

The Following essay has been produced to help alleviate the numerous confusions that have occurred over the centuries when people refer to 'The Wigmore Chronicle'. This essay is largely extracted from the early Introductory paragraphs to:

The Wigmore Chronicle, 1066 to 1377: A Translation of John Rylands Manuscript 215, ff. 1-8 and Trinity College, Dublin, MS.488, ff. 295-9

ed. & Trans. Remfry, P.M., [Ceidio, 2013].

Introduction

The translation presented in this book is taken from two surviving copies of what was probably originally a set of annals commenced in the last few years of the thirteenth century. These would seem to have been known as the Wigmore chronicle and were recorded as being kept in Wigmore abbey during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. The two surviving texts were copied independently probably within fifty years of each other. To my knowledge neither has been previously translated into English, although both have been transcribed^{*1}. The translations in this book are taken from these two copies. The John Rylands Latin, MS. 215, has been examined to check the accuracy of the 1934 transcription and a few amendments have been made. The original of the Dublin text has not been checked against the transcription used, due to the distance involved and the fact that it is from a more modern source.

The Wigmore chronicle contains a lot of Mortimer information, but there is little else that does not appear in older original sources. A close study of the manuscript shows that the Rylands text copies a chronicle that was based upon several earlier chronicles^{*2}. The later Dublin text is one of the few nearly 'contemporary chronicles' that cover the years 1367 to 1377, although this text as it survives is hardly a chronicle. It seems likely that the national information within the Dublin text was generally taken from only two slightly earlier chronicles and to this local Herefordshire information was added. The main source would appear to have been the leading contemporary chronicle of the mid fourteenth century, *The Universal Chronicle of Ranulf Higden*^{*3}. This too will be examined in this book, but unfortunately not this essay, as its idiosyncratic format would appear to be the basis of the composition of the latter part of the Wigmore chronicle. The Dublin text is clearly slanted towards the deeds of the Mortimer earls of March and their relatives, as well as particular events in the Middle Marches of Wales.

The local and Mortimer family associations found in the Wigmore chronicle are not recorded in other chronicles or contemporary documentation and so are not now independently verifiable. The few dates that can be checked via royal records of births and deaths seem reasonably accurate, but suffer in the same manner as most compiled chronicles. Most birth days are correct, although the year is often wrong. This generally suggests that these dates were written into the

^{*1} Evans, B.P., *The Family of Mortimer* [PhD thesis, Cardiff, 1934], 486-512; Taylor, J. 'A Wigmore Chronicle, 1355-77', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society* XI [1964], 81-94. Roger Pearse's Quick Latin programme has been used to begin the translations throughout this book. This uses Whitaker's Words 1.97 dictionary and is an excellent tool for initial readings before using Latham, R.E., *Revised Medieval Latin Word-list* [Oxford, 1983]. Quick Latin can be found at <http://www.quicklatin.com>

^{*2} These earlier chronicles are examined in the appendix, list given at end of essay.

^{*3} *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis; together with the English Translations of John Trevisa and of an Unknown Writer of the Fifteenth Century* [9 vols, 1865-86].

chronicle some time after the events they describe. Several sources for the two transcripts translated here are obviously the same as those for the Wigmore Latin Founders text now bound within Chicago MS 224^{*4}. It is no great leap of faith to suggest that the major source for our two texts was a lost Wigmore chronicle that ran from 1066 until after 1377. The Rylands text, which is taken from the earlier portion of the lost Wigmore chronicle, is nowhere near as forthcoming on the affairs of the earlier Mortimers as the later Dublin text. This is probably because such early information simply was not available to the original author or authors when they wrote many years after the events they describe. Consequently the mass of the Mortimer and local information increases in the chronicle as the years go by, veritably blossoming into the fourteenth century.

Both independent Wigmore texts, Rylands and Dublin, contain information concerning the Mortimer family and events in Wigmore that has not been preserved elsewhere. As such it is fitting for the Mortimer History Society to be involved in their first translation and publication. I am indebted to Dr Paul Dryburgh and Dr Ian Mortimer for helping find errors in this text and making many useful comments and amendments. All mistakes still found are, of course, my own.

