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This article examines the use made of English sources, possibly of Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls, by the writers and illustrators of a world history composed in papal Avignon in the regional vernacular, Occitan. The fact that such documents were available and used as a source in this international context raises new questions about the uses to which these texts were put. The making and the writing of this manuscript has been studied in two articles, also published in eBLJ, by Federico Botana and Alexander Ibarz. This article builds on their investigations to analyse a single monarch list, that of England, as well as to develop further the consideration of the manuscript’s intended readership.

Eg. MS. 1500 (hereafter, MS. L1) contains two texts in medieval Occitan: an illustrated universal chronicle from the Creation to the year 1313, L’Abreujamen de las estorias (‘The Abbreviation of the Histories’), and a catalogue of the provinces of the Western Christendom, the Provinciale Romane Curie. The Abreujamen is a vernacular translation of a Latin tabulated world history by the Franciscan friar Paolino Veneto, compiled in Venice and Avignon, called the Compendium gestarum rerum regnorumque originem (c. 1321-23) (MS. Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Zanetti latino 399 (=1610), hereafter M). The Compendium is an illustrated, diagrammatic version of a world history that is also attributed to Paolino, entitled the Notabilium Historiarum Epithoma. In the mid-1330s, when he was bishop of Pozzuoli, Paolino Veneto recast his Epithoma and Compendium as an illustrated world history, the Satyrica gestarum rerum, regum atque regnorum et summorum pontificum historia (usually abbreviated to Satyrica Historia). Manuscript M, produced in Avignon in the early 1320s, contains diagrams and texts that only appear in the versions of his history that Paolino produced in Naples in the mid-1330s.1

This paper emerges from a research project funded by the Leverhulme Trust. MS L1 has been transcribed by Alexander Ibarz; Federico Botana has established new evidence for the manuscript’s provenance, history and illustrative programme. Federico Botana, ‘The Making of L’Abreujamen de las estorias (Eg. MS 1500),’ eBLJ (2013), art. 16 (http://www.bl.uk/eblj/2013articles/article16.html), and Alexander Ibarz, ‘The Provenance of the Abreujamen de las estorias (London, British Library, Egerton MS. 1500) and the Identification of Scribal Hands (c. 1323),’ eBLJ (2013), art. 17 (http://www.bl.uk/eblj/2013articles/article17.html). My thanks to both my colleagues for their assistance and support in preparing this article. My thanks also to Andrea Worm, Anne Lawrence-Mathers, Isabelle Heuillant-Donat, Tony Moore, Françoise Le Saux, and especially to Marigold Norbye for their generous advice and suggestions. This project could not have happened without the encouragement and advice of Peter Ricketts, who sadly died before he could see its results. This article is dedicated to his memory.

Federico Botana has established that Paolino Veneto was personally involved in at least part of the creation of the *Abreujamen* (MS. *L*'). The other, smaller, part of this Occitan-language codex survives as BL, Add. MS. 17920 (MS. *L*2). It is a compilation of devotional and didactic texts in Occitan, datable to the late 1320s, and long believed to be connected to the entourage of Pope John XXII. The *Abreujamen* is therefore part of a larger compilation that was produced by other, unidentified, hands. Between 1321 and 1326, Paolino Veneto worked as an apostolic penitentiary, a member of a multilingual college that granted absolutions, dispensations and indulgences. The apostolic penitentiary office employed a staff of twelve scribes, most of whom came from Southern French regions. It provided the ideal location for a translation of his ambitious world history into Occitan. The possibility that the codex was produced there is reinforced by the fact that *L*1 and *M* were illustrated by artists who had made books for the cathedral church of Notre-Dame des Doms.

As Botana and Ibarz have shown, the codex that is now *L*1-*L*2 was created by three scribes, one of whom also acted as a compiler and annotator for the benefit of an unidentified male addressee (Ibarz has presented a possible identification, to which I will return at the end of this article). Those scholars who have studied and edited *L*2 have ignored *L*1, but the *Abreujamen* supports their long-standing suggestion that the compilation was made for a young nobleman by someone who had care of his education. The intended reader can be assumed to have been secular, but we should not exclude children such as John XXII’s great-nephew Pierre de Via who was tonsured and given the first of ten benefices at the age of six (1318) and was granted dispensation to continue his studies in his own palace on becoming bishop of Albi in 1333.

---


4 The apostolic penitentiaries were involved in the annulment of the marriage of the king of France, the consideration of two alternative matches, and his remarriage (with dispensations concerning consanguinity) in May–August 1322; similar activity surrounded Charles’s next marriage in 1324, Guillaume Mollat, ‘Jean XXII et Charles IV le Bel (1322-1328)’, *Journal des Savants*, ii (1967), pp. 92-106 (pp. 95-6).


Nor was there a wide gap between secular and ecclesiastical patronage. John XXII (Jacques Duèze) had been chamberlain to King Robert of Naples, Count of Provence before he was appointed bishop of Avignon by Pope Clement V in 1310. Avignon was a fief of the count of Provence, and by basing himself in the bishop’s palace, the new pope placed himself tacitly under the protection of the king of France’s powerful cousin. The papal curia was filled with men from John XXII’s native Quercy, and it has been estimated that ninety-five natives of the Quercy became prelates between 1309 and 1376. According to Guillemain, John XXII paid for at least eight relatives’ weddings during his reign, and he favoured his secular relatives. There was therefore no shortage of influential Occitan-speaking men and women at Avignon in the 1320s.

The kings of ‘Britain, that is to say, England’

None of Paolino’s histories has a named dedicatee, but his genealogies and accompanying historical anecdotes display bias in favour of the Neapolitan Angevins. Among the dozens of king lists and lines of succession in the Abreujamen, the kings of ‘Britain, i.e. England’ would have had little to offer to Robert of Naples, but plenty to interest an Occitan-speaking reader, given the importance of the duchies of Aquitaine and Guyenne to the English crown. They deserve special attention both for their unusual source, and for the clues that they provide for the intended readership of the Abreujamen.

Both Gascony and the Quercy were Occitan-speaking and had strong political links with the interests of the kings of England. Gascony had been favoured by the Gascon-born Pope Clement V (1305-1314). Despite there being grounds for a positive depiction in the Abreujamen of a valuable ally against the king of France, the Plantagenet kings of England are given short shrift, and Edward II has been erased, then reinstated. England is imagined as a single unit, designated la ylha (the island, insula in M), often called ‘Britain, i.e. England’. Wales and Scotland are barely mentioned (Scotland has no king list), but there are a handful of references to Ireland. L contains a translation of a description of Ireland that was given to John XXII by Edward II’s envoy Philip of Slane, bishop of Cork, in 1324-25; it is likely therefore that a member of that delegation contributed to the elaboration of the history of England.

