

NORFOLK INVOLVEMENT IN DYNASTIC CONFLICT 1469-1471 AND 1483-1487

by Michael Sayer, M.A.

For most of the fifteenth century Norfolk and Suffolk were dominated by the two rich and powerful families of Mowbray and de la Pole.¹ Their mutual antagonism during the lifetime of William de la Pole, first Duke of Suffolk, the royal favourite, tended to reinforce the traditional Mowbray hostility to the house of Lancaster and John Mowbray, the third Duke of Norfolk, was twice imprisoned under Henry VI whom he was said to have been plotting with York's steward Oldhall to depose in 1450.² Despite Suffolk's fall and death that year and the creation of Norfolk's son as Earl of Surrey and Warrenne while still a child in 1451, this underlying pattern was enabled to persist by the continuation of court backing for Suffolk's protégés Sir Thomas Tuddenham of Oxborough and the lawyer John Heydon of Baconsthorpe,³ while Norfolk built up his own interest from Framlingham Castle, based on men like Sir Robert Wingfield⁴, Thomas Danyell (hitherto Suffolk's man)⁵, John Radclyffe⁶, and others.⁷ Nevertheless, no Yorkist claim to the throne had yet been asserted, and Sir Philip Wentworth, the royal standard-bearer at St. Alban's in 1455, was then apparently a Mowbray follower⁸, although the Duke himself was a day late for the battle. He was able to choose the knights of the shire for Norfolk in 1455⁹ without court opposition and he and his retainers are named in the Lancastrian commissions of array against York and the Nevills up to 28 April 1460.

However, Norfolk remained lukewarm and Lancastrian control of the region rested on lesser territorial figures like Lord Scales¹⁰, Danyell (who had now become his retainer), Tuddenham¹¹, Heydon, John Wyndham¹², Edmund Blake¹³, Wentworth (now a courtier)¹⁴, Giles Seintlow¹⁵, and others¹⁶, whose influence collapsed quickly in 1460¹⁷. The de la Poles, in eclipse during the minority of John, the second Duke of Suffolk, had no doubt been alienated by the favours shown to Henry VI's Tudor half-brothers, Edmund marrying young Suffolk's divorced child-bride the heiress Margaret Beaufort, and Jasper receiving Duke William's Earldom of Pembroke. By October 1460 both Dukes had joined York, Suffolk (still a minor) marrying his daughter Elizabeth, and both were in the Yorkist army at second St. Alban's on 17 February 1460/1 and Ferrybridge on 28 March. The next day, Norfolk's late arrival at Towton proved decisive for Edward IV and he must have played a leading part in the reign but for his death on 6 November. Although there was thus a period when both Dukes were minors, Norfolk's heir being in the wardship of Sir John Wenlock, the Mowbray interest remained strong, Sir John Howard (who had been knighted at Towton) becoming Sheriff¹⁸, constable of Norwich and Colchester castles, and in 1462 taking a strong force to assist Edward IV in the north¹⁹, while the late Duke's followers John Timperley and Richard Southwell were both in favour.²⁰

THE DUKES OF NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK

John Mowbray, fourth Duke of Norfolk, had livery of his lands on 23 March 1464/5. He was to be the leading nobleman in East Anglia for most of the next ten years. He had no more scruples than his father about the practise of what is

now called bastard feudalism. He was quicker to profit from the weakness of the crown than to support it but his assistance was important enough when given to secure him as an important ally of the Yorkist throne. His cousin Sir John Howard was the better Yorkist, and seems not to have been so deeply involved in his activities. The Duke had married in 1462 Elizabeth Talbot whose brother the Earl of Shrewsbury had been killed by the Yorkists at Northampton two years earlier. He might almost seem a forceful and over-mighty subject, and yet it appears that he was entirely under the influence of his chief counsellor William Brandon.^{2 1}

Probably the full extent of the Mowbray activities will never be known. No indentures of service survive among the muniments at Arundel Castle. But certainly it seems that the scale of the last Duke's operations was bigger even than those of his father. In 1468, he forced Thomas Charles of Loddon and Kettleburgh to convey him his manors in Siseland, Kettleburgh and Loddon and the advowsons of Kettleburgh and Easton, having had him imprisoned for thirteen weeks as a Lancastrian. Meanwhile, Lord Herbert was disseising Charles in Wales. Not until 1 Henry VII, ten years after the Duke's death, were the properties recovered by Charles's daughters Elizabeth wife of Edmund Clere of Stokesby and Margery Marshall.^{2 2}

This, however, was nothing compared to the Duke's involvement in what has become the cause célèbre of fifteenth century Norfolk history, the disputes over the estates of Sir John Fastolf. Ageing and in declining health, the old Garter knight, victor of the Battle of the Herrings and one of the best known veterans of the Hundred Years War, returned to his native county and built Caister Castle for his retirement. By including among his executors men such as William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester, and two local serjeants at law, William Yelverton of Rackheath and Rougham and William Jenny of Knodishall, he no doubt hoped to secure some measure of assent to his last wishes. His executors, including John Paston of Paston, were to found a college of priests at Caister. A will dated 14 June 1459 gave the residue of his properties to be sold but another will, made 3 November, just before his death, left all his Norfolk and Suffolk lands to Paston subject only to the founding of the college, and gave wide powers to him and Thomas Howes, Rector of Pulham, another executor. Disputes engulfed wills and estates alike. When John Paston died on 21/22 May 1466, he had been since Fastolf's death twice knight of the shire (1460 and 1461),^{2 3} thrice imprisoned by Edward IV, and had seen Caister briefly occupied in 1461 by the third Duke of Norfolk, and in 1465 by Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales, with a follower called Scarning and sixteen men, while also in 1465 the Duke of Suffolk had seized Hellesdon and Drayton.

Suffolk seems to have been a negative character. He was confirmed in his lands and titles on 23 March 1462/3 on coming of age. He never exploited his alliance with the house of York. When his sons did so, he gave them no real backing. There are, however, two references in the Paston Letters to his being ill, on 8 June 1464 and 20 May 1478,^{2 4} and perhaps his ineffectiveness was due to ill health. On 7 January 1462/3, Margaret Paston wrote of him:^{2 5} 'They love not in no wyse the Dwke of Sowthfolk nor his modyr. They sey that all the tretourys and extorsyonerys of thys contre be meynteynd by them and by syche as they get to them with her goodys, to that intent to meynten suche extorsyon style as hathe be do by suche as hathe had the rewyll undyr them before tyme'. Suffolk's eldest son John was made Earl of Lincoln 13 March 1466/7, aged four.

It was hardly satisfactory for the central government to have two great nobles pursuing their own ends with such disregard for law, especially considering the dangers this might cause in a renewed outbreak of war. Edward IV seems to have tried to ensure that the sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk was a personal retainer, such as Sir Thomas Montgomery of Faulkbourne, who succeeded Howard. Montgomery was followed in 1463 by William Calthorpe who had Mowbray leanings but the next two sheriffs were Alexander Cressener of Hawkedon and Alphamstone, a Yorkist, and William Hopton of Westwood in Blythburgh who later became a Privy Councillor and Treasurer of the Household. Hopton was followed in 1466 by Montgomery for a third year and John Twyer,²⁶ the next sheriff, may have had a similar court attachment, while Roger Ree who followed him was an Usher of the Chamber and certainly did so. The last two seem not to have been of local origin, while Montgomery was from Essex. where many of Cressener's interests also lay.

The realities of power, however, decisively favoured the two Dukes. In a crisis Edward needed them. The northern rising of 1469 left him a prisoner of the Nevills on 28 July and Norfolk took the opportunity to lay siege to Caister within a fortnight. He knew that both sides would be likely to court him, or at least avoid antagonising him. When Edward had regained his freedom and issued commissions of array for the county on 29 October, 16 November, and again on 12 February 1469/70 to move against the Lincolnshire rebels (and then Warwick and Clarence), he named only the two Dukes, Scales (now Earl Rivers) and Sir John Howard. Ree's successor as sheriff was Norfolk's retainer John Heveningham of Heveningham.

THE MOWBRAY INTEREST AT THE SEIGE OF CAISTER CASTLE

There seems little doubt that the last Mowbray Duke's chief councillor was William Brandon. He had manors in Henham and Trimley and married Elizabeth daughter of Sir Robert Wingfield, the third Duke's enemy, but sister of Sir John and Sir Robert, who were Mowbray supporters. In June 1469, his brother-in-law Thomas Wingfield reported to John Paston Edward IV's view of Brandon.²⁷ The latter had spoken to the King on the Duke's behalf concerning Caister. 'Brandon', said the King, 'thow thou can begyll the Dwk of Norffolk, and bryng hym abow the thombe as thow lyst, I let the wet thow shalt not do me so; for I undyrstand thy fals delyng well inow.' Wingfield went on to report that the King continued 'that if my Lord of Norffolk left not of hys hold of that mater, that Brandon shold repent itt, every vayn in hys hert, for he told hym that he knew well inow that he myght reauyll my Lord of Norffolk as he wold; and if my Lord dyd eny thyng that wer contrary to hys lawys, the Kyng told hym he knew well inow that it was by no bodys menys but by hys.'²⁸ Two months later Brandon totally ignored this forceful language.

Brandon seems to have spent most of his life as a Mowbray retainer. He was escheator of Norfolk and Suffolk 1454-5 and Marshall of the King's Bench from 1457. In January 1461-2 he became King's servitor, and was member of Parliament for Shoreham in 1467. In 1468 he was put in the commission of the peace for Suffolk, and a year later became customer of Ipswich. He was not of an old family and indeed was the first of his line to hold manors. In short, he made his career under the Mowbray Dukes.

