# Unrolling History:

# Fifteenth-Century Political Culture and

# Perceptions on the Canterbury Roll

Maree Shirota

A thesis submitted to the University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand, for fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in History

June 2015

Senior Supervisor: Dr. Chris Jones (University of Canterbury, History)
Associate Supervisor: Dr. Richard Bullen (University of Canterbury, Art History)

**Abstract**

The Canterbury Roll is a fifteenth-century genealogical chronicle roll that traces the succession of English kings from Noah until the Wars of the Roses. Created in a period when genealogy and ancestry had practical and ideological meaning in society, the Canterbury Roll is symbolic of the ideas of dynasty, myth and heritage that its original creators and readers valued. This thesis departs from previous historiographical approaches to genealogical rolls by treating the Canterbury Roll as a document that reflects the political culture in which it was produced. By examining the image, text and materiality of the manuscript, the thesis develops on existing scholarship and offers insights into the depiction of political prophecies, political theories of effective kingship, the justification of royal deposition and English perceptions towards foreign kingdoms and dominions. Political prophecies on the roll reveal how genealogy and prophecy contribute to a broader sense of history and prestige that the Lancastrian kings claimed to inherit. By using mythical royal depositions, the roll justifies the removal of Richard II and the Lancastrian dynasty's legitimacy through not only hereditary right, but also contemporary political theory that validated the ousting of ineffective kings. The thesis also establishes that the roll reveals contemporary English attitudes towards other territories such as Scotland, Wales and France, which reflect the political and diplomatic context of the period. These themes demonstrate the capacity of genealogical manuscripts to present a nuanced view of contemporary political concepts. In doing so, this thesis both provides an in-depth textual analysis of the Canterbury Roll, and contributes to the historiography of medieval genealogical literature and political thought by approaching the manuscript as a source for the political culture of early fifteenth-century England.

**Table of Contents**

## Acknowledgements

I am sincerely grateful to the many people who supported the writing and completion of this thesis.

First and foremost, I owe a great deal of gratitude to my supervisors for their encouragement and advice. I am indebted to Dr. Chris Jones, who first introduced me to the Canterbury Roll in one of his undergraduate courses. Several years later, his dedicated supervision has made this thesis possible. For your guidance, advice and encouragement, thank you. I would also like to thank Dr. Richard Bullen for his perspectives, reading my drafts and improving my prose. Also at the University of Canterbury I would like to thank the History Department and the staff at the Macmillan Brown Library.

I am grateful to the staff at: the British Library, National Library of Wales (Aberystwth), Lincolnshire Country Archives (Lincoln, UK), King's College Library (Cambridge, UK), the Bodleian, Brasenose College and Queen's College libraries in Oxford for helping me to navigate through their archives and collections for this project. I also thank Peter Vangioni, Curator at the Christchurch Art Gallery Te Puna o Waiwhetu.

I extend my gratitude to the University of Canterbury for the generous financial support that funded my studies. The Summer Scholarship I received from the University in 2013 developed into this Master's thesis, which was financed by a Master's Scholarship in 2014. I would also like to offer my gratitude to the Australia and New Zealand Association of Medieval and Early Modern Studies (ANZAMEMS), New Zealand Federation of Graduate Women (NZFGW) and the Canterbury History Foundation (CHF), for supporting my research by providing financial assistance for my archival research and attendance at numerous conferences in Australia and the United Kingdom.

I am thankful to all my friends for their interest and support in my work. Special thanks to Jacqueline Murphy, Stephanie Zhang, Scott Nicholas and Lucy-Jane Walsh for keeping me sane by dragging me out of my office, and to my fellow postgraduates, in particular Greg Hynes, Ruth Larsen and Hannah Smith for their support. Thank you to Emily, who listened patiently to my ramblings about dead kings, proofread my writing and encouraged me to do my best.

My deepest thanks go to my parents for providing unwavering support throughout my studies, for teaching me to love stories and most importantly, how to march to the beat of my own drum.

**<u>Notes on the text</u>**

  While there is an existing transcription and translation of the manuscript by Arnold Wall, which was published in 1919, it contains some inaccuracies and missing text. Therefore, references in the thesis to the text of Christchurch, University of Canterbury, MS 1 are all my own transcriptions and translations. Relevant sections of the transcription are in the appendices to the thesis.

  There are no images included in this thesis. However, the primary source of the thesis, Canterbury MS 1, is viewable online as part of a digital project hosted by the University of Canterbury's website:

Jones, C., Shirota, M., Johnson, M., Shaw-Brown, D. and Welch, E., 'The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Facsimile with Commentary', <www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll>.

Link to photographic section: http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/rolling.shtml

**Introduction**

Nearly a century ago, towards the end of the Great War, an English professor in New Zealand gathered donations from friends and colleagues to purchase a medieval scroll. On behalf of Canterbury College in Christchurch, Professor Arnold Wall acquired the manuscript in 1918.[1] It was a fifteenth-century genealogical roll of the kings of England. In early twentieth-century colonial New Zealand, the roll embodied the rich and lengthy history of Britain, and was a tangible link with the medieval past, offering a sense of continuity for the fledgling tertiary institution.[2] The roll's depiction of English royalty was a symbol of the prestige of British tradition and history. The roll's new home at a nascent colonial university was a sign of the College's cultural, intellectual, and political allegiance to Great Britain. The manuscript, now known as the Canterbury Roll (Christchurch, University of Canterbury, Canterbury MS 1),[3] was an object symbolic of the link between England's prestigious history and the College. About five hundred years earlier, the same roll represented the allegiance of aristocratic families to the political legacy of English royalty under the Lancastrian king, Henry VI. In both contexts, though centuries and antipodes apart, the Canterbury Roll was an object imbued with political and cultural meaning to its owners and readers. This thesis will offer an examination of the roll as a political document that has until now been overlooked as

---

[1] Rebecca Hayward, 'Prestige and Pedagogy: The Ownership of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts by New Zealand Universities', in *Migrations, Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, ed. Stephanie Hollis and Alexandra Barratt (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), p. 91.

[2] Ibid., p. 94.

[3] This thesis refers to the roll as the shortened form of its description in the modern catalogue, Canterbury MS 1, or as the 'Canterbury Roll' (the name adopted by the University of Canterbury Library's Special Collections in 2011). Previously it was known as the 'Maude Roll'.

a source for exploring aspects of political culture, perceptions and structures in early fifteenth-century England.

Medieval scholarship recognises the value of English genealogical chronicle rolls as important primary sources that represent a unique type of historical narrative. The thesis builds on three strands of historiography. Firstly, it develops extant research on Canterbury MS 1. Most of the scholarship exclusively focused on this roll has been related to its context in colonial New Zealand.[4] However, it has been specifically referenced in broader studies of genealogical chronicle rolls, which is the second strand of historiography to which this thesis contributes. Since these manuscripts were undervalued and underexplored until the 1970s, the scholarship on genealogical rolls is still developing.[5] Previous political approaches to the rolls have tended to focus on the dynastic and propagandist contexts, while the representation of broader political concerns has not yet been examined. This thesis will further contextualise Canterbury MS 1, exploring its broader political context beyond propaganda. This

---

[4] Hayward, 'Prestige and Pedagogy', pp. 89–107; Robert Allen Rouse, 'Inscribing Lineage: Writing and Rewriting the Maude Roll', in *Migrations, Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, ed. Stephanie Hollis and Alexandra Barratt (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), pp. 108–22; Jones, Chris, 'Remembering the Past', in *Treasures of the University of Canterbury*, ed. Chris Jones, Bronwyn Matthews with Jennifer Clement (Christchurch: Canterbury University Press, 2011), pp. 85–90.

[5] Alison Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV', in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. Charles Ross (Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979), pp. 171–92; Ralph A. Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 83–103; For more literary and cultural approaches: Raluca L. Radelescu, 'Genealogy in Insular Romance', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* ed. Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 7–25; Olivier de Laborderie, 'The First Manuals of English History: Two Late Thirteenth-Century Genealgoical Rolls of the Kings of England in the Royal Collection', *Electrionic Birtish Library Journal* (2014): pp. 1–25; Olivier de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir - Les généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre (1250–1422)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013).

demonstrates a fresh approach to genealogical rolls generally. Finally, the thesis uses the

Canterbury Roll as an alternative source for studying medieval political theory.[6]

Traditionally, research on political thought has been primarily based on the texts of

intellectual thinkers and university masters. In more recent years, there has been a

historiographical trend to use chronicles, which were traditionally considered 'literary'

works, as sources for political ideas. By assessing the roll afresh as a cultural and political

object strongly marked by the contemporary political atmosphere, this thesis combines all

three historiographical elements. By analysing Canterbury MS 1 for its underlying concepts

of the organisation, construction and representation of English political prophecies, kingship

theory and England's perception of foreign territories and dominions, this thesis offers new

perspectives on genealogical rolls and English political culture in the fifteenth century.


**The Canterbury Roll**

Canterbury MS 1 in the Special Collections of the University of Canterbury Library is

a genealogical chronicle roll from fifteenth-century England. The roll traces the succession of

English kings, starting with the biblical figure of Noah and originally ending with Henry V,

though later modifications extend the lineage to Edward IV. It was produced by an

anonymous scribe in England sometime between the late 1420s and early 1430s. It is almost

five metres long, thirty-three centimetres wide, and made of six pieces of parchment that have

---

[6] Recently, other non-traditional sources, such as images have been used to discuss politics and power, for example: Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in sixteenth-century England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), in which the use of royal images and representation are used to examine the exercise of power.

been pasted together.[7] A single red line down the entire length of the roll is the focal point of

the manuscript. It offers a visual representation of the lineage of the kings of England.

Starting with Noah, the red line follows the succession of kings through Trojan, British,

Anglo-Saxon, Norman, French, and English ancestors until the fifteenth century.[8] Other

minor lines supplement the central red line. A green line represents the Welsh princes and a

purple line symbolises the dukes of Normandy, though neither is as extensive as the line

illustrating the English kings. From Edward III's reign, the central line starts to alternate

between red and blue ink, symbolising the English claim to the kingdom of France.[9] At least

two different scribes contributed to the current form of the roll. The original scribe, who was

working in the early 1430s, was responsible for most sections of the manuscript (Noah to

Henry V). A second scribe, who most probably had Yorkist affiliations, added modifications

to the original scribes' work, sometime after 1461.[10]


Circles, colour-coded lines and illustrations add another dimension to the reading of

Canterbury MS 1. On the roll, a circle double-lined in black denotes a historical or legendary

character, and the name of the figure is written inside. There are few illustrations: a faded red

rose on top of a picture of Noah's ark; petal-like ink-drawn frames in black and red around

---

[7] For further description: Margaret M. Manion, Vera F. Vines, and Christopher de Hamel, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in New Zealand* (Melbourne: Thames & Hudson, 1989), no. 53, p. 79; Rouse, 'Inscribing Lineage', pp. 108–13; Jones, 'The Canterbury Roll', pp. 84–90.

[8] Concerning the biblical, classical, and legendary content: Maree Shirota, 'Myth', <www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll/Myth/index.shtml>, 'The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Facsimile with Commentary', April 2013 version. Last accessed 1 November 2014.

[9] Other manuscripts that also feature a central line that alternates between red and blue (although not in a pattern identical to MS 1) following Edward III's reign include: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Marshall 135; Aberystwyth, NLW, MS 12389E.

[10] Rouse, 'Inscribing Lineage', pp. 108–13.

some circles; the occasional image of a crown above the medallions of select kings, such as Egbert. A Latin commentary complements the diagram on either side of the central line by remarking on significant episodes in the history of England. The commentary was compiled from a variety of sources, including Gildas, Ranulph Higden, Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, and William of Newburgh.[11] It is probable that the original scribe left the manuscript incomplete and that it was intended to end with the accession and minority of Henry VI. After Henry V (the last king on the original version), the central line continues until a 'gap' where Henry VI would presumably have been included. It is highly probable that an ornate initial 'H' was planned for this space at the end, in the same manner as similar contemporary manuscripts.[12]

Alison Allan first suggested that the roll dates from between 1429 to 1438.[13] This can be narrowed down to between 1429 and 1433. A revised examination of the names and titles of individuals on the roll suggests further refinement of the dates. Allan established the earliest date for the roll based on titles that it assigns to the Neville brothers. Robert Neville is described as the 'Bishop of Salisbury', a position he held between 1427 and 1438.[14] His

---

[11] First identified by Arnold Wall: 'Introduction', in *Handbook to the Maude Roll: Being a XVth century MS Genealogy of the British and English Kings from Noah to Edward IV, with Marginal History*, ed. and trans. Arnold Wall (Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1919), n.p.

[12] Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales [henceforth NLW], Rolls 55; Cambridge, King's College, MS 43; London, British Library, MS Additional 18002; British Library, MS Sloane 2732 A; Oxford, Queen's College, MS 167; Oxford, Brasenose College, MS 91. Of these, NLW Rolls 55 is the best-illuminated example, with the entire initial and a crown coloured brightly, gilded with gold, and featuring a miniature portrait of Henry VI sitting inside the arch of the letter 'H'.

[13] Alison Allan, 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1981), p. 264.

[14] Ibid.

brother, Richard Neville, is named Earl of Salisbury, a title he acquired in 1429, after the

death of his father-in-law in November 1428. Allan's estimated latest date for the roll,

however, can be narrowed: in 1433, Duarte (known as Edward in English), became king of

Portugal. On the manuscript, he is called by his English name and does not have any title. His

mother Philippa is labelled 'Queen of Portugal'. This suggests that the roll was completed

prior to Duarte's coronation in 1433.[15] At least thirty years later, in the 1460s, another scribe

continued the roll's depiction of English kings.[16] These later modifications extended the

genealogy to Edward IV and his siblings. The roll names Richard as the Duke of Gloucester,

which strongly suggests the roll was edited after 1461, the year in which he acquired that

title. In order to continue the diagram, the Yorkist scribe drew a circle for Henry VI off-

centre, separated from the central axis. Further additions, mostly down the left hand side of

the roll, were added to make sense of the Yorkist claim to the throne. These include drawing

red lines between Edward III and Edward IV and textual denunciations of Henry IV as a

usurper.[17] As the Yorkist modifications have been examined by Allan and Rouse, the primary

focus of this thesis will be on the pre-Yorkist, 1429–33 section, which has yet to be

examined.


**Historiography**

There is a small but growing body of scholarship focused specifically on Canterbury

MS 1. After Canterbury College in Christchurch purchased the roll in 1918 from the local

---

[15] Sandra Sider, *Handbook to Life in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 20.

[16] Rouse, 'Inscribing Lineage', pp. 109–13.

[17] Ibid., pp. 111–13.

Maude family, it remained somewhat neglected for almost a century.[18] Although there is no

evidence that the Maude family held it for more than a few years (or a few decades at best), it

was dubbed the 'Maude Roll'. The lack of local interest for most of the twentieth century

added to its obscurity, although there have been periodic revivals of interest in its existence in

New Zealand. Its acquisition by the College warranted a mention in the national *New Zealand*

*Herald* newspaper and the local Christchurch newspaper, the *Press*.[19] Arnold Wall published

an edition and translation in 1919, and also delivered a public lecture on the roll in 1920.[20]

After 1920, no mention was made of the manuscript until Wall's autobiography in 1965.[21] In

1972, it was displayed as part of an exhibition entitled 'Illuminated Manuscripts' at the

Robert McDougall Art Gallery, in Christchurch.[22] The only time the roll was subsequently

displayed was as part of the 'Family Ties' exhibition hosted jointly by the University of

Canterbury and Canterbury Museum on the University's Ilam campus (2014). The first

published scholarly reference was not until 1979, in an article by Alison Allan.[23] Only two

articles have focused exclusively on the manuscript since then: one by Robert Rouse (2007)

---

[18] The Maudes were an established local family, whose most famous member, Sybilla Maude, established New Zealand's first district nursing service in 1896. For the Maude family's arrival and settlement in New Zealand, see the first two chapters in Vivienne Allan, *Nurse Maude: The First 100 Years* (Christchurch: Nurse Maude Foundation, 1996).

[19] 'Genealogy of Kings', *New Zealand Herald*, 8 September 1919, p. 9; 'The Maude Roll: An Interesting Piece of Research', *Press* (Christchurch), 10 April 1920, p. 9.

[20] L. A. Stringer, 'Notice for a public lecture at Canterbury College on the Maude Roll', *The Press* (Christchurch), 14 April 1920, 'Advertisements' col. 7, p. 1.

[21] Wall, *Long and Happy*, p. 87.

[22] In a letter dated 22 May 1972 from R. W. Hlavac (University of Canterbury) to Jonathan Mane (Robert McDougall Art Gallery), Hlavac confirmed that the University was pleased to loan both the Maude Roll and the Lübeck Bible to the Gallery: Christchurch, Christchurch Art Gallery Te Puna o Waiwhetu, Robert and Barbara Stewart Library and Archives, 'Illuminated Manuscripts', Exhibition file #51 (1972). I am grateful to Peter Vangioni, Curator at the Christchurch Art Gallery Te Puna o Waiwhetu, for this information.

[23] Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', p. 189.

and another by Chris Jones (2011).[24] Both offer an introduction to the manuscript and provide

a summary of its contents and general historical context. More recently, the University of

Canterbury digital project *The Canterbury Roll* gave the manuscript an online presence

through high-resolution photographs and a series of short articles describing the general

historical context.[25] Using Canterbury MS 1 as a case study, this thesis will combine several

historiographical trends together: the thesis develops on existing historiography of

genealogical rolls by utilising new approaches to chronicles and political ideas.


Generally, genealogical chronicle rolls have been under examined, despite the

numerous copies that have survived from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and in

contrast to extensive research on other medieval manuscripts. There are at least forty English

genealogical chronicle rolls dating from 1265 to 1422,[26] and twenty-one that have survived

from the reign of Henry VI (1422–71).[27] The survival of these rolls suggests that although

they were not as popular as some texts, such as Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, of which

there are over a hundred surviving manuscripts, they were nonetheless part of a group of

popular historical narratives in mid-to-late medieval England.[28] In the nineteenth and early

twentieth century, scholars such as Charles L. Kingsford and Thomas Wright often dismissed

---

[24] Jones, 'The Canterbury Roll', pp. 85–90; Rouse, 'Inscribing Lineage', pp. 108–22.

[25] Chris Jones et al., 'The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Facsimile with Commentary', April 2013 version, <www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll>. Last accessed 24 September 2014.

[26] Olivier de Laborderie, 'A New Pattern for English History: The First Genealogical Rolls of the Kings of England', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literaure in Late-Medieval Britain and France*, ed. Edward Donald Kennedy and Raluca L. Radulescu (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), p. 47.

[27] Sydney Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 44, (1961–62), pp. 41–43.

[28] De Laborderie, 'A New Pattern for English History', p. 48.

rolls as items that have 'no value'.[29] They were thought to be of far less importance than other forms of literature and documentation. Even those who did show an interest in such manuscripts, such as Wright, regarded them as 'objects of curiosity', but considered not to belong in the 'national records'.[30] While it was acknowledged that chronicle rolls could provide a version of English history as it was 'received in medieval times', the rolls were often dismissed as 'useless genealogical tables of the fabulous kings'.[31]

Only in the last half-century has there been any academic interest in these manuscripts. Since the late 1970s, several scholars, notably Alison Allan, Ralph A. Griffiths, Sydney Anglo, and Olivier de Laborderie, have studied fifteenth-century English genealogical rolls.[32] The most extensive studies specifically on English rolls remain limited to Allan's unpublished doctoral thesis on Yorkist propaganda (1981) and Olivier de Laborderie's work on English genealogical rolls produced between 1265 and 1422 (2013).[33] Allan's thesis focused on genealogical rolls as part of wider Yorkist propaganda during the Wars of the Roses. Griffiths used the pedigree rolls such as Canterbury MS 1, as examples of

---

[29] Charles L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1913), pp. 164–65.

[30] Thomas Wright, *Feudal Manuals of English History, a Series of Popular Sketches of Our National History* (London: Joseph Mayer, 1872), pp. x–xii.

[31] Ibid., p. xix.

[32] For a brief overview of genealogical rolls in fifteenth century, in partiuclar those produced after 1450, see Allan, 'Political Propaganda'; Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda'; Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda,'; Griffiths, *King and Country*; for genealogical chronicles before 1422 see de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir*.

[33] Allan, 'Political Propaganda'; de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir*. Unfortunately, the following was embargoed at the time of writing: Jaclyn Rajsic, 'Britain and Albion in the Mythical Histories of Medieval England' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford, 2013).

fortifying the royal lineage.[34] These approaches to genealogical manuscripts highlighted their significance as texts with a clear ideological function: to enhance the prestige and legitimacy of kings.[35]

Since Allan and Griffiths wrote, there has been less emphasis on the political nature of genealogical rolls and more interest in the literary and cultural insights that the manuscripts offer. Genealogical rolls from earlier centuries have been explored in articles that have focused on specific themes. For example, Judith Collard and Joan Holladay have researched the way in which gender is addressed in thirteenth-century rolls.[36] The last major display of English genealogical rolls was in 2011 at the British Library, as part of a larger exhibition on illuminated manuscripts, suggesting a revival of interest in these rolls in the past decade.[37] *Broken Lines*, a collection of essays published in 2008 discussed a range of medieval genealogical literature, highlighting the importance of this genre to literary and historical study:[38] Raluca Radelescu and Matthew Fisher contributed to the edition by

---

[34] Griffiths, *King and Country*, p. 94.

[35] Godfried Croenen, 'Princely and Noble Genealogies, Twelfth to Fourteenth Century: Form and Function', in *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle*, ed. Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999), p. 84.

[36] Judith Collard, 'Gender and Genealogy in English Illuminated Royal Genealogical Rolls from the Thirteenth Century', *Parergon*, 17 (2000), pp. 11–34; Joan Holladay, 'Women in English Royal Genealogies of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries', in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan, Ellen M. Shortell and Madeline Harrison Caviness (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 348–64.

[37] Joanna Fronska, 'Royal Identity: Genealogical Chronicle of the English Kings', in *Genius of Illumination*, ed. Scott McKendrick, John Lowden and Kathleen Doyle (London: The British Library, 2011), pp. 344–46.

[38] *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval England and France*, ed. Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward Donald Kennedy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008).

examining the issues of romance and historiography respectively in genealogical literature.[39]

Recently, de Laborderie's work offered an extensive examination of the development and

significance of English genealogical rolls. He has argued that the rolls contributed to the

emergence of an English national identity and conscience. De Laborderie's book is one of the

few works to address genealogical manuscripts as material objects and to consider their

broader cultural purpose.[40] However, Canterbury MS 1 falls outside the chronological scope

of his project, which ends in 1422. The developing scholarship on the rolls has thus far

contextualised them in their broader literary and political context. However, no one has yet

examined the function and significance of genealogical chronicle rolls as sources of political

culture in late medieval England.

This thesis will build on extant research by examining Canterbury MS 1 as a source

for understanding early fifteenth century political culture. Such an approach will complement

existing studies of medieval political theory that employ non-traditional source material.

Traditionally, the study of medieval political thought has been based around the works by

medieval intellectuals such as Giles of Rome and John Quidort of Paris.[41] However, the

views of the intellectual elite do not necessarily reflect the views of other sections of society,

---

[39] Matthew Fisher, 'Genealogy Rewritten: Inheriting the Legendary in Insular Historiography', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* ed. Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 123–41; Raluca L. Radelescu, 'Genealogy in Insular Romance', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* ed. Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 7–25.

[40] For the form and function of the genealogical roll format: de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir*, pp. 47–79.

[41] For example, Joseph Canning, *History of Medieval Political Thought: 300–1450* (London: Routledge, 1996); Antony Black, *Political Thought in Europe 1250–1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

and nor are they guaranteed to be the only sources of medieval political thought and culture. Recently historians have analysed non-traditional sources, such as chronicles, that previously remained largely the domain of literary studies, to understand alternative attitudes towards 'political culture' and the underlying 'political' conceptions that shaped medieval society. John Watts suggested that in addition to institutional and formal structures of government and polity, a political culture influenced peoples' awareness and comprehension of politics through varied forms of media, such as language, art, architecture, and even conversations.[42] 'Political culture' is a vast term that Watts describes as a combination of ideology, media and social networks that create the complex political world in which medieval society functioned.[43] Andrea Ruddick, in her study of thirteenth and fourteenth-century English identity, defined political culture as the 'conventions, values and assumptions that inform and condition political activity'.[44] In recent decades, historians have begun to examine non-traditional sources, such as chronicles, to better understand the political culture and perceptions that shaped medieval society.

Chronicles were usually compilations of existing works, and unlikely to have explicitly 'political' themes. However, the importance of chronicles in understanding the political perceptions that formed medieval Europe is increasingly recognised. Bernard Guenée noted that the process of compiling chronicles can reveal insights into the compiler's

---

[42] John Watts, *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300–1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 129–30.

[43] Ibid., p. 130.

[44] Andrea Ruddick, *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 21.

perspectives.[45] The re-writing and editing of the past in chronicles, books and anthologies reveals the perceptions and agendas of the compilers and their audience.[46] Chronicles were employed by Elizabeth Brown to examine the perceptions of the Capetian dynasty.[47] Chris Jones developed the historiography of French chronicles by using them to discuss perceptions of claims to universal authority in France in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[48] English chronicles have also been re-assessed in a new manner: John Spence argued that Anglo-Saxon prose chronicles were compiled and written within a complex institutional and personal network with political and personal agendas at stake.[49] Alicia Marchant's use of English and Welsh chronicles reveals that the texts create a literary representation of the Welsh revolt (c.1400–1415) that uses sophisticated narrative strategies and literary constructs to re-write the past.[50] Thus far, chronicles have been examined to explore the society's understanding of a political culture that informed medieval political thought, but genealogical chronicle rolls have not yet been studied in this manner. Genealogical rolls are also

---

[45] Bernard Guenée, 'L'historien et la compilation au XIIIe siècle', *Journal des Savants* (1985), p. 126.

[46] S. Kelly and J. J. Thompson, 'Imagined histories of the book: current paradigms and future directions', in *Imagining the Book*, ed. S. Kelly and J. J. Thompson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), p. 9.

[47] Elizabeth A. R. Brown, 'La généalogie capétienne dans l'historiographie du Moyen Âge. Philippe le Bel, le reniement du reditus et la création d'une ascendance carolingienne pour Hugues Capet', in *Religion et culture autour de l'an Mil Royaume capétien et Lotharingie (Actes du colloque Hugues Capet 987–1987. La France de l'an Mil, Auxerre, 26 et 27 juin 1987–Metz, 11 et 12 1987),* ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard (Paris: Picard, 1990), pp. 199–214.

[48] Chris Jones, *Eclipse of Empire? Perceptions of the Western Empire and its Rulers in Late Medieval France* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

[49] John Spence, *Reimagining History in Anglo-Norman Prose Chronicles* (York, UK: York Medieval Press, 2013).

[50] Alicia Marchant, *The Revolt of Owain Glyndŵr in Medieval English Chronicles* (York: York Medieval Press, 2014).

documents that were compiled, written and disseminated for use in medieval society, and they too are sources that can shed light on medieval England's conceptions of political ideas.

This thesis is the first study to approach a genealogical chronicle roll as a source for exploring political culture in early fifteenth-century England. There are limitations with this approach. For example, it is difficult to distinguish whether the rolls were coherent, strongly edited and carefully composed manuscripts, or the result of random texts developed over time by the scribe, commissioner and readers without any consistent purpose. However, this thesis will demonstrate that the nuanced selection of text and manipulation of diagrams strongly suggests a conscious effort by the compiler to construct a calculated narrative. Furthermore, this is a micro-study focused on just one of several rolls that have survived, and does not offer an extensive overview of the entire 'family' of rolls. Nevertheless, focused studies on specific sources are vital to creating a broad understanding of a society that produced them. The thesis will reveal insights into the political perspectives, assumptions, and values held by those who created and used the roll: the elite aristocratic families of Lancastrian England.

**New Approaches**

Chapter one summarises the development of genealogical chronicle rolls in fifteenth-century England. It offers an overview of the evolution of the genealogical roll genre in medieval England, placing Canterbury MS 1 in its broader manuscript context. By examining the content on Canterbury MS 1 as a visual and textual object that can be assessed for its representation of abstract political concepts, this chapter will address some of the issues related to the study of this particular 'genre' of manuscript. Moreover, this chapter examines

the potential origins, purpose, and audience of the roll, by building on existing scholarship. Extant research suggests that the rolls were items of propaganda for a narrow, but important audience: the gentry and nobility who supported the English kings. The chapter affirms this view, but also contributes to the scholarship by suggesting additional avenues of provenance by introducing the previously overlooked families, the Nevilles and Percys. The rolls were objects of political value, as they were symbolic of political affiliations and the ideology underpinning the culture of social and political elites in England. This chapter argues that the makers and readers of rolls like Canterbury MS 1 were conscious of the construction of political narratives on the diagram and text. In doing so, the chapter lays the foundation for further exploration of the roll's reflection and contribution to early fifteenth-century political culture.

Thus far, existing analysis of the Canterbury Roll's political themes has been restricted to the propaganda and dynastic interests held by the political elites of English society. Chapter two develops these ideas further, by offering insights into the political culture of the period. The chapter provides a detailed overview of the foundation and origins of England through political prophecy as represented on Canterbury MS 1. This will offer a genealogical perspective on prophecy while supplementing the existing scholarship this topic. Political prophecy was a popular phenomenon and important aspect of political thought in medieval England. By assessing the use and manipulation of prophecies in the text of Canterbury MS 1, this chapter argues that the prophecies were selectively used for laying down the conceptual and historical foundations of an English kingdom, and to exert a form of Lancastrian cultural hegemony through assertion and authoritative interpretations of prophecies. To do this, the chapter will consider prophecies that make their appearance on the roll as case studies. They include prophecies centred on major figures in the history of

England, such as Brutus, Arthur, Cadawalladr and St Edward the Confessor. Although genealogical rolls and prophecies have been examined before, this is the first comprehensive assessment of multiple prophecies on a single roll. Combined, the political prophecies that appear on the roll highlight key moments in the history of Britain and England. In particular, they address the origins and foundations of the kingdom that the Lancastrian kings were claiming to inherit. This offers an alternative perspective on the intersection between genealogy and political prophecy on Canterbury MS 1.

Having established how the roll constructs the history of England through various prophecies, the third chapter will consider the concept of kingship and legitimacy in early fifteenth-century England. This chapter discusses the attempts by the roll's creator to legitimise the Lancastrian dynasty on the manuscript through both visual and textual means. It will assess the use of genealogical rolls to legitimise the Lancastrian dynasty and why this was considered necessary. The reasons lie in the beginnings of the Lancastrian dynasty with the deposition of Richard II and the installation of Henry of Bolingbroke as Henry IV in 1399. Although the roll has remarkably little to say about the deposition of Richard II, textual analysis of the roll's commentary has revealed that it uses mythical kings to reflect on the function and role of the 'king' of England. The use of ancient royal depositions as a proxy to comment on contemporary depositions suggests an attempt to legitimise the removal of an incumbent monarch. This implies that there was a formula for the suitability of a king and what the 'Crown' entailed. The intention is to examine the roll in the context of contemporary political thought. The roll's representation of deposition theory brings to light how noble families who possessed these kinds of manuscripts may have perceived their king's authority and legitimacy.

