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## A Comparative Study of Pepys 2314 and UVic Brown.Lat.1: Poetry and Matrilineage in a Fifteenth-Century English Genealogical Roll

## I. Introduction

Held in University of Victoria's Special Collections and University Archives, MS Brown Lat. 1 is a twenty-one-foot, late fifteenth-century genealogical roll of English kings on nine membranes of parchment. ${ }^{1}$ Written in Latin (with one instance of English), the roll includes seven vertical text columns. The columns work chronologically from the Christianization of England and mark the succession of the Christian year ("Anni a Nativitate Christi"), Popes ("Romani pontifices"), Archbishops of Canterbury ("Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis"), and the years from the conversion of England ("Anni Christianitatis Anglie"), as well as Sunday Letters ("Littere Dominicales") and Golden Numbers (here called "Numeri primacionum") to allow calculation of Sundays and Easter for each year. Significant historical events are also recorded in the text columns, especially in the central and largest column, which records the kings of England following the Kentish line ("Reges Kancie"), under the following header:

Hii successere tibi Reges Anglia uere
Primo Christicala gaudebat Kancia sola
Huc Augustine tibi laus resonat sine fine.

[^0]These English Kings have rightly followed you (Christian Kent first rejoiced alone). To this point, Augustine, your praise resounds without end. ${ }^{2}$

As is clear from this header, as well as the column recording Archbishops of Canterbury, the Victoria roll is associated with Kent and specifically with St Augustine's Abbey in Canterbury.

This association can also be corroborated by related manuscripts that provide further information about the roll's likely origins.

A link between Victoria's MS.Brown.Lat. 1 and a genealogical roll held at Cambridge University, Magdalen College, Pepys Library MS 2314 (ca. 1450) was first noted by Dr. Adrienne Williams Boyarin at the University of Victoria in the spring of 2015. ${ }^{3}$ The first catalogue entry for Pepys 2314, written by M. R. James in 1923 for Bibliotheca Pepysiana: Part III: Mediaeval Manuscripts (84), further allowed a connection between Pepys 2314 and Thomas of Elmham's Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis (Cambridge University, Trinity

Hall MS 1, ca. 1414-1418), which includes Elmham's very similar genealogical table as prologue to its chronicle. ${ }^{4}$ When James was at work on his catalogue of Pepys Library's medieval holdings, he had just completed his catalogue of Trinity Hall manuscripts and was thus in a unique position to notice similarities between Pepys 2314 and Trinity Hall MS 1:

[^1]The note for the year 822 [in Pepys 2314] betrays a connexion with St. Augustine's abbey. And, in fact, a comparison of this roll with the similar table prefixed to Thomas of Elmham's unfinished History of the Abbey of St. Augustine ... shows that the roll is not independent of that work. The method of reckoning by years of St. Augustine is common to both. Various notes, e.g. that on Pope Joan, agree word for word; and some small events, e.g. the siege of Leeds Castle (Kent) in 1320, are recorded in both. Moreover the fact that Thomas of Elmham became a Cluniac accounts for the mention of the Cluniacs and of Lewes, which was their first home in England. The general style of writing closely resembles that of the manuscript of Elmham at Trinity Hall. ${ }^{5}$

James' argument was that Pepys 2314 was created using Elmham's work as an exemplar for its column structure and its early historical records. The Pepys roll, however, continues after Elmham's work ends and includes expanded later historical material that is not present in Trinity Hall MS 1, so it cannot be an exact copy of Elmham's table. The Victoria roll appears to be one manuscript generation out from this relationship: it copies the Pepys roll, which in turn used the Elmham table as template.

With my own work in situ at Cambridge, the connection between these three manuscripts has been confirmed. Pepys 2314 has the same columns in the same order as the Victoria roll, and it seems likely that the slightly later Victoria roll has been copied from Pepys 2314, which

[^2]displays an earlier script and decorative style. Aside from minor divergences, which may simply be the result of copying errors and additions, ${ }^{6}$ the two rolls are nearly identical. While Pepys roll continues its dating system until 1550, and MS Brown Lat. 1 continues only until 1472, the textual content varies little. The last historical-event entry on both rolls is the death of the John of Lancaster, $1^{\text {st }}$ Duke of Bedford in $1435,{ }^{7}$ and, in general, the text entries on both rolls, as James also claimed for the connection between the Pepys roll and Elmham manuscript, "agree word for word" (85). For one simple example, a note beginning at the year 1282 records the recovery of King Arthur's crown: in Pepys 2314 (the earlier manuscript), it reads "Corona regis arthuri inuenta est que apud wall' magno honore fuit et domini regi oblata," and in MS Brown Lat. 1 "Corona Regis Arthuri inuent' est qui apud wall' magno honore fuit et Domino Regi oblata." MS Brown Lat. 1 replicates PL 2314's language but miscopies or miswrites an abbreviation (qui instead of que) and varies miniscule and majuscule letters. Such changes are likely the result of different copying dates, scripts, and spacing. The script of Victoria roll, for instance, begins in a laboured Gothic, which may be an attempt to imitate the practiced Gothic bookhand of the Pepys 2314, but it quickly gives way to a Humanistic script that is more consistent with its later date.

Having completed a preliminary transcription of Victoria's MS Brown Lat. 1 (see
Appendix 2) and explored Pepys 2314 in person for the sake of comparison between the two genealogical rolls, I can state definitively that Brown.Lat. 1 is a copy of Pepys 2314 and that both manuscripts, thus, share a connection to Thomas of Elmham's work in Trinity Hall MS 1. This project aims to outline salient comparative elements of the Pepys and Victoria rolls-both the

[^3]similarities and differences-so that their relationship and the ways in which MS Brown.Lat. 1 is unique might be better understood. To this end, in the following sections, I will discuss MS Brown.Lat.1's distinct emphasis on English kings, its embedded poetry, and its unique interest in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Yorkist lineages.

## II. Of Kings and Poetry: MS Brown.Lat.1's Emphasis on Kings

As M.R. James argues, "the main subject of the [Pepys] roll is the succession of the Archbishops of Canterbury," while Elmham's table in Trinity Hall MS 1 accords equal attention to the popes, the kings of England, and the Archbishops of Canterbury. ${ }^{8}$ James's point about Pepys 2314 concerns detail rather than display: the textual content and the dating method (history begins with the archbishopric of Augustine) emphasizes the role of archbishops and of Canterbury in English history. While Victoria's MS.Brown.Lat. 1 shares much of this content, its textual and spatial focus, by contrast, is clearly kings.


Figure 1: Detail of folio $2 r$ of Trinity Hall MS 1.

[^4]

Figure 2: The beginning of Pepys 2314, now bound as a codex. The column headings are not original and were reconstructed in modern conservation efforts. The Victoria roll supplies the original headings.


Figure 3: The beginning of UVic's MS Brown.Lat.1.

As these images show (Figures 1-3), Elmham's table, never conceived of as a roll, contains no lines visually connecting English kings to their genealogies and includes more textual information (in black ink) on significant grants of rights to St. Augustine's Abbey; in the Pepys roll, more similar to the Victoria roll, the column tracing the lineage of the kings is the largest, to accommodate illuminated crowns and the more complex genealogical connections in later centuries, but is much narrower than the matching central column in MS Brown.Lat.1. While the Victoria roll mirrors Pepys in its column arrangement and length (both are almost exactly
twenty-one-feet long), the most noticeable difference between the two is the lack of illuminated crowns and the significantly increased width of MS.Brown.Lat.1. The Victoria roll is nearly twice as wide— 43.2 cm versus 21.8 cm respectively—but it allots almost all of this increased size to the central column that traces the lineage of the English kings. The other columns remain more or less the size they are in Pepys 2314. MS Brown.Lat.1, in other words, focuses on royal lineage in a way that its related manuscripts do not, and its layout suggest that it was intentionally structured to achieve this distinction.

While Pepys 2314 is more formally decorative in its representation of royal lineage, with a unique illuminated gold-leaf crown set above each king or deposed king's name, set on a double-lined red circle, the size of the column does not overpower other information. While Brown.Lat. 1 marks kings only textually, with names and red-ink couplets, there is enough space above kings' names that further embellishment might have been planned. I think, however, that the Victoria roll's kings were intended to be read instead of seen. The visual emphasis in Brown.Lat. 1 is on lineage (with red circles around the children, grandchildren, and greatgrandchildren of crowned kings) rather than on the kings themselves. Where the kings are concerned, the text about them is more important than their crowns.

