
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the more peculiar phrases, to the extent that they could be worded more easily and differently, from *Laudabiliter* in order to see whether those peculiar phrases appear elsewhere in letters produced by Hadrian’s court.\(^{388}\)

O’Doherty then begins to draw comparisons between *Laudabiliter* and other letters. For example, he finds that the phrase “*gratum et acceptum habemus*” appears in four other letters and points out that this kind of Latin is “idiomatic” in every literal sense of the word.\(^{389}\) He lists a number of other phrases but stops short of inundating his work with laborious comparisons and challenges others to attempt the same without drawing the conclusion that the dictator of *Laudabiliter* was very likely the same dictator of Hadrian’s other letters.\(^{390}\) He also points to the frequent use of the “*tanto…quanto*” construction.\(^{391}\)

Next, O’Doherty provides two reasons as to why one might still doubt this evidence. He brings up the letter sent to Louis VII (the same letter from the “Crusade in H.” theory) and notes that the resemblance between the two letters and the similar language is uncanny.\(^{392}\) While many scholars, such as Gasquet and Chaillot, had enamoured themselves with the theory that one letter, i.e. *Laudabiliter*, was copied from the other, O’Doherty contends that this was not the case. He then explains a more simplified chronology to that of Thatcher. He believes that the account of Robert de Monte (also known as Robert Torigny/Torigni) from around September 1155 states that “Around the feastday of St. Michael, Henry, King of the English, having held a council at Winchester, conferred with his barons about conquering the kingdom of Ireland and giving it to his brother, William. But because his mother the empress was not pleased, the
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expedition at that time was stopped.”

This letter then corroborates another that O’Doherty examines: “[Henry] proposed to lead an army into Ireland so that he might subjugate it under his rule and install his brother as king of that island with a counsel of bishops and religious men.”

O’Doherty thus suggests that it was the bishops and religious men who were present at the Council of Winchester in 1155 also desired the invasion of Ireland because they wanted to bring Ireland back within the jurisdiction of the see of Canterbury – a privilege that it had enjoyed prior to the Synod of Kells in 1152, which established the four archbishoprics in Ireland. Thus, John of Salisbury was chosen as emissary to Hadrian not only because he was a close friend of Hadrian, but also because he was the secretary to the party most interested in the invasion, Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury. The difference between Laudabiliter and John’s account from the Metalogicon is then explained by the fact that John of Salisbury was privy to the intentions of Henry II, Theobald, and the bishops of England and that is what he wrote about and that is why the two texts do not entirely agree with one another. That is to say, John wrote about Henry’s intentions and plans and not what Laudabiliter actually endorsed.

In the second section O’Doherty’s discusses his findings in the context of Pope Alexander III’s three letters sent in September 1172. O’Doherty found that Alexander’s three letters were in response to letters sent by Irish prelates to Henry II that the king then forwarded to
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Those letters, according to Benedict of Peterborough, were “thus received [by Henry] each one from an archbishop and a bishop with a seal hanging on the outside in the manner of a charter.” Benedict also then affirms, two pages later, that Pope Alexander confirmed those letters that Henry forwarded: “For the highest priest with apostolic authority confirmed him and the heirs from the king that they thus established kings in perpetuity.” The letters that Alexander III sent were then published at the Synod of Waterford in 1173 either by their own merit or alongside the false bull Quoniam ea per O’Doherty’s hypothesis.

O’Doherty dedicates the third section of his article to refuting the authenticity of Quoniam ea, a false letter Gerald of Wales included after Laudabiliter in his Expugnatio Hibernica. This has already been discussed, in part, in the context of Sheehy’s discussion where he adds more detail to O’Doherty’s arguments. First, O’Doherty shows that the plural use of vestri, vobis, vestra, and vos are a distinct flaw in Quoniam ea as all of Alexander’s other sixteen letters to Henry II use tui, tibi, tua, te and never the former mode of the Latin plural form of “you.” The author then begs the question as to whether Gerald of Wales provided a faulty transcript of an otherwise real letter. Henry Orpen, a contemporary of O’Doherty, believes that Benedict of Peterborough and Roger Hoveden reference Quoniam ea in their works, but O’Doherty believes that, per the quote above, that the chroniclers actually refer to the three definitely authentic letters of Alexander III. O’Doherty does not fully discount Orpen’s idea; however, he suggests that, though Gerald’s version of Quoniam ea is certainly inauthentic, there

---

398 Ibid. 141-142
400 Benedict of Peterborough (last), Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis: The Chronicles of the reigns of Henry II and Richard I. 28; O’Doherty, ‘Rome and the Anglo-Norman Invasion of Ireland’. 142
401 O’Doherty, ‘Rome and the Anglo-Norman Invasion of Ireland’. 144
is still some evidence to suggest that there may have been an authentic version of *Quoniam ea* issued at some point. From the annals of Roger of Hoveden, O’Doherty believes that the language used may suggest that a document subsequent to the three letters of Alexander was sent to Henry in further confirmation; this may be *Quoniam ea*.\(^{402}\) Benedict of Peterborough speaks similarly of another document.\(^{403}\) Regardless, *Quoniam ea* as it appears in *Expugnatio Hibernica* is certainly inauthentic. O’Doherty concludes further with confidence that “the brief of Hadrian IV, granted at the request of John of Salisbury in 1155, is extant; it is the famous *Laudabiliter*.”\(^{404}\)

Following the sources which, by and large, exclusively discuss *Laudabiliter*, there is an unsurprising pause in the historiographical record with works about the life of Nicholas Breakspear and his pontificate as Hadrian IV. Two brief biographies of Hadrian IV, which appeared in journals, were published in the middle of the twentieth century.\(^{405}\) Cavendish’s article serves as a fluff piece that provides only a brief overview of Hadrian’s pontificate. However, Ullmann’s article is actually more than just a biographical piece that offers a grander argument.\(^{406}\) Ullmann argues that during his pontificate, Hadrian acted in an “unpretentious and unostentatious manner” which ultimately initiated the “age of the great medieval popes.”\(^{407}\) In what comes across as a refreshing break from the previous biographies and arguments pertaining to the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*, Ullmann makes no mention of the bull and states that he intentionally avoided producing another biography of Hadrian’s life.\(^{408}\) Ullmann makes a bold comparison between the pontificate of Gregory VII, a pope who vies for the descriptor of “most

\(^{402}\) Ibid. 144
\(^{403}\) Ibid. 144
\(^{404}\) Ibid. 145
\(^{406}\) Ullmann, ‘The Pontificate of Adrian IV’. 233
\(^{407}\) Ibid. 233
\(^{408}\) Ibid. 233
powerful medieval pope”, and Hadrian IV. Yet, Ullmann is not alone in making such a comparison as M. Farley in 1978 drew a similar comparison between the two popes.