After examining the ideology surrounding kingship and deposition, the final chapter will consider the representation of relationships between England and its neighbouring territories. This will be discussed alongside the historical context of the early 1430s. This analysis specifically considers the depiction of foreign territories that are presented on the Canterbury Roll. The chapter will assess the portrayal of Scotland, Wales and France on Canterbury MS 1, and what this can reveal about English perceptions of these foreign territories. The English government during the early fifteenth century was preoccupied with Owain Glyndŵr's rebellion, which accounts for the great interest that the roll has in Welsh affairs. Furthermore, the roll's representation of the royal lineages of England and France united through hereditary descent offers yet another dimension of the genealogical manuscript. This chapter argues that English interests in France and the insistence on the 'dual kingdom' concept played an important part in the purpose and construction of this genealogical chronicle roll. By comparing the depiction and treatment of foreign dominions and territories, this chapter argues that Canterbury MS 1 was invested in creating a genealogical narrative of England's foreign relations to establish claims of the Lancastrian kings to Welsh and French territories.

By examining an underexplored manuscript and its historical and political context, the thesis suggests new ways of understanding genealogical chronicle rolls in relation to aspects of broader political culture. In addressing the important political perspectives on the roll, this study not only supplements several areas of medieval manuscript scholarship by providing an in-depth textual analysis of Canterbury MS 1, but also offers its own interpretation of the relationships between genealogical manuscripts and the context in which they were produced.

## Chapter 1

**Genealogical Chronicle Rolls: Provenance, Purpose and Materiality[1]**

**Introduction**

Canterbury MS 1 is one of several genealogical chronicle rolls to have survived form the fifteenth century. This chapter will firstly, contextualise the roll by placing it in the broader development of genealogical writing in medieval Europe. As medieval society placed importance on concepts of hereditary descent and social cohesion through patrilineal connections, genealogies were utilised for a variety of social, legal, and political functions. After exploring the wider societal developments that fostered English genealogical rolls, the chapter will examine Canterbury MS 1's diagram format and presentation of English kingship. The format and layout depicts a stylised and idealised vision of English history, which reveals some underlying conceptions in medieval political culture. Following this, the chapter moves on to assess how English rolls from the fifteenth century have been approached as political documents thus far in historiography. Scholarship has tended to concentrate on the use of the rolls as propaganda tools that promoted a particular dynastic narrative of English kings. Scholars such as Ralph Griffiths and Alison Allan suggest that the rolls were manifestations of political ideologies among aristocratic and royal families during times of dynastic instability.[2] Genealogical chronicle rolls occupied a unique position in

---

[1] Some material in this chapter will be published in: Shirota, M, 'Royal Deposition and the Canterbury Roll,' *Parergon*, 32:2 (2015).

[2] Alison Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV', in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England,* ed. Charles Ross (Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979), pp. 171–92; Ralph A. Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 83–103.

medieval political culture, as they educated, shaped, and influenced the historical and political world in which the elite families of England operated. By introducing the Nevilles of Middleham and the Percys as families that have been previously overlooked in discussions about gentry interests in genealogical issues, this chapter will develop on extant research.

## Development of Genealogical Chronicle Rolls: Form and Function

Genealogy served important legal, cultural, historical and social functions in Medieval Europe. Genealogical narratives of history were an expression of social memory that developed in the medieval period. Gabrielle Spiegel, in her discussion of French chronicles, argues that chronicles used genealogical history in a series of biographies linked by hereditary succession to narrate a past based on generations, not a calendar or annalistic notion of time.[3] The use of genealogies in historical narratives in France appeared at the same time as the noble families began to organise themselves into 'vertical structures' based on a hereditary lineage.[4] This suggests that genealogical constructs of historical narratives were a reflection of social developments. The social and cultural evolution of how prestige and power were related to land and title meant that tracing one's ancient forebears had resonance with contemporaries. Howard Bloch identified a development in Medieval Europe when the possession of land shifted from a 'horizontal' ownership between the same generation of family members, to a more 'vertical/temporal' system, where the land is kept as one whole and ownership is transferred on the principle of primogeniture. The relationship between land and the family that possessed it changed gradually from one that was orientated towards

---

[3] Gabrielle M. Spiegel, 'Genealogy: Form and Function in Medieval Historical Narrative', *History and Theory*, 22:1 (1983): pp. 47–49.

[4] Ibid., p. 47.

kinship groups and patrimony to one that was centred on indivisible 'family lands', which fostered a line of descent of individual land holders.[5] Francis Ingledew described 'genealogical textuality' as expressing a historical consciousness that correlates 'the possession of territory and power' to the 'ownership of time'.[6] The length of time of ownership was associated with prestige.[7] The further back a family's forebears could be traced, the more a family was regarded as older and established. This, combined with demonstrating dynastic prestige through legendary ancestors, is a powerful motive for the pedigree to extend all the way back to biblical beginnings, such as Noah on Canterbury MS 1. Moreover, the use of myths to explain the origins of a people and their rulers was widespread in medieval Europe.[8] Canterbury MS 1, therefore, is part of a long tradition of genealogical narratives of history in medieval England.

Among land-owning classes of society, lineage was an important practical matter that supported claims to lands, honours and 'rights'. Lineal descents were taken seriously as they had 'a real bearing on a family's prestige'.[9] Family genealogies, royal or not, often helped to consolidate a family's position within an area. They developed an image and identity of the

---

[5] Howard Bloch, *Etymologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 64–75. For further comment on this phenomenon, see Francis Inglewood, 'The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*', *Speculum*, 69:3 (1994): pp. 665–704.

[6] Inglewood, 'The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History', p. 673.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Barbara Yorke, 'Anglo-Saxon Origin Legends' in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), p.15.

[9] Matthew L. Holford, 'Family Lineage and Society: Medieval Pedigrees of the Percy Family', *Nottingham Medieval Studies,* LII (2008): p. 165.

family on a 'track through time'.[10] While they were a reflection of the desire to preserve a family's history and identity, they were also serious records for reference. Hereditary descent was important in the later medieval period as succession and inheritance became increasingly standardised.[11] Genealogical documents had legal ramifications that could be used in courts. For example, in an often-cited case, Sir Richard le Scrope and Sir Robert Grosvenor contested each other's right to bear arms. In 1385, the case went to court and was settled using genealogical material.[12] This example highlights the importance of genealogies in legal arguments of succession and inheritance. Genealogies were important to the social, economic and political structures of the landowning and titled classes, as they could settle legal claims to lands, honours and arms. This highlights the acceptance and importance of genealogical material in medieval society.

The defining feature of genealogical rolls is the diagram format. The evolution of the genealogical roll layout has been largely attributed to clerical or secular educational purposes. This is due to the brevity of text and the visual impact of the rolls, which suggest that they were for visual display and perhaps pinned to a wall as educational tools.[13] The particular format of genealogical rolls and their popularity are attributed to *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi,* written in the twelfth century by Peter of Poitiers (d. 1215), Chancellor of

---

[10]   David Crouch, 'The Historian, Lineage and Heraldry, 1050–1250', in *Heraldry, Pagentry and Social Display in Medieval England*, ed. Maurice Keen and Peter Cross (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), p.18.

[11] Crouch offers a summary of the historiographical evolution of the idea of lineage in Western Europe: Crouch, 'The Historian, Lineage and Heraldry, 1050–1250', pp. 20–28.

[12] Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2004), pp. 80–81.

[13] Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', p. 173.

the University of Paris. Peter is credited with having developed the distinctive 'circle-and-line' diagram layout of genealogical chronicle rolls. The format is believed to have functioned as a teaching aid by simplifying biblical stories for ease of memorisation.[14] According to de Laborderie, the genealogical form abbreviated the essential specifications of history with clarity and brevity, which made the format useful for memory aids.[15] The genealogy of Christ's ancestors could be abridged and simplified to a diagram layout to educate clerics and laymen.[16] The initial popularity of the format could be attributed to its function as study tools for clergy and others to understand biblical history. In England, records of royal descent can be traced back as early as the eighth and ninth centuries from Anglo-Saxon king-lists,[17] but the use of the royal genealogical roll format is attributed to Matthew Paris (d. 1259), a Benedictine monk from St Albans, who created manuscripts of royal pedigrees.[18] By the fifteenth century, genealogical chronicle rolls were probably 'mass produced' in secular workshops. Several manuscripts have near-identical format, colour-scheme and text, suggesting that all were produced by a small group of craftsmen.[19] Unfortunately for Canterbury MS 1 it is near impossible to trace it back to its workshop of origin. However, the existence of pedigree rolls with remarkably similar commentary and

[14] C. M. Kauffmann, 'An Early Sixteenth-Century Genealogy of Anglo-Saxon Kings', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institues,* 47 (1984): p. 209.

[15] Olivier de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir - Les généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre (1250-1422)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013), p. 174.

[16] William H. Monroe, 'A Roll-manuscript of Peter of Poitier's Compendium', *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, 65:3 (1978): p. 92.

[17] Kauffman, p. 210.

[18] Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MSS. 16 and 26: Joanna Fronska, 'Royal Identity: Genealogical Chronicle of the English Kings', in *Genius of Illumination*, ed. Scott McKendrick, John Lowden, and Kathleen Doyle (London: The British Library, 2011), p. 344.

[19] Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', p. 174

layout strongly suggests that the roll was not a 'one-off' production, but based on a template.[20] The diagrams and format, which make these rolls part of a unique 'genre' of medieval manuscripts, are a significant element to include in discussions of genealogical rolls.

Genealogical rolls often include some text alongside the diagram. The commentary text was usually borrowed from other documentation, such as chronicles. Manuscripts such as Canterbury MS 1 were not claiming to produce a new version of history, but instead included established historical texts to substantiate their argument. For example, Canterbury MS 1 explicitly refers to *Polychronicon* by Ranulph Higden (d. 1364), when explaining a Welsh uprising.[21] It is important to note that the written sources for these rolls, the chronicles, were consulted in politics as they were often considered credible records of the past and had a reputation for authenticity. In 1457, John Hardyng presented his chronicle to the Lancastrian Henry VI. After the Yorkist Edward IV claimed the throne, he revised his chronicle and presented an 'updated' version to the new king. Although the two editions were similar, the rewritten text emphasised the legitimacy of the House of York.[22] Some chroniclers writing slightly later in the fifteenth century, such as John Rous and William Worcester similarly changed or altered their writing depending on who was in power.[23] Furthermore, the roll

---

[20] Other genealogical rolls that start with Noah and are similar in style (though not identical) to Canterbury MS 1 include: Oxford, Queen's College Library, MS 167; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Marshall 135; Lincoln, Lincolnshire County Archives, 2 TDE/K-1; Aberystwyth, NLW, MS Rolls 39; MS Sloane 2732 A; Cambridge, King's College, MS 43.

[21] Appendix D, 4: '…dicit policronicon . lib° 7. ca ° 40 °.'

[22] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p.145.

[23] Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England II: C. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London: Routeledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), pp. 315–37.

format itself probably added to the 'authoritativeness' of the genealogies, as rolls were associated with administrative documents, giving genealogical rolls the impression of official documentation.[24] Like chronicles, genealogies and pedigree chronicle rolls were quasi-authoritative documents.[25] While often overlooked, the combination of visual and textual aspects can communicate a variety of values, assumptions, ideologies and themes that underlie the society that produced the rolls.

**Form and Visual Presentation of Dynastic Continuity**

The form and function of genealogical rolls present unique challenges and opportunities to analyse the way in which political ideologies and structures are represented and treated. This section utilises both the diagram and text to further understand the propagandist and dynastic themes of the roll. Although rolls such as Canterbury MS 1 are often described as 'genealogical chronicles' or 'pedigree chronicles' and may use chronicle sources, they do not communicate information as the latter would. While chronicles often can be examined just through text, the information on genealogical rolls cannot be fully understood without the both the diagrams and commentary. The diagram is a defining aspect of this genre, which also structures presentation of written text on the parchment. There is quite a lot of variation within the genealogical roll genre. The circles, which represent people, and lines, which represent some sort of connection between two circles, can be arranged in multiple ways. Most genealogical rolls in England are vertical and are read top to bottom,

---

[24] De Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir*, p. 78.

[25] Olivier De Laborderie, 'The First Manuals of English History: Two Late Thirteenth-Century Genealgoical Rolls of the Kings of England in the Royal Collection', *Electrionic Birtish Library Journal* (2014): p. 8**.**

such as Canterbury MS 1. Horizontal rolls, which are unfurled left to right, such as

Aberystwyth, NLW, Rolls MS 22, are very rare. In both types of rolls however, there is

limited space for extended commentary. The text would have been carefully selected to

ensure that it was arranged on the roll in an aesthetically balanced manner. Reducing history

to a circle-and-line format, of course, simplifies historical narratives, meaning that it can

effectively and easily communicate key ideas visually. It provides a sense of continuity by

linking one regal figure to the next.[26] In combination with the text, which comments on

historical events as well as the lives of kings, the diagram permits the eye to visually trace the

'history' of the people of England. Fundamentally, the layout of Canterbury MS 1 suggests

that kings can track their authority over English lands and English history by tracing the royal

line through time back to Noah. The visual elements promote a vision of England's royal

succession as constant, unchanging, and continuous. This reveals an ideological underpinning

to the roll format: it visually and tangibly takes the reader through the long and prestigious

tradition of English kingship until the contemporary era.


While Canterbury MS 1 suggests a continuous direct descent of English kings

visually, symbolised by the red line, this concept is impossible to align with the reality of the

rulers in England. The longest continuous uncontested father-to-son succession of English

kings is before Richard II's deposition, and only lasts six generations: from John to Richard

II. This period of less than two centuries (John was crowned in 1216, and Richard II was

deposed in 1399), was the longest duration of royal succession by primogeniture without

interruption in medieval England. Often, the transition between rulers was not 'vertical', but

---

[26] Simon Walker, 'Remembering Richard: History and Memory in Lancastrian England', in *The Fifteenth Century IV: Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain*, ed. Linda Clark and Christine Carpenter (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2004), p. 29.

actually 'horizontal' as younger brothers succeeded their elder siblings, rather than the crown

passing to the next generation. For example, William Rufus (d. 1100) and Henry I (d. 1135)

were both crowned in preference to their older brother, Robert (d. 1134) – but this is not

immediately obvious on the roll, since all kings are listed one after another on the red line.

After the Norman Conquest of 1066, there were other instances of an irregular succession of

kings: Stephen of Blois (d. 1154) was crowned king instead of the more 'legitimate'

challenger, Henry I's daughter Matilda (d. 1167); John (d. 1216) succeeded his childless

older brother Richard I (d. 1199), instead of his nephew Arthur, the young son of another

deceased older brother. This last scenario is reversed in the situation in 1377, when the ten-

year-old Richard II (son of eldest son of Edward III), was crowned instead of Edward's

second surviving son, John of Gaunt, who was a politically experienced adult.[27] In 1399,

Henry of Bolingbroke (the eldest son of John of Gaunt) replaced his cousin, Richard II.[28] On

Canterbury MS 1, all these irregularities are ignored and the kings all maintain a

representative circle on the same central red line. The complexity of succession is

disregarded. Canterbury MS 1 makes it appear as though brothers or cousins are father and

son, especially if there is no textual explanation regarding the link between them. The roll

streamlines history into an artificial narrative, idealising England's royal lineage as

standardised and hereditarily unquestionable. In turn, this reinforces the concept that the

English kingdom is strengthened by a stable royal dynasty.

---

[27] Peter McNiven, 'Legitimacy and Consent: Henry IV and the Lancastrian Title, 1399–1406', *Mediaeval Studies* (1982): pp. 475–76.

[28] For further detail of disputed succession to the throne of England since the Norman Conquest, especially regarding the successors to William the Conqueror and Edward I, see Chris Given-Wilson, 'Legitimization, Designation and Succession to the Throne' in *Building Legitimacy, Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies*, ed. Isabel Alfonso, Hugh Kennedy and Julio Escalona (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 97–100.

In addition to internal dynastic disputes between varying branches of the royal dynasties, England experienced invasions by the Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Danes and Normans. On Canterbury MS 1, kings by conquest such as William the Conqueror and Cnut, appear on the central red line of the manuscript, as if they have inherently become 'English' by conquering England. For example, the purple line, which represents the Norman dukes, starts with Rollo, the historical founder of the duchy, but then the line ends with William of Normandy.[29] The purple line 'joins' the red line through William, as if he has combined Norman and English blood when he seized control of England. It was actually several generations later when William's grandson, Henry II (d, 1154) ascended that the king of England had Anglo-Norman blood in his veins, as his mother was of Anglo-Saxon descent. The diagram, however, is more concerned with portraying William the Conqueror as having somehow brought together the essence of Norman and English kingship. This suggests that the viewer is required to accept the continuous red line as symbolic of the *position* of the English king, rather than a true representation of dynastic or hereditary succession. This highlights an ambiguity on the roll: it does not define exactly what the red line represents. It could symbolise the office of the crown, or a royal lineage that symbolises hereditary descent, or the history of England that is personified by the king. The roll's presentation of the past merges the history of a people and their king, producing an idealised version of hereditary royal succession and smoothing over irregular successions. There are parallels here between genealogical manuscripts and chronicles. For example, William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum* stresses the continuity between the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans. He strategically compiles his chronicle to prepare the reader for the coming of the Normans,

while also emphasising William the Conqueror's claim to the throne by appointment.[30]

Canterbury MS 1 does something similar in a visual format by emphasising a smooth

transmission of kingship after the Norman Conquest. This again emphasises the continuity of

a central royal authority as crucial to the narrative of English history. The roll visually

communicates to its audience that the continuity of 'royal' dynasty is central to the existence

of the English kingdom. Whether the king is a usurper or conqueror, they fulfil their position

as England's king and extend the red central line to the next generation.


**Origins of Canterbury MS 1: Rolls as Propaganda**

Having explored the development of genealogical rolls, their value in medieval

society, and the underlying ideological function of the roll format, this chapter will assess

how Canterbury MS 1 has been contextualised as a political document and its use in medieval

society. Royal pedigrees form part of a broader discussion of power, propaganda and

authority. The ability of genealogical chronicle rolls to promote one dynasty over another

made them excellent tools for propaganda, especially in times of contested royal succession.[31]

This section considers the political context of royal genealogical rolls and their provenance

and purpose. Arnold Wall attempted to contextualise Canterbury MS 1 as a document that

proved the loyalty of the Maude family to the Yorkists during the Wars of the Roses. His

theories are largely unsubstantiated, and his theory of the roll's provenance has been

---

[30] For analysis of William of Malmesbury's promotion of continuity, see Michael A. Faltera, 'Narrating the Matter of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Norman Colonization of Wales' in *The Chaucer Review*, 35:1 (2000): p. 63. For the appointment of William the Conqueror, see William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regnum Anglorum*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 228.

[31] For more on Yorkist propaganda efforts using genealogical chronicle rolls, see: Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', pp. 171–92.

questioned.[32] In more recent historiography, Allan and Griffiths started the study of the immediate political reasons for the popularity of genealogical manuscripts among powerful noble families in early fifteenth century. The significance of dynastic concerns during the early fifteenth century, decades before the Lancastrian-Yorkist conflict, probably accounts for the popularity of genealogical rolls that promoted Lancastrian kings. These rolls would have been on interest to not only royalty, but also gentry, nobility, and other social and political elites, who had a vested interest in the success of a particular royal family. These ideas are developed further in this section by applying them specifically to Canterbury MS 1.

Royal genealogical chronicle rolls became more popular during times of dynastic concerns or when there was a desire to popularise the prestige of a particular dynasty. Kings often sought legitimisation in various ways, such as from God, by conquest, 'election' or blood inheritance. Among them, blood lineage was a powerful and accepted form of legitimacy for transferring lands, titles and authority. Whenever possible, kings sought legitimacy by hereditary right.[33] While hereditary right was not in itself enough to justify the overthrowing of an existing royal dynasty, the use of pedigree was important for establishing a regime and for securing popular acceptance.[34] For example, genealogical rolls produced during the reign of Edward I emphasised the prestige of the Plantagenet family, even though

---

[32] Rebecca Hayward, 'Prestige and Pedagogy: The Ownership of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts by New Zealand Universities', in *Migrations, Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, ed. Stephanie Hollis and Alexandra Barratt (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), pp. 89–95.

[33] Given-Wilson, 'Legitimization, Designation and Succession to the Throne', p. 89.

[34] Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', p. 189.

there was no obvious challenger to the throne.[35] This was accomplished by emphasising the

Plantagenet connection to Anglo-Saxon ancestors and their 'Englishness'.[36] Other rolls were

deliberately designed to convince viewers of a righteous claim to the throne. In the fifteenth

century, there was a 'boom' in the production of royal genealogical rolls. This is indicative of

the relevance and interest in family bloodlines, which increased further in the latter half of the

century when the Lancastrian-Yorkist conflict escalated.[37] In the case of Canterbury MS 1,

the 1428–33 section of the manuscript can be understood as a pre-emptive strike against rival

claims that might discredit the legitimacy of the Lancastrian regime. As a form of symbolic

authority, genealogical chronicle rolls such as Canterbury MS 1 had an important function in

representing the nature of royal power and legitimacy. This shows how the purpose of royal

genealogies was to support or emphasise a particular narrative of the ruling dynasty.


Allan produced the first modern study of fifteenth-century genealogical rolls. In a

footnote in her article from 1979, Allan cites Canterbury MS 1 as an example of a

Lancastrian pedigree that was later modified into one that supported the Yorkist king, Edward

IV.[38] She offers a broad summary of the development of genealogical material, but her

emphasis remains on the immediate dynastic propagandist messages communicated by this

type of manuscript in the context of the Wars of the Roses. In doing so, her work brought

genealogical chronicle rolls to light as important political documents that functioned as tools

---

[35] Joanna Fronska, 'Royal Identity: Genealogical Chronicle of the English Kings', in *Genius of Illumination*, ed. Scott McKendrick, John Lowden, and Kathleen Doyle (London: The British Library, 2011), p. 345.

[36] Ibid., pp. 345–46.

[37] Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', p. 174.

[38] Ibid., p. 173.

for Yorkist propaganda. Rightly, she argues that genealogical rolls were consciously planned

and drafted documents that appealed to gentry and nobility because they provided a 'semi-

learned' argument to support their king's lineage.[39] Although Allan demonstrated the usage

of genealogies and their value as sources of medieval propaganda, her analysis was restricted

to the rolls' function at propaganda tools.

 

The dynastic controversy of the Lancastrian kings, stemming from 1399, has attracted

much scholarship, due to the perception that it was the 'origin' for the Wars of the Roses.[40]

Current consensus places the start of the wars in the 1450s and hereditary issues are not

regarded as a major factor in the escalation of the conflict.[41] The failure of the Lancastrian

government and the incompetence of Henry VI, once his personal rule started in 1437, were

major factor that propelled the conflict.[42] However, in 1979, Ralph Griffiths brought back the

relevance of dynasty, an issue that had generally been missing from twentieth-century

scholarship about the Wars of the Roses. He also commented on genealogical chronicle rolls

and Canterbury MS 1 specifically.[43] Griffiths argued that ever since 1399, 'the dynastic

stability, strength and cohesion of the house of Lancaster' was of great permanent concern.'[44]

His article discussed the three major noble families related to Henry VI (the Holands,

---

[39] Ibid., p. 189.

[40] Ian Mortimer, 'Richard II and the Succession to the Crown,' *History*, 91 (2006): p. 320.

[41] Keith Dockray, 'The Origins of the Wars of the Roses', in *The Wars of the Roses*, ed. A. J. Pollard (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995), p. 65.

[42] Ibid., p. 88.

[43] Griffiths, *King and Country*, pp. 92–94.

[44] Ibid., p. 85.

Staffords and Beauforts) and how by the 1440s, Henry VI's paternal uncles had either died or seemed increasingly unlikely to father legitimate heirs, and that the Lancastrian 'sense of dynasty' was becoming urgent to uphold.[45] In 1988, A. J. Pollard noted that issues of dynasty remained relevant, as the inability of Henry VI to rule effectively was compounded by the doubt surrounding his dynastic origins.[46] The creation of manuscripts such as Canterbury MS 1 suggests that the history and lineage of the kings of England were considered relevant in the first half of the fifteenth century. They bolstered support for Henry VI's minority. Though his study's central ideas were about the significance of dynastic sentiment during the early fifteenth century, Griffiths expanded on the noble and royal interest in genealogy.

**Gentry Origins of Canterbury MS 1: Beauforts, Nevilles and Percys**

Although the specific year of production is difficult to verify, Canterbury MS 1 was most likely created during the minority reign of Henry VI (1422–37).[47] During this period, there was no obvious succession crisis, and there was no clear challenge to the throne. Regarding the domestic situation of the kings of England, an alternative hereditary claim did not threaten the House of Lancaster in the early fifteenth century. After Henry IV's seizure of the crown in 1399, the Lancastrian kings were not directly challenged on basis of illegitimate

---

[45] Ibid., p. 86.

[46] Dockray, 'The Origins of the Wars of the Roses', p. 79.

[47] For dating for Canterbury MS 1, see the thesis introduction. Henry VI's minority reign formally ended in November 1437: Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Minority of Henry VI, King of England and France', in *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England*, ed. Charles Beem (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 180.

dynastic descent until the 1460s.[48] The dynastic issue was not 'clearly raised' until 1460,

when Richard, the Duke of York, presented for the first time his formal claim to the throne.[49]

Lancastrian kings were generally successful in establishing a monarchy with a 'sense of

dynasty', one which faced down challenges both at home and abroad. The Lollard rebellion

in 1414 was suppressed in London, and the Southampton Plot was thwarted and its

ringleaders executed in 1415. Potential threats against the monarchy were quashed or at least

contained. Although this could be a sign of an insecure dynasty, the failure of successive

plots to destabilise the House of Lancaster, evidenced by uncontested succession of the infant

Henry VI to the throne after his father's death, suggests otherwise. It appears that the

legitimacy of the House of Lancaster was not a problem during the reign of Henry V.[50] As

argued by Griffiths, concern about the stability of the House of Lancaster emerged after the

death of Henry V in 1422.[51] This is because there was probably an implicit understanding of

the fragility of the Lancastrian dynasty due to the low number of potential male heirs and its

origins in usurpation.[52] The minority of Henry VI and the lack of close male royal relatives

could have heightened the awareness of 'genealogical anxiety' to make it worth reiterating

the Lancastrian lineage on a manuscript such as Canterbury MS 1.[53] Establishing a 'lineage'

of English kings with mythical ancestry offered prestige for the young dynasty. The new

---

[48] Philip Edwards, *The Making of the Modern English State, 1460–1660* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p. 20.

[49] Ibid., p. 19.

[50] Griffiths, *King and Country*, p. 86.

[51] Michael Bennett, 'Edward III's Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376–1471', in *The English Historical Review*, 113:452 (1998): p. 601.

[52] Griffiths, *King and Country*, pp. 86–87.

[53] For more on 'genealogical anxiety', see: Raluca L. Radelescu, *Romance and its Contexts in Fifteenth-Century England, Politics, Piety and Penitence* (Woodbridge: Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 2013), p. 22.

Lancastrian kings embraced the powerful links that could connect them with the past kings of England.

Griffiths' thoughts on the Lancastrian supporters seeking a 'sense of dynasty' further broadens the political context of Canterbury MS 1. The king's lineage was not the only point of emphasis on some genealogical rolls. Despite the royal connections on Canterbury MS 1, there are suggestions that it was perhaps commissioned by a noble family with Lancastrian affiliations. There are no obvious marks or marginalia that provide clues to its place of origin in the fifteenth century. According to Griffiths, the three families that were close to the Lancastrian bloodline and had vested interest in dynastic connections were the Holands (descendants of Henry IV's full sister Elizabeth), and the Staffords (descendants of one of Edward III's younger sons, Thomas of Woodstock), and the Beauforts (illegitimate children of John of Gaunt, and therefore half-cousins of Henry IV). [54] On Canterbury MS 1, the Staffords are restricted to a small cluster near Thomas of Woodstock. The Earl of Stafford is only given his title, although the names of the earl's siblings imply that the circle is supposed to represent Humphrey Stafford, sixth Earl of Stafford.[55] The Holands are absent from the manuscript. By contrast, the Beauforts are prominently displayed on the roll. The children of John Beaufort are listed along with their titles: Henry (Duke of Somerset), Thomas (Count of Perche), John (Earl of Somerset), Edmund (Count of Mortain), Joan (Queen of Scotland), and Margaret (Countess of Devon). The Beauforts are not relegated to a corner like the Staffords, but evenly spaced to the immediate right side of the central line, in neat rows directly beneath

[54] Richard II legitimized his Beaufort cousins in 1397: Michael Bennett, 'Richard II and the Wider Realm', in *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, ed. Anthony Goodman and James L. Gillespie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 195.

[55] *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. E. B. Fryde, D. E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy (London: Royal Historical Society, 1986), p. 453.

Henry V and his royal siblings. The presence of the Beaufort family alongside the kings of England strongly suggests that the roll could represent an appreciation for the 'parlous dynastic situation of the Lancastrian royal family' and an attempt to 'buttress the Lancastrian line' through production of genealogies that emphasised the noble lineages that supported the House of Lancaster.[56]

As already explained by Griffiths, the Beauforts, Staffords and Holands were leading families in English politics with close hereditary links to the Lancastrians. Out of these noble families, the Beauforts are the most prominently featured family on Canterbury MS 1. However, this chapter will develop on Griffiths' ideas by including two other noble families and their potential connections with the roll: the Nevilles and Percys. On Canterbury MS1, two cousins of the Beauforts, Robert and Richard Neville, the children of Joan Beaufort (John Beaufort's sister) and Ralph Neville, are also depicted.[57] Richard and Robert Neville appear on the Canterbury Roll alongside the 'gap' where Henry VI ought to be. They are not on the central line, but their positioning on the manuscript makes them appear important and close to the English kings. Mentioned in the thesis introduction with regard to the dating of the manuscript, the two brothers were part of a family that was prominent in fifteenth-century English politics. Their mother, Joan Beaufort, was the legitimized daughter of John of Gaunt and his mistress, Katherine Swinford. Their father was Ralph Neville, who was created Earl of Westmorland in 1397. In short, the two brothers were, like the Beauforts, 'half-cousins' of Henry IV, with whom they shared a grandfather. Visually, they are positioned just below the

---

[56] Griffiths, *King and Country*, p. 94.

[57] For further discussion of the three key families related to Henry VI (the Holands, Staffords, and Beauforts): Griffiths, *King and Country*, pp. 83–99.

Beauforts. While all the Beaufort children are present on the roll, not all the Nevilles are present. Apart from Richard and Robert Neville, the rest of the Neville siblings are missing from the roll. The two brothers appear alongside five empty circles that might have been 'filled in' with the names of their siblings, suggesting that the roll was left unfinished.[58] The detailed presence of the Beaufort and Neville children on the roll is unusual, as the rest of the manuscript has a tendency to ignore the 'minor' branches of the royal line. In the remainder of the manuscript, if the focal point strays away from the central line of English kings, it is usually to another royal family (such as the French or Welsh), rather than a noble family within England. In addition, there is no commentary referring to the two families or any explanation given 'in text' regarding their presence. Their inclusion on the manuscript suggests that the manuscript was written with Beaufort-Neville sympathies in mind.