Both the Pepys roll and the Victoria roll include poetry that is not present in Elmhelm's table: underneath the name of each king is a couplet that briefly summarizes his reign. When these couplets are read together (see Appendix 1), they form a complete long poem in rhyming Latin couplets that memorialize the kings of England. This embedded poem does not appear to be unique to Pepys 2314 and MS.Brown.Lat.1. Other medieval manuscripts survive which include similar poems in rhymed couplets: at least one has a fourteen-line version of the same poem (that is, the same content but much abridged from the embedded poem in these rolls,
beginning with Alfred), which was apparently used to assist in remembering the order of succession of English kings and was once attributed to Matthew Parker (Archbishop of Canterbury $1563-1575) .{ }^{9}$ The larger poem embedded in the rolls is relatively simple: each king has a couplet that remarks on an important aspect of his reign. For most, the couplets refer to significant wars they fought, civil unrest that plagued their reigns, or legal precedent they instituted. In some cases, their good or bad character is noted. In the case of Alfred the Great, his legendary founding of the University of Oxford is memorialized: "Oxoniis flores / Alured fert iste priores" (Alfred brought forth the first flowers of Oxford). ${ }^{10}$ While this poem may be original to the Pepys roll, it is given much more prominence in the Victoria roll, once again suggesting that the Victoria roll is an object meant to be read closely. With this emphasis on text over visual representation, the Victoria roll begins to create a narrative of kingship, which develops further as readers continue through the line of succession.

The Victoria roll has one notable textual addition that is missing from both Pepys 2314 and Trinity Hall MS 1: a seven-line poem dedicated to Alfred the Great (d. 899), which follows immediately upon the couplet memorializing of his founding of Oxford and thus visually appears as an eight-line epitaph in the central column, between the roll's calendar years of 874 and 881 , with the rubricated first line "Oxoniis flores Alured fert iste priores," as follows:

[^5]Oxoniis flores Alured fert iste priores.
Nobilitas innata tibi probitatis honorem,
Armipotens Alurede, dedit probitasque laborem
Perpetumque labor nomenem; mixta dolori
Gaudia semper erant, spes semper, mixta timori.
Si modo victus cras in crastino bella parabas.
Iam post transfactos regni viteque labores,
Christus et si[nt] vera quies sceptrumque perhenne.

Alfred brought forth the first flowers of Oxford. Innate nobility, valiant Alfred, gave you the honour of valour and valour [gave you] toil [and] toil an everlasting name; joys were ever mixed with sorrow, hope ever mixed with fear. If at one moment the victor, the next morning you readied for battle. Now, after having done the labour of realm and life, may Christ and true rest be your eternal sceptre.

The seven lines that are unique to MS Brown.Lat. 1 are likely copied from another unknown exemplar. Versions of the same poem can be found elsewhere. The first four lines appear in Asser's Life of King Alfred (written 893). Although Asser's original work was lost in the 1731 Ashburnham House fire that destroyed many of Sir Robert Cotton's books, the text of the Life survives in an edition by Matthew Parker printed in $1574 .{ }^{11}$ As Parker was Archbishop of Canterbury, his use of Asser's text indicates another Canterbury connection for the Victoria roll.

[^6]In addition, Parker's manuscript copy of his Asser edition was bequeathed to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, upon his death—a provenance likely related to Parker's time as master of Corpus Christi College and Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University. ${ }^{12}$ Scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries knew a fourteen-line version of the same epitaph (including the Victoria roll's seven lines but interspersing seven more), but there is no evidence that they knew the original source: by 1876, G.E. Watson wrote only that it was "from an old black-letter history of England." ${ }^{13}$ In any case, it is clear that some variation of the Victoria roll's Alfred poem was circulating as early as when Asser wrote his Life of King Alfred and that inclusion of it mattered to the copyist of the Victoria roll.

The Alfred poem, as it exists in Brown.Lat.1, combined with the Oxford couplet that also exists in Pepys 2314, emphatically celebrates one of the great kings of England as both a patron of scholars and an embattled military leader. Alfred's reign featured "mixta dolori / Gaudia semper ... spes semper, mixta timori" (joys ever mixed with sorrow, hope ever mixed with fear). Particularly relevant to the Victoria roll's treatment of royal power and lineage, Alfred is a king who constantly "toils" for his throne and realm: the short poem uses forms of the noun "labour" (toil, labour, struggle) three times and contrasts this with the "quies" (repose, rest) that Alfred finally experiences in death. This notion of labouring for kingship and toiling in battle, and the highlighting of Alfred the Great as a model king, aligns with an interest in the many civil wars of England evident elsewhere in MS Brown.Lat.1.

[^7]Simon Keynes has argued that King Alfred was considered "prototypically British" from at least the late-medieval period: "Beset throughout his reign with the reality or threat of Viking invasions, Alfred battled fiercely and suffered heroically in leading his people to their eventual victory; at the same time he promoted the causes of religion and learning, and by the example of his government [he] upheld truth, justice and the Anglo-Saxon way." ${ }^{14}$ This image of Alfred as an ideal Anglo-Saxon king is exactly what led Matthew Parker to produce his edition of The Life of King Alfred: the first Archbishop of Canterbury during Elizabeth I's reign, Parker wanted "to locate the Elizabethan church in a laudable, historical tradition," and this led to his "sustained study of Anglo-Saxon[s]." ${ }^{15}$ Thus, King Alfred's narrative became a propagandistic tool for Elizabethan antiquarians, grounding both the early Church of England and Elizabeth I's reign in an idealized Anglo-Saxon past. The Alfred poem in Brown.Lat. 1 serves a similar purpose; it links the great Anglo-Saxon king's royal descendants of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to his deep (and romanticized) warrior-scholar model.

By placing its emphasis on text, as opposed to illuminated images or intrusive decoration, the Victoria roll thus creates a narrative of English kingship that is absent from its related manuscripts. In this sense, the Victoria roll instructs its readers on both good and poor kingship, lauding Alfred's accomplishments in the seven-line poem, for instance, but simultaneously critiquing the bad character of other kings mentioned in the larger embedded rhymed-couplet poem. These poems allow readers to interpret kingship for themselves, while reflecting on a narrative history of the English throne. Combined with the Victoria roll's emphasis on genealogy, the poems serve a propagandistic function-though different from Parker's propaganda-which is continued through the roll's later interest in Yorkist lineages. As the roll

[^8]moves into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it becomes clear that it places a unique emphasis on matrilineal inheritance, as will be discussed in detail in the next section. To understand the importance the inclusion of the Alfred poem in this context, it is crucial to realize that any descendants of Alfred, following Edmund Ironside (i.e., Alfred's last direct male descendent), had to trace their heritage through Matilda of Scotland, ${ }^{16}$ the wife of King Henry I and mother of Empress Matilda.

## III. MS Brown.Lat.1, Wars of the Roses, and the Yorkist Claim

MS Brown.Lat. 1 displays a unique interest in specific branches of the late-medieval and early modern royal family tree. This special interest is marked not only by the textual emphasis noted above, but also by visual emphasis on particular genealogical lines. Unlike its counterpart in Pepys Library MS 2314, Brown.Lat. 1 connects certain family members and royal generations with thick green crayon lines that are markedly distinct from the thin red ink ones used to connect others. While Pepys 2314 does also track specific persons of interest-with thin blue ink lines similar to its thin red ink ones-they begin earlier than the green lines in Brown.Lat. 1 (at 1084 as opposed to 1100) and follow a consistent pattern: they record marriages between different branches of the royal family. ${ }^{17}$ This is certainly not the case with Brown.Lat.1, where the meaning of the lines is not as immediately clear. More often than not the green lines connect parents to children, and they are few and far between until the early fourteenth century, where they suddenly become common and seem to indicate special interest in specific branches leading up to the era of the Wars of the Roses (see Figures 4 and 5 just below).

[^9]

Figure 4 and 5: A side-by-side comparison of Pepys 2314 and Brown.Lat. 1 for the years 1230-1305. In Pepys 2314, blue ink lines mark royal marriages. In Brown.Lat.1, green crayon lines mark persons and lineages of interest. Brown.Lat.1's increased notation of children and grandchildren is also visible (in circles).

A complete catalogue of the Victoria roll's green crayon lines is as follows:
A. 1100-1154: line connecting Empress Matilda, daughter of Henry I, to her son Henry II, skipping over King Stephen and his heirs.
B. 1216-1272: line connecting Henry III to his son Edward I, bypassing other children and grandchildren of Henry III.
C. 1246-1361: line connecting Eleanor of Lancaster to her son Richard, $4^{\text {th }}$ Earl of Arundel (cf. Line I).
D. 1250-1341: line connecting Elizabeth de Burgh ("Alienora" in MS Brown.Lat.1), $4^{\text {th }}$ Countess of Ulster, to her husband Lionel of Antwerp, son of Edward III.
E. 1287-1306: line connecting Elizabeth of Rhuddlan, youngest daughter of Edward I, to all seven of her included children: John, Margaret, William, Eleanor, Edward, Eneas, and Humphrey (all de Bohun, cf. Line I).
F. 1313-1326: line connecting King Philip IV of France to his daughter, Isabella, Queen of England (married to Edward II).
G. 1331-1377: line connecting Edward the Black Prince to his son Richard II.
H. 1349-1368: line connecting Richard of Conisburgh, son of Edmund of Langley, $1^{\text {st }}$ Duke of York, to his wife Anne Mortimer.
I. 1376-1413: line connecting Mary de Bohun, wife of Henry IV and granddaughter of Eleanor of Lancaster, to her son Henry V (cf. Lines C and E).