The Duke was also accompanied at the siege by his brother-in-law Sir Humphrey

Talbot, who was not perhaps a retainer in the full sense, bearing in mind the prior commitment he presumably had to his own family interest, and by members of several leading Norfolk and Suffolk families.

John Radclyffe, who would have been seventeen, was the son by the heiress of Fitzwalter, of John Radclyffe, killed at Ferrybridge. His father had been a leading Mowbray follower. He was not to become prominent until later when he was summoned to Parliament as Lord Fitzwalter in 1485 on his mother's death, but was accompanied by two of his family, James Radclyffe²⁹ and Black John Radclyffe.³⁰ James Radclyffe seems also to have had a foot in the Nevill camp through his wife Katherine, widow of Oliver Dudley and daughter of George, Lord Latimer. Her brother Sir Henry Nevill was killed at the battle of Edgcote on 14 July 1469. The Radclyffes came into Norfolk from Lancashire with the marriage of Sir John Radclyffe, Seneschal of Aquitaine and Governor of Bordeaux, who died in 1440, to Cecilia daughter of Sir Thomas Mortimer of Attleborough.

Sir Thomas Waldegrave of Smallbridge had been knighted by Edward IV at Towton, no doubt in the retinue of the Duke of Norfolk. He was of an old knightly family and is presumably meant by William of Worcester in his list of the besiegers in place of the unidentifiable Sir John.³¹

Henry Wentworth of Nettlestead was of a Lancastrian family. His father Sir Philip was as observed attainted in 1461 and beheaded after Hexham in 1464. His mother was a Clifford. With his uncle Henry he was pardoned in 1462, and secured the reversal of his father's attainder in 1464. He became an esquire of the household in 1468. Although settled in Suffolk, with his uncle Henry at Codham in Essex, his family was of Yorkshire origin and retained interests there. After the disasters that had befallen his father, he was no doubt glad to be able to attach himself to a powerful noble whose family had taken the Yorkist side in 1460-1. And he married Anne, daughter of the Yorkist Sir John Say. Worcester lists Sir Philip Wentworth among the besiegers, but must mean Henry, who was knighted later.

Sir John Wingfield of Letheringham (called Sir Thomas by Worcester) had been knighted at Edward IV's coronation and had been with the King in the north in 1462. His father, Sir Robert, who died in 1454, originally the third Duke's steward, became a great enemy of the Mowbrays as already seen, but it seems that some kind of settlement was effected, for his sons John and Robert became Mowbray followers. John became sheriff in 1454 while his brother Robert received a pardon, (when described as of Framlingham Castle), on 6 February 1454-5, and was knight of the shire for Suffolk in 1455. Sir John Wingfield married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir John FitzLewes of West Horndon, Essex, and his family was the surviving branch of the Wingfields of Wingfield whose estates had passed by marriage to the de la Poles. Sir John was accompanied at the siege by William and Thomas Wingfield, apparently his fifth and sixth sons. Thomas was by way of being a friend of the Pastons, but clearly had to appear.

John Heveningham of Heveningham had in 1458 been involved with Mundford, the Pastons and Berneys.³² He was with Edward IV in the north in 1462. Before the siege began in earnest, he was sent to negotiate a surrender but this was refused. Shortly after the siege, he was made sheriff.

Four members of the Debenham family came to the siege. Gilbert Debenham of Wenham had started life as an esquire in the household of the Duke of Exeter, who mentioned him in his will in 1426. Between 1426 and 1453 he was six times

knight of the shire for Suffolk, and once member for Ipswich.³³ He was at one time the Mowbray steward and exercised a form of tyranny over Ipswich and Colchester. When the Earl of Oxford was restored to his lands in 1463-4 Debenham was exempted from any effects on his manor of Vaux in Wenham. With Debenham were his sons Sir Gilbert, William and Robert, and perhaps another. The eldest had married the widow of William, Lord Zouche of Haringworth, but although she died next year leaving him no child, he did not remarry, it seems.

Sir William Calthorpe of Burnham was another friend of the Pastons, and a cousin. Indeed, Sir John Paston, in his will in 1479, entailed Caister on him in the event of the extinction of his more immediate family. He, too, was unable to avoid coming. He came of an old Norfolk family that had given Norwich a bishop in Walter de Suffield two centuries earlier. He was knight of the shire in 1445 and sheriff in 1441-2, 1458-9 and 1463-4, and his position had been unaffected by the change of dynasty. He was knighted at the Queen's coronation on 26 May 1465, and had served in the North in 1462. In June 1469 he was reported as one of Gloucester's men, but this seems to have been wrong.³⁴ His first wife Elizabeth, who had died in 1437, was daughter of Reginald, Lord Grey de Ruthin. He remarried Elizabeth, daughter and coheir of Sir Miles Stapleton of Ingham³⁵ by his second wife Catherine, daughter of Sir Thomas de la Pole of Grafton, brother to the first Duke of Suffolk.

Besides these knights and gentlemen, the Duke of Norfolk had several lesser retainers with him who had made their careers in Mowbray service. John Timperley of Hintlesham was there. As three generations of his family bore the same name, there is a little confusion between them. The first John came to Hintlesham from Cheshire, and was of Framlingham in 1452, and knight of the shire for Suffolk 1445. According to Copinger he died in 1460.³⁶ In this case, it was the second John, (who died in 1491), his son, who received the pension in 1461. One or other of them was member for Ipswich in 1455 and Reigate in 1453 and 1460. The son was member for Yarmouth in 1467 and customer of Ipswich, and was to be a trustee of the Duke in 14 Edward IV. He married firstly Sir John Howard's bastard daughter Joan. His son, the third John, was member for Steyning in 1467 and Ipswich in 1469. One or other was at Caister. This was another family with a tradition of Mowbray attachment.

Richard Southwell was, as has been seen, a retainer of the third Mowbray Duke. He had been escheator in 1455-6 and 1459-60 and member for Yarmouth in 1455. He was excepted from Acts of Resumption in 1461, 1464 and 1467, and was to be so again in 1474, the year he became a trustee of the Duke. He made a good second marriage to Amy, daughter and coheir of Edmund Wychingham of Wood Rising.

Other old Mowbray retainers at the siege were Robert Letham (or Leedham) of Witton,³⁷ John Loveday or Losday (later Letham's executor),³⁸ and Hugh Austin of Starston.³⁹ The other besiegers on Worcester's list are John Lancaster of Bressingham and two sons, a Herward of Cromer, a Bardwell of West Harling, a Swansey, Simond Fitz-Simond from Essex, and a son each of Lord Cobham (Brooke), Fulk Stafford and Sir Lawrence Reynford.

The siege began in mid-August and by 10 September the Duke had sent James Hobart to Archbishop Nevill to put his case, presumably as a holding operation.⁴⁰ Hobart was apparently the Duke's legal adviser. He was second son of Thomas Hobart of Overbury Hall in Leyham and had been member for Ipswich in 1467.

Like most career lawyers, he had of necessity to accept each change of dynasty as it came, and did so.

The defenders were Sir John Paston's younger brother John, with Osbern Berney of Braydestone (third son of John Berney of Reedham), and John Daubeny, probably of the family from Sharrington. They had a handful of servants and valets under them. The garrison surrendered on 26 September by which time Daubeny had been killed.⁴¹ A safe conduct was obtained, apparently with the help of Clarence and the Archbishop. Although it had its precedents, such as Suffolk's two attacks on Hellesdon and destruction of Drayton in 1465, it may not be unfair to suggest that the siege of Caister was the biggest act of private lawlessness in the reign after the battle of Nibley Green.

Worcester's list is of particular interest because it presumably shows the Mowbray interest at virtually full strength. Even so, it will be observed that relatively few Norfolk and by no means all Suffolk families were involved with the Duke. It is unfortunate that there is no similar list of the de la Pole faction but there is little doubt that many of the Norfolk gentry lived quietly through the period without strong attachment to either Duke, or indeed to any great lord. With a weakened crown, and lacking any other focus for their loyalties, they could not, however, in any way form a check or counterweight to the power of the Dukes.

THE EARL OF OXFORD AND THE READEPTION OF HENRY VI

In March 1469-70, in the aftermath of the Lincolnshire rebellion, Edward IV moved suddenly against Warwick and Clarence, who had to flee to Calais. Norfolk might not have been expected to be involved as a county, but when on 25 April 1470 Henry Grey of Ketteringham was ordered to seize the Norfolk and Suffolk lands of their supporters there were two local names on his list, William Knyvett and Richard Roos. Warwick was back in September, bringing Clarence with him, and having made an alliance with Queen Margaret. On 6 October Edward fled from Nottingham to King's Lynn, and just managed to escape to the Low Countries with Gloucester and a few adherents, including Sir Gilbert Debenham and Sir Robert Chamberlain (son of Sir Roger). Sir Thomas Montgomery was captured. In London, Henry VI resumed the throne under the auspices of the Nevills. The leading figure in East Anglia was John de Vere, thirteenth Earl of Oxford.

Oxford's mother was a Howard and cousin of Sir John. Through her father, another Sir John, she inherited the Barony of Plaiz and in due course Oxford was to become entitled through her to that of Scales. He was married to Warwick's sister Margaret so that he was par excellence the man connected with the Nevills as well as the House of Lancaster. Edward IV had imprisoned him in the Tower in 1468 but he was pardoned on 5 April 1469. He fled to France in 1470, joining Queen Margaret while Warwick and Clarence went to Calais, and now became Constable of England. His main power was in Essex centred on Wivenhoe and Castle Hedingham. His life reads like a romance of chivalry.