Paolino and his colleagues used two historical sources for the kings of England. One was probably a copy of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae (hereafter HRB), a text that was very widely disseminated across Europe (see Appendix). This article suggests that the second was probably a genealogical roll of the kings of England, of a sort that was fashionable at the time. This roll may have been illustrated, because the format of these rolls counts among the several possible sources for the illustration scheme of the Abreujamen. There are linguistic grounds for concluding that the roll was written in Anglo-Norman rather than Latin. Such a manuscript roll could have come to Avignon in the diplomatic baggage of the prelates who were sent on behalf of Edward I and Edward II, and in particular any who dealt with the apostolic penitentiary regarding questions of legitimacy, marriage, or ecclesiastical discipline. The Dominican bishop Philip of Slane is very likely to have carried such a document, but he was unlikely to have been alone in giving books. In 1322-

---

10 Robert of Naples also provided the curia with substantial payments of his dues as papal vassal: Weakland, ‘Administrative and Fiscal Centralization’, pp. 290-1.
12 Guillemain, La Cour pontificale d’Avignon, pp. 127-8, 132-3, 157, 166-74.
13 Wüstefeld, ‘Las Merevilhas’.
14 All references are to Geoffrey of Monmouth, The History of the Kings of Britain, ed. Michael D. Reeve, trans Neil Wright (Woodbridge, 2009), hereafter HRB.
23, the Franciscan bishop of Annaghdown, Gilbert Ó Tigernaig, visited Avignon (where he died) in a final attempt to resolve a dispute that had kept him a suffragan in England for over a decade.\(^{15}\) Several embassies from England and Ireland sought to gain papal approval concerning the Bruce invasion and other matters; such missions would have benefited from displaying an illustrated roll that supported the claims of the king of England over either Scotland or France. John XXII supported his royal vassal Edward II in the period 1316-18 both against the Brusces, and against the Remonstrance of the Irish princes.\(^{16}\) The Franciscan order in Ireland, in particular, was torn over the issue of loyalty to Edward II in 1324-25.\(^{17}\) Despite its ambivalence towards the Norman kings of England, the *Abreujamen* includes claims that the king of Britain Aurelius Ambrosius was granted rule over France and Ireland (f. 28v), and that Malgo conquered Ireland and the islands (f. 31v). A summary of Merlin’s prophecy concerning Uther Pendragon suggests that the ruler of France will be Arthur and that the descendants of Arthur’s sister will rule over Ireland (f. 29r). This, plus the fact that Scotland is omitted from the *Abreujamen*, would point to a source that privileged Anglo-Irish relations.\(^{18}\)

The proposals presented at Avignon by the bishop of Cork were an attempt to tighten English royal control over the Irish dioceses and monastic houses. Although John gave Philip the impression that he approved the proposals, he did not implement them. Watt suggests that Philip of Slane’s mission failed because of the complaints that had been made against Edward II by the prelates of both England and Ireland at the Council of Vienne (1311). It may also lie in the conflict between Edward II and the French crown over his refusal to pay homage to the Duchy of Aquitaine (1323-25), and in the fact that John XXII supported Queen Isabella throughout the last years of the king’s reign.\(^{19}\) As we shall see, the *Abreujamen* depicts the post-Conquest kings of England in a negative light.

The history of Britain before the Anglo-Saxon era points to an interest in England’s relationship with Rome. In keeping with the *Brut* tradition, the name ‘Brutus, a quo Britannia’ appears in a small arch that grows out of the base of Silvius, king of Italy and the Latins, son of Ascanius, and father of Silvius Aeneas (f. 8v). However, on the preceding folio, the columns of Priam and Aeneas are separate and the connection between the Trojans and the Romans is not made explicit. Brutus appears, therefore, to be a Latin, rather than a Trojan, founder of Britain. On f. 16v, a column marked *regnum britannie* appears, containing Casibellaunus, ‘venqutz per Cezar’ (defeated by Caesar), who is prominently placed next to a large head of Julius Caesar and facing (on the opposite folio) the family of Christ. His successor is his brother, *Tenaci frater* (Tenuantius). A note adds says that he was Duke of

---


18. A short column for Scotland is inserted in the *Satyrica Historia*, Vat. Lat. 1960, f. 11r. Unfortunately, the leaves of the *Provinciale in L* that contained the dioceses of the British Isles are lost. The *Provinciale in M* provides translations into the vernacular for the dioceses of England (e.g. ‘de Uellus e de Bathe’ for Bath and Wells, ‘de York’), a handful of similar notes for those of Ireland (‘Armatha sive Armagh’ for Armagh, ‘de Diuelan’ or ‘Duielan’ for Dublin), but none for Scotland (f. 94rv).

Cornwall, ‘drechurier e batalhers’ (just and warlike). Kymbelinus appears with a lengthy note (f. 18v), once more concerning his relationship with Rome. The earliest history of the regnum britannie, therefore, depicts it as a rebellious offshoot of Rome. It accords the kingdom an importance in the history of the world that it loses almost at once.

The Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls and the visual design of the Abreujamen

Out of some forty genealogical rolls of the kings of England produced between 1271 and 1422, de Laborderie notes that over thirty were created in illustrated form with an Anglo-Norman text, between the years 1271 and 1327. 20 The majority of these rolls date from the reign of Edward I (1272-1307), embedding his claims to Wales and Scotland in a vision of himself as the descendant of an ancient line of rulers of Britain. 21 However, these rolls did not appear suddenly in response to Edward’s expansionist aims. They are datable from his accession to the end of the reign of his son Edward II in January 1327. Also, these texts were created across a remarkably wide geographical region, and a few were continued long after their initial production. Many were owned by a predominantly secular aristocratic readership, some were written in Latin for monastic use, and they may have reached a wide audience.