Five of the nine green crayon lines are dedicated to tracing the Yorkist claim to English throne, and seven of the nine show precedent for inheritance of the throne through the matrilineal line, an argument used to support the Yorkist claim during the opening years of the Wars of the Roses, when Edward IV claimed the crown by tracing his lineage to Lionel of Antwerp, son of Edward III: "Lionel was married to Elizabeth de Burgh, the daughter and sole heir of the deceased William de Burgh, third earl of Ulster. The marriage was consummated in 1352 and produced only one recorded child, Philippa Lionel, who married Edmund (III) Mortimer, earl of March: the house of York descended from this union." ${ }^{18}$ The marriage of Lionel and Elizabeth (who is referred to as "Alienora," or Eleanor, in MS Brown.Lat.1) is highlighted by green Line

[^10]D, and green Line C implicitly also highlights this connection to Edmund Mortimer, because the son of Eleanor of Lancaster, Richard (IV) Arundel, married Phillipa Mortimer, Edmund's daughter. Furthering this emphasis on Yorkist lineage, green Line H connects Richard of Conisburgh, son of Edmund of Langely, Duke of York, to his wife Anne Mortimer: Richard and Anne were the grandparents of Edward IV and Richard III, the two York kings of England. ${ }^{19}$ Anne Mortimer, moreover, was the descendent of Philippa Mortimer (Lionel of Antwerp's daughter), suggesting that the Victoria roll's green lines are working together to illustrate Yorkist claims the throne as passed matrilineally through Philippa and Anne. ${ }^{20}$

It was certainly not unheard of for inheritance to be traced through a matrilineal line, as MS Brown.Lat. 1 demonstrates throughout. This pattern begins with green Line A, which marks the conflict over succession between Empress Matilda and King Stephen by connecting Matilda to her son Henry II and emphatically bypassing Stephen and his heirs. Henry II inherited the English throne through his mother's royal blood, political power, and her participation in a protracted civil war. ${ }^{21}$ Henry I had publicly declared that he expected his daughter Matilda to inherit his throne: "Henry I wished to secure the succession to England and Normandy in his own line by recognizing her [Matilda] as his heir. She crossed the channel to England in 1126, and in January 1127 he obtained oaths of allegiance to her from all the bishops and magnates present at his Christmas court. ${ }^{" 22}$ However, when Henry I died in December 1135, Matilda was at her husband's lands in Anjou, ${ }^{23}$ giving her cousin Stephen, a nephew of Henry I, opportunity to stake his own claim. The lengthy civil war that followed did not end until Stephen declared

[^11]Matilda's son his heir. ${ }^{24}$ MS Brown.Lat. 1 alludes to this conflict in the Latin couplet that accompanies Stephen's name and by emphatically bypassing him with the first green crayon line: "Hic Stephano strictum / sit iter de iure relictum," that is, "Here the straight way of the law was abandoned by Stephen." As the Victoria roll makes clear, Henry II lawfully ascended to the throne in 1154, finally claiming his mother's inheritance. ${ }^{25}$

As the green crayon lines become more frequent in Brown.Lat.1, this focus on the rights entailed in matrilineal inheritance continues. For instance, Line E connects Elizabeth of Rhuddlan, daughter of Edward I, to all of her de Bohun children without any inclusion of their father Humphrey de Bohun, $4^{\text {th }}$ Earl of Hereford, and Line F highlights Elizabeth's sister-in-law Isabella of France, daughter of Phillip IV of France, and the wife of Edward II and mother of Edward III. It was through this Isabella that Edward III of England eventually declared himself the rightful heir to the French throne and thus began the Hundred Years' War. ${ }^{26}$ Like Matilda, Isabella began a civil war (known as the Despenser War, 1321-1322) to place her son on the throne of England. ${ }^{27}$ In this instance, Isabella was fighting to dethrone her own husband, Edward II, but nonetheless the Victoria roll's emphasis remains on her inheritance and connections to both the English and French thrones. ${ }^{28}$ Brown.Lat.1's focus on the de Bohun family shows similar concerns: green Line E and I connect women to de Bohun inheritance, first through Eleanor of Lancaster's marriage and children (as mentioned) and then through Mary de Bohun, granddaughter of Eleanor of Lancaster, wife of Henry IV, and mother of Henry V. Mary de Bohun was co-heir, along with her sister Eleanor de Bohun, to the de Bohun fortune and thus

[^12]brought considerable benefits to her husband Henry IV, who was not clearly in line to be king at the time of their marriage. ${ }^{29}$ Collectively, these cases seem to highlight precedent for any matrilineal claim to power.

Such a precedent would have served the interest of Yorkists in the time that the Victoria roll was probably created. As noted above, green Lines D and H support Yorkist claims by tracing the Clarence and Mortimer lines through Elizabeth de Burgh's marriage to Lionel of Antwerp, Duke of Clarence, and through Anne Mortimer's marriage to Richard of Conisburgh. It was through these two marriages that the House of York would claim their right to the throne: "York [i.e., Richard, $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Duke of York and son of Anne Mortimer and Richard of Consiburgh] in 1460 asserted rights transmitted via both his great-grandmother Philippa of Clarence [i.e., the daughter of Elizabeth de Burgh and Lionel of Antwerp], and his mother Anne Mortimer." ${ }^{" 30}$ When Edward IV later claimed the throne of England, he in turn argued "that back in 1399 the new king should have been Edmund Mortimer, the grandson of Edward III's second son Lionel [of Antwerp], Duke of Clarence (d. 1368), to whom the Crown 'by law and conscience belonged', and from whom it should have passed to the house of York. ${ }^{31}$ A toddler at the time of Edward III's death, Edmund Mortimer was the true heir under primogeniture, but was too young to assert his own claim, "thus retaining his head."32 According to Michael Hicks, "selfpreservation ... may [also] explain why Richard, Duke of York, Edmund's nephew and heir, had sported the arms and livery only of York and not of Clarence until 1460." ${ }^{33}$ Based on these

[^13]connections, highlighted by the thick green lines in Brown Lat.1, it appears that our Victoria roll has a strong interest in Yorkist lineage and claims at the opening years of the Wars of the Roses, set alongside precedents for such claims. Given the possible range dates for the creation of the roll-as mentioned above, between 1435 and 1472 but, in relation to Pepys 2314, likely after 1450 -these emphases suggest an origin date close to the opening years of the Wars of the Roses (which spanned roughly 1455-1487). Indeed, it was not until 1460, right in the middle of the possible date range for the Victoria roll, that Richard, $3^{\text {rd }}$ Duke of York and son of Anne Mortimer, "overtly challenged the Lancastrian right to rule and claimed the throne for his own line. ${ }^{34}$ The Victoria roll was most likely produced around 1460 , in precisely this political climate.

It is also telling, from this perspective, that the final significant historical event recorded on the roll is the death of the John, Duke of Bedford, in 1435. Hicks identifies the year 1435 as the beginning of many years of concern over the line of inheritance:

Although Henry V had three brothers, each died without legitimate offspring to carry forward their claims: Thomas, Duke of Clarence in 1421; John, Duke of Bedford in 1435; and in 1447 Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. From 1435 to 1447 only Henry V's son Henry VI and his uncle Gloucester survived of the male line of Lancaster ... When Gloucester died in 1447, there remained only the king to continue the Lancastrian line. Who was to succeed Henry VI was therefore a pressing issue from at least 1435 onwards. ${ }^{35}$

[^14]Following the death of Bedford, around the time of the Victoria roll's creation ca. 1460, the future of the English throne was less certain than it had been in centuries. Brown Lat. 1 does not record any historical event after 1435, even though its Christian year column continues to 1472 , and thus the roll finishes its entries well before Edward IV ascended to the throne in 1461 and began the relatively brief rule of the House of York over England. Edward IV's absence suggests that the creation date of the Victoria roll is most likely 1460-1461, after the Yorkist claims but before certain Yorkist victory. ${ }^{36}$

That the roll so clearly traces both sides of the matrilineal Yorkist claim to the thronethat is, through Elizabeth de Burgh (also known as Elizabeth of Clarence through her marriage to Lionel of Antwerp, Duke of Clarence) and through Anne Mortimer-cannot be mere coincidence. Material features of the roll as it currently survives, in fact, substantiate the importance of this aspect of the roll's history: the section that features the green lines highlighting these two matrilineal claims (membranes 7-8) shows use-related wear that is nowhere else evident. It is possible that this particular section was kept on display, which accounts for the increased damage and notable discolouration of these membranes.

