Beyond Private Matter: A Prayer Roll for Queen Margaret of Anjou

Author(s): Sonja Drimmer

Source: *Gesta*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (2014), pp. 95-120

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#) on behalf of the [International Center of Medieval Art](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/675419>

Accessed: 30/04/2014 13:04

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The University of Chicago Press and International Center of Medieval Art are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Gesta.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Beyond Private Matter: A Prayer Roll for Queen Margaret of Anjou

SONJA DRIMMER *University of Massachusetts Amherst*

Abstract

A prayer roll made for Margaret of Anjou (1430–1482), queen consort to Henry VI of England, has received little attention despite its production for a queen Shakespeare called the “she-wolf of France.” Previous descriptions have characterized the roll as a conventional display of female piety and evidence of Margaret’s devotion to the Virgin Mary. However, closer attention reveals that, far from being conventional, the roll is an anomalous object on a number of counts. It is the only known illuminated roll devoted to the Virgin; its specific representation of the Virgin and Child is unprecedented; it contains none of the typical instructions to the devotee to place the roll close to the body; and it is nearly twice as wide as the average prayer roll. This article revises our understanding of the Margaret of Anjou roll by comparing it to a range of material beyond the intimate devotional objects to which it has been related previously. Consideration of the historical circumstances of Margaret’s arrival in England, records describing a ceremonial pageant that honored her, and objects associated with her highlights the political stakes attendant on Margaret’s assimilation of a Marian exemplar. Embodying features of the genealogical rolls disseminated in support of her husband, the Margaret of Anjou roll asserts a Marian genealogy for the queen tantamount to the monarchic lineages that legitimized her husband. By intertwining both Marian and genealogic discourse, the roll articulates how Margaret of Anjou was integral to the welfare of England.

A roll of devotions to the Virgin Mary now housed in the Bodleian Library (Jesus College, MS 124) offers a familiar portrayal of late medieval queenship (Fig. 1). Toward the top of the roll, a sumptuously dressed woman kneels before a prie-dieu that supports an open book. On the book rests a scepter that identifies the devotee as a queen, as does the crown on her head. Precisely which queen is specified in the escutcheon supported by two angels to the right, which enframes the arms of Margaret of Anjou (d. 1482) impaled with those of her husband, King Henry VI of England (d. 1471), whom she married in 1445.¹ Reddish blond hair cascades down the queen’s back, golden chains drape her neck, and numerous rings encrust her fingers. Despite this worldly magnificence, the queen gazes heavenward at the depiction of the Virgin and Child above. Set within the axle of a rota, the Virgin appears as the queen’s double, with flaxen tresses flowing from beneath her crown, a placid and unindividuated face, and a regal mantle. Queenship is figured here as a conventionally Marian enterprise, with the Virgin as the maternal lodestar that Margaret, like her royal predecessors and counterparts, was expected to pursue. However, the Margaret of Anjou roll is in no sense a conventional devotional object.

This paper offers an analysis of the Margaret of Anjou roll that accords special attention to the roll’s material and

I am deeply grateful to Kathryn Smith for her constructive and erudite readings of this article. I thank, also, the anonymous reader, as well as Linda Safran and Adam S. Cohen, for their insights and constructive feedback. My interest in the Margaret of Anjou roll originated in research I carried out for the British Library exhibition “Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination,” and I thank the American Trust for the British Library for funding my position as a predoctoral curatorial intern. While at the British Library I benefited from the advice, encouragement, and guidance of Scot McKendrick, Kathleen Doyle, Claire Breay, Julian Harrison, Deirdre Jackson, and Sarah Biggs. A grant from the Association for Manuscripts and Archives in Research Collections (AMARC) provided funds for the purchase of reproductions. I would also like to thank Alixe Bovey, Daniel DiCenso, and Anna Zayaruznaya, as well as the Early Book Society, at whose biennial conference in 2011 I presented a preliminary version of this paper. Finally, I extend my gratitude to Charley McNamara for his editorial work on my transcription of the roll.

1. Margaret of Anjou has been the subject of several biographies, all of which have been critically assessed and revised in Helen E. Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou: Queenship and Power in Late Medieval England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003). For the most thorough biography of Henry VI, see Ralph Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422–1461* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

Gesta v.53n1 (Spring 2014).

0031-8248/2010/7703-0004 \$10.00. Copyright 2014 by the International Center of Medieval Art. All rights reserved.

Figure 1. Margaret of Anjou prayer roll, Oxford, Jesus College, MS 124, on deposit in the Bodleian Library, detail of Margaret of Anjou kneeling beneath a rota with the Virgin and Child, ca. 1445–55 (photo: The Principal and Fellows of Jesus College, Oxford).

performative qualities. Earlier descriptions of the roll have characterized it as a typical expression of female piety that reflects Margaret of Anjou's personal devotion to the Virgin.² Beyond this assessment, the roll has never been the subject of extended consideration, possibly because, as an ostensible prayer roll, it is considered a known entity, lacking the requisite enigmas that move scholars to the critical act. Yet the roll is a rare object on a number of counts, including its noticeably large width, its depiction of a queen of England,³ and its dedication to the Virgin. In recent years, as art history has taken an increasingly material turn, scholars who have addressed the physicality and presence of works of art have found that older interpretations require reevaluation, and objects of seemingly little interest offer intriguing possibilities for assessment.⁴ The Margaret of Anjou roll affords one such

opportunity, through which we stand to gain insights into the participation of objects in formulating ideals of queenship in the later Middle Ages.

As Madeline Caviness, Joan Holladay, Anne Rudloff Stanton, and others have argued, objects made for medieval queens are far from typical aids to female instruction and piety. Rather, they demand analysis from a perspective that is sensitive to the exceptionality of their intended viewers.⁵ What a study of the Margaret of Anjou roll adds to our understanding is that objects produced for the queen's gaze extended beyond the private to participate in the public and political discourse that articulated a queen consort's role within her husband's regime. We can only begin to gauge the nature of this participation by attending closely to the physical properties of this object, its material mediation, and its performative valence

2. Diana Dunn remarks of this roll and another image of Margaret of Anjou that, "at one level these images may be regarded as no more than conventional representations of piety and learning but even so they are neglected by historians who prefer to focus on evidence of Margaret's less womanly conduct." Dunn, "Margaret of Anjou, Queen Consort of Henry VI: A Reassessment of her Role, 1445–53," in *Crown, Government and People in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Rowena Archer (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 107–43, at 112. Joanna L. Laynesmith refers to the roll as "an exquisite prayer roll to the Virgin," which she includes among a list of deeds and objects that attest to Margaret's Marian devotion. See Laynesmith, "Constructing Queenship at Coventry: Pageantry and Politics at Margaret of Anjou's 'Secret Harbour,'" in *The Fifteenth Century III: Authority and Subversion*, ed. Linda Clark (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 137–47, at 143. And Elizabeth Danbury writes, "In a Flemish book of hours probably made for her, Anne of Bohemia is portrayed at prayer before the Virgin Mary . . . while in a roll containing a hymn and prayers to the Virgin, Margaret of Anjou appears kneeling in worship . . . These images again underline both queens' personal devotion to the Virgin Mary, the model for all queens—as for all women." Danbury, "Images of English Queens in the Later Middle Ages," *Historian* 46 (1995): 3–9, at 8.

3. As Kathleen Scott has pointed out, depictions of late medieval English queens in manuscript illustration are rare: Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts, 1390–1490* (London: Harvey Miller, 1996), 2:343. The other extant representations of Margaret of Anjou appear in the Talbot Shrewsbury book (London, British Library, MS Royal 15 E vi, fol. 2v); Skinners' Company, London, Book of the Fraternity of Our Lady's Assumption (London, Metropolitan Archives, Guildhall, MS 31692, fol. 34v); and a portrait medal by Pietro da Milano (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, A.182-1910). On the portrait medal, see Frederick Hepburn, "The Queen in Exile: Representing Margaret of Anjou in Art and Literature," in *The Fifteenth Century XI: Concerns and Preoccupations*, ed. Linda Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2012), 61–90.

4. A great deal of research has been devoted to the dependence of twentieth-century art historical practice on photography and the advancement of reproductions-dependent methodologies by Heinrich Wölfflin and Erwin Panofsky. The first full-length historiographic study to approach this practice critically, and which remains a seminal work, is Michael Ann Holly, *Panofsky and the*

Foundations of Art History (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1984). More recently, Marilyn Desmond and Pamela Sheingorn put the point acutely when they remarked, "Panofsky used photographs to juxtapose objects in a way that emphasizes their similarity in composition and content while erasing their difference in size and medium, and he subjects to one disciplinary view artifacts that in their original contexts were shaped for distinctly different kinds of viewing." Desmond and Sheingorn, *Myth, Montage, and Visuality in Late Medieval Manuscript Culture: Christine de Pisan's 'Epistre Othea'* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), 38. See also Barbara E. Savedoff, "Looking at Art through Photographs," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51, no. 3 (1993): 455–62; and the splendid discussion of the misalignment between material culture and art historical practice in Michael Yonan, "Toward a Fusion of Art History and Material Culture Studies," *West 86th: A Journal of Decorative Arts, Design History, and Material Culture* 18, no. 2 (2011): 232–48. Yonan makes the provocative point (240) that "art history has tricked itself into believing that it is a discipline of images, when really it has always been a discipline of objects."

5. See Madeline H. Caviness, "Patron or Matron? A Capetian Bride and a Vade Mecum for her Marriage Bed," *Speculum* 68, no. 2 (1993): 333–62; eadem, "Anchoress, Abbess, and Queen: Donor and Patrons or Intercessors and Matrons?" in *The Cultural Patronage of Medieval Women*, ed. June Hall McCash (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996), 105–54, esp. 133–43; Joan A. Holladay, "The Education of Jeanne d'Evreux: Personal Piety and Dynastic Salvation in her Book of Hours at the Cloisters," *Art History* 17, no. 4 (1994): 585–611; Anne Rudloff Stanton, "The Psalter of Isabelle, Queen of England, 1308–1330: Isabelle as the Audience," *Word & Image* 18, no. 4 (2002): 1–27; Sylvia Huot, "A Book Made for a Queen: The Shaping of a Late Medieval Anthology Manuscript (B.N. fr. 24429)," in *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*, ed. Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 123–43; Barbara Zeitler, "The Distorting Mirror: Reflections on the Queen Melisende Psalter," in *Through the Looking Glass: Byzantium through British Eyes*, ed. Robin Cormack and Elizabeth Jeffreys (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 69–83; and Kathleen S. Schowalter, "The Ingeborg Psalter: Queenship, Legitimacy, and the Appropriation of Byzantine Art in the West," in *Capetian Women*, ed. Kathleen Nolan (New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2003), 99–135.

within contemporary idioms of queenship. An account that is receptive to these features leads to the conclusion that the roll did not operate on an exclusively private or devotional plane. What emerges, instead, is an object that co-opts conventional languages of pious expression for the purposes of issuing a specific, timely, and public statement about Queen Margaret's integrality to the welfare of England.

Margaret of Anjou as Queen Consort: Ideals and Expectations

While queenship in the Middle Ages was often expressed in Marian terms, Margaret of Anjou presents a case in which the queen's assimilation of this eternal ideal was promoted explicitly and frequently as the remedy to two contemporary crises: first, the uncertain future of the Lancastrian house, which had no legitimate successor to Henry VI; and second, the Hundred Years' War, which the English had been losing steadily since the death of Henry V in 1422. Margaret's ties to some of Europe's most significant ruling families promised a solution to each of these dilemmas. Of her early life, relatively little is known.⁶ She was born on 23 March 1430, the daughter of René of Anjou (1409–1480) and Isabella of Lorraine (1400–1453) and the niece of Charles VII of France. Much of Margaret's youth was spent under the care of her mother and her paternal grandmother, Yolande of Aragon (d. 1442), women who had ruled in their respective husbands' and sons' absences and who acquired reputations for independence and administrative acumen. Her entrée into politics came at the age of nine, when she became the subject of numerous marriage negotiations. Despite a negligible dowry and empty titles to lands over which her father had utterly no control, Margaret was a strategic choice for the English in their pursuit of a conclusion to the Hundred Years' War, and she was betrothed to Henry VI in 1444.

The marriage of Margaret to Henry VI in the following year was therefore exceptional for the symbolic freight it supported and for the formidable promises it was expected to fulfill.⁷ While it was entirely typical for a royal marriage to represent and effect political alliances, Margaret's marriage to Henry VI shouldered the added onus of symbolizing the anticipated conclusion to a long-standing war; and while it was a queen's duty to produce an heir to the throne, Margaret's nubility was the single coefficient capable of perpetuating an

entire royal house.⁸ An exuberant letter to Margaret from Cecily Neville, wife of Richard, duke of York, gives vivid language to the hopes pinned on Margaret's pregnancy in 1453. Sending her best wishes, Cecily prays for the "noble fruit of your said body, for the greete trust and most comfortable surety and wele of this realme and of the kynge's true leige people of the same."⁹ What is important for the present purposes is that immediate and desperately desired political ramifications attended Margaret's ability to carry out her main function as consort. Via the lineage from which she descended and the lineage she would extend, Margaret was to be a guarantor of both national stability and international quietude.