Seventeen years prior to Farley’s article, in 1961, Maurice Sheehy published an article that specifically aimed to establish once and for all the authenticity of Laudabiliter as it appears in Gerald of Wales’s Expugnatio Hibernica. He heavily references O’Doherty but also briefly references Oliver Thatcher’s theory. Like Norgate, O’Doherty, and Malone, Sheehy contends that Laudabiliter was real and issued by Hadrian to Henry II of England. In his article Sheehy does not go so far as to question the views of each author who has argued against the authenticity of Laudabiliter as he cites Norgate as having effectively achieved this already. Sheehy, Norgate and O’Doherty reach similar conclusions about the roles of John of Salisbury and Gerald of Wales; they believe both sources to be authentic. Sheehy, however, hopes, as he says, to reach a definitive conclusion to the argument by conducting a close textual analysis of the transcription of Laudabiliter as it appears in Gerald of Wales’s Expugnatio Hibernica. In this way he expands much more on the analysis already conducted in brief by J.F. O’Doherty.

Before conducting his analysis, Sheehy delves into a brief historiographical review of Laudabiliter. Sheehy points out that there is no evidence of objections or controversies regarding the authenticity of Laudabiliter prior to the sixteenth century. He thus suggests that the uncertainty of the document became tied up with religious controversy and English and Irish identity during the period of the Reformations and rose up again during the rise of Irish nationalism in the nineteenth century. Sheehy argues that because the English Crown separated itself from the Catholic Church during Henry VIII’s reign, religious tensions motivated
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the Irish to reject English rule and any semblance of it. Additionally, Sheehy suggests that the English had presumed dominion over Ireland since *Laudabiliter* and Henry VIII then declared kingship over Ireland, stating that it was no longer a part of the pope’s lands.\(^{413}\) This sentiment was common among Protestant royalists at the time who were aware of *Laudabiliter*’s claims and insisted that they obey King Henry VIII instead:

> In these indentures of submission, all the Irish lords do acknowledge King Henry the Eighth to be their sovereign Lord and King, and desire to be accepted of him as subjects. They confess the King’s supremacy in all causes and do utterly renounce the Pope’s jurisdiction, which I conceive to be worth noting, because when the Irish had once resolved to obey the king, they made no scruple to renounce the Pope. And this was not done by the mere Irish, but the chief of the degenerate English families did perform the same.\(^{414}\)

Sheehy also discusses another work from the period of Henry VIII, James Ussher’s *A Discourse on the Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and British* in which he denounced the pope’s authority to rule Ireland via the Donation of Constantine and denounced *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity. Ussher recognised that the Donation of Constantine was a forgery but falsely claimed that *Laudabiliter* was a forgery. And, like John Lynch and James MacGeoghegan, he argues that the pope did not have the authority to rule Ireland even if the Donation of Constantine were not a forgery.\(^ {415}\) Regardless, he uses his claims to show that the Church’s claims over Ireland were not real at a time when Henry VIII considered himself King of Ireland.\(^ {416}\) Indeed, Sheehy adds that the English, during the Reformations, actively denied Hadrian’s bull as it conferred authority over Ireland to the sitting pope and not the King of
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England. The English legal experts at this time instead claimed that the King of England rightfully rules over Ireland because King Arthur had supposedly ruled Ireland (which lined up with Gerald of Wales’s claims about Henry II).

Having discussed some of the historiographical context, Sheehy launches into an in-depth philological analysis of the transcription of *Laudabiliter* as it appears in Gerald of Wales’s work. Going much further than O’Doherty, Sheehy produces ample evidence to support the document’s authenticity by pointing out that the document adheres to the rules imposed by the papal chancery at that time, namely, that each sentence ends in the *cursus* format of long and short syllables (also known as stressed and unstressed syllables respectively). The *cursus* was a metrical pattern that added emphasis and accent on certain parts of a Latin sentence. There were three kinds: *cursus velox*, *cursus planus*, and *cursus tardus*. During the twelfth century there was agreement and consistency within these documents that the *cursus velox* would always occur at the end of a sentence. Sheehy lays out the rules of the *cursus velox*: he notes that the *cursus velox* must be seven syllables long, the first three syllables must be separated by the last four syllables with one or more *caesurae* (a pause) and a new word or words. Additionally, the *cursus velox* requires that the second of the seven syllables must be short and the sixth syllable must be long. For example, the first sentence of *Laudabiliter* ends with “*exigis et favorem*”([long, short, short,] caesura, [short,] caesura, [short, long, short]).
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With this evidence, Sheehy thus argues that not only is *Laudabiliter* similar in style to other letters produced by the papal chancery during Hadrian’s pontificate, but the infamous document may have been written or dictated by the same person who wrote or dictated some of Hadrian’s other letters throughout his pontificate.¹²³ Sheehy hopes by this evidence to excise all doubt about the authenticity of the document. The only argument left in support of it being inauthentic is that it is a forgery of exceptional quality to the point of perfection. Such a conclusion, however, to borrow from Sylvester Malone, seems more like one that a Pyrrhonist might adopt. Sheehy does not make this connection, but he concludes that Gerald of Wales’s transcription is authentic despite the fact that it lacks some of the more obvious signs of authenticity such as a signature, addressee, or date. Additionally, he adds that some confusion arises in calling *Laudabiliter* a privilege and not a letter. Like some previous scholars (Moran, Norgate, O’Doherty), and against Gerald’s and the early chroniclers’ words, Sheehy emphasises that the version of *Laudabiliter* included in *Expugnatio Hibernica* is simply a commendatory letter and not an actual letter that granted a privilege. He supports the theory of Norgate that Hadrian actually sent two letters, one a privilege and the other an accompanying commendatory letter, *Laudabiliter*.⁴²⁴ Overall, Sheehy’s article seemingly sets the record straight about *Laudabiliter* by offering strong evidence to suggest that it is exceedingly unlikely that the only available transcript of the document was forged for the benefit of Henry II by Gerald of Wales.