[^15]

Figure 6: This image shows where Brown.Lat.1's use-related damage begins, coinciding with an increase in the green crayon lines. See also figure 4, which shows a cleaner section of the roll immediately preceding this one.

This evidence puts University of Victoria's MS.Brown.Lat. 1 in the company of other such rolls that were created around the same time and were interested in the matrilineal claims of the House of York. Osbern Bokenham's "Clare Roll" is one example, the text of which was preserved by Sir William Dugdale in his Monasticon. ${ }^{37}$ Bokenham (d. ca. 1464), an Augustinian friar at Stoke by Clare in Suffolk, has a number of Yorkist writings attributed to him. ${ }^{38}$ Similar to the embedded poem in Pepys 2314 and Brown.Lat.1, Bokenham's "roll" was a genealogical poem and covered many of the same Yorkist figures that the Victoria roll emphasizes, including Elizabeth de Burgh's marriage to "Kyng Edwardis son the third... Sir Lyonel." ${ }^{39}$ The poem also describes Philippa's marriage into the Mortimer family:

Lefe he ony frute, this Prince mighty?-
Sir, yea, a doughtir, and Philipp she hight;
Whom sir Edmond Mortymer weddid, truly,
Firste erle of the Marche, a manly knight. ${ }^{40}$

Bokenham's relationship with his patron, Richard, $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ Duke of York, and his consequent desire to support the York claim, has been well established by scholars in recent years. ${ }^{41}$ Hicks even suggests that such rolls were particularly important in the early years of the civil war, as they narratively and visually served as a reminder of York lineage: "In the highly unlikely eventuality

[^16]that York [himself] was unaware of this distinguished ancestry, the Clare Roll prepared c. 1455 by Osbert Bokenham would have reminded him. ${ }^{42}$ Bokenham's roll, like the Victoria one, puts heavy emphasis on matrilineage: "As a Yorkist sympathizer, Bokenham had political motives in favouring matrilineage ... York's claim to the throne passed through Phillipa, daughter of Lionel of Clarence [i.e., of Antwerp] and was contested by the Lancastrians on the grounds of the patrilineal principle of primogeniture. ${ }^{" 43}$ Moreover, this focus returns us to the very beginning of Plantagenet rule, with Henry II and his mother the Empress Matilda, an association that the Yorkists (and the Victoria roll) encouraged:

The surname Plantagenet first used by Richard, Duke of York, was coined from Henry II's badge of the yellow broom (planta genesta). It was a reminder to contemporaries that Henry II himself had derived his own claim from his mother Empress Matilda: even if unable to reign, a woman had transmitted her title to her son. ${ }^{44}$

By highlighting these instances of matrilineage and the Yorkist argument for it, the Victoria roll joins Bokenham's Clare Roll in its propagandistic functions. It is worth noting that Brown.Lat.1's likely exemplar, Pepys MS 2314, does not display a similar interest in the House of York and uses its blue lines only to record marriages throughout the roll. Neither does Pepys 2314 emphasize Empress Matilda's relationship to her son Henry II: there is no blue line connecting mother to son and no bypassing of King Stephen in the Pepys roll. Despite their clear relationship, then, these two rolls were produced with different interests and goals in mind. The Victoria roll highlights civil war, complex issues of matrilineage and good kingship, and the

[^17]Yorkist claim to the throne of England at a specific moment in history, while the Pepys roll records royal genealogies and historical events without further interpretation.

## IV. Findings and Conclusions

Victoria, McPherson Library MS Brown Lat. 1 very clearly has a close association with both Cambridge, Magdalen College, Pepys Library MS 2314 and Cambridge, Trinity Hall MS 1 (Thomas Elmham's history of St Augustine's Abbey). Where Trinity Hall MS 1 is centred around Canterbury and its religious institutions, Pepys 2314 expands upon the Elmham manuscript, as M.R. James first noted, to include more contemporary historical events and additional details about royal lineage. MS Brown Lat. 1 takes this evolution one step further by making royal genealogy its primary focus through a series of distinctions and additions that emphasize a particular version of English heritage. The Victoria roll places emphasis on a textual narrative of kingship that is not present in its related manuscripts through the inclusion of both the embedded rhymed-couplet poem (Appendix 1), which is present in Pepys 2314, and the seven-line King Alfred poem, which is not in Pepys 2314 or Trinity Hall MS 1 and is unique to Brown.Lat.1. While Brown.Lat.1's exemplar (Pepys 2314) contains striking visual elements, such as illuminated crowns, the Victoria roll is clearly an object that is meant to be read closely. Its format reflects the roll's intended use: it makes a Yorkist argument for English royal lineage, and the green crayon lines that make this argument are not immediately be obvious without reader interpretation. However, by heavily foregrounding kingship, civil wars, and matrilineal inheritance, the Victoria roll created a narrative case for the Yorkist claim to the English thrown in the opening years of the Wars of the Roses, and highlights the women who made it possible.

## Appendix 1:

## A Genealogical Poem on English Kings in Rhymed Couplets, as Embedded in Victoria, McPherson Library, MS Brown Lat. 1

Rex Ethelbertus primus : stat honore repertus.
Edbaldi Regis : violencia fit via legis.
Rex Ercombertus : regni fit predo repertus.
Egbertus pressit : heredes hinc male cessit.

Lothario Regi : claret via consona legi.
Edrici iura : Cadwalla tulit nece dura.

Morti Mulo datur : Dorobernia quo gratulatur.
Wythredo proceres : gaudent et tercius heres.
Edberti Regis : patris assunt comoda legis.
Ius Ethelberto : floret diademate certo.
Alrici cura : fuit regno caritura.
Mors notat Alrici : qui tres regnant inimici:
Ethebert Cuthred : pulsus certamine Balthred.
Hic Westsaxonicus Rex Egbertus memoretur:
Qui regnum Britonum dat ut Anglia iure vocetur.
Ethelwlphus prestat : Christo bona que manifestat.
Ethelbald florem : retinens fratri dat bonorem.
Ethelbert cedit : fidei meritis et obedit.

Vis Ethelredi : Danos dat turbine cedi.

Oxoniis flores : Alured fert iste priores.

Edwardus primus : Christo fit cultor optimus.
Paret Ethelstano : regnum diademate sano.
Edmundo cedit : lex quem latro nece cedit.
Gignacium fecit : Edredus nana reiecit.
Edwini cura dedit : ecclesie mala plura.
Rex pius Edgarus : Christo stat culmine darus.
Martir hic Edwardus : regno redolet quasi nardus.
Ius Ethelredi : Swain dant prelia cedi.
Edmundus ferri : latus hic uult iure referri.

Cuncti conquestus : fuit Anglorum manifestus.
Heraldi meta : Danica fit plebe repleta.
Hardecuncti pietas : vult Edwardo dare metas.
Edward insigne : diademate petit sibi digne.
Haraldus trusor : prisci federis fit abusor.
Anglis Conquestor : Willelmus hic est tibi testor.
Willelmi memores : poterunt retinere stupores.
Henrico ciues : iubilant stat stemate diues.

Hic Stephano strictum : sit iter de iure relictum.
Henrico regimen : Thome trinit nece Luuen.
Ricardi vita : per prelia fit polimita. ${ }^{45}$
Cunctis vult annis : Anglis dolor esse Johannis.
Scisma Baronense : notat Henricumque Lewense.
${ }^{45}$ Victoria MS reads polinita; this reading is from Pepys 2314.

Edwardi cura ${ }^{46}$ : supportant Anglica iura.
Edwardi ${ }^{47}$ luctus Kanaruan : stat nece ductus.