The Various Mortimer Chronicles

If it is accepted that the two translations within this book are independent copies made at different times and taken from a lost original chronicle, it is useful to examine similar chronicles which have a strong Mortimer or Wigmore flavour. This is quite a complex subject, not least due to the two accounts printed by William Dugdale in 1656 from what is now the Chicago MS 224. His *Fundationis ejusdem Historia* is an Anglo French account of the foundation of Wigmore abbey during the reigns of Henry I (1100-1135), Stephen (1135-54) and Henry II (1154-89)^{*5}. This work commences with the statement that it was translated into French from 'ancient books' in Wigmore abbey. There seems little doubt that this French version was written up in the late fourteenth century using material that apparently commenced in the mid twelfth century^{*6}. At a later date, the Wigmore French Foundation account was bound up with another work called *Fundationis et Fundatorum Historia* in the Chicago manuscript. The bulk of this work commences with a Brut which runs from Brutus to Gwladys Ddu (d.1251), the daughter of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth (d.1240), and granddaughter of King John (d.1216). It also contains a genealogy of the English royal family which ends with King Richard II (d.1400). The work was obviously drawn up before Richard's abdication in September 1399, but after the coming of age of Earl Roger Mortimer of March in 1394/5 and before his death on 20 July 1398. The text consists of many personages described in attractively drawn roundels with various snippets of data about them added to the original text. Some of these interpolations were added well into the 1450s. The Brut occupies folios 7 to 47 of the manuscript. There then follows the *Fundationis et Fundatorum Historia* as printed by Dugdale. This composition seems of the same age as the Brut, but may have been written up immediately afterwards, possibly in the time period 1399 to 1401. For its earlier portion the Wigmore Latin Founders uses a text possibly written in 1262 or 1263 as it ends telling of Roger Mortimer's war during those two years

And from then [his acquiring Wigmore lordship in 1247] the said Roger held the said lands and castles for fifteen years, until, during the war, the said castles were betrayed by his own men.

^{*4} Giffen, M.E., 'The Wigmore Manuscript and the Mortimer Family', [Ph.D. thesis, Chicago Illinois, 1939]; 'A Wigmore Manuscript at the University of Chicago', *National Library of Wales Journal* VII [1951-2], 216-25.

^{*5} Dugdale, W., *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. Caley, J., Ellis, H. and Bandinel, B. [6 vols, London, 1846-9] VI (i), 344-8 and translated in Dickinson, J.C. & Ricketts, P.T., 'The Anglo-Norman Chronicle of Wigmore Abbey', 413-445.

^{*6} Given-Wilson, C., 'Chronicles of the Mortimer Family, c.1250-1450', *Harlaxton Medieval Studies* [1997], 70.

et extunc tenuit dictus Rogerus dictas terras et castra per xv annos, donec, imminente guerra, prodita fuerant dicta castra per homines suos.^{*7}

This does sound rather like an event that had been recorded contemporaneously. It should be noted that the Rylands Wigmore chronicle transcript uses a similar phrase in 1262 when the destroyers of Cefnllys castle are described as ‘the traitors of Maeliennydd’ (*proditores de Melenith*). All of these works are complex documents which are in need of a full translation and critical analysis. For our purposes, it is mainly important to note their existence and carry these documents in mind when considering the Wigmore chronicle.

It is worthy of comment when contemplating the history of the Mortimers of Wigmore that the four surviving ‘Mortimer histories’, Rylands, Dublin, and the two foundation histories, all appear to have been written independently of one another and in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. It is also noteworthy that another history of the Mortimers seems to have been drawn up as early as 1263, when family histories appear to have been quite rare. The nearest comparison in the Marches would be the Fitz Warin Chronicle^{*8}. This might have been written in the 1260s, but is not overly helpful while examining the Wigmore chronicle.

Finally, to aid in understanding the Wigmore chronicle and the other chronicles linked to it, a timeline has been produced. This is placed towards the end of this essay.

Part I: John Rylands Latin, MS. 215, ff. 1-8

This portion of the chronicle was first professionally noticed by Thomas Duffus Hardy, who described it as a ‘Wigmore Chronicle from 1066 to 1307’, a title that translated its original Latin designation, *Chronicon de Wigmore ab A.D. 1066 ad A.D. 1307*^{*9}. This first surviving portion of the Wigmore chronicle, as it is now preserved in Rylands, seems to have been written on, or soon after, 21 May 1382, judging from the final sentence. This was dated 76 years after the final copied annal entry for 1306. As the entire work can be seen to be all in the same hand it is quite obvious that the whole was copied in one go and was terminated on the day of, or soon before, 21 May 1382. The title and the apparently unfinished nature of the last sentence of the main text, would suggest that the copyist never fulfilled his probable intention of transcribing the chronicle down to the death of King Edward I on 7 July 1307. That he intended to reach the death of Edward is obvious from the title he gave the work. Study of the text shows that the Rylands manuscript is simply a copy of an original chronicle which is now lost. Further there is currently no reason to disbelieve that this chronicle continued beyond 1306 and was one and the same as the chronicle of which parts were later copied into the Dublin MS.