While these genealogical texts are repetitive, their content is not fixed. Lesley Coote has suggested that the genealogical roll and codex might be viewed as the medieval equivalent of a family photo-album: it seeks to bring people together within a shared history, but it is also constructed, subjective, iterative and infinitely malleable. 22 The earliest surviving Anglo-Norman copies of royal catalogues show that there were competing versions of the past that vied for attention. 23 In the early fourteenth century, the Anglo-Norman prose Brut manuscripts (dated by Marvin to c. 1272-1307 at the earliest), as well as Rauf de Boun’s Petit Brut (c.1309) blended legend and chronicle in order to present a portrait of England as a land that was enriched and strengthened by its discontinuity, its successive conquerors and varied peoples. 24 Other manuscripts served a propagandist purpose; one example is a compilation of histories and documents in support of Edward I’s claim to the Scottish throne, which opens with a gallery of images of the kings of England from William the Conqueror to Edward I (Oxford, Bodleian, MS. Rawlinson D 329). 25

Royal MS. 14 B. VI is one of the Anglo-Norman rolls that could have been a source for the Abreujamen. This is a complete luxury copy with Anglo-Norman text, seven membranes long, painted, with gold leaf initials and crowns. It narrates the king list from the Heptarchy to the reign of Edward I (reigned 1272-1307). It is assumed to have been created during the

---
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reign of Edward II (1307-1327) and extended later up to the year 1340.26 The Anglo-Norman text matches that of an earlier example (Royal MS. 14 B. V), as well as UCLA, MS. Rouse 49 (c. 1377), and a roll that was edited by Wright in 1872. Tyson has edited a mid-thirteenth century version of the same text, now in The Hague.27 The roll depicts each king in majesty, crowned and seated on a throne. Each king also has a head-and-shoulders ‘bust’ head in a roundel that depicts him as an uncrowned heir.

The rolls were part of a wider fashion for illustrated royal genealogies. Contemporary examples of such similar works include the *Abingdon Chronicle* (to 1302), illustrated with a series of heads of post-Conquest kings (Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. R. 17. 7), and the fragments of a rulers’ gallery, probably produced for the entourage of Edward I, now known as the *Effigies ad regem Angliae* (Cotton MS. Vitellius A. XIII).28 These illustrated royal genealogies may derive their visual design from Matthew Paris’s histories, but Suzanne Lewis and Andrea Worm have argued convincingly that columns of kings’ heads portrayed in roundels developed from Peter of Poitiers’s *Compendium Historiae*, a late-twelfth-century Parisian text that proved immensely successful in England.29 The enthroned full-length king of the Anglo-Norman rolls does not appear in the *Abreujamen*, but the small crowned head within a shape (not a roundel but an arched window) is clearly a development from models that were similar to those of the roll genealogies (figs 1 and 2).

---


27 Tyson, ‘An Early French Prose History’. Thomas Wright, *Feudal Manuals of English History: A Series of Popular Sketches of our National History compiled at different periods, from the thirteenth century to the fifteenth, for the use of the feudal gentry and nobility, now first edited from the original manuscripts* (London, 1872), manuscript I, a roll that belonged to Joseph Mayer in 1872, and that opened with the Heptarchy diagram, pp. xiii, xxi. The roll is now lost (my grateful thanks to the staff of Liverpool University Library Special Collections).


Fig. 1. British Library, Royal MS. 14 B. VI, membrane 3 (detail): Edgar (enthroned) and his four children. Edward Martyr appears both as heir (head within roundel) and as the next enthroned king.

Fig. 2. Eg. MS. 1500, f. 6 (detail).
Paolino Veneto is not believed to have visited England, so there are no grounds for assuming that he had access either to the chronicles of Matthew Paris in Saint Albans, or to artefacts of the English royal court such as the book that contained the *Effigies*. Rather, the *Abreujamen* reflects an accessible and widely-known visual resource. It is the visual aspect of the source, as well as certain elements of the text, that point to a roll in preference to an unillustrated, abbreviated *Brut* chronicle.

Most of the English king rolls take two points in distant history as their starting point: some open with the unification of the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of England (the Heptarchy) under a single ruler, Egbert. Others may include the Heptarchy and its diagram (fig. 4), but they go further back to the mythical invasion of the British Isles by the exiled Trojan Brutus and his companions. They confect an unbroken history out of the discontinuous English monarchs while stressing the importance of such breaks and disconnections. Lamont has argued that discontinuity serves a rhetorical purpose in the genealogical rolls by reminding the reader that political unity is a construct. In any case, the texts are composites that draw on many sources, both directly and through earlier, equally composite, summaries. The rolls share a common core with the thirteenth-century portion of Tyson’s ‘short prose *Brut*’ chronicle, and a thirteenth-century Anglo–Norman genealogical chronicle published in 1865 by John Glover as the *Livere de Reis de Brittanie e Le Livere de Reis de Engletere*. Glover calls it ‘an abridgement, with some large insertions, of a very common short French chronicle’. Glover suggests that these chronicles were designed to provide an accessible history for a young or uninformed reader. The same function can be ascribed to the synoptic king lists of the *Abreujamen*: it is a useful list, but it is also rendered memorable through a diagrammatic pattern, much like the Anglo–Norman rolls.

The Heptarchy diagram does not appear in *L*¹. It is inserted in *M*, however, as a group of seven kings who are linked by faint lines to one ruler, ‘Eadbrichtus’ (Egbert), in the time of Popes Boniface IV (reigned 608–615) and Adeodatus I (615–618) (*M*, f. 56r) (fig. 3).

---

31 Tyson, ‘An Early French Prose History’. *Livere de Reis de Brittanie e Le Livere de Reis de Engletere*, ed. John Glover (London, 1865). The manuscripts are Trinity College, MS. R.14.7 (or 883), and Biblioteca Vaticana, Barberini 3528 (the latter identified by de Laborderie).
32 Glover, p. xiii.
The text copied directly above the Heptarchy in *M* is lifted from a concluding section of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s chronicle concerning Galaes, Queen of Wales.\(^\text{33}\) In both *M* and the later *Satyrica Historia* (Bibl. Vat. Lat. 1960, f. 210r), it is not the circular diagram that appears on many genealogical rolls, and that derives from the work of Matthew Paris (fig. 4).

![Fig. 4. Royal MS. 14 B. V, membrane 1 (detail). The diagram of the Heptarchy.](image1)

Nor is it based on one of the alternative schemes that existed at the time, such as three parallel columns of Heptarchy kingdoms, counties and dioceses (fig. 5).

![Fig. 5. Royal MS. 13 A XVIII, f. 115v, first half of the fourteenth century. A diagram of the Heptarchy showing the seven kingdoms and their corresponding counties and dioceses, illustrating Wace, *Le Roman de Rou*.](image2)

\(^{33}\) *HRB*, II. 27. 103. My thanks to Françoise Le Saux for identifying this passage.
The diagram in MS M is rather an inverted family tree, with heads of the seven kings treated as if they were seven brothers whose single descendant is Egbert. However aberrant the scheme looks, it may also be traced back to the genealogical rolls, because at least one of the Anglo-Norman rolls describes the kings of the Heptarchy as seven brothers (‘.vii. freres’).35

The rolls also harmonize the invasion of England by William the Conqueror with this illusory continuum by stalling the chronology, effectively moving backwards in time. They place the head of Harold Godwinson directly beneath that of Edward the Confessor, and follow it with a genealogy of the dukes of Normandy from the reign of Rollo, which pushes the historical narrative several generations back and imposes a second lineage history for the eleventh century up to the year 1065.36 By not placing the two lineages in parallel, the rolls present the Dukes of Normandy as the rightful successors to Edward the Confessor, rather than as rival claimants. The stitch in time stresses the legitimacy both of Duke William’s title as Duke of Normandy and his actions in taking the throne from Harold.