Oxford's principal lieutenants were his brothers Sir George and Sir Thomas, and four squires. Robert Harleston of Shimpling, Suffolk, was a younger brother of John Harleston of Shimpling (who died in 1457 and had been three times knight of the shire for Suffolk), and uncle and heir of John Harleston, who died in 1459.⁴² Robert with his relation William Harleston were both included in the new commission of the peace for Suffolk. The other three squires were

Robert Gybbon of Wingfield,^{4 3} William Godmanston of Bromley, Essex, and John Durrant of Collewston, Northamptonshire.

Besides these, the new government already had a number of actual or potential supporters in Norfolk. William Knyvett of Buckenham Castle was the son of John Knyvett of Buckenham, Mendlesham and Weldon. He had been knight of the shire in 1467 and now became sheriff. With his father, he had been in the commission of the peace since 1464 and Wedgwood thinks he sat in the Readeption Parliament. With his father, (who only died 5 Henry VII, 1489-90), he was on the commission of oyer and terminer of 18 and 27 October 1470. Knyvett had been Customer of Boston 1463-4 and of Ipswich 1465-8. His wife Alice was sister to Edmund, Earl of Kent, who as Lord Grey de Ruthin had betrayed the Lancastrians at Northampton in 1460. Why he was proscribed in April 1470, and whether as a follower of Warwick or of Clarence, is hard to say. His grandmother was the eventual heiress of the Cliftons of Buckenham Castle, and at this time he was the only effective head of a family of such standing pursuing a course so clearly independent of either local Duke.

Richard Roos, proscribed with Knyvett, was his uncle by marriage. He was a younger brother of Thomas, Lord de Roos, who had been beheaded after Hexham, and he married Joan Knyvett, widow of Robert Toppes, Mayor of Norwich. His brother's Norfolk property included manors in Houghton-in-the-dale, Hackford next Reepham, and Watton. Like Knyvett, Roos was included in the commission of oyer and terminer of October 1470. He and John Knyvett were friends of the Pastons.^{4 4}

The Paston family were keen supporters of the new government, as was only to be expected. They had originally welcomed the change of 1460-1, but before that had had links with Oxford's father. Sir John had served with Edward IV in the north in 1462, and been knighted in 1463. He succeeded his father in 1466 and was knight of the shire in 1467, despite his quarrel with both Dukes. Recently he had lent money to Archbishop Nevill and now he recovered Caister thanks to the new regime. Few people could have been so closely bound to it through their own vital interests. He and his brother John were both on the oyer and terminer and he may have been made Constable of Norwich Castle.^{4 5}

Besides Oxford, Warwick, Clarence and the two Dukes the other members of the commission of oyer and terminer were Sir William Calthorpe, John Radclyffe (Fitzwalter), John Jenney, John Hastings of Elsing, John Fincham, Richard Pygot, Thomas Billing the judge, Roger Townshend and Henry Spelman. The first two of these seem to have become detached from the Mowbray interest. In view of the way the Mowbrays' supporters were treated at this time, it seems perhaps unlikely that they could have been Norfolk's representatives in the new order. Jenney had been in the commission of the peace ever since Henry VI's first reign. His property was at Hardwick and Intwood and he was younger brother of William Jenney of Knodishall, later to be a judge and a knight. John Fincham of Fincham was of an old gentle family and probably a lawyer, and remained singularly unaligned. He was in every successive commission of the peace beginning during the first reign of Henry VI and ending during that of Henry VII. He was not, it seems, the retainer of any noble, and his wife was Beatrix, daughter of Henry Thoresby, a Lynn merchant. He was typical of the many gentry in Norfolk who belonged to no party but continued to function much the same within the context of whatever situation existed. The lawyer, Henry Spelman, was of another ancient but (hitherto) undistinguished line. One of his wives was the heiress of

Narborough and her inheritance seems to have been divided rather in the favour of her Spelman children, than of those by her first husband, Thomas Shouldham. Spelman's leanings, it will appear, seem to have been more pronounced than any the Jenneys or Fincham may have had. John Hastings, of grander pedigree,^{4 6} seems to have been relatively uncommitted.

Further individuals on whom the Radeption government could count, or had to rely, can be found in the commission of 14 February 1470/1 appointed to examine the state of Yarmouth. Yarmouth seems to have gone into a decline, much to the detriment of its trade and defences, and it sought a remission of part of its yearly fee farm. Oxford, Calthorpe, Paston and Knyvett were appointed, together with John Heydon, William Jenney, Hugh Fenne, Edmund Clere and James Arblaster. Heydon had been dropped from the commission of the peace in 1461 but was now restored. He had been pardoned on 23 April 1462. His return to some kind of favour caused some trouble to the Yelvertons and not all his new colleagues looked kindly upon him.^{4 7} Astute enough to avoid disaster in 1461, he may have planned to continue his career. On the other hand, he may have been brought in to strengthen the government position. Probably his main concern now was Baconsthorpe Castle which he began, and was to be finished by his son Sir Henry. William Jenney of Knodishall was a lawyer.^{4 8} Like the Hobarts, Townshends and Yelvertons, he accepted each change of dynasty as it came. He had sat in Parliament for Horsham, Dunwich, and Suffolk and been a trustee of Sir John Fastolf's will, in which duties he had fallen out with the Pastons over Cotton. He had become a serjeant at law in 1463 and in due course was to be a knight, and judge of the King's Bench.

Hugh Fenne had been member for Yarmouth in 1450. From 1452 to 1476 he was Auditor of the Exchequer and from 1463-1467 Under Treasurer of England. He had property in Ickburgh, Herringby, Scoulton and Hilborough. His daughter and heir Margaret married George Nevill, Lord Bergavenny, who was a supporter of Edward IV in 1471 and knighted by him at Tewkesbury. Fenne seems to have been, in effect, a civil servant.

Edmund Clere of Stokesby had no love for the Mowbrays. He had been knight of the shire in 1447, in the royal household 1443-60, but had been escheator in 1469-70. In 1451 he had taken letters from the Duke of York to the Mayor and Citizens of Lynn.^{4 9} Whether he obtained any redress for the wrongs to his father-in-law two years before is uncertain. Nevertheless he was in the Yorkist and Tudor commissions of the peace. James Arblaster of Wychingham had been an Oxford retainer in the past and connected with the Pastons.^{5 0} All in all, the new government had a rather disparate band of supporters in Norfolk: old Lancastrians from the past, persons wronged by the Mowbrays, and a few independents. Fears of Heydon and the general uncertainty were among the factors which prevented them from coalescing into a strong group in the few months given them.

The two Dukes were, however, in eclipse. On 12 October 1470, John Paston reported to his mother:^{5 1} 'The Dwk and the Dwchess [of Norfolk] swe to hym [Oxford] as humbylly as evyr I dyd to them; in so myche that my Lord of Oxynforth shall have the rwyll of them and thers, by ther owne desyirs and gret meanys.' There was not much else they could do. Although both Dukes were kept in the commission of the peace, there was a purge that included many Mowbray supporters. Brandon was dropped in both Norfolk and Suffolk, Southwell, Heveningham, Sir Robert Wingfield,^{5 2} Twyer, Sir Richard Harcourt and William

Lunner of Mannington^{5 3} were also dropped in Norfolk. Heveningham remained in the Suffolk commission,^{5 4} but Sir John Howard, Waldegrave, Hobart, Gilbert Debenham (senior), Sir John Wingfield, Thomas Wingfield, William Gedding and Sir Thomas Brewes were dropped.^{5 5} Debenham indeed, was imprisoned.^{5 6} Howard's dropping may not, however, be significant, because the new government made an attempt to gain his support, summoning him to Parliament as Lord Howard on 15 October 1470.

Edward IV set sail to regain his kingdom in March 1470-1. When off Cromer, he sent ashore Sir Gilbert Debenham and Sir Robert Chamberlain but they found the country too closely held. The 'Arrivall' claims that they were well received but their return to ship accords more with the Davies Chronicle: 'One of the Erle Oxenfordes brother withe the comons of the cuntre arose up togedere and put hym abake to the see ageyne'.^{5 7} The brother was no doubt Sir Thomas de Vere, to whom on 14 March, (the day Edward landed at Ravenspur), the Earl wrote from Hedingham to say he would be at Bury the next Monday and then move on to Norfolk himself.^{5 8} On 19 March Oxford wrote^{5 9} from Bury to Henry Spelman, Thomas Seyve,^{6 0} John Seyve of Mundford, James Radclyffe,^{6 1} and John Brampton the elder^{6 2} to meet him that Friday at Lynn.

Oxford now moved on to Newark with Henry, Duke of Exeter, William, Lord Beaumont,^{6 3} and an estimated four thousand men, according to the 'Arrivall'. Edward, however, slipped past Montagu to reach Nottingham where Sir Thomas Montgomery and other personal followers joined him. At Coventry, Warwick declined battle, awaiting Clarence who now defected. Meanwhile, Lord Howard proclaimed Edward in Suffolk.^{6 4} It is noticeable that this action was attributed to neither Duke, but perhaps Warwick held them in London with warrants under the Privy Seal.