The entire Rylands account consists of a quire of eight folios inserted into the beginning of a quarto volume consisting of 64 folios in total. There are also four blank, but lined, folios at the start of the book which is 10¼ by 7¼ inches. After the text of the copied Wigmore chronicle, the bulk of the book contains a Latin Brut, or *Chronicon Angliae* as it is titled. This runs from folio 9 to 64v, and ends with the murder of King James I of Scotland in 1437. It is almost certain that the two manuscripts bound together are of a dissimilar provenance, but, as Neil Ker noted, some of the initial letters were similar, so that there was a possibility that both were written by the same hand^{*10}. Despite this, the dissimilarity of the two is almost proved by a later comment jotted on the top of

^{*7} *Idem*, 71, but cf Dickenson & Ricketts, 415, where it is shown that the original French Foundation story was written in two parts, one around 1189 and the other after 1252.

^{*8} The Fitz Warin Romance has been published many times with various commentaries. The latest being *The History of Fulk Fitz-Warine* by Alice Kemp-Welch with an introduction by Louis Brandin [In Parenthesis Publications, Old French Series, Cambridge, Ontario, 2001]. The accuracy of the statements within the work concerning the Fitz Warin family are discussed in, Remfry, P.M., *Whittington Castle and the families of Bleddyn ap Cynfyn, Peverel, Maminot, Powys and Fitz Warin* [Malvern, 2007].

^{*9} *A Descriptive Catalogue of Materials for Great Britain*, Hardy, T.D., [London, 3 vols, 1862-71] III, 291, no.518.

^{*10} Mr Ker’s catalogue of unpublished Rylands MSS was kindly shown to me by John Hodgson, Collections and Research Support Manager (Manuscripts and Archives), The John Rylands University Library.

leaf 9. Here is an inscription which would appear to predate the addition of the Wigmore chronicle to the current book. The sentence is barely legible, although it is possible to make out the name of 'Richard Salford elect'. This does not help us with the provenance of the manuscript, although a Richard Salford was abbot of Abbingdon between 1401 and 1415. The fact that the name of a possible owner was included here, at the start of the second work in the Rylands MS, would again suggest that this portion of the Wigmore chronicle and the Brut were originally quite separate entities which were only brought together after the Brut had been marked as the property of Richard Salford.

Within the volume is a flyleaf which states that the manuscript was the property of John Towneley esquire, before it passed to the Heber Collection in June 1809 at a cost of £1 11s 6d. Subsequently it was acquired by Sir Thomas Phillips in 1836 before being bought by the John Rylands Library between 24 and 28 April 1911 for £61. This is all we know for certain of the book's provenance.

When we come to look at the copy we have of the Wigmore chronicle in Rylands MS.215, we find that it has similarities to MS. Cotton Cleopatra D. ix. 7, up to 1283, but contains less detail. Despite this, specific entries are often fuller in one chronicle than in the other. The origins of the Cottonian text are now thought to be Lichfield cathedral^{*11}. From 1303 to the end, the Lichfield annals were said to be 'almost the same as *Annales Wigornenses*'^{*12}. In spite of this, it is noteworthy that the Worcester chronicle would appear to use Wigmore as a source during the early period up to 1303, but Lichfield does not. Further Wigmore would appear to use Worcester as a source after 1303, reversing their former roles. This is even more apparent by the fact that the Wigmore scribe badly mistranscribes several of the later Worcester entries in a manner that does not occur before 1303. Lichfield was some fifty miles from Wigmore and 37 miles from Worcester, so the lending of manuscripts and borrowing of sources is a distinct possibility.

The Lichfield annals (MS. Cotton Cleopatra D. ix. 7) were titled, probably at or soon after their writing, *Breve Chronicon per annos digestum, a R. Gulielmo I ad ann. 1314* - "A Brief Chronicle set in chronological order from King William I to the year 1314", or alternatively, *Anno ab Incarnatione millesimo sexagesimo sexto* - "By year from the Incarnation one thousand and sixty-six". Up until 1279 this work resembles the Wigmore chronicle, but lacks all the Mortimer and local Wigmore details. It appears to have originally ended in 1304, but has been concluded in a second hand up until 1314. There is then a final entry in a new hand concerning the treaty of 1341 between the kings of England and France. It is no longer believed that the chronicle was compiled in the regions of Gloucestershire, southern Gwent or Glamorgan^{*13}.