The Nevilles were a powerful family that emerged in the late fourteenth century and rose rapidly through English politics during the fifteenth. For a short period, one of their own, Cecily Neville, was mother of two kings of England, Richard III and Edward IV. Yet as Charles R. Young has discussed, the Nevilles did not materialise out of nowhere.[59] Ralph Neville was created Earl of Westmorland in 1375, and he married twice. His children from his first wife, Margaret Stafford, and those of his second, Joan Beaufort, had disputed bitterly over his estate after his death in 1425. His descendants from his first wife inherited the earldom of Westmorland, but the bulk of his estate went to his second set of children from

---

[58] Other royal genealogies with the Beaufort-Neville cousins include: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ashmolean Rolls 39; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Marshall 135; Oxford, Brasenose College, MS 91; Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives, 2-TDE/K/1; Aberystwyth, NLW, Rolls 55; Aberystwyth, NLW, Rolls 39; London, British Library, MS Royal 14 B VIII.

[59] Charles R. Young, *The Making of the Neville Family in England 1166–1400* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1996), p. 141.

Joan.[60] The latter branch of the family was called the Nevilles of Middleham, and they are the

Nevilles represented on Canterbury MS 1. Their half-siblings, the Nevilles of Westmoreland,

are not present. This strongly suggests that the 'Beaufort' and therefore the 'royal' blood that

connected the Nevilles of Middleham to Henry VI was key to their inclusion on the roll.

Moreover, the Nevilles of Middleham had the opportunity to become very powerful under the

Lancastrian kings, unlike the earls of Westmoreland. The decision of Ralph Neville to

support the first Lancastrian king, Henry IV, opened up possibilities for the members of the

family to take leading positions in military and political spheres for most of the fifteenth

century. This was especially true for those of Beaufort descent.[61] For example, another

powerful family in northern England and primary rivals of the Nevilles, the Percys, had

rebelled against Henry IV and paid the price by losing their estates between 1403 and 1440.

The Nevilles took this opportunity to establish themselves as the most powerful family in the

north of England.[62] The Nevilles of Middleham benefitted from their staunch support of the

Lancastrian kings in the first half of the fifteenth century, and their prominent presence on a

Lancastrian manuscript is reflective of their political affiliation. The connection between the

early years of Henry VI's reign and the Nevilles of Middleham may explain the 'closeness'

that is depicted between the two families on the Canterbury Roll. By the 1450s, the Nevilles

of Middleham had switched their allegiance from Henry VI to the Yorkists. However, during

the minority reign of Henry VI, the Nevilles' loyalty to the Lancastrian kings was

unquestioned, and their presence on the Canterbury Roll may point towards a manifestation

of their desire to show allegiance to the Lancastrian dynasty.

---

[60] Ibid., p. 145.

[61] Ibid., p. 140.

[62] Ralph A. Griffiths, 'Local Rivalries and National Politics: The Percies, the Nevilles, and the Duke of Exeter, 1452–55,' *Speculum*, 43: 4 (1968): p. 590.

The 'Beaufort-Neville' connection is evident due to the presence of these families on the roll. However, there is another possible aristocratic connection with the family that became the Nevilles' greatest rivals: the Percys. It has been claimed that the Percys had commissioned other royal genealogical rolls, such as Bodleian Library, Roll 5, which suggests that the Percys were interested in manuscript genealogies in the fifteenth century.[63] Taking a more lateral approach to Canterbury MS 1, such as examining the provenance of other rolls of similar date and type, has revealed yet another perspective to the origins of the roll. A roll that is very similar to Canterbury MS 1, including the 'Beaufort-Neville' section, is the Bodleian Library's Marshall 135. This contains a short paragraph that appears to name Henry Percy, second Earl of Northumberland (d.1455), as the commissioner of the manuscript.[64] Despite a Percy having commissioned it, this roll does not feature any Percy family member on the manuscript, much like Canterbury MS 1. Marshall 135's connection between the Percys, Beauforts, and Nevilles probably stems from marriages between the families. The second earl's father and grandfather (Henry 'Hotspur' Percy and Henry, the first earl) both rebelled against Henry IV and had their estates and honours confiscated. However, Henry V re-granted them to Henry, the second earl in 1416.[65] The same year, Henry Percy married Eleanor Neville (d. 1472), daughter of Joan Beaufort and sister of Richard and Robert Neville, bringing the earls of Northumberland into a familial relationship

---

[63] Gudrun Tscherpel, 'The Political Function of History: Past and Future of Noble Families', *Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Richard Eales (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2003), p. 87.

[64] The paragraph appears on the reverse of Oxford, Bodleain Library, Marshall 135: 'ad instanciam strenuissimi domini mei duci henrici comitis secundi northumbrie'.

[65] Tscherpel, 'The Political Function of History', p. 93.

with the Beauforts. In 1424, Henry Percy's sister Elizabeth (d. 1436) married Ralph Neville
(d. 1484), second Earl of Westmorland. Furthermore, in 1422, Henry Percy was appointed as
a member of the conciliar government during Henry VI's minority. During this period, Percy
was a part of the 'faction' supporting Bishop Henry Beaufort (d. 1447) against the Duke of
Gloucester.[66] This suggests that Percy interests became more aligned with the Beaufort-
Nevilles through both politics and marriage during the late 1410s and 1420s. Furthermore,
the Percys had been loyal supporters of the Lancastrian kings after their failed rebellion.[67]

Although there is no evidence suggesting that Henry Percy was personally responsible
for the production of the entire sub-group of royal genealogical rolls that include the
Beaufort-Neville emphasis, it is possible that Marshall 135 and others like it, such as
Canterbury MS 1, were produced in connection with the Percys during the 1420s. As an
object imbued with political ideology and propaganda, it is reasonable to assume that a noble
family, such as the Beauforts, Nevilles, or Percys, possessed the roll in the 1430s. If not
directly owned by these families, the prominence of the Beaufort-Neville cousins on these
manuscripts suggests that they were popular with Lancastrian supporters with connections to
them. Moreover, different patrons with similar political concerns may have commissioned
rolls from the same workshop.[68] The potential makers and readers of genealogical rolls, who
most likely had a gentry background, were at least semi-literate, interested in English history

---

[66] Ralph Griffiths, 'Percy, Henry, second Earl of Northumberland (1394–1455)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 43, pp. 704–06.

[67] Tscherpel, 'The Political Function of History', p. 98.

[68] Allan suggests they were produced in a small secular workshop: Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', pp. 173–74.

and lived in a political culture that placed importance on issues of royal dynastic continuity. The rolls have much more to reveal about the broader underlying political ideologies and assumptions held by the nobility within a genealogical framework of English kingship and history. 'Political context' is not confined to the themes of dynastic propaganda and royal succession, and the following chapters of this thesis will build on assessing Canterbury MS 1 as source for understanding the underlying political structures and perceptions held by the potential owners, creators, and readers of the roll.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has contextualised Canterbury MS 1 within a manuscript tradition and developing historiography. Although the details of the provenance and the commissioner are unknown, this chapter has suggested some possible origins of the roll. As part of the English tradition of genealogical narrative history, Canterbury MS 1 is a political document that presents a pro-Lancastrian perspective of English history, perhaps with special interest for the Beaufort, Neville or Percy families. This provides a base for further analysis of the roll's content, as it highlights the cultural and political importance of genealogical material among the social elites who were the manuscript's potential audience. The function of genealogical chronicle rolls as manifestations of political allegiance and support for a particular dynasty mark them as a highly politicised type of manuscript, worth examining for other perspectives on political culture.

Thus far, the contextualisation of Canterbury MS 1 has been limited to the immediate political background and motivations of the roll's potential creators and audience. Allan

utilised genealogical rolls as an example of political propaganda and Griffiths argued that rolls demonstrated the political and dynastic issues of the nobility. Both highlight the value placed on the 'sense of dynasty' among aristocratic and royal families during periods of political tension. Their studies offered views on the direct motivations of the nobility that invested in the rolls and laid foundations on which to further build these ideas. Literature on 'political' contexts of rolls from the fifteenth century remains limited to the work by Allan and Griffiths. While the existing research contextualises the roll in regard to aspects of themes such as political propaganda, dynastic awareness and national identity, there are still gaps in the literature. This chapter has summarised historiographical approaches and research on Canterbury MS 1. Building on extant research that this chapter has reviewed, the rest of this thesis will explore the Canterbury Roll's engagement with broader themes within 'political culture', such as prophecy, deposition theory and English relations with other political entities. The following chapters will fill some of the gaps in the contextualisation of the roll, addressing the depiction of broader political structures and perceptions Canterbury MS 1.

## Chapter 2

**The Use of Political Prophecies on Canterbury MS 1**

**Introduction**

On Canterbury MS 1, the commentary deals with not only the history of England and its kings, but also political prophecy. Cryptic, obscure and interpreted in numerous ways, political prophecies were a phenomenon that reached their peak in England between the twelfth and seventeenth centuries. Political predictions were used and manipulated to justify change, rationalise a crisis, legitimise usurpation and bolster authority. Canterbury MS 1 was produced in a period when prophecy functioned as a part of political discourse and reflects this trend. The chapter will discuss the roll's engagement with key features of medieval political prophecy. The prophecies initially appear to be marginal in the text of a chronicle history of the kings of England. However, rolls such as Canterbury MS 1 did not exist in isolation from the literary and cultural influences of the time, including political prophecy. The commentary refers to the prophetic figures of Brutus, Arthur, Cadwalladr and Edward the Confessor. The roll's portrayal of these prophetic figures offers a view of how they were understood in early fifteenth-century society. This chapter will consider prophecy on Canterbury MS 1 within the context of the popularity and power of the late medieval English prophetic tradition and politics.

Broadly speaking, the prophecies on this roll represent well-known English medieval political prophecies. Three of these have already been fulfilled according to the manuscript,

and one is yet to become reality, but is not given a specific timeframe. None of them are original prophecies. Much like the rest of the content in the commentary, the prophecies have been borrowed from other medieval sources, such as Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae [*henceforth *HRB]* and the anonymous *Vita Ædwardi Regis*. Despite the absence of a prophecy on the roll that explicitly refers to the reign of Henry VI, the selection of material in the text as a whole reveal the influence of the medieval prophetic tradition. They add another dimension to the legitimisation of the House of Lancaster and Henry VI. By focusing on the prophetic parts of the text, the chapter will their origins, interpretations and assess them in the political context of fifteenth-century England.

**The Significance of Prophecy in Medieval Politics**

In order to assess the elements of political prophecy on Canterbury MS 1, it is crucial to understand their origin and formation in the medieval period.[1] Most simply, a political prophecy is an attempt to predict the political future. Its definition is 'self-evident' according to Rupert Taylor, who summarised it as an expression of written or spoken thought foretelling coming events of a political nature.[2] This definition does not reflect the complex reality of prophecies, as they can encompass the past, present, and future. This has been addressed by Karen Moranski and Lesley Coote, both of whom have developed discussions

---

[1] For a summary of the development of political and apocalyptic prophecy in the Western European tradition from antiquity, see chapter one of Jennifer E. Forster, 'Politics, Prophecy, and Propaganda in Early Modern England', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Kent State University, 2005), pp. 22–48.

[2] Rupert Taylor, *Political Prophecy in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911), p. 2.

about 'political prophecy' functioning as a discourse.[3] There are certain notable features of medieval political prophecy. For example, often they incorporate the observation of signs, symbols, and *mirabilia* in cryptic descriptions that must be 'de-coded' in order to be understood properly.[4] Chris Given-Wilson divided prophetic writings that were prevalent in later medieval England into two groups: the first is 'apocalyptic' and the second is 'political'.[5] The first type is concerned with the Day of Judgement and the end of the world. A seminal study on this kind of medieval prophecy was Marjorie Reeves' work on the twelfth-century Sicilian abbot Joachim of Fiore and his influential thoughts on apocalyptic prophecy in Medieval Europe.[6] The second type, which Given-Wilson calls 'political', generally related to secular English medieval prophetic literature that was derived from Geoffrey's *HRB*. Geoffrey's work consisted of a selection of predictions that could be separated into independent episodes and continued to inspire prophecies for several centuries. Geoffrey's work often considered as the foundational source of English prophecies because of the lasting influence and impact it had on the English prophetical tradition.[7] The

---

[3] For a discussion of issues raised by Taylor's definition, see: Karen R. Moranski, 'Predicting the Past and Recounting the Future: Prophecy and Propaganda in Later Medieval Britain' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995), pp. 4–18 and Lesley Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press with Boydell Press, 2000), p. 13.

[4] Jean-Claude Schmitt, 'Approximating the Future', *Medieval Futures: Attitudes to the Future in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Peregrine Rand, ed. J. A. Burrow and Ian P. Wei (Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2000), p. 9.

[5] Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2004), p. 39.

[6] Majorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); Majorie Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future: a Medieval Study in Historical Thinking*, new ed. (Stround: Sutton Publishing, 1999).

[7] Sharon Jansen, *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII* (London: Boydell Press, 1991), p.10; Karen R. Moranski, 'The "Prophetiae Merlini", Animal Symbolism, and the Development of Political Prophecy in Late Medieval England and Scotland', *Arthuriana*, 8:4 (1998): p. 59.

prophecies mentioned on Canterbury MS 1 fall under this second category. Generally, most prophecies had anonymous authors, but many have been attributed to holy men or scholars, such as Joachim of Fiore, or legendary figures, such as Merlin. In many cases, the same prophecy was recycled by different generations, as they could be manipulated or re-interpreted depending on the changing purpose and context, as the roll will demonstrate.

Political prophecies in late medieval and early modern England have been the subject of numerous studies since Rupert Taylor attempted the first survey of English medieval prophetic literature in 1911. As the first comprehensive study of the genre, Taylor's focus was predominantly on particularly well-known political prophecies in medieval England. His work has formed the foundation for numerous studies of political prophecy in medieval and early modern England. Political prophecies from the early modern period have been extensively studied in the past few decades. Frequently, prophetic material associated with the Tudors has been the subject of these studies.[8] However, Paul Strohm, Helen Fulton and Lesley Coote have also examined the uses of prophecy as propaganda during the coup of 1399.[9] While Fulton believes that prophecy was manipulated by elites as a means of exerting

---

[8] For political prophecies associated with the Tudors, see: Tim Thornton, *Prophecy, Politics and the People in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006); Howard Dobin, *Merlin's Disciples: Prophecy, Poetry and Power in Renaissance England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990); Sharon Jansen, *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII*; Jennifer E. Forster, 'Politics, Prophecy, and Propaganda in Early Modern England'; A. Fox, 'Prophecies and politics in the reign of Henry VIII', *Reassessing the Henrican Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform, 1500–50*, ed. A. Fox and J. Guy (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 77–94.

[9] Helen Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', *Arthurian Literature*, ed. Roger Dalrymple and Keith Busby (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 64–83; Lesley Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs*; Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimization, 1399–1422* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

'hegemonic power to restore consensus',[10] Coote has developed the concept that political

prophecies were not a literary genre (as they have been treated since Taylor's thesis) but a

discursive tool employed by those without political power to communicate ideas about kings,

the people, and the kingdom.[11] Coote considered how prophecies were used in genealogical

writings and the discourse between collective memory, genealogy and prophecy, drawing on

examples of where all three overlap in medieval texts.[12] This chapter will build on these

existing studies. Instead of assembling various texts of genealogy and prophecy from

different manuscripts or comparing the usage of the same prophecy in different manuscripts,

it will narrow the focus down to just one manuscript and the instances of political prophecy

that appear within it. Analysing the prophetic elements on a single document, rather than

collecting them from various genealogical manuscripts offers an alternative way of looking at

the same phenomenon. It reveals the inescapable intersection of prophecy and genealogy

throughout this particular narrative of English history, and how the differently each prophecy

is presented for varying purposes in a single manuscript.


The ability to predict the political future was a power. The political influence and

authority of prophecies came from the revelation of predetermined events. To understand

this, it is important to consider the typical perception of how time and history work in a

medieval Christian framework.[13] From a medieval perspective, time is teleological and

---

[10] Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 65.

[11] Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs*, p. 13.

[12] Lesley Coote, 'Prophecy, Genealogy, and History in Medieval English Political Discourse', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* ed. Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 26–44.

[13] Schmitt, 'Approximating the Future', p. 16.

constantly moving towards the Last Judgement.[14] Along the way, various predetermined events could be unveiled by God in cryptic messages in the form of prophecies. To the medieval mind, prophecy was 'history in a future tense'.[15] Prophecy was the divinely revealed knowledge that lay 'beyond the scope of human observation'.[16] Prophecies offered the potential for this knowledge to be de-coded and understood.[17] The glimpses into the pre-determined future were obscured in vague codes, making them malleable to various scenarios of the future or applicable retrospectively to past historical events. The ability of prophecies to be retro-fitted to historical events gave the ambiguous stories credibility, especially as they often combined fact and fiction, disguising history as prophecy.[18] Once some prophecies were established as having been 'fulfilled', further authority was lent to other prophecies that had yet to come true.

Prophecies were taken seriously in English medieval society.[19] An English obsession with political prophecies was commented on by contemporary continental writers, such as

---

[14] Caroline Eckhardt, 'Prophecy and Nostalgia: Arthurian Symbolism at the Close of the Middle Ages', *The Arthurian Tradition*: *Essays in Convergence*, ed. Mary Flowers Blackwell and John Bugge (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1988), p. 110.

[15] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 45.

[16] R. W. Southern, 'Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 3. History as Prophecy', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, vol. 22 (1972), p. 160.

[17] Julia Crick, 'Geoffrey and the Prophetic Tradition,' in *The Arthur of Medieval Latin Literature: The Development of the Arthurian Legend in Medieval Latin*, ed. Sian Echard (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2011), p. 67.

[18] Jansen, *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII*, p. 15.

[19] Ibid., p. 10.

Phillippe de Commynes, who wrote that the English were 'steeped in prophecy'.[20] Fulton

argues that political prophecies thrived in periods of contested kingship, citing a 'mania' for

these predictions during the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV and Edward IV.[21] Prophecies have

the ability to explain political instability, which accounts for the surge of prophetic literature

during political strife and civil war. The Canterbury Roll was not created during these 'peak'

periods of prophetic production. However, the roll's prophecies show the prevailing influence

of divinatory material even during times of apparent dynastic stability. In the early fifteenth

century, there were attempts to control the circulation of prophecies, which demonstrate the

political threat they could pose. For example, in 1402, a law was passed by Henry IV against

Welsh prophecies.[22] The legislation also commanded that no Welshmen could gather to hear

bards. This was to stem the popularity and spread of political prophecies.[23] This shows that

the regime considered anti-Lancastrian prophecies as a threat and took action to limit the

dissemination of disadvantageous prophecies that harboured potentially anti-English

sentiments, particularly during the Welsh Revolt in the early fifteenth century. The ability of

prophetic literature to enhance the mystique and prestige of rulers resulted in some medieval

and early modern royals taking advantage of symbolic meaning and predictions.[24] This meant

that prophecies and their interpretations became a cultural battleground for competing

---

[20] Given-Wilson, *Chronicles*, p. 40.

[21] Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 65.

[22] Jansen, *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII*, p. 18.

[23] Susan Martha Shwartz, 'The Prophecies of Merlin and Political Propaganda in England from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Henry VII' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard University, 1977), p. 68.

[24] For examples of prophecies supporting Henry IV, see: Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 78.

ideologies.[25] Within this context, political prophecy was fundamentally about power. It could shape public opinion through a cultural and literary medium and portray the abstract concept of power relationships.[26] Prophecies could justify change of the established order and bolster dynastic claims for legitimacy. As such they offer an important perspective from which to understand medieval perceptions of power and authority.

Usually accompanied by the language of conflict, conquest and domination, the political prophecies of medieval England were closely bound to the political atmosphere of the time.[27] Prophecies do not take into account the administration of government or how to maintain law and order. They are more interested in conquests than the specifics of certain events or the practical mechanics of government.[28] Prophecies frequently 'predicted' a change of regime, rebellion or conquest. Often they could be used by either 'side' of the conflict in any given situation. For example, one of the famous political predictions of the period that supposedly 'came true' is the 'Six Kings to Follow King John' prophecy.[29] This prediction was ultimately derived from one of Merlin's prophecies that named a succession of English kings all symbolised by various animals representing their reigns. After King John, the prophecy lists: the Lamb (Henry III), the Dragon (Edward I), the Goat (Edward II),

---

[25] For detailed comparison of competing prophecies that supported either Richard II or Henry IV, see: Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', pp. 72–74.

[26] Lesley Coote, 'A Language of Power: Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England', *Prophecy: The Power of Inspired Language in History, 1300–2000*, ed. Bertrand Taithe and Tim Thornton (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997), p. 21.

[27] For more on the use of language, including the use of rhetoric techniques, see: Coote, 'A Language of Power', pp. 19–23.

[28] Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs*, p. 22.

[29] For a detailed analysis several versions the 'Prophecy of Six Kings', see T. M. Smallwood, 'The Prophecy of the Six Kings', *Speculum*, 60:3 (1985): pp. 571–92.

the Boar (Edward III), the Ass (Richard II) and the Mole (Henry IV).[30] Initially, it was

interpreted in a pro-Lancastrian manner. Henry IV was the Mole, who courageously took

down the weak Ass. In later pro-Yorkist versions, the Mole or the Moldwarp was an evil

character, igniting strife and confusion in England.[31] The latter interpretation was used for a

time against Henry IV by the Percys and Owain Glyndŵr during their rebellion in the early

1400s.[32] This shows how prophecies could be manipulated by opposing factions. The

popularity of political prophecy was an opportunity for different political ideologies to

establish advantageous interpretations of prophecies. The 'Six Kings' prophecy is an example

of how predictions can shape political narratives.

**The English as King-Killers: Brutus and the Trojan Origins of England**

The first prophecy on Canterbury MS 1 is in reference to Brutus, the mythical founder

of Britain. The significance of Brutus as an ancestor of Britons is highlighted on Canterbury

MS 1 by the visual decoration of a large crown placed above the name 'Brutus' on the

diagram. Up until this point, the commentary consists of statements that describe what

happened from the time of Noah. In the roll's paragraph about Brutus, the scribe tries to

summarise the tale of Brutus' journey in a very succinct manner. In doing so, it also includes

a prophecy. The roll says that 'after receiving a reply from Diana, Brutus went on his way to

---

[30] Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 77.

[31] Shwartz, 'The Prophecies of Merlin and Political Propaganda in England from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Henry VII', p. 66; Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 79.

[32] Moranski, 'The "Prophetiae Merlini", Animal Symbolism, and the Development of Political Prophecy in Late Medieval England and Scotland', p. 65.

the place of salt'.[33] This refers to the vision that the goddess Diana revealed to Brutus, in which she prophesises his journey to establish Britain. The 'place of salt' is an early pit stop on Brutus' route west to fulfil his destiny. Diana's role in the Brutus myth originates in *HRB*: she tells Brutus of deserted land that he will furnish as 'New Troy'.[34] This 'deserted land' is Albion, which Brutus later renames after himself as Britain. From the twelfth century, the *HRB* became an influential work that connected the Trojans to Briton, providing England with a well-developed origin myth. The commentary's mention of Diana, which immediately evokes her prophecy to Brutus, emphasises the supernaturally endorsed, 'exceptional' nature of England and its kings. As Brutus was one of the Trojan refugees, his journey parallels Aeneas's founding of Rome.[35] Britain is placed on equal standing to the Roman Empire and can claim Trojan origins. The medieval fascination with Troy is reflected in the literature surviving from the period.[36] The English saw their kingdom as the heir to ancient Troy, and developed its own foundation myth that connected Trojan refugees with Britain. Political

---

[33] Appendix A, 1: '…Inde response accepto Diana iter capit et ad locum Salinarum devenit…' The roll says 'locum salinarum', but in Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain: An edition and translation of the De gestis Britonum ('Historia Regum Britanniae')[HRB]*, Latin text ed. Michael D. Reeve, trans. Neil Wright (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia Anglorum*, it is 'lacum Salinarum' (Salt Lake). Refer to: Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, p. 21; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 31.

[34] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, pp. 18–21.

[35] Ingledew, 'The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae', *Speculum*, 69:3 (1994): p. 677.

[36] For uses of Troy in England: James Simpson, 'The Other Book of Troy: Guido delle Colonne's Historia Destructionis Troiae in Fourteenth and Fifteenth-century England', *Speculum*, 73:2 (1998): pp. 397–423. For assessment of the Trojan myth in literature (Gower and Lydgate in particular), with emphasis on the gendered presentation of imperial tropes, see Sylvia Federico, *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, USA: University of Minnesota Press, 2003). For the development of the 'Brutus' myth in England, see Thea Summerfield, 'Filling the gap: Brutus in the *Historia Brittonum*, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* MS F, and Geoffrey of Monmouth', *The Medieval Chronicle VII*, ed. Juliana Dresvina and Nicholas Sparks (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), pp. 85–102.

prophecy is part of Britain's founding myth, and it provides a divinely inspired beginning to the genealogy of English kings. The connection to antiquity adds prestige to the current rulers of England and bolsters a sense of greatness for the kingdom. This demonstrates the importance of prophecy in genealogical histories of England produced in the late medieval period.


The roll also refers to another prophecy that offers a new perspective on the portrayal of Brutus in genealogical rolls. It tells us that according to the prophecy of the magicians, Brutus' mother died in childbirth and that his father was killed with an arrow while hunting. Later, Brutus was expelled from Italy for unexplained reasons.[37] This expulsion is the catalyst for Brutus to embark on a wandering journey through Greece and Western Europe until he comes to Britain and defeats the giants living there. This prophecy appears to have been taken from Geoffrey's *HRB*. In Geoffrey's version, Brutus's mother dies in childbirth, and he is responsible for inadvertently killing his father while out hunting. The accidental murder of his father leads to Brutus' expulsion.[38] The obvious difference between the two versions of the magicians' prophecy is that the roll conveniently omits Brutus' accidental combined patricide and regicide. The *HRB* is not necessarily the direct source for this material despite its position as the authoritative version.[39] However, comparing these variants of the Brutus myth and considering why the roll used one particular version is an opportunity to reflect on the re-telling and compilation of a genealogical and prophetic history of England.

---

[37] Appendix A, 1: 'Brutus post matris patrisque interfectionem matris in partu et patris in venando cum sagitta secundum magorum vaticinium expulsus ab Italia…'

[38] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, pp. 8–9.

[39] Ingledew, 'The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History', p. 677.

The omission of Brutus' regicide on Canterbury MS 1 was undoubtedly intentional, as having England's founding figure and royal ancestor responsible for the death of both his parents would have been unappealing part of the legend for an English audience. The French had already seized on this aspect of the Brutus myth. As Colette Beaune has explained, French texts of the fifteenth century used Brutus for anti-English purposes.[40] The link between the mythical founder of Britain and actual accounts of regicide in English history were not lost on the French. The English had a regicidal tendency, as Jean Juvenal des Ursins wrote in 1444: 'Ilz on une maniere en Angleterre quilz ne tiennent comte de changier leur roy quant bon leur semble, voire des les tuer et faire morir mauvauisement'.[41] The reputation of the English as 'king-killers' was supported by fact that out of the six kings of England between 1327 and 1461, four died violently.[42] Among them, only Henry V was killed by a non-English enemy; the rest were most likely murdered by their fellow countrymen. On account of the deposition and subsequent suspicious death of Richard II in 1399, it was important to the compiler of Canterbury MS 1 to avoid any parallels that implied that the House of Lancaster was founded on regicide. The subtle alteration of the Brutus story on the roll is telling of how the Lancastrian supporters wanted to paint a positive picture of their origin myth, their founding hero and avoid any suggestion that their dynasty was established by regicide.

---

[40] Colette Beaune, *The Birth of an Ideology: Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late-Medieval France*, trans. Susan Ross Huston, ed. Frederic L. Cheyette (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 233–34.

[41] Quotation from J. Juvenal des Ursins, *Tractie compendieux de la querelle de France contre les Anglois*, Biblioteche Nationale, MS. Fr. 17512, fol. 34v a., in P. S. Lewis, *Essays in Later Medieval French History* (London: Hameldon Press, 1985), p. 191.

[42] Edward II (d. 1327), Richard II (d. 1400), Henry V (d. 1422), Henry VI (d. 1461).

**The Return of the Welsh? Merlin, King Arthur and Cadwalladr on Canterbury MS 1**

The next major prophecy in Canterbury MS 1 is related to the legendary king Arthur. By the late fourteenth century, Arthur was well-known as the great chivalrous king with the power to unite Christendom.[43] Arthur's presence on the roll is accompanied with a few paragraphs that describe his role in British history. The text refers to Merlin and his prophecies briefly in two different sentences. The first paragraph recounts a battle between the Saxons and the Britons. It notes that the defeated Britons retreated to the hills of Ereri (Snowdonia), where Merlin prophesised.[44] The text then goes on to describe one of Merlin's prophecies in which he foresaw the death of Aurelius Ambrosius after seeing a comet appearing in the sky that took the shape of a dragon. We are told that Uther, who is traditionally regarded as Arthur's father, received his epithet 'Pendragon' from this incident.[45] The roll's commentary continues by describing the great achievements of Arthur, naming him as the hero who conquered much of Europe. Although difficult to source, this section of text is probably based on Geoffrey's *HRB*. This is because although Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon* is named as a source on the roll, Higden did not involve Merlin in the conception of Arthur.[46] There is no reference to the dragon-star in the sky and Arthur's birth in the *Polychronicon*. Higden only mentions that Uther killed 'Gorolus' (Duke of

---

[43] Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 66.

[44] Appendix B, 1 : '…Britonibus fugerunt ad montes Ererii ubi prophetavit Merlinus.*'*

[45] Appendix B, 2 '…Uther sic Pendragon nuncupatur quia sic Merline est prophetatus est propter stellam que ….apparuit effigiem draconis…'

[46] Stephen Thomas Knight, *Merlin: Knowledge and Power though the Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), p. 100.

Cornwall) and married the Duke's wife, 'Igerna'.[47] So it is unlikely that the roll's scribe used

Higden to develop this section, but instead used Geoffrey work to develop this story.

Geoffrey's two mythical figures, Arthur and Merlin, had a powerful influence over

prophetic literature in England for centuries.[48] Over two hundred copies of *HRB* have

survived, showing the popularity of his works.[49] The roll's version of this prophecy is lacking

in detail compared to Geoffrey's text. Geoffrey tells us there were several rays that emanated

from the dragon. One ray was going towards France, another towards Ireland; there were also

seven smaller beams. Merlin was summoned to interpret the phenomenon by Uther. Merlin

declared that Aurelius Ambrosius was dead, and that the dragon in the sky represented Uther

himself, who would be the next king of the Britons. In his interpretation of the portent,

Merlin claimed that Uther's son, Arthur, would rule all the kingdoms that lie under the

dragon's ray over France, while the ray over Ireland represented Uther's daughter, whose

descendants would rule Britain.[50] The obvious difference between the roll's version and the

*HRB*'s version is that the former is less detailed than the latter and does not directly link the

apparition of the dragon in the sky with the coming of Arthur, the great British king who will

conquer multiple kingdoms. This myth was used repeatedly by kings from Edward I to Henry

---

[47] Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an unknown writer of the fifteenth century*, ed. by Churchill Babington and Joseph Rawson Lumby, vol. 5 (London: Longman Green, 1865–1886), p. 314.

[48] Julia Crick, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth, Prophecy and History', *Journal of Medieval History*, 18 (1992): p. 357.

[49] Identified in: John Spence, *Reimagining History in Anglo-Norman Prose Chronicles* (York, UK: York Medieval Press, 2013), p. 403.

[50] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, p. 178.