Sheehy’s study opens possibilities of modern digital research as the photograph he provides in his article requires updating. Moreover, since Sheehy is the only scholar to produce a
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¹²⁴ Ibid. 63. An argument could be made that Sheehy agrees with John of Salisbury and, to an extent, Gerald of Wales on account of their claims that the letter was accompanied by a privilege. Gerald, however, incorrectly calls the document he transcribed a privilege, when it was only a letter.
detailed philological argument for the authenticity of *Laudabiliter*, it would be beneficial for another scholar of comparable Latinity to analyse the document to confirm Sheehy’s findings. However, since no modern scholar since Sheehy seemingly references his work in a negative light, perhaps most find his argument entirely plausible. Sheehy himself went on to later produce a critical edition of a number of important Irish primary sources under the title *Pontificia Hibernica; Medieval Papal Documents Concerning Ireland, 640-1261*. For the entry of *Laudabiliter* Sheehy finds that all extant copies generally agree on the wording of the document as they all stem back to Gerald of Wales’s *Expugnatio Hibernica* or possibly to Ralph Diceto’s *Opera Historica*.

The twentieth-century scholars, following Norgate’s criticism of the many arguments lodged against *Laudabiliter*, began to accept the authenticity of the document as the evidence from the closer textual analysis prove it to be authentic. As previously mentioned, the editors of the renewed edition of *Expugnatio Hibernica* cite Norgate, O’Doherty, and Sheehy in stating their position in the debate. O’Doherty and Sheehy contributed much in the way of bringing the debate to a close as the evidence in favour of the authenticity weighs too greatly against that for its inauthenticity.

**Twenty-first-Century Scholars**

The more recent twenty-first-century works regarding *Laudabiliter* all agree that the infamous document is authentic; however, from this concluded status, more nuanced debates emerged thereafter. Duggan echoes the speculations of O’Doherty and Thatcher as to the actual implications of *Laudabiliter* and its impacts, whereas Maeve looks to the impact *Laudabiliter* caused in Ireland after the twelfth century.
In 2003, Anne Duggan and Brenda Bolton collated and edited a series of essays into a cohesive book about Hadrian IV and his deeds. This book also, helpfully, includes a number of translated primary sources, including excerpts from Matthew of Paris’s works and Cardinal Boso’s biography from Olivier Duchesne’s Le Liber Pontificalis, among many other sources, including the infamous Laudabiliter, as well.\(^{425}\) The book itself came about following a conference on Hadrian held in the year 2000, celebrating the 900\(^{th}\) anniversary of his approximate birthdate (c.1100). The chapters within the book represent all but one of those presented at the conference, as well as five additional papers. The articles vary by focusing on different aspects of Hadrian’s life, ranging from his early life and adolescence to his friendship with John of Salisbury or his Christianising campaign in Scandinavia.

The paper that deals with Laudabiliter was written by Anne J. Duggan who adds yet more nuance to Hadrian’s infamous document. Duggan begins by outlining the complex historiography of the matter. She confirms the conclusions of O’Doherty and Norgate that Laudabiliter is authentic and that it had no bearing on Henry’s invasion. What is more, Duggan confirms that Henry forwarded the sealed letters from the Irish bishops to Pope Alexander III and received the three letters from Alexander in return.\(^{426}\) She follows the previous scholars’ conclusions further in saying that Laudabiliter was not a grant either, and that Quoniam ea in Gerald’s work is false. Additionally, she follows O’Doherty’s conclusion that the meeting at Winchester facilitated John of Salisbury’s embassy to Hadrian in 1155 and thus Hadrian later issuing Laudabiliter to Henry via John of Salisbury.\(^{427}\) Duggan attributes much agency to Theobald and John as she calls the sequence of events leading up to the acquisition of

---

\(^{425}\) NB: the translation of Laudabiliter used by Duggan and Bolton is the exact same translation produced by Scott and Martin. The Latin transcript traces back to Sheehy’s critical edition.

\(^{426}\) Duggan, ‘Chapter 7: Totius Christianitatis Caput. The Popes and the Princes’. 139-140

\(^{427}\) Ibid. 141
Laudabiliter “the Canterbury Plot.” Duggan supposes that Henry did not use Laudabiliter because it did not give him the royal power he wanted as it kept papal lordship over Ireland as part of St. Peter’s dominion.

Duggan then attempts to discover Henry’s motives for entering Ireland and she posits that while “the Canterbury Plot” held importance in procuring Laudabiliter, she argues against previous scholars as she argues that Henry’s primary motivation for invading Ireland was for Henry to give the kingdom to his brother, William, per the account of Robert of Torigny (see above). While W.L. Warren, renowned historian of Henry II, discounted this idea and sided with the Canterbury Plot theory for Henry’s justification of invasion, Duggan firmly posits that Henry wanted to give his brother a kingdom of his own. Duggan puts plenty of stock in Robert Torigny’s account which others avoided because, as they say (according to Duggan), Torigny was not heavily involved in English affairs. Duggan rebuts by saying that few chroniclers wrote about Henry’s early reign anyway, and that Torigny was close to the empress Matilda and he also recorded that Cardinal John Paparo’s presence in Ireland with the Synod of Kells in 1152 caused a disturbance in Canterbury. Her arguments on this point come across rather unconvincingly and to truly discover Henry’s motives for invading Ireland is no easy task and veers a little from the purview of this paper. It seems that while Henry may have originally wanted to give his brother, William, a kingdom, the Canterbury Plot partially facilitated his invasion. What seems a greater motivator is Henry’s right as king being challenged by Strongbow, who became king following Diarmait Mac Murchada’s death since Strongbow had
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432 Ibid. 144
433 Ibid. 144
married Mac Murchada’s daughter. Duggan later attests that this was one of the causes for Henry’s entry to Ireland.\textsuperscript{434} The fact that Henry did not promulgate \textit{Laudabiliter} when he received it suggests that it may have had no use to him.