Interestingly there is another chronicle which could well be copied from the Wigmore chronicle or at least share a common source. This is the MS. Corpus Christi College, Canterbury 433, Item 2, which extends from 1066 to 1294 under the title *Chronicon a Conquaestu ad annum 1294* - "Chronicle from the Conquest to the year 1294". The entries in this are very short and irregular up until the reign of King Richard I, but become increasingly fuller until the end, although they are often less detailed than the Wigmore chronicle^{*14}. This was probably written up around 1295 and could well be another chronicle started by the historical enquiries made by King Edward I of his monasteries and their chronicles in March 1291^{*15}. Much of the text is identical to Wigmore and it seems likely that it copied the Wigmore chronicle, although it is also possible that they shared

^{*11} Watson, A.G., *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 700-1600 in The Department of Manuscripts The British Library*, [London, 1979, 2 vols], no.525.

^{*12} *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts Relating...* III, 291, no.519.

^{*13} *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts Relating...* III, 352, no.579.

^{*14} *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts Relating...* III, 246, no.441. My thanks go to Gill Cannell, the Sub Librarian of Parker Library, Corpus Christi College Cambridge, who brought the image of this ms to my attention at http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/manuscript_description_long_display.do?ms_no=433. I look forward to all mss being available in this superb manner.

^{*15} Stones, E.L.G., 'The Appeal to History in Anglo-Scottish Relations between 1291 and 1401', parts I and II, *Archives*, ix (1969-70), 11-21, 80-3.

a similar source. If CCC 433 does copy our original Wigmore chronicle it would seem likely that this was in existence by 1295. Comments in the text relating to Haughmond abbey suggest that this was compiled there - an abbey only thirty miles from Wigmore. The idea that this chronicle was compiled at Much Wenlock, which is also mentioned in the text, seems highly unlikely as it does not contain an entry concerning the finding of St Milburg. This event does occur in the Wigmore chronicle, and presumably also its source, so its omission from a Wenlock text, which obviously had access to it, seems highly unlikely.

It is obvious that the Worcester chronicle, as its copy has come down to us, either shared a similar source to Wigmore, or that one copied the other. In fact, as I hope to show, it seems likely that the latter parts of the Wigmore chronicle copied the Worcester chronicle and not the other way round. This fits well with the Wigmore chronicle being kept contemporaneously before 1303 at the latest. Internal evidence would suggest that the original chronicle of Wigmore was commenced in or before 1295.

Another chronicle that has been linked to Wigmore is the Ludlow chronicle, which extends from 1 to 1338AD^{*16}. This appears to have been compiled quite near to the time of its final entry in 1338. It was probably compiled after 1328 as it mentions Roger Mortimer (d.1330) in 1288 as 'afterwards earl of March'^{*17}. It is not certain that the only surviving transcript of the text is complete. Certainly the text does not carry a Mortimer bias and seems to have no link with our Wigmore chronicle, although only a full analysis of the Ludlow annals would confirm this.

We can therefore see that the Wigmore chronicle, or what we have of it today, was probably commenced in the late thirteenth century and used earlier sources to reconstruct the earlier Norman period. Therefore, as the chronicle reached time within memory, ie in the 1260s, its entries expanded accordingly and became more reliable as a historical source in its own right^{*18}. Indeed the chronicle obviously became reasonably popular, apparently being used as a source for at least three other chronicles, Lichfield, Haughmond (CCC 433) and Worcester.

Part II, Trinity College, Dublin, MS.488, ff. 295-9

The second surviving section of the Wigmore chronicle is to be found in Trinity College, Dublin, MS.488, ff. 295-9^{*19}. This has been copied into a version of Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*. It would appear to be written in a fifteenth century hand. The flyleaf states that these extracts from an ancient chronicle run from the coronation of William the Conqueror in 1006 (an error for 1066) to July 1387. Folio 3 to 303v contains the *Polychronicon* with a continuation to 1376. The extracts concerning the Wigmore chronicle are within this on folios 295 to 299. After this are a series of chronicles dealing with the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. The latest study of the text would suggest that the Higden portion of the manuscript, including the Wigmore section, dates to the second half of the fifteenth century, while the flyleaf and much of the rest of the manuscript is in a hand that would seem to be of the first half of the sixteenth century.