In the Abreuiamen, the transition from Edward the Confessor to Harold and William is also accompanied by a ducal list of Normandy (ff. 43v–44r). The column of the kings of England lists ‘Ardecnotus filius’ (Hardecnut) and ‘Edwardus Sanctus filius’ (Saint Edward the Confessor). To their right, the column of ‘Dukes of Normandy and Apulia’ is empty down to Robert Guiscard (1015–1085), but to the right of that line appears a further column called ‘origo moderorum regum anglie’ (the origins of the current kings of England). This column copies the Dukes of Normandy from the Anglo-Norman rolls: a tiny Rollo, William, Richard and Richard. However, their line is linked diagonally to Robert Guiscard, ruler of Sicily, who is depicted in profile with a lengthy biographical note (fig. 6). Here, material that was used in the Anglo-Norman rolls to justify the Norman invasion has been manipulated to associate the kings of England and Dukes of Normandy with the kingdom of Sicily. As we will see, the relationship is not designed to be flattering.

---

35 See also Lewis, The Art of Matthew Paris, pp. 166 and 169-70.
36 Lamont, p. 249, transcribing UCLA, Rouse MS 49, memb. 1 (c. 1377).
36 See Royal MS. 14 B. VI, and discussion of UCLA, Rouse MS 49 by Lamont.
Fig. 6. Eg. MS. 1500, f. 43v (detail). The column of Kings of England is placed next to a small column of the Dukes of Normandy that leads to Robert Guiscard, who is in the column rubricated ‘Dukes of Normandy and Apulia’.
The Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls and the text of the *Abreujamen*

Tyson has noted that the illustrated rolls placed great stress on identifying each ruler. Many reigns are given a short assessment: ‘Cesti Athilred fu bon home quant a Deu e al secle’ (This Ethelred was a good man in his relationship with God and with the world). Alfred ‘fu quointes hommes e sage en totes chosis’ (was an adroit and wise man in all things). Negative descriptions of reigns are comparatively rare, but are similar in style: Edwyn the son of Edmund reigned after Edred, ‘Iceti fu mauves, e luxurious, e malement se demeneit ver Deus e ver tute genz’ (This one was bad, lecherous, he behaved wickedly towards God and towards all people).37 Edwyn’s wicked life contrasts with those of his saintly successors Edgar and Edward Martyr.38

The comparable notes appended to King Adheulfus (Ethelwulf) in both *L* and *M* provide the first evidence in favour of a genealogical roll as the source (transcription by Ibarz):

Adheulfus
Aqst fo lo prumier rei de la gen dels angles, e renhet per tota la ylha. E anet ha Roma, e donet trahut ha Leo papa, lo qual hueu es pagautz, so es assaber, per cascuna maio .i. denier dargen. E des lo comensamen de son reaume e lhi Dassi els Goti, e Nourgienses e Vandali, e la dicha ilha an destruh  tro que uengro lhi Norman e lo reys Guilhem quais per ii C. e .xxx. ans. (*L*, *Abreujamen*, f. 38v)

(Ethelwulf. This was the first king of the English people, and he reigned over the whole island. He went to Rome and gave a tribute to Pope Leo that is paid now, that is to say: one silver denier for every household. And since the beginning of his reign, the Dacians [Danes], the Goths, the Norwegians and the Vandals and the others have destroyed the said island, until the Normans and King William came, for two hundred and thirty years.)

*M* has a heavily abbreviated version of the same text; the name ‘Aldheulfus filius .i. rex anglorum’ precedes a sentence: ‘Hic insule monarchiam tenuit […]’ (This one held the rulership of the island […] (f. 63v). The name of Aldeulfus is set beneath a sketched name that reads Alueredus. Alured is the name that most genealogical rolls give to King Alfred the Great (the son of Ethelwulf), indicating possible confusion at this point.

Compare the passage concerning Ethelwulf in several Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls:

Pus ala à Rome, e dona tuz les aunz de checune mesun de Engletere un dener, ke est apelé de dener sent Pere. Pus duna checun an .iii.c. besanz de argent, l’un .c. au lumere sent Pere, et l’autre .c. au lumere sent Pol, et à l’apostoyle .c. (Wright, p. 2)

(Then he went to Rome and gave one denarius every year, from each household in England, which is called the denarius of Saint Peter. Then he gave everyone three hundred besants of silver: one hundred for the lights of Saint Peter, another hundred for the lights of Saint Paul, and one hundred to the pope.)

Needless to say, ‘Peter’s pence’ (or ‘Rome peny’ according to the *Petit Bruit*) was of interest to John XXII, whose administration made repeated attempts to collect it from both England and Ireland.39 In *M*, but not in the *Abreujamen*, Ethelwulf’s successors are named as Ædebalduis

---

37 All quotations from Wright, pp. 3, 5, 11, checked against Royal MS. 14 B. VI.
38 Wright, pp. 11-12 and 15-16, checked against Royal MS. 14 B. VI.
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filius (Ethelbald, the first son of Ethelwulf, who reigned for five months only) and Edredus frater, who may be either Ethelbert or Ethelred, the second and third sons of Ethelwulf. The omission of the three oldest brothers of Alfred in the Abreujamen and their shadowy appearance in M suggest that both the Latin and the Occitan scribes were working from a common source that M followed more closely than L.

A further fragment of evidence is the following note that is appended to Ethelwulf’s successor ‘Elfred’ (Alfred) in the Abreujamen (as I noted above, M appears to confuse Alfred with Ethelbald at this point):

aquest donet ta gran securitat ha la ylha. que aqui hon auia cami de mainhtas uias el fagia metre Joyels daur penden els albres. e aquest Joyels nuls homs no augia tocar ni penre (Transcription by Ibarz.)

(This one gave such security to the island that wherever there was a path with many roads, he made people hang golden jewels from the trees, and nobody dared either touch or taken these jewels; f. 38v, col. c, ll. 21-31).