VIII, who all claimed to be the successors to Arthur.[51] For example, Henry VI's grandfather, Henry IV, painted himself as the Arthurian hero who had returned from exile to claim the throne.[52] Arthurian political prophecies part of a long tradition in medieval England. The inclusion of Arthur and Merlin in Canterbury MS 1 highlights the literary context in which the roll was created.

Geoffrey's *HRB* and Merlin's prophecies appear to have been accepted broadly, despite the scepticism of some chroniclers, including Higden.[53] However, a vital part of the 'sky dragon' prophecy, which interprets the dragon's rays as symbolic of the coming of Arthur, is absent from the roll. The roll describes Arthur as a 'great warrior',[54] but nothing supernatural or extraordinary is suggested about his person or his achievements. He is credited with conquering many lands, but nothing is mentioned about him being a British hero. Visually, most kings have unembellished circles around their names, except for a select few deemed extraordinarily important who are given decorations around their circles.[55] For example, Egbert and Brutus have crowns above their circles, while William the Conqueror's circle has ink-drawn flower petals around it and his name written in red ink. Arthur does not have an embellished circle. The lack of emphasis on Arthur was probably on purpose, in

---

[51] For more on Arthurian myth claimed by English kings, see: Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England,* p. 43; Sydney Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, no. 44 (1961–62), pp. 17–48.

[52] Fulton, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', p. 73.

[53] Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England, II, c., 550– c. 1307* (London: Routledge, 1974), pp. 212–13.

[54] Appendix B, 3: '…Arthurus nobilis bellator…'

[55] On Canterbury MS 1, these 'special' figures on the central axis are (in chronological order): Noah, Brutus, Lucius, Egbert, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror and Henry V.

order to 'downplay' his importance in English history. Although his grandfather had claimed

to be Arthur's successor, by the reign of Henry VI, there was no urgent need to claim

succession to Arthur to legitimise power. The Lancastrian dynasty seemed firmly established

between the late 1420s and early 1430s, when this manuscript was most likely drafted.

However, as Ralph Griffiths has reminded us, this sense of security was rather superficial.[56]

Despite Shakespeare's Henry V, who declares himself a Welshman,[57] the historical Henry V

had no Welsh bloodline, and neither did his father or son. Shakespeare's use of Welsh

references to Henry V was mostly likely motivated by Anglo-Welsh relations in the late

sixteenth century and Tudor propaganda efforts to connect their ancestry with the ancient

Britons.[58] In reality, Henry VI and the Lancastrian kings did not actually have any Welsh

ancestry. During the reign of Henry VI, prophecies that dealt with the return of Arthur were

discouraged in order not undermine his rule.[59] Hailing the return of Arthur had negative

implications for Henry: Arthur's descendant could only become king by replacing the

Lancastrian dynasty. A Lancastrian scribe, such as the one commissioned to produce

Canterbury MS 1, could not have predicted the 'Wars of the Roses' in the early years of

Henry VI's reign, but he may have taken care to focus on the conventional English history,

without over-enthusiastically claiming Arthur as an ancestor of his own king. It is probable

---

[56] For more: Ralph A. Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambledon, 1989), pp. 83–103

[57] In William Shakespeare's *Henry V*, the character of Henry V proclaims twice that he is Welsh: 'No, I am a Welshman' (4.1), and 'For I am Welsh…' (4.7): William Shakespeare, *King Henry V* (New York: Airmont Publishing, 1967).

[58] For the 'Welsh identity' of Henry V, see chapter five of Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). For a study on Shakespeare and his portrayals of Welsh princes, see: Marisa R. Cull, *Shakespeare's Princes of Wales: English Identity and the Welsh Connection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 110.

[59] Shwartz, 'The Prophecies of Merlin and Political Propaganda in England from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Henry VII', p. 46.

that he wanted to downplay the lack of association between Arthur and Henry VI by de-emphasising the role of the former in British history. There is no concrete evidence to suggest that Henry VI actively and consciously used political prophecy.[60] However, Canterbury MS 1 represents the attempt by Lancastrian sympathisers to include Arthur as a part of conventional British history, but not to over-emphasise his mythical status.

The only 'unfulfilled' prophecy on the roll also refers to one from Merlin, and is closely connected to Arthur. The roll tells us that Cadwalladr, the last king of the Britons, left Britain, and that the defeated Britons were henceforth called the 'Welsh', named after their leader Wallo.[61] The Welsh were destined never to recover the crown of Britain until they had transferred the relics of Cadwalladr from Rome to Britain.[62] This is also based on a prophecy from Geoffrey, whose version is very similar.[63] Hidgen also says that when the bones of Cadwalladr are returned from Rome, the Welsh will again have a king.[64] The 'restoration' of Welsh (British) rule was interpreted as hinging on the return on Cadwalladr's blood descendant. This became a very powerful concept in the second half of the fifteenth century, as this prophecy was harnessed by various factions trying to establish support for the long-awaited return of the Welsh hero.[65] Furthermore, this myth was associated with another of the

---

[60] Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs,* p. 168.

[61] Appendix B, 4: '…non Britones a Bruto sed Wallenses a suo duce Wallone dicti…'

[62] Appendix B, 4: '…diadema regni nunquam adepturi quosque reliquas et ossa Kadwalldri a Rome a Britanniam apportaverit.'

[63] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB,* pp. 278–81: '…quam britones, reliquiis eius potiti, illas ex Roma in Britanniam asportarent…'

[64] Ranulph Higden, *Polychronicon*, vol. 6, p. 160.

[65] Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', p. 21.

prophecies of Merlin: the prophecy of the two dragons. The white dragon was believed to represent the Saxons, and the red dragon symbolised the Britons. Initially, the white dragon is successful, but then ultimately is defeated by the red dragon – symbolising the triumph of the British over the Saxons.[66] This particular prophecy is not mentioned on the manuscript, but it is worth considering as it also relates to the return of Cadwalladr's descendants, and its omission on the manuscript was most likely a deliberate decision by the compiler.

Much like the prophecy of the dragon in the sky, there was good reason to discourage a Lancastrian manuscript from over-emphasising the tenuous link between Henry VI and the British kings, since it hardly existed. As Sydney Anglo pointed out, although the majority of genealogies of Henry VI used a conventional account of British history, there was no particular effort made to link the Lancastrian king with British ancestors. This was because there was 'no connection that could have been satisfactorily employed'.[67] Canterbury MS 1 falls into the same category, since it follows the orthodox genealogy of English kings, but no particular attention in the commentary or diagram is given to linking Henry VI with the ancient British kings. Meanwhile, potential challengers to the throne had arguably better claims not only to the English crown via more direct descent from Edward III, but also to Welsh ancestry and the related prophecies. Any rival claimant for the throne who *could* have emerged during the minority of Henry VI would most likely have a Mortimer-Yorkist lineage. The most convincing alternative hereditary claim to the throne was from the descendants of Philippa of Clarence (daughter of Edward III's second surviving son) and her husband Edmund Mortimer (d. 1318). The Mortimers could trace their ancestry to the

---

[66] Coote, 'A Language of Power', p. 17.

[67] Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', p. 21.

marriage of Gwladys Ddu, daughter the Welsh prince Llyweln the Great (d. 1251), and Ralph de Mortimer in 1230. According to medieval authorities, Llyweln's lineage harked back to Rhodri Mawr (d. 878) and then to Cadwalladr himself.[68] In fact, within four decades of this roll bring drafted, Edward IV, whose grandmother was Anne Mortimer (d. 1413), was victorious as the Yorkist challenger to Henry VI. Using his Mortimer ancestry, Edward IV's descent was traced to Cadwalladr,[69] and he was presented as the true heir of the Welsh hero.[70] Although the scribe who compiled the original Canterbury Roll could not have predicted the development of a 'Yorkist claim', he would have avoided any material that highlights the return of the Welsh, since Henry VI was not a Welsh hero.

Although this study has focused on the original Lancastrian version of the roll (dated 1422–33) thus far, it is worth examining the Yorkist modifications that were made a few decades later to stress the significance of genealogy and prophecy on the roll. Much like the majority of genealogical rolls produced during the reign of the Yorkist king Edward IV, Canterbury MS 1's Yorkist modifications include the Mortimer lineage on the royal genealogy.[71] The Yorkist modifications attempt to connect Edward IV with the Mortimer (and therefore Welsh) ancestry. The later scribe who had Yorkist sympathies is unknown. He extended the line of English kings down to Edward IV and his siblings with a series of smudged red lines filled with inaccuracies. For example, the Lancastrian version already had

---

[68] Ibid., pp. 21–22.

[69] Ibid., p. 22

[70] Eckhardt, 'The Presence of Rome in the Middle English Chronicles of the Fourteenth Century ', p. 111.

[71] Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', p. 22.

a circle with the name 'Richard, Duke of York' (Edward IV's father) on the manuscript, which appeared at the right-hand side of the central axis. The Yorkist scribe, however, was either unhappy with the marginalised placing of Edward IV's father, or needed more blank manuscript space than was provided. Instead of using the existing 'Richard' circle, the Yorkist scribe chose to draw a completely new circle representing the same 'Richard' on the left-hand side of the axis. Despite some inaccuracies, the extension of Edward IV's ancestry also included his Mortimer bloodline from his paternal grandmother, Anne Mortimer. The scribe manipulated the Mortimer genealogy to 'fit' within the blank space on the manuscript. The Mortimer lineage is full of misleading diagrams. Due to the numerous mistakes in the genealogy, it is possible that the Yorkist scribe did not bother to research the finer points of Mortimer family history. For example, Roger Mortimer, the second Earl of March, appears horizontally alongside his son Edmund, the third Earl of March, as if they were siblings. Alternatively, perhaps the scribe was willing to forego an historically accurate representation of relationships in order to draw as much of the Mortimer family as he could into the small space available. Regardless of the mistakes, it is striking that comparatively, far less attention is given to the other ancestors of Edward IV. The scribe has not even bothered to link Joan Beaufort (who is on the original Lancastrian version and is of royal blood, albeit illegitimately) with her daughter Cecily Neville (Edward IV's mother). Unable to continue the Mortimer lineage back to the Welsh princes due to the restricted parchment space, the scribe summarised the key point, Edward IV's important ancient Welsh lineage, with the phrase: '*Llewellinus princeps Wallie geniut Gladunddmnu*'. This sentence is written above the names of five of the Mortimer children of Ralph de Mortimer and Gwladys Ddu.[72] The weight placed on Edward IV's Mortimer ancestry shows a conscious effort to link him with

---

[72] The five names appear in order from left to right: Edmund Mortimer, Roger Mortimer, Ralph Mortimer, Roger Mortimer and Hugo Mortimer.

his Welsh bloodline. This shows that from a Yorkist perspective, highlighting the connection to Cadwalladr was an important genealogical point worth emphasising. All of the Yorkist scribe's efforts to link Edward IV to the Welsh princes through his grandmother, Anne Mortimer, demonstrate the importance of political prophecy and genealogies in this context.

The use of Welsh ancestry to bolster support continued late into the fifteenth century. During the 1480s, 'bardic consensus' eventually settled on Harri Tudur, who would later be known as Henry Tudor, the founder of the Tudor dynasty, as the 'prophetic hero' who would restore the Welsh and Britons to power.[73] Unlike Edward IV, Henry VII did not have to look far to find Welsh (British) ancestry since his grandfather was a Welshman. His paternal lineage attracted the interest of prophetic writers, since he was a descendant of the native princes of Wales. As such, he was related to Cadwalladr, the last king of the Britons. This was a prerequisite for Henry Tudor's role as the *mab darogan* (son of prophecy).[74] The English and the Welsh saw Henry VII as the great '*rex futurus*' of British history.[75] Moreover, Henry VII named his heir Arthur in a very symbolic gesture[76] and also utilised the symbolism of the red dragon, by using it as a standard presented at the Battle of Bosworth Field.[77] The parallels drawn between Cadwalladr's long-awaited descendant and Henry VII were part of a longer tradition of Welsh support for a leader of Welsh descent that was

---

[73] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales,* p. 15.

[74] Ibid.*,* p. 14.

[75] Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England,* p. 236.

[76] Eckhardt, 'The Presence of Rome in the Middle English Chronicles of the Fourteenth Century', p. 112.

[77] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales,* p. 21.

exploited by bards and writers.[78] This tradition was one that Edward IV's supporters tried to

manipulate to their advantage, but one that Henry VI could not exploit effectively due to an

absence of any Welsh ancestry. If Henry VI had any Welsh ancestry, Canterbury MS 1 would

probably have portrayed Merlin's prophecies very differently, by emphasising the revival of

the Welsh royal bloodline. Comparing how the reigns of Henry VI, Edward IV and Henry

VII have treated Geoffrey's prophecies of the Welsh hero's return highlights the significance

of genealogy and political prophecy.


The decision to include the prophecy about Cadwalladr's descendants *at all* in the

original Lancastrian version of the roll is mysterious, considering that the Lancastrian kings

did not have Welsh ancestry and it would have been easy to omit this sentence. There are two

considerations regarding its inclusion. First, it is phrased in a way that states only the

conditions for a British/Welsh restoration: that the Welsh must recover the bones and relics of

Cadwalladr. It does not mention that this *will* eventually happen or how this might transpire.

This implies that this prophecy was not particularly anti-Lancastrian in sentiment, as it only

followed Geoffrey's *HRB* and conventional accounts of English history. Much like the

inclusion of Arthur's deeds, the roll follows a traditional narrative, which includes this

prophecy. Secondly, if this roll was commissioned and produced by nobility with Lancastrian

interests, then it is likely that the 'return of Cadwalladr' was not necessarily a concept to be

avoided.[79] Coote argues that the readership for prophetic texts would have been limited to

---

[78] Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', p. 20.

[79] The provenance and commissioner of the roll is unknown. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, the Neville-Beaufort families, or the Percies (who had allied themselves with Owain Glyndŵr and the Welsh rebellion in the early 1400s against Henry IV), may have had a part to play in its production.

those who were fairly educated and probably held some authority locally, but did not possess any actual power over the policies and events within the prophetic texts. Instead, prophecy was a 'language of power for the un-empowered in later medieval England' and a form of political commentary which was an important part of English political consciousness.[80] Following this argument, it is possible that the commissioner and scribe of the roll were not particularly compelled to avoid the prophecy of Cadwalladr, even if they were Lancastrian supporters. If their backing of Henry VI was based on political motivations, then leaving a prophetic 'warning' that the House of Lancaster might eventually succumb to another dynasty could be a calculated comment. The inclusion of this outwardly non-threatening and conventional prophecy about Cadwalladr's return may reflect a subtle subversive attitude to the Lancastrian regime.

## Canterbury MS 1's interpretation of Edward the Confessor's 'Green Tree' Prophecy

The final and most detailed of the prophecies on the roll is the 'Green Tree' prophecy of the penultimate Anglo-Saxon king, St Edward the Confessor (d. 1066). Also known in Latin as the '*abor viridis*' or '*abor fertilis*' prophecy, it first appears as part of the anonymous *Vita Ædwardi Regis* (c. 1065–67).[81] Edward, in a revelation from God, was the chosen individual to be granted this vision. This highlighted Edward's holiness, as he shared God's knowledge in a way other people did not. As witness to this knowledge, Edward's prestige and credibility increased in the minds of the reader. An additional implication here is that the English and their kings have a special relationship with prophecy and by proxy, a connection

---

[80] Coote, 'A Language of Power', p. 26.

[81] Coote, 'Prophecy, Genealogy, and History in Medieval English Political Discourse', p. 31.

with God.[82] Saint-kings such as Edward were a special category among medieval saints. Often they were an 'expression of a society in which the church accepted the task of sanctifying the ancestors of the monarch' and 'royal dynasties hoped to celebrate their own lineage'.[83] On the roll, the circle of St Edward is one of only seven on the central axis that includes some embellishment. His circle is slightly larger than standard, his name is written in red ink, and it has a curly frame drawn in dark-coloured ink. This denotes St Edward as an extraordinary king among the others listed. The roll tells us that Edward uttered a prophecy when near death, in which he referred to the noble blood of the kings of England being 'cut' until the time of Henry II.[84] Then the commentary elaborates on the prophecy in a lengthy paragraph and interprets it for the reader: St Edward's vision consisted of a green tree that had its trunk cut and separated from its root by three acres of land. Despite being severed, the tree re-connected with its roots and was restored. The tree, the commentary tells us, signifies the kingdom of England,[85] and its root represents the line of succession from Alfred to when the royal line was transferred to the Normans.[86] The three acres refer to the three kings who had no connection with the old ruling family: Harold Godwinson, William the Conqueror and William Rufus. William's son, Henry I, married Matilda, an act that joined the Norman and England royal lines.[87]

---

[82] Coote, 'A Language of Power', pp. 24–25.

[83] André Vauchez, 'The Saint', in *Medieval Callings*, trans. Lydia Cochrane, ed. Jacques Le Goff (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990), p. 322.

[84] Appendix B, 5: '…Sanctus Edwardus…divinitus revelatem… in extremis…'

[85] Appendix B, 5: 'Arbor hec Anglorum regnum gloriam…significat.'

[87] Appendix B, 5: '…Matildam duxit in uxorem…regum Normannorum et Anglorum conjungens de duobus inum faciens.'

Although the prophecy is interpreted for the reader on the roll, the same prophecy was understood differently both before and after the fifteenth century. In the 1120s, William of Malmesbury interpreted the first half of the prophecy, where the tree is severed, as fulfilled, but did not see an end to the troubles that affected the kingdom after it became a dominion of foreigners.[88] Osbert of Clare (d. c.1158) also had a near-identical reading of the prophecy, where the Battle of Hastings brought about the 'severing' of England.[89] The same prophecy was reproduced a century later by Ælred, abbot of Rievaulx (d. 1167) when he wrote a new version of the life of Edward the Confessor. Ælred reinterpreted the prophecy in a favourable light for the monarch of the time, Henry II.[90] In Ælred's version, the green tree was not real, but a 'genealogical' tree.[91] It was cut because of the Norman invasion, but then re-joined when the old ruling Anglo-Saxon bloodline returned to the English crown. After the first three Norman kings, there was a succession crisis between Empress Matilda, the daughter of Henry I and Matilda of Scotland, and her cousin, Stephen of Blois. After an extended period of civil war between the two factions, Henry II became the first Anglo-Norman king of England. His mother was the descendant of the old English ruling house and his father was Geoffrey of Anjou.[92] For Ælred, Edward's prophecy was about the return of the Anglo-Saxon lineage to the crown. Another fifteenth-century genealogical roll, Cambridge, King's College, MS 43, explains the vision as referring to the return of the Yorkist and the rightful

---

[88] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, vol. I, ed. R. A. B. Mynors with R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 414–16.

[89] Hugh M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 56.

[90] Michael Evans, *The Death of Kings: Royal Deaths in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2007), p. 182.

[91] Coote, *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England,* p. 60.

[92] Thomas, *The English and the Normans,* p. 140.

Plantagenet bloodline to the crown of England after being usurped by the Lancastrians.[93] This prophecy was again re-interpreted in the mid-nineteenth century by Ambrose Philipps de Lisle. He believed that it referred to the English Reformation (the severed tree) and the eventual return of 'England to the See of St Peter'.[94] The differing interpretations of the same prophecy demonstrates how the vague nature of prophetic writings, especially with regard to the exact timing of a predicted event and the exact personages involved, meant that prophecies could be recycled and re-used repetitively.

On the Canterbury Roll, Ælred's version is used. It is the most developed prophecy on the entire roll. This suggests that the compiler believed that this particular prophecy was worth describing in detail for his audience. This prophecy and its interpretation rationalise a time of crisis and justify the outcome. The establishment of the Lancastrian kings was very different contextually to that of the Matilda-Stephen crisis, but a reader of the roll may have observed an echo of similarity with the succession crisis of 1399. As highlighted by Coote, this prophecy exemplifies the intersection between genealogy, history and prophetic text.[95] The broader message of the 'Green Tree' prophecy here could explain the disruption in the 'proper' line of succession of English kings as something that has happened before, predetermined by this vision. This suggests that the Matilda-Stephen conflict and the eventual resolution were predestined to occur. Though not explicitly stated, the implication here is that the Lancastrian succession to the throne was also predetermined. However, by being very

---

[93] Coote, 'Prophecy, Genealogy, and History in Medieval English Political Discourse', p. 41.

[94] Letter from Ambrose Phillips de Lisle to Reverend W. R. Brownlow, dated 10 December 1869, in Edmund Sheridan Purcell, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Philipps de Lisle* , ed. Edwin de Lisle (London: Macmillan and Co., 1900), p. 350.

[95] Coote, 'Prophecy, Genealogy and History in Medieval English Political Discourse', p. 34.

clear on establishing Ælred's interpretation of the prophecy, the roll says that this prophecy had *already* been fulfilled, and that it ought not to be reinterpreted for any Yorkist claim as it was on Cambridge, King's College, MS 43. On our roll, Ælred's version is emphasised in significant detail in order to prevent other interpretations of the 'Green Tree' prophecy. This way, the prophecy can simultaneously rationalise how dynastic change, such as regime change in 1399, was sometimes an unavoidable occurrence, while describing the fulfilment of a prophetic vision to prevent any negative reinterpretation.

**Conclusion**

Prophecies are not the focal point of this genealogical roll, but their presence provides an opportunity to assess the intersection of genealogy and prophecy in this context. Prophecies were often used throughout English history to explain the founding of Britain, justify English aspirations to greatness and great heroes, and to rationalise times of political crisis. This chapter has assessed the prophecies that appear in the commentary, and analysed their origins and purpose in a contemporary political context. The prophecies on the roll reflect the conventional story of English history. However, the selection, interpretation and nuance behind each predictions has revealed the roll as a political document that offers a nuanced understanding of contemporary prophetic texts to support and emphasise a favourable view of English history and its kings. The prophecies of Brutus stresses England's claim to Trojan prestige and greatness, but Canterbury MS 1 also reminds us that the roll is keen to depict a highly selective version of the 'conventional' story. Another hero who is associated with prophecy, Arthur, is made curiously insignificant when compared to the other 'great kings' who ruled England. The reason for this portrayal of Arthur and the ancient British kings becomes evident after considering the prophetic and genealogical consequences

for Henry VI, who could not effectively claim to be the prophetic answer for many that referred to the return of the Welsh. Finally, we see genealogy and prophecy intertwine clearly in the prophecy of the 'Green Tree', which was interpreted in numerous ways over centuries. The selection of one particular version of the 'Green Tree' prophecy that fit the Lancastrian agenda reveals how the scribe of this genealogical roll negotiated differing ideologies and interpretations for prophetic authority. The Canterbury Roll engages in the phenomenon of political prophecies through the commentary, which reveals how the Lancastrian dynasty viewed itself and Henry VI in the broader history of England.

**Chapter 3**

**Canterbury MS 1 and Kingship: The narrative construction of royal depositions[1]**

**Introduction**

Canterbury MS 1 presents English kinship as linear, orderly, and continuous. Yet, as the roll's creators and audience knew, this narrative was far from reality. The deposition of unpopular and unsatisfactory kings occurred with relative frequency in a supposedly 'continuous' genealogy of the English crown, and had a significant effect on the concept of medieval kingship. While there are numerous possibilities for examining the conceptions of royal power that are expressed on genealogical chronicle rolls, by using the portrayal of royal deposition on Canterbury MS 1 as a case study, this chapter will examine concepts of kingship in late medieval England, and how this contributed to the legitimisation of the House of Lancaster. The focus on royal deposition is for two main reasons: firstly, because of the effect that Richard II's deposition in 1399 had on perceptions of the Lancastrian kings who followed him, and secondly, because the roll's complete silence regarding the change of regime in 1399 from Plantagenet to Lancastrian is an omission that is worth examining. The focus on deposition will lead to an examination of the manuscript's ability to be read as both a document that contributes to the legitimisation of the Lancastrian kings and a kind of 'mirror of princes' that reflects medieval ideas about competent and incompetent rulers. The roll's narrative construction surrounding the forcible removal of both ineffective and

---

[1] This chapter expands on material covered that has been accepted for publication in: Shirota, M, 'Royal Deposition and the Canterbury Roll,' *Parergon*, 32:2 (2015).

tyrannical kings in myth and the contemporary past also support the founding of the House of Lancaster.

This chapter will consider the role and responsibilities of a king as portrayed on Canterbury MS 1 and theories of deposition. By isolating sections of the Canterbury Roll's commentary that refer to a change of regime, this chapter will highlight the selective editing undertaken by the compiler to construct an understanding of royal deposition that reflected contemporary political ideas. The editorial choices made by the compiler will be discussed alongside the broader historical and political contexts. Although deposition could cause political instability or even trigger a succession crisis, it was also a type of political mechanism for replacing an inadequate ruler by another more suited for the role. Deposition formed a fundamental aspect of medieval kingship. In order to analyse these ideas, this chapter will focus on examining the roll as it first appeared (between 1428 and 1433), when it was still a Lancastrian document, prior to the later modifications made under Yorkist kings.

**The Medieval Theory of Kingship and the Revolution of 1399**

The theory and practice of kingship as a form of government was evolving in medieval Europe. The essence of the 'informal' or 'popular' view of late medieval English kingship was characterised by two major concerns that are present on Canterbury MS 1. Firstly, as discussed in the previous chapter, there is a strong focus on mythical and historical ancestors.[2] The preoccupation with the legendary history of a people is a European-wide phenomenon, as various cultures and people tried to explain their origins. Combined with

---

[2] W. M. Ormrod, *Political Life in Medieval England, 1300–1450* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995), p. 62.

origin myths, the myths of ancestral kings was a way of offering prestige, authority, and

history to contemporary rulers, as well as a form of identity to the people they reigned over.

The connection made between the recent and distant past was very important to medieval

kingship. Secondly, the understanding of royal power was connected with the performance of

a king in his role. Kings of England were not necessarily defined by their hereditary right to

rule; their effectiveness in functioning as kings also played a part. Literary works, such as

those in the 'mirror of princes' genre, provided inoffensive criticism and 'guidebooks' to

rulers of illustrate how they should act.[3] In addition to the mythical ancestry and kingship,

Ormrod suggests that another important popular characteristic of medieval kingship was

'heroic deeds in arms'.[4] In this study, military success has been combined with 'good'

kingship, as it fulfils the requirement of defending the realm. These major characteristics of

English kingship are reflected on Canterbury MS 1.


Generally speaking, dominant medieval political thought held that the king was

considered to be divinely ordained to rule and kingship was the best and most natural form of

government.[5] There was a strongly held belief in the rightness of kingship in medieval

Europe, with the exception of Italian city-republics.[6] The king was someone who could 'bring

peace to the countryside, impose more impartial justice, and defend the realm against outside

---

[3] Raluca L. Radelescu, *Romance and its Contexts in Fifteenth-Century England, Politics, Piety and Penitence* (Woodbridge: Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 2013), p. 7.

[4] For more see Ormord, *Political Life in Medieval England, 1300–1450*, p. 62.

[5] Chris Given-Wilson, 'Legitimization, Designation and Succession to the Throne in fourteenth century England,' in *Building Legitimacy, Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies*, ed. Isabel Alfonso et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 89.

[6] Antony Black, *Political Thought in Europe 1250-1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 136.

attack', and obedience to him was a serious moral obligation.[7] By the late medieval period, the king was considered to have certain responsibilities to his subjects. A king was the protector of the realm, guarantor of due process, and custodian of the law.[8] The ability to keep law and order, provide stability, and dispense justice was desired in the person of the king as much as, if not more than, hereditary right. This reflects the concept of the 'dual role' of kings, as described by Ernst Kantorowicz.[9] A king was an individual, but also a personification of divine law who embodied semi-juristic attributes. The dual facets to kingship led to the de-individualisation of different kings, and gave way to the notion of a set of characteristics that defined effective kingship. This kind of royal adequacy was represented by the 'just king', who was pious, virtuous, and ruled according to his responsibilities. In England, the coronation oath also expressed the responsibilities and expectations of the king. Between 1308 and the seventeenth century, the oath comprised four clauses that outlined the king's duties: to protect the church, maintain peace, administer justice, and uphold the laws.[10] The monarch had power because he fulfilled the obligations that the role required of him. As these characteristics developed towards the later medieval period, the reverse of the ideal, an incompetent (*rex inutilis*) or tyrannical king, developed in

---

[7] Ibid., p. 137.

[8] C. D. Fletcher, 'Narrative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II,' *Journal of Medieval History*, 30:4 (2004), p. 324; Edward Powell, *Kingship, Law and Society: Criminal Justice in the Reign of Henry V* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 29; John Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 21.

[9] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975), p. 369–84.

[10] Nigel Saul, *The Three Richards: Richard I, Richard II and Richard III* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), p. 23.

tandem.[11] The tyrant and *rex inutilis* were different concepts, but both were violations of the expectations of kingship. Moreover, the character of 'royal uselessness' became part of the legal formulation that surrounded deposition proceedings. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there was an evolution of the legal framework for theories of rightful resistance to royal authority.[12] Furthermore, the development of the concept that kings could be removed and replaced for not meeting these expectations was convenient for the new Lancastrian dynasty, as their regime was established on the failure of Richard II.

These concepts associated with kingship, especially the definition of a competent king, were significant in the establishment of the House of Lancaster as England's ruling dynasty. The first Lancastrian king, Henry IV, had, firstly, to justify his hereditary claim to succeed Richard II, and secondly, to provide sufficient grounds for Richard II's deposition from the throne. Both of these issues are addressed on Canterbury MS 1 though deliberate omission and selective editing of the commentary. The removal of Richard, the legitimate incumbent, was possible on a practical level due to the anti-Ricardian movement in the final years of the fourteenth century.[13] However, there was controversy surrounding the hereditary

---

[11] For the development of the concept of the 'useless' king and its development in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: Edward Peters, *The Shadow King: 'Rex Inutilis' in Medieval Law and Literature,715–1327* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970).

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 216.

[13] There is extensive research regarding the final years of the reign of Richard II and his deposition. For an overview: Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997); B. Wilkinson, 'The Deposition of Richard II and the Accession of Henry IV,' *English Historical Review*, 54 (1939): pp. 215–39; Miri Rubin, *The Hollow Crown: A History of Britain in the Late Middle Ages* (London: Penguin Books, 2006), pp. 159–175; Anthony Tuck, *Richard II and the English Nobility* (London: Edward Arnold, 1973), pp. 187–227; Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II and the Higher Nobility,' in *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, ed. Anthony Goodman and James L. Gillespie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 107–28.

justification of Henry IV's claim to the throne: he was the son of John of Gaunt, who was the third surviving son of Edward III. John of Gaunt had an elder brother, Lionel of Antwerp, Duke of Clarence, whose descendants technically also had a claim to the throne. If both Gaunt and Clarence (who were uncles of Richard II) had sons, the descendants of Clarence would have an advantage. However, Clarence's descendants were from his only legitimate child, his daughter Philippa, who had married Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March. Her descendants had a claim to the English crown through the female line of descent. This hereditary argument to the throne is commonly called the 'Mortimer claim'. Theoretically, the Mortimer claim mentioned above was legally valid. The Westminster Chronicle, written during the reign of Richard II, states that if the king died without children, the crown would pass by hereditary right to one of the sons of Philippa Mortimer.[14] After Henry IV claimed the crown in 1399, several revolts early in the Lancastrian reign were raised in the name of the Mortimer Earl of March: the Percy Rebellion (1403), Archbishop Scrope's revolt (1405), and the Southampton Plot (1415).[15] However, due to the increasing stability of the Lancastrian regime, the Mortimer claim had no traction. By the time of Henry VI, there appears to have been general acceptance of the Lancastrians and there had been no plots in the name of the Mortimer heir since 1415. As there was no clearly defined law of succession in 1399, it was possible to claim that the House of Lancaster's 'male-only' descent from Edward III was more 'right' than that of the Mortimer claim, just as the opposite was possible.[16] Although the Mortimer descendants were not a substantial threat to Henry V and

---

[14] *The Westminster Chronicle 1381–1394*, ed. trans. by Leonard C. Hector and Barbara Harvey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 192–95.