The Wigmore chronicle part of the manuscript commences, within the copy of *Polychronicon*, with a marginal statement that the scribe was now copying a new chronicle, which he was only transcribing in part and not in full. This is a shame for much of the original Wigmore chronicle has consequently been lost as no other copy seems to have been made that has survived. Worse, no original Wigmore chronicle has apparently ever been recorded or even mentioned as

^{*16} BL. Cotton Nero MS A iv, ff.8r-62v.

^{*17} The only modern examination of the chronicle occurs in Given-Wilson, C., 'Chronicles of the Mortimer Family, c.1250-1450', *Harlaxton Medieval Studies* [1997], 79-81.

^{*18} The longer entries in the reigns of Richard and John (1189-1216) are most likely due to the greater detail found in contemporary chronicles of this period, rather than a Wigmore source of that era. This idea is strengthened by the paucity of the record between 1217 and 1263.

^{*19} This manuscript has been described in Colker, M.L., *Medieval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College Dublin*, TCD MS 488, formerly MS. E.2.25. My thanks to Jane Maxwell, Principal Curator, Manuscripts & Archives Research Library, Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland, for pointing me in the direction of this reference.

existing in the post Reformation period. There is no other heading or information as to the provenance of our Wigmore chronicle section in the manuscript. Despite this, its contents would strongly suggest that the unnamed chronicle it partially transcribed came from Wigmore abbey and that this was a later part of the chronicle that has survived as the Rylands MS 215. The cleric, Adam Usk (bef.1355-1430), gives a strong clue to the provenance of the original document when he states:

*Iam redeamus ad dictum Radulphum, maritum dicte Wladus Thui, filium Hugonis, filii Rogeri, filii Hugonis fundatoris abbathie de Wygmore, filii Radulphi Mortumer qui primo uenit cum Wyllielmo conquestore in Angliam; iste Radulphus, dicto filio suo Hugone in dominio de Wygmore relicto, in Normaniam reuersus, ibi mortuus est, ut habetur in coronisis^{*20} dicte abbathie.^{*21}*

This was first translated in 1908 and the text given as:

Now let us go back to Ralph Mortimer, the husband of Gwladus the Dark and son of Roger, son of Hugh, the founder of the abbey of Wigmore, son of Ralph Mortimer who first came with William the Conqueror into England. This Ralph leaving his son Hugh in his lordship of Wigmore, went back into Normandy and there died.

This translation leaves much to be desired and even missed the reference to the Wigmore chronicles. The next version in 1997 is far nearer to the sense of the original Latin:

Now let us go back to the aforesaid Ralph, the husband of the aforesaid Gladys Duy, who was the son of Hugh, son of Roger, son of Hugh the founder of Wigmore abbey, son of Ralph Mortimer who first came to England with William the Conqueror; this Ralph left his aforesaid son Hugh in the lordship of Wigmore and returned to Normandy, where he died, as is stated in the chronicles of the aforesaid abbey.

Like all Latin translation we would all word things slightly differently, based upon our areas of expertise. Consequently a perhaps final version for the Wigmore chronicle should read:

Now let us return to the said Ralph, the husband of the said Gladys Ddu, the son of Hugh, the son of Roger, the son of Hugh the founder of Wigmore abbey, the son of Ralph Mortimer who first came with William the Conqueror to England; that Ralph, bequeathing to his said son Hugh the lordship of Wigmore, returned to Normandy, where he died, as is thought in the chronicles of the said abbey.

It may be pedantic to go over such old ground, but the different readings are important. Initially in the first translation all mention of the Wigmore chronicle is ignored. In the second far superior version all the main facts are brought out, but in the final version a better rendition of Mortimer history is given - and it should be noted that both modern versions are within general parameters to be taken as good translations of the precisely imprecise Latin!