Edward reached London and then turned back to face Warwick in the fog of Easter morning at Barnet. Oxford was on the Lancastrian left, and with him were the two John Pastons, the younger brother being slightly wounded.^{6 5} He drove Lord Hastings, on the Yorkist right, off the field but went too far in the gloom and on returning Warwick's men confused the star of Oxford with the sun of York and attacked him. In the confusion, the battle was lost, Warwick and Montagu killed and Exeter severely wounded. Among the casualties on the other side were Lords Cromwell and Saye and Sir Humphrey Bouchier, son of Lord Berners. Howard was clearly with the Yorkists. His son Thomas was wounded, and next year married Bouchier's widow Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Sir Frederick Tilney of Ashwellthorpe and Boston, thus becoming stepfather to the translator of Froissart. Oxford escaped, although the two Pastons were captured and Sir John reported Godmanston slain.^{6 6} Shortly afterwards Oxford was writing to his Countess to send him some money promised him by the Prior of Thetford and hopefully asked her to send 'Pastun, Fylbryg [and] Brews' to him.^{6 7}

TEWKESBURY

Those of the Lancastrian leaders not killed at the battle of Tewkesbury on 4 May 1471 were dragged from sanctuary in the Abbey and beheaded. Whether the Prince of Wales was murdered after the battle or killed during it has been disputed. Queen Margaret was captured shortly afterwards while Henry VI died in suspicious circumstances in the Tower.

By now if not at Barnet, the Mowbray interest had joined the Yorkists. Those knighted at Tewkesbury included Brandon,^{6,8} Heveningham, Thomas Wingfield, Henry Wingfield (either uncle or brother of the latter) besides Edward Wodehouse of Kimberley, James Tyrrell of Gipping and Terry Robsert of Syderstone who were probably with the Duke, Henry Grey of Ketteringham and Edward's retainer Roger Ree. Norfolk sat with Gloucester in judgment on the prisoners. Indeed the Mowbrays were now at the height of their power. On 23 June Caister was re-occupied. Sir John Wingfield became sheriff. Those who had been dropped as Yorkists from the commission of the peace at the Readeption were restored. The Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk together chose the knights of the shire in 1472, selecting Sir Richard Harcourt and Sir Robert Wingfield for Norfolk^{6,9} while Brandon was elected with Chamberlain for Suffolk.^{7,0} John Timperley became member for Gatton and John Timperley, junior, for Bramber in the same Parliament. Sir Gilbert Debenham became one of the King's carvers and in 1474 a Captain in Ireland. The same year, Sir Robert Wingfield became Comptroller of the Household and one of Norfolk's trustees, and was granted a market at East Harling. The younger Timperley was Escheator in 1474-5. Things had returned to normal.

The leading Norfolk supporters of the Readeption were pardoned, Heydon on 28 November 1471, Knyvett on 3 December, William Paston on 9 December,^{7,1} Sir John Paston on 21 December and his brother John on 7 February. A pardon for Henry Wentworth on 4 December and for Thomas Danyell on 9 March seem to indicate that they, too, had been involved although no other evidence has been found. Roos was pardoned only on 3 March 1473/4. Knyvett soon recovered. He sat for Melcombe in 1472 and became a Knight of the Bath on 18 April 1475. In 1479 he became sheriff again. Heydon's son Henry was to become Comptroller to Cecily, Duchess of York. The Radclyffes seem not to have suffered. James's brother Robert (who married his Lancastrian second wife at Sir John Paston's house in Fleet Street on 30 April 1472^{7,2}) soon became sheriff in succession to Ree (who had followed Wingfield), and served a second term four years later. (In due course he and James were both knighted while John Radclyffe was to become knight of the shire in 1477/8 with Thomas Howard.) Spelman sat in the 1472 Parliament for Hindon and was in due course to become Recorder of Norwich. John Jenney's son Thomas sat for Tavistock.

The only East Anglian attainders were those passed in 1474 on Oxford and his two brothers, Robert Harleston,^{7,3} Godmanston, Durrant and Gybbon. Oxford and Beaumont had made an abortive landing at St. Osyth in Essex on 28 May 1473 and on 30 September seized St. Michael's Mount where they held out until 15 February. It is hard to know what Oxford hoped to achieve. He was imprisoned in Hammes Castle near Calais. Possibly Sir Thomas Montgomery interceded for the lives of the de Veres. It will be remembered that his brother had died with Oxford's father and elder brother, while he himself was a feoffee of Oxford's mother. Although removed from the commission of the peace in 1470, he had not otherwise suffered, and demonstrated a remarkable capacity for survival in 1485, possibly with Oxford's help.^{7,4} Sir Thomas de Vere's attainder was reversed in 1477/8.

The relative leniency of the Yorkists was largely due to the completeness of their victory. The descendants of Henry IV were now extinct. Of the remaining leaders of the Lancastrians, the Duke of Exeter (Henry VI's heir at law), Queen Margaret, and Oxford were prisoners, while only the Earl of Pembroke, now an exile in Brittany with his young nephew Richmond, was free.

In East Anglia the earlier excesses of the Dukes no doubt counted in favour of those who had supported Henry VI. In particular the lives of the Pastons were not sacrificed to Mowbray vengeance. Indeed it would be tempting to see the Readeption in Norfolk almost entirely in the context of a reaction against the Dukes and their partisans, and as a forerunner of the great support the local gentry gave the crown after 1485. Oxford, even to his enemies, was humane and just,⁷⁵ and there is nothing to show that the self-seeking Heydon was allowed the license he had before 1460. The evidence of six months, however, is inconclusive as well as incomplete, and before a real transformation in East Anglia could occur, the power of the Mowbrays, for whom the second reign of Henry VI proved a mere interruption, had to disintegrate. Nevertheless, the Davies Chronicle may be right to imply that far more people than the Pastons alone made up the Norfolk support for the Readeption. In this case, although not focussed on a Norfolk leader or organised on so permanent a base as the Mowbray interest, it must at least in part have been a response to the siege of Caister Castle.

LORD HOWARD AND THE MOWBRAY INHERITANCE

John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, died on 17 January 1475/6, the last of his house, leaving an only child Anne. Despite his ill-treatment at the Duke's hands, Sir John Paston wrote ten days later, perhaps fearing a royal interest in Caister but possibly shewing an East Anglian dislike of strangers,⁷⁶ 'Lat us alle prey God sende my Lady off Norffolk a soone . . . ffor if the Kyngys soone mary my lords dowghtr, the Kyng wolde that hys soone sholde have a ffayr place in Norffolk.' However, the Duke left no posthumous child.

Edward IV pursued his plan to marry Anne to his younger son Richard, Duke of York. Her mother agreed to accept a reduced dower, and many of the estates were settled jointly on Richard and Anne by Act of Parliament with remainder to him for life if she died without issue. William, Lord Berkeley, one of Anne's prospective coheirs in that event, was persuaded to release his right to the reversion of a moiety of the inheritance to Edward IV and his issue in tail male with ultimate remainder back to the Berkeleys, for release from a debt of £34,000. Meanwhile, Richard was invested with the old Mowbray titles. He was created Earl of Nottingham on 12 June 1476 and Duke of Norfolk and Earl Warenne on 7 February 1476/7. On 15 January 1477/8, the marriage took place. Among those knighted on the occasion was Henry Wentworth of Nettlestead.

The Mowbray interest was now leaderless and began to disintegrate. The estates were under crown control except those held in dower by the last Duke's widow. Caister was returned to the Pastons in 1476. The other prospective coheir, Lord Howard, had no real means of holding the interest together.⁷⁷

Sir Thomas Waldegrave and Sir Edward Wodehouse had died. Sir William Calthorpe was almost seventy and others may have been growing old. Debenham, an opponent of Brandon since 1472, had close personal ties with the King. Moreover, Howard had not been at Caister and never seems to have been closely involved with the Mowbray interest under the last Duke, and Brandon can scarcely have aspired to such an influence over Howard as he had over his old master. Wedgwood has conjectured from their witnessing a deed 20 August 1476⁷⁸ that Sir William Calthorpe, Sir John and Sir Robert Wingfield were then of the Duke of Suffolk's council along with two other witnesses Sir Richard Harcourt and Sir Thomas Brewes, although this does not seem conclusive. Although several

Norfolk names are on the list of those who went to sea with Howard in 1481, it would be premature to conclude that they were all his personal followers, although they include four former Mowbray retainers, Sir Henry Wentworth, Sir John Heveningham, John Timperley and William Wingfield. In this way the Mowbray retainers were fragmented, for there was no effective heir to the Mowbray power. However, the Blanch Lion was to haunt England from its grave and the Mowbray lands were inextricably linked with the fate of the House of York.

On 16 January 1480/1, the little Duchess Anne died aged eight and this assured the Howards of their reversion to the moiety of the Mowbray estates, part on the death of the Dowager Duchess and part on that of the Duke of York. Then, two years later, the death of Edward IV on 9 April 1483 plunged England into uncertainty. Despite Richard III's own interest in the deaths of his brother's children, it can hardly be regarded as fortuitous that their deaths enabled him to hand Richard's Mowbray estates to Lords Berkeley and Howard and recreate Richard's Mowbray titles for their benefit. Howard was to play such an important part in the new reign that one must suspect a deliberate connection, at least on the part of Richard III, although Howard and Berkeley were never linked with the murders in what contemporary opinion has survived.

Only the death of the Duke of York could extinguish his rights to the estates settled with remainder to him for life by the Act of 1477/8 and to the titles granted to him. Who would have risked accepting the lands and titles of a king's son from a usurper in the rightful owner's lifetime? Finally, Edward V too stood in the way of the Berkeley reversion. When, therefore, Howard was created Duke of Norfolk and Berkeley Earl of Nottingham on 28 June 1483, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Princes in the Tower were dead.