As far as conclusions about John of Salisbury’s \textit{Metalogicon} and the text of \textit{Laudabiliter}, Duggan believes that the documents clearly contradict one another regarding the rights conferred to Henry; John says Henry was granted hereditary right, but \textit{Laudabiliter} features no such passage, nor do Alexander’s letters feature such a passage.\textsuperscript{435} She theorises, in agreement with Thatcher, that Henry requested dominion over Ireland in an initial embassy to Hadrian that was denied and John of Salisbury then returned with only half of what Henry had hoped for, \textit{Laudabiliter}.\textsuperscript{436} What Henry received was not the grant he had sought, but a commendatory letter. Like other more recent scholars, Duggan heavily deemphasises the importance and the role of \textit{Laudabiliter} in the course of events.\textsuperscript{437} In reaching her conclusion Duggan flips back and forth between accepting \textit{Laudabiliter} and refuting it in a manner that leaves the reader wanting something more conclusive.

Lastly, the most recent work to be produced about the life of Hadrian IV comes not in the form of a monograph but rather a Ph.D. dissertation by Patricia Fagan in 2006. Fagan set out to establish and discuss the papal policies of Hadrian IV to show that he not only brought “unique contributions to the office,” but also that he introduced qualities that would appear innovative to the modern papacy of the early 2000s.\textsuperscript{438} Fagan achieved this by examining Hadrian’s early life, “his reform agenda within the Roman church itself, his entanglements with the political powers

\textsuperscript{434} Ibid. 150
\textsuperscript{435} Ibid. 146
\textsuperscript{436} Duggan, ‘Chapter 7: Totius Christianitatis Caput. The Popes and the Princes’. 148; Thatcher, ‘Studies Concerning Adrian IV’. 158
\textsuperscript{437} Duggan, ‘Chapter 7: Totius Christianitatis Caput. The Popes and the Princes’. 149
\textsuperscript{438} Patricia Fagan, ‘Pope Adrian IV, the Clear-Eyed Chief Executive, and His Papacy (1154-1159)’ (Doctoral, University of California, 2006). vii
of the day, and his interaction with the Roman clergy.” While on its surface Fagan’s work does come across as a call back to the nineteenth-century biographical works, she seeks to discuss the consequences of Hadrian’s papacy, as well as his approach to reigning as a pope in order to show that he could actually be worthy of a title as lofty as “great man.” This is especially true in her discussion of *Laudabiliter*, which is not overly concerned with the authenticity of the document, but instead focuses on what the letter meant to the Roman church and what Hadrian’s goals were when the letter was issued. Fagan does not, however, cite Norgate or Sheehy and simply tacitly accepts its authenticity. Instead, she cites Anne Duggan’s paper, “*Totius Christianitis Caput*: The Popes and the Princes”, and commends its solid argument. Fagan then compares *Laudabiliter* to a similar bull issued by Gregory VII, which made similar claims over Spain. Fagan’s dissertation ultimately frames Hadrian as a pope who guarded the flock in a time of political turmoil and opposition.

A year after Fagan’s dissertation, Duggan published an article entitled “The Power of Documents: The Curious Case of *Laudabiliter*” in which she discusses her new theory about *Laudabiliter*. She addresses the historiographical debate again, including Sheehy, O’Doherty, and Norgate, and re-enters the debate. After providing a synopsis of the historiography and the circumstances of Gerald of Wales’s *Expugnatio Hibernica* and John of Salisbury’s *Metalogicon*, Duggan begins making new assertions about *Laudabiliter*. She believes that one of the most important reasons to doubt *Laudabiliter* is the lack of a date attached to the document. This issue was originally raised by Moran in 1872 and answered by Norgate in 1893. The lack of a date is
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not necessarily indicative of inauthenticity as much as it is an editorial choice or mistake on Gerald of Wales’s part.\textsuperscript{444} As for the arguments in favour of authenticity, Duggan finds the two most compelling pieces of evidence in favour of authenticity to be John of Salisbury’s forty-second chapter of \textit{Metalogicon} and the letter from Hadrian to King Louis VII.\textsuperscript{445} The latter, known \textit{Satis Laudabiliter}, as she argues, shares the same organisation and Latin formulae and greatly resembles the infamous document – it certainly does resemble \textit{Laudabiliter}. She then suggests that \textit{Laudabiliter} as it appears in \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica} was edited by Gerald of Wales to better fit his grand narrative.\textsuperscript{446} Furthermore, she believes that Gerald of Wales used the letter sent to Louis VII, \textit{Satis Laudabiliter}, as a basis for his version of \textit{Laudabiliter}.\textsuperscript{447} She believes that Gerald of Wales found John of Salisbury’s account in \textit{Metalogicon} and sought out the letter that John referred to rather than the Alexander letters and then opted for “sexing up” the organisation of the letter by moving around sentences to better fit the narrative now seen in \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}.\textsuperscript{448} As she suggests, the order in \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica} emphasises Henry’s desires rather than Rome’s, a difference with which Duggan takes issue.\textsuperscript{449} Duggan’s research is quite convincing and it is difficult to fault her method. To be clear, Duggan believes that a real \textit{Laudabiliter} existed at some point, but the \textit{Laudabiliter} in \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica} is not the real document. However, her argument become less convincing when she posits a rather farfetched theory: “[Gerald] concocted the ridiculously false \textit{Privilegium Alexandri Tercii [Quonium Ea]} to support the falsified \textit{Laudabiliter}.”\textsuperscript{450} This suggestion is all too convenient to

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{444}] Norgate, ‘The Bull Laudabiliter’. 32; Sheehy, ‘The Bull “Laudabiliter”’. 61
\item[\textsuperscript{445}] Duggan, ‘The Curious Case of Laudabiliter’. 261-262
\item[\textsuperscript{446}] Ibid. 265-266
\item[\textsuperscript{447}] Ibid. 262-263
\item[\textsuperscript{448}] Ibid. 264
\item[\textsuperscript{449}] Ibid. 263. See also Duggan’s suggested reorganisation of \textit{Laudabiliter} on page 263 and 271-275
\item[\textsuperscript{450}] Ibid. 268
\end{itemize}
believe. And again, per Ockham’s razor, it remains more tempting to consider the simpler solution that *Laudabiliter* was authentic as it appears in *Expugnatio Hibernica*.