Adam Usk in his compilation made many errors of fact. In these two sentences he stated that Ralph Mortimer, the husband of Gladys who died in 1246, was the son of Hugh Mortimer. Actually he was his brother, *frater* was the word he should have used, not *fili*. The error is

^{*20} This would only make sense as a misspelling of *chronicis* as it appears in Thompson cited below

^{*21} *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, ed & trans Given-Wilson, C. [Oxford, 1997], 45-7; *Chronicon Adae de Usk AD.1377-1421*, ed & trans Thompson, E.M. [London, 1904], 21-2.

obviously Adam's for the surviving Wigmore and Mortimer texts nowhere make this mistake. Yet the crucial point is that Adam mentioned chronicles that were kept at Wigmore abbey. Further, we know that this portion of Adam's chronicle was written around February 1401. This also tells us that the chronicles were extant in the abbey before this date.

Adam's entire statement could be a precis of the much longer Wigmore Latin Founders genealogies, which survive in Chicago and were drawn up at the end of the fourteenth century. If it is, it is surprising that little of this data has been transferred into the Wigmore chronicle, but then again there are few dates in this text which could have been transferred to a set of annals. By the late thirteenth century the events related about the eleventh century and even the twelfth century would have been classified as time out of memory. In the legal Hopton Commission of 1278-82, the reign of Richard I (1189-99) was taken as the limit of admissible evidence, which again shows the limit of human memory in the medieval period^{*22}. This limit of human memory is also relevant to the increase in the density of information in the Wigmore chronicle from the 1260s onwards. This again tends to point to a late 1290s commencement date for the annals.

It is interesting that the extracts taken from the Wigmore chronicle are placed in no chronological order in Dublin MS.488. This is exactly how the Ricardian section of Adam's chronicle is set out, with a total disregard for chronology. Indeed it is worth quoting Adam in full, when, in his own chronicle of the years 1377 to 1399, which he wrote up in February 1401, he stated:

Be tolerant, reader, of the sequence of years in which I have narrated events up to this point, for I have simply set down from memory what I saw and what I heard, with more thought for the truth of what happened than for the order in which it happened.^{*23}

Quite possibly the Wigmore section of the Dublin text was related to Adam's research, although only a close study of both original texts would be useful to take this matter further.

As Adam Usk wrote this passage during February 1401, we have an early fifteenth century writer who knew of the Wigmore chronicle, or chronicles as he put it. This may well suggest that Adam knew of several works on Mortimer history kept at Wigmore abbey. Currently four possible Wigmore manuscripts survive; the two examined here, the Wigmore French Foundation and the Wigmore Latin Founders. Added to these would have been the original Wigmore chronicle as probably compiled in the 1290s and continued intermittently until at least 1379^{*24}. Similarly an entry concerning the kingdom of Castile made nominally in 1371 would suggest that this was written before 1392 and certainly before 1402. The surviving text of the chronicle in the late fifteenth century Dublin MS copy could suggest that the original author of the surviving section commenced his work around 1368 and updated the work until after 1379, though how much of this was written contemporaneously is open to question. The manner of the surviving fifteenth century copy might suggest that the original layout was haphazard, or that the fifteenth century copyist simply cherry picked the data he was interested in over a period of time and thereby confused the chronology. The similarity in haphazard chronology between Adam Usk and the Dublin MS should be noted.

The work of Ranulf Higden was the most copied of medieval manuscripts with over 120 versions surviving to this day. It is therefore lucky that someone thought to copy extracts from the far less popular Wigmore chronicle into their own copy of this work. Almost certainly the scribe

^{*22} See the Introduction, Davies, J.C., *The Welsh Assize Roll, 1277-1284* [Cardiff, 1940] for the Hopton Commission and the Introduction to the *Annales Cambriae. A Translation of Harleian 3859; PRO E.164/1; Cottonian Domitian, A 1; Exeter Cathedral Library MS. 3514 and MS Exchequer DB Neath, PRO E.164/1*, ed & trans. Remfry, P.M. [Malvern, 2007], for the possible use of some of this information.

^{*23} *The Chronicle of Adam Usk, 1377-1421*, ed & trans Given-Wilson, C. [Oxford, 1997], 18.

^{*24} The entry for 1364 must have been compiled after December 1379, as it mentions the marriage between Elizabeth Mortimer and Harry Hotspur that month.

was of a Herefordshire or Mortimer extraction to take such notice and record so many Mortimer events as well as several Wigmore occurrences. As most *Polychronicons* ended in the mid fourteenth century it is little surprise that the 'Dublin' scribe used another chronicle to continue his story. It is our good fortune that he chose the Wigmore chronicle to take the text on up into the reign of King Richard II (1377-99).