Berkeley had no share, it seems in the Mowbray's East Anglian lands. Indeed, he was never a strong supporter of Richard III and became Marquess under Henry VII. Howard, however, became Earl Marshal on the same day that he became Duke of Norfolk, and that his son Thomas became Earl of Surrey and a Knight of the Garter. On 16 July he was granted powers of supervision over a block of thirteen counties in the south and east of England.⁷⁹ He stood closer to the throne than any Mowbray.

THE REBELS OF 1483

The murders of the Princes and the summary deaths of Rivers, Sir Richard Grey and Lord Hastings clearly had the effect of making many people uneasy as to whom might be next. Whatever might be thought of the ruthlessness of Edward IV in 1461 and at Tewkesbury, all those who suffered were Lancastrians or, latterly, Nevill supporters. Hastings was no lover of the disliked Woodvilles, and his death must have been enough to make most Yorkists a little lukewarm if they tried to consider the reasons for it. It cannot have been easy for them to feel safe when Richard III turned on his brother's children and one of his brother's most loyal supporters, whatever may have been felt about Rivers and Grey. Nevertheless, there are puzzles about 1483 that are still hard to explain.

How did Henry, Earl of Richmond, an exile in Brittany, who had been out of the country for twelve years, become a candidate for the throne? Henry VI's heir at law was Henry Holland, Duke of Exeter, who drowned in 1475.⁸⁰ This would have left the Lancastrian claim vested in his sister the Countess of Douglas, mother of Ralph Nevill, third Earl of Westmorland. He is known to have been an

invalid and only this can explain the fact that the head of the senior branch of the Nevills played no active part in the Wars of the Roses. Clearly, however, any candidate had to be willing to fight Richard III and it must have been common knowledge that Westmorland would not. At this moment an East Anglian prelate, albeit with few Norfolk and Suffolk links and with little possible influence in an adjoining diocese, emerged in a crucial role.

John Morton, Bishop of Ely, seems to have been Richmond's protagonist. Yet he must have needed some reassurance as to Richmond's character and readiness, even if he had known him well as a boy during the Readeption. And what hold must not Morton have developed over Buckingham to persuade him to throw over the King he had so recently helped to the throne in favour of an exile? After all, Buckingham could have produced his own, albeit remote, claim to the throne. One can only surmise that the Duke was either weak and erratic or was in reality unambitious and had been used by Richard as long as it suited him and now was repelled by what had happened. At all events, the singular obstacles that were overcome, principally it seems by Morton, in reforming a Lancastrian party in 1483 may excuse this digression from purely Norfolk history.

The main centres of the 1483 rebellion in October were the Welsh marches, the West country and Kent. Bad weather prevented Richmond from landing, or Buckingham from crossing the Severn and joining forces with the rebels in the south-west. The attainders passed attest the extent of disaffection but coordination failed and with it the rebellion. The leaders lost their heads. Norfolk figures appear with singular lack of organisation at all three centres.

At Brecon it is no surprise to find Sir William Knyvett. Beaumont's wife, Buckingham's aunt, had had her marriage annulled in 1477 and Knyvett had married her as his second wife. On 18 July 1483, no doubt under Buckingham's auspices, he had become Constable and Steward of Castle Rising. A commission of 23 October links his name with Dorset. He was attainted and hard put to it to save his life. He had to convey his manor and castle at Buckenham to the King and the manor of Old Buckenham to the Queen, and pay them respectively 700 and 100 marks. His Hilborough and Wymondham properties he had to convey to Sir James Tyrrell of Gipping, Richard III's trusted follower and, according to his confession, the murderer of the Princes.

Among the Exeter insurgents was Thomas Lovell of Beachamwell. He came of a junior branch of an old family, whose pedigree has been considerably confused by historians.^{8 1} Among the children of Thomas Lovell of Barton Bendish by Joan Muswell were Thomas, the eldest, who succeeded to Barton Bendish, and Ralph, of Beachamwell. Of these two, Thomas Lovell married Anne, sister of Robert Toppes of Norwich. He was in the commission of the peace and died 19 Edward IV and was father of Gregory^{8 2} and another Thomas. Ralph Lovell of Beachamwell was succeeded by his own son Thomas, the rebel of 1483 who married Isabel, daughter of Thomas, Lord de Roos who was beheaded after Hexham.

At Maidstone we find men whose presence indicates how clearly the Mowbray interest had broken up. John Wingfield of Letheringham, (son of old Sir John who had died in 1481), who was currently sheriff of Norfolk and Suffolk^{8 3} was there together with his brother-in-law (or future brother-in-law) Robert Brewes, (son of Sir Thomas who had died in 1482 by Elizabeth Debenham), and his first cousins William and Thomas Brandon. The Maidstone rebels, with those at Exeter and Brecon, were attainted later in the year. The two Brandon boys fled

to join Richmond in Brittany⁸⁴ while their father, although in the commission to investigate Suffolk treasons on 10 December 1483, obtained a pardon in March and fled to sanctuary in Gloucester at Michaelmas 1484 and stayed there until after Bosworth. Another malcontent was Thomas Hansard.⁸⁵ Unavailing commissions for his arrest were issued on 14 July 1484, 20 October, 9 February and 10 May 1485.

Meanwhile the King tried to consolidate his position. As early as 28 June 1483 Sir Henry Ogard, Sir Robert Radclyffe⁸⁶ and John Paston⁸⁷ had been dropped from the commission of the peace on Norfolk. (Nevertheless the new Duke summoned the latter to join him on 10 October that year).⁸⁸ At Richard's coronation, Edmund Bedingfeld of Oxburgh (which he had had license to crenellate the year before), William Hopton of Westwood and Christopher Willoughby of Parham were knighted and Tyrrell advanced to Banneret. After the rebellion, various rewards were given, theoretically for support but perhaps in some cases as bribes. Sir Hugh Hastings of Elsing, Gressenhall and Fenwick (son of John who had died in 1477), received a grant of £101. 6s. 7d. a year, Thomas Heveningham (son of Sir John) received £10 a year, and Thomas Lovell of Enfield⁸⁹ (probably brother of Gregory) and his mother the manor of Polstead in Burnham which Thomas Fenys of Herstmonceux had forfeited. A few attainders were repealed, including that of Durrant, but no others with Norfolk links.

A Yorkshire knight, Sir John Everingham of Birkin, presumably loyal to the King who had inherited Warwick's Yorkshire lands, was added to the commission of the peace. Sir Gilbert Debenham, whose father had died in 1481, became a knight of the body, while Sir Robert Chamberlain became sheriff of Anglesey and, with his son Ralph, receiver of North Wales, keeper of Snowdon and constable of Beaumaris. In 1484 John Timperley became Escheator. A new supporter was found in Ralph Willoughby, an esquire of the body, who had married the widow of Humphrey Castell of Raveningham. On 10 December 1483 he was one of those appointed to look into treasons,⁹⁰ and on 30 March 1484 he was made Constable of Buckenham Castle and steward of the manor. The same year he was made sheriff and on 12 May receiver of the honour of Richmond for Norfolk and Suffolk. The majority of the gentry remained lukewarm. Most of these included in the various commissions of array and the peace, Bedingfeld, Ralph Shelton, Fincham, Henry Heydon, Sir William Boleyn, John Radclyffe, Robert, Edmund and Robert Clere, Spelman, Southwell, Hobart, Edmund Jenney, Townshend, Hastings (and John Paston and Ogard, still serving on commissions of array), happily and often enthusiastically accepted the change of dynasty in 1485.

Meanwhile Richard also pardoned a number of the rebels of 1483, although not reversing their attainders which were presumably only suspended. Robert Brewes was pardoned on 23 February 1483/4 and John Wingfield and his son and namesake the next day. Wingfield was later knighted by the King, and both he and Brewes were later named in various commissions. Brewes seems to have been granted £10 a year from the fee farm of Ipswich on 4 March 1483/4. A pardon was granted to Thomas Brandon on 27 January 1484/5 but his brother William's lands were the subject of crown grants.⁹¹

RICHARD III AND THE DE LA POLES

John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln, Suffolk's eldest son, became twenty-one in 1483. He and his brothers were far more forceful than their father and their

uncle Richard used them extensively despite their youth. Lincoln was made President of the Council of the North and Chief Governor of Ireland, where in 1478 his father had been Lieutenant. In 1484 the King lost both his Queen and his son, and in May 1485 Lincoln was declared heir presumptive to the throne.

Richard de la Pole, the seventh and youngest son,⁹² could hardly have been more than sixteen when added to the commission of the peace on 6 December 1483. He was included in the treasons commission of 10 December and next year in the commissions of array of 1 May and 8 December. On 6 September 1484 he was made Constable of Castle Rising and in 1485 he was sheriff.

It does not seem that the de la Poles developed a strong local interest, however. No recognisably East Anglian names occur in the list of twenty-eight attainders after Lincoln's death at Stoke in 1487 apart from Lincoln himself. When his brothers Edmund, William and Richard were attainted in 19 Henry VII they were linked with Tyrrell and Sir John Wyndham, both executed in 1502, of whom the latter had been knighted at Stoke while the former had continued in Henry VII's service.

To anticipate, the de la Poles were not molested after Bosworth, although Lincoln and his brothers probably fought there, and neither Suffolk nor his younger sons suffered after Stoke.⁹³ Suffolk died in 1491 or 1492. His eldest surviving son, Edmund, was only allowed to use the title Earl, and was beheaded by Henry VIII in 1513, Richard was killed at the battle of Pavia in 1525 while Sir William, who had been knighted by Henry VII at Blackheath in 1497 died a prisoner in the Tower without issue in 1539 or 1540, the last male of his line.