Finally, Maeve Callan deals briefly with the document in the context of the so-called “re-Christianising” efforts proclaimed by *Laudabiliter*. In her introduction alone, Callan swiftly addresses the debate and the problems with the document and its influence and impact on the historical record.\(^\text{451}\) Since Callan’s work is not specifically aimed at the studies of Hadrian, or of *Laudabiliter*, she focuses much of her discussion on the background and the circumstances pertaining to the document.\(^\text{452}\) Callan’s greater concern is the supposed condition of Ireland as it is described in *Laudabiliter* and English chroniclers.\(^\text{453}\) She adds that the pretended condition of Ireland as described in *Laudabiliter*, i.e. the weeds of vices etc., was not raised at the 1215 Lateran IV council.\(^\text{454}\) Callan also demonstrates some of the impacts that *Laudabiliter* caused in Ireland – largely in the context of heresy and the mistreatment of the Irish by the English.\(^\text{455}\) This shift shows a wider acceptance of the document and shows that the debate is no longer especially relevant in the historic discussion. Instead, the debate revolves around the nuances and the details of the acquisition of *Laudabiliter* as well as Henry’s motives.

The discussion of *Laudabiliter* in the twenty-first century largely revolves around the nuance of the document and not so much whether the document ought to be considered authentic. The few scholars who examined *Laudabiliter* in recent years consider how the document actually played a role in the course of events. Historians generally agree that too much stock was put in the document before and that the document was of little use to King Henry II

\(^{452}\) Ibid. 7
\(^{453}\) Ibid. 8
\(^{454}\) Ibid. 11
\(^{455}\) Ibid. 18-19, 69,
because it served merely as a commendatory letter and not so much the grant of land he had perhaps hoped for when he received it. Further discussion was added to the difference between the document discussed in the *Metalogicon* and *Laudabiliter* itself. Only Duggan’s theory regarding the sentence order of *Laudabiliter* remains as the most substantial change in the historiography for the twenty-first century. This theory, however, comes across as farfetched.

Conclusion

The debate over the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* stems most consistently from national and confessional identities clashing over a document that, in reality, held little importance over the historical events in the twelfth century regarding Henry II’s invasion of Ireland. The arguments lodged against its authenticity do not hold water and though the circumstances of *Laudabiliter* should certainly raise suspicion, the fairer assumption to make is that the document held little weight or importance beyond the “commendatory letter” that Cardinal Patrick Francis Moran first described it as, – which later scholars came to consensus upon. To summarize, the evidence endorsing its authenticity (in brief) are as follows:

i) The *cursus velox* syllabic pattern at the end of each sentence of *Laudabiliter* found in Gerald of Wales’s transcription of the letter.456

ii) John of Salisbury’s account and receipt of *Laudabiliter* in chapter forty-two of *Metalogicon*.

iii) The letters sent by the Irish legates to Rome that were forwarded by Henry II to Alexander III.

iv) Alexander III’s three letters to the prelates and legates in Ireland, Henry II, and the princes of Ireland in 1172.

v) The acknowledgement at Winchester of the desire to invade Ireland shortly after receipt of the document in 1155 – Empress Matilda, however, did not approve of the invasion.

vi) Domhnall O’Neill’s letter to John XXII in 1317

vii) Pope John XXII’s letter to Edward II in 1318

viii) The omissions of *Quoniam ea* in manuscript copies of Gerald of Wales’s works.

---

456 See Appendix A.
a. Some evidence also indicating that while *Quoniam ea* is inauthentic that another real confirmation was made after the three letters from 1172.

Of course, this list does not include the logical rebuttals to the number of arguments that endorse inauthenticity – many of which were posited by Norgate, such as the arguments from silence and the resort to excessively complicated explanations when a simple cause is sufficient. The arguments against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* come across as specious, entirely circumstantial and veer towards conspiratorial; for their arguments to be true would require a number of extraordinarily well-coordinated efforts to ensure that Henry II had the right to invade Ireland only for him then to not use the document. There are too many separate pieces of evidence scattered in the record for the simplest solution to not be the right one: that *Laudabiliter* was authentic and real. For *Laudabiliter* to be a forgery scholars would have us believe that Gerald of Wales or somebody else had the skill to perfectly mimic the writing style and Latinity of Hadrian’s chancery, that somebody also perfectly mimicked John of Salisbury’s writing style, diction, and Latinity in *Metalogicon*, that Alexander III’s three letters were also forged and false, that Domhnall O’Neill wrote a complaint to John XXII about a document that was forged, that John XXII’s letter to Edward II regarding O’Neill’s letter reads *concessisse dicitur* (“said to be conceded”), not *concessit* (“conceded”) and also choose to interpret that phraseology in a way that would indicate *Laudabiliter* might not have been issued by Hadrian, all to discount the authenticity of a document that held little bearing on Henry’s invasion of Ireland. Of course, those are not all the arguments lodged against the authenticity of *Laudabiliter* as some scholars, namely Chaillot and Gasquet, looked to Hadrian’s letter to King Louis VII of France and Henry II that denied them permission to enter Spain; Malone put that matter to rest. Also, among the arguments are those which premise on the actions of Hadrian being out of character; such arguments are often fruitless as to develop a character of a historical figure is virtually
impossible, particularly with so few records pertaining to the events in question. Additionally, the fact that *Laudabiliter* is currently not known to exist in any papal archives is not entirely indicative of its inauthenticity. Editors such as Cardinal Caesar Baronius and Augustine Theiner doubted the document as well, but its lack of appearance in their works amongst other authentic documents speaks little to *Laudabiliter*’s inauthenticity as many documents pertaining to Ireland were not kept in the archives until Innocent III’s reign.457

Perhaps the most important authors who endorse the inauthenticity of *Laudabiliter* include Cardinal Patrick Francis Moran, Louis Chaillot (commonly referred to as “the Writer of the Analecta), and Stephen McCormick. Moran offers the most reasonable positions in the debate, while Chaillot and McCormick pack their respective works full of criticisms against *Laudabiliter*’s authenticity that, in some cases, work against their favour in the debate.458

Perhaps having read this paper the reader is left wondering if there remains any ambiguity even among those who hold the document as authentic. The following statements about *Laudabiliter* may be accepted as true.

i) *Laudabiliter* as it appears in Gerald of Wales’ *Expugnatio Hibernica* is authentic.

ii) The document discussed by John of Salisbury in chapter forty-two of *Metalogicon* is the same *Laudabiliter*.

iii) *Laudabiliter* had little to no bearing on Henry’s conduct in Ireland. It did not motivate him to invade Ireland.

iv) *Laudabiliter* is not a privilege or a grant. It is a commendatory letter from Pope Hadrian IV to Henry II.

a. *Laudabiliter* did not make Henry king of Ireland nor give him any tangible ownership over Ireland as its lord or make Ireland his fief. Hadrian cites the Donation of Constantine and points out that all islands belong to the successors of St. Peter in an especial right.