Recent biographies have tended to parse the queen's life in two parts, one on either side of significant events that occurred in 1453. Margaret gave birth to a long-awaited son in the same year that the war reached its disastrous conclusion for the English, with the loss of all territories in France except Calais. Exacerbating the tension of this period was Henry VI's mental collapse between August 1453 and December 1454, which—depending on one's point of view—necessitated or provided an opportune alibi for the queen's growing political involvement.¹⁰ Whatever the actual dynamics or motives, Queen Margaret began in this period to defend vigorously her husband's and, by extension, her son's place on the throne from challenges and eventually military attacks by Richard, duke of York, and his growing faction. Her public visibility and involvement in political affairs progressively increased in the years leading up to Henry's deposition in 1461, during their exile and his brief reaccession at the end of 1470, and finally at his death six months later.¹¹ It is this period that earned her Shakespeare's moniker—the "she-wolf of France" with a "tiger's heart wrapt in woman's hide"¹²—and the repu-

8. Griffiths, *Reign of King Henry VI*, 255. On the criteria for choosing queens in late medieval England, see Joanna L. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship, 1445–1503* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 28–71.

9. Carole Rawcliffe, "Richard, Duke of York, the King's 'obesant liegeman': A New Source for the Protectorates of 1454 and 1455," *Historical Research* 60, no. 142 (1987): 232–39, at 237.

10. For a summary of various perspectives on Margaret's political interventions and entanglements during these years, see Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 77–111. As Maurer has it, Henry's incapacity simply disrupted the fiction that Margaret had been acting on behalf of her husband all along.

11. On these years, see Griffiths, *Reign of King Henry VI*, 715–895; and Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 127–211. Rosemarie McGerr adds some important information regarding the juridical measures taken by Margaret to protect her son's inheritance: McGerr, *A Lancastrian Mirror for Princes: The Yale Law School New Statutes of England* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011), 91–99.

12. *Henry VI*, part 3, act 1, scene 4, lines 111 and 138. See Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 28–32.

6. The most extensive recent discussion of Margaret's early life can be found in Margaret L. Kekewich, *The Good King: René of Anjou and Fifteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

7. Maurer explores these expectations in *Margaret of Anjou*, 17–48.

tation by which she is most famously known. As a result, a debate that has for years monopolized accounts of Margaret's life considers the extent to which her actions during the early part of her reign as consort prefigured her political interventions and ambitions in the latter part.¹³ My concern here, however, is not with Margaret's actions and character but, rather, with contemporary notions as to her role within the king's regime and how these notions were expressed in objects associated with the queen. More broadly, I am suggesting that the object under investigation emerged from an overdetermined matrix of perception and expectation and was likewise informed by a range of objects, events, and performances in which such perceptions and expectations found expression. As we shall see, the Margaret of Anjou roll is a devotional object modeled on the personal prayer rolls that were produced in mid-fifteenth-century England, but it is in so many ways discrepant with this corpus—not least in its production for so exceptional a figure (i.e., a queen)—that it resists simple categorization as an object of female devotion.

The Margaret of Anjou Roll

Consideration of the Margaret of Anjou roll reveals that, beyond the familiar contours of a devotional roll, it bears numerous anomalies in its illumination, facture, and textual contents—anomalies that all but rule out its function as a private devotional object.¹⁴ The precise circumstances of the roll's commission are unknown, but attestation to its connection with Margaret of Anjou appears on the roll's dorse: a note written in 1681 by Anthony Wood, secretary to the antiquar-

13. Earlier biographers did indeed see Margaret's aggression (or capacity for it) in these early years; see Mary Ann Hookham, *Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou*. . . (London: Tinsley, 1872), 1:279–321; and J. J. Bagley, *Margaret of Anjou: Queen of England* (London: Jenkins, 1948). More recently, revisionist accounts argue that between 1445 and 1453 Margaret acted according to the expectations of good ladyship to which she, as a queen, would have been held. See Dunn, "Margaret of Anjou, Queen Consort of Henry VI"; and Patricia-Ann Lee, "Reflections of Power: Margaret of Anjou and the Dark Side of Queenship," *Renaissance Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (1986): 183–217, at 183–91. In yet another revision, Kekewich (*Good King*, 111–12) perceives Margaret to have been a canny political advocate for her Valois family, who actively pursued its interests during the peace negotiations of 1445.

14. The roll is described in the following: Daniel Rock, *The Church of our Fathers, as Seen in St. Osmund's Rite for the Cathedral of Salisbury*. . . (London: John Murray, 1849), vol. 3, pt. 1, 312–14; Jonathan J. G. Alexander and Elzbieta Temple, *Illuminated Manuscripts in Oxford College Libraries, the University Archives, and the Taylor Institution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), no. 564; and Scot McKendrick, John Lowden, and Kathleen Doyle, eds., *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination* (London: British Library, 2011), cat. no. 31.

ian Ralph Sheldon. It states, "the picture within drawne was made for Margaret of Anjou, wife of Hen 6 of England, as it appeares by the arms joyning to it // 1681 Abosco."¹⁵ Further, the bookscript and the pictorial illumination localize the production of the roll to London about 1445–55, sometime within the decade following Margaret's arrival in England and marriage to Henry VI in 1445. The style of the illumination indicates that the roll was executed by an associate of or by William Abell (d. ca. 1474) himself, a figure who, among numerous other works, illuminated a genealogy of Henry VI as well as the charters for Eton College (1440) and King's College, Cambridge (1446).¹⁶ The charters are particularly reminiscent of the Margaret of Anjou roll in their representation of the monarch kneeling below the Virgin of the Assumption (Fig. 2).¹⁷ In terms of its personnel, geography, and date, then, the roll emerged from an artistic milieu closely linked with the court and from what we know to have been the place and time period marking the zenith of prayer rolls' production.¹⁸

15. Sheldon is the only known owner of the roll before its bequest to Jesus College. See I. G. Philip, "Sheldon Manuscripts in Jesus College Library," *Bodleian Library Record* 1 (1939): 119–23, at 122.

16. For a complete list of works attributed to Abell and a later revision of this list, see Jonathan J. G. Alexander, "William Abell 'lymnour' and 15th Century English Illumination," in *Kunsthistorische Forschungen: Otto Pächt zu seinem 70 Geburtstag*, ed. Artur Rosenauer and Gerold Weber (Salzburg: Residenz, 1972), 166–72; and Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts*, 2: no. 94. For more on Abell, see Helen Combes, "William Abell: Parishioner, Churchwarden, Limnour, Stationer in the Parish of St. Nicholas Shambles in the City of London," *Ricardian* 12, no. 150 (2000): 120–32. The Eton College Charter is ECR 39/57.

17. Cambridge, King's College Archives, KC/18. On this charter (Fig. 2), see Richard Marks and Paul Williamson, eds., *Gothic: Art for England, 1400–1547* (London: V&A, 2003), cat. no. 20. See also *ibid.*, cat. no. 348. On the illumination of charters, see Elizabeth Danbury, "The Decoration and Illumination of Royal Charters in England, 1250–1509: An Introduction," in *England and her Neighbours, 1066–1453: Essays in Honour of Pierre Chaplais*, ed. Michael Jones and Malcolm Vale (London: Hambledon Press, 1989), 157–79.

18. The most comprehensive study of prayer rolls can be found in Don C. Skemer, *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 235–79. See also Curt F. Bühler, "A Middle English Prayer Roll," *Modern Language Notes* 52 (1937): 555–62; Rossell Hope Robbins, "The 'Arma Christi' Rolls," *Modern Language Review* 34, no. 3 (1939): 415–21; Curt F. Bühler, "Prayers and Charms in Certain Middle English Scrolls," *Speculum* 39, no. 2 (1964): 270–78; Hellmut Rosenfeld, "Die Münchner Gebetsrolle Clm 28 961: zur Buch- und Frömmigkeitsgeschichte des 15. Jahrhunderts," *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 51 (1976): 48–56; Jeanne Krochalis, "God and Mammon: Prayers and Rents in Princeton MS. 126," *Princeton University Library Chronicle* 44 (1983): 209–21; Don C. Skemer, "Amulet Rolls and Female Devotion in the Late Middle Ages," *Scriptorium* 55, no. 2 (2001): 197–227; W. C. M. Wüstefeld, "A Remarkable Prayer Roll, Attributed to the Master of Sir John Fastolf (Rouen, c. 1440, Museum

The origins of the twenty-five surviving examples¹⁹ demonstrate that prayer rolls appear to have been a specifically English devotional aid produced in the late fourteenth and throughout the fifteenth century; several extant examples

Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, MS ABM h4a),” *Quaerendo* 33, nos. 1–2 (2003): 233–46; and Hugo van der Velden, “A Prayer Roll of Henry Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick,” in *Tributes in Honor of James Marrow: Studies in Painting and Manuscript Illumination of the Late Middle Ages and Northern Renaissance*, ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne Korteweg (London: Harvey Miller, 2006), 521–49.

19. Illuminated rolls that contain devotional material have previously been numbered at sixteen; in addition, there are five archival references for rolls now lost. See Hans-Walter Stork, “Realienkundliches auf den Tafelbildern des Conrad von Soest, oder: was auf den Bildern zu lesen ist,” in *Conrad von Soest: neue Forschungen über den Maler und die Kulturgeschichte der Zeit um 1400*, ed. Brigitte Buberl (Gütersloh: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2004), 166–94. Stork does not cite the shelfmarks for the sixteen rolls he has located, so it is not possible to know whether our lists correspond. My count brings the number of extant rolls up to twenty-five, the shelfmarks of which are as follows: Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 7-1953; Chicago, Newberry Library, MS 32; Edinburgh, Scottish Catholic Archives MS GB 0240 CB/57/9 (*olim* Blairs College 9); London, British Library, MS Add. 22029; London, British Library, MS Add. 32006; London, British Library, MS Add. 88929 (*olim* Durham, Ushaw College Library MS 291); London, British Library, MS Egerton 3044; London, British Library, Harley Rot. 43 A. 14 (this manuscript is housed in the British Library under the shelfmark Harley Charter 43 A. 14 and is described in the Harley Charters catalogue, although the case for the manuscript says Rot., and it is cited as such elsewhere); London, British Library, Harley Rot. T. 11; London, Wellcome Historical Medical Library, MS 632; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28961; New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS 410; New York, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS Add. 04; New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS G.39; New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M.486; New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M.779; New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M.1092; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Add. E. 4; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodleian Roll 16 (SC 2975); Oxford, Jesus College, MS 124, on deposit in the Bodleian Library; Princeton University Library, MS 126; Rostock, Universitätsbibliothek, MS theol. 45^a; San Marino, Huntington Library, HM 26054; San Marino, Huntington Library, HM 39467; Utrecht, Catharijneconvent, ABM h4a; and a roll now held in the private collection of Toshiyuki Takamiya but formerly housed in St. John’s Seminary in Wonerth (for a description, see Christopher de Hamel’s entry in the sale catalogue Sotheby’s, London, 24 June 1980, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts and Miniatures*, 68, lot 73). This list does not include the many workaday *cartellini*, narrow but sometimes very long rolls on which charms or amuletic texts were written by professional scribes, local sages, or by laypeople for their own use. Also excluded from this list are Exultet rolls, which appear to have been mainly an Italian devotional accessory that flourished in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. See Guglielmo Cavallo, *Rotoli di Exultet dell’Italia meridionale* (Bari: Adriatica, 1973); and Thomas Forrest Kelly, *The Exultet in Southern Italy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

were also produced in the Netherlands, which had a large English population.²⁰ They are typically constructed from narrow strips of parchment and of two or more membranes pasted or sewn together, sometimes amounting to a length of more than 180 cm (almost 6 feet) and in rare cases many more than that.²¹ The illumination and its adjoining text are often composed within numerous short registers that facilitate sectional reading and viewing as the roll is unfurled, a process eased by the pipes of wood, ivory, or some other durable material on which they were originally wound.²² Of the twenty-five extant rolls, the majority were produced in the fifteenth century, either in England or for English patrons both male and female.²³ Almost all examples feature

20. It seems highly likely that many prayer rolls were destroyed during the Reformation. The classic study on the systematic destruction of religious objects and books under Henry VIII is Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 377–477; see also Richard Marks, *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England* (Stroud: Sutton, 2004), 258–75.

21. London, British Library, MS Egerton 3044 is approximately 9 m (30 feet) long.

22. At least one roll has survived with its original scrinium case of *cuir-ciselé*: New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M.1092; see Joachim M. Plotzek, *Andachtsbücher des Mittelalters aus Privatbesitz* (Cologne: Das Museum, 1987), 246–47, cat. no. 86. A colophon on the lower portion of the roll dates it to 1491.