BOSWORTH AND THE NEW REIGN

Richmond landed at Milford Haven on 7 August 1485. Among the Lancastrian exiles with him, the most prominent was Oxford who had escaped from Hammes by persuading his gaoler, Sir Walter Blount, to defect.⁹⁴ With him too were many of the discontented Yorkists, including the Woodvilles. On landing, he knighted young William Brandon who became standard-bearer. In due course he was joined by the Talbots, and either now or as an exile Thomas Lovell of Beachamwell joined him.

Richard III assembled an army that considerably outnumbered the insurgents. Norfolk no doubt brought a contingent. He had summoned John Paston to meet him at Bury.⁹⁵ 'Brynge with yow seche company of tall men as ye may goodly make at my cost and charge, be seyed that ye have promysyd the Kyng; and I pray yow ordeyne them jakets of my levery'. But support for the King was lukewarm. The battle was decided by the intervention of the Stanleys and the inactivity of Northumberland. Norfolk was killed leading the van against Richmond's led by Oxford. On the opposing side, Sir William Brandon was killed by Richard himself.

In Norfolk, John Paston became sheriff and Oxford Constable of Castle Rising. Sir William Willoughby⁹⁶ became Constable of Norwich Castle on 5 March. The county accepted the change well, and Sir Hugh Hastings, for one, was high enough in favour to be excepted from the first Act of Resumption of the new reign. The Radclyffes,⁹⁷ who had perhaps been under a cloud, came into favour. John was summoned to Parliament as Lord Fitzwalter, and Sir James became Lieutenant of the Tower. Sir Robert was restored to the commission of the peace,

with the others dropped in 1483. Lovell became Speaker, and Chancellor of the Exchequer. The attainted Lancastrians were restored to their titles and estates, including Beaumont⁹⁸ and Knyvett. Ralph Shelton was knighted at the Queen's coronation. Hobart and Townshend continued to prosper in their careers, both becoming knights and the former Attorney General in 1487 and a Privy Councillor.

The leading Yorkists were attainted, including Norfolk and Surrey. However, in due course most of these were reversed, and Surrey himself was restored in 1489 although he had to wait until his victory at Flodden in 1513 to regain the Dukedom. Lesser figures received pardons, among them Ralph Willoughby on 24 February 1485/6, who had been dropped, with Everingham,⁹⁹ from the commission of the peace.

Perhaps the best evidence of East Anglian support for the new dynasty is the list of knights made at the battle of Stoke, 16 June 1487. Among them were Thomas Lovell,¹⁰⁰ his cousin Gregory Lovell, Robert Brandon,¹⁰¹ John Wyndham of Felbrigg,¹⁰² John Paston, George Hopton (son of Sir William) and Thomas Tyrrell.¹⁰³ Sir Edmund Bedingfeld was advanced to Banneret. The only dissonant notes for the remainder of the century were when Sir Robert Chamberlain was convicted of treason in 1491¹⁰⁴ and when Fitzwalter, Sir Robert Radclyffe and Debenham became involved with Perkin Warbeck in 1496.¹⁰⁵ In the case of Debenham and Chamberlain, this was the last fling of two career Yorkists. The reasons for Radclyffe involvement are less obvious.

Although this local loyalty to the Tudors partly reflects a delayed reaction by the gentry to the wrongs inflicted by the ducal interests, some of which were only now put right,¹⁰⁶ it is also an indication of how weak the interests themselves had now become. Howard took only a share, albeit the East Anglian one, of the Mowbray inheritance, and even this was subject to the last Mowbray Duchess's dower.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, he inherited when the Mowbray faction had already broken up and his two years' dukedom was too short to recreate it. His responsibilities in government must in any case have left him less time than the Mowbrays had to live the life of a local prince and his death on the losing side at Bosworth finally made the recreation of a powerful interest in the Mowbray image impossible. His son was carefully watched by Henry VII.

The de la Poles were probably always less powerful than the Mowbrays after 1450 and their own involvement on the losing side, compounded by Lincoln's misjudged Simnel fiasco in 1487, allowed them no chance thereafter to increase their strength. Instead they were systematically crushed by a dynasty that owed nothing to the East Anglian ducal families. Their close blood ties with the house of York helped accomplish their extinction.

Both Howard and the young de la Poles were also more closely linked with the Crown than their predecessors had been and this lack of detachment again jeopardised their future. Perhaps their families' lack of suffering left them less brutally aware of the need not to put their trust in princes than Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, whose father and grandfather had both fallen on the battlefield for the house of Lancaster, and who had only recovered his lands and titles after several years when Edward IV wished to counterbalance the power of the Nevills in 1469. At Bosworth this nobleman demonstrated a realism in the amoral political climate that his East Anglian peers could have done well to emulate. Sixteen years after his restoration, with devastating irony, Earl Henry brought

the policy of balances to its logical conclusion when the new lord of Middleham went to his death before the watching banners of the Percys.

September 1974

¹ It is estimated that both had incomes of £2,000 a year. See T. B. Pugh and C. D. Ross, 'English Baronage and Income Tax of 1436', *Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research XXVI* (1953.)

² See R. L. Storey, *End of the House of Lancaster* (1966) p.79 for a discussion of this incident. Sir William Oldhall was attainted in 1459 and disappears. (His will was proved in 1460.) His son-in-law Walter Gorges died seized of some of his Norfolk lands 6 Edward IV but the attainder was only reversed 4 Henry VII for Oldhall's grandson, Sir Edmund Gorges of Wraxall.

³ For some account of their activities see R. L. Storey, *op. cit.*, appendix III and Blomefield's *History of Norfolk* vol. III chapter XIX.

⁴ With whom, however, after he had ceased to be his steward, he prosecuted a violent feud, see R. L. Storey, *op. cit.*, appendix IV. Nevertheless Wingfield's sons became Mowbray retainers.

⁵ Thomas Danyell was son of William Danyell of Daresbury, Lancashire, and in 1452 married Margaret daughter of Sir Robert Howard, sister of John, later Duke of Norfolk. For some account of his behaviour to John Wodehouse see Blomefield XI 60. He gave much trouble to Osbert Mundford. He was Constable of Castle Rising 27 Henry VI, and latterly a follower of Lord Scales. Together with John Doubiggyng, also a Scales man (see *Paston Letters* no. 967), he fought for Lancaster at Towton in 1461, and they were attainted, but fled to Harlech, where they were received by David ap Jeuan ap Eyneon and Reynold ap Griffith ap Plethen. Danyell received a general pardon 9 March 1471/2 and his attainder was reversed on his own petition 1473. Blomefield identifies him with Thomas Danyell of Walsoken who had a manor in Stanhoe and died 1474. For his involvement with Norfolk for a while after Suffolk's fall, see *Paston Letters* nos. 172 and 181.

⁶ John Radclyffe was of Attleborough, son of Sir John Radclyffe, K.G. He married Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Walter, 7th Baron Fitzwalter, and was called Lord Fitzwalter although not summoned to Parliament. After his death at Ferrybridge, 28 March 1461, his widow remarried John, Lord Dinham.

⁷ William Lee, John Brond, Charles Nowell and Sir Hugh John were prominent. See Ancient Indictments K.B.9/85/pt. 1 nos. 9, 37, 49 (31 Henry VI). Nowell was a yeoman of the crown 1465-83 and then became usher of the chamber.

⁸ See *Paston Letters* nos. 207, 243, 245.

⁹ *Paston Letters* no. 244. These were his cousin John Howard and Sir Roger Chamberlain of Gedding.

¹⁰ Thomas, Lord Scales, a veteran of the French wars, became Constable of Castle Rising in 1456. With Lords Hungerford and Lovell, he held the Tower against Warwick in July 1460 but was murdered escaping from it in a barge on 25 July.

¹¹ Tuddenham, who was Treasurer of the Household 1458-1460, was dropped from the commission of the peace in 1461. He clearly hoped to regain some influence, but in February 1461/2, Edward IV beheaded a number of Lancastrians summarily for being in touch with Queen Margaret. The most prominent was the Earl of Oxford and his eldest son Aubrey, but they also included Sir William Tyrrell, John Montgomery, Sir William Kennedy, and Tuddenham (who was beheaded with Tyrrell and Montgomery on 24 February). There were no attainders so probably they could not be justified.

¹² Knight of the Shire 1459. This was the Coventry Parliament that passed the first attainders. He died 1475.

¹³ Knight of the Shire 1459. Blake was Usher of the Chamber and Clerk and Surveyor of the Works to Henry VI. He was also Controller of the Customs at Yarmouth, Receiver of the Honours of Clare, Rayleigh and Richmond in Norfolk and Suffolk, Porter of Clare Castle, and Warrener of Swaffham. On 6 December 1459 he was made receiver of the forfeited lands of York and Salisbury in Norfolk and Suffolk. He disappears in 1461 when he ceases to appear in the commission of the peace. He was a brother of Simon Blake of Swaffham (Blomefield II 202-3) and his son Thomas (died 1505 will proved P.C.C.) was excepted from Henry VII's first Act of Resumption. The latter refers to his sister Margaret Danyell in his will.

¹⁴ Wentworth was carver to Henry VI and Sheriff in 1446/7 and 1459/60, but in 1455, when standard bearer at St. Albans, he fled. He was attainted in 1461 and captured at the battle of Hexham and beheaded with Oliver Wentworth and the other Lancastrian prisoners afterwards on 18 May 1464. His attainder was reversed for his son later in the year.