458 See above the letter of John XXII and the Remonstrance of Irish Lords to John XXII.
Beyond just the arguments about *Laudabiliter* shifting and changing over time, the implications of *Laudabiliter* changed also. Perceptions of it evolved from giving Henry kingly authority in Ireland, to lordly authority, to nothing, and finally to it simply serving as a commendatory letter. This debate took place mostly in the nineteenth century and the debate certainly died down following Norgate and O’Doherty with Sheehy putting the lid on the debate. With this paper I hope I have sealed the lid on this debate. The nuance and details of the acquisition of *Laudabiliter* and Henry’s motive for invasion, however, remains to be discussed and discovered in full.
Appendix A
English Translation of Laudabiliter. Scott and Martin’s English translation was chosen as they translated from Sheehy’s critical edition of the Latin text of Laudabiliter.

Cambrensis Giraldus, Expugnatione Hibernica: The Conquest of Ireland, trans. A. Brian Scott and F. X. Martin (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1978), 144-147

Critical Edition of Laudabiliter with cursus velox metre scheme highlighted in bold font.


Adrianus episcopus servus
Adrian the bishop, the servant of the
servorum Dei carissimo in Christo
servants of God, to his dearest son in Christ, the
filio illustri Anglorum regi salutem et
illustrious king of the English, greeting and
apostolicam benedictionem.
apostolic blessing.

Laudabiliter et satis fructose de
In right praiseworthy fashion, and to
glorioso nomine propagando in terris
good purpose, your magnificence is
et eterne felicitatis premio cumulando
considering how to spread abroad the glorious
in celis tua magnificentia cogitat, dum
name of Christ on earth, and thus store up for
ad dilatandos ecclesie terminos, ad
yourself in heaven the reward for eternal bliss,
declarandam indoctis et rudibus
while striving as a true Catholic prince should,
populis Christiane fidei veritatem et
to enlarge the boundaries of the Church, to
vitiiorum plantaria de agro dominico
reveal the truth of the Christian faith to peoples
exstirpanda, sicut catholicus princeps
still untaught and barbarous, and to root out the
intendis, et ad id convenientius
weeds of vice from the Lord’s field; and the
exequendum consilium apostolice
more expeditiously to achieve this end, you
sedis exigis et favorem. In quo facto
seek the counsel and favour of the Apostolic
quanto altiori consilio et maiori
discretione procedis tanto in eo
feliciorem progressum te, prestante
Domino, confidimus habiturum, eo
quod ad bonum exitum semper et
finem solem attingere que de ardore
fidei et religionis amore principium
acceperunt. Sane Hiberniam et omnes
insulas quibus sol iustitie Christus
illuxit et que documenta fidei
Christianae ceperunt ad ius beati Petri
et sacrosancte Romane ecclesie quod
tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit non est
dubium pertinere. Unde tanto in eis
libentius plantationem fidelem et
germent gratum Deo inserimus quanto
id a nobis interno examine districtius
prospicimus exigendum. Significasti
siquidem nobis, fili in Christo
carissime, te Hibernie insulam ad
subdendum illum populum legibus et
vitiqurum plantaria inde extirpanda
velle intrare et de singulis domibus

See. We are confident that in this matter, with
God’s help, you will attain that degree of
success which is in proportion to the loftiness
of your aims and the amount of discretion you
display as you proceed with them. For
enterprises which have their starting point in
burning faith and love of religion are always
ultimately successful in achieving their goal.
That Ireland, and indeed all islands on which
Christ, the sun of justice, has shed His rays, and
which have received the teaching of the
Christian faith, belong to the jurisdiction of
blessed St. Peter and the holy Roman church is
a fact beyond doubt, and one which your
nobility recognises. So we are all the more
eager to implant in those islands the offshoot of
faith, an offshoot pleasing to God, as we realise
that an examination of our own heart sternly
requires of us that we should take this action.
You have indeed indicated to us, dearly beloved
son in Christ, that you wish to enter this island
of Ireland, to make that people obedient to the
laws, and to root out from there the weeds of
In his article, “The Bull ‘Laudabiliter’ A Problem in Medieval Diplomatique and History” Sheehy has this comma as a full stop and notes that *dominum veneretur* also follows the *cursus velox* metre scheme. See page 62 of Sheehy, ‘The Bull “Laudabiliter”’.

Cardinal Moran contests Thomas Wright’s translation of this italicised portion. See page 51 of Moran ‘Bull of Adrian the Fourth’. The portion shown is, however, in accordance with Moran’s translation of the text.

*annuam unius denarii beato Petro* vices, that you are willing to pay St. Peter the
*velle solvere pensionem et iura* annual tax of one penny from each
*ecclesiarum illius terre illibata et* household,\(^ {460} \) and to preserve the rights of the
*integra conservare.* Nos itaque pium churches of that land intact and unimpaired.
*et laudabile desiderium tuum cum* We therefore support your pious and
*favore congruo prosequentes et* praiseworthy intention with favour which it
*petitioni tue benignum impendentes* deserves and, granting our benevolent consent,
*assensum gratum et acceptum* we consider it pleasing and acceptable that you
*habeamus ut pro dilatandis ecclesie* should enter that island for the purpose of
*terminis, pro vitiorum restringendo* enlarging the boundaries of the church,
*decursu, pro corrigendis moribus et* checking the descent of wickedness, correcting
*virtutibus inserendis, pro Christiane* morals and implanting virtues, and encouraging
*religionis augmento, insulam illam* the growth of the faith in Christ; that you
*ingrediaris et que ad honorem Dei et* pursue policies directed towards the honour of
*salutem illius terre spectaverint* God and the well-being of that land, and that
*exequaris, et illius terre populus* the people of that land receive you honourably
*honorifice te recipiat et sicut dominum* and respect you as their lord, all this being on
*veneretur,\(^ {459} \) iurenimirum ecclesiarum* condition that the rights of the church remain
*illibato et integro permanente et salva* intact and unimpaired, and without prejudice to
*beato Petro et sacrosancte Romane* the payment to St. Peter and the holy Roman

\(^ {459} \) In his article, “The Bull ‘Laudabiliter’ A Problem in Medieval Diplomatique and History” Sheehy has this comma as a full stop and notes that *dominum veneretur* also follows the *cursus velox* metre scheme. See page 62 of Sheehy, ‘The Bull “Laudabiliter”’.