23. Skemer (“Amulet Rolls and Female Devotion,” 199) has noted that “[w]omen were considered gender-prone to use written amulets,” a presumed bias that he reinforces with selective evidence and compounds by allying the roll form with a desire to “bypass Church mediation.” He adduces little evidence in support of this medieval bias, citing a line from St. Jerome but adding nothing further. Additionally, the roll that is the principal subject of Skemer’s article contains a prayer for a *latorem* and a *famulum* (i.e., a male), yet because of the presence of a “birthing charm,” he refers to the owner of the roll as female. To be sure, women were among the intended beneficiaries of rolls’ protection. Incontrovertible evidence for female use is the frequent inclusion of prayers for safe childbirth, and seven rolls in particular are referred to as “birth girdles.” However, complicating the picture of gendered use is the fact that rolls’ explicit promises for a safe and speedy labor often occur together with a variety of other prayers as well as evidence of male use, including donor portraits of males, the masculine form of substantives for the votary, and owner inscriptions by males. One example is London, British Library, MS Rot. T. 11, whose owner is named William. On this roll, see Kathryn M. Rudy, “Kissing Images, Unfurling Rolls, Measuring Wounds, Sewing Badges and Carrying Talismans: Considering Some Harley Manuscripts through the Physical Rituals They Reveal,” *British Library Journal* (2011), article 5, 42–56. See also W. A. Pantin, “Instructions for a Devout and Literate Layman,” in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. Jonathan J. G. Alexander and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 398–422. On birth girdles, see Walter J. Dilling, “Girdles: Their Origin and Development, Particularly with Regard to their Use as Charms in Medicine,

Figure 2. Cambridge, King's College Archives, KC/18, confirmation charter for King's College, 1446 (photo: by kind permission of The Provost and Fellows of King's College, Cambridge). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

texts and images that relate to the wounds of Christ (*arma Christi*).²⁴

A further feature that occurs in almost every known prayer roll is an explicit call to tactile engagement, which is aided by visual stimuli and attested by traces of physical interaction.²⁵ The illumination on these rolls runs the gamut of quality, whether, as in the prayer roll made about 1439 for Henry Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, with luscious miniatures, or, as in the roll made about 1500 for a woman of the Lancaster-Fleming family of Westmoreland, with desiccated penwork surrounding a stylized rendering of a kneeling dev-

otee.²⁶ Reinforcing the significance of tactile religious experience in these rolls are the instructions they include, often in the vernacular (even when the majority of the roll's text is in Latin), enjoining the worshipper to incline his attention to the images before him. The Beauchamp roll (Fig. 3), for example, repeatedly calls on the reader to "regardes," while the Prince Henry prayer roll—produced in the late fifteenth century for an as-yet-unidentified patron and given to the prince who eventually became Henry VIII—contains a miniature of the Crucifixion followed by instructions that expressly refer the viewer to its form (Fig. 4): "And then stedefastly behold the sydes & sey. . . And so behold the handes & sey. . . And then behold the hed and sey."²⁷ Common to all of these instructions

Marriage, and Midwifery," *Caledonian Medical Magazine* 9 (1912–14): 337–57; Mary Morse, "Seeing and Hearing: Margery Kempe and the Mise-en-Page," *Studia Mystica* 20 (1999): 15–42; Stephanie L. Volf, "A 'Medicyn of Wordes': Women, Prayer, and Healing in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century England" (PhD diss., Arizona State University, 2008), 258–300; and Mary Morse and Joe Gwara, "A Birth Girdle Printed by Wynkyn de Worde," *Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 13 (2012): 33–62.

24. Van der Velden, "Prayer Roll of Henry Beauchamp," 543.

25. Aside from the Margaret of Anjou roll, I know of only one roll (Princeton University Library, MS 126) that does not contain instructions for the devotee to look at or in some manner handle it. See Krochalis, "God and Mammon," 213. For indexical evidence of physical interactions with manuscripts and rolls, see Rudy, "Kissing Images, Unfurling Rolls."

26. The latter roll: New York, Morgan Library & Museum, MS M.486. On this roll, see Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts*, 1:76n16; and Martha W. Driver and Michael T. Orr, *An Index of Images in English Manuscripts from the Time of Chaucer to Henry VIII, c. 1380–c. 1509*, vol. 4, New York City: Columbia University–Union Theological (London: Harvey Miller, 2007), 47, no. 43, 155.

27. "And then stedfastly behold the sides and say. . . And so behold the hands and say. . . And then behold the head and say." Van der Velden ("Prayer Roll of Henry Beauchamp," 546–49) includes a transcription of the text on the Beauchamp roll. On the Prince Henry roll (London, British Library, MS Add. 88929), see McKendrick, Lowden, and Doyle, *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination*, cat. no. 44.

Figure 3. Prayer roll for Henry Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, Utrecht, Catharijneconvent, ABM h4a, detail of Henry Beauchamp in prayer below the Crucifixion, ca. 1439 (photo: © Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, Ruben de Heer). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

is a reliance on sight in order to stimulate an empathic response to Christ's suffering.

Other rolls encourage physical interaction to solicit divine protection or for more explicitly amuletic and theurgic purposes. A number of the *arma Christi* rolls, for example, open with some variation on "This cros XV tymys metyn ys þe lenght of oure Lord Ihesu Criste. And þe day þat þou beryst it vpon þe or lokist þer-vpon, þou shalt haue þise gret giftis,"²⁸ proceeding to list the calamities from which the looker or bearer will be shielded. Regardless of how we might judge the potentially heterodox nature of these rolls, it is evident from the instructions to the user that they were written in the belief that their efficacy worked, at least primarily, through visual or physical contact.²⁹

28. "This cross measures one fifteenth the height of Our Lord Jesus Christ. And on the day that you carry it with you or look upon it, you shall have these great gifts." London, British Library, Harley Rot. 43 A. 14. Quoted from Bühler, "Prayers and Charms," 274.

29. The two might actually be considered the same, according to the theory of extramission. In this medieval theory of optics, eyes emit rays that commingle with rays emanated by the object viewed.

Figure 4. Prince Henry prayer roll, London, British Library, MS Add. 88929, detail of the Crucifixion, between 1485 and 1509 (photo: © The British Library Board). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

Unlike the rolls just described, the Margaret of Anjou roll contains neither the material, visual, textual, nor residual features to intimate that it was put to personal or amuletic use. Significantly, Margaret's roll has a much ampler width than all surviving prayer rolls, a feature that is obscured in photographic reproductions (Fig. 5). It is constructed from two long parchment membranes pasted together, for a total length of 158 cm and a uniform width of 22.5 cm. In contrast, the average width of extant prayer rolls is 12.8 cm,³⁰ a number that accrues even greater importance when we consider that the average span of a modern adult female's hand, from the tip of the thumb to the little finger, is 18–19 cm. This indicates that Margaret's roll did not fit comfortably in her hand, whereas the vast majority of extant prayer rolls would almost certainly have done so. Similarly, the pictorial illumination at the top of the roll occupies a vertical space of 33 cm, while the three successive prayers below run in an uninterrupted progression for 65 cm—lengths that almost entirely rule out the possibility of sectional viewing.³¹ As my own experience handling the roll has borne out, it must be unfurled in its entirety, using both hands, in order to be both read and viewed in any logical sense. Information on the use of devotional rolls is scarce, but these numbers indicate that Margaret's roll was intended to be used in a manner different from other surviving examples.

Another unique feature of this roll is its dedication to the Virgin and the form of her representation. There are no known prayer rolls devoted exclusively to the Virgin; many include selected prayers to her, as well as a representation, but in none of these is the Virgin the principal object of the roll's devotions.³² Furthermore, the rota at the head of the roll is

An active capacity, extramission enables the seer to come into a kind of physical contact with things seen. See David C. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision from al-Kindi to Kepler* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 136–49. For a brief summary of models of vision, see Michael Camille, "Before the Gaze: The Internal Senses and Late Medieval Practices of Seeing," in *Visuality before and beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw*, ed. Robert S. Nelson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 197–223, at 204–8. However, the amuletic nature of wearing the roll on the body lay in a gray area that was barely tolerated and at times expressly forbidden by the Church. See Robert N. Swanson, *Indulgences in Late Medieval England: Passports to Paradise?* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 224–77, esp. 247–48.

30. This average is taken from the measurements of all twenty-five rolls, which range in width from 8 to 13 cm.

31. The roll continues for a further 60 cm without text or illumination. Of these extra 60 cm, 24 contain thirty-four lines of ruling without text.

32. Good summaries of Marian imagery in medieval England can be found in Marks, *Image and Devotion in Late Medieval England*, 38–63, 121–56; Nigel Morgan, "Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in Thirteenth-Century England," in *England in the Thirteenth Century*, ed. W. M. Ormrod (Stamford: Watkins, 1991),

Figure 5. Margaret of Anjou prayer roll, Oxford, Jesus College, MS 124, on deposit in the Bodleian Library, ca. 1445–55 (photo: The Principal and Fellows of Jesus College, Oxford). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

unprecedented. Dominating the pictorial portion is a wheel, at the center of which is the Virgin, crowned and haloed, holding the Christ child in her right hand and a flower, probably a lily, in her left (Fig. 1). The wheel itself comprises texts whose orientation changes with the imagined turning of the wheel itself. Leaving aside the utter singularity of this rota, to which I return below, the words that are its structural edifice cannot be read by a stationary viewer unless the roll itself is rotated, a near-impossible maneuver. Furthermore, the depiction of Margaret at the base of the rota decreases the likelihood that the roll was meant to be turned, given the illogicality of creating a portrait to be seen upside down (not to speak of the potential offense it might cause).³³ What is more probable is that the texts on the rota were inscribed in the knowledge that they would not be seen or read while being held by a single, kneeling devotee (see the appendix for a transcription of the roll). Instead, it appears that these texts were intended to be sung. The blue sphere that envelops the Virgin and Child contains the versicle and response to the “Ave regina caelorum,” and the gold spokes that radiate from the largest circle contain the entire text of the “Salve regina,” both of which were “among the best known chants of the Middle Ages.”³⁴ In addition, the little *cartellini* radiating around the Virgin name all those people (the poor, the

faint-hearted, those who mourn, the [lay] people, the clergy, religious women, and all men) who are invited to pray for the Virgin’s intercession in the “Sancta Maria, succurre miseris,” another text that was sung in the English liturgy and that is written in full in golden letters just outside the rota’s hub.³⁵ Finally, the largest, stanzaic spokes of the rota record the very prayers such petitioners might voice, in the form of seven stanzas of eight leonine verses each to the Virgin: the verses compile conventional constructions (e.g., “Salve regina mater miseris medicina Lux matutina rosa flos et Stella marina”) but were possibly recomposed expressly for this commission.³⁶ All of them are addressed in the first-person plural and represent the petitions of groups rather than the individual pleas of a single donor or devotee. As variations on the “Salve regina,” it seems highly probable that they, like the other texts of the rota, were composed for vocal performance. Mary and Richard Rouse have shown that poets and lyricists often committed verses to rolls, which they read or sang for their patrons, and there is ample visual material showing figures chanting while holding scrolls and rolls, both with and without musical notation. The textual evidence suggests that the Margaret of Anjou roll may have served a similar function.³⁷

In addition, the nature of the texts on the main body of the roll beneath the pictorial register share almost nothing in common with the kinds of prayers found on other surviving examples. Absent from Margaret’s roll are instructions for its use or vouches for its efficacy, elements that occur on every other known prayer roll except one. In contrast, the majority of the Margaret of Anjou roll is occupied by a series of three separate hymns to the Virgin Mary, each introduced by the generic Latin rubric “ad beatam virginem oracio.” The first is “De deliciis virginis gloriosae,” a hymn attributed to the thirteenth-century friar John Peckham (or Peckham), which hails the Virgin and praises her life from conception to her Assumption. According to one scholar, it is a notably

69–103, at 86–92; idem, “Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in Fourteenth-Century England,” in *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1991 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Nicholas Rogers (Stamford: Watkins, 1993), 34–57; and idem, “The Coronation of the Virgin by the Trinity and Other Texts and Images of the Glorification of Mary in Fifteenth-Century England,” in *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1992 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Nicholas Rogers (Stamford: Watkins, 1994), 223–41. Morgan (“Coronation of the Virgin,” 241) notes the increasing humanization and heightened emphasis on Mary’s maternal qualities during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In contrast, the fifteenth century saw intensified interest in her regality, what Morgan describes as “the late medieval obsession with images of the glorification of Mary.” See also Miri Rubin, *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary* (New York: Allen Lane, 2009), 285–312.

33. To be upside down was common pictorial shorthand for an array of desultory or disreputable characteristics—including licentiousness—in medieval art. A prime example is Salome, who is often depicted in manuscript illumination as an acrobat, walking on her hands before Herod. See Julia Zimmermann, “‘Gestus histrionici’: zur Darstellung gauklerischer Tanzformen in Texten und Bildern des Mittelalters,” in *Gestik: Figuren des Körpers in Text und Bild*, ed. Margreth Egidi et al. (Tübingen: Narr, 2000), 71–85; and Jean Leclercq, “‘Ioculator et saltator’: Saint Bernard et l’image du jongleur dans les manuscrits,” in *Translatio Studii: Manuscript and Library Studies Honoring Oliver L. Kapsner*, ed. Julian Plante (Collegeville, MN: St. John’s University Press, 1973), 124–48.

34. David J. Rothenberg, *The Flower of Paradise: Marian Devotion and Secular Song in Medieval and Renaissance Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 17.

35. Gareth Curtis and Andrew Wathey, “Fifteenth-Century English Liturgical Music: A List of the Surviving Repertory,” *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle* 27 (1994): 1–69, at 25–26, 30, 33, 35, 65; and David Fallows, “English Song Repertories of the Mid-Fifteenth Century,” *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 103, no. 1 (1976–77): 61–79, at 64.

36. “Hail Queen mother, remedy to the wretched, morning Light, rose blossom, and Star of the sea.” I have not been able to identify these verses in any printed or manuscript sources. While they certainly may have existed before the occasion of the roll’s production for Margaret, their rarity suggests that they may have been rather recherché and chosen specifically and very deliberately for this occasion.

37. Mary Rouse and Richard Rouse, “Roll and Codex: The Transmission of the Works of Reinmar von Zweter,” in *Authentic Witnesses: Approaches to Medieval Texts and Manuscripts* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 13–29.

Figure 6. Margaret of Anjou prayer roll, Oxford, Jesus College, MS 124, on deposit in the Bodleian Library, detail of Margaret of Anjou's arms, ca. 1445–55 (photo: The Principal and Fellows of Jesus College, Oxford). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

restrained composition, lacking the affective qualities of contemporary Marian literature.³⁸ Following this hymn are stanzas nineteen through twenty-five of “O Virgo splendens,” which open with a hail to the Virgin, this time as instructress and attendant, and then implore that she pray to the king (“ora regem”) to cast a favorable glance on the world.³⁹ Finally, there is a series of twenty-five “Aves,” most referring to the Virgin with a superlative adjective. Because of the absence of deictics, instructions, and affective language, the texts on the Jesus College roll lack the functional, personal, and emotive qualities that other prayer rolls foster with their exhortations to look and to touch. Rather, the schedule of texts here is chiefly laudatory.