[15] T. B. Pugh, 'Southampton Plot of 1415,' in *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Age: A Tribute to Charles Ross*, ed. Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherbourne (New York: St Martin's Press, 1986).

[16] Peter McNiven, 'Rebellion, Sedition and the Legend of Richard II's Survival in the Reigns of Henry IV and Henry V,' in *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 73:1 (1994): p. 116.

Henry VI, the existence of alternative hereditary heirs had the potential to undermine the House of Lancaster.

The importance of hereditary right was recognised by medieval contemporaries and Henry IV made efforts to justify his 'blood right' early in his reign. What had been achieved with military might and fortunate circumstances had to be supported by legal means in order to justify the displacing of one royal dynasty with another. Henry IV recognized his need for an undisputed hereditary claim in 1399, and went to great lengths to create one. He looked to several generations before, to the sons of Henry III: Edward I and his younger brother, Edmund 'Crouchback'. Henry IV was descended from the younger brother, Edmund. Henry IV claimed that his ancestor Edmund was in fact the elder brother, who on account of his physical deformity had been made to give way to his younger brother Edward.[17] He manufactured this genealogy, asserting that he had the 'right lyne of the Blode coming fro the gude lorde kyng Henry therde.'[18] Thus, by switching the birth order of the two brothers and priority of actual succession, the reign of Richard II (who had descended from Edward I) was deemed invalid (conveniently, this also invalidated the Mortimer claim). According to the *Eulogium Historiarum*, this 'Crouchback' legend was also used by Henry IV's father, John of Gaunt, in the parliament of 1396, in which he put forward his son Henry as heir. John Hardyng, who also mentions this legend, says that Gaunt commissioned a fake chronicle in

---

[17] Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Lanuage of Legitimation, 1399-1422* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 3–5.

[18] *Rotuli Partliamentorum, III, 423*, quoted in Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Crown and the Royal Family in Later Medieval England,' in *Kings and Nobles in the Later Medieval Ages*, ed. Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherbourne (Alan Sutton: Gloucester, 1986), pp. 15–46.

order to support the claim.[19] The attempt to utilise the myth represents an ambitious

Lancastrian attempt to re-write the family's dynastic origins, and deny the opportunity for a

counter-claim to emerge. Henry IV, recognizing the need for an accepted reason to justify

overthrowing Richard, invited a committee of doctors, bishops, and chroniclers (including

Adam Usk) to investigate Henry IV's right to the throne.[20] However, the 'Crouchback' story

was summarily dismissed by the committee.[21] Adam Usk, who was on the commission,

points to all the other chronicles that say that Edward I was indeed the elder brother, and

rightful king of England.[22] On Canterbury MS 1, the 'Edmund Crouchback' legend is absent,

as if mentioning it will draw undue attention to the Lancastrian succession. Instead, the roll

depicts the transition from Richard II to Henry IV as uneventful, without a commentary

description.


 Moreover, justification for removing Richard II and the subsequent succession of

Henry IV depended on the negative perception of Richard's reign, rather than on Henry's

'better' hereditary claim.[23] Although it was not the first time that a king had been deposed in

England, it was the first time in two hundred years that the direct line of descent (from John

---

[19] Given-Wilson, 'Legitimization, Designation and Succession to the Throne in Fourteenth-Century England,' pp. 93–94.

[20] Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne,* p. 4; Adam Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk 1377–1421*, trans. C. Given-Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)*,* pp. 62–65.

[21] Alison Allan, 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1981), p. 198.

[22] Adam of Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk 1377–1421*, p. 65. Referring to the 'Crouchback' theory, Usk writes, 'ecce quid historie P de Grw per totam Angliam quod Edwardus primogenitus regis Henrici erat…'

[23] Joel Burden, 'How Do You Bury a Deposed King? The Funeral of Richard II and the Establishment of Royal Authority in 1400,' in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399–1406*, ed. Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (York: York Medieval Press: 2003), p. 37.

of England to Richard II) had been broken. In 1399, England did not have a law of succession for the English crown. This meant that there was no formal legal procedure to follow in an instance when the preferred system, the principle of male primogeniture, was not possible.[24] Although Michael Bennett's analysis of British Library, Cotton Charter XVI 63 shows that in 1376 Edward III had declared his wishes for succession of the male line if Richard remained heirless,[25] there was no recognized system for removing incompetent kings from their position.[26] There was no strictly legal way for the English to depose their own king since neither parliament nor the courts had jurisdiction over the king.[27] The summoning of a commission by Henry VI to discuss how to justify his usurpation indicates that there was great significance placed on the process and rationale for the deposition. As Peter McNiven has explained, Richard's removal was technically justified by, firstly, Richard's abdication due to self-confessed incompetence, and, secondly, his 'proved' incompetence.[28] The problem of judging a king was avoided by Richard's 'voluntary' abdication, which left the integrity of royal jurisdiction intact.[29] Just as land belonged to a 'lineage rather than to an individual',[30] royal authority belonged to the nascent impersonal conception of the Crown,

---

[24] Peter McNiven, 'Legitimacy and Consent: Henry IV and the Lancastrian Title, 1399–1406,' *Mediaeval Studies,* 44 (1982): p. 475.

[25] Michael Bennett, 'Edward III's Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376–1471', *The English Historical Review*, 113:452 (1998): p. 607.

[26] Omrod, *Political Life in Medieval England,* p. 82.

[27] Michael Bennett, 'Henry of Bolingbroke and the Revolution of 1399', in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406,* ed. Gwilyn Dodd and Douglass Biggs (York, UK: York Medieval Press: 2003), p. 22.

[28] McNiven, 'Legitimacy and Consent', p. 470.

[29] Powell, *Kingship, Law and Society,* p. 34.

[30] James Simpson, 'The Other Book of Troy: Guido delle Colonne's *Historia Destructionis Troiae* in fourteenth and fifteenth-century England,' *Speculum*, 73 (1998): p. 402.

rather than to an individual king.[31] Deposition was not supposed to undermine the institution

of the Crown, but signified the failure of an individual king. It implied that the whole

kingdom accepted Henry IV's usurpation, committing the kingdom to the proposition that the

former king had been validly deposed or had abdicated.[32] The deposition of Richard II in

1399 contributed to the long history of discontinuities and ruptures in the 'lineal' succession

of English kings.


In the Articles of Deposition, part of the 'official' version of events that described the

removal of Richard between 29 September and 1 October 1399, there were thirty-three

charges laid against the King. Although it is uncertain how heavily the articles were modified

before they were circulated, they were certainly an attempt to justify the usurpation.[33] The

Articles show Richard's unworthiness as king,[34] and highlight, as Michael Bennett points out,

'the principle that the king was subject to the law'.[35] Although the Articles did not explicitly

describe Richard as a tyrant, they aligned his actions and motivations with the existing idea of

a tyrannical or incompetent ruler.[36] Jean-Philippe Genet's study on the prevalence of the

---

[31] Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies,* p. 381.

[32] Gerard E. Caspary, 'The Deposition of Richard II and the Canon Law', *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Boston College, 12–16 August, 1963*, ed. Stephan Kuttner and J. Joseph Ryan, (Vatican: S. Congregatio de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, 1965), pp. 200–1.

[33] Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles of Revolution 1397–1400, The Reign of Richard II*, ed. and trans. Chris Given-Wilson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), p. 168.

[34] Fletcher, 'Narrative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II', p. 325.

[35] Bennett, 'Henry of Bolingbroke and the Revolution of 1399', p. 24.

[36] Jenni Nuttall, *The Creation of Lancastrian Kingship: Literature, Language and Politics in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 12.

words 'tyranny' and 'tyrants' in fifteenth-century English written works suggests that 'tyranny' was not a term used frequently in late medieval England.[37] However, Genet also acknowledges that the English were prepared to accept a king who could prevent civil war and who was strong enough to prevent warfare in the country.[38] Even if the word 'tyranny' may not have been used in official records, the concept of an unsuitable king who was politically undesirable and incompetent still manifests in the charges against Richard II. In the parliamentary records, the accusations against Richard commence with 'the king is charged for his evil government…', and continue to list his 'needlessly grievous' burdens on the people.[39] He is described as breaking promises and the law, showing favouritism to certain lords, and not following proper procedure. Richard's failure to guarantee due process was also emphasised, as this was a catalyst for the revolution of 1399. Henry Bolingbroke, the future Henry IV, had come to lead the rebellion against the King after he had been denied his father's inheritance.[40] Henry's father, John of Gaunt, was the greatest landowner in England. After John's death in early 1399, Richard permanently disinherited Henry, thus breaking an earlier promise. This disinheritance was a contemporary example of the 'abuse' of royal power as it demonstrated Richard's inability to guarantee due process in the transmission of land.[41] Henry's initial aim of recovering his father's lands developed rather

---

[37] Jean-Philippe Genet, 'The Problem of Tyranny in Fifteenth Century England', *Moreana*, 50:191–2 (2013), p. 61.

[38] Ibid., p. 66.

[39] Records and Process' from *Rotuli Partliamentorum, III, 415–53; Annales Ricardi Secundi,* 257–87, cited in English translation from *Chronicles of Revolution,* pp. 172–73.

[40] Mark Arvanigian, 'The "Lancastrianization" of the North in the Reign of Henry IV, 1399–1413,' in *Reputation and Representation in Fifteenth-Century Europe*, ed. Douglas L. Biggs, Shanon D. Michalove, and Albert Compton Reeves (Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 9.

[41] Christopher Allmand, 'Opposition to Royal Power in England in the Middle Ages', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, 33 (2004): p. 60; Fletcher, 'Narrative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II', p. 328.

rapidly into the concept of 'saving' his fellow victims of the King's tyranny as the 'representative of all the disinherited of the kingdom'.[42] Within four months, Henry had returned from exile to reclaim his father's lands and the throne.[43] In the Lancastrian narrative, Richard is presented as acting in his own interests, failing to uphold the 'rightful laws and customs of the realm, but preferring to act according to his arbitrary will and to do whatever he wishes…',[44] thereby demonstrating his unsuitability as king.

One would think that a royal genealogical roll prepared only a quarter of a century after the accession of the House of Lancaster would at least mention a change in dynasty, if not elaborate on it. After all, the process and theoretical justification behind the establishment of Henry IV had significant links with the deposition of Richard II. However, the events of 1399 are peculiarly absent from the roll. Nothing is mentioned about Richard II or Henry IV's rise to power. The only mention of Henry IV in the original commentary is connected with the uprising of Owain Glyndŵr in Wales. The roll has the chance to justify the Lancastrian succession and yet passes over the change of dynasty without comment, when it does for some earlier depositions. It seems almost counter-intuitive not to seize the convenient opportunity to discredit Richard II or to uphold the legitimacy of the House of Lancaster. It is possible that this represents a conscious choice to ignore a key moment in the recent past and create a façade of uncontroversial continuity between the Plantagenet and Lancastrian kings. By ignoring the establishment of the new dynasty on questionable grounds, the roll makes the central line of English kings smoothly transition from Richard II

---

[42] Fletcher, 'Narrative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II', p. 336.

[43] Chris Given-Wilson, 'Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian Inheritance', *English Historical Review* 109:432 (1994): p. 553.

[44] 'Records and Process' from *Rotuli Partliamentorum, IV, 415–53; Annales Ricardi Secundi, 257–87,* cited in English translation from *Chronicles of Revolution*, pp. 172–77.

to Henry IV, suggesting that there was no controversy. Nevertheless, the reason for neglecting this episode of English history is unclear and impossible to verify. However, the lack of any commentary on the remarkable turn of events in 1399 is noteworthy. Nor is there any comment regarding Edward II's deposition in 1327.[45] In the earlier case, however, Edward II had a son who eventually succeeded him: Edward III. The availability of a son doubtless made this latter situation less contentious for the roll's compiler. Despite the roll's silence on these two crises of the fourteenth century, it describes earlier royal depositions in English history in a way that suggests a coherent ideology concerning changes of royal dynasty.

**Mythical Kings and Richard II: the Construction of Deposition on a Genealogical Roll**

Although the roll has nothing to say about the most recent depositions at the time of its creation, further examination reveals that the manuscript actually suggests a role for deposition as a political mechanism. In earlier sections of the roll, there are several forcibly removed kings whose stories are described in the commentary. Some mythical kings are also described as having been removed, usually by assassination. Not all have specific justifications for their demise. For example: 'Porrex' was assassinated for killing his brother, 'Basianus' was killed by 'Caratius', and 'Gracianus' was killed by the 'common people' for savage behaviour. A mythical king of Britain whose deposition is mentioned with extensive detail is Archigallo, who supposedly reigned in either the fourth or fifth century. In the text, Archigallo's deposition is described twice in two different paragraphs on either side of the

---

[45] For a general overview of Edward II's reign: Rubin, *Hollow Crown*, pp. 29–56; for more detailed analysis: Seymour Philipps, *Edward II* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011).

central line.[46] This is unique in the text, as the commentary does not repeat the same event in two distinctly separate paragraphs anywhere else. This strongly suggests that Archigallo's deposition was deliberately emphasised in the text.

According to the manuscript, Archigallo was deposed for 'savagery' and replaced by his younger brother, Elidure. Five years later, Elidure met his elder brother in a forest, and then feigned illness to assemble all the lords in his kingdom together. He then convinced them to swear allegiance to the former king, and Elidure took the crown from his own head and gave it to Archigallo. The latter was crowned again, and reigned as a 'good' king after the restoration.[47] The description of Archigallo's rise, fall, and rise again in the commentary demonstrates that there were obligations expected of a king. If those responsibilities were not met, then there was cause for deposition. Although it is very difficult to trace the immediate sources used by the roll's compiler, it is likely that Ranulf Higden's fourteenth-century *Polychronicon*, which narrates a similar version of the tale, was consulted.[48] This is because Higden's *Polychronicon* (specifically books one and seven) is referenced by name in the roll's text in two separate instances, although it is not directly cited as the source for the episode about Archigallo. Although Archigallo's story is found in other sources, its earliest

---

[46] Two paragraphs on either side of the central line start with: (appendix C, 1) 'Deposito Archigallo a regni solio propter suam ferocitatem…' and (appendix C, 1) 'Istum archigallum … propter suam ferocitatem a regni solio deposuerunt …'.

[47] Appendix C, 1: 'Deposito Archigallo a regni solio propter suam ferocitatem Elidurus frater eius in regem electus est qui propter pietatem quam fecit in suum fratrem postea primus appollatus'.

[48] For Higden's version of Archigallo's deposition: Ranulf Higden, *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; together with the English translations of John Trevisa and of an unknown writer of the fifteenth century*, ed. Churchill Babington and Joseph Rawson Lumby, vol. 4 (London: Longman Green, 1865–86), pp. 27–29.

version appears in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *HRB*.[49] Geoffrey expanded the story to include

descriptions of Archigallo's seizure of wealth, promotion of the low-born, and habit of

stripping the riches from nobles. According to Geoffrey, the nobles rose up against their king

and replaced him with Elidure.[50] Five years later, when his pious brother transferred the

crown back to him, Archigallo 'mended his ways' and began to reverse the policies from his

earlier reign by being fair and just.[51] The first half of this story (in its more detailed form in

the *HRB*) is remarkably similar to one of the common contemporary narratives of Richard

II's deposition in 1399. Richard was accused of showing favouritism and elevating 'new

men' to high status, much to the frustration of others.[52] Although Richard did not survive

long enough to be given a second chance, the moral of the roll's story is clear: rule well, or be

deposed.


Another early deposed king of legend was Eynan. The roll tells us that he too, on

account of his 'savagery', was deposed after six years on the throne and replaced by a

kinsman, Idwallo.[53] These kings are not mentioned in Higden's *Polychronicon*, suggesting

that the roll's compiler found this information by consulting Geoffrey of Monmouth's work

directly. In Geoffrey's version, the reason for Idwallo's removal is elaborated: Eynan

---

[49] Other sources (although not in Latin) include Wace's *Brut*: *Roman de Brut, a History of the British: Text and Translation*, trans. and ed. Judith Weiss (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), pp. 88–93.

[50] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, ed. Michael D. Reeve, trans. Neil Wright (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), p. 63.

[51] Ibid., p. 64.

[52] Allmand, 'Opposition to Royal Power in England in the Middle Ages,' p. 59.

[53] Appendix C, 2: 'Iste Eynanius propter suam ferocitatem sexto anno regni sui a sede regia depositus fuit …'.

(Eynianus) neglected justice and preferred tyranny.[54] His cousin Idwallo understood that he had to respect what 'lawful and right', making him the preferred leader.[55] This short episode also demonstrates that a ruler must fulfil the expectations of a king. Canterbury MS 1 shows that mythical British history provided examples 'tyrants, who, once their divine mandate to rule was forfeited, were overthrown by their own people'.[56]

The stories of these two mythical kings show that hereditary right is preferred in a king, but it is not a fundamental requirement to rule. The mention of these tales of little-known legendary kings could be a deliberate editorial choice as the Lancastrians came to rule England in 1399 after Richard II and his negative reputation. It is notable that neither Ranulph Higden nor Geoffrey of Monmouth elaborate very much on these kings. All the information about Archigallo, Eynan, and Idwallo is contained in just two paragraphs in book three of Geoffrey's *HRB*. In Higden's *Polychronicon*, Archigallo and Elidurus are the focus of just one paragraph, while Idwallo and Eynan are not even mentioned. By drawing attention to these obscure kings and their fates, the roll puts forward an idea of a good king, while justifying the removal of a failed king. This idea reflects the broader concepts of royal competence that developed during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Moreover, it supports the Lancastrian claim to the throne by emphasizing, via the proxy of mythical rulers, the shortcomings of Richard and justifying the change of regime.

---

[54] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, p. 65: '… Ennianus … namque iusticia, tyrannidem praeelegerat, quae illum a solio regni deposuit'.

[55] Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, pp. 64–65: '… Idwallo … qui … correctus ius atque rectitudinem colebat'.

[56] Bennett, 'Henry of Bolingbroke and the Revolution of 1399', p. 30.

The specific descriptions in the text and the reasons for the deposition of Archigallo and Eynan suggest three things: firstly, that the nobles have a right to just rule by their king. Secondly, they have the ability to remove a tyrant or a *rex inutilis* if there is consensus. Finally, it suggests that the replacement for a deposed king cannot be just any nobleman. The successor is a kinsman who is 'fit' to rule, that is, someone who exhibits characteristics of royal 'adequacy'. The parallels between Richard II, whose reign was 'tyrannical' according to the Lancastrians, and the 'bad' reigns of Archigallo and Eynan are unmistakeable. Moreover, at the start of his reign, Henry VI's supporters would certainly have welcomed a comparison that reinforced the boy-king's authority by showing his grandfather to be the man who saved the kingdom by removing a failed king. The references to Elidure and Idwallo set a very early precedent for effective kings replacing their incompetent or despotic predecessors. The effort to include these episodes from the early history of Britain, with particular notice given to the reason for the depositions in each case, suggests that ineffective and tyrannical English kings who had failed to show competency had been deposed since the days before the Anglo-Saxons. Deposition, in this light, is an unfortunate, but essential part of the history of kings in Britain. By normalizing the usurpation of power and justifying it on account of incompetent hereditary rulers, the Lancastrians' own path to the crown could be seen to be justified, and became another example of the workings of good governance.

As noted, the passages relating to the depositions of Archigallo and Eynan are comparable to the Lancastrian narrative of the recent deposition of Richard II. Although Richard II was never called a tyrant, the Lancastrian version of his reign used existing ideas to construct Richard as lacking the abilities to fulfil his duty, much like the deposed mythical kings. Contemporaries who were familiar with the *HRB* would have recognized the link, and even if the reader was only vaguely acquainted with the roll's sources, he or she would have

noted the powerful connection between how a king rules and his deposition.[57] Ideas regarding

what defines a 'tyrant' and how to deal with one had been discussed earlier in medieval

political thought, such as in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. In the treatise, John recognizes

the divine powers granted to a king by God, but also believes that a king should remain

obedient to the law and be concerned with the well-being of the entire community and even

argues that it is justified to slay tyrants.[58] The strength of the English medieval monarchy

relied, as noted by Griffiths, 'first and foremost, on the character, ability and experience of

individual English monarchs' and the 'attitudes and ambitions of the English nobility.'[59] The

capability of the king to rule effectively with the nobility was a very important aspect of the

English monarchy. As de Laborderie theorized, English royal legitimacy was not

conceptualised as strictly hereditary. Instead, a unique vision of royal rightfulness emerged,

one that implies what de Laborderie terms a *monarchie contractuelle*, a government that

functioned due to the co-operation between the king and elites.[60] Canterbury MS 1 describes

deposition as a necessary political mechanism to ensure the survival and effectiveness of

royal power. Replacing an incompetent king was rendered acceptable, by emphasising that it

---

[57] The popularity of Geoffrey's *HRB* is evidenced by at least 217 known manuscripts surviving in England and northern France: Michael D. Reeve and Neil Wright, 'Introduction', *The History of the Kings of Britain: An edition and Translation of the De gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britanniae)*, ed. Michael D. Reeve and trans. Neil Wright, (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007), p. vii.

[58] John of Salisbury, *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philosophers*, ed. and trans. Cary J. Nederman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990): p. 25. For more on John of Salisbury and tyranny, see Rouse, Richard H. and Rouse, Mary A., 'John of Salisbury and the Doctrine of Tyrannicide', *Speculum*, 42:4 (1967): pp. 693–709.

[59] Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Crown and the Royal Family in Later Medieval England,' in *Kings and Nobles in the Later Medieval Ages*, ed. Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherbourne (Alan Sutton: Gloucester, 1986), p. 5.

[60] For more on the development of this concept regarding genealogical chronicle rolls in England, see Olivier de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir - Les généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre (1250-1422)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013), pp. 334–39.

had happened before in English history. The Lancastrian kings' presence on the roll as the most recent royal dynasty of England was due to the deposition of Richard II, who was removed on account of unpopularity and incompetency. By presenting a history of England that is filled with discontinuities and other deposed 'bad' kings, Canterbury MS 1 constructs a history of England and provides a pattern of the irregularities that support the foundations of the Lancastrian dynasty.

## Genealogical chronicles as a 'Mirror of Princes'? Kingship on Canterbury MS 1

The roll's theme of kingship also contrasts ineffective or tyrannical rulers with 'good' kings. In the roll's brief comments on rulers there is often a stark divide between 'bad' rulers, who clearly abuse their position and destabilised the kingdom, and 'good' rulers, who led successful military engagements and kept peace and justice in the kingdom. This is reminiscent of the medieval tradition of the 'mirror of princes' genre, which outlined principles of 'ideal' secular rulership. This has also been suggested by de Laborderie, who argues that genealogical rolls were a hybrid between a chronicle history and a mirror of princes, as they can be read as putting forward concepts of a *roi modele* for contemporary kings.[61] In his study of genealogical rolls from 1250 to 1422, de Laborderie highlights that the only kings who are criticised are those that have been weak or did not assume all their responsibilities.[62] On Canterbury MS 1, in a similar manner, some failed kings are described as having a miserable death rather than being deposed. While most of the commentary does not provide details of the death or final resting place of kings, there are three notable exceptions: Gracianus, Harold Godwinson, and William Rufus. According to the manuscript,

---

[61] Ibid., pp. 289–92.

[62] Ibid., p. 260.

Gracianus Romanus reigned by hereditary right, but '…on account of his savageness the common people slew him'.[63] This extract bluntly lays down the consequences of bad kingship.[64] A historical king, Harold Godwinson (d. 1066), also experienced a similar fate. The commentary describes him as a traitor who unlawfully usurped the crown. William the Conqueror killed him, but the text makes clear that his death was actually by 'God the Avenger'.[65] The suggestion that his death was divine intervention suggests that undesirable kings are eliminated by the will of God. Furthermore, William II (Rufus) is also depicted as a tyrannical man, whose 'cruel life' met a 'miserable end'.[66] This corresponds with chronicle accounts of his reign.[67] Readers of the roll would have drawn on personal memory or knowledge of recent history. They would have viewed Richard II's demise, even though it is not recorded on the roll, as an 'act of God' and a sign of divine endorsement of the House of Lancaster.

---

[63] Appendix C, 3: 'Gracianus romanus iure hereditario … propter cuius feritatem plebani ipsum occiderunt'.

[64] A similar comment is found in Higden: '… Gratianus … fecit se regem Britanniae; at quia nimian excercuit tyrannidem, a populo suo plebio occisus est', *Polychronicon*, vol. 5, p. 204. Cf. 'Exin tantam tyrannidem in populum exercuit ita ut cateruis factis irruerunt in illum plebani et interfecerunt': Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, p. 111.

[65] Appendix C, 5: '… unde domino ultore contra regem Willelmum in bello occubuit …'

[66] Appendix C, 5: 'Willelmus Rufus … tirannus deo exosus … vitam suam crudelem misero fine … terminavit …'

[67] Henry of Huntingdon says William Rufus was evil to himself and to the people in *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 449. William of Malmesbury describes William Rufus' death as an unfortunate accident while he was out hunting in the New Forest but that only few nobles out of many mourned William's passing: *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 2 vols, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), vol. 1, p. 573.

In contrast, Canterbury MS 1 is very clear when endorsing 'kingly' values, such as the piety of certain kings. The excerpts offered about 'good' kings demonstrate what was expected from competent and responsible kingship.[68] Elidure, the brother of Archigallo, was reputedly a good ruler during his time on the throne. As a man who voluntarily abdicated in favour of giving his elder brother a second chance to be a good king, Elidure is described as a pious ruler.[69] A historical king, Edgar I the Peaceful (d. 975), is similarly praised. The commentary elaborates on his pious actions, such as founding the abbeys of Glastonbury, Abingdon, Burh (Peterborough), Thorney, and Ramsey.[70] At least one chronicler, William of Malmesbury, included a less flattering account of Edgar's personality. William implied that Edgar was a womanizer, and suggested that his reign was peaceable because England was crisis-free, rather than due to any positive character trait on its ruler's part.[71] Nonetheless, Edgar's tangible expressions of piety, such as supporting religious houses and the political stability he apparently provided, result in a more positive portrayal on the roll.[72] These examples of 'good' kings emphasise the desired traits of justice and piety, both of which were contrary to the Lancastrian narrative of Richard II. While in reality, Richard had supported

---

[68] On this genre in relation to Richard II: Ulrike Grassnick, '"O Prince, Desyre to be Honourable": The Deposition of Richard II and Mirrors for Princes,' *Fourteenth Century England IV*, ed. J. S. Hamilton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 159–61.

[69] Appendix C, 1: '… sortitus est hoc nomen pius quia predictam pietatem in fratrem suum fecerat.'

[70] Appendix C, 6: 'Edgardus dictus pacificus eo quo in pace et inviolabili iustitia regnum feliciter gubernavit … fundavit enim Abbathas de Glaston de Abyndon de Burgo de Torneye et de Ramyseye …'. 'Burgo' is probably a variation of 'Burh', an early name for Peterborough: *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. and trans. M. J. Swanton (London: J. M. Dent, 1996), p. 33, n. 14.

[71] *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, p. 259.

[72] Edgar may not have been responsible for the founding of all the abbeys that the roll attributes to him. This description likely stems from the fact the Benedictine reform movement was at its most dynamic during his reign. For the latter: Julia Barrow, 'The Chronology of the Benedictine "Reform"', in *Edgar, King of the English 959–975: New Interpretations*, ed. Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), p. 211.

re-building projects at Westminster Abbey, Canterbury Cathedral, and York Minister,[73] none of these pious works are mentioned on the roll. This highlights the selective compilation undertaken by the roll's creators, and emphasises the nuanced political nature of the roll.

**Conclusion**

By deposing an unsatisfactory king, the House of Lancaster could promote a dynasty characterized by good kingship. Considering the ideas of kingship and power that were circulating in the late medieval period, Canterbury MS 1 reflects contemporary ideas about undesirable kings, and uses these to reconcile the discontinuities of English kingship for Lancastrian benefit. It suggests that by the early fifteenth century, English kingship was not solely dependent on hereditary right. Although blood succession was certainly preferred, conventional, and helpful for legitimization, it was not a fundamental principle that determined succession to the throne.[74] The concept of 'suitability' for kingship and whether a monarch had the intellectual and personal capacity to rule effectively over the realm were important factors to be considered. The information provided on the roll about the reigns of the mythical and historical kings also suggests something about the Lancastrian vision of how their dynasty fitted into the larger, longer history of England. At a time when the exercise of royal power was judged according to the ability of the king to fulfil expectations and uphold the conventions of the law, Henry VI's supporters could draw on the themes of 'renewal' and 'continued discontinuity', as the realm is portrayed as recovering from mythical and historical disruptions and from unsatisfactory rulers.

---

[73] John H. Harvey, 'Richard II and York,' in *The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack*, ed. F. R. H. DuBoulay and Caroline M. Barron (London: Athlone Press, 1971), p. 209.

[74] Allmand, 'Opposition to Royal Power in England in the Middle Ages,' p. 61.

The purpose of the 1429–33 version of Canterbury MS 1 was probably to support the legitimization of the Lancastrian dynasty. It can also be read as a political document that reflects contemporary (if not specifically Lancastrian) views of kingship and the deposition of Richard II. In the later medieval period, the ideology of kingship was evolving. Comparing these ideas to the roll's portrayal of kingship has brought to light important connections between the role of kings in society and the right to remove or replace those incumbents who proved incompetent in their role. Henry IV and Henry V had established a durable dynasty after 1399. Nevertheless, Lancastrian power was buttressed by more than simply political and military success. Canterbury MS 1 is an example of an object with literary, historical, and political meaning that could demonstrate support for the young dynasty's claims. This approach to Canterbury MS 1 casts light on some contemporary ideas about royal authority and deposition, and the way in which the Lancastrian dynasty sought to establish its legitimacy.

**Chapter 4**

**English Perspectives of Scotland, Wales and France**

**Introduction**

Genealogical rolls are frequently associated with internal dynastic politics in England. However, the English kingdom was not an isolated entity. Genealogical manuscripts provide insights into relations between England and other territories. This chapter will compare the depictions of Scotland and Wales on the roll, taking particular note of the political circumstances in the early fifteenth century. England's northern and western neighbours are presented very differently on the roll. This chapter will assess and account for the differences by considering contemporary political concerns. Scotland, seen as an independent kingdom, is hardly mentioned and treated very much as a foreign entity. In contrast, the roll shows considerably more interest in Wales. The roll uses diagrams and text to emphasise that the Welsh have no royal lineage after 1328 and that its peoples have been absorbed into the greater English kingdom, reflecting contemporary politics. Following this, the chapter will focus on the way in which the roll deals with English claims to the French crown. During the creation of Canterbury MS 1, which coincided with the minority reign of Henry VI, English expansion into France reached its peak. This historical background explains the heightened interest in the 'dual monarchy' concept, and genealogical justifications of the Lancastrian kings to the kingdoms of France and England. These perspectives reveal the significance of hereditary connections to not only claiming the throne of England, but also the extent to

which genealogical chronicles were used to validate English involvement with other

territories.