\(^ {460} \) Cardinal Moran contests Thomas Wright’s translation of this italicised portion. See page 51 of Moran ‘Bull of Adrian the Fourth’. The portion shown is, however, in accordance with Moran’s translation of the text.
ecclesie de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione. Si ergo quod concepisti animo effectu duxeris prosequente complendum, stude gentem illam bonis moribus informare et agas tam per te quam per illos quos ad hoc fide, verbo et vita idoneos esse prospekeris ut decoretur ibi ecclesia, plantetur et crescat fidei Christiane religio et que ad honorem Dei et salutem pertinens animmare per te taliter ordinentur ut a Deo sempiterne mercedis cumulum conseque merearis et in terris gloriosum nomen valeas in seculis obtinere.

church of an annual tax of one penny from every household. Therefore if you wish to bring to a successful conclusion the design which you have thus conceived, take particular care to instruct that people in right behaviour and, both in person, and acting through those whom you consider well-suited for this purpose by reason of their strong faith, eloquence and Christian religion may be planted and grow, and that everything pertaining to the honour of God and the salvation of men’s souls may be so ordered that you may be deemed worthy to win from God that crowning reward of everlasting life, and may obtain on earth glorious name for all ages.
Appendix B


Alexander episcopus servus servorum
Dei carissimo in Christo filio illustri
Anglorum regi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Alexander bishop, servant of the servants of God,
gives his greetings and apostolic blessing to his most beloved son in Christ, the noble king of the English.

*Quoniam ea que a decessoribus nostris rationabiliter indulta noscuntur perpetua merentur stabilitate firmari, venerabilis Adriani pape vestigiis inherentes, vestrique desiderii fructum attendentes, concessionem eiusdem super Hibernici regni dominio vobis indulto, salva beato Petro et sacrosancte Romane ecclesie sicut in Anglia sic et in Hibernia de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione, ratam habemus et confirmamus quatenus, eliminatis*

Since all the grants made by our predecessors, and which are clearly seen to have been made on reasonable grounds, ought to be confirmed and given perpetual force, following closely in the footsteps of the venerable Pope Adrian, and as we now await the successful fulfilment of your wishes, we confirm and ratify his concession regarding the granting to you of dominion over the kingdom of Ireland, saving only the yearly tax of one penny payable to St. Peter and the holy Roman church from each household in Ireland just as it is in England. This we do in order that, once the vile
terre illius spurciciis, barbara nacio, que 
Christiano censetur nomine, vestra 
diligencia morum induat venustatem, et 
redacta in formam hactenus informi 
finium illorum ecclesia, gens ea per vos 
Christiane professionis nomen cum 
effectu de cetero consequatur.

practices of that land have been stamped out, this 
barbarous nation, Christian only in name, may by 
your diligent efforts take on a new comeliness in 
the sphere of morals, and that after the church of 
that land, hitherto undisciplined, has been reduced 
to order, thanks to your efforts that race may in the 
future really earn the name of Christian which they 
own profess.
Appendix C

Alexander III’s three letters. One to the prelates of Ireland, one to Henry II of England, and one to the Irish princes. For synopses of these letters see Henry Orpen Goddard, *Ireland Under the Normans 1169-1216*, vol. 1, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), http://hdl.handle.net/2027/bc.arl./:13960/t7qn8fb72. 302-304


To the Irish Prelates

Alexander episcopus servus servorum Dei venerabilis fratribus Christiano Lesmorensi episcopo apostolice sedis legato, et Gelasio Ardmachensi, Donato Cassiliensi, Laurentio Dublinensi et Catholico Tuamensi archiepiscopis et eorum suffraganeis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Quantis vitiorum enormitatibus gens Hibernica sit infecta et quomodo, Dei timore et Christiane fidei religione postposita, ea sequatur que pericula parium animarum ex vestrarum serie litterarum nobis innotuit et aliorum etiam veridica relatione nichilominus ad noticiam apostolice sed plerumque pervenit. Inde est utique quod nos ex vestris litteris intelligentes quod per potentiam karissimi in Christo filii nostri Henrici illustris Anglorum regis qui divina inspiratione compunctus coadunatis viribus suis gentem illam barbaram, incultam et divine legis ignaram suo dominio subiuagavit, ea que in terra vestra tam illicite committuntur, cooperante Domino, incipiunt iam desistere gaudio gavisi sumus et ei qui iamdicto regi tantam victoriam contulit et triumphum inmensas gratiarum actiones exsolvimus, prece supplici postulantes ut per vigilanciam et sollicitudinem ipsius regis vestro cooperante studio gens illa indisciplinata et indomita cultum divine legis et religionem Christiane fidei per omnia et in omnibus imitetur et vos ac ceteri ecclesiastici viri honore et tranquillitate debita gaudeatis. Quoniam igitur decet vos ad ea prosequenda que tam pio sunt inchoata principio sollicitam adhibere diligentiam et
favorem, fraternitati vestre per apostolica scripta mandamus atque precipimus quantinus
memorato regi sicut viro magnifico et devotissimo ecclesie filio, ad manutenendam et
conservandum terram illam et ad extirpandam inde tante abhominationis spuricitiam quantum,
salvo vestro ordine et officio, poteritis diligenter et viriliter assistatis. Et si quis regum,
principum vel aliorum hominum ipsius terre contra iuramenti debitum et fidelitatem predicto regi
exbitam ausu temerario venire temptaverit, si ad commonitionem vestram celeriter sicut debet
non resipuerit, eum auctoritate apostolica freti omni occasione et excusatione postposita censure
ecclesiastica percellatis. Ita mandatum nostrum diligenter et efficaciter executuri ut sicut prefatus
rex tanquam catholicus et christianissimus princeps vos tam in decimis quam in aliis
ecclesiasticis iusticiis vobis restituendis et in omnibus que ad ecclesiasticam pertinente liberatem
pie ac benigne dicitur exaudisse ita etiam vos sibi ea que ad regiam respiciunt dignitatem
conservetis firmiter et quantum in vobis est faciatis ab aliis conservari.
Datum Tusculani xii kalendas octobris.