One nuance in particular intimates Margaret's lack of involvement in the commissioning of this roll. There is a significant discrepancy in the tincture of her heraldic arms,⁴⁰ which are supported by two angels in the upper portion of the

38. A. G. Rigg, *A History of Anglo-Latin Literature, 1066–1422* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 222–23. The hymn is printed in *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, ed. Guido Maria Dreves, 50 (Leipzig: Fues, 1907), no. 397.

39. *Rhythmus XII* from the *Mariale* of Bernard Morlanensis (also known as Bernard of Cluny or Bernard of Morlay). See Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi*, no. 323.

40. On Margaret's arms, which she adopted from her father, René of Anjou, see Christian de Mérindol, *Le roi René et la seconde maison d'Anjou: emblématique art histoire* (Paris: Léopard d'Or, 1987), 102–3. The study provides an exhaustive account of the arms of the House of Anjou and is a particularly excellent resource for its numerous figures.

Figure 7. London, British Library, MS Royal 15 E vi, Talbot Shrewsbury book, fol. 2v, detail of Margaret of Anjou's arms, 1444–45 (photo: © The British Library Board).

roll (Figs. 1 and 6).⁴¹ We might compare her arms here with those displayed on the frontispiece to the Talbot Shrewsbury book, a heavily illuminated compilation of romances, political tracts, chivalric treatises, chronicles, and statutes that was produced about 1444–45 on the order of John Talbot, first earl of Shrewsbury and Waterford (d. 1453), and presented to Margaret as a wedding gift (Fig. 7).⁴² Other examples of

41. There may be two errors: in the compartment for the arms of Hungary, which should be a barry of eight argent and gules, we see a barry of only six argent and gules. This error could easily be attributed to the lack of space in the minuscule compartment, which forced the illuminator to compromise strict accuracy—and, indeed, a number of other English manuscripts with Margaret's arms contain only six stripes.

42. See McKendrick, Lowden, and Doyle, *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination*, cat. no. 143. This manuscript is touched on, briefly, in a vast number of sources, and it has only recently become the subject of serious study. A notable early analysis is Catherine Reynolds, “The Shrewsbury Book, British Library Royal MS. 15.E.VI,” in *Medieval Art, Architecture, and Archaeology at Rouen*, ed. Jenny Stratford (London: British Archaeological Association, 1993), 109–16. See also Michel-André Bossy, “Arms and the Bride: Christine de Pizan's Military Treatise as a Wedding Gift for Margaret of Anjou,” in *Christine de Pizan and the Categories of Difference*, ed. Marilyn Desmond (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 236–56. A recent collection contains four essays devoted to the manuscript and expands considerably our understanding of both its pictorial and textual contents: Anne D. Hedeman, “Collecting Images: The Role of the Visual in the Shrewsbury Talbot Book (Royal 15 E. vi),” in *Collections in Context: The Organization of Knowledge and Community in Europe*, ed. Karen Fresco and Anne D. Hedeman (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2012), 99–119; Andrew Taylor, “The Time of an Anthology: British Library MS. Royal 15 E. vi and the Commemoration of Chivalric Culture,” in *ibid.*, 120–33; Craig Taylor, “The Treatise Cycle of the Shrewsbury Book, BL Ms. Royal 15 E. vi,” in *ibid.*, 134–50; and Karen Fresco, “Christine de Pizan's *Livre des fais d'armes et de chivalerie* and

Margaret's arms can be seen in a manuscript of the *Nova statuta Angliae*, which she may have commissioned for her son (ca. 1457–61, with later additions),⁴³ and in a Psalter made about 1380 to which her arms were later added.⁴⁴ These three examples show the consistent portrayal of Margaret's arms: in the lower right quarter, representing the arms of Lorraine, or, on a bend gules three alerions displayed argent. On the roll the colors are reversed, showing gules on a bend or three alerions, which presumably were displayed argent but are now damaged and difficult to see. (In lay terms, the arms should have a red diagonal stripe over a gold ground, but in the roll we see a gold diagonal stripe over a red ground.)

This oversight is conspicuous. It suggests that the roll was commissioned not by Margaret for herself but, rather, by someone else for her. More speculatively, it may be that the roll was produced, possibly in haste, around the time of Margaret's arrival in England, in a period when government officials and members of the aristocracy were preparing for the entry and coronation of a new queen consort.⁴⁵ A glitch in communications could easily have resulted in this error, particularly if the specifics of Margaret's arms were transmitted via the monochromatic impression made by a seal or even by consulting an actual seal.⁴⁶ A further thirty-four lines on the roll were ruled but contain no text, again intimating the rushed nature of the roll's completion. John Carmi Parsons has drawn attention to the habit of "naturalizing" queens consort in the culture of their new home, explaining that such "naturalizing" was "a critical consideration for England as royal brides were usually sought outside the kingdom and

their foreignness intensified feelings of distrust."⁴⁷ A gift that elaborates on a typically English form of devotional object—that is, a roll—would qualify as an instrument in this effort.

A further set of irregularities gives the impression that during production the illuminator revised his plan in order to accommodate the roll's exceptional recipient. Specifically, it appears that the queen was meant to appear in a different position. A vertical black line demarcates the space of the prie-dieu from that of the left-hand angel (Fig. 6) and interrupts the pattern of the tiles. Minute amounts of green paint have begun to flake off in this left section, indicating that the parchment in this area is rougher, possibly from having been scraped, and thus not optimal for retaining pigment. The scroll that extends from Margaret of Anjou's mouth is itself blank but points to the verses on the rota above, "Salve regina mi[sericordi]e vit[a]." Perhaps the illuminator noted, belatedly, the felicity of the rota's text and the words that should issue from the queen's mouth; rather than portray the devotee, as is common, with a separate inscribed banderole, he appears to have moved her prie-dieu back one to two centimeters and placed her so that her head would align with a scroll emerging from the rota. An ultraviolet image of this portion shows that the space around the banderole has been scraped (Fig. 8). Another indication that a banderole was not originally intended to encompass words on the rota is the vague outline around the phrase "Salve regina mi[sericordi]e vit[a]" and the absence of a white ground behind the text, whereas the portion of the banderole outside the rota is painted in white. The banderole emerging from her mouth and pointing to the words "Salve regina" just above promotes Margaret as the queen consort of England through acknowledgment of the Queen of Heaven. This evidence indicates that the rota was not originally planned to incorporate a prayer extending from the queen's mouth but was, at a later stage in the roll's production, altered to capitalize on the serendipity of a hail to the Queen of Heaven from the queen of England.⁴⁸

the Coherence of BL Ms. Royal 15 E. vi," in *ibid.*, 151–78. A fully digitized copy of the manuscript can be seen at <http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/>.

43. New Haven, Yale Law School, Goldman Library, MssG +St11 no. 1. On this manuscript and Margaret of Anjou's participation in its production, see Rosemarie McGerr, "A Statute Book and Lancastrian Mirror for Princes: The Yale Law School Manuscript of the *Nova Statuta Angliae*," *Textual Cultures* 1 (2006): 6–59; and eadem, *Lancastrian Mirror for Princes*, 75–101.

44. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 38-1950. See Lucy Freeman Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts, 1285–1385* (London: Harvey Miller, 1986), 2: no. 139. The accurate display of Margaret's heraldry in this latter book would have been a priority given the Psalter's original heraldic significance. The heraldry in the book, owned by members of the Bohun family, announces the marriage between Mary de Bohun and Henry Bolingbroke, later Henry IV and grandfather to Henry VI.

45. Numerous errors and incomplete illuminations attest to the rushed completion of the Talbot Shrewsbury book; Reynolds, "Shrewsbury Book."

46. See John Gage, *Color and Culture: Practice and Meaning from Antiquity to Abstraction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 79–92, esp. 91.

47. John Carmi Parsons, "Ritual and Symbol in the English Medieval Queenship to 1500," in *Women and Sovereignty*, ed. Louise Olga Fradenburg (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1992), 61. Indeed, Margaret's "Frenchness" became a primary target for criticism when dissatisfaction with her husband grew. Such criticisms had a long life, on which see Lee, "Reflections of Power."

48. The extended trapezoidal shape on the left side of the green tiled space (the right side is rectangular) is more sensible within the context of this conclusion. Likewise, at the lower hem of Margaret's gown, underdrawing for tiles is visible and no paint appears to have been applied. Perhaps Margaret's robe was to feature an ermine trim, which was not completed in time for the roll's presentation (hints of ermine trim can be seen in the robe's neckline and at the opening immediately below where her hands are on the outer edges of the robe).

Figure 8. *Margaret of Anjou prayer roll*, Oxford, Jesus College, MS 124, on deposit in the Bodleian Library, detail of Margaret and banderole under ultraviolet light, ca. 1445–55 (photo: The Principal and Fellows of Jesus College, Oxford). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

Close attention to the physical, pictorial, and textual components of the Margaret of Anjou roll reveals so many differences from the corpus of objects to which it has previously been compared that to conceive of it exclusively in terms of a devotional object would be to misrepresent or only partially represent its facture and function. Rather, it appears to have been an improvisation on the roll form, designed as a tribute to its exceptional recipient. All of these ostensibly anomalous features—the error in her arms, the nature of the roll’s texts, the apparent modifications to her portrayal—take on even greater significance once we consider a number of objects and events associated with the queen. In the following section I offer a recontextualization of the Margaret of Anjou roll within a material and performative corpus that is, in a number of respects, more fitting to the contours of the roll

than the devotional objects to which it has previously been compared.

Salve regina! A Marian Genealogy of Queenship

Given that Margaret’s public political interventions and her apparent transgressions have monopolized accounts of her later reign and shaded the perceptions of her behavior in the preceding period, it is curious that the—admittedly sparse—attention paid to the Jesus College roll to date has been directed exclusively at its putatively personal and devotional qualities. Indeed, as evidence of the queen’s Marian devotion, it has been mentioned alongside the bejeweled golden plaque that Margaret presented in 1453 to the Shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham, as well as the window she commissioned in Westminster Abbey depicting her and the king kneeling before the Virgin.⁴⁹ In spite of this tantalizing congruence, the anomalous and otherwise extraordinary features of the Margaret of Anjou roll recommend alternative avenues of inquiry.

Throughout the Middle Ages, the roll format was commonly used for many purposes beyond the devotional. Rolls were used as supports for account keeping, for obits, for charters, for the display of family pedigree, and in numerous other contexts.⁵⁰ Within each of these categories, objects conform not only in their textual contents and function but also in physical character, where more granular genre distinctions emerge. Logically, those that had a public function or were intended for display are wide enough to be viewed from a modest distance.

Despite the obvious textual dissimilarities, a specific body of genealogy known as the heptarchy rolls provides an apt

49. For the plaque, see A. R. Myers, “The Jewels of Queen Margaret of Anjou,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 42 (1959): 113–31, at 124. The window no longer survives, but, in the one extant household account of Margaret of Anjou, instructions detail payment to be made to John Prudde, the “king’s glazer” (vitriatori Regis), for “glass and glazing for one window of two lights in the chapel of the Blessed Mary de la Pewe, worked with two images of the King and Queen genuflecting and hailing the Blessed Mary with the arms of the King and Queen flourished with flowers and also with words written by the queen[?]” (vitro et vitriacione vnius fenestre de duobus luminibus in capella Beate Marie de le Pewe operate cum duobus ymaginibus Regis et Regine genuflectantium et salutacionis Beate Marie cum armis Regis et Regine florissied cum floribus necnon verbo Regine scripto). See idem, “The Household of Queen Margaret of Anjou, 1452–3, II,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957–58): 391–431, at 423–24 (my translation).

50. On the diverse uses to which the roll support was put, see Raymond Clemens and Timothy Graham, *Introduction to Manuscript Studies* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 250–58.

material and genre context for the Margaret of Anjou roll.⁵¹ Produced continuously from 1271 to 1422, these rolls, of which well over twenty survive,⁵² contain a chronicle of the kings of England, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy; fifteen of these rolls depict, at the head, a diagram of the seven kingdoms.⁵³ One example, made in the first quarter of the fourteenth century and now in the Royal collection of the British Library, takes the standard, if more elegant and elaborate, form (Fig. 9).⁵⁴ It is a roll 27.5 cm wide and 475 cm (more than 15 1/2 feet) long, at the top of which is a schematic map of England in the form of a circle that situates all seven kingdoms with respect to one another and to the cardinal directions. The large circle embraces three rings of smaller circles containing Anglo-Norman texts. Within the central ring, the text describes in general terms the arrangement of England into seven dominions (“Engleterre contient de longe vii rentz”). Surrounding this is a ring of seven slightly smaller circles, each of which encloses a very brief description of one of the seven kingdoms (Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Sussex, and Wessex). Finally, the outermost ring contains small circles that name the kingdoms and label the four cardinal directions. Beneath this diagram is a block of text, the beginning of an Anglo-Norman chronicle of England.⁵⁵ The chronicle continues for the length of the

51. For the most extensive study of these rolls, see Olivier de Laborderie, “Ligne de reis: culture historique, représentation du pouvoir royal et construction de la mémoire nationale en Angleterre à travers les généalogies royales en rouleau du milieu du XIII^e siècle au début du XV^e siècle” (PhD diss., École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris, 2002). See also idem, “A New Pattern of English History: The First Genealogical Rolls of the Kings of England,” in *Broken Lines: Genealogical Literature in Medieval Britain and France*, ed. Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 45–61; and Alixe Bovey, *The Chaworth Roll: A Fourteenth-Century Genealogy of the Kings of England* (London: Sam Fogg, 2005).