This note can only have been taken from an Anglo-Norman genealogical roll. The corresponding passage is common in that tradition, but it does not appear in the Livere de Reis de Brittaine (compare Glover, p. 16), or in the Petit Bruit:

Icesti sustint si bone pes en Engletere, ke il fist pendre boys de or par les comunes passagis e par les voys, dunt fist establer tel pes, ke ne fust nul tresspassant si hardi ke osast ren prendre ni ravir (Wright, p. 5).

(This one maintained such good peace in England that he ordered people to hang up golden chains on common paths and on the roads, from which he was able to establish such a peace that there was no passer-by so brave that he dared to take or to steal anything.)

The divergence between the rolls ‘par les comunes passagis e par les voys’ (along the common paths and along the roads) and the Occitan ‘hon auia cami de mainhtas uias’ (where there was a road with many paths) reflects a variant tradition in the Anglo-Norman rolls, one that was transcribed by Tyson:

Il comaundeit pendre par les comuns pasages ou les voies et les sentes s’assemblent buyes d’or ke le chiminans regardoient e si n’estoit nul si hardi ke les osast ravir ni prendre.

(He ordered there to be hung on common routes where roads and pathways meet some golden arm-rings, which travellers looked upon, and none were brave enough to dare steal or take them.)

The passage is grammatically accurate but the translators have rendered the Anglo-Norman/Old French buyes and boys (bracelet or arm-ring) as joyels (jewels). This is all the more puzzling because the equivalent note in M reads armilla aurea (golden arm-rings) (f. 64v) in its note for ‘Elfredus frater junior’ (the epithet junior shows awareness that this king was the youngest brother). Occitan speakers could have used either armilla or the masculine noun bous (arm-ring, metal ring) to render the French buyes/boys, but bous was comparatively

---

40 The brothers in the Anglo-Norman illustrated rolls are Ethelbald, Ethelbert, Ethelred and Alfred. The Petit Bruit is more confused, and lists Adelbraund and Adilbrit (co-rulers), followed by Adelstan I and finally Alfrord, p. 11.

41 Tyson, ‘The Manuscript Tradition’, pp. 116-17. Tyson does not give a source for her transcription but her article is devoted to the manuscript at The Hague, Royal Library, MS. 75 A 2/2, datable to before 1307.
rare, possibly archaic. There are therefore grounds for concluding that the translators of the *Abreuçamen* worked from an Anglo-Norman text and struggled to identify a suitable equivalent in Occitan for a word that they understood to be a version of *armillas*. They may also have opted for *joyels* in order to privilege the sense of the text over the more sophisticated vocabulary that would have been implied by *bous*.

According to the genealogical rolls and the *Livere de Reis de Brittaine*, King Alfred divided up the kingdom’s ‘rents’ in order to identify and assist impoverished groups in his society, and then emulated this in his division of his day into three periods of eight hours. Hanging golden arm-rings over public roads to deter thieves interested the compilers of *L* and *M* far more than either Alfred’s financial acumen or his pious time-keeping.

No notes are appended to the unbroken line of succession of *reges anglie* from Edmund to Ethelred (ff. 40v-41r). However, *M* provides a substantial note for Edgar (f. 68v), which is identifiable in the genealogical rolls from its reference to Saint Dunstan praying at the altar at the moment of his birth. His successor Edward Martyr was also the subject of a small marginal note in *M* (f. 68v). The Anglo-Norman rolls are full of entertaining anecdotes about this group of kings. Edred is a good king but his lineage is destined to decline: ‘La hardiesce de lui fu si noble, ke il ne forlingneit pas plus ke son pere ne ces freres’ (His courage was so noble that he did not decline from the moral status of his ancestors more than did his father or his brothers). Edwin’s villainous nature is designed to contrast with that of his saintly brother Edgar, a peaceable and wise king, father to Edward Martyr (murdered by his wicked stepmother), and the unwise Ethelred. The *Abreuçamen* lacks these lively details.

Furthermore, the subsequent folios neglect the king list of England. On ff. 42v-43r, the column of the *reges anglie* has not been inked, although it contains two rulers, Edmund Ironside and Cnut. The Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls are complimentary about the reign of ‘Cnuto, ex Danis’, the most powerful king of England since Arthur, but they also stress the importance of Edmund Ironside’s son Edward the Exile, who fled to Hungary and married the daughter of the king. A little marginal note concerning the exile of Edward appears in *M*, but otherwise the subject is omitted. The story was used in Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls to embed the rival claims to the throne of England of Stephen, Matilda and Henry II Plantagenet in the legendary life of St Margaret of Scotland, daughter of Edward the Exile. Indeed, St Margaret is given her own line of descent to her daughter, the Empress Matilda, when Matilda appears in a genealogy (fig. 7).

42 The word, transcribed *bals/baus*, occurs only once in the troubadour corpus, in a twelfth-century poem, and it was misunderstood by the scribes who copied it c. 1300: see the discussion in Simon Gaunt, Ruth Harvey and Linda M. Paterson (eds.), *Marcabru: A Critical Edition* (Cambridge, 2000), poem XIX, line 20, pp. 271-2.
43 Wright, pp. 5-8, Glover, p. 16.
44 Wright, pp. 46-47, all references checked against Royal MS. 14 B. VI.
45 Wright, p. 11.
46 Wright, pp. 12-16.
47 Wright, pp. 18-19.
Edward the Exile’s daughter Margaret sails from Hungary to England but finds herself blown by winds onto the shores of Scotland, where she marries King ‘Marcolf’ (Malcolm III, reigned 1057-93). St Margaret of Scotland furnished Edward I with his claim to the Scottish throne, and she also enabled the Plantagenets to claim descent from the Anglo-Saxon royal line. By omitting Margaret, $L$ and $M$ miss an opportunity to associate the kings of England with Hungary’s Árpád dynasty (the contemporaneous Anglo-Norman prose Brut edited by Marvin specifies that Edward married the daughter of the king of Hungary). Edward the Exile is a contemporary of the first Árpád king of Hungary, St Stephen (d. 1038) and the pious Andrew I (reigned 1046-1060). The king list of the Árpád dynasty from Saint Stephen to Andrew I features in the lower right-hand half of the same folio, with an extended narrative note on the facing page. The Hungarian king list may have been added quickly at a slightly later point in the composition of $L$, but it was added nevertheless under the direct supervision of Paolino, as he had exceptional access to Hungarian histories. The king of Hungary in the 1320s was Charles I of Anjou, nephew of King Robert of Naples and founder of a new, Angevin, dynasty. There are several ways of interpreting the omission of St Margaret of Scotland. The available sources may not have included it, meaning that it is only by dint of chronology that the English group appears on the same folio as the kings of Hungary. A second hypothesis is that it was important to avoid a connection between the kings of England and the beata stirps of Hungary (a lineage of royal saints), at a point when

---

48 Wright, pp. 20-1.
50 Marvin, p. 220.
the House of Anjou was appropriating Hungarian holy kingship for itself. While it may be
unwise to speculate about ‘intention’ when noting omissions of detail, the erasure of Scotland
from the history of the world at the height of the Anglo-Scottish wars looks suspicious and
(in this instance) may also explain why the story has been left out.