This chapter fills a gap in the literature on English genealogical rolls as it is focuses

specifically on the way foreign kingdoms and territories are represented. Much of the

scholarship on fifteenth-century genealogical rolls focuses on dynastic politics and domestic

propaganda. Alison Allan, Ralph A. Griffiths and Sydney Anglo, in particular, have

contributed to research regarding the use of genealogies to promote and reinforce the dynastic

and hereditary legitimacy of various monarchs and their dynasties. Allan used genealogical

rolls to explore Yorkist propaganda in the mid-fifteenth century, while Anglo explored the

manipulation of genealogical material for dynastic popularity and legitimacy in England.[1]

However, the portrayals of foreign territories on royal genealogies have been neglected. This

chapter shows that although Canterbury MS 1 is predominantly interested in the kings of

England, it does not present the English kingdom as an isolated, inward-looking dominion. It

shows awareness of England's diplomatic position with other kingdoms and territories. By

placing the roll in its 'international' and diplomatic context, it can offer a new perspective on

the relations between England and its neighbouring kingdoms and dominions.

---

[1] Sydney Anglo, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 44 (1961–2): pp. 17–48; Alison Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV', in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. Charles Ross (Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979), pp. 171–92; Alison Allan, 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1981).

**Canterbury MS 1 and the portrayal of the Kingdom of Scotland**

Although Canterbury MS 1 is a genealogical roll of the kings of England, the roll does not present England as an isolated dominion. It shows awareness of England's position and relations with other kingdoms and sovereign territories. The impression of Scotland that the roll offers is that the diplomatic relations between England and the northern kingdom were relatively indifferent. The roll tells us two things about Scotland. Firstly, England occasionally engages in military conflict with Scotland, and secondly the Scots have two origin myths. The constant military and diplomatic interactions between Scotland and England during the medieval period is mostly ignored on the roll. The kings of Scotland do not have their lineage visually depicted on the roll. Scottish rulers generally do not appear on the diagram. Only the occasional English consorts of Scottish kings, such as Henry III's sister, Queen Joan of Scotland, are visually represented with a circle. Most of the text references in the commentary are only in passing and no strongly defined Anglo-Scottish narrative is developed. The few comments about Scotland are usually in a military context. One sentence tells us that King Edreld subjugated the Scots[2] and another says that William the Conqueror dominated Scotland.[3] These claims of conquest are not elaborated in any further detail. For the most part, Scotland is portrayed as a foreign entity without much political or genealogical interest for English kings. The general absence of references throughout the roll provides an opportunity to speculate over the treatment of the northern kingdom on this manuscript, since actual Anglo-Scottish relations were an important English political concern during the early fifteenth century.

---

[2] Appendix D, 1: 'Edredus…subjugata sibi Scotia…'

[3] Appendix D, 1: 'Willmus…subjugavit sibi Scotiam…'

Although generally the roll suggests a lack of interest in Scotland, there are two points of interest. The first is the diagram's representation of the legendary figure Albanactus, and the second is the commentary text about Scotus, another mythical Scot. They are the two founding figures of Scotland in different versions of Scottish origin myths. According to one version, Brutus, whose journey from Troy to England was discussed earlier in chapter one, had three sons: Albanactus, Locrinus and Kamber. After Brutus died, his island kingdom of Britain was split into three sections, one share for each of the three brothers. Locrinus was given England, Kamber had Wales, and Albanactus inherited the northern section of Britain.[4] On the roll, Locrinus is presented as the true heir of Brutus, as he is on placed just underneath his father, on the same central axis, while Kamber is on the right, and Albanactus on the left of the central line. The inclusion of all three brothers, even though none of Albanactus' descendants are pictured, highlights the prevalence of the Brutus myth in England, and how the English viewed themselves as the 'leading' nation. This is significant because the same genealogical argument to justify English superiority is part of a long tradition of English perceptions of Scotland.

For centuries, the two kingdoms of England and Scotland were in conflict. Edward I (d. 1307) invaded Scotland in 1296, claiming feudal overlordship to intervene in the Scottish succession crisis. In 1301, he used the mythical unity of Brutus' Britain and its subsequent division to justify his superiority. In Edward I's interpretation of the myth, although all three sons inherited a share of Brutus' Britain, Wales and Scotland were considered subordinate to England. This concept continued over a century later. In 1417 at the Council of Constance

---

[4] R. James Goldstein, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), p. 64.

(1414–18), the English called Wales, Ireland and Scotland as part of the nation of 'England or Britain'.[5] Canterbury MS 1, which is from about a decade after the council, also presents the idea that out of all three kingdoms, England is superior to Scotland or Wales. Although the roll does not expand fully on the Brutus myth nor articulate Edward I's claim to overlordship of Scotland, the visual and textual commentary suggests that out of the three brothers, Locrinus, was superior to his brothers and the chief heir to Brutus' Britain.

However, Canterbury MS 1 also depicts another origin myth of the Scots. Aside from the sentence about Brutus, there is just one substantial section of text referring to Scotland: a paragraph that describes the mythical founder of Scotland as Scotus, a youth who led his people from the Red Sea to northern Britain.[6] This differs slightly from the major contemporary versions of the Scottish origin myth, which had been circulating since the eleventh century. By the fourteenth century, Scottish origin myths were used to counter English pretentions to superiority and to claim greater antiquity for the Scottish rulers.[7] In traditional accounts of the Scottish origin myth, the Scots were named after an Egyptian princess, Scota.[8] Two major Scottish chronicles from the fifteenth century, John of Fordun's

---

[5] Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The Island of England in the Fifteenth Century: Perceptions of the Peoples of the British Isles', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29 (2003): 182.

[6] Appendix A, 2: 'Egiptiis in mare rubeo submersis qui superfuerunt expulerunt a se quondam nobiliem iuvenem nomine Scotum…tertiam gentem in britanniam addiderunt quam scotos apppellaverunt a quibus dicta est scotia prius Albania ab ablanacto filio bruti nominata.'

[7] Griffiths, 'The Island of England', p. 103.

[8] Edward J. Cowan, 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 63:176 (1984), p. 121. For detail on the Scota myth, see Marjorie Drexler, 'Fluid Prejudice: Scottish Origin Myths in the Later Middle Ages', *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. Joel Rosenthal and Colin Richmond (New York: St Martin's Press, 1987), pp. 61–76.

*Chronica Gentis Scotorum,* which was influential in Scotland until at least the sixteenth century,[9] and Walter Bower's *Scotichronicon*, which was heavily based on Fordun's work and follows the same narrative, refer to Gaythelos, a Greek who left his homeland and arrived in Egypt. There he married Scota, the daughter of a Pharoah. The couple and their supporters later left Egypt and settled on land that would be called Scotia.[10] The chronicler Adam of Usk (d. 1430) also mentions the Scota myth to explain the origins of England's northern neighbours.[11] This shows that English chroniclers of the fifteenth century also knew of the Scota myth. However, in *Lebor Gabala* and some Irish versions on the myth, the Scota tradition was altered to include a male founder, such as 'Eber Scot' or 'Riphath Scot'.[12] Since the commentary on Canterbury MS 1 is predominantly from English perspective and most of the identified sources are English,[13] this interpretation of Scota as 'Scotus' is unusual. Nonetheless, the inclusion and development of this paragraph strongly suggests that the Scottish origin myth was not only acknowledged, but accepted and incorporated into the roll by its creators. This invites speculation as to why the roll uses two versions of the origin myth of the Scots, while it still lacks information about the rest of Scottish history or Anglo-Scottish relations.

---

[9] Drexler, 'Fluid Prejudice: Scottish Origin Myths in the Later Middle Ages', p. 62.

[10] Walter Bower, *A History Book for Scots: Selections from Scotichronicon*, ed. D. E. R. Watt (Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1998), pp. 5–7.

[11] Adam of Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk 1377–1421*, ed. and trans. Chris Given-Wilson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 209.

[12] Cowan, 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland', p. 123.

[13] Arnold Wall, 'Introduction', *Handbook to the Maude Roll* (Auckland, NZ: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1918), n. p.

The presentation of the northern kingdom is probably related to foreign policies and diplomatic relations between England and Scotland between 1400 and 1436. Broadly speaking, during this period, Scotland was not an active major threat to England, who generally had the upper hand politically during this period. Henry IV had invaded Scotland in 1400, though this appears to have been a lacklustre exercise. It has been described by historians as 'devoid of military glory'.[14] With no enemy to engage in battle and running low on supplies, Henry IV had 'retreated ignominiously back to England'.[15] Even contemporary chroniclers who were known to be sympathetic to Henry IV, such as Adam of Usk, had little to say about this northern excursion of just a fortnight.[16] Usk briefly explains that due to underhanded Scottish tactics (a scorched-earth policy), the English suffered heavier losses, but he does not linger on the failed campaign.[17] Canterbury MS 1 omits this episode entirely. Neglecting to elaborate on an apparently mediocre military expedition suggests that the roll's compiler decided to omit episodes that did not highlight the successes of English kings or add prestige to the English kingdom. After 1400, the next major military conflict between the two kingdoms was more than three decades later in the 1430s, as England enjoyed the upper hand in Anglo-Scottish relations throughout the early fifteenth century.

England's advantageous position is clear from an incident in September 1402, when Scottish forces invaded Northumberland. The Scots were soundly defeated by the English at

---

[14] Cynthia J. Neville, 'Scotland, the Percies and the Law in 1400', *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399–1406*, ed. Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (York: York Medieval Press, 2003), p. 73.

[15] Pollard, A. J., *Late Medieval England, 1399–1509* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), p. 32.

[16] Antonia Gransden, *Historial Writing in England II: c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century*, (London: Routledge, 1974), pp. 83–84.

[17] Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk*, p. 175.

the Battle of Homildon Hill. All Scottish leaders were either killed or captured in the decisive English victory.[18] Then, from 1406 to 1424, the English had the diplomatic advantage of having James I, King of the Scots (d.1437), in captivity. The heir to the ailing Robert III (d. 1406) was captured en route to France in 1406, and remained detained in England for eighteen years, which made him a 'guarantor of Scottish diplomatic caution'.[19] The detained James I was released in 1424 after he married Joan Beaufort (half-niece of Henry IV, not to be confused with her aunt of the same name who married Ralph Neville). Joan is titled 'Queen of Scotland' on Canterbury MS 1, making her one of the very few Scottish royals to appear on the roll. Her husband is not mentioned at all. For James' release, the English managed to secure beneficial conditions, such as a ransom, the release of 27 hostages and a truce.[20] These events highlight that while Anglo-Scottish relations continued to be tense in the first half of the fifteenth century, there was no significant Scottish threat to invade England, and nor was there any serious English aggression towards the integrity of Scottish territory.

Furthermore, between the period 1422 and 1437, the foreign policies of both England and Scotland underwent some transformation. Although the Scottish support of the Dauphin in France continued, Scottish diplomacy towards England changed significantly after 1424. Scottish policies towards England became less aggressive. There was no southward expansion, although occasional quick raids across the border kept the English garrisons on

---

[18] Pollard, *Late Medieval England 1399–1509*, p. 37.

[19] Robert Rees Davies, *The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dŵr* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 122.

[20] Alexander Grant, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland, 1306–1469* (London: Edward Allen, 1984), p. 45.

alert.[21] On the other hand, the English were interested in more conciliatory relations with Scotland. While the Scottish frontier was a constant problem for the English council during the minority of Henry VI, the English had, as Griffiths notes, 'other preoccupations and straitened finances'.[22] War with Scotland could be very costly for the English at a time when France was absorbing English resources. Although the northern border was never secure and the English did not relax their northern defences,[23] war did not break out on the northern border until 1436.[24] The changing diplomatic attitudes between the two kingdoms, and England's perceived advantageous position could account for the downplaying of Scotland on the roll.

Scotland was a subordinate, but nevertheless autonomous kingdom. Unlike Wales, which was becoming more closely aligned with the English kingdom during the fourteenth century, Scotland was still a sovereign kingdom.[25] Despite the theoretical overlordship of Scotland claimed by generations of English kings, translating the theory into practical power was a struggle and, in the fifteenth century, not aggressively pursued.[26] Scotland was a separate entity from England. As pointed out by Sarah Peverley, medieval maps often depicted Scotland and England as detached from each other. This represented a physically

[21] Ibid., pp. 32–34.

[22] Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998), p. 162.

[23] Ibid., p. 159.

[24] Ibid., p. 161.

[25] A. J. Pollard, 'Introduction: Society, Politics and the Wars of the Roses', *The Wars of the Roses*, ed. A. J. Pollard (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995), p. 17.

[26] Andrea Ruddick, *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 26.

independent Scotland.[27] Some maps made the two kingdoms appear separate by using non-existent rivers that 'cut' through the Anglo-Scottish border.[28] On the Hereford Map, Scotland appears as a totally separate island, as does Ireland. Even in the early fourteenth century, although Scotland was subjected to Edward I, in English documents, Scotland was still described as a 'realm'.[29] Canterbury MS 1 also suggests that although the English had a theoretical feudal claim over their northern neighbour, during the period this roll was produced, Scotland operated as an independent kingdom complete with its own origin myth and royal lineage. By including both Albanactus and Scotus as founding figures of Scotland, the roll offers some concessions to the Scots' own version of their origins. In doing so, it recognizes Scotland as a dominion that is, for now, separate from England.

**The Glyndŵr Revolt and the English perception of Wales**

The treatment of Wales on Canterbury MS 1 is very different from that of Scotland. This is most likely due to the English vision of Wales as part of the English kingdom since the reign of Edward I. Visually the Welsh princes are a significant presence on the roll. Parallel to the central red line on the roll representing the English kings, there is a dark green line that runs down the manuscript on the right-hand side. It starts from one of Brutus' sons, Kamber, and lists the princes of Wales alongside the central red line. Although the roll's

---

[27] Sarah Peverley, 'Medieval Maps of Scotland', http://sarahpeverley.com/tag/anglo-scottish-war/ . Last accessed 12 April 2015.

[28] Some examples include: British Library, MS Harley 3686, f. 13 (dated from the second quarter of the fifteenth century), and British Library, MS Royal 14 C VII, f. 5v (dated from the thirteenth century). Both maps have very wide rivers cutting though most of the northern border, leaving a small segment of land connecting the two kingdoms.

[29] Michael Prestwich, 'Colonial Scotland: The English in Scotland under Edward I', *Scotland and England, 1586–1815*, ed. Roger A Mason (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1987), p. 7.

compiler omitted the Scottish royal line descended from Albanactus, the Welsh princely

lineage is portrayed as a subordinate genealogy alongside the English royals. This

manipulation of the Brutus myth to 'claim' Wales, while leaving Scotland (for the most part)

uninvolved in the English royal genealogy reveals the significance of genealogy in territorial

claims of the English kingdom. The depiction of Wales on Canterbury MS 1 offers a fresh

perspective on Anglo-Welsh relations and perceptions.

The roll's line of Welsh princes ends with Gruffydd ap Llywelyn (*Gruffrius* on

Canterbury MS 1) and his four sons: Owain Goch (*Oweyngoth)*, Llywelyn (*Lewelinus*),

Dafydd (*David*) and Rhodri (*Rodri*). The second of these brothers, commonly referred to as

Llywelyn the Last, was the last effective sovereign Prince of Gwynedd and was defeated by

Edward I of England in 1282. His brother, Dafydd, was executed in the summer of 1283.[30] A

secondary Welsh line, further to the right, accompanies the main green line. It splinters off

from the primary line of Welsh princes after Rhodri Mawr (the Great), who had ruled the

kingdoms of Gwynedd, Powys and Seisyllwg. After Rhodri Mawr's death in around 878, his

kingdom was divided among his sons. While the main green line continues with Rhodri's

eldest son, Anarawd ap Rhodri, who became leader of Gwynedd, the second line starts with

his younger brother Cadell ap Rhodri, Prince of Seisyllwg (which later became part of

Deheubarth). This suggests that the secondary Welsh line refers to Deheubarth's rulers. The

Deuheubarth line ends with 'Rhys'. The scribe has not made the individuals clearly

identifiable, which suggests a lack of effort on part of the compiler. The reference text used to

create the lineage of Welsh rulers is also unknown. By the time of Llywelyn the Last in the

---

[30] Glanmor Williams, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales c. 1415–1642* (Oxford: University of Wales Press, 1987), p. 31.

thirteenth century, these principalities had more or less been merged together, although there was no political unit recognized as 'Wales' in a modern sense.[31] On our manuscript, the two lines of Gwynedd and Deheubarth are kept separate. This demonstrates an attempt to represent the different principalities within Wales, and perhaps to understand and incorporate the divisions of 'Wales', while bringing it under English influence.

The commentary makes frequent references to Anglo-Welsh military events. Wales is mentioned in nine separate paragraphs in the text, and at least seven of these refer to battles or wars involving the Welsh. This is notable compared to other countries or political entities such as Scotland, France or the Papacy. Other areas that were of English interest, such as Ireland, are also generally ignored. The first mention of Wales in the text is near the beginning of the roll when it describes Kambrius, a son of Brutus, being given the area Kambria. The roll tells us that 'Kambria is called Wales after a leader named Waclus'.[32] After this statement, almost all of the references that follow relate to conquering Wales or Welsh resistance. There are paragraphs in the commentary that include descriptions of: Harold Godwinson's military victories in Wales between 1055 and 1063;[33] William the Conqueror's invasion of Wales between 1066 and 1080s;[34] and a lengthy paragraph dedicated to explaining that Llywelyn ap Gruffudd's refusal to come to the king's parliament led to

---

[31] Ibid., p. 31.

[32] Appendix A, 3:'Kambrio cessit partes ultra sabrina et mare quam nomine suo kambriam appellavit que nunc Wallia dicta a quodam duce Wacle sic dicta.'

[33] Appendix D, 2: 'Anno eiusdem 22° haraldus filius comitis Godwini subdidit sibi Walliam…'. This refers to Harold's wars against Gruffydd ap Llywelyn: Kelly DeVries, 'Harold Godwinson in Wales', *The Normans and Their Adversaries at War*, ed. Richard Philip Abels, Bernard S. Bachrach and C. Warren Hollister (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), p. 67.

[34] Appendix D, 2: 'Willmus …subjugavit scilicet Walliam…'

Edward I's subjugation of Wales.[35] In reality, Edward I decided at a council of prelates and magnates to declare war on Llywelyn ap Gruffudd after the latter's refusal to pay homage to the English king.[36] The commentary goes on to describe the death of Llywelyn and one of his brothers, David (*Dafydd*). It then quotes a section from the seventh book of Ranulph Higden's *Polychronicon*, complete with a citation.[37] Within the section that was copied from Higden, the text includes a poem that vilifies the Welsh prince Llywelyn.[38] The disproportionate focus on Edward I's victory over the Welsh, as shown by the detailed text, underlines its importance for the compiler of the roll. Fifteenth-century references to Wales occur at the very end of the Lancastrian version of the roll. One of the last paragraphs describes an 'Owynus Glyndore' and names him responsible for the strife in Wales.[39] The commentary then explains that the Welsh started to act in a more 'English' manner after this uprising, and implies that the Welsh have now become more civilised because they imitate the English.[40] These details suggests that with the 'Glyndore' revolt defeated, Wales was being absorbed into England, both politically and culturally.

---

[35] Appendix D, 2: 'Secundo anno edwardi lewilinus princeps Wallie ad parliamentum regis in Anglia venire noluerat… Rex adiit waliam…'

[36] Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1988), p. 170.

[37] This paragraph (appendix D, 4) ends with: '…ut dicit policronicon . lib° 7. ca ° 40 °.'

[38] The poem includes lines such as (appendix D, 3): 'Hic iacet errorum princeps et predo vivorum…' and '…mendax fuit wallicus ille.'

[39] Appendix D, 5: '…surrexxrunt in Wallia quidam Owynus Glyndore et actri infestavit totam Walliam ferro flamma fere per septennium…'

[40] Appendix D, 5: '…Sed tempore henrica quinto filii sui ceperunt Wallenses more anglorum vivere…' This is also from Higden, as the commentary reads at the end of this sentence: '…polichonicon . lib. 1° ca° 38°'

The roll's emphasis on Welsh affairs led Arnold Wall to hypothesise that the manuscript's origins may be connected to Wales;[41] however, as discussed in chapter one, there is insufficient evidence to support this hypothesis. Similar rolls have also been linked to a Welsh provenance, based purely on the inclusion of Welsh lineage. One of these, NLW Rolls 55, bears textual similarities with Canterbury MS 1, although it starts with Adam and not Noah. NLW Rolls 55, also known as the 'Madryn Roll', was described as the 'Second Latin Roll' in Thomas Wright's part transcription in 1872. Wright also assumed that the 'curious narrative of Welsh affairs' is strong evidence that 'it was made for some feudal baron on the borders of Wales'.[42] That manuscript happened to be at Madryn Castle in Wales in the nineteenth century, which may have contributed to Wright's assumption that there was a Welsh connection. However, Wright explains that its provenance prior to its appearance in John Camden Hotten's catalogue of topographical books in 1864 is unknown.[43] As recently as 1995, Michael Siddons speculated that NLW Rolls 55 was made for a Welsh or Marcher family.[44] Claims for the provenance of both rolls are conjectures that have been inferred from the Welsh narrative on the roll. In neither case is there any solid evidence to substantiate a Welsh provenance.

---

[41] Arnold Wall, 'Introduction', in *Handbook to the Maude Roll: being a 15th century MS. genealogy of the British and English kings from Noah to Edward IV, with a marginal history* (Auckland, NZ: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1918), n.p.

[42] Thomas Wright, *Feudal Manuals of English History, a Series of Popular Sketches of Our National History (*London: Joseph Mayer, 1872), p. xviii. Named 'Second Latin Roll' by Thomas Wright, this roll in 1872 was in the possession of T. L. Duncombe Jones-Parry of Madryn Castle, a prominent Welsh politician in the late nineteenth century.

[43] Ibid., p. xix.

[44] Michael Powell Siddons, 'Welsh Pedigree Rolls', *National Library of Wales Journal,* 29:1 (1995), p. 3.

Moreover, the roll's interest in Welsh affairs could also be explained by the political circumstances of the fifteenth century. Although the English liked to believe that Wales was under their control after the victory of Edward I in 1282, there had been numerous revolts since Edward's conquest.[45] During Henry VI's reign, central control over Wales was weakened due to several factors. For example, the leading English families of the Welsh March (the Despensers, Mortimers, and Staffords), were weakened by a series of minorities in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and experienced difficultly in maintaining revenue from Welsh estates.[46] Added to this, in the decades before the creation of Canterbury MS 1, England was challenged by a revolt that lasted from about 1400 to 1415. This rebellion, led by Owain Glyndŵr, was the last significant Welsh bid for independence from English rule. Canterbury MS 1 describes Owain Glyndŵr (*Owynus Glyndore*) as a mere Welsh rebel, but in reality his revolt had a powerful impact on the English in the early fifteenth century. Owain's claim to the title of Prince of Wales was based on his assertion that he was the closest surviving descendant of all three princely lines (Gwynedd, Powys and Deheubarth).[47] Notably, Canterbury MS 1 deliberately avoids validating any contemporary Welsh prince ending the visual representations of the Welsh princely genealogy with Llywelyn and Dafydd, who were both executed by Edward I in 1282 and 1283. Owain's pedigree as a Welsh prince is ignored, demonstrating the roll's selective portrayal of genealogies. The Welsh people, as imagined on the roll, had lost their right to a princely

---

[45] Famous Welsh rebels include who do not appear by name on the roll include: Rhys ap Maredudd (1287), Llywelyn Bren (1316) and Owain Lawgoch (1378): Williams, p. 3.

[46] Ralph A Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambeldon Press, 1991), pp. 63–65.

[47] John K. Bollard 'Owain Glyndŵr, Princes Wallie*'*, *Owain Glyndŵr: A Casebook*, ed. Michael Livingstone and John K. Bollard (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), p. 426.

hereditary lineagae during the reign of Edward I when Wales was incorporated into the English kingdom.

The Glyndŵr revolt was large enough to warrant serious consideration by the English.[48] The level of destruction is difficult to gauge, as contemporary evidence has a tendency to exaggerate the extent of damage caused in the war. There is consensus, however, that the rebellion had heavy economic consequences. For example, in the county of Flint, no ministers' accounts exist for the period between 1403 and 1405. In 1403, the Duchy of Lancaster reported no revenue from the lordships of Brecon, Kidwelly and Carnwyllion.[49] This demonstrates a paralysis of the administration and the inability to collect revenue. When they do reappear, they report damage of townships. This shows that the revolt's destruction was severe enough to disrupt English administration and finances. The Welsh success at the Battle of Bryn Glas (near Pilleth) in 1402 meant that Glyndŵr's forces could easily raid the south central Marches and threaten border settlements.[50] The gravity of the developing threat is demonstrated by decisions made by the English government. For example, it appointed men with 'impeccable military credentials', such as Thomas and Henry Percy, as lieutenants. Both had experience with border warfare against the Scots.[51] Although this backfired when the Percys revolted against Henry IV, their initial failure to crush the Welsh rebellion shows

---

[48] For an overview of the social and political background to the revolt and the main events during the revolt, see: Davies, *The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dŵr*.

[49] Williams, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales C. 1415–1642*, p. 18–9.

[50] Davies, p. 109.

[51] Ibid., p. 182.

that the guerrilla tactics of the Welsh were effective against English forces. The seriousness

of the revolt is reflected in the considerable interest in Welsh affairs.

　　　　Furthermore, the Welsh rebels were aware of the political significance of their revolt

and sought broader recognition for their stand against the English, both from allies and at

European-wide councils. In 1404, Owain was crowned Prince of Wales in the presence of

envoys from Scotland and Spain.[52] In the same year, he signed a treaty with French, who

were keen to exploit English weakness, and formed an alliance against their common

enemy.[53] The treaty with France was significant, not only for the reinforcements that the

French agreed to provide, but also because Owain Glyndŵr was recognized by a major

European kingdom as the legitimate sovereign Prince of Wales.[54] A Franco-Welsh army even

advanced on Worcester in August 1405 against Henry IV.[55] Glyndŵr, who styled himself as

the Prince of Wales, also set up his own court at Castle Harlech and changed his political

allegiance to the Avignon pope, which was contrary to English policy.[56] During the Western

Schism, which lasted from 1378 until the end of the Council of Constance (1414–18), there

were simultaneously multiple popes. Secular heads of state aligned themselves with particular

candidates. Henry IV recognized the Pope in Rome, while the Kingdom of France and the

Kingdom of Scotland recognized the Pope in Avignon. By declaring that the Welsh

---

[52] Ibid., p. 182.

[53] Kelly DeVries, 'Owain Glyndŵr's Way of War', *Owain Glyndŵr: A Casebook*, ed. Michael Livingstone and John K. Bollard (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), pp. 445–55.

[54] Ibid., p. 455.

[55] J. E. Lloyd, *Owen Glendower* (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1931), pp. 101–6.

[56] Williams, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales C. 1415–1642*, p. 4.

principality would support Boniface IX (Avignon), Owain demonstrated Welsh independence and initiative regarding both religious and foreign policy. Moreover, at the Council of Constance, there was a debate about the nature of the relationship between Wales and England, with particular regard to the impact this would have on the voting 'blocks' at the council.[57] The debate revealed conflicting narratives of what constituted a 'nation': the English insisted (as on Canterbury MS 1) that the contemporary English people descended from Brutus, the original inhabitant of the isle of Britain, whereas the Franco-Welsh delegation argued that only the Scots and Welsh had original British ancestry, and that the English were successors of the invading Anglo-Saxons.[58] The importance placed on genealogical descent of peoples (*gens*) for validating claims to community and nationhood at the Council of Constance highlights the significance of competing genealogical narratives in a broader European context. The efforts made by Welsh rebels to be recognized as an independent country and the diplomatic issues that resulted regarding Anglo-Welsh relations emphasises that the perception of Wales was an important issue for the English government in the first half of the fifteenth century. Canterbury MS 1 is a contemporary document that 'sells' the English version of the genealogical and political domination of Wales by England.

Glyndŵr's revolt lost momentum within a few years, but it took more than a decade to die out completely. Although the surrender of the Isle of Angelesy in 1406 was a significant English victory, without the capitulations of the two major castles of Aberstwyth and Harlech, the English could not declare outright success. When Castle Harlech fell in 1409,

---

[57] This took place after the revolt was put down, but there were important connections between the revolt and the members of the Anglo-Welsh delegation at the Council of Constance, as explained in: Marchant, p. 161.

[58] Ibid., p. 164.

Owain Glyndŵr's revolt was finally defeated, and the last major challenge to Henry IV's power over Wales was removed.[59] Although the English managed to stamp out most of the rebellion by 1410, Glyndŵr himself evaded capture and his death remained unconfirmed. A Welsh chronicle says that he went into hiding in 1415 and that despite many assuming him dead, 'the seers maintain he did not'.[60] His burial place remains a mystery even now. It is assumed that he died by 1416, because in that year Henry V offered a royal pardon to Owain Glyndŵr's surviving son, Maredudd ab Owain, rather than offering it to his father.[61] For the English, the unconfirmed death of the rebel leader was an unsatisfactory end.

Glyndŵr represented a revolt that took a decade and a half to extinguish.[62] For the contemporary English, this was not a minor uprising that was contained at a local level. It damaged economic, administrative and social structures and involved serious attempts by its leader to be recognized by other sovereign kingdoms. Glyndŵr had led the most successful rebellion since the Norman Conquest, won numerous battles, terrorised the Marches and caused chaos for the English. As a failed rebellion, it is easy to view this revolt as inconsequential, but for the Lancastrians and the English, the Welsh rebellion was a very real threat for several years. This particular rebellion was significant for early fifteenth-century contemporaries in England, and it is reasonable to suggest that the compiler and readers of Canterbury MS 1 would have been aware, or perhaps even have experienced this revolt.

---

[59] Thomas. B. Pugh, *Henry V and the Southampton Plot of 1415* (Gloucester: Sutton, 1988), p. 85.

[60] Translation of the Annals of 'Owen Glyndŵr, extracted from Peniriath MS 135, from: J. E. Lloyd, *Owen Glendower* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 154.

[61] Davies, T*he Revolt of Owain Glyn Dŵr*, pp. 326–67.

[62] Ibid., pp. 328–9.

Glyndŵr's revolt resulted in several legal restrictions on the Welsh, such as preventing a Welshman from purchasing property, or punishing Englishmen who married Welsh women by preventing them from holding office legally in Wales.[63] Although these regulations were not strictly enforced, it shows the legal measures taken to re-enforce the 'lesser' status of the Welsh in the English kingdom. The roll's interest in Welsh affairs may be reflective of the revolt's impact on England, and English insistence on Welsh assimilation into the kingdom. The detailed insertion of the Welsh rulers and analysis of the commentary suggests that the interest in Welsh affairs is not due to the roll's provenance, but the political context of the early fifteenth century.