52. De Laborderie, “Ligne de reis,” describes some forty genealogical rolls produced in England during this period. Margaret Lamont refers to more than twenty that begin with the Anglo-Saxon heptarchy. See Lamont, “‘Genealogical’ History and the English Roll,” in *Medieval Manuscripts, their Makers and Users: A Special Issue of Viator in Honor of Richard and Mary Rouse* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 245–62, at 246.

53. Lamont, “‘Genealogical’ History and the English Roll,” 260.

54. London, British Library, MS Royal 14 B vi. On this roll and a very similar example (London, British Library, MS Royal 14 B v), see McKendrick, Lowden, and Doyle, *Royal Manuscripts: The Genius of Illumination*, cat. nos. 117–18.

55. Adapted from Peter of Poitiers, *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi*. See William H. Monroe, “13th- and Early 14th-Century Illustrated Genealogical Manuscripts in Roll and Codex: Peter of Poitiers’ *Compendium*, Universal Histories and Chronicles of the Kings of England” (PhD diss., Courtauld Institute of Art, London, 1989).

Figure 9. London, British Library, MS Royal 14 B vi, genealogical roll of the English kings, detail of the heptarchy diagram, ca. 1300–1307 (photo: © The British Library Board). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

roll, positioned beside and around roundels that depict the successive kings of England in a genealogical diagram.

The circular diagram at the top of the roll clarifies the purpose of this genealogical display: to promote unification and to endorse the continuity of a single governing entity over a diversity of peoples. The arrangement of the seven kingdoms within a single circle insists on the geographic underpinnings to the argument for unification and thus ratifies its accordance with nature.⁵⁶ As Joan Holladay notes, the roll format

56. De Laborderie, “New Pattern for English History,” 60.

for these genealogical diagrams, “by virtue of the frequency with which it was employed for transcriptions of royal documents, also conferred on the genealogical material an official status.”⁵⁷ Moreover, “[t]he similarity in width between the statute rolls and the genealogical rolls would have tightened this analogy.”⁵⁸ A similar associative transfer appears to be at play in the Margaret of Anjou roll, where a uniquely wide roll of prayers to the Virgin Mary features at its head an unprecedented circular diagram. While modern scholars—hampered by the shortcomings of photographic reproduction and possibly swayed by expectations of gendered behavior—have assumed that the roll fits within a specific genre of private devotional object presumably targeted at women, its physical characteristics and the visual model it incorporates usher its meaning in a more political direction.

The likelihood of this associative transfer is supported further by the revival and revision of the heptarchy rolls as a specifically Lancastrian form of genealogy in the first half of the fifteenth century.⁵⁹ Several such rolls (with and without the diagram) produced in the fourteenth century were updated in the following century to include Lancastrian kings,⁶⁰ and at least one genealogy of Henry V, prepared during the minority of Henry VI, employs a diagram modeled on those that appear in the heptarchy rolls (Fig. 10).⁶¹ One further example underscores how present the heptarchy rolls were even as late as Margaret’s arrival in England: a codex (made ca. 1445–before 1461) containing the Anglo-Saxon genealogy of Henry VI emulates the roll format and contains, at its conclusion,

Figure 10. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley Rolls 6, genealogical roll of the English kings, detail of the heptarchy diagram, ca. 1422–37 (photo: The Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford). See the electronic edition of *Gesta for a color version of this image*.

57. Joan A. Holladay, “Charting the Past: Visual Configurations of Myth and History and the English Claim to Scotland,” in *Representing History, 900–1300: Art, Music, History*, ed. Robert A. Maxwell (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), 115–32, at 123.

58. Ibid.

59. De Laborderie mentions this revival (“New Pattern for English History,” 48), but he does not pursue its historical context or the motivations behind it. I am unaware of any publications that address this revival in detail.

60. E.g., University of California, Los Angeles, Rouse MS 49 (end of the fourteenth century with additions between about 1399 and before 1406); Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd.iii.58 (continuations after 1431); London, British Library, MS Harley Roll C. 7 (ca. 1288 with additions from the time of Henry VI to Prince Edward of Wales, and further additions after 1461); London, College of Arms, MS 20/5 (ca. 1307–27 with updates from the reign of Henry VI); and the Chaworth roll (private collection; 1320s with additions between ca. 1399 and 1413). In contrast, the Yorkists tended to prefer that the roll begin with Adam and Eve. See 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 (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1979), 171–92.

61. The roll is incomplete.

a depiction of Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou kneeling in prayer before the Trinity—the first known illumination of a king and queen of England together before a devotional image (Fig. 11).⁶² Through the purposeful archaism of tinted outline drawing, a specialty of Anglo-Saxon artists, the image visualizes Henry and Margaret as the rightful descendants to the lineage that the preceding branches, rays, and medallions describe.

The reuse and revision of the Anglo-Saxon rolls is logical because the Lancastrians claimed Anglo-Saxon heritage. What gave a further impetus to this revival, however, was the sudden death of Henry VI’s father, Henry V, in 1422, following his successful campaigns in France. Concerns about English ability to maintain their claim to France during the long minority

62. See Kathleen Scott, “The Illustration and Decoration of the Register of the Fraternity of the Holy Trinity at Luton Church, 1475–1546,” in *The English Medieval Book: Studies in Memory of Jeremy Griffiths*, ed. A. S. G. Edwards, Vincent Gillespie, and Ralph Hanna (London: British Library, 2000), 155–83, at 167, 177.

Figure 11. London, British Library, MS Harley 318, fol. 8v, genealogy of Henry V, Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou kneeling in prayer, ca. 1445–before 1461 (photo: © The British Library Board). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

of Henry VI led to a rash of propaganda, designed to convince the English and French public alike of the child king's right to both thrones. An iconography of unification under English rule is a hallmark of Lancastrian propaganda during this period, and an endorsement for the historic merger that created England is of a piece with the renewed campaign.⁶³

63. On Lancastrian propaganda under Henry VI, see B. J. H. Rowe, "King Henry VI's Claim to France in Picture and Poem," *Library*, 4th ser., 13 (1932–33): 77–88; and 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): 145–62. Little work has been done on visual propaganda under Henry V, although a number of studies address the literature of propaganda in these years. Derek Pearsall, among others, has pointed to the Lancastrians' use of poets—notably, John Lydgate—to pen verses in support of their legitimacy. See Pearsall, *John Lydgate* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1970), esp. 169;

The Margaret of Anjou roll was illuminated by an artist—or at least someone very closely allied with this artist—who produced at least one major genealogical roll in support of Henry VI between 1447 and 1455. Therefore, the medium was certainly in his repertoire and within the horizon of his artistic options when executing this devotionally oriented roll.⁶⁴

In assimilating features of the genealogical rolls that re-emerged during Lancastrian rule, the Margaret of Anjou roll coaxes out the genealogical discourse that, by the fifteenth century, inhered in any representation of a queen alongside the Virgin Mary.⁶⁵ The historical lines of a queen's own descent made far fewer appearances in medieval visual culture than her heraldry, plucked as she was from her own family tree and grafted to her husband's; indeed, there are no known medieval genealogies whose terminal descendant is female.⁶⁶ A woman's license and, hence, legitimacy to sit beside the king as his consort were encapsulated—again, visually—in the titular capital, inherited from her father, that she brought with her in the moment of her marital transfer. Nowhere is the relevance of this point to Margaret of Anjou made more explicit than in the frontispiece to the Talbot Shrewsbury book (Fig. 12). Facing the image of Sir John Talbot, earl of Shrewsbury, presenting the book to Margaret, a lavish depiction of Henry VI's genealogy literally marginalizes the queen: she is nowhere to be seen in this diagram, yet her heraldic arms are quartered with those of Henry in the right-hand margin of the page. The dedicatory verses that accompany the diagram give a temporal dimension to the queen's spatial marginalization, rendering her descent an afterthought: "In this book

Linne R. Mooney, "Lydgate's 'Kings of England' and Another Verse Chronicle of the Kings," *Viator* 20 (1989): 255–89; Lee Patterson, "Making Identities in Fifteenth-Century England: Henry V and John Lydgate," in *New Historical Literary Study: Essays on Reproducing Texts, Representing History*, ed. Jeffrey N. Cox and Larry J. Reynolds (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 69–107; and Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399–1422* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

64. London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 501. See Scott, *Later Gothic Manuscripts*, 2: no. 95.

65. Given the ultimate derivation of royal genealogical rolls from Peter of Poitiers' *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi*, a female equivalent with the Virgin as its source would have been within the realm of possibility. See Raluca L. Radulescu and Edward D. Kennedy, introduction to Radulescu and Kennedy, *Broken Lines*, 1–5.

66. On the place of women in medieval genealogy, see Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *L'ombre des ancêtres: essai sur l'imaginaire médiéval de la parenté* (Paris: Fayard, 2000). Klapisch-Zuber refers specifically to a woman's place within genealogy as a graft ("images de greffon," 324). For an excellent discussion of Jesse Tree imagery and its possible preparation in one manuscript for a female viewer, see Anne Rudloff Stanton, "La genealogie comence: Kinship and Difference in the Queen Mary Psalter," *Studies in Iconography* 17 (1996): 177–214.

Figure 12. London, British Library, MS Royal 15 E vi, fols. 2v–3r, Talbot Shrewsbury book, presentation of the book to Margaret of Anjou and the genealogy of Henry VI, 1444–45 (photo: © The British Library Board). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

is a figure, called a genealogical table, by which it is shown and demonstrated in full truth that the king, our sovereign, your fiancé (May God protect him!), is descended from the most noble ancestor, the good king Saint Louis, as are you, I am sure.”⁶⁷ Women within genealogical networks were instrumental rather than focal, the necessary coefficients to propagation.

Nevertheless, the abbreviation of a woman’s own descent in a heraldic display (or endnote) did not entirely bar her from participation in genealogical narrative. The lineage that a queen consort did represent was a specifically Marian one,

67. “Ou livre a une figure / genealogie nomee / par la quelle est tres bien prouuee / verite demonstrent a plain / que le roy nostre souverain / le vostre affye que dieux y gart / est venu de si noble part / comme du bon Roy saint louys / si este vous, certain en suys.” London, British Library, MS Royal 15 E vi, fol. 2v; translation in Taylor, “Time of an Anthology,” 122.

what Zrinka Stahuljak has referred to as a bloodless genealogy, where “consanguinity is replaced with spiritual affinity.”⁶⁸ Unlike the diachronic nature of patrilineal genealogy, which constructed a narrative of agnatic descent through time, a queen’s genealogical worth was synchronic, a heritage of unaltered Marianism that punctuated eternity. What distinguishes Margaret of Anjou’s Marian inheritance from the generic iterations allied with other queens was its pointedly political inflection throughout the first part of her reign as consort. While other queens were held to similar expectations, Margaret’s maternal functions were entirely subtended by the vital repercussions it was hoped they would have.

Paul Strohm has noted that “Marian texts almost invariably exist in complicated dialogue . . . over the conflicting

68. Zrinka Stahuljak, *Bloodless Genealogies of the French Middle Ages: Translatio, Kinship, and Metaphor* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 123; see also, more generally, 112–41.

ideas of Maria Regina, or Mary as victorious queen, and Mary as mediatrix, or humble intercessor with the divine.”⁶⁹ The unusual rota on the Margaret of Anjou roll discloses a creative effort to reconcile the contradictions of this dialogue and to craft a Marian progenitor specifically suited to Margaret’s intended function as consort (Fig. 1). As mentioned above, the image of the Virgin and Child as the axle of a schematic wheel is unprecedented.⁷⁰ There is, however, an enormous body of imagery showing the two at the center of an aureole of light, including the Virgin and Child in Glory, the Madonna Immacolata, and the Virgin of the Apocalypse: these iconographies collapse into a single image Mary’s royalty and maternity. In this particular case, the issuance of the Virgin’s royalty through her son is accentuated by the lily she holds in her left hand, a reference to the flowering rod of Aaron that likewise recalls the floriate scepter with which medieval queens were often depicted. Enfolded into this single attribute are thus two powerful emblems of maternity and regality,⁷¹ which are reinforced by the similarly polysemous loosened and sweeping tresses that fall around the Virgin’s shoulders.⁷²

But the Virgin here is not simply queen and mother; she is also intercessor, a role for which there was no standard iconography as crisp and as pat as, say, the Virgin of Humility or the Virgin of Mercy.⁷³ Positioned at the center of a wheel,

69. Paul Strohm, *Hochon’s Arrow: The Social Imagination of Fourteenth-Century Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 97.

70. Comparisons might be made to the schematic wheels that accompany the *Speculum theologie*, at the centers of which appear God or Christ. See Lucy Freeman Sandler, *The Psalter of Robert de Lisle* (London: Harvey Miller, 1983; repr., London: Harvey Miller, 1999), 107–15. The only diagrams known to me that contain an image of the Virgin at the axle are those that depict the Mystic Paradise, found in manuscripts of the *Speculum virginum*. See, for example, London, British Library, MS Arundel 44, fol. 13r.

71. On the iconography of the flowering rod and its development as an attribute of Marian queenship, see T. A. Heslop, “The Virgin Mary’s Regalia and Twelfth-Century Seals,” in *The Vanishing Past: Studies of Medieval Art, Liturgy and Metrology Presented to Christopher Hohler*, ed. Alan Borg and Andrew Martindale (Oxford: B.A.R., 1981), 53–63.

72. See Claire Richter Sherman, “The Queen in Charles V’s ‘Coronation Book’: Jeanne de Bourbon and the *Ordo ad Reginam Benedicendam*,” *Viator* 8 (1977): 255–98, at 271–72. The *Liber regalis*, the book that details all rituals and procedures for English coronations, states expressly that the queen’s hair must be loose: “the queen must be bareheaded and her hair must be decently let down on her shoulders. And she shall wear a circlet of gold adorned with jewels to keep her hair the more conveniently in order upon her head.” Leopold G. Wickham-Legg, ed., *English Coronation Records* (London: Constable, 1901), 128.