Wyndesor Edwardi : flores pangunt leopardi.
Ricardi mores : excellunt dabsiliores.
Mucro dat Henrici quod quique ruiunt iniuria. ${ }^{48}$
Henrici cura : pater ecclesia valiltura. ${ }^{49}$
Lilia quam cicius Francorum celica dona
Rexit Parisius : fuit hinc geniata corona. ${ }^{50}$

[^18]
## Appendix 2: <br> Preliminary Transcription of Victoria, McPherson Library, MS Brown Lat. 1

Some of the transcription provided here is based on the work of previous University of Victoria students: membranes 1-3 were transcribed by Sophie Boucher, Brynn Fader, Rebekah Prette, and Molly Trepanier, in April 2015, though I have checked their work and made minor corrections; Devan Gillard made a draft transcription of membranes 4-5 in December 2018, and I have also referred to that draft-generously provided by Devan-though have not made direct use of it. The transcription of membrane $4-9$ is preliminary, and membranes $8-9$ are only partially complete, due to the extensive damage present on the roll. From Membrane 9, only the rubricated text has been included, as they were the only entries on MS Brown Lat. 1 still visible. Membranes 7-9 were completed with the assistance of Dr. Adrienne Williams Boyarin in consultation with the Pepys roll. This preliminary transcription is intended to be a basis for future work with the Pepys roll. Transcription practice generally follows Raymond Clemens and Timothy Graham, Introduction to Manuscript Studies (Ithaca, 2007), pp. 75-77, with some adjustments to account for the format and spatial representation of entries in columns. When letters are included in the double-square brackets that indicate damage, those letters are provided from Pepys MS 2314.

|  | Rom(ani) Pontifices | Hij successere tibi Reges Anglia uere Primo (christ)icala gaudebat kancia sola Huc Augustine tibi laus resonat fine sine <br> Reges kancia | Archiep(iscopi) Cantuar(iensis) |  | O <br> O <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 597. <br> 598. <br> 599. <br> 600. <br> 601. <br> 602. <br> 603. <br> 604. <br> 605. <br> 606. <br> 607. <br> 608. <br> 609. <br> 610. <br> 611. <br> 612. <br> 613. <br> 614. <br> 615. <br> 616. <br> 617. <br> 618. <br> 619. <br> 620. 621. | $\mathrm{S}($ an $) \mathrm{c}($ tus $)$ Gregorius papa $\mathrm{j}^{\text {(us) }}$ illius n(omi)n(us) sed in num(er)o paparum a $S$ (anc)to petro lxvij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ <br> Obitus Gregorii Sannitanus. <br> Bonifacius iij ${ }^{(\mathrm{us})}$ Bonifacius iiij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ <br> Deusdedit <br> Bonificius .v. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ | Ethelbertus baptizat(ur) anno regni sui xiij ${ }^{\circ}$ iiij ${ }^{\circ}$ Non(as) Iunij <br> Rex Ethelbertus primus. stat honore repertus <br> Ethel burga <br> Edbaldus <br> Ed <br> Edbaldi Regis. violencia fit via legis. <br> Ermen <br> E[[us]] redus. | Augustin(us) venit in Angliam. <br> Palliu(m) mittit(ur) au: gustino Ordinac(i)o melliti et Iusti obi tus Augustini Lau rentius. <br> Mellitus. | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 25 \end{gathered}$ |  | 9. <br> 10. <br> 11. <br> 12. <br> 13. <br> 14. <br> 15. <br> 16. <br> 17. <br> 18. <br> 19. <br> 1. <br> 2. <br> 3. <br> 4. <br> 5. <br> 6. <br> 7. <br> 8. <br> 9. <br> 10. <br> 11. <br> 12. <br> 13. <br> 14. |
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| 622. |  |  |  |  | 26 | c | 15. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 623. |  | Ethel: | Ermen |  | 27 | b | 16. |
| 624. |  | redus. | githa. | Iustus. | 28 | G | 17. |
| 625. |  |  |  |  | 29 | f | 18. |
| 626. | Honorius ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ | Ethel | Ermen |  | 30 | e | 19. |
| 627. |  |  |  |  | 31 | d | 1. |
| 628. |  |  |  |  | 32 | B | 2. |
| 629. |  |  | nena. |  | 33 | a | 3. |
| 630. |  |  |  |  | 34 | g | 4. |
| 631. |  | Mer: | Mil: |  | 35 | f | 5. |
| 632. |  | phyn: | gi: |  | 36 | D | 6. |
| 633. |  | nus. | iba. |  | 37 | c | 7. |
| 634. |  |  |  |  | 38 | b | 8. |
| 635. |  | Milbur: | Mildre: <br> da. | Honorius. | 39 | a | 9. |
| 637. | Seuerus |  | da. |  | 40 | F | 10. |
| 638. | Iohannes iiij ${ }^{(4 s)}$ |  |  |  | 41 | e | 11. |
| 639. |  |  |  |  | 42 | d | 12. |
| 640. | Theodorus. |  |  |  | 43 | c | 13. |
| 641. |  |  | bercom |  | 44 | A | 14. |
| 642. |  |  | bertus |  | 45 | g | 15. |
| 643. |  | Rex Ercombertus, R | Regni fit predo repertus. |  | 46 | f | 16. |
| 644. |  |  |  |  | 47 | e | 17. |
| 645. |  |  |  |  | 48 | C | 18. |
| 646. |  |  |  |  | 49 | b | 19. |
| 647. |  |  | Erme Ercon |  | 50 | a | 1. |
| 648. | Martinus .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  | nilda. gotha. |  | 51 | g | 2. |
| 649. |  |  |  |  | 52 | E | 3. |
| 650. |  |  |  |  | 53 | d | 4. |
| 651. |  |  |  |  | 54 | c | 5. |
| 652. |  |  |  |  | 55 | b | 6. |
| 653. |  |  |  |  | 56 | G | 7. |
| $654 .$ | Eugenius .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | Vacauit |  | f |  |
| 655. |  |  |  |  | 58 | e | 9. |
| 656. | Vitalianus .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ | Egbertus pressit: her | heredes hinc male cessit. | Deusdedit | 59 | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 10. |
| 657. |  |  |  |  | 60 | B | 11. |
| 658. |  |  |  |  | 61 | a | 12. |
| 659. |  |  |  |  | 62 | g | 13. |
| 660. | [End of Membrane 1] |  |  |  | 63 | f | 14. |
| 661. |  |  |  |  | 64 | D | 15. |
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| 662. |  |  |  | 65 | c | 16. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 663. |  |  |  | 66 | b | 17. |
| 664. |  |  |  | 67 | a | 18. |
| 665. |  |  | Vacauit | 68 | F | 19. |
| 666. |  |  |  | 69 | e | 1. |
| 667. |  |  |  | 70 | d | 2. |
| 668. |  |  |  | 71 | c | 3. |
| 669. |  |  | Theodorus | 72 | A | 4. |
| 670. | Adeodatus . ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 73 | g | 5. |
| 671. |  |  |  | 74 | f | 6. |
| 672. |  |  |  | 75 | e | 7. |
| 673. |  |  |  | 76 | C | 8. |
| 674. | Bonus .j ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$. |  |  | 77 | b | 9. |
| 675. |  |  |  | 78 | a | 10. |
| 676. | Agatho $\mathrm{j}^{(\mathrm{us})}$ | Lotha |  | 79 | g | 11. |
| 677. |  | rius |  | 80 | E | 12. |
| 678. | Leo. ij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$. | Lothario Regi. claret via consona legi |  | 81 | d | 13. |
| 679. |  | Lothario Regi. claret via consona legi |  | 82 | c | 14. |
| 680. | Benedic(t)us ij ${ }^{(\mathrm{us})}$ |  |  | 83 | b | 15. |
| 681. | Iohannes .v. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 84 | G | 16. |
| 682. |  |  |  | 85 | f | 17. |
| 683. | Canon ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$. |  |  | 86 | e | 18. |
| 684. |  |  |  | 87 | d | 19. |
| 685. |  | Edricus |  | 88 | B | 1. |
| 686. |  |  |  | 89 | a | 2. |
| 687. |  |  |  |  | g | 3. |
| 688. | Sergius .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ | Morti mulo datur dorobernia quo gratulatur. |  | 91 | f | 4. |
| 689. |  |  |  | 92 | D | 5. |
| 690. |  |  |  | 93 |  | 6. |
| 691. |  |  | Vacauit. | 94 | b | 7. |
| 692. |  | Wythredus |  | 95 | F | 8. |
| 693. |  | Wythredo proceres. gaudent (et) tercius heres | Brithwaldus | 96 | F | 9. |
| 694. |  |  |  | 97 |  | 10. |
| 695. |  |  |  | 98 | d | 11. |
| 696. |  |  |  | 99 |  | 12. |
| 697. |  |  |  | 100 | A | 13. |
| 698. |  |  |  | 101 | f | 14. |
| 699. |  |  |  | 102 | f | 15. |
| 700. |  |  |  | 103 | e | 16. |
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| 701. | Leo iij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ ( hic non | computatur eoq(uo)d |  | 104 | C | 17. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 702. | patriciu(m) r(omanorum) | duorum factus est papa(m) |  | 105 | b | 18. |
| 703. | Iohannes vj. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 106 | a | 19. |
| 704. |  |  |  | 107 | g | 1. |
| 705. | Iohannes vij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 108 | E | 2. |
| 706. |  |  |  | 109 | d | 3. |
| 707. | Sisininus. ${ }^{\text {jus) }}$ |  |  | 110 | c | 4. |
| 708. | Constantinus. j ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 111 | b | 5. |
| 709. |  |  |  | 112 | G | 6. |
| 710. |  |  |  | 113 | f | 7. |
| 711. |  |  |  | 114 | e | 8. |
| 712. |  |  |  | 115 | d | 9. |
| 713. |  |  |  | 116 | B | 10. |
| 714. |  |  |  | 117 | a | 11. |
| 715. | Gregorius ij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 118 | g | 12. |
| 716. |  |  |  | 119 | f | 13. |
| 717. |  |  |  | 120 | D | 14. |
| 718. |  |  |  | 121 | c | 15. |
| 719. |  |  |  | 122 | b | 16. |
| 720. |  |  |  | 123 | a | 17. |
| 721. |  |  |  | 124 | F | 18. |
| 722. |  |  |  | 125 | e | 19. |
| 723. |  |  |  | 126 | b | 1. |
| 724. |  | Edbertus |  | 127 | c | 2. |
| 725. |  |  |  | 128 | A | 3. |
| 726. |  | Edberti Regis patris assunt comoda legis |  | 129 | g | 4. |
| 727. |  |  |  | 130 | f | 5. |
| 728. |  |  |  | 131 | e | 6. |
| 729. |  |  |  | 132 | C | 7. |
| 730. |  |  |  | 133 | b | 8. |
| 731. | Gregorius iij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 134 | a | 9. |
| 732. |  |  | Cadwinus. | 135 | g | 10. |
| 733. |  |  |  | 136 | E | 11. |
| 734. |  |  |  | 137 | d | 12. |
| 735. |  |  |  | 138 | c | 13. |
| 736. |  |  | Nothelmus | 139 | b |  |
| 737. |  |  |  | 140 | G | 15. |
| 738. |  |  |  | 141 | f | 16. |
| 739. |  |  |  | 142 | e | 17. |
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| 740. |  |  |  | 143 | d | 18. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 741. | Zacharias |  | Cuthb(er)tus. | 144 | B | 19. |
| 742. |  |  |  | 145 | a | 1. |
| 743. |  |  |  | 146 | g | 2. |
| 744. |  |  |  | 147 | f | 3. |
| 745. |  |  |  | 148 | D | 4. |
| 746. |  |  |  | 149 | c | 5. |
| 747. |  |  |  | 150 | b | 6. |
| 748. |  |  |  | 151 | a | 7. |
| 749. |  |  |  | 152 | F | 8. |
| 750. |  |  |  | 153 | e | 9. |
| 751. | Stephanus ij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 154 | d | 10. |
| 752. |  |  |  | 155 | c | 11. |
| 753. |  |  |  | 156 | A | 12. |
| 754. |  |  |  | 157 | g | 13. |
| 755. |  |  |  | 158 | f | 14. |
| 756. | Paulus .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 159 | e | 15. |
| 757. |  |  |  | 160 | C | 16. |
| 758. |  |  |  | 161 | b | 17. |
| 759. |  |  | Bregwinus. | 162 | a | 18. |
| 760. |  |  |  | 163 | g | 19. |
| 761. |  | Ethelbertus |  | 164 | E | 1. |
| 762. |  | Alricus |  | 165 | d | 2. |
| 763. |  | Ius Ethelberto floret |  | 166 | c | 3. |
| 764. |  | Diademate certo. Alrici cura fuit regno caritura |  | 167 | b | 4. |
| 765. |  | Diademate cero. Arici cura fut regno carura |  | 168 | G | 5. |
| 766. |  |  |  | 169 | f | 6. |
| 767. |  |  |  | 170 | e | 7. |
| 768. | Stephanus iij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 171 | d | 8. |
| 769. | [End of membrane 2] |  |  | 172 | B | 9. |
| 770. |  |  |  | 173 | a | 10. |
| 771. | Adrianus .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 174 | g | 11. |
| 772. |  |  |  | 175 | f | 12. |
| 773. |  |  |  | 176 | D | 13. |
| 774. |  |  |  | 177 | c | 14. |
| 775. |  |  |  | 178 | b | 15. |
| 776. |  |  |  | 179 | a | 16. |
| 777. |  |  |  | 180 | F | 17. |
| 778. |  |  |  | 181 | e | 18. |
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| 779. |  |  |  | 182 | d | 19. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 780. |  |  |  | 183 | c | 1. |
| 781. |  |  |  | 184 | A | 2. |
| 782. |  |  |  | 185 | g | 3. |
| 783. |  |  |  | 186 | f | 4. |
| 784. |  |  |  | 187 | e | 5. |
| 785. |  |  |  | 188 | C | 6. |
| 786. |  |  |  | 189 | b | 7. |
| 787. |  |  |  | 190 | a | 8. |
| 788. |  |  |  | 191 | g | 9. |
| 789. |  |  |  | 192 | E | 10. |
| 790. |  |  | Athelardus | 193 | d | 11. |
| 791. |  |  |  | 194 | c | 12. |
| 792. |  |  |  | 195 | b | 13. |
| 793. |  |  |  | 196 | G | 14. |
| 794. |  | Obitus Alrici |  | 197 | f | 15. |
| 795. | Leo tercius | Cessauet germen vltimi regis |  | 198 | e | 16. |
| 796. |  | Regum Kancie Kancie |  | 199 | d | 17. |
| 797. |  | Mors notat Alrici q(uod) tres regnant Inimici |  | 200 | B | 18. |
| 798. |  | Ethebert Cuthred pulsus certami(n)e Balthred |  | 201 | a | 19. |
| 799. |  | Coronacio Egberti apud westsaxons |  | 202 | g | 1. |
| 800. |  |  |  | 203 | f | 2. |
| 801. |  |  |  | 204 | D | 3. |
| 802. |  |  |  | 205 | c | 4. |
| 803. |  |  | Wolfredus. | 206 | b | 5. |
| 804. |  |  |  | 207 | a | 6. |
| 805. |  | Cuthredus p(er)ijt. Balredus intrusit |  | 208 | F | 7. |
| 806. |  | Cuthredus p(er)iju. Balredus intrusit |  | 209 | e | 8. |
| 807. |  |  |  | 210 | d | 9. |
| 808. |  |  |  | 211 | c | 10. |
| 809. |  |  |  | 212 | A | 11. |
| 810. |  |  |  | 213 | g | 12. |
| 811. |  |  |  | 214 | f | 13. |
| 812. |  |  |  | 215 | e | 14. |
| 813. |  |  |  | 216 | C | 15. |
| 814. |  |  |  | 217 | b | 16. |
| 815. | Stephanus iiij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 218 | a | 17. |
| 816. | Paschalis .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  | 219 | g | 18. |
| 817. |  |  |  | 220 | E | 19. |