**The Dual Monarchy: Canterbury MS 1 and Henry VI's claim to the French throne**

In addition to suppressing the Welsh rebellion, fifteenth-century England was also preoccupied with the war in France. The impact of the Anglo-French war is visible on Canterbury MS 1, where the hereditary claim of Edward III to the French crown is depicted by the use of colour symbolism. The red central line, which represents the English kings, changes after the circle depicting Edward II. It begins to alternate between blue and red, producing a quartered effect on the central line. Tracing the blue colour, we can see that the scribe went to the trouble of inserting an abridged genealogy of the French kings on the left of the manuscript, starting with St Louis IX (d.1270). The effort taken to draw the French royal genealogy back to St Louis was probably a conscious decision by the compiler, as a

---

[63] Ralph A. Griffiths, 'The English Realm and the Dominions and the King's Subjects in the Later Middle Ages', in *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society*, ed. J. G. Rowe (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1986), p. 94.

royal saint added a sacral dimension to the French royal lineage.[64] The French kings descend from St Louis through predominantly blue lines. One long blue line links Philip IV of France (d. 1314), with his daughter, Isabelle, who married Edward II of England in 1308. Her blue circle connects to her husband's red circle, and also touches the red and blue line that extends down from the pair. The central line leading away from Isabelle and Edward has both blue and red colours alternating within the single line, and her four children have alternating colours, including Edward III. The blue symbolically represents the French royal house. The traditional coat of arms of the kingdom of France was *azure semé* with *fleurs-de-lis or.* In England, the royal arms consisted of *gules*, three lions *passant guardant*, a design that had been well established from 1198.[65] Edward III crossed these two arms of the royal houses: he quartered the royal arms of France and England and created a new coat of arms that was 'a bold visual statement of intent', a clear signal of Edward's dynastic ambition.[66] Canterbury MS 1 echoes the sentiment in a visual manner.[67] It is not the only genealogical roll from this period to have the red and blue central line of descent. Other manuscripts that have a blue and red central line extending from Edward III include: Aberystwyth, NLW, MS 12389 E and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Marshall 135. Among these, the central line on Canterbury MS 1

---

[64] For more on the importance of St Louis in the context of dynasticism and legitimacy of the French royal lineage, see: M. Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of Saint Louis, Kingship Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), pp. 230–31.

[65] Caroline Shenton, 'Edward III and the Symbol of the Leopard', *Heraldry, Pagentry and Social Display in Medieval England*, ed. Peter Cross and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), p. 69.

[66] Adrian Ailes, 'Heraldry in Medieval England: Symbols of Politics and Propaganda', *Heraldry, Pageantry and Social Display in Medieval England*, ed. Peter Cross and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), pp. 88–89.

[67] The blue and red lines were first identified as symbolic of the English and French royals in: Chris Jones, 'Remembering the Past', *Treasures of the University of Canterbury Library*, ed. C. Jones, B. Matthews with J. Clement (Christchurch: Canterbury University Press, 2011), p. 88.

has a unique variation: it alternates the two colours in a quartering fashion, reminiscent of

quartering fields on a coat of arms. Other rolls, such as NLW MS 12389 E, have the red and

blue colours running parallel to each other along the remaining length of the central line after

Edward III. The symbolic colours and the commentary present to the audience a hereditary

argument that the Lancastrian kings of England also have a legitimate claim to the kingdom

of France.


Alongside the intersection of the French and English royal lines, there is a lengthy

paragraph that explains the genealogy of the French monarchy. The text describes the French

royal lineage, recounting the French royal descent from St Louis to Jean II. It identifies the

marriages and children of the kings of France, so that the reader can follow the successions of

French kings in more detail than on the diagram. For example, the roll's pictorial diagram

only labels the kings of France and does not offer any information regarding daughters, wives

or other male children. For additional information, the text tells us that '*Philippus secundus'*

(actually Philip V: the roll is referring to him as the second son of Philip IV) had two

unnamed daughters: one married the Count of Flanders, and the other, the Dauphin of

Vienne. Both daughters did not have children while Philip V was alive.[68] The main point of

this paragraph, however, is not about the extended French royal family, but to illustrate that a

Valois, Philip VI, succeeded the French crown, instead of Edward III of England. The

English viewed Edward III as the direct descendant of Philip IV as he was the only surviving

male grandchild. The text tells us that 'Philippus filius Karoli de Valoys et occupavit regnum

Francie ubi dominus Edwardus debuisset succedere ex linea descendente dicti Philippi

---

[68] Appendix D, 6:'… Philippo secundus genitus Philippi pulcri qui de uxore sua suscitavit duas filias quarum una deposata erat comiti flandre altera dolphino de viennis…'

pulcri.'[69] This sentence clearly elucidates the English claim that the successors to Edward III should be kings of France.

When Charles IV of France died childless in 1328, the crown went to his first cousin Philip VI (d.1350). Edward III of England, nephew of Charles IV, argued that he, as the closest living male heir, should have succeeded his uncle, instead of Philip VI. Edward argued that he was closer in blood through his mother, Isabelle, sister of Charles IV.[70] Edward III assumed the title King of France in January 1340, though the French did not recognize this. Although he gave up the title in 1360, Edward III continued to assert his right in 1369.[71] To emphasise the English perspective, the roll does not have a circle to represent Philip VI. The circle of Charles of Valois is linked directly to his grandson, 'Johannes' (most probably Jean II of France), without his son, Phillip VI, in between the two generations. Canterbury MS 1 denies Philip VI the throne of France by erasing him from the lineage of French kings. This supports the claims of Lancastrian kings to the crown of France though these visual and textual examples. The insertion of the royal French genealogy and the texts serves to emphasise the importance of the French bloodline to the kings of England. Canterbury MS 1 communicates with both text and diagrams the legitimacy of Lancastrian kings to the French throne by using the Edwardian claim.

---

[69] Ibid.

[70] Anne Curry, 'Two Kingdoms, One King: The Treaty of Troyes (1420) and the Creation of a Double Monarchy of England and France', *The Contending Kingdoms: France and England 1420-1700*, ed. Glenn Richardson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 24.

[71] Curry, 'Two Kingdoms, One King', p. 24.

In 1420, despite the existing hereditary Edwardian claim through the female line of descent, Henry V had secured a different claim to the French throne – one that is not depicted on Canterbury MS 1. In 1420, Henry V was in a position to negotiate the Treaty of Troyes. This treaty disinherited the Dauphin, Charles, and recognized Henry V as the heir to the French crown after the death of Charles VI of France. Each kingdom was to remain administratively separate, but would be united by one dynasty and king.[72] The Treaty of Troyes became the constitutional and legal basis for the Anglo-French dual monarchy.[73] It is notable that the Treaty of Troyes did not directly reference the claims of Henry V's ancestor, Edward III. This was most likely a calculated omission, as acknowledging Edward III's claims would then invalidate the legitimacy of French kings after 1328 and undermine Charles VI.[74] Furthermore, the Treaty did not rely on the marriage of Catherine, Charles VI's daughter, to Henry V. The wedding of Henry V and Catherine was held two weeks after the treaty was sealed, definitively separating the marriage and Henry's heirship.[75] The unexpected deaths of Henry V (31 August 1422) and Charles VI (21 October 1422) in quick succession changed the context of the Treaty of Troyes. As Charles VI's son, the Dauphin, was disinherited in 1420 according to the Treaty of Troyes, the successor to both crowns was Henry V's son, who was also Charles VI's grandson, Henry VI. Despite the Treaty of Troyes, which was in effect until the mid-1430s, Canterbury MS 1 does not refer to this recent legal basis for the English claim to the French crown. The compiler of the roll must have been aware of the treaty, as it was valid during the 1420s, and yet does not elaborate on this. The

[72] C. T. Allmand, *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War c. 1300– c.1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 30.

[73] Mark Warner, 'The Anglo-Burgundian Dual Monarchy and the House of Burgundy, 1420–1435: The Survival of and Alliance', *French History*, 11:2 (1990), p. 107.

[74] Curry, 'Two Kingdoms, One King', p. 24.

[75] Ibid., p. 30.

roll only uses the Edwardian claim from a century earlier. It is likely that this represents an English belief that despite the treaty, the Edwardian claim was a truly lawful claim. Henry V was an adult with political and military experience and could promote his own heirship in person, the infant Henry VI could not do so as effectively. Sources supporting Henry VI stressed his hereditary descent from St Louis of France and English royals in English propaganda, which made him the successor to both crowns. This sentiment manifests on Canterbury MS 1, as it visually and textually presents the hereditary argument for Henry VI's right to both crowns.

Despite Henry V's untimely death in 1422, which 'deprived England of a dynamic leader' and left his infant son as king,[76] contemporaries were optimistic about continuing the vision of the 'dual monarchy'. The Duke of Bedford, who acted as Regent of France during his nephew's infancy, made great efforts to retain northern France under English control in the years following his brother's death.[77] In order to convince the French of Henry VI's legitimacy as their king, the Anglo-French administration in France deployed political propaganda to project the idea of a 'dual monarchy'.[78] An example that highlights this is found in the coronations of Henry VI. During the period when Canterbury MS 1 was most likely produced, Henry VI, was crowned twice, once for each of the kingdoms that he claimed. In November 1429, at age eight, he was crowned as king of England in Westminster Abbey. He was crowned king of France in 1431 in Paris. Both coronations were probably in

---

[76] Allmand, *Lancastrian Normandy*, p. 25.

[77] J. W. McKenna, 'Henry VI of England and the Dual Monarchy: Aspects of Royal Political Propaganda, 1422–1432', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 28 (1965), p. 145.

[78] Ibid.

response to the coronation of Charles VII of France in Reims, the traditional location for the

consecration of French kings, on 17 July 1429 and the English defeat at Orléans in the same

year.[79] There is evidence to support this theory as the Duke of Bedford pushed for the French

coronation of Henry VI as early as 1429, immediately after Charles VII coronation.[80] In

1431, Henry VI's coronation in Paris was celebrated with imagery reflecting the concept of

the dual monarchy. There was a tableau with two crowns suspended above his head,

surrounded by actors dressed as peers of France and England.[81] Furthermore, Henry V's final

resting place, the Chantry Chapel at Westminster Abbey, which was constructed by Henry VI

according to his father's plans, incorporates the statues of both St Edward and St Denis,

spectres of both England and France.[82] This also demonstrates the dual monarchy of England

and France that Henry V laid the groundwork for, and his son made a reality. The

genealogical representation of the same concept appears on Canterbury MS 1, as it presents

the bloodlines of both royal dynasties coming together in the Plantagenet and Lancastrian

lineage.

The late 1420s and early 1430s, the approximate time in which Canterbury MS 1 was

first drawn up, was a period when the tide began to turn against the English in their Anglo-

French war. With the benefit of hindsight, modern scholars consider the period 1428–31 to

---

[79] Anne Curry, 'The "Coronation Expedition" and the Henry VI's Court in France, 1430–1432', *The Lancastrian Court: Proceedings of the 2001 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Jenny Stratford (Donington, UK: Shaun Tyas, 2003), p. 29.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid., p. 52.

[82] Ralph A. Griffiths, 'Succession and the Royal Dead in Later Medieval England', in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000–c.1600*, ed. F. Lachland and M. Penman (Turnout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008) p. 108.

mark a turning-point in the war and a major crisis for the English forces in France after some major losses.[83] It is important, however, to recognize that in a European-wide context, England had been a military power in Western Europe for more than a century by this time, securing victories against the French since the time of Edward III.[84] After the deposition of Richard II in 1399, the first two Lancastrian kings maintained a strong offensive in Engalnd's continental war. Henry V was legendary in battle against the French, with significant victories at Agincourt (1415), Caen (1417), and Rouen (1419). These battles are omitted on Canterbury MS 1, which again reinforces the roll's downplaying of Henry V's victory though conquest or treaty – but instead promoted his genealogy. After the death of Henry V, despite having a child-king, the English position in France was not compromised during Henry VI's minority between 1423 and 1428. During this five-year period, the English expanded their territory and held a strong position on the continent.[85] This shows that the aggressive momentum of the English forces continued during Henry VI's minority, keeping the idea of a 'dual monarchy' possible for the English.

From 1429, the English situation in France changed after a series of victories by the French. The Siege of Orléans (1428–29) was a significant victory for the French forces, from which the English never fully recovered. Contemporaries of the scribe of Canterbury MS 1, however, would have considered the collapse of the siege as only a setback, and the possibility of France becoming part of the English kingdom was still very much within grasp.

---

[83] C. T. Allmand, *Lancastrian Normandy,* p. 36.

[84] Nigel Saul, *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 6.

[85] Warner, 'The Anglo-Burgundian Dual Monarchy and the House of Burgundy, 1420–1435: The Survival of and Alliance', p. 115.

After all, the English monarchy was still resilient in the war against the French for most of this period. Even after the damage inflicted by Joan of Arc in 1429, the Anglo-Burgundian alliance survived and recovered for an English offensive in 1433–34, by taking back a large part of the county of Maine.[86] The war was still 'winnable' for the English during the early 1430s. It was only until the disasters in 1435–36, when the Anglo-Burgundian alliance ended, that English hopes on the continent began to diminish.[87] The dream of English kings from Edward III to Henry V to completely conquer France was never fulfilled, but until the mid-1430s, it was still active. This demonstrates that during the period between 1428 and 1433, when Canterbury MS 1 was produced, the English claim to France was still a legitimate and reasonable aspiration. In a period when the English expansion into France was facing setbacks and some degree of uncertainty, the use of a royal genealogical roll to emphasise and re-state the concept of a dual monarchy may have been part of an effort to revive support for the ideal of England and France united under one king, Henry VI.

**Conclusion**

Genealogical rolls, especially ones produced during the fifteenth century, are frequently associated with the Wars of the Roses and competing internal dynastic struggles between royal families in England. Within a broader European context, however, Canterbury MS 1 can be interpreted as a manuscript that supports and promotes the English kingdom as envisioned in the late 1420s and early 1430s. Comparing the roll's treatment of Scotland and Wales demonstrates the different perceptions that the English regime had towards these two neighbouring territories. Contemporary events in Wales, such as the Glyndŵr revolt, can

---

[86] Warner, 'The Anglo-Burgundian Dual Monarchy and the House of Burgundy, 1420–1435: The Survival of and Alliance', p. 130.

[87] Curry, 'The "Coronation Expedition"', p. 52.

offer an explanation for the motivation behind this depiction. The treatment of the Welsh princes and suggestions of assimilation reveal a genealogical perspective on the English domination of Wales. Furthermore, English ambitions to the kingdom of France are displayed on the roll. This not only highlights the hereditary claim of English kings since Edward III to the French crown, but also brings to light the contemporary concerns and issues of the 'dual monarchy'. In a period of uncertainty in the French war, the roll supports and promotes the English right to the kingdom of France through genealogical connections. Canterbury MS 1 promotes a Lancastrian narrative of their royal genealogy that justified the assimilation of Wales into England, and the inheritance of the English and French kingdoms.

**Conclusion**

The Canterbury Roll is a fifteenth-century English genealogy of the kings of England. It is an object that reflects the political concerns, such as dynasty, propaganda, myth and national history, of the period in which it was created. By focusing on the political themes that the roll depicts, this thesis has approached Canterbury MS 1 afresh as a source for political concepts. Genealogical chronicle rolls were not produced in isolation from the social, cultural, and political concerns of the era, and they can contribute to the wider understanding of early fifteenth-century society. This thesis has offered an innovative micro study of one medieval roll by combining historiographical and methodological strands from studies in medieval political thought, chronicles and genealogical material objects. Although propaganda and national historiography are major influences and driving forces of roll production, the thesis has offered new ways to understand the society in which Canterbury MS 1 was produced. It has examined major themes of how an English genealogy depicts and incorporates contemporary prophetic beliefs, political theory and perceptions of foreign territories.

Since the late 1970s, the modern historiography of genealogical rolls has recognised the significance of rolls as historical artefacts. However, the rolls are frequently viewed either as literary texts or as pieces of political propaganda. While these views are valid, this thesis has argued that genealogical rolls are also valuable reflections of contemporary political culture. There is a developing methodology in the field of medieval chronicles, in which chronicles are used as sources for understanding how society more broadly viewed and understood political concepts. Using a similar methodological approach to analyse the

Canterbury Roll as a case study, the thesis initiates the evaluation of the broader political

culture portrayed on genealogical chronicle rolls. In doing so, this thesis has addressed gaps

in three areas of genealogical roll historiography: the representation of political prophecy, use

of deposition theory and portrayal of foreign lands.

The owners and readers of rolls such as the Canterbury Roll were most likely people

associated with several powerful noble families in the fifteenth century. Developing on the

work by Alison Allan and Ralph A. Griffiths, this thesis argued that two previously neglected

families,[1] the Nevilles of Middleham and the Percys are implicated as interested parties in

royal genealogical rolls. The potential ownership of the Canterbury Roll is vital to understand

not only the purpose and immediate function of the manuscript, but also to examine

underlying conscious and unconscious political conceptions that informed its creation and

use. In establishing the possible original audience, the thesis explored the political ideas that

shaped medieval political culture.

The elements of political culture that this thesis has illuminated include political

prophecies, which were a significant feature of cultural, literary and political life in medieval

England. Highlighting each episode of divination on the roll illuminates broader issues, such

as the value placed on prophecies in medieval politics and society, and the manipulation of

prophecy for legitimising a royal dynasty. In doing so, the roll enacts a selective re-telling of

---

[1] Alison Allan, 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1981); Alison Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV', in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, ed. Charles Ross (Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979), pp. 171–92; Ralph A. Griffiths, *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambledon, 1991), pp. 83–103.

prophecies tailored for consumption by Lancastrian supporters. The Canterbury Roll also deals with broader theoretical concepts of power and authority. By emphasising carefully selected episodes in English mythical history, the roll draws parallels between the depositions of legendary kings and the deposition of Richard II in 1399. Through the proxy of legendary kings, the Canterbury Roll uses deposition theory to justify the Lancastrian dynasty's legitimacy through not only hereditary right, but also mythical precedence and political theory. This shows how political concepts of kingship and deposition were understood by the political and social elites who owned rolls such as Canterbury MS 1. The Lancastrian kings were not only concerned with legitimizing their position domestically within England, but also with asserting power over Wales and justifying the war in France. Thus, finally, the thesis has placed the manuscript in a European context, to analyse its representations of English diplomatic relations to other political entities on the roll. The portrayal of Scotland and Wales on Canterbury MS 1 reflects contemporary English attitudes to its neighbouring countries. The thesis argues that the English readers of the roll were less concerned about Scottish invasions and more apprehensive of another Welsh uprising after the revolt led by Owain Glyndŵr. Furthermore, the roll presents a genealogical argument through image and text of the hereditary right of English kings to acquire the crown of France. This demonstrates a manifestation of the 'dual monarchy' concept, highlighting how England's claim to France was visualised and understood through genealogical concepts. These themes on the roll demonstrates both the capacity of genealogical manuscripts to present nuanced views of contemporary political concepts, but also that they were a type of document infused with the cultural and political atmosphere of fifteenth-century England. This thesis contributes to the historiography by utilising a previously underexplored manuscript as a source for understanding the how the creators and readers of the genealogical rolls perceived the political culture in which they lived.

There are still numerous avenues for further research on Canterbury MS 1. For example, the roll's engagement with fifteenth-century political culture, discussed in the thesis, may be further developed by attention to economic and religious themes. The roll refers to economic situations, such as a bad harvest leading to inflation during the reign of Edward III,[2] while there are several other references made about the financial health of England on issues like taxation, inflation, ransom and debt. Such a topic has the potential to shed light on how the English economy was perceived to function and offer insights into how kingship affected the kingdom's finances. Thus far, there is no study that assesses the financial issues portrayed on any genealogical chronicle roll, making the topic an excellent future project based on this thesis. Alternatively, the roll describes many episodes that involve the Church. Although royal genealogies are centred on the secular theme of English kings, the Church, both as a political and religious entity, was clearly of great importance to medieval society and politics, especially since the roll itself starts with Noah. On Canterbury MS 1, there are numerous references to bishops, popes, the Church and construction of abbeys yet to be examined. The roll could offer insights into the perception of the Church, which would further develop existing historiography of the relationships between church and state in medieval England. Furthermore, although Olivier de Laborderie (2013) offered an extensive study of English genealogical rolls between 1250 and 1422, and Allan (1981) concentrated on Yorkist rolls from 1450 to 1471,[3] there is a lack of any comprehensive study focused on genealogical rolls produced during the first three decades of Henry VI's reign

---

[2] Appendix C, 7: 'Anno primo Edwardi tertii erat … ex qua provenit tanti bladi caristia ut quartarum frumenti ad xl scilicet venderetur'.

[3] Allan, 'Yorkist Propaganda', pp. 171–92; Olivier de Laborderie, *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir - Les généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre (1250-1422)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013).

between 1422 and 1450. This thesis has examined just one roll from this period, and a broader study of the rolls from the first thirty years of Lancastrian kingship is due.


Over centuries, the Canterbury Roll has been used to demonstrate allegiance to conceptions of authority, whether to a young Lancastrian king, a Yorkist king, or to the legacy of English intellectual and historical heritage in a twentieth-century colonial university. The roll is an object steeped in the political culture of fifteenth-century England, and yet its appeal to later generations is a testament to its ability to represent a link to England's mythical and medieval past. Originally created as a demonstration of support and loyalty to the Lancastrian dynasty, the roll symbolically connected late Medieval England and its kings with the long, continuous legacy of monarchy. This thesis revealed vital, yet until now underexplored, aspects of the relationship between the Canterbury Roll and its historical context. In doing so, it has expanded the scholarship on English genealogical chronicle rolls, linked broader political themes such as prophecy, kingship and foreign entities to genealogies, and newly discussed interactions between genealogy and political culture. By concentrating on Canterbury MS 1 and seeking to understand its broader context, this thesis has established that genealogical chronicle rolls are complex modes of narration that reflect English society's perceptions on a range of themes. Each of the themes addressed in this thesis form part of a distinctive, 'genealogical' framework that incorporates medieval ideological perceptions of history, prophecy, royal authority and foreign political entities during the minority of Henry VI.

## **Bibliography**

### **Manuscripts**

**University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand**

MS 1

**National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth, Wales, UK**

MS 12389 E
MS 22
MS 42
MS Rolls 39
MS Rolls 55

**Lincolnshire County Archives, Lincoln, UK**

2 TDE/K-1

**King's College Library, Cambridge, UK**

MS 43

**British Library, London, UK**

MS Additional 18002
MS Additional 21058
MS Harley T 12
MS Lansdowne 456
MS Royal 14B VIII
MS Sloane 2732 A
MS Stowe 72
MS Stowe 73

**Bodleian Library, Oxford, UK**

MS Ashmolean Rolls 21
MS Ashmolean Rolls 39
MS e Mus 42
MS Lyell 33
MS Marshall 135

**Brasenose College, Oxford, UK**

MS 91

**Queen's College Library, Oxford, UK**

MS 167
MS 168

## Published Primary Sources

*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, edited and translated by M. J. Swanton (London: J. M. Dent, 1996).

*Chronicles of Revolution 1397–1400*: *The Reign of Richard II,* edited and translated by Chris Given-Wilson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).

*Feudal Manuals of English History, a Series of Popular Sketches of Our National History*, edited by Thomas Wright (London: Joseph Mayer, 1872).

*Handbook to the Maude Roll: being a 15th century MS. Genealogy of the British and English kings from Noah to Edward IV, with a marginal history,* edited and translated by Arnold Wall (Auckland, NZ: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1918).

*The Life of King Edward the Confessor*, edited and translated by Frank Barlow (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962).

*The Westminster Chronicle 1381–1394*, edited and translated by Leonard C. Hector and Barbara Harvey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

Adam of Usk, *The Chronicle of Adam Usk 1377–1421*, edited and translated by Chris Given-Wilson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Bower, Walter, *A History Book for Scots: Selections from Scotichronicon*, edited by D. E. R. Watt (Edinburgh: Mercat Press, 1998).

Geoffrey of Monmouth, *The History of the Kings of Britain: An edition and translation of the De gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britanniae)*, Latin text edited by Michael D. Reeve and translated by Neil Wright (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007).

Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, edited and translated by Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

John of Salisbury, *Policraticus: Of the Frivolities of Courtiers and the Footprints of Philiosphers*, edited and translated by Cary J. Nederman (Cambridge: Cambridge Universtiry Press, 1990).

Ranulph Higden, *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden monachi cestrensis: together with the English translations of John Trevisa and of an unknown writer of the fifteenth century, vols. I-VII*, edited by Churchill Babington (London: Longman, Green, 1865–1886).

Wace, Robert, *Brut*: *Roman de Brut, a History of the British: Text and Translation*, edited and translated by Judith Weiss (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002).

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regnum Anglorum, 2 vols.,* edited and translated by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

**Newspaper Articles**

'Genealogy of Kings', *New Zealand Herald*, 8 September 1919, p. 9.

'The Maude Roll: An Interesting Piece of Research', *Press* (Christchurch), 10 April 1920, p. 9.

Stringer, L. A., 'Notice for a public lecture at Canterbury College on the Maude Roll', *The Press* (Christchurch), 14 April 1920, col. 7, p. 1.

**Websites**

Jones, C., Shirota, M., Johnson, M., Shaw-Brown, D. and Welch, E., 'The Canterbury Roll – A Digital Facsimile with Commentary', April 2013 version, <www.canterbury.ac.nz/canterburyroll>.

**Secondary Sources**

*Handbook of British Chronology*, edited by E. B. Fryde, D. E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy (London: Royal Historical Society, 1986).

Ailes, Adrian, 'Heraldry in Medieval England: Symbols of Politics and Propaganda', in *Heraldry, Pagentry and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Peter R. Cross and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 83–104.

Allan, Alison, 'Royal Propaganda and the Proclamations of Edward IV', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 59:140 (1986): pp. 146–154.

---- 'Political Propaganda Employed by the House of York in England in the Mid-Fifteenth Century, 1450–1471' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, 1981).

---- 'Yorkist Propaganda: Pedigree, Prophecy and the "British History" in the Reign of Edward IV', in *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, edited by Charles Ross (Gloucester: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979), pp. 171–92.

Allan, Vivienne, *Nurse Maude: The First 100 Years* (Christchurch: Nurse Maude Foundation, 1996).

Allmand, Christopher, 'Opposition to Royal Power in England in the Late Middle Ages.' *Zeitschrift fuer historische Forschung*, 33 (2004): pp. 51–70.

---- *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War c. 1300– c.1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

---- *Lancastrian Normandy 1415–1450: The History of a Medieval Occupation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

Anglo, Sydney, 'The British History in Early Tudor Propaganda', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 44 (1961–2): pp. 17–48.

Arvanigian, Mark, 'The "Lancastrianization" of the North in the Reign of Henry IV, 1399–1413', in *Reputation and Representation in Fifteenth-Century Europe*, edited by Douglas L. Biggs, Shanon D. Michalove and Albert Compton Reeves (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 9–38.

Astell, Ann W, *Political Allegory in Late Medieval England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

Aston, Margaret, 'Richard II and the Wars of the Roses', in *The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack*, edited by F. R. H. DuBoulay and Caroline M. Barron (London: Athlone Press, 1971), pp. 280–317.

Baldwin, David, *The Kingmaker's Sisters: Six Powerful Women in the Wars of the Roses* (Stroud: The History Press, 2011).

Barron, W. R. J., Francoise Le Saux and Lesley Johnson, 'Dynastic Chronicles', in *The Arthur of the English: The Arthurian Legend in Medieval English Life and Literature*, edited by W. R. J. Barron (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1999), pp. 11–46.

Barrow, G. W. S., *Scotland and Its Neighbours in the Middle Ages* (London: Hambeldon Press, 1992).

Barrow, Julia, 'The Chronology of the Benedictine "Reform",' in *Edgar, King of the English 959–975: New Interpretations*, edited by Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008).

Beaune, Colette, *The Birth of an Ideology, Myths and Symbols of Nation in Late-Medieval France*, edited by Frederic L. Cheyette, translated by Susan Ross Huston (Berkley: University of California Press, 1991).

Bennett, Michael, 'Henry of Bolingbroke and the Revolution of 1399', in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399-1406,* edited by Gwilyn Dodd and Douglass Biggs (York, UK: York Medieval Press: 2003), pp. 9–34.

---- 'Richard II and the Wider Realm', in *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, edited by Anthony Goodman and James L. Gillespie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 187–204.

---- 'Edward III's Entail and the Succession to the Crown, 1376–1471', *The English Historical Review*, 113:452 (1998): pp. 580–609.

Black, Antony, *Political Thought in Europe 1250–1450* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Bloch, Howard, *Etymologies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

Bollard, John K., 'Owain Glyndŵr, Princes Wallie', in *Owain Glyndŵr: A Casebook*, edited by Michael Livingstone and John K. Bollard (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), pp. 425–30.

Bovey, Alixe, Olivier de Laborderie and Marigold Norbye, *The Chaworth Roll* (London: Paul Holberton, 2005).

Brown, Elizabeth A. R., 'La généalogie capétienne dans l'historiographie du Moyen Âge. Philippe le Bel, le reniement du reditus et la création d'une ascendance carolingienne pour Hugues Capet', in *Religion et culture autour de l'an Mil Royaume capétien et Lotharingie (Actes du colloque Hugues Capet 987–1987. La France de l'an Mil, Auxerre, 26 et 27 juin 1987 – Metz, 11 et 12 1987),* edited by Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard (Paris: Picard, 1990), pp. 199–214.

Burden, Joel, 'How Do You Bury a Deposed King? The Funeral of Richard II and the Establishment of Royal Authority in 1400', in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399–1406,* edited by Gwilyn Dodd and Douglass Biggs (York, UK: York Medieval Press: 2003), pp. 35–53.

Canning, Joseph, *History of Medieval Political Thought: 300–1450* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Caspary, Gerard E., 'The Deposition of Richard II and the Canon Law', in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Medieval Canon Law, Boston College, 12–16 August, 1963*, edited by Stephan Kuttner and J. Joseph Ryan (Vatican: S. Congregatio de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, 1965), pp. 189–209.

Collard, Judith, 'Gender and Genealogy in English Illuminated Royal Genealogical Rolls from the Thirteenth Century', *Parergon*, 17 (2000): pp.11–34.

Conolly, David K., *Maps of Matthew Paris: Medieval Journeys through Space, Time and Liturgy* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2009).

Coote, Lesley, 'Prophecy, Genealogy, and History in Medieval English Political Discourse', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* edited by Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 27–44.

---- *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: York Medieval Press with Boydell Press, 2000).

---- 'A Language of Power: Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England', in *Prophecy: The Power of Inspired Language in History, 1300–2000*, edited by Bertrand Taithe and Tim Thornton (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1997), pp. 17–30.

Coote, Lesley and Tim Thornton, 'Richard, Son of Richard: Richard III and Political Prophecy', *Institute of Political Historical Research*, 73:182 (2000): pp. 321–30.

Cowan, Edward J., 'Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland', *The Scottish Historical Review*, 63:176 (1984): pp. 111–35.

Crick, Julia, 'Geoffrey and the Prophetic Tradition', in *The Arthur of Medieval Latin Literature: The Development of the Arthurian Legend in Medieval Latin*, edited by Sian Echard (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2011), pp. 67–82.

---- 'Geoffrey of Monmouth, Prophecy and History', in *Journal of Medieval History*, 18 (1992): pp. 357–71.

Croenen, Godfried, 'Princely and Noble Genealogies, Twelfth to Fourteenth Century: Form and Function', in *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle*, edited by Erik Kooper (Amsterdamn: Rodopi, 1999), pp. 84–95.