73. See Catherine Oakes, *Ora pro nobis: The Virgin as Intercessor in Medieval Art and Devotion* (London: Harvey Miller, 2008). Oakes explores images that stress Mary’s intercessory function, but, as

Figure 13. Chaworth roll, private collection, detail showing the heptarchy diagram and the wheel of fortune, ca. 1320s (photo: Robert McCarthy, Columbia University MA '86). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

the mediatrix Virgin offers a potential antidote to capricious Fortuna, the only female representation seen, consistently, in a correlative position in medieval imagery. The analogy is accentuated by the crown that Fortuna conventionally wears, like the crowned Virgin as she is portrayed on the Margaret of Anjou roll. A reminder of the ephemeral nature of all dominion, Fortuna makes a sobering appearance just above the heptarchy diagram on two genealogical rolls: the Chaworth roll (Fig. 13), made in the 1320s and updated sometime be-

she shows in vivid detail, there was no standard visual form that encapsulates it.

tween 1399 and 1413, and Cambridge, University Library, MS Oo.7.32, made in 1307, with additions after 1321.⁷⁴ Surrounding Dame Fortune on the Chaworth roll are verses in Anglo-Norman—the orientations of which change with the imagined turning of the wheel—that caution the reader against trusting so fickle a lady.⁷⁵ Of course, the opposite recommendation is offered when the object of faith is the Virgin. As is described above, all of the texts on the Margaret of Anjou roll represent either the petitions of those invited to seek the Virgin's aid or the praise of those who venerate her. The pictorial and textual elements of the rota on the Margaret of Anjou roll thus combine to provide a very specific form of notation: one that stresses the Virgin's status as queen, mother, and mediator for those who seek her protection from misfortune. Broadened to the national scale, the roll makes the case for Margaret's integrality to the fortunes of England.

Placed on a support that recommends comparison to official genealogies—and a class of highly politicized ones at that—this traditional female paragon confers a more specific and local meaning than is typically associated with the Marian ideal. This format, reserved for the expression of political legitimacy, validates Margaret's place in a Marian genealogy, suggesting that there is nothing less official about her spiritual inheritance than there is about Henry's genetic one. By extension, the roll sanctions Margaret's activities as an intercessor and grants them a certified place in the English political ecology. In what follows, I propose another genre alignment for the roll: the ceremony that greeted Margaret on her arrival into London in 1445. Like the heptarchy rolls, the pageants featured in this ceremony furnished a language of queenship within which the roll was both produced and understood.

Beyond the Private Devotional Object: Performance and Display

No known evidence details the circumstances of the roll's presentation, and a lack of documentation on the use of

large rolls offers little hope for recovering with certainty the mechanical aspects of its use. However, the very absence of evidence relating to use, such as written instructions on the roll or material traces of physical interaction, may itself be an indication of its function. In addition, between the width that renders the roll difficult to handle, the orientation of its texts, and the continuous layout that makes them impossible to read in small sections, the roll appears not to have been designed with practical purposes in mind. An alternative possibility is that the Margaret of Anjou roll was devised as a gift for the queen, one that issued an expressive statement through the act of presentation. More speculatively, the object might have featured in a performance such as an entry ceremony, although there is no known precedent for the presentation of a roll to a queen in such a context.⁷⁶ My primary aim is to show that the roll resonates so strongly with the Marian statements issued in the pageants I describe below that it should be considered within the same political context that the pageants explicitly invoke. Only secondarily do I wish to suggest that it might have been incorporated into such an event.

Margaret's entry into London on 28 May 1445 in particular showcased a series of statements, gestures, and images that resonated with elements of the roll. A formative occasion, the entry ceremony dramatized the process by which the eternal Marian ideal was drafted into the service of urgent preoccupations: specifically, it elaborated on Margaret's duties to broker peace and to provide an heir.⁷⁷ The first four pag-

76. It is worth noting, however, that numerous features of pageants in honor of Margaret were unprecedented. Nicola Coldstream makes this point a number of times in "The Roles of Women in Late Medieval Civic Pageantry in England," in *Reassessing the Roles of Women as "Makers" of Medieval Art and Architecture*, ed. Therese Martin (Boston: Brill, 2012), 1:175–94. Specifically, she states (185) that "there was barely any reference to current politics [in coronation entry ceremonies] before the entry of Margaret of Anjou."

77. A "transcript" of Margaret's coronation triumph exists in the preliminary folios to a manuscript of John Gower's *Confessio amantis* (London, British Library, MS Harley 3869, fols. 2r–4v), which was later copied by John Stowe (London, British Library, MS Harley 542, fols. 101r–2v) and was formerly believed to have been written by John Lydgate. For a study of the pageants, see Gordon Kipling, "The London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou: A Medieval Script Restored," *Medieval English Theatre* 4 (1982): 5–27; and idem, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 191–201. The pageants are also mentioned, briefly, in a number of other contemporary and near-contemporary sources. See, for example, *A Chronicle of London from 1089 to 1483 Written in the Fifteenth Century*. . . . (London, 1827), 134; James Gairdner, ed., *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1876), 185–86; and Robert Fabyan, *The New Chronicles of England and France*, ed. Henry Ellis (London, 1811). For further information on pageants in honor of queens, see Cynthia J. Brown, *The Queen's Library: Image-Making at*

74. For a discussion of both rolls, see Bovey, *Chaworth Roll*, 14–16, 22–23. More information on the Cambridge roll can be found in Monroe, "13th- and Early 14th-Century Illustrated Genealogical Manuscripts," 2: no. D3.

75. "Dame fortune me face nomer / Ascuns serrunt de longe vie / Tout la monde ay a governor / Ascuns morront par lur folie / Riches et poueres et toute gent / Jeo vous di bien saunz resort / Tons sont a mon comandement / Nul ne eschaper la mort / Ascune gent voil enhancer / Bon serroit sur toute rien / Ascunes a poverté liverer / Lessier le mal et fere le bien." The Cambridge roll features a similar poem in Middle English: "þe leuedi fortune is boþe frend and fo / Of þore che makit riche of riche poure also / Che turneþ wo al into wele and wele in to wo / Ne triste no man to þis wo[rld] þe whel it turnet so." In Julia Boffey and A. S. G. Edwards, eds., *A New Index of Middle English Verse* (London: British Library, 2005), no. 3408.

eants figured grace (a word whose repetition forms a counterpoint to the procession) as the peace that Margaret would bring to a war-sick nation. First, at the foot of the bridge at Southwark, Margaret was greeted by the personifications of Plenty and Peace: the former appears to have delivered her speech before a sign announcing the injunction “ingredimini et replete terram” (go forth and fill the Earth),⁷⁸ after which Peace pronounced, “So trusteth youre poeple, with affiaunnce, Through youre grace and highe benignite, Twixt the reawmes two, Englande and Fraunce, Pees shal approche, rest and unite.”⁷⁹ The implication of this pairing was that the consolidated blood ties between England and France forged by Margaret’s fecundity would result in a lasting peace between the two nations.⁸⁰ Gordon Kipling has found that in its structure and themes, the ceremony corresponds to Aquinas’s formula of the Third Advent, in which Christ first brings grace to humanity and subsequently ascends to glory. This spiritual template does hold, but I would modify Kipling’s assessment by remarking that it served to ratify decidedly secular expectations.⁸¹

the Court of Anne of Brittany, 1477–1514 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011); and Anne-Marie Legaré, “L’entrée de Jeanne de Castille à Bruxelles: un programme iconographique au féminin,” in *Women at the Burgundian Court: Presence and Influence*, ed. Dagmar Eichberger, Anne-Marie Legaré, and Wim Hüskens (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 43–55.

78. A reference to Genesis 8:17, “ingredimini super terram crescete et multiplicamini super eam” (go ye upon the earth: increase and multiply upon it). The quote is one of only two Latin phrases in the manuscript, and it appears just beneath a heading (i.e., not in the margin) that indicates the location of this first pageant at the foot of Southwark Bridge (MS Harley 3869, fol. 2r). Kipling (“London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou,” 17) interprets these inscriptions as recording phrases emblazoned on the pageants.

79. “And thus your people trust with confidence that, through your grace and utmost kindness, peace between the realms of England and France shall approach, remain, and unify.” MS Harley 3869, fol. 2r. Kipling, “London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou,” 19.

80. At the second pageant, of Noah’s Ark, an expositor enlarged the analogy between Margaret and Peace, comparing the new queen to “the Doue that brought the braunche of pees . . . tokyn and signe that the Floode shulde cesse.” MS Harley 3869, fol. 2r. Kipling, “London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou,” 20.

81. Gordon Kipling has promoted the view (“London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou” and *Enter the King*) that late medieval entry ceremonies were informed, both structurally and thematically, by a coherent religious template and, in turn, endorsed a Christ-based model of kingship. Although Kipling is scrupulous in the notes to his transcription of Margaret of Anjou’s entry and clarifies in detail his editorial priorities, his marginal additions of Latin biblical citations that correspond to the Middle English text in the manuscript lend the transcript a greater religiosity than is justified. To belabor this point is necessary, if pedantic, given that at least one significant, rigorous, and overall excellent work of scholarship has been influenced erroneously by Kipling’s editorial priorities: McGerr

The scope of the pageant’s irenic comparisons was expanded in the subsequent pageant, in which Margaret’s peace brokering was inflected as the intercessions enacted by *virgines mediatrices*. At Leadenhall, Dame Grace appeared alongside the allegorical figures of Truth, Mercy, Justice, and Peace from Psalm 84.⁸² Acting as God’s deputy and chancellor (chancelere de Dieu), Dame Grace is recorded to have said:

Fourre patentes, faire, fresssh, and legible,
Conteynyng iiiii preceptes imperiale,
Sealles impressed for memorialle,
To these sustres fourre thus be directe,
Whiche as mynystres further proclamen shalle,
T’encresen pees, werres to correcte.⁸³

In other words, this spiritual official distributed four mock letters patent to signify the establishment of peace. In her analysis of this event, Rosemarie McGerr observes that while “medieval discourses of queenship often associate queens with peace, prosperity, mercy, and fertility . . . this pageant also depicts Margaret’s new role in terms of earthly processes of ratifying laws . . . as if to suggest that divine grace should lead Margaret to earthly negotiations of power, as much as in spiritual matters.”⁸⁴ If Margaret’s later aggrandizement of the queen’s council is any measure, she appears to have taken the recommendations of this tableau to heart.⁸⁵

The second half of the triumph turned to the glory prophesied for Margaret. As before, when spiritual grace was reconfigured as political peace, in this second act glory was construed as the reward for furnishing dynastic continuity. First, at the Great Conduit in Cheap was narrated the par-

(*Lancastrian Mirror for Princes*, 82), referring to the pageants, claims: “the two surviving copies of the pageants include marginal texts in Latin that echo Biblical passages and are thought to have been presented visually as part of the pageant performances. . . . Altogether, the Middle English poems and their marginal texts bring together the primary languages, as well as the discourses of religion, law, and courtly literature.” Again, no such Latin phrases appear in the margins of the manuscript. All quotations from the ceremony’s script are from my own observations of the manuscript.

82. Kipling (*Enter the King*, 193) notes that this allegory figured commonly in the Middle Ages as an Advent homily associated with the Annunciation.

83. “Four letters patent, fair, fresh, and legible, / Containing four royal precepts, / Seals impressed for remembrance, / Shall be directed to these four sisters, / Who as ministers shall announce / the spread of peace and the end to warfare.” Just before this speech, Grace is referred to in the manuscript as both “chancelere de Dieu” and “Goddess vicarie genrale.” MS Harley 3869, fol. 2v. Kipling, “London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou,” 20.

84. McGerr, *Lancastrian Mirror for Princes*, 88.

85. See Anne Crawford, “The Queen’s Council in the Middle Ages,” *English Historical Review* 116, no. 469 (2001): 1193–1211.

able of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (Matt. 25:1–13), the former of whom are said to wait in innocence and perfection for their spouses. As one might expect, the implication was that Margaret would be a Wise Virgin, whose heart burned only “to serue [serve] the Spouse.”⁸⁶ Proceeding to the next station, at the Cross in Cheap, Margaret was met by a pageant of the Heavenly Jerusalem, which projected the transformation of London on her provision of an heir. Finally, in the culmination of the triumph at the church of St.-Michael-le-Querne, Queen Margaret’s glorious destiny was mirrored proleptically in the vision of the Queen of Heaven, crowned with twelve stars on her head.⁸⁷ It was here that the Marian metaphors of the entire procession reached their climax, and Margaret was installed before the vision she was expected to emulate.⁸⁸

Even if Margaret was not proficient in English when she arrived in London, she cannot have failed to detect the expectations being delineated before her eyes. I would go so far as to argue that the visual nature of these pageants did not simply reinforce such messages but was their primary vehicle of expression. Most important about the visions articulated in the pageants were the very real political stakes attendant on Margaret’s intercessory function, whether as a quasi-official mediator between two nations, as a suppliant with privileged access to her lord’s ear, or as a vehicle for consolidating the French and English royal lines.⁸⁹ It was in this atmosphere that Margaret found herself a “hinge,” the one who “Through [her] grace and highe benignite, Twixt the reawmes two,

Englande and Fraunce, Pees shal approche, rest and unite.”⁹⁰ If the Virgin represented the graft that allowed divine spirit to unite with divinely sanctioned body, then, the London pageants declared, Margaret represented the graft that provided a Lancastrian heir to occupy the French throne.⁹¹

The London pageants were vital in establishing the identity between Margaret and Mary as a touchstone of the queen’s public persona. However, this equivalence went well beyond the generic in that it was fostered in an environment of dynastic urgency and national insecurity, where politically meaningful outlets existed for Margaret’s Marian gestures.⁹² Just six months after her coronation, for example, the queen featured as a mediator in the peace negotiations between England and France. A letter from Charles VII to Margaret, urging her to convince Henry to surrender Maine, received a response from the queen. Signed and dated 17 December 1445, the letter expresses her wishes for peace and promises that “we will upon our part, stretch forth the hand and will employ ourselves herein effectually to our power in such wise that reason would that you, and all others, ought herein to be gratified.”⁹³ A subsequent letter in which Henry VI accedes to King Charles’s demands famously cites “our dear and well-beloved companion the queen, who has requested us to do this many times.”⁹⁴ Similar language was used on a rather different occasion, in 1450, when the king offered amnesty to the participants in Cade’s Rebellion, a monthlong revolt centered on Kent, which stemmed from an assortment of grievances both local and national.⁹⁵ In the preamble to the text of the pardon, the king claims to have been moved to this gesture of clemency “among others, by the most humble and persistent supplications, prayers and requests of our most serene and beloved wife and consort the queen.”⁹⁶ Even if Margaret’s

86. MS Harley 3869, fol. 3r. Kipling, “London Pageants for Margaret of Anjou,” 21.

87. MS Harley 3869, fol. 4r. This vision is taken from Revelation 12:1.

88. It may be that, as with the pageant of the Heavenly Jerusalem before it, the expositor of this last tableau spoke in front of an image, in this case of the Virgin in Glory.