|  |  |  |  |  | Baxter 36 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 857. |  |  |  |  | 260 | D | 2. |
| 858. | Nicholaus ${ }^{\text {jus) }}$. | Ethelbald flore |  |  | 261 | c | 3. |
| 859. |  | fratri dat bon | Ethelbertus |  | 262 | b | 4. |
| 860. |  |  |  |  | 263 | a | 5. |
| 861. |  | Ethelbert cedit |  |  | 264 | F | 6. |
| 862. |  |  |  |  | 265 | e | 7. |
| 863. |  |  |  |  | 266 | d | 8. |
| 864. |  |  |  |  | 267 | c | 9. |
| 865. |  |  |  |  | 268 | A | 10. |
| 866. |  |  |  |  | 269 | g | 11. |
| 867. | Adrianus iij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 270 | f | 12. |
| 868. |  | Vis Ethelredi |  |  | 271 | e | 13. |
| 869. |  | Vis Ethelredi |  |  | 272 | C | 14. |
| 870. |  |  |  |  | 273 | b | 15. |
| 871. |  |  | redus | Athelredus. | 274 | a | 16. |
| 872. | Johannes viij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  | edus |  | 275 | g | 17. |
| 873. |  | Oxoniis flores | res. |  | 276 | G | 18. |
| 874. |  | Nobilitas innat | orem. |  | 277 | d | 19. |
| 875. |  | Armipotens A | q(ue) laborem |  | 278 | c | 1. |
| 876. |  | perpetum q(ue) | ixta dolori. |  | 279 | b | 2. |
| 877. |  | Gaudia semper | mixta timori. |  | 280 | G | 3. |
| 878. |  | Si modo victus | la parabas. |  | 281 | f | 4. |
| 879. |  | Iam post trans | Labores |  | 282 | e | 5. |
| 880. |  | Christus et sic | que perhenne / |  | 283 | d | 6. |
| 881. | [End of Membrane 3] |  |  |  | 284 285 | B a | 7. 8. |
| 882 | Martinus ij. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 286 |  | 9 |
| 883 | Adrianus iij. ${ }^{\text {us) }}$ |  |  |  | 287 | D | 10 |
| 884 |  |  |  |  | 288 | D | 11 |
| 885 | Stephanus .v. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 289 | c | 12 |
| 886 |  |  |  |  | 290 | b | 13 |
| 887 |  | prudens |  |  | 291 | a | 14 |
| 888 |  |  | ${ }_{\substack{\text { Rollo } \\ \text { primus dux }}}$ |  | 292 | F | 15 |
| 889 |  |  | Normannie qui et Rober: | Pleigmundus | 293 | e | 16 |
| 890 |  |  |  |  | 294 | d | 17 |
| 891 | Formosus j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  | est in baptis: mo Nac(i)one |  | 295 | c | 18 |
| 892 |  |  |  |  | 296 | A | 19 |
| 893 |  |  |  |  | 297 | g | 1 |
| 894 |  |  |  |  | 298 | f | 2 |