Whatever the provenance of the entire manuscript, the piece which is of importance to this study, the extracts from the Wigmore chronicle, were made in the fifteenth century. They run irregularly and unchronologically from 1359 to 1377 and contain two singular entries for 1349 and 1355. It is therefore readily apparent that the original portion of the Wigmore chronicle between 1306 and 1359 has been effectively lost. Worse, what has survived, certainly in the post 1359 sections, would appear to be only a chronologically mangled and undated precis of that section. It is also quite certain from the two entries outside the main span of the chronicle, that the original chronicle as copied, ran from at least 1349 to 1377. Therefore it is clear that the bulk of the chronicle between 1349 and 1360 has been lost. Again, the fact that the Rylands text ends abruptly in 1306 and the Dublin text starts irregularly in 1349 suggests that both come from an original chronicle that ran from 1066 to 1377 and possibly beyond.

The Dublin extracts of the Wigmore chronicle have some severe problems. Some sections have been badly transcribed with words missing and passages apparently confused. Further they have been put together in no particular chronological order. To make matters worse the scribe also failed to note the annal years, though sentences often being with *Hoc anno* or *Eodem anno* without a qualifying year designation and obviously in the wrong order. The use of such phrases shows that the text was originally written by year and probably follows the Higden manuscript for style. Unfortunately no original years were copied into the Dublin transcript, except for an anachronistic insertion of the date 1370 into an annal that can be shown to have referred to 1367. The lack of secure dating was possibly due to the original manuscript lacking these, or, more likely, because the copyist simply was not interested in checking back in the chronicle to find the regnal years at the start of each annal. We can therefore be reasonably certain that the original work the scribe copied began before 1349 and possibly ran on beyond 1377.

The Dublin text ends with a possibly incomplete list of those who had died in Herefordshire after 1368. Why the year 1368 was chosen as the commencement date for these deaths is unknown, as too is why no obit was given. Possibly the scribe was simply drawing from memory those knights he knew to have died since he arrived at Wigmore. This, of course, is pure speculation, but the fact that the scribe used Herefordshire knights strongly suggests his geographical location. The last known obit for any of those knights mentioned seems to be Lord Thomas Chandos on 6 October 1375. This is a little over two years before the extracts cease in 1377. Therefore it suggests that the copyist had finished copying these extracts from the Wigmore chronicle when he wrote this and that no knights died in Herefordshire between October 1375 and December 1377. However it should be noted that the obits of at least four of the knights mentioned are currently unknown, and those that are known are patently not listed chronologically.

The Dublin text was written after December 1379 as an entry which can be dated to 1364 mentions a marriage that did not occur until slightly before 10 December 1379. It is of course possible that the knowledge of this event was added into the Dublin extracts from the scribe's personal knowledge and did not exist in any lost original Wigmore chronicle. The scribe obviously copied a document which was partially written up near-contemporaneously at different times. In the entry for the 1365 birth of Edward Plantagenet, the elder brother of King Richard II (1377-99), the copied Wigmore text states that he was thought of as King Edward V. This would suggest that the original author was unaware that Edward would die in 1370, or that Prince Edward would die in 1376 without ever becoming king. It would also suggest that the Dublin copyist of the Wigmore chronicle did not bother to correct these facts. Conversely the scribe of the 1367 entry, concerning the birth of the young Prince Richard, was obviously aware that he survived his eldest brother

Edward and succeeded his grandfather in 1377. Judging from the comment on the birth of Prince Edward in 1365 this section was therefore written before 1370, as the author was unaware of Prince Edward's death. The entry was then copied *verbatim* into the Dublin MS at a time when it was obviously wrong. Similarly the Dublin scribe at least must have written of Richard's birth after 1377, as he was aware of King Richard II's succession. The evidence might suggest that this section of the original Wigmore chronicle was begun anachronistically in 1368. It was carried on irregularly until the final entry of December 1377. This final entry was made some time after December 1379. Alternatively it might simply be that the current copy was made in one session and the original text, written at different times, was simply copied *verbatim*, as was common practice.

In conclusion it can be seen that there was only one Wigmore chronicle and that this ran from at least 1066 to 1377 or later. This work was probably begun in 1295 and was then continued roughly contemporaneously for several years and was probably still being irregularly added to in the latter part of the fourteenth century. Two independent copies of this were made and survive in the Dublin and Rylands libraries. Additional to these were the two apparently independent Wigmore texts printed by William Dugdale in 1656, from what is now the Chicago MS 224. These are the *Fundationis ejusdem Historia* and the *Fundationis et Fundatorum Historia*, which often wrongly called Wigmore chronicles, confusing what was already a confused situation even further.