¹⁵ Not a Norfolk man, but Sheriff 1448/9 and 1457/8. Attainted 1461.

¹⁶ Among them one can include four who suffered from the events of 1460-1461. Sir John Prisot, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, was dropped from the commission of the peace in 1461 and seems to have retired to Shotesham St. Mary (see Blomefield V 516-7 and *Norfolk Archaeology XXVI* 15). John Yates of Norwich was attainted in 1464 for having joined Queen Margaret following a pardon, and died in Flanders. Thomas Tyringham occupied his lands from 1467 but John's daughter and heir Joan wife of Richard Passelegh had the attainder reversed 1 Henry VII. Ralph Makerell, parson of Risby, was attainted in 1461, this being reversed on his own petition in 1473.

One of the worst sufferers was Osbert Mundford of Hockwold who married Elizabeth, daughter of John Berney of Reedham. A former Treasurer of Normandy and Marshal of Calais, he had been much troubled by Danyell over his manor of Braydestone. On 23 May 1460 he was sent with John Baker and 200 men-at-arms to reinforce Henry, Duke of Somerset, at Guisnes. He was attacked by Warwick's fleet under Lord Fauconberg at Sandwich while awaiting a favourable wind and *non sine conflictu praegrandi* (Whethamstede) captured and taken to Calais. His sister Elizabeth married Andrew Trollope (see will of Osbert Mundford, their father, proved 1456 Norwich Consistory Court), presumably he who took the Calais garrison over from York to the King at Ludford in 1459. This may explain why Mundford and two of his men were beheaded at Risebank on 25 June 1460. His widow was persecuted by Edmund Rous, Walter Gorges, and John Curde, who entered her manor in East Lexham with Warwick's support – see *Paston Letters* no. 433. It was held of Lord Beaumont's honour of Wormegay, which was given to Warwick's brother Montagu in 1462. Mundford's heirs had recovered the manor by 1495.

¹⁷The 120 men sent by Norwich to help the King in 1460 may have been summoned by the Yorkists after Northampton in his name. Anyway, Edward treated Norwich well on his accession and their commander, William Rookwood, continued to be employed in commissions. See also Blomefield II 466 and III 162-3.

¹⁸Sir Thomas Cobham, not a local man, had been appointed in November 1460 but did not account, so Howard's effective term of office may have antedated his appointment on 6 March.

¹⁹It included Sir William Calthorpe, Sir Robert Chamberlain of Gedding, John Heveningham of Heveningham, Edward Wodehouse of Kimberley, Sir John Wingfield of Letheringham (knighted at the coronation and presumably a Mowbray supporter by now, unlike his father), John Berney of Reedham, and John Paston (he who was later knighted). (Lambeth ms. 448)

²⁰John Timperley of Hintlesham received a pension while Southwell received the Duke's office of Marshal of the Exchequer during his heir's minority.

²¹*Paston Letters* no. 612.

²²*Rotuli Parliamentorum* 1 Henry VII.

²³In 1461, Paston's colleague as knight of the shire was John Berney, his wife's first cousin. He was of Reedham and Witchingham (where he owned Turteville's manor), but has been confused with his cousin and namesake (d. 1471) also of Witchingham (who owned Clay Hall and Street Hall manors there). It is clear that the knight of the shire was of Reedham unless his namesake were also a cousin of Paston and William Rookwood. (See *Paston Letters* nos. 361 and 401 to 405.) *Paston Letters* no. 681 probably refers to him and should therefore be dated 1473: the writ of *diem clausit extremum* after the death of John Berney of Reedham was issued on 3 November 1473, which would make it two days before Margaret Paston's letter. It should be added that the Paston-Berney relationship can be demonstrated in full for the Reedham branch but not their cousins. I therefore conclude that the Paston's cousin John Berney, the knight of the shire, was indifferently known as of Reedham and as of Witchingham. The Witchingham Court rolls at New College, Oxford, are of no real use for the Berney pedigree.

²⁴*Paston Letters* nos. 490 and 817.

²⁵*Paston Letters* no. 435.

²⁶He was of Hunstanton where he owed his standing to having married Alice, widow of John le Strange (who died in 1436).

²⁷*Paston Letters* no. 612.

²⁸Equally, however, Edward IV would not intervene over Hellesdon or Drayton when he passed through Norfolk but wanted to let the law take its course. (*id.*)

²⁹Fourth son of Sir John Radclyffe of Attleborough, K.G. (grandfather of John who married the heiress of Fitzwalter) by his second marriage, and thus great-uncle of the half-blood to the head of the family. (See Burke's *Landed Gentry* 18th edn., vol. III 1972.)

³⁰Apparently the son of Roger Radclyffe, second son of Sir John Radclyffe K.G. and thus first cousin to John who married the Fitzwalter heiress. See also *Paston Letters* no. 201.

³¹William of Worcester's list in his *Itineraria* pp. 321-5 is mistaken in three Christian names, and omits some entirely. It appears to have been compiled well after the event, as he calls knights persons who were, in some cases, only knighted later. It also duplicates five names.

³²Commission to arrest them and others 10 December 1458. (C.P.R.)

³³Wedgwood makes his son and namesake member for Ipswich in 1455 but this may be a confusion.

³⁴*Paston Letters* no. 612.

³⁵Stapleton too survived the change of dynasty without trouble and died in 1466. He was *de jure* fifth Lord Ingham according to Peerage law as it was becoming established. His first wife Elizabeth, daughter and coheir of Sir Simon Felbrigg of Felbrigg, K.G. (standard bearer to Richard II), died without issue. Sir Miles' widow remarried in or before 1468 as his third wife, Sir Richard Harcourt of Stanton Harcourt and Ellenhall, who became a de la Pole supporter. (see *Paston Letters* no. 591.)

³⁶Copinger VI 54.

³⁷See *Paston Letters* nos. 132 and 201 for some of his earlier activities. At one stage he had been a Cromwell man.

- ³⁸ Blomefield VII 265.
- ³⁹ Blomefield V 345.
- ⁴⁰ *Paston Letters* no. 619.
- ⁴¹ 'Cum Querela' – Worcester, *op. cit.*
- ⁴² Copinger I 197. Robert seems to have married Alice daughter and coheir of Sir Henry Bruyn of Ockenden. She remarried Sir John Heveningham, who survived until 1499. Her sister Elizabeth (I.P.M. 9 Henry VII) married Sir William Brandon II, and later Thomas Tyrrell, a cousin of Sir James.
- ⁴³ Wingfield Castle was Suffolk's seat. What was a Wingfield man doing with Oxford?
- ⁴⁴ *Paston Letters* nos. 656 and 529.
- ⁴⁵ *Paston Letters* no. 654.
- ⁴⁶ His father, Sir Edward Hastings, as heir male of the family, had a lawsuit with Lord Grey de Ruthin over the Hastings arms and, refusing to submit to an adverse judgement, died in the Fleet in 1436 after twenty years imprisonment. His widow later married John Wyndham.
- ⁴⁷ *Paston Letters* no. 656.
- ⁴⁸ At times he had been a Mowbray man and once a Cromwell follower. See *Paston Letters* nos. 43, 132 and 529.
- ⁴⁹ K.B.9/85/10.
- ⁵⁰ See, e.g. *Paston Letters* nos. 192, 193 and 194.
- ⁵¹ *Paston Letters* no. 654.
- ⁵² Younger brother of Sir John Wingfield of Letheringham. He married Anne, widow of Sir William Chamberlain and daughter and heir of Sir Robert Harling of East Harling. He died childless in 1480 or 1481. She remarried John, Lord Scrope of Bolton.
- ⁵³ He died 25 April 1481. (M.I. Itteringham – Blomefield VI 474.)
- ⁵⁴ As did William Jenney, Thomas Billyng the judge, Richard Pygot, John Clopton, Thomas Higham and John Sulyerd. Clopton and Higham were associates of John Heydon (see *Paston Letters* no. 656) and were dropped from 1471 to 1475. Pygot also occurs in the October 1470 oyer and terminer for Norfolk.
- ⁵⁵ After Tewkesbury, there was a general restoration to the commission in both counties. Waldegrave who died in 1472 did not come back, nor did Thomas Wingfield, while Brewes returned in 1473 with Sir Robert Fenys, who was a new Readeption appointment. The Harlestons were dropped for good.
- ⁵⁶ Wedgwood cites Early Chancery Proceedings 71/2.
- ⁵⁷ Does this indicate a popular reaction against the Mowbrays?
- ⁵⁸ *Paston Letters* no. 663.
- ⁵⁹ *Paston Letters* no. 664.
- ⁶⁰ See also Blomefield II 277.
- ⁶¹ Another former Mowbray man.
- ⁶² Probably of the family from Albury, Hertfordshire.
- ⁶³ Commonly called Lord Bardolf, his mother having been the Bardolf heiress. Through her he inherited the honour of Wormegay. He lost his father, the first Viscount, and his father-in-law, the Duke of Buckingham, the same day, both killed by the Yorkists at Northampton. He was captured at Towton in 1461 and attainted while the honour of Wormegay was given to John Nevill, later Lord Montagu, in 1462.
- ⁶⁴ *Paston Letters* no. 665.
- ⁶⁵ *Paston Letters* no. 668.
- ⁶⁶ *Paston Letters* no. 668.
- ⁶⁷ *Paston Letters* no. 669. The last two seem to have been John Felbrigg, an enemy of the Wyndhams, and Sir Thomas Brewes of Stinton and Topcroft. The latter had been sheriff 1438-9 and 1442-3 and knighted in 1465 at the Queen's coronation. His first wife was sister to Sir William Calthorpe and his second sister to Sir Gilbert Debenham. Despite being dropped from the Suffolk bench, he seems to have been employed by the Readeption government, but one of his sons may be indicated here. His daughter later married John Paston. Brewes died in 1482. On 8 September 1469, a commission to arrest Felbrigg and John Berney of Witchingham had been issued, addressed to Norfolk and his men and Harcourt, so he may have been opposed to them.
- ⁶⁸ Wedgwood says he was a knight in 1468, citing the Suffolk commission of the peace. However, this is arranged in index form in the published edition of the Patent Rolls indicating only that he was a knight at some stage during the period covered. He is not referred to as a knight by the *Paston Letters* (e.g. no. 622) in 1469.
- ⁶⁹ *Paston Letters* no. 701.
- ⁷⁰ Sir Gilbert Debenham, however, contested Brandon's election. See R. Virgoe, 'Three Suffolk Parliamentary Elections of the Mid-Fifteenth Century', *Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research XXXIX* (1966).
- ⁷¹ He was uncle of Sir John, and married Anne daughter of Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset. He sat for Newcastle-under-Lyme in 1472. He died in 1496 (will proved P.C.C.).
- ⁷² *Paston Letters* no. 692.
- ⁷³ His manor at Shimpling was granted in 1475 to Sir William Stanley but recovered in 1485.