|  |  |  |  |  |  | Baxter 38 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 934 |  |  | ta dux |  | 338 | c | 4 |
| 935 | Leo septimus |  | Norman: |  | 339 | d | 5 |
| 936 |  |  | nie |  | 340 | B | 6 |
| 937 |  |  |  |  | 341 | a | 7 |
| 938 | Stephanus viij ${ }^{(\mathrm{us})}$ |  |  |  | 342 | g | 8 |
| 939 |  |  |  |  | 343 | f | 9 |
| 940 |  |  |  |  | 344 | D | 10 |
| 941 | Martinus iij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ | Edmundus |  |  | 345 | c | 11 |
| 942 |  | Primus |  |  | 346 | b | 12 |
| 943 |  | Edmundo cedit lex quem latro nece cedit |  |  | 347 | a | 13 |
| 944 |  |  |  |  | 348 | F | 14 |
| 945 | Agapitus ij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 349 | e | 15 |
| 946 |  | Eadredus |  |  | 350 | d | 16 |
| 947 |  | Gignaciu(m) fecit. edredus nana reiecit |  |  | 351 | c | 17 |
| 948 |  |  |  |  | 352 | A | 18 |
| 949 |  |  |  |  | 353 | g | 19 |
| 950 | Iohannes xij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 354 | f | 1 |
| 951 |  |  | Ricardus |  | 355 |  | 2 |
| 952 |  |  | Dux Nor: |  | 356 | DC | 3 |
| 953 |  |  | mannie |  | 357 | b | 4 |
| 954 |  |  |  |  | 358 | a | 5 |
| 955 |  |  |  |  | 359 | g | 6 |
| 956 |  | Edwini Cura dedit eccl(es)ie mala plura. |  |  | 360 | EC | 7 |
| 957 |  | Edwini Cura dedit eccl(es)ie mala plura. |  |  | 361 | d | 8 |
| 958 |  |  |  | Elflinus | 362 | c | 9 |
| 959 |  | Edga |  | Dunstanus | 363 | b | 10 |
| 960 | Leo. octauus. | rus. |  |  | 364 | G | 11 |
| 961 |  | Rex pius Edgarus (christ)o stat culmine darus |  |  | 365 |  | 12 |
| 962 | Iohannes xiij ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 366 | e | 13 |
| 963 |  |  |  |  | 367 | d | 14 |
| 964 |  |  |  |  | 368 | CB | 15 |
| 965 |  | Sancta Edmun Editha |  |  | 369 | a | 16 |
| 966 |  | Editha dus. |  |  | 370 | g | 17 |
| 967 |  |  |  |  | 371 | f | 18 |
| 968 |  |  |  |  | 372 | D | 19 |
| 969 | Benedictus vj ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 373 | c | 1 |
| 970 | Bonus .j. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 374 | b | 2 |
| 971 | Bonifacius vij. ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ |  |  |  | 375 | a | 3 |
| 972 |  |  |  |  | 376 | F | 4 |
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| 1267 | Obitus Clementis | Alienora Katerina |  |  |  | 670 | c | 13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1268 |  |  |  |  |  | 671 | b | 14 |
| 1269 |  |  |  |  |  | 672 | G | 15 |
| 1270 |  |  |  |  |  | 673 | f | 16 |
| 1271 |  |  |  |  | Obitus Bonifacij | 674 | e | 17 |
| 1272 | Gregorius x(us) |  |  |  |  | 675 | d | 18 |
| 1273 |  |  |  |  | Rob(er)tus ij ${ }^{\text {(us) Kilwarby }}$ | 676 | B | 19 |
| 1274 |  | Edwardus | j.(us) |  |  | 677 | a | 1 |
| 1275 | Innocentius v(us) | post Con | qu(estum) |  |  | 678 | g | 2 |
| 1276 | Adrianus v ${ }^{\text {(us) }}$ | Edwardi Crura Supportant An | glica Iura |  |  | 679 | ${ }_{\text {f }}$ | 3 |
| 1277 | Iohannes Xxj |  |  |  |  | 680 | D | 4 |
| 1278 | Nicholaus inj | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Alienora } \\ & \text { nupta Co: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ed(mund)us } \\ & \text { Comes } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 681 | c | 5 |
| 1279 |  | miti de | kancie |  | Emonet(ur) Rob(er)tus in | 682 | b | 6 |
| 1280 | Martinus iiij(us) | Bars. |  |  | Cardinalem Johannes | 683 | a | 7 |
| 1281 |  | Iohannes | Thomas |  | primus Peckham | 684 | F | 8 |
| 1282 |  |  | Broderton |  | Princeps wallis | 685 | e | 9 |
| 1283 |  | Johanna Henricus | Comes Mar eschall |  | Lewlinus decollat(ur) cuiu(s) | 686 | d | 10 |
| 1284 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [\|nupta Com(iti) } \\ & \text { Wal] rren } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | caput intuiri London edere fuit coronatu(m) | 687 | c | 11 |
| 1285 | [[Honorius]] iiij(us) |  |  |  | David f(rate)r Lewlini capit(ur) trahit(ur) suspendit(ur) | 688 | A | 12 |
| 1286 | [ [Honorius] ${ }_{\text {dir }}$ (s) | nupt gilber | $\text { th [[ }[* * *$ | ta Ducissa | et Decollat(ur) | 689 | g | 13 |
| 1287 |  | io de clare | ${ }^{* * * * * * *]}$ | Norfolchie |  | 690 | f | 14 |
| 1288 | Nicholaus iij(us) | comiti Glou cestrie | Comiti <br> Hertford |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thuri inuent(us) est q(u)i } \\ & \text { apud wall(ie) magno } \end{aligned}$ | 691 | e | 15 |
| 1289 |  |  |  |  | honore fuit et | 692 | CC | 16 |
| 1290 |  | Margare | Alfonsus |  | D(omi)no Regioblata. | 693 | b | 17 |
| 1291 |  | ta Maria |  |  |  | 694 | a | 18 |
| 1292 |  |  | disponsat | disponsat |  | 695 | g | 19 |
| 1293 |  |  | Iohann | Ioh(ann)i Hasting | Obitus Iohannis | 696 | EC | 1 |
| 1294 | Celestinus v(us) <br> [End of Membrane 7] | Gilbertus Elizabeth | Monbray | Comiti Pem brochie | Rob(er)tus iiij(us) Wyn | 697 | d | 2 |
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| 1447 |  |  |  | 849 | c | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1448 |  |  |  | 850 | d | 3 |
| 1449 |  |  |  | 851 | a | 4 |
| 1450 |  |  |  | 852 | F | 5 |
| 1451 |  |  |  | 853 | e | 6 |
| 1452 |  |  |  | 854 | d | 7 |
| 1453 |  |  |  | 855 | c | 8 |
| 1454 |  |  |  | 856 | A | 9 |
| 1455 |  |  |  | 857 | g | 10 |
| 1456 |  |  |  | 858 | f | 11 |
| 1457 |  |  |  | 859 | e | 12 |
| 1458 |  |  |  | 860 | C | 13 |
| 1459 |  |  |  | 861 | d | 14 |
| 1460 |  |  |  | 862 | a | 15 |
| 1461 |  |  |  | 863 | g | 16 |
| 1462 |  |  |  | 864 | E | 17 |
| 1463 |  |  |  | 865 | d | 18 |
| 1464 |  |  |  | 866 | c | 19 |
| 1465 |  |  |  | 867 | b | 1 |
| 1466 |  |  |  | 868 | G | 2 |
| 1467 |  |  |  | 869 | f | 3 |
| 1468 |  |  |  | 870 | e | 4 |
| 1469 |  |  |  | 871 | d | 5 |
| 1470 |  |  |  | 872 | B | 6 |
| 1471 |  |  |  | 873 | a | 7 |
| 1472 | [End of Membrane 9] |  |  | 874 | g | 8 |
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For a full manuscript description, including material and decorative features, see Boucher, et al.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ All citations of UVic's MS.Brown.Lat. 1 are normalized from my own transcriptions. For a full preliminary transcription (barring the extremely damaged m. 9), see Appendix 2. Translations are my own, with the assistance of Dr. Adrienne Williams Boyarin and Dr. Iain Higgins. In this case, the translation is tentative: "Christicala" (worshipper of Christ, Christian) normally appears as "Christicola." ${ }^{3}$ These findings were written up by a group of undergraduate students-Sophie Boucher, Brynn Fader, Rebekah Prette, and Molly Trepanier-who were completing a description and transcription of membranes 1-3 for a manuscript studies course taught by Dr. Williams Boyarin that term (see Boucher et al.). Dr. Williams Boyarin was assisting the group with their transcription when she found M.R. James's related entry for Pepys MS 2314 in his Bibliotecha Pepysiana: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Library of Samuel Pepys, vol. 3, and investigated the string of connections discussed here.
    ${ }^{4}$ See Charles Hardwick, Historia Monasterii S. Augustine Cantuariensis. Hardwick edited and published the contents of this manuscript for the Rolls Series in 1858. Thomas of Elmham (d. ca. 1427) was a monk at Canterbury, by 1407 the treasurer of St. Augustine's Abbey, and eventually the Prior of the Cluniac Priory at Lenton (Nottingham). See S.E. Kelly for more information.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ M.R. James 85. The note on Pope Joan that James mentions is assigned to the year 853-855 and is also present in Victoria's Brown.Lat.1: it reads "Hic obiit Leo iiii cuius tamen anni usque ad Benedictum tercium computantur eoquod mulier in Papam promota fuit que homo masculus putabatur Johannes ... Ista non computantur quia femina fuit" (Here died Leo IV, whose years are counted up to Benedict III since a woman was promoted to Pope who was thought to be a man: Joan. She is not counted because she was a woman).