There is explicit bias, however, in the treatment of the Norman conquest of England
(f. 44v). There is an unbroken line of succession from Harold Godwinson to Henry I,
supported by three notes. The first of these justifies the conquest on the grounds of Harold’s
wickedness): 

This Hernoldus (Harold) was the son of Count Godiernus (Godwin). When the king died
he occupied the kingdom, then he was killed in battle by William, his successor, because
when he was in his youth, he was ordered or sent to the court of the Duke of Normandy
to learn good manners. Then he made a pact with the aforesaid William that he would give
him his sister as his wife, and the aforesaid William would also give his sister as wife to this
Hernoldus. But when this Hernoldus was king he did not wish to keep the promise that
has been mentioned above. For this reason, William waged war on him, threw him out of
the kingdom, and took his sister to be his wife once he had killed him in battle. And those
who are now reigning are of his lineage.)

The present kings of England therefore descend from a usurper and perjurer, Harold,
via his sister. The claim is historically incorrect, as well as absent from the rolls and the Brut
tradition. It might well result from a simple error, in that Harold swears to marry William’s
sister in several sources. The ‘new’ anecdote strengthens a by-then traditional depiction of
Harold as a perjurer, but it also smears the Plantagenets as members of a lineage of traitors.
The change may be slight but it is clever: there is no dynastic break between the Anglo-Saxon
kings and the Norman kings, and the latter inherit a moral flaw from their maternal ancestor.
The deposition and execution of a sinful king are also addressed in the short note that is
devoted to Guillelmus filius (William Rufus):

El tems d’aquest Rei issi sancs bulhens dun estanc. Aquest Rei moric pel cop d’una sageta
deuand lo pobol, coma maluas Rei que el era (L', f. 44vc, 57-9; transcription by Ibarz).

(In the time of this king, boiling blood issued from a lake. This king died from the blow of
an arrow, in front of the people, like the wicked king that he was.)

This is a truncated version of the story that William Rufus (whose alleged crimes encompass
gnawing on a crucifix) ignored many portents of his death, including a fountain in Berkshire
that emitted blood for fifteen days; this story is included in one of the rolls transcribed by

52 The note for Henry I only states that he died in Normandy.
53 My thanks to Marigold Norbye for clarifying this point. See Marvin, p. 236 (Harold swears to marry William’s
sister), and de Laborderie, “‘Ligne de reis’”, 6e partie, p. 156, and 7e partie, pp. 27-8.
de Laborderie. However, there is no support for the statement that William Rufus was shot ‘in front of his people’. Quite the contrary, several king lists provide plentiful detail about his murder in the New Forest by Walter Tirel. Some include an image of William Rufus being shot by an arrow – we may therefore be dealing with a misinterpreted illustration. One such example from the reign of Edward II (not a roll but a codex, Royal MS 20 A. II) depicts William Rufus crowned and enthroned, his chest pierced by an arrow, and makes him the distant successor to King Constans of Britain, who is also shown enthroned and crowned as a man stabs him with a sword. This illustrated genealogy was extended with a poem that is known as the ‘Lament of Edward II’ (f. 10rv). Combined with the statement that the present kings of England are descendants of Harold Godwinson, it is likely that the *Abreujamen* is discrediting the lineage of Edward I and Edward II. French historians of the later Middle Ages would comment on the murders and usurpations that characterized the English monarch lists. It may be that this text, pre-dating the fall of Edward II and written a century before that of Richard II, anticipates that view.

Certainly the manuscript loses interest in the successors of William Rufus. On f. 49v, the lines of the kings of England have only been partly inked in red, and two kings have been erased: the second erased space preserves the outline of a crown and the black ink of the name Henricus filius (Henry the son), who must be Henry I, inserted mistakenly as the son rather than the brother of William Rufus. The next English king (f. 50v) is a beardless ‘Stephanus eius nepos’ (Stephen, his nephew), with no accompanying note, meaning that the Anarchy is not included, and the monarch list remains unbroken. The king list resumes with ‘Henry, the grandson of Henry from the daughter’ (Henry II Plantagenet) (f. 53r). He faces the king of Sicily, William (1155-1189), and a note between them states ingloriously that William took to wife the daughter of the king of England and had no children by her. The story is true in part: Henry II’s daughter Joan married William II of Sicily in 1177. Their own son, Bohemond (born in 1181) did not survive infancy. She subsequently married Count Raymond VI of Toulouse in 1196 and was the mother of Raymond VII, the last Raymondine count of Toulouse. The omission of the Plantagenet connection for Counts Raymond VI and VII in a manuscript that was produced for Occitan-speaking readers is interesting, and it draws attention to the fact that the counts of Toulouse are almost absent from the *Abreujamen*. Above all, the note shows that the Plantagenets are depicted only in terms of their failure to be of any use to the kingdom of Sicily, a title that was claimed by the family of Robert of Anjou.

The Plantagenet kings of England, offshoots of the twelfth-century Counts of Anjou, are downplayed by the French (Capetian) house of Anjou. There is a further hint of competitiveness in the fact that Richardus filius (Richard I Lionheart) is given no biographical

---


55 Royal MS 20 A. II, ff. 6r, 2r, 10rv (c. 1307-1327). The manuscript is available online: [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal_MS_20_A_II&index=22](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Royal_MS_20_A_II&index=22). For the story of Constans, see Geoffrey of Monmouth, *HRB*, VI. 94-96.


57 Probably John and his son Henry III, copied by accident and subsequently erased. They appear in their proper place on f. 53v. The kings have also been removed to make space for the lineage of Roger II of Sicily.

note, along with John frater and Henricus filius (Henry III) (f. 53v). Although the Plantagenet kings were not household names for some of the chroniclers of this time (the Petit Bruit is confused about them), the Anglo-Norman genealogical rolls devote a lengthy biographical note to the crusading and other exploits of Richard I Lionheart and a short and damning narrative to John.

Fig. 8. Eg. MS. 1500, f. 56v (detail). Edward I is in the third column from the left. A niche has been erased at the top of the column.