89. Over the last twenty-five years a raft of scholarship has been devoted to medieval queens’ exercise of power (if not necessarily authority) through the act of intercession. Notable contributions to the literature on the topic include Joan Ferrante, “Public Postures and Private Maneuvers: Roles Medieval Women Play,” in *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988), 213–29; John Carmi Parsons, “The Queen’s Intercession in Thirteenth-Century England,” in *The Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, ed. Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995), 147–77; idem, “The Intercessionary Patronage of Queens Margaret and Isabella of France,” in *Thirteenth-Century England VI: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1995*, ed. Michael Prestwich, Richard H. Britnell, and Robin Frame (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), 145–56; Strohm, *Hochon’s Arrow*, 95–119; and Lois L. Huneycutt, “Intercession and the High-Medieval Queen: The Esther Topos,” in Carpenter and MacLean, *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women*, 126–46.

90. On a woman’s position as a “hinge” in genealogy, see Stahuljak, *Bloodless Genealogies*, 123.

91. For a similar argument regarding a manuscript made for Queen Isabelle, see Stanton, “Psalter of Isabelle, Queen of England,” 24–25.

92. On this urgency in particular, see Ralph A. Griffiths, “The Sense of Dynasty in the Reign of Henry VI,” in Ross, *Patronage, Pedigree and Power in Later Medieval England*, 13–36.

93. “tendrons de notre part la main, y nous y employons effectuelment a notre povoir telement que par raison vous et tous autres en devez estre contens.” Joseph Stevenson, ed., *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Wars of the English in France during the Reign of Henry the Sixth, King of England* (London: Longman, 1861), 1:165–66.

94. Ibid., vol. 2, pt. 2, 640 and 1:183–84.

95. See I. M. W. Harvey, *Jack Cade’s Rebellion of 1450* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

96. “inter alia humilimis ac instantissimis supplicacionibus precibus atque rogatibus serenissime ac amatissime conthoralis atque consortis noste Regine.” Kew, The National Archives, C66/471,

role in both the negotiations and the pardon was purely rhetorical—a pretense that allowed the king to acquiesce while maintaining the veneer of strength—her presence was nevertheless beckoned into a political arena and required to satisfy the demands of this intermediary role.

Returning to the Margaret of Anjou roll, we can see that it is entirely in sync with the languages, performances, and gestures that came together in the London pageants, which were themselves actualized in political events shortly after they took place. In addition to identifying this rhetorical congruity between object and performance, I would like to consider that the roll might have been presented to the queen in a similar ceremonial context, or as part of the rituals of gift giving within the court.⁹⁷ As I cautioned above, there is no evidence of rolls having been presented during pageants, although luxury objects were indeed incorporated as props in such events. A ring, for example, was gifted to Margaret of Anjou by an actor playing St. Edward on the occasion of her entry into Coventry in 1456.⁹⁸ This tradition continued into the sixteenth century, when, for example, the paper containing the text of a speech read before Queen Elizabeth was kissed by its young orator and then presented to the queen. As with so many of these ceremonial gifts, it is unknown what the queen did or was even meant to do with it once the pomp had ended.⁹⁹ Perhaps the prop/gift fulfilled its function once it had been performed.

m.13. The full text of the preamble and a translation are in Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 68n4.

97. On gift giving in late medieval England and France, see Brigitte Buettner, "Past Presents: New Year's Gifts at the Valois Courts, ca. 1400," *Art Bulletin* 83, no. 4 (2001): 598–625. On the presentation of books, see Dhira B. Mahoney, "Courtly Presentation and Authorial Self-Fashioning: Frontispiece Miniatures in Late Medieval French and English Manuscripts," *Mediaevalia* 21, no. 1 (1996): 97–160; and Erik Inglis, "A Book in the Hand: Some Late Medieval Accounts of Manuscript Presentations," *Journal of the Early Book Society for the Study of Manuscripts and Printing History* 5 (2002): 57–97.

98. *The Coventry Leet Book: or Mayor's Register, Containing the Records of the City Court Leet or View of Frankpledge, A.D. 1420–1555*, transcribed and ed. Mary Dormer Harris, *Early English Text Society* 134 (1907): 288. The most heavily gift-laden ceremony on record was the civic triumph in honor of London's reconciliation with Richard II in 1392. Over the course of numerous pageants the king was presented with "keys to the city, a ceremonial sword, three horses, a pair of golden crowns, a pair of golden chalices, and two pairs of sculptured, golden altarpieces." Kipling, *Enter the King*, 118. The entire text of Richard Maidstone's account of the triumph is translated and edited in Charles Roger Smith, "Concordia: Facta inter Regem Riccardum II et Civitatem Londonie per Fratrum Riccardum Maydiston, carmelitam, sacre theologie doctorem, anno Domine 1393" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1972).

99. *The passage of our most drad Soueraigne Lady Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London to westminster the daye before*

Following this hypothesis through leads to the question: What statements might have been made had such a presentation of the Margaret of Anjou roll occurred? Cynthia J. Brown has observed that in a Parisian procession much like those that greeted Margaret in London, Anne of Brittany (d. 1514) was drafted into participating as an actor in some of the tableaux designed for her viewing and was thus simultaneously "the protagonist of her own living theater in its movement through the capital city and a spectator of dramatic presentations . . . that portrayed her relationship to the city and kingdom."¹⁰⁰ Both observer and observed, queens took part in pageants to view the exemplary figures whom they were expected to emulate and to articulate in that same moment their capacity to enact the values those figures exemplified. As a ratifying document and performed object, the Margaret of Anjou roll might have expressed the mutual symbiosis between Margaret's commitment to a humble Marian ideal and the public's commitment to Margaret's elevation as queen. Kipling has argued that the presentation of gifts to kings during civic ceremonies likened them to Christ at Epiphany, and it seems to me that the offering of a roll to Margaret could have effected a similar transformation. By unfurling the roll, displaying it, and singing its texts,¹⁰¹ actors could have created a living tableau of the very image at its crest, with the Queen of Heaven surrounded by *cartellini* that name all those who might petition her aid.

Whether or not such a performance ever occurred, the Margaret of Anjou roll would have exerted further pressure on Margaret to cooperate in establishing an acceptable code of rapport between queen and country. Indeed, the eighty-two extant letters that Margaret wrote lobbying on behalf of

her coronacion (1558; STC [2nd ed.] 7590), 15. Similarly, the marriage of Philip to Queen Mary was celebrated in a triumph that included "a skoller of Paules skoole [who] delyvered unto the kinges highnes a fayre boke, which he receyved verye jentlie." J. Elder, *The copie of a letter sent in to Scotlande of the arivall and landyng, and most noble marryage of . . . Philippe, prynce of Spaine to the . . . Princes Marye quene of England* (1555; STC [2nd ed.] 7552), 19. This book might be what Scott Oldenburg is referring to when he states that "among the adornments of the royal wedding of Philip and Mary was a book revealing that Philip was descended from John of Gaunt." Oldenburg, "Toward a Multicultural Mid-Tudor England: The Queen's Royal Entry Circa 1553, *The Interlude of Wealth and Health*, and the Question of Strangers in the Reign of Mary I," *English Literary History* 76, no. 1 (2009): 99–129, at 103.

100. Brown, *Queen's Library*, 19.

101. Singing did occur in such ceremonies: in the 1474 entry ceremony for Prince Edward in Coventry, for example, actors playing the children of Israel sang while casting out ("castynge out") wheat cakes, Jacob and his seven sons engaged in "mynstralcye of harpe and dowsemeris" (minstrelsy of harp and dulcimer), and a similar musical accompaniment played in the background for the speech of King Edward. Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 392.

subjects attest to an open collaboration in implementing the kind of protocol visualized on this roll.¹⁰² A key word here is *open*: in the case of Margaret, the queen's intercessory activity was neither covert nor unofficial, and there is every reason to believe that it was a fully fledged component of the royal political machine. Indeed, objects associated with Margaret from the early period of her reign express the expectation that the queen was to be wholly and openly integrated into her husband's regime. The Talbot Shrewsbury book contains a dense concentration of treatises on government, warfare, and chivalry,¹⁰³ which, if these were intended to educate the son it was hoped Margaret would have—and this is by no means a necessary condition—nevertheless formed part of her own early education as queen consort. As such, it authorized her possession of martial, chivalric, and administrative knowledge even in the unlikelihood that it would find practical application.¹⁰⁴ Like many queens and noblewomen before her, Margaret was admitted to the Order of the Garter and was granted an annual allowance of the robes that came with this privilege.¹⁰⁵ Not only did she gain membership to this chivalric order but, much more unusually, Margaret also included the livery of her husband's Lancastrian house in her own seal. To the 1448 foundation charter for Queens' College, Cambridge, in which Margaret is named as founder, is affixed a well-preserved example of her seal:¹⁰⁶ in addition to

Figure 14. *Cambridge, Queens' College, Item 8, foundation charter seal, 1448* (photo: reproduced by kind permission of The President and Fellows of Queens' College, Cambridge). See the electronic edition of *Gesta* for a color version of this image.

102. On these letters, see Maurer, *Margaret of Anjou*, 54–66. The texts of seventy-four of these letters is printed in Cecil Monro, ed., *Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckett and Others: Written in the Reigns of Henry V. and Henry VI. from a MS. Found at Emral in Flintshire* (London: Camden Society, 1863).

103. Specifically, the *Arbre des batailles* by Honoré Bouvet (fols. 293r–326v), an abridged version of Henry de Gauchi's *Li livres du gouvernement des roys et des princes* (fols. 327r–62v), *Les chroniques de Normandie* (fols. 363r–402v), the *Bréviaire des nobles* by Alain Chartier (fols. 403r–4v), *Le livre des fais d'armes et de chevalerie* by Christine de Pizan (fols. 405r–38v), and the statutes of the Order of the Garter (fols. 439r–40v).

104. Craig Taylor has argued, further, that the book served in part as a vehicle through which Talbot impressed his own hawkish ambitions on the queen, effectively acknowledging the need for her complicity in his designs to reignite the wars with her native land ("Treatise Cycle of the Shrewsbury Book," 146–50).

105. See James L. Gillespie, "Ladies of the Fraternity of Saint George and of the Society of the Garter," *Albion* 17, no. 3 (1985): 259–78; and Diana Dunn, "Margaret of Anjou, Chivalry and the Order of the Garter," in *St George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Colin Richmond and Eileen Scarff (Windsor: Dean and Canons of Windsor, 2001), 39–56. Margaret was granted the garter in 1447, and wardrobe accounts record the king's order to the Keeper of the Great Wardrobe to issue the Garter robes to the queen (Kew, The National Archives, E101/409/19).

106. William George Searle, *The History of the Queens' College of St Margaret and St Bernard in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1867), 1:15–16.

the more common show of heraldic arms impaled with those of the king and surmounted by a crown there is an encircling collar of Lancastrian SS (Fig. 14).¹⁰⁷ Although, as Elizabeth Danbury has noted, "[r]elatively little work has as yet been undertaken on the subject of women's seals in England in the Middle Ages," it does appear that Margaret is the only medieval queen aside from her successor, Elizabeth Woodville, to have employed her husband's livery in such a manner.¹⁰⁸ A

107. The precise meaning of the SS remains cryptic. See George Frederick Beltz, "Notices Relating to the Ancient 'Collars of the King's Livery' and, in Particular, Those Which Are Still Denominated 'Collars of SS,'" *Retrospective Review*, ser. 2, 2 (1828): 500–510; John Gough Nichols, "On Collars of the Royal Livery," *Gentleman's Magazine*, n.s., 17 (1842): 477–85 and n.s., 18 (1842): 353–60, 595–97; Arthur Perceval Cust, *The Collar of S.S.: A History and a Conjecture* (Leeds: Jackson, 1910); C. K. Jenkins, "Collars of SS: A Quest," *Apollo* 49, no. 1 (1949): 60–62; and Doris Fletcher, "The Lancastrian Collar of Esses: Its Origins and Transformations Down the Centuries," in *The Age of Richard II*, ed. James L. Gillespie (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 191–204.