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ For instance, the year 1111 is absent from MS.Brown.Lat.1, and the year 1118 appears twice, though neither of these errors is present in Pepys 2314. For other typical copying errors, see the notes of Appendix 1 below. Noteworthy additions to the Victoria roll are discussed in more detail below. ${ }^{7}$ Pepys 2314 includes one entry below 1435, recording the 1450 marriage of Margaret Beaufort to John de la Pole ( $2^{\text {nd }}$ Duke of Suffolk), that is not visible in the Victoria roll, but the bottom two membranes of the Victoria roll are badly damaged, and some ink almost completely faded. This entry, however, is presented as part of the genealogical line, not with other historical events (usually recorded near dates).

[^4]:    ${ }^{8}$ James 84. The evenly-distributed spacing of the table in Trinity Hall MS 1 can be seen via online digitization here: https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-TRINITYHALL-00001/1

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ Holkham Hall MS 228 (including material from the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries), fol. 173b. The poem written in this manuscript was attributed to Matthew Parker in the 1883 by the Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (issue 9, 359). The fact that Parker was an Archbishop of Canterbury makes it possible that he had access to what is now Pepys MS 2314, from which he may have culled his couplets. A new catalogue of medieval Holkham Hall manuscripts is now available: Suzanne Reynolds, A Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library at Holkham Hall: Manuscripts from Italy to 1500: Part 1, Shelfmarks 1-399.
    ${ }^{10}$ This couplet, which appears in both the Pepys and Victoria rolls, refers to the common misconception that Alfred founded the University of Oxford. For more, see P. Wormald. University College at Oxford has also published an open-source blog post on the subject, available here: https://www.univ.ox.ac.uk/news/king-alfred-univ-part-1/

[^6]:    ${ }^{11}$ See S. Hagedorn, "Matthew Parker and Asser's 'Elfredi Regis Res Geste.'" Parker, as Archbishop of Canterbury, would have had access to Elmham's manuscript, and possibly even Pepys 2314 (see note 9).

[^7]:    ${ }^{12}$ Before his archbishopric, Parker was Master of Corpus Christi College (from 4 December 1544) and Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University (from January 1545). See D. Crankshaw and A. Gillespie for more details.
    ${ }^{13}$ G.E. Watson 364. The 14 -line version of the poem can be seen in J. Francis, Notes and Queries (1876), and T. Pettigrew, Chronicles of the Tombs. Francis identifies the source as an "old black-letter history of England," while Pettigrew provides no source information.

[^8]:    ${ }^{14}$ S. Keynes 225.
    ${ }^{15}$ Crankshaw and Gillespie.

[^9]:    ${ }^{16}$ L. Huneycutt.
    ${ }^{17}$ As first noted by Dr. Adrienne Williams Boyarin.

[^10]:    ${ }^{18}$ W.M. Ormrod, "Lionel [Lionel of Antwerp], duke of Clarence (1338-1368), prince."

[^11]:    ${ }^{19}$ R. Horrox, "Edward IV (1442-1483), king of England and lord of Ireland."
    ${ }^{20}$ Ormrod.
    ${ }^{21}$ For more on Matilda and the Anarchy, see M. Chibnall, The Empress Matilda: Queen Consort, Queen Mother, and Lady of the English.
    ${ }^{22}$ M. Chibnall, "Matilda [Matilda of England] (1102-1167), empress, consort of Heinrich V."
    ${ }^{23}$ Chibnall, "Matilda [Matilda of England]."

[^12]:    ${ }^{24}$ E. King, "Stephen (c. 1092-1154), king of England."
    ${ }^{25}$ T. Keefe, "Henry II (1133-1189), king of England, duke of Normandy and of Aquitaine, and count of Anjou."
    ${ }^{26}$ Ormrod.
    ${ }^{27}$ J.C. Parsons.
    ${ }^{28}$ J.R.S. Phillips.

[^13]:    ${ }^{29}$ A.L. Brown and H. Summerson. It may also be of interest that Mary de Bohun was the mother of John of Lancaster, $1^{\text {st }}$ Duke of Bedford, whose death in 1435 is the last historical event recorded by both the Victoria roll and Pepys 2314.
    ${ }^{30}$ M.A. Hicks 42. This refers to the 1460 Act of Accord, a Middle English version of which is present in another University of Victoria medieval manuscript: MS.Lat.9.
    ${ }^{31}$ Hicks 14.
    ${ }^{32}$ Hicks 43.
    ${ }^{33}$ Hicks 43.

[^14]:    ${ }^{34}$ Hicks, 14.
    ${ }^{35}$ Hicks, 43-44.

[^15]:    ${ }^{36}$ Though Pepys 2314 ends at the same historical-event point, part of my argument is that the $1^{\text {st }}$ Duke of Bedford's death takes on a greater significance in the Victoria roll because it so clearly foregrounds these issues of inheritance.

[^16]:    ${ }^{37}$ The location of the original "Clare Roll" manuscript is unknown. The text was preserved in Dugedale's Monasticon Anglicanum. See D. Gray for more details.
    ${ }^{38}$ D. Gray. In another interesting connection, Matthew Parker became Dean of Stoke-by-Clare on 4 November 1535, where the "Clare Roll" would have been held (see Crankshaw and Gillespie for more).
    ${ }^{39}$ C. Horstmann, Osbern Bokenam's Legenden, lines 61-62.
    ${ }^{40}$ Horstmann, lines 64-67.
    ${ }^{41}$ For further reading on the subject, see C. Turner Camp, "Osbern Bokenham and the House of York Revisited" and S. Delany, "Bokenham's Claudian as Yorkist Propaganda."

[^17]:    ${ }^{42}$ Hicks 43
    ${ }^{43}$ A. Spenser 80
    ${ }^{44}$ Hicks 42

[^18]:    ${ }^{46}$ Victoria MS reads crura; this reading is from Pepys 2314.
    ${ }^{47}$ Victoria MS reads Edwardus; this reading is from Pepys 2314.
    ${ }^{48}$ Victoria MS reads ruunt iniurici; this reading is from Pepys 2314.
    ${ }^{49}$ The word valitura [Ualitura] is faded in the Victoria MS but confirmed with Pepys 2314.
    ${ }^{50}$ The last two lines are uncertain and determined through consultation with Pepys 2314: the Victoria MS is severely faded at this point and shows only shadows of the words.