59 In Petit Bruit, pp. 19-22, Stephen is described as the son of Henry I; Henry II appears twice (once as the son of Stephen). Stephen’s reign is peaceful and Matilda is omitted. Rauf de Boun wrote for a prominent member of the court of Edward I but he appears to know almost nothing about the predecessors of Henry III. Yet contemporaries were aware of the Anarchy: see Fisher, ‘Genealogy Rewritten’, p. 134.
On f. 56v, Edwardus filius (Edward I) appears without a note, as an old man with a long white beard. A niche has been erased at the top of the column, possibly meant to depict him; the head has been moved down, possibly simply to fit his accession date of 1270 (fig. 8). On f. 57r, the head of Edward II has also been erased. A ghostly niche inked in red is all that can be made out on this folio, which flanks the large space that was accorded to the eleven children of Charles II of Anjou. Was he removed to make way yet again for the Neapolitan Angevins? Far from it. On folio 59v, Edward II appears along with Charles I of Anjou, King of Hungary, and the rulers of Cyprus and Armenia, as a reigning monarch. The head is by the same artist who added the kings of Hungary, but drawn at a slightly earlier, less rushed, stage of the illustration campaign. The rubric beneath his head reads ‘Odoardus filius regnat’ (Edward the son, reigns). The use of Edward II in preference to the king of France or the Holy Roman Emperor to mark the end-point of the world history is all the more intriguing because it is at odds with the nuanced, even hostile, treatment of the post-conquest kings of England.

Conclusion

The king list of England constructs ‘the island’ as an isolated unit with only the flimsiest connection with mainland Europe, no crusading history worth mentioning, and little to no part to play in the major political events of the day. Its pre-Heptarchy kings are the rulers also of Ireland. The use of a genealogical roll for the post-Heptarchy catalogue possibly reflects the absence of other sources. However, the fact that someone was able to transcribe some toponyms in correct English into M gives the lie to the idea that Paolino and his team had no contact with anyone who could provide oral report for England. The roll was used for the pre-Conquest and Conquest period, but it was set aside after the death of William Rufus, in all probability because of a bias against the Plantagenet kings that took the form of downplaying the reigns of his successors. The omission of Margaret of Scotland robs the English regnal line of its claims against the Bruces but it also compounds the absence of Scotland from the world history. Despite the inclusion of statements that could support English rule over Ireland, and that are easily ascribable to Philip of Slane, there are no grounds for assuming that the text itself was designed with Ireland in mind.

Is it possible, therefore, to suggest an intended reader for the Abreujamen? The internal evidence points overwhelmingly to a member of the immediate family of King Robert of Anjou, King of Naples, Count of Provence, and titular king of Sicily and Jerusalem. Not only are his political and dynastic interests stressed (the most noteworthy of these, for the compilers, was the throne of Hungary), but the rival lineage of Aragon is downplayed. The Abreujamen is written in Occitan, a language that was spoken and written in Provence, and L–L’ was created in the region of Avignon. However, there is no evidence that the Neapolitan Angevins commissioned Occitan-language texts. The Abreujamen omits the counts of Toulouse despite drawing on Bernard Gui’s chronicles, which included a catalogue of their reigns. It is therefore unlikely that the city of Toulouse, which had no leading aristocratic court at this time, was involved. The text shows no interest in Gascony, which would exclude the southern regions of Aquitaine as much as the lands ruled by the counts of Foix and of Béarn.

What remain are the Occitan-speaking regions that were ruled by the kings of England: Aquitaine, Agenais, Quercy and Guyenne. The Quercy entourage of John XXII should have been well-disposed towards the king of England in his capacity as Duke of Guyenne, but the problematic position of Edward II in the mid-1320s, as well as his conflict with the king of France, may have weakened existing loyalties. In the twelfth century, the Quercy was disputed between the kings of
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60 My thanks to Federico Botana for clarifying this point.
61 The remaining two folios show the head of Pope Clement V, who died in 1314 (f. 60r), and Emperor Henry VII, who died in 1313 (f. 60v).
62 See n. 18.
63 See my ‘The Italian Angevins’.
England as dukes of Aquitaine and the counts of Toulouse. It was held by the counts of Toulouse from 1196 until the absorption of the comital territories into the French crown in 1279. It would not be held by the kings of England until the treaty of Bretigny in 1360. The area bordering on Gascony around the Agenais, the Limousin and the Quercy was in dispute between England and France for much of the later thirteenth century, but most of the local lay and ecclesiastical lords seem to have privileged their relationship with the king of France.\(^{64}\) This, then, would appear to be the most likely profile for the intended readership of the English material in the \textit{Abreujamen}.

The most receptive readers for such a king list would be members of an Occitan-speaking court with anti-English, pro-French interests, that was linked by marriage to the family of Robert of Naples. Alexander Ibarz has suggested that a possible patron or reader for \(L^1-L^2\) could be the young prelate Elias Talleyrand de Périgord.\(^{65}\) The most prominent secular figure in this milieu that had a marital connection with Robert of Naples would be his sister Agnes of Périgord, who married King Robert’s brother John of Gravina on 14 November 1321. Their father Count Elias Talleyrand VII of Périgord (1295- c. 1311) had been loyal to the king of France. Despite King Edward II’s confirmation of his territories on 4 June 1325, their brother Count Archambaud IV (reigned 1311-1336) sided with France against the English, as would his brother and successor Roger-Bernard (1336– c. 1368).\(^{66}\) Their mother Brunissende de Foix was the daughter of Count Roger Bernard III of Foix and Marguerite of Béarn. The English kings always had a tense relationship with the viscounts of Béarn. John of Gravina has no known connexion with England, but he is named on the last folio of the \textit{Abreujamen} as the hero of the war against the Emperor Henry VII.\(^{67}\) Another Périgord sister had married one of John XXII’s great-nephews in 1319.\(^{68}\) Agnes’s three sons were born too late to be credible candidates for the ‘vos senher’ annotations of \(L^1-L^2\) (they would have been infants in the late 1320s and although these notes are marginalia, they were added close to the manuscript’s creation). As Ibarz has suggested, her brother Elias Talleyrand de Périgord might have owned the manuscript. The Périgord family may thus create a bridge between the secular genealogy, the Occitan language and the complex political and dynastic interests of an Angevin and papal entourage that took a dim view of the English royal presence on the Continent.

Appendix: The kings of Britain and England in Eg. MS. 1500 (\(L^1\)).

The king list of Britain up to the Heptarchy is sometimes inaccurate. It may be drawn from some of the genealogical rolls that start with Brutus, but some of the notes that accompany the kings appear to be taken directly from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s \textit{Historia Regum Britanniae}, which enjoyed some success in Northern Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Confused sections such as f. 32v and 33v (see below) make it unlikely that the source was a coherent metrical epitome such as the \textit{Gesta Regum Brittaniae}.\(^{69}\) I have left the name unchanged where I am hesitant to identify a given name with its known equivalent.