108. Elizabeth Danbury, "Queens and Powerful Women: Image and Authority," in *Good Impressions: Image and Authority in Medieval Seals*, ed. Noël Adams, John Cherry, and James Robinson (London: British Museum, 2008), 17–24, at 17. The extensive introduction to the most recent survey of heraldry in England and Wales, by Michael Siddons (*Heraldic Badges in England and Wales* [Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2009]), does not include a discussion of women and their use of badges and devices.

token of maintenance, the SS collar declares the queen's status as a loyal member of her husband's retinue.

When repositioned alongside these objects and released from the restrictive confines of the devotional corpus to which it has previously been compared, the Margaret of Anjou roll emerges as a participant in a coherent program that promoted the centrality of the queen's position at court. Medieval queens have classically been differentiated from kings by the unauthorized nature of their power, exercised in the interstices of administration, through such activities as intercession, influence, and patronage. Yet, just as recent historical scholarship has questioned the classic binary that opposes the public actions of the king with the private gestures of the queen,¹⁰⁹ so readings of objects made for queens must incorporate the public, political dimensions and contemporary inflections of their imagery. As a devotional object that praises queenship, as a visual complex that co-opts features of highly politicized genealogy, and as a document that remediates the public performances staged before the queen's eyes, the Margaret of Anjou roll welcomes a Marian model of beneficence into the machinery of state and condones its public exercise.

Appendix

Transcription of the Margaret of Anjou Roll (Oxford, Jesus College, MS 124, on deposit in the Bodleian Library)
IHC

Transcription of all the texts on the rota, from the innermost to the outermost

Blue ring around the Virgin and Child

Dignare me laudare te virgo sacrata da michi virtute[m]

109. See Theresa Earenfight, "Without the Persona of the Prince: Kings, Queens and the Idea of Monarchy in Late Medieval Europe," *Gender and History* 19, no. 1 (2007): 1–21. Over the past several years, medievalists working within a feminist perspective have chipped away at the once-cherished methodological boundary between "private" and "public." Whereas scholars had formerly characterized specifically male authority by its public exercise and female power by its private and even covert sphere of action, scholars such as Earenfight have observed that the two spaces never truly operated autonomously. Like their male counterparts, queens were subjected to a kind of scrutiny that rendered their every activity, no matter how seemingly private or domestic, as public. The most obvious example is the open performance of a queen's churching, the ritual following the birth of a child. See Caroline Shenton, "Philippa of Hainault's Churchings: The Politics of Motherhood at the Court of Edward III," in *Family and Dynasty in Late Medieval England: Proceedings of the 1997 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Richard Eales and Shaun Tyas (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2003), 105–21.

White scrolls radiating from the blue ring

o[mn]es ho[mn]es
miseri[s]
pussila[n]i[m]es
flebiles
pop[u]lus
cler[ic]us
femine

Gold words surrounding the ring with the radiating scrolls

Sancta Maria succure miseris Iuva pusillanimes refove
flebiles ora p[ro] populo interveni pro clero inter-
cede pro devoto femineo sexu sentiant omnes tuum

Gold spokes radiating from the outermost ring

Salve regina mi[sericordi]e vit[a] dulc[edo] & spes nos-
tra salve
Ad te clamamus exules filii Eva
Ad te suspiram[us] ge[men]tes & fle[n]t[es] i[n] hac
lac[rimarum] valle
Eva ergo ad vocata nostra
Illos tuos mi[sericord]es oculos ad nos co[n]verte
Et Iedum b[e]n[e]d[ictum] f[ructum] vent[ris] t[ui]
no[bis] p[ost] h[oc] ex[s]i[lium] o[ste]nde
O cleme[n]s opia o dulcis Maria salve

Stanzas in gold within the outermost ring

Salve regina mater miseris medicina
Lux matutina rosa flos et Stella marina
Clavis es ut credo celestis apertio vale,
Vite dulcedo spes n[ost]ra piissima Salve
Celi virgo decor assumpta tuis benedictis
S[an]c[t]a Maria p[re]cor miseris succ[u]rre relictis
Nobis succ[u]rre nobis miseris miserere
Pacis & in turre tecum da virgo manere

Portas pulsam[us] noli largissi[m]a claudi
ad te clamam[us] g[ra]tissima quesum[us] audi
hui[us] in exilio maris h[er]edes sumus Eve
p[ro] pomi p[re]cio su[n]t gaudia vendita ve ve
sed nos clama[n]tes a[l]ia tibi v[ir]go pusillo
ffac exultantes fore morsu mortis ab illo
ffac vos sublimes q[ue] dep[ro]mim[us] velut una
ergo pusillanimes s[an]c[t]a maria iuva

Mater in hac valle lacrimar[um] carce[re] fle[n]tes
In pacibus psalle nos co[n]forta[n]do geme[n]tes
nos hoc p[re]cam[us] hoc flem[us] et h[oc] tribulamur
et suspiram[us] ut p[er] te pace fruamur
ergo flebilib[us] nobis refoveo faveto
I[m]mo debilibus da vires corde quieto

mentis amore nove fortes vos effice[re] leto[s]
et flentes refove la[n]gue[n]te dolore repleto[s]

En p[ro]p[ri]us totus q[ui] cer[tus] ab hoste tenetur
Ut de[us] est notus nec claro corde videtur
ergo mox eth[er]a virgo lux splendida dia
cecis esto via tu v[est]ra vocata Maria
ora p[ro] populo ne m[er]gat eos g[em]ine fluve[n]
N[ost]r[is] nu[n]c oc[u]lo receabile[?] porrigere lumen
Tu[n]c siit aurora nox est O virgo decora
Surgas absq[ue] mora ia[m] p[ro] p[ro]pp[ri]o p[re]cor ora

Qui p[re]beret iter vicis celi quali prece
In fovea[m] pariter cadit heu cec[us] duce ceco
Ergo vias certas ut gra[tia] detur hale[n]di
Ad nos co[n]vertas illos oc[u]los misere[n]di
Ac intervenias p[er] clero virgo venusta
ut mo[n]strare vias studea[n]t per dog[ma]ta iusta
Omnes he[re]ticas cum clero dest[ru]e sectas
Quas ad catholicas leges i[n]f[i]me reflecta[s]

Ih[esu]m v[ir]go piu[m] fructu[m] ve[n]tri[s] qu[e]
dignum
post h[oc] exilium nobis ostende benignu[m]
ffructu[m] ventris eum qua scit[us] absq[ue] reatu
Int[er]cede deum pro devoto famulatu
ut necis a nexu solvant[ur] p[ro] gen[er]ali
ffemineo sexus nu[n]c ores in speciali
ffemi[n]ia fe[m]ineos pariendo suscipe luct[us]
ut gaudent[ur] eos valea[n]t p[ro]duce fruct[us]

Hostis u[t] q[ui]e f[r]eme[n]s no[stra] s[an]cta ma[ria]
gaud[ere] deme[n]s
ad te clamo geme[n]s o dulc[e] & o pia cleme[n]s
audi clama[n]te[m] bis t[er] salve replicante[m]
ut tecu[m] cante[m] fac me p[re]cibus lac[ri]ma[n]-
te[m]
et q[ui]cu[m]que volu[n]t t[er] virgo p[re]ces celebrare
Et celeb[ra]ndo colu[n]t tecu[m] facias iubilare
O[mn]is ho[m]o q[ui] tuu[m] valeat sentire levame[n]
Q[ui] cor amore suu[m] replere tuo studet A[men]

The blue text making up the outermost ring

Suscipio vota per vestra pie camina tot
Audio verba bona vobis ero grata patulus
Ad me clamate salve vel ave resonat
Et tunc filioli pia vota mee dabo pro
Ille quidem plene vos diligit atque sereit
Ergo relativo sibi corde placete que vin[?]t
Omnes esse satis salvos volumus valeati

The texts below the depiction of Margaret kneeling

Ad beatam virginem Oracio

Salve sancta mater dei radix vite robur spei mortis in
angustiis per te queso co[n]solari
da sincere meditari de tuis deliciis.

Salve deo consecrata priusqu[am] huic mundo nata
intra matris uterum. Do[mi]no fixa speciali ut nec
lapsu veniali peccares in posterum.

Salve stella principalis tui namq[ue] lux natalis finem
fert errorib[us] virginalis flos illuxit vita tota for-
mam duxit vite nove moribus.

Salve tante pietatis vas ut regem maiestatis de sup[er]nis
tra[he]ris. Gabriele nuntiante inaudita post & ante
nuntia susceperes.

Salve nutrix castitatis nec adhere[n]s nu[n]tiantis
don[ec] certa fieres. Salve virginali flore quod celesti
fusa rore filium concip[er]es.

Salve casta sunamitis fide credens inauditis dei plena
gaudio. Salve lux humilitatis te ancillam vocans gra-
tis dato regni solio.

Salve spiritu lustrata salve carne repurgata celi refri-
gerio. Salve deo sup[er]fusa salve generans conclusa
cordis & incendio.

Salve deum ventre gerens qua humanu[m] genus me-
rens per te sic letificat O q[uam] gaudens cecinisti
alvo [Christum] cum sensisti canticu[m] magnificat

Salve partu singularis virgo gignens virgo paris virgi-
nu[m] purissi[m]a. Gaude tanti vultu[m] regis ridens
cuius pannis regis me[m]bra sincerissima

Salve tantam gerens prolem fructum vite levis solem
tenebratis p[ro]ferens visionem pastorem stellam
viamq[ue] regalem corde puro conferens.

Salve lege volens regi non astricta tamen legi purgande
puerp[er]e nam impurum nil sensisti nec de viro
concepisti si de dei munere.

Salve templo figurali finem cultui legali ferens tuum
filu[m] Simeone gratulante sed & tibi co[m]minante
sue mortis gladiu[m].

Salve tutrix Nazaraei qui est omnis tutor rei secessu
egipto cui curam cu[m] custodis frustrans furiam
herodis fugiens cum filio.

Salve gratulans infantem ex egipto remeantem galilee
civibus. Sic stans extra nunc iudeam tandem visita-
bit eam veniens ex gentibus.

Salve [Christum] qu[ae] lactentem repperisti disse-
rentem tridui[m] post reditum leta natu[m] redux-
isti leta tecum tenuisti regem regum subditum.

Salve cernens chorscantem miris facti[s] & mostran-
tem deitatis gl[ori]am operando potestatem predi-
cando veritatem vita sanctimoniam.

Salve grandi cum dolore [Christum] madidum cruore
cernens in patibulo sed hinc minies doluisti quod
hunc pati credidisti pro salvando seculo.

Salve salutis alumna salve fidei columna in qua fides
floruit quando p[er]cusso pastore grex disp[er]sus
est timore & in fide corruit.

Salve [Chrsitum] triumphantem & infernum spolian-
tem cognosce[n]s cum gaudio et post mortem vite
datum viq[ue] sua suscitatum gaude tali filio.

Salve virgo videns leta mala mundi post deleta con-
scendentem fium supra solium ce celeste concur-
rente turba teste civiu[m] celestum.

Salve gaudens cotemplata de supernis destinata mu-
n[er]a discipulis iuxta filii promissum sp[iritu]m de
celis missum igneis & linguis.

Salve celitus assumpta no[n] me[n]s sola sed resumpta
corporis substantia ibi sola te transcendit olim in te
q[ui] descendit incarnati gloria.

Salve iubar singulare celi su[m]mi luminare toti mundo
radians universum restauratum per te videns & sub-
stratum tibi digne glorians.

Salve virgo tam sublimis carceratos nos in ymis prece
tua libera. In te iuva confidentes & devote recen-
sentes data tibi munera.

Salve sola spes salutis nos in valle servitutis pressos tot
miseriis iuva pia potestate tabescentes egestate tuis
reple copiis.

Hoc in fine mater oro votis totis hoc imploro virginum
piissima A me diligi dignare & me digne fac amare
te virgo dulcissima.

Cessent alii amores tui trahant me odores & intendant
gracie h[oc] detinear languore hoc nutriri da dul-
core ad obtentum glorie. AMEN

Ad beatam virginem Or[acio]
O magistra & ministra vere sapientie ffac me rectum &
p[er]fectum in viam iusticie.

Posce natum ut reatum meum ip[s]e diluat et implora
ut in hora mortis nil me terreat.

Ora regem ut sic legem ip[s]ius custodia[m] ut ex
mundo transeundo letus hunc aspiciam.

O beata sic p[e]cc[ata]a tuis dele precibus que co[m]-
misi paradisi ut quiescam sedibus.

Te colentes fac gaudentes cuncta pellens noxia et pro-
cura ut mansura p[er]fruamur gloria.

Maris stella sic compella aures su[m]mi iudicis ut nos
festis rex celestis societ angelicis.

Ut in sorte et cohorte sup[er]nor[um] ciuiu[m] nume-
remur & letemur in terra viventium. AMEN.

Ad beatam virgine[m] Or[acio]
Ave amantissima virgo maria
Ave benignissima virgo maria
Ave clementissima virgo maria
Ave devotissima virgo maria
Ave electissima virgo maria
Ave felicissima virgo maria
Ave gloriouissima virgo maria
Ave honestissima virgo maria
Ave iocundissima virgo maria
Ave carissima virgo maria
Ave lucidissima virgo maria
Ave mitissima virgo maria
Ave nobilissima virgo maria
Ave officiosissima virgo maria
Ave purissima virgo maria
Ave quies deo castissima virgo maria
Ave reverentissima virgo maria
Ave sci[enti]ssima virgo maria
Ave tutissima virgo maria
Ave venustissima virgo maria
Ave excellentissima virgo maria
Ave pudica virgo maria
Ave zelus iusticie virgo maria
Ave titulus g[en]ere virgo maria
Ave thalamus pudicie virgo maria
AMEN