Timeline of Events Relevant to the Wigmore Chronicle

Year	Place	Event
1186	Mont St Michael	Robert Torigni, a source of Wigmore, dies
bef 1189	Wigmore?	First part of lost Wigmore Latin Foundation written
1232	Margam	End of Margam annals, an apparent source of Wigmore
aft 1252	Wigmore?	Second part of lost Wigmore Latin Foundation written
1263	Wigmore?	Original Latin Founders written
1263	Waverley	Wigmore ceases to use Waverley as a source
1283	Bristol	Wigmore's first chapter at St Augustine's, Bristol
Mar 1291		Edward I asks to see chronicles of all the religious houses
1295	Bury St Edmunds	Fl Wig continuation, a source of Wigmore, ends
1295	Wigmore	Wigmore chronicle compiled
1295	Haughmond	CCC MS.433 compiled from Wigmore chronicle?
1303	Worcester	Worcester annales copied Wigmore to here
1303	Wigmore	Wigmore chronicle copies Worcester to 1306+
1304 to 1314	Lichfield	Lichfield copies Wigmore to 1279/83 or more likely shares a similar source. This may be Worcester which Lichfield copies from 1303 to 1308.

1306	Wigmore?	Last entry from Wigmore chronicle copied into Rylands
1306	Westminster?	Last known use of <i>Flores</i> by Wigmore
1349-77		Dublin extracts data from the Wigmore chronicle
1356		<i>Eulogium</i> compiled and then continued to 1377+
1366		Up to this date <i>Eulogium</i> used as source for Wigmore, after this date they seem to share sources
1368	Wigmore?	Possible date for the Dublin extracts of the Wigmore chronicle being begun
1377	Wigmore	Last known entries into Wigmore chronicle
Dec 1379	Wigmore	Last implied date in Dublin extracts
May 1382	Wigmore?	Rylands copied Wigmore chronicle up to 1306
1388	Oxford	Adam Usk a teacher at Oxford
1394-98	Wigmore?	Wigmore Latin Founders written
bef 1401	Wigmore?	Wigmore French Foundation translated from Lost Wigmore Latin Foundation
Mar 1401		Adam Usk mentions the 'Wigmore chronicles'
1450-99		Dublin extracts of Wigmore chronicle copied
1462-63		Capgrave writes his chronicle, possibly using Wigmore as a source

Contents of The Wigmore Chronicle, 1066 to 1377: A Translation of John Rylands Manuscript 215, ff. 1-8 and Trinity College, Dublin, MS.488, ff. 295-9,
ed. Remfry, P.M., [Ceidio, 2013]

Introduction	i
The Various Mortimer Chronicles	ii
Part I: John Rylands Latin, MS. 215, ff.1-8	iv
Part II, Trinity College, Dublin, MS. 488, ff.295-9	viii
The Constituent Annals of Part I, John Rylands Library, Latin MS. 215	xvii
The Annal Sources of the Wigmore Chronicle	xix
The Main Sources of the First Part of the Wigmore Chronicle to 1306	xx
Description of the first part of the Wigmore Chronicle	xxii
The Constituent Annals of Part II, Trinity College, Dublin, MS. 488	xxv
Timeline	xxvii
Conventions of the Translation	xxix

The Surviving Text of the Wigmore Chronicle, 1095 to 1377

Part I, 1066 to 1306	1
Part II, 1349 to 1378	72

Appendix

Florence Worcester and his Continuators, AD 1 to 1301	103
Robert Torigni, AD 94 to 1186	108
Waverley Annals, AD 1 to 1291	109
Margam Annals, 1066 to 1232	111
Roger Wendover, AD 1 to 1235	112
Matthew Paris, <i>Chronica Majora</i> , AD 1 to 1259	113
Matthew Paris, <i>Historia Anglorum</i> , 1067 to 1253	115
Tewkesbury Annals, 1066 to 1263	117
<i>Flores Historiarum</i> , AD 1 to 1327	118
<i>Flores Historiarum</i> Manuscripts	119
The Contents of <i>Flores Historiarum</i>	122
Worcester Annals, AD 1 to 1308	123
Ranulf Higden's <i>Polychronicon</i> , to 1360	127
The Bruts	128
<i>Eulogium Historiarum</i>	128
Adam Usk	129
Capgrave's Chronicle of England	131
Bibliography	132