\(^{64}\) My thanks to Tony Moore for this information; see also Claire Taylor, \textit{Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy} (Rochester, NY, 2011), pp. 46-51, 65, 73-4.

\(^{65}\) Ibarz, pp. 5–6.


\(^{67}\) The Vatican manuscript also has a connection with John of Gravina (MS. Vat. Lat. 1606, f. 12v).

\(^{68}\) De Saint-Allais, p. 35.

A Genealogy of the Kings of England in Papal Avignon: British Library, Egerton MS. 1500

f. 8v: *Kings of the Romans*. Brutus ‘a quo Britania’, son or successor to Silvius, king of Italy and the Latins.


f. 18r: Kymbelinus, filius Tenvatii (the son of Tenvantius). His successor is his brother ‘Aristagus’.

f. 18v: an empty column marked *Kings of Britain*.

f. 20r: Marius filius.

f. 20v: Coilus filius.

f. 21v: Lucius filius.

f. 22v: Sulgentius (Sulgenius).

f. 23v: Bastanus filius eius.

f. 24v: Cauranus, Asclepiodecetus dux (Asclepiodotus), Coel dux, Constantius Imperator (Constantius Chlorus), Constantius filius eius (his son, the Emperor Constantine). (The kings coincide with the reign of the Emperor Diocletian; there is no link between the two columns).

f. 25v: Octauius. The reges britanie i.e. anglie (Kings of Britain, i.e. England), are in the time of the Emperor Constantine.

f. 26v: The column is present but empty.

f. 27v: Maximianus, Gratianus munceps.71

f. 28v: Constantinus, Constans, Vortigirnus (Vortigern), Vortimerius (Vortimer), Vortiginitius, Aurelius Ambrosius.

Note: A portent foretells his rule over France and Ireland.

Note C on the facing folio, f. 29r, explains that it predicts the advent of Uther Pendragon. Arthur is destined to reign over France, and the descendants, male and female, of Arthur’s sister will reign over Ireland.72

f. 29v: Uther Pendragon and Arthur.

f. 30v: ‘Constantinus cognatus’, he kills the two sons of Modret in battle.73

f. 31v: Aurelianus Conanus nepos (Aurelius Conanus), Malgo, who conquers Ireland as well as other countries.74

f. 32v: Carecius amator (Careticus),75 the co-rulers Caduanus (Cadwan) and Heldifridus. Heldifridus’s son Hetelfridus (Ethelfrid) faces his cousin Cadulus (Cadwallon), the son of Cadwan. Ethelfrid’s son Osricus (presumably Osric) succeeds and the line becomes a single line once more.76 On the facing folio, f. 33r, three notes give details about the reigns and the conflict with the Saxons.

70 Compare Marvin, p. 150. Arthur shall rule over France. Arthur’s sister shall rule over Ireland and shall have seven sons, each of them a king.

71 ‘Constantino cognato suo. & filio cadoris ducis cornubie diadema britannie concessit,’ HRB, XI. 178. 83–84.

72 The note concerning Malgo reads ‘This Malgo obtained Hibernia, Gorlardia, the Orcades [Orkneys], Norway, Dacia [Denmark] and the islands’. The text draws on Geoffrey: ‘Hic totam Britanniam sibi subiugauit; adiacentes quoque insulas, Hyberniam uidelicet atque Hyslandiam, Gothlandiam, Orcades, necnon Norwegiam et Daciam, durissimis preliis sue potestati adiecit’, HRBV 1, 11.183, ed. Neil Wright, p.176.

73 ‘Cui successit Kareticus amator ciuilium bellorum,’ HRB, XI. 184. Carecius amator is not an epithet, but rather a description of him as ‘fond of war’.

74 A conflation of events narrated in HRB and HRBV1 books XI–XII, but omitting Gormondus’s invasion and the conversion of England.

75 HRR, III. 53.

76 The column between the British and French kings contains a condensed summary of the ‘red and white dragon’ episode, see HRB, VII (Prophecies of Merlin). 5.
f. 33v: Osualdus (Oswald), Haly, *i.e. rex anglie*, Telmi, Corobaldus filius, Cantibertus filius, Egbertus filius, Iocheire filius. A red line of succession to the left of Oswald contains a smaller head of Cadwallader, son of Cadwallon, king of England.\(^{77}\)


f. 34v: Edrut and Uigred, filius Egberti.

f. 35v: Heldebrectus (possibly Æthelberht of Wessex).


ff. 38v: Adheulfus (Ethelwulf) ‘first king of the English people’, Elfred frater junior (Alfred the Great, his younger brother); both have notes appended.\(^{78}\)

f. 39v: Eaduardus filius (Edward the Elder, son).

f. 40v: Ethelstanus (Æthelstan).

f. 41v: Edamondus frater (Edmund, brother); Edredus frater (Edred, brother); Eduinus filius Edamondi (Edwy, son of Edmund); Edgarus frater (Edgar, brother); Euanardus filius (Edward the Martyr, son); Edredus frater (Etheldred Unread, brother).

f. 42v: Edmundus (Edmund Ironside) and Cnutus (Cnut). The column of the *reges anglie* has not been inked.

f. 43v: Ardecnotus filius (Hardecnut, son), Edwardus Senior filius (Edward the Confessor, son).


f. 44v: Ernoldus nepos (Harold Godwinson, nephew), Guillelmos I, Guillelmos filius (William II), Henricus frater (Henry I). [A break in the columns for a history of the crusades, ff. 44v–49r.]

f. 49v: The column of the kings of England has only been partly inked, and two kings have been erased. The name Henricus filius can still be made out for the second king. The other missing king may therefore be John, and the column may be a mistaken version of that on f. 53v.

f. 50v: ‘Stephanus eius nepos’ (Stephen, nephew or grandson of Henry I).

f. 51v: An excised miniature immediately below the columns of France and England.

f. 53r: Henricus nepos Henrici ex filia (Henry II, maternal grandson of Henry I), Ricardus filius (Richard I).

f. 53v: Johannes frater (John, brother), Henricus filius (Henry III, son).

f. 56v: Odoardus filius (Edward I, son).

f. 57v: erased niche inked in red, probably intended for the head of Edward II.

f. 59v: Odoardus filius regnat (Edward II, son, reigns).

\(^{77}\) *HRB*, XII, for Oswald, Cadwallo, and Cadwallader.

\(^{78}\) Æthelred of Wessex is missed out, as, below, is Harald Harefoot.