To King Henry II of England

Alexander episcopus servus servorum Dei karissimo in Christo filio Henrico illustri
Anglorum regi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Celebri fama et veridica relatione plurimum non sine multa mentis alacritate comperimus
quomodo sicut pius rex magnificus princeps de gente illa Hybernica que divino timore postposito
tanquam effrenis passim per abrupta deviat vitiorum et christianae fidei religionem abicit et
virtutis et se interimit muta cede et de regno illo quod Romani principes orbis triumphatores suis
temporibus in accessum, sicut accepimus, reliquerunt,faciente Domino cuius intuitu, sicut
indubitanter credimus, adversus ipsam gentem incultam et indisciplinam, potenciam tue
serenitatis extenderas mirabiliter ac magnifice triumphasti. Nam ut alias enormitates et vicia
quibus eadem gens omissa religione christianae fidei satis irreverenter deservit presentialiter omittamus, sicut venerabiles fratres nostri Christianus Lesmoriensis episcopus apostolice sedis legatus, archiepiscopi et episcopi terre suis nobis litteris intimarunt, dilectus filius noster Radulfus Landavensis archidiaconus, vir prudens et discretuset regie magnitudini vinculo precipe devotionis stricteus qui hoc oculata fide perspexit, viva nobis voce tam sollicitie quam prudenter exposuit, predicta gens sicut forte plenus ad noticiam regie serenitatis pervenit novercas suas publice introducunt et ex eis non erubescunt filios procreare, frater uxorem fratris eo vivente abutitur, unus duabus se sororibus concubinis inmiscet et plerique illorum, matre relictis, filias introducunt; et omnes passim in quadragesima vescuntur carnibus nec solvunt decimas nec sacras Dei ecclesias et personas ecclesiasticas prout debent aliquatenu reverentur. Unde quod sicut eisdem archiepiscopis et episcopis significantibus et prefato archidiacono plenus et expressus nobis referente concomerimus, coadunato magnifico tuo navali et terrestri exercitu ad subiugandam tuo dominio gentem illam et ad extirpandam tante abominationis spurcitiam, divina inspirante clementia, tuum animum erexisti gratum sicut debemus gerimus omnimodis et acceptum et exinde ei a quo omne bonum procedit et qui pios fidelium suorum actus et voluntates in suo beneplacito salutis disponit, devotas graciaram referimus actiones, omnipotentem Dominum voti viis precibus exorantes ut sicut per potentiam tuae magnitudinis ea que tam illicite in prescripta terra fiunt, incipiunt iam desistere et pro viciis virtutum germina pululare, ita etiam, cooperante Domino, per te predicta gen ad tue sempiterne gloria coronam inmarcescibilem et sue salutis profectum, abiecta spurcia peccatorum, omnimodam christianae religionis suscipiat disciplinam. Rogamus itaque regiam excellentiam tuam monemus et exhortamur in Domino, atque in remissionem tibi peccatorum iniungimus, quatenus in eo quod laudabiliter incepisti tuum propensius animum robores et confortes et gentem illam ad cultum
christiane fidei per potentiam tuam revoces et conserves ut sicut pro tuorum venia peccatorum adversus eam tantum laborem ut credimus assumpsisti, ita etiam de sue salutis profectu coronam merearis suscipere sempiternam. Et quia sicut tue magnitudinis excellentia noscit Romana ecclesia aliud ius habet in insula quam in terra magna et continua, nos eam de tue devotionis fervore speramque tenentes quod iura ipsius ecclesie non solum conservare velis sed etiam apliare et ubi nullum ius habeas debes sibi conferre, magnificentiam tuam rogamus et sollicite commonemus ut in prescripta terras iura beati Petri nobis studeas sollicite conservare et si etiam ibi non habeas tua magnitudo eadem ecclesie eadem iura constituat et assignet, ita quod exinde regie celsitudini gratias debeamus exsolvere copiosas et tu primitias tue glorie et triumphi Deo videaris offere.

Datum Thusculani xii kalendas octobris.

To the Irish Nobles

Alexander episcopus servus servorum Dei dilectis filiis nobilibus viris regibus et principibus Hybernie salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Ubi communi fama et certa relatione plurimum nobis innotuit quod vos karissimum in Christo filium nostrum Henricum regem Anglie illustrem in vestrum regem et dominum suscepistis et ei fidelitatem iuravitis tanto ampliorem leciaram in corde concepimus quanto per eiusdem regis potentiam in terra vestra, cooperante Domino, maior pax erit atque tranquillitas et gens Hybernie que per enormitatem et spurcitiam vitiorum adeo videbatur longius recessisse, divino cultui propensius informabitur et melius christianae fidei suscipiet disciplinam. Unde super eo quod tam potent et magnifico regi et tam devoto ecclesie filio vos voluntate libera subdidistis providentiam vestram digna laudis commendatione prosequimur cum exinde vobis ecclesie et toti populo illius terre utilitas speret non inmodica proventura. Monemus itaque nobilitatem
vestram attencius et mandamus quatinus fidelitatem quam tanto regi sub iuramenti religione
fecistis ei cum debita subiectione firmam et inconcussam servare curetis et ita vos sibi in
humilitate et mansuetudine exhibeatis obnoxios et devotos quod eius semper gratiam possitis
uberiorem percipere et nos inde prudentiam vestram digne debeamus commendare.
Datum Tusculani xii kalendas octobris.
Appendix D

Quick reference chart of the main scholars addressed in this paper and their stance on the Authenticity of *Laudabiliter*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Lynch</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James MacGeoghegan</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lanigan</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lingard</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Hart-Milman</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Francis Moran</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Chaillot</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiden Gasquet</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvester Malone</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Stokes</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen McCormick</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Morris</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Norgate</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Tarleton</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Thatcher</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard Henry Orpen</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Hull</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F. O’Doherty</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Sheehy</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Martin &amp; Brian Scott</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Duggan</td>
<td>2003/2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maeve Brigid Callan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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