Crouch, David, 'The Historian, Lineage and Heraldry, 1050–1250', in *Heraldry, Pagentry and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited by Maurice Keen and Peter Cross (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 17–37.

Cull, Marisa R., *Shakespeare's Princes of Wales: English Identity and the Welsh Connection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Curry, Anne, 'Two Kingdoms, One King: The Treaty of Troyes (1420) and the Creation of a Double Monarchy of England and France', in *The Contending Kingdoms: France and England 1420–1700*, edited by Glenn Richardson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 23–42.

---- 'The "Coronation Expedition" and the Henry VI's Court in France, 1430–1432', in *The Lancastrian Court: Proceedings of the 2001 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Jenny Stratford (Donington, UK: Shaun Tyas, 2003), pp. 29–52.

Dalton, Paul, 'The Topical Concerns of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britannie*: History, Prophecy, Peacemaking and English Identity in the Twelfth Century', *Journal of British Studies*, 44: 4 (2005): pp. 688–712.

Davies, Robert Rees, *The Age of Conquest: Wales, 1063–1415* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

---- *The First British Empire: Power and Identities in the British Isles 1093–1343* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

---- *The Revolt of Owain Glyn Dŵr* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

De Laborderie, Olivier, 'The First Manuals of English History: Two Late Thirteenth-Century Genealgoical Rolls of the Kings of England in the Royal Collection', *Electrionic Birtish Library Journal* (2014): pp. 1–25.

---- *Histoire, mémoire et pouvoir - Les généalogies en rouleau des rois d'Angleterre (1250–1422)* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2013).

---- 'A New Pattern for English History: The First Genealogical Rolls of the Kings of England', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France,* edited by Raluca Radelescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 45–61.

DeVries, Kelly, 'Owain Glyndŵr's Way of War', in *Owain Glyndŵr: A Casebook*, edited by Michael Livingstone and John K. Bollard (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013), pp. 435–50.

---- 'Harold Godwinson in Wales', in *The Normans and Their Adversaries at War*, edited by Richard Philip Abels, Bernard S. Bachrach and C. Warren Hollister (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001), pp. 65–86.

Dickinson, John, 'The Medieval Conception of Kingship and Some of Its Limitations, as Developed in Policraticus of John Salisbury', *Speculum* 1:3 (1926): 308–37.

Dobin, Howard. *Merlin's Disciples: Prophecy, Poetry and Power in Renaissance England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

Dockray, Keith, 'The Origins of the Wars of the Roses', in *The Wars of the Roses*, edited by A. J. Pollard (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995).

Doig, James, 'Political Propaganda and Royal Procalmations in Late Medieval England', *Historical Research*, 71:176 (1998): pp. 253–80.

Drexler, Marjorie, 'Fluid Prejudice: Scottish Origin Myths in the Later Middle Ages', in *People, Politics and Community in the Later Middle Ages*, edited by Joel Rosenthal and Colin Richmond, (New York: St Martin's Press, 1987), pp. 61–76.

Eckhardt, Caroline, 'The Presence of Rome in the Middle English Chronicles of the Fourteenth Century', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 90: 2 (1991): pp. 187–207.

---- 'Prophecy and Nostalgia: Arthurian Symbolism at the Close of the Middle Ages', *The Arthurian Tradition*: *Essays in Convergence*, edited by Mary Flowers Blackwell and John Bugge (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1988), pp. 109–26.

Edwards, Philip, *The Making of the Modern English State, 1460-1660* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

Evans, Michael, *The Death of Kings: Royal Deaths in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2007).

Faltera, Michael A., 'Narrating the Matter of Britain: Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Norman Colonization of Wales', *The Chaucer Review*, 35:1 (2000): pp. 60–85.

Federico, Sylvia, *New Troy: Fantasies of Empire in the Late Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2003).

Fisher, Matthew, 'Genealogy Rewritten: Inheriting the Legendary in Insular Historiography', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* edited by Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 123–41.

Fletcher, C. D., 'Narrative and Political Strategies at the Deposition of Richard II', *Journal of Medieval History*, 30:4 (2004): pp. 323–41**.**

Fletcher, Robert Huntington, *The Arthurian Material in the Chronicles* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1906).

Forster, Jennifer E., 'Politics, Prophecy, and Propaganda in Early Modern England', (unpublished doctoral thesis, Kent State University, 2005).

Fox, A., 'Prophecies and politics in the reign of Henry VIII', in *Reassessing the Henrician Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform, 1500–50*, edited by A. Fox and J. Guy (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), pp. 77–94.

Fox-Davies, Arthur Charles, *A Complete Guide to Heraldry* (New York: Bonanza Books, 1987).

Fronska, Joanna, 'Royal Identity: Genealogical Chronicle of the English Kings', in *Genius of Illumination*, edited by Scott McKendrick, John Lowden and Kathleen Doyle (London: The British Library, 2011), pp. 344–346.

Fulton, Helen, 'Arthurian Prophecy and the Deposition of Richard II', in *Arthurian Literature XXII*, edited by Roger Dalrymple and Keith Busby (Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 64–83.

Gaposchkin, M. Cecilia, *The Making of Saint Louis, Kingship Sanctity, and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008).

Genet, Jean-Philippe, 'The Problem of Tyranny in Fifteenth Century England', *Moreana*, 50 (2013): pp. 43–66.

---- 'La Monarchie Anglaise: une image brouillée', in *Représentation, pouvoir et royauté à la fin du Moyen Age*, edited by Joël Blanchard (Paris: Picard, 1995), pp. 93–107.

Given-Wilson, Chris, 'Legitimization, Designation and Succession to the Throne in Fourteenth Century England', in *Building Legitimacy, Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies*, edited by Isabel Alfonso, Hugh Kennedy and Julio Escalona (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 89–106.

---- *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (London: Continuum, 2004).

---- 'Richard II and the Higher Nobility', in *Richard II: The Art of Kingship*, edited by Anthony Goodman and James L. Gillespie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 107–28.

---- 'Richard II, Edward II, and the Lancastrian Inheritance', *English Historical Review*, 109:432 (1994): pp. 553–71.

Goldstein, R. James, *The Matter of Scotland: Historical Narrative in Medieval Scotland* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993).

Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England, II, c., 550–c. 1307* (London: Routledge, 1974).

Grassnick, Ulrike, '"O Prince, Desyre to be Honourable": The Deposition of Richard II and Mirrors for Princes', in *Fourteenth Century England IV*, edited by J. S. Hamilton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 159–74.

Grant, Alexander, *Independence and Nationhood: Scotland, 1306–1469* (London: Edward Allen, 1984).

Griffiths, Ralph A., 'Succession and the Royal Dead in Later Medieval England', in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000–c.1600*, edited by F. Lachland and M. Penman (Turnout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 97–109.

---- 'The Minority of Henry VI, King of England and France', in *The Royal Minorities of Medieval and Early Modern England*, edited by Charles Beem (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 161–94.

---- 'Percy, Henry, second Earl of Northumberland (1394–1455)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 43, pp. 704–06.

---- 'The Island of England in the Fifteenth-Century: Perceptions of the Peoples of the British Isles', *Journal of Medieval History*, 29 (2003), pp. 177–200.

---- *The Reign of King Henry VI* (Stroud: Sutton, 1998).

---- *King and Country: England and Wales in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Hambeldon Press, 1991).

---- 'The King's Court during the Wars of the Roses: Continuities in an Age of Discontinuities', in *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, edited by Adolf von Birke (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the German Historical Institute, 1990).

---- 'The Crown and the Royal Family in Later Medieval England', in *Kings and Nobles in the Later Medieval Ages*, edited by Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherbourne (Alan Sutton: Gloucester, 1986), pp. 15–46.

---- 'The English Realm and the Dominions and the King's Subjects in the Later Middle Ages', in *Aspects of Late Medieval Government and Society*, edited by J. G. Rowe (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1986), pp. 83–105.

---- 'Wales and the Marches in the Fifteenth Century', in *Fifteenth-Century England, 1399–1509*, edited by S. B. Chrimes, C. D. Ross and R. A. Griffiths (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972), pp. 145–72.

---- 'Local Rivalries and National Politics: The Percies, the Nevilles and the Duke of Exeter, 1452–55', *Speculum*, 43:4 (1968): pp. 589–632.

Guenée, Bernard, 'L'historien et la compilation au XIIIe siècle', *Journal des Savants*, (1985), pp. 119–35.

Hamilton, J. S., 'The Uncertain Death of Edward II?', in *History* Compass, 6:5 (2008): pp. 1264–1278.

Hanley, Sarah., 'Mapping Rulership in the French Body Politic: Political Identity, Public Law and the "King's One Body"', *Historical Reflections*, 23:2 (1997): pp. 123–49.

Harvey, John H., 'Richard II and York', in *The Reign of Richard II: Essays in Honour of May McKisack*, edited by F. R. H. DuBoulay and Caroline M. Barron (London: Athlone Press, 1971), pp. 173–201.

Hayward, Rebecca, 'Prestige and Pedagogy: The Ownership of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts by New Zealand Universities', in *Migrations, Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, edited by Stephanie Hollis and Alexandra Barratt (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), pp. 89–107.

Hicks, Michael, 'Heirs and non-heirs: perceptions and relatives amongst the English nobility, c. 1300–1500', in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000–c.1600*, edited by F. Lachland and M. Penman (Turnout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 191–200.

Holford, Matthew L. 'Family Lineage and Society: Medieval Pedigrees of the Percy Family.' *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 52 (2008): pp. 165–90.

Holladay, Joan, 'Women in English Royal Genealogies of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries', in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, edited by Evelyn Staudinger Lane, Elizabeth Carson Pastan, Ellen M. Shortell and Madeline Harrison Caviness (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 348–64.

Ingledew, Francis, 'The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae', *Speculum*, 69:3 (1994): pp. 665–704.

Jansen, Sharon, *Political Protest and Prophecy under Henry VIII* (London: Boydell Press, 1991).

Jones, Chris, 'Remembering the Past', in *Treasures of the University of Canterbury*, edited by Chris Jones, Bronwyn Matthews with Jennifer Clement (Christchurch: Canterbury University Press, 2011), pp. 85–90.

---- *Eclipse of Empire?: Perceptions of the Western Empire and Its Rulers in Late-Medieval France* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).

Kantorowicz, Ernst H., *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975).

Kauffmann, C. M., 'An Early Sixteenth-Century Genealogy of Anglo-Saxon Kings', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institues*, 47 (1984): pp. 209–16.

Kearny, Hugh, *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Kelly, S. and J. J. Thompson, 'Imagined histories of the book: current Paradigms and future directions', in *Imagining the Book*, edited by S. Kelly and J. J. Thompson (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 1–16.

Kennedy, Edward Donald, 'The Antiquity of Scottish Civilization: King-lists and genealogical chronicles', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France,* edited by Raluca Radelescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 159–74.

Kingsford, Charles L., *English Historical Literature* (New York: Burt Franklin, 1913)

Knight, Stephen Thomas, *Merlin: Knowledge and Power though the Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).

Lamont, Margaret, '"Genealogical" History and the English Roll', in *Medieval Manuscripts, Their Makers and Users*, edited by Henry Kelly (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 245–61.

Lewis, P. S., 'War Propaganda and Historiography in Fifteenth-Century France and England.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5:15 (1965): pp. 1–21.

---- 'Two Pieces of Fifteenth-century Iconography', in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 27 (1964): pp. 317–320.

Lloyd, J. E., *Owen Glendower* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931).

Lomas, Richard A., *The Fall of the House of Percy, 1368–1408* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007).

Manion, Margaret M., Vera F. Vines, and Christopher de Hamel, *Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in New Zealand* (Melbourne: Thames & Hudson, 1989).

Marchant, Alicia, *The Revolt of Owain Glyndŵr in Medieval English Chronicles* (York: York Medieval Press, 2014).

Marvin, Julia, 'Arthur Authorized', in *Arthurian Literature XXII*, edited by Keith Busby and Roger Dalrymple (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005), pp. 84–99.

McKenna, J. W., 'Henry VI of England and the Dual Monarchy: Aspects of Royal Political Propaganda, 1422–32', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 28 (1965): pp. 145–62.

McNiven, Peter, 'Rebellion, Sedition and the Legend of Richard II's Survival in the Reigns of Henry IV and Henry V', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 73:1 (1994): pp. 93–117.

---- 'Legitimacy and Consent: Henry IV and the Lancastrian Title, 1399-1406', *Mediaeval Studies* (1982): pp. 470–88.

Monroe, William H., 'A Roll-manuscript of Peter of Poitier's Compendium', *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, 65:3 (1978), pp. 92–107.

Moranski, Karen R., 'The "Prophetiae Merlini", Animal Symbolism, and the Development of Political Prophecy in Late Medieval England and Scotland', *Arthuriana*, 8:4 (1998): pp. 58–68.

---- 'Predicting the Past and Recounting the Future: Prophecy and Propaganda in Later Medieval Britain' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995).

Morgan, Philip, '"Those were the days": a Yorkist Pedigree Roll', in *Estrangement, Enterprise and Education in Fifteenth-Century England*, edited by Sharon D. Michalove and A. Compton Reeves (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1998), pp. 107–16.

---- 'Henry IV and the Shadow of Richard II', in *Crown, Government and People in the Fifteenth Century,* edited by R. Archer (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1995), pp. 1–31.

Mortimer, Ian, 'Richard II and the Succession to the Crown', *History,* 91:303 (2006): pp. 320–36.

Murphy, Neil, 'Between France, England and Burgundy: Amiens Under the Lancastrian Dual Monarchy, 1422–35', *French History*, 262 (2012): pp. 143–63.

Neville, Cynthia J., 'Scotland, the Percies and the Law in 1400', in *Henry IV: The Establishment of the Regime, 1399–1406*, edited by Gwilym Dodd and Douglas Biggs (York: York University Press, 2003), pp. 73–94.

Norbye, Marigold Anne, 'Genealogies and dynastic awareness in the Hundred Years War. The evidence of *A tous nobles qui aiment beaux faits et bonnes histoires*', *Journal of Medieval History*, 33:3 (2007): pp. 297–319.

Nuttall, Jenni, *The Creation of Lancastrian Kingship, Literature, Language and politics in Late Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Oakley, Francis, 'Celestial Hierarchies Revisited: Walter Ullmann's Vision of Medieval Politics', *Past and Present*, 60 (1973): pp. 3–48.

Ormrod, W. M., *Political Life in Medieval England, 1300–1450* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995).

Penman, Michael, '*Difficione successionis ad regnum Scottorum*: Royal succession in Scotland in the later Middle Ages', in *Making and Breaking the Rules: Succession in Medieval Europe, c. 1000–c. 1600*, edited by F. Lachaud and M. Penman (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 43–59.

Peverley, Sarah, 'Anglo-Scottish Relations in John Hardyng's Chronicle', in *The Anglo-Scottish Border and the Shaping of Identity, 1300–1600*, edited by Katherine Terrell and Mark P. Bruce (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 69–86.

---- 'Medieval Maps of Scotland', [web blog], 18 September 2014, http://sarahpeverley.com/2014/09/18/medieval-maps-of-scotland/, (accessed 12 April 2015).

Pollard, A. J., 'Neville, Richard, fifth Earl of Salisbury (1400–1460)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 40, pp. 524–26.

---- *Late Medieval England, 1399–1509* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

Powell, Edward, *Kingship, Law and Society: Criminal Justice in the Reign of Henry V* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989).

Powicke, Michael R., 'The English Commons in Scotland in 1322 and the Deposition of Edward II', *Speculum*, 35:4 (1960): pp. 556–62.

Prestwich, Michael, *Edward I* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1988).

----- 'Colonial Scotland: The English in Scotland under Edward I', in *Scotland and England, 1586–1815*, edited by Roger A Mason, pp. 6–17 (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1987).

Pugh, Thomas B., *Henry V and the Southampton Plot of 1415* (Gloucester: Sutton, 1988).

Purcell, Edmund Sheridan, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Philipps de Lisle*, *I*, edited by Edwin de Lisle (London: Macmillan and Co., 1900).

Radelescu, Raluca L. and Edward Donald Kennedy, 'Introduction' in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* edited by Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 1–5.

---- *Romance and its Contexts in Fifteenth-Century England, Politics,Piety and Penitence* (Woodbridge: Suffolk: D. S. Brewer, 2013).

---- 'Genealogy in Insular Romance', in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in late-medieval Britain and France,* edited by Raluca Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2008), pp. 7–25.

---- 'Yorkist Propaganda and the Chronicle form Rollo to Edward IV', *Studies in Philology*, 100 (2003): pp. 401–24.

---- *The Gentry Context in Malory's Morte D'Arthur* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2003).

Reeves, Marjorie, *Joachim of Fiore & the Prophetic Future: A Medieval Study in Historical Thinking* (Stroud: Sutton, 1999).

---- *The Influence of Prophecy in the later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

Reeve, Michael D. and Neil Wright, 'Introduction', *The History of the Kings of Britain: An edition and Translation of the De gestis Britonum (Historia Regum Britanniae)*, edited by Michael D. Reeve and translated by Neil Wright (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007).

Richmond, Colin, 'The Nobility and the Wars of the Roses, 1459–61', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 21 (1972): pp. 71–85.

Rose, Alexander, *Kings in the North: The House of Percy in British History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 2002).

Rouse, Richard H. and Rouse, Mary A., 'John of Salisbury and the Doctrine of Tyrannicide.' *Speculum*, 42:4 (1967): pp. 693–709.

Rouse, Robert Allen, 'Inscribing Lineage: Writing and Rewriting the Maude Roll', in *Migrations, Medieval Manuscripts in New Zealand*, edited by Stephanie Hollis and Alexandra Barratt (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2007), pp. 108–22.

Rubin, Miri, *The Hollow Crown: A History of Britain in the Late Middle Ages* (London: Penguin Books, 2006).

Ruddick, Andrea, *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Saul, Nigel, *The Three Richards: Richard I, Richard II and Richard III* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006).

---- *Richard II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).

Scattergood, V. J., *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Blandford Press, 1971).

Schmitt, Jean-Claude, 'Approximating the Future', in *Medieval Futures: Attitudes to the Future in the Middle Ages*, translated by Peregrine Rand, edited by J. A. Burrow and Ian P. Wei (Boydell Press: Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 3–18.

Schwyzer, Philip, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Sharpe, Kevin, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in sixteenth-century England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

Shenton, Caroline, 'Edward III and the Symbol of the Leopard', *Heraldry, Pagentry and Social Display in Medieval England*, edited Peter R. Cross and Maurice Keen (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), pp. 69–81.

Shirota, M, 'Royal Deposition and the Canterbury Roll,' *Parergon*, 32:2 (2015) [forthcoming].

Shwartz, Susan Martha, 'The Prophecies of Merlin and Political Propaganda in England from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Henry VII' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard University, 1977).

Sider, Sarah, *Handbook to Life in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Siddons, Michael Powell, 'Welsh Pedigree Rolls', *National Library of Wales Journal,* 29: 1 (1995): pp. 1–16.

Simpson, James, 'The Other Book of Troy: Guido delle Colonne's Historia Destructionis Troiae in Fourteenth and Fifteenth-century England', *Speculum*, 73:2 (1998): pp. 397–423.

Smallwood, T. M., 'The Prophecy of the Six Kings', *Speculum*, 60:3 (1985): pp. 571–92.

Southern, R. W., 'Presidential Address: Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 3. History as Prophecy', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fifth Series, 22 (1972): pp. 159–180.

Spiegel, Gabrielle, M., 'Genealogy: Form and function in Medieval Historical Narrative', *History and Theory*, 22:1 (1983): pp. 43–53.

Spence, John, *Reimagining History in Anglo-Norman Prose Chronicles* (York, UK: York Medieval Press, 2013).

Strohm, Paul, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimization, 1399-1422* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).

Summerfield, Thea, 'Filling the gap: Brutus in the *Historia Brittonum*, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* MS F, and Geoffrey of Monmouth', in *The Medieval Chronicle VII*, edited by Juliana Dresvina and Nicholas Sparks (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), pp. 85–102.

Taylor, Craig, 'The Salic Law and the Valois Succession to the French Crown', *French History¸* 15:4, (2001): pp. 358–77.

Taylor, Rupert, *Political Prophecy in England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911).

Thomas Wright, 'Introduction', in *Feudal Manuals of English History, A Series of Popular Sketches of our National History*, pp. xix–xx (London: Joseph Mayer, 1872).

Thomas, Hugh M., *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation and Identity*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Thornton, Tim, *Prophecy, Politics and the People in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006).

Tolhurst, Fiona, 'The Britons as Hebrews, Romans and Normans: Geoffrey of Monmouth's British Epic and Reflections of Empress Matilda', *Arthuriana*, 8:4 (1998): pp. 69–87.

Tscherpel, Gudrun, 'The Political Function of History: Past and Future of Noble Families', in *Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, edited by Richard Eales (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2003), pp. 87–104.

Tuck, Anthony, *Crown and Nobility 1272–1461* (Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble, 1985).

Ullman, Walter, *Medieval Political Thought* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1975).

Valente, Clare, 'Deposition and Abdication of Edward II', *The English Historical Review*, 113:453 (1998): pp. 852–81.

Walker, Simon. 'Remembering Richard: History and Memory in Lancastrian England', in *The Fifteenth Century IV: Political Culture in Late Medieval Britain*, edited by Linda Clark and Christine Carpenter (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2004), pp. 21–32.

Wall, Arnold. 'Introduction', in *Handbook to the Maude Roll: being a 15th century MS. genealogy of the British and English kings from Noah to Edward IV, with a marginal history* (Auckland, NZ: Whitcombe and Tombs, 1918).

Warner, Mark, 'The Anglo-Burgundian Dual Monarchy and the House of Burgundy, 1420–1435: The Survival of and Alliance', *French History*, 11:2 (1990): pp. 103–30.

Watts, John, *The Making of Polities: Europe, 1300–1500* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

---- *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Weir, Alison, *Britain's Royal Families: The Complete Genealogy* (New York: Vintage, 2008).

Wilkinson, B., 'The Deposition of Richard II and the Accession of Henry IV', *English Historical Review*, 54:214 (1939): pp. 215–39.

Shakespeare, William, *King Henry V* (New York: Airmont Publishing, 1967).

Williams, Glanmor, *Recovery, Reorientation and Reformation: Wales c. 1415–1642* (Oxford: University of Wales Press, 1987).

Wright, Thomas, 'Introduction', in *Feudal Manuals of English History, a Series of Popular Sketches of Our National History*, edited by Thomas Wright (London: Joseph Mayer, 1872), pp. ix–xxiv.

Yorke, Barbara, 'Anglo-Saxon Origin Legends', in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, edited by Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Young, Charles R., *The Making of the Neville Family in England 1166-1400* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1996).

Vauchez, André, 'The Saint', in *Medieval Callings*, edited by Jacques Le Goff, translated by Lydia Cochrane (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990), pp. 313–45.

Zara, Veronique, 'The Historical Figure of Arthur in Wace's "Roman de Brut"', *Arthuriana,* 18:2 (2008): pp. 17–30.

**<u>Appendices</u>**

**Appendix A: Origin Myths of England, Scotland and Wales**

1: *After the death of his parents, Brutus wanders through Greece and Europe with the blessing of Diana. He discovered Britain and names the island after himself.*

'Brutus post matris et patris que interfectionem matris in partu et patris in venando cum sagitta secundum magorum vaticinium expulsus ab italia iter suum per greciam arripuit ubi quosdam de troianus in captivitate prandesii regis grecorum invenit. Inventos que associavit iuducta Innogena prandasii filia in uxorem per duos dies et totidem noctes a grecia maria sulcando in leogeciam applicuit insulam a piratis vastatam. Inde responso accepto a Diana iter capit et ad locum salinarum devenit ad aras phlistinorim et inter sicadem et montes agaric pr[…]divertit… Brutus vero insulam Albion Britanniam a nomine suo appellavit socios que suos britones construxit que in ea civitatem quam novam troianam appellavit que londonia iam nuncupatur…'

2: *Scotland's two mythical founders: Albanactus and Scotus.*

'Albanacto cessit portionem ultra humber que nunc scotia dicta quam Albaniam nomine suo appellavit.'

'Egiptiis in mare rubeo submersis qui superfuerunt expulerunt a se quondam nobiliem iuvenem nomine Scotum…tertiam gentem in britanniam addiderunt quam scotos apppellaverunt a quibus dicta est scotia prius Albania ab ablanacto filio bruti nominata.'

3: *The Welsh origin myth.*

'Kambrio cessit partes ultra sabrina et mare quam nomine suo kambriam appellavit que nunc Wallia dicta a quodam duce Wacle sic dicta.'

**Appendix B: Prophecy and Prophetic Figures on Canterbury MS 1**

1: *The Saxons defeated the Britons, who fled to where Merlin prophesised.*

'…apud ambresburiam contra saxones ibique devictis Britonibus fugereunt ad montes ererii ubi prophavit Merlinus.'

2: *Uther was called 'Pendragon' after he saw a dragon-shaped star in the sky.*

'Iste Uther sic pendragon nuncupatur quia sic merline est prophetatus propter stellam que in morte aurelii apparuit effigiem draconis et radium emittentem qui genuit arthurum ex igerna uxore gorloyus ducis cornubie et postea apud Almusbery sepultus est.'

3: *There was a noble warrior named Arthur during the reign of King Cedric of Wessex.*

'Tempeore Cerdicis regis WestSexie surrexit apud britones Arthurus qui Arthurus nobilis bellator duodecies dux belli fuit et duodecies victor exstitit.'

4: *The Welsh were destined never to recover the crown Britain.*

Degenati igitur britones a britannea nobilitate non britones a bruto sed Wallenses a suo duce Wallone dicti diadema regni numquam adepturi quonsque reliquias et ossa Kadwalladri a roma in britanniam apportaverint.'

5: *At the end of his life, St Edward utters the 'Green Tree' prophecy.*

'…Sanctus Edwardus sibi divinitus revelatam celitus edidit dum ageret in extremis sicut in vita sua manifeste continertur et est prophecia ista. Arbor quelibus viridis a suo truncco decisa cum ad trium iugerum spatium a radice separetur. Que cum nulla mami hominis cogente. nulla urgente neccetate ad suum reversa trunccum in antiquam radicem sese receperit resumpto que succo rursum refloruerit et fructum fecerit tunc sperandum est aliquid de turbulatione remedium. Hanc tum parabolam cum spiritu alacriori rex quasi a portis mortis revocatus dixisset inclinato humiliter capite valedicens seclom expiravit. Abor hec anglorum regnum gloriam foliorum fructum fecundissimum significat … Matildam duxit in uxorem semen regnum Normannorum et Anglorum coniungens de duobus unum faciens .'

**Appendix C: Tyrants, *Rex Inutilis* and Pious Kings on Canterbury MS 1**

1: *Archigallus is deposed and his is replaced by his brother Elidurus.*

'Deposito Archigallo a regni solio propter suam ferocitatem Elidurus frater eius in regem electus est qui propter pietatem quam fecit in suum fratrem postea primus appollatus…'

'Istum Archigallum insula propter suam ferocitatem a regni solio deposuerunt et Elidurum fratrem suum erexerunt …'

'… sortitus est hoc nomen pius quia predictam pietatem in fratrem suum fecerat.'

2: *Eynanius was deposed on account of his savagery.*

'Iste Eynanius propter suam ferocitatem sexto anno regni sui a sede regia depositus fuit …'.

3: *The roman Gracianus was killed by the common people on account of his savageness.*

'Gracianus romanus iure hereditario missus a maxinano contra pictos qui patriam a mari usque ad mare vastaverunt propter cuius feritatem plebani ipsum occiderunt. '

4: *Harold Godwinson died in battle against William the Conqueror.*

'… unde domino ultore contra regem Willelmum in bello occubuit …'

5: *William Rufus was a tyrant who was killed by an arrow in 1100.*

'Willelmus Rufus in regem Anglie coronatus construxit turrim Londonis et magna aulam Westmonasteri ejius anno 2°.

'Factus est terre motus et peregrinatio jerosolimitania apparente signo crucis in vestibus hominis tirannus deo exosus suis neqam sibi neque or suos oppressit alieneginius medndax cum regnasset 13 annis denum vita suam crudelem misero fine percussa cum sagitta in nova foresta terminavit annis gratie 1100 [?] Augusti et sepultus est Wyntonie.'

6: *King Edgar the Peaceful funded the construction of many abbeys.*

'Edgardus dictus pacificus eo quo in pace et inviolabili iustitia regnum feliciter gubernavit … fundavit enim Abbathas de Glaston de Abyndon de Burgo de Torneye et de Ramyseye …'.

7. *Inflation during the reign of Edward III.*

'Anno primo Edwardi tertii erat … ex qua provenit tanti bladi caristia ut quartarum frumenti ad xl scilicet venderetur'.

**Appendix D: English relations with Wales, Scotland and France**

1: *King Eldredus and William the Conqueror invade Scotland.*

'Edredus…subjugata sibi Scotia…'
'Willmus…subjugavit sibi Scotiam…'


2: *William the Conqueror, Harold Godwinson and Edward I invade Wales.*

'Willmus …subjugavit scilicet Walliam…'
'Anno eiusdem 22° haraldus filius comitis Godwini subdidit sibi Walliam…'.
'Secundo anno Edwardi Lewilinus princeps Wallie ad parliamentum regis in Anglia venire
noluerat rex adiit waliam…'


3: *Poem about Llywelyn the Last.*

'Hic iacet Anglorum tortor tutor venedorum
Princeps wallorum Lewilinus reglam morum
Gemma occenonorum flos regnum preteritorum
Forma futurorum dux laus lex lux populorum
Alius vero scripsit sic
Hic iacet errorum princeps et predo vivorum
Perditor anglorum sax livida secta rerorim
Numem wallorum trux dux homidia piorum
Fex troianorum strips fallax causa malorum
Per santus david m [millia] bene metrificavit
Per sanctos mille mendax fuit wallicus ille.'


4: *Madoc's Welsh Revolt.*

'…cito post captus est madocius et ab illo tempore quinenrunt Wallenses a prelis et
principatum Wallie dedit edwardo secundo silo et comitri cestrie ut dicit policronicon . lib° 7.
ca ° 40 °.'

5: *Owain Glyndŵr's Welsh Revolt.*

'Primo anno henrici quarti surrexxrunt in Wallia quidam Owynus Glyndore et actri infestavit totam Walliam ferro flamma fere per septennium. Sed tempore henrica quinto filii sui ceperunt Wallenses more anglorum vivere polichonicon . lib. 1° ca° 38°'

6: *English claims to the French crown.*

'Philippus filius sancti Lodowici genuit Philippum dictis pulcrum et Karolum de Valoys cui Philipo filio sancti Lodowici successet in regno francie dictis Phlippus pulcher qui relictis tribus filiis et una filia domina Isabella regna Anglie que vivente patre suo peperit dominum Edwardum tertium decessit cui successit Lodowicus eius primogenitus qui vivente patre suo de prima uxore sua filia ducis Burgundie suscitavit unam filiam de qua ipse vivente nulla proles fuit suscitata…'

'…Philippo secundous genitus Philippi pulcri qui de uxore sua suscitavit duas filias quarum una deposata erat comiti flandre altera dolphino de viennis sed de ipsius eo vivente nulla proles fuit suscitata mortuo dicto Phillipo sine herede masculo successit…'

'… Philippus filius Karoli de Valoys et occupavit regnum Francie ubi dominus Edwardus debuisset succedere ex linea descendente dicti philippi pulcri.'