⁷⁴ He held the pall at Henry VII's coronation and was excepted from his first Act of Resumption.

⁷⁵ See, for example *Paston Letters* no. 886.

⁷⁶ *Paston Letters* no. 771.

⁷⁷ Nevertheless he was in high favour. His son was Sheriff and later knight of the shire.

⁷⁸ Calendar of Ancient Deeds V 69.

⁷⁹ Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Kent, Sussex, Surrey, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire.

⁸⁰ The Beaufort claim, vested in Lady Stanley, should probably be discounted. The Beauforts were legitimated, with the assent of Parliament, by letters patent 9 February 1396-7, but these were exemplified and confirmed 10 February 1406-7 with the introduction of a saving clause *excepta dignitate regali*. Philippe de Commynes considered Exeter the nearest relation of the House of Lancaster (*Memoires*, lib. iii cap. 4). When the Lancastrian attainders of 1461 and later were reversed 1 Henry VII, Exeter's was not included. Thus the Lancastrian claim to the throne remained theoretically wiped out. Even so, Westmorland had to give Henry VII bonds of £400 and 400 marks and the keeping, rule and marriage of his eldest son.

⁸¹ See for example Blomefield I 323, VII 271-2, 288; W. Rye, 498-500. See also G. L. Harrison, 'Notes on the Lovells of E. Harling', *Norfolk Archaeology* XVIII pp 46-77.

⁸² Gregory Lovell married Margaret daughter of Sir William Brandon the elder, and was knighted at Stoke in 1487. His son Francis was devisee of Sir Thomas Lovell.

⁸³ In succession to Sir Henry Wentworth. Wentworth went on to be Sheriff of Yorkshire 1489-90 and later to marry as his second wife Elizabeth, widow of Thomas, Lord Scrope of Masham, and daughter and eventual coheir to John Nevill, Lord Montagu.

⁸⁴ Hall's Chronicle. In 1478 young William was said to have been arrested for a double rape. (*Paston Letters* no. 821).

⁸⁵ He was of Ludborough, Lincolnshire, but acquired Suffolk connections through a Brewes wife. Knighted at Stoke in 1487.

⁸⁶ His second wife was Margaret, widow of Sir Thomas Dymoke and daughter of the sixth Baron Welles. Her first husband was beheaded after the Lincolnshire rebellion, 1470.

⁸⁷ His elder brother, Sir John, had died unmarried in 1479. In 1477 he had married Margery, daughter of Sir Thomas Brewes, apparently by his Debenham wife. About 1479 his brother Edmund married Henry Spelman's sister Catherine, widow of William Clippesby.

⁸⁸ *Paston Letters* no. 876.

⁸⁹ The will of Thomas Lovell of Enfield, gentelman, was proved in 1521, in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (33 Maynwaryng).

⁹⁰ The others appointed to this commission were Richard de la Pole, Hopton, Wentworth and Edmund Jenney of Knodishall.

⁹¹ However his wife's family disputed his right to South Ockendon in Essex, perhaps to try and frustrate the royal grant.

⁹² But possibly older than William, traditionally his senior, since in his exile in 1522 he styled himself Suffolk in a letter to the Margrave of Brandenburg (45th Rep. Dep. Keeper of Public Records, Appendix ii, p.8).

⁹³ It is interesting that Lincoln produced an impersonator. Certainly it could not have been for his supporters' benefit but must have been intended to influence the uncommitted. Had he been successful, Lincoln must surely have made himself King, but perhaps he felt the de la Pole claim would not get much support. If so, Richmond, with a worse claim, had no such misgivings in 1483 or 1485. If, moreover, none of Lincoln's brothers were at Stoke, one may ask whether the two short years of Richard's reign had been long enough to weld them into an effective force when so young.

⁹⁴ Meanwhile at nearby Guisnes, Sir James Tyrrell, now Captain there, apparently sat and awaited the outcome of events. Oxford had tried to escape unsuccessfully, or possibly to drown himself, in 1478, it seems. (*Paston Letters* no. 821.)

⁹⁵ *Paston Letters* no. 884.

⁹⁶ Sir William was knighted by Henry VII at Bosworth. He was, it seems, younger brother of Sir Robert Willoughby, also knighted there, whom Hall records as joining Richmond in Brittany in 1483, and who in due course became first Lord Willoughby de Broke. They were cousins of the Willoughbys of Parham, Lords Willoughby de Eresby.

⁹⁷ They should not be confused with their distant cousin, Sir Richard Radclyffe, Richard III's henchman who was killed at Bosworth.

⁹⁸ Beaumont remarried Elizabeth, daughter and heir of Sir Richard Scrope. However, he was found to be mad in 1487 and his person and lands were put in the care of his old companion Oxford. Beaumont died childless in 1507 and Oxford married his widow as his second wife.

⁹⁹ However, Everingham was a knight of the body by 15 December 1486.

¹⁰⁰ In due course he went on to be K.G., Treasurer of the Household, President of the Council and Constable of the Tower. He was an executor of Henry VII's will and remained in favour under Henry VIII.

He died without issue in 1524 leaving his property to Francis, son of his cousin Sir Gregory. Sir Thomas's brother Sir Robert, Sheriff in 1488/9 and knighted at Blackheath in 1497, had died in 1521, leaving daughters only. By coincidence, he often resided at his house called Elsing's in Enfield but it seems unlikely that he can have been the Thomas granted Polstead Hall by Richard III.

¹⁰¹ Another son of old Sir William, and brother of Richmond's former standard bearer. He was knight of the shire for Norfolk in 1491 but died without issue in 1524. His brother Thomas married Lord Berkeley's widow and became an esquire of the body, a knight at Blackheath in 1497, and eventually K.G., but also died childless in 1509. His heir was his eldest brother William's son Charles, who became Duke of Suffolk and was to marry the King's daughter.

¹⁰² Son of John Wyndham (the colleague of Tuddenham and Heydon) who had died in 1475. He had been dropped from the commission of the peace after Bosworth. Sir John was convicted of treason with Sir James Tyrrell and both were beheaded 6 May 1502. They were attainted with Sir John's son Thomas 19 Henry VII but the same Parliament reversed this. Sir John's first wife was a daughter of the first Howard Duke while his son Thomas, who married secondly a daughter of Sir Henry Wentworth, became a knight and Vice Admiral of England.

¹⁰³ Either son or brother of Sir James.

¹⁰⁴ Chamberlain was convicted of plotting treason at his house at Barking and attainted and executed. Gedding was granted to Sir Robert Ormeston who married his widow. Also attainted was, as his fellow conspirator, Richard White of Thorpe Parva, near Diss. The latter's family cannot have suffered long as his next brother in due course succeeded to the property (Blomefield I 139).

¹⁰⁵ Fitzwalter, Sir Robert Radclyffe and Sir Gilbert Debenham were attainted and the first two beheaded although the latter seems to have died in prison. Sir Robert had married as his third wife the widow of Henry le Strange of Hunstanton who had died 25 November 1485. The attainders of Fitzwalter and Debenham were reversed 19 Henry VII, the latter's for his nephew and heir Robert Brewes.

¹⁰⁶ For instance Charles's dispossession.

¹⁰⁷ As late as 1496, she presented to the living of Forncett.

SOURCES

I Primary Sources

A. Unpublished

The principal unpublished sources are the Ancient Indictments of the King's Bench (Public Record Office, KB9). These in the majority of cases are concerned with ordinary crimes and not connected with local or national affairs, although not all lawlessness came before the courts (see *Paston Letters* no. 612). A few of the indictments are arranged in County Files but the majority are in Year Files. A full search of the latter would no doubt reveal further details of the period.

Regrettably, the Duke of Norfolk's archives at Arundel Castle contain little relating to the Mowbrays or the first Howard Duke, and no indentures of service, according to Dr. F. W. Steer, the archivist.

Some use has been made of wills proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury and Consistory Court of Norwich.

B. Chronicles

'Historie of the Arrivall of King Edward IV', *Camden Soc. I* (1838), pp. 2, 8.
College of Arms M.S. Arundel 5, published in 'Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles', *Camden Soc. N.S. XXVIII* (1880) p. 179.

E. Hall, *Chronicle* (1809 edition), especially for 1471 and pp.349, 424.

Lambeth M.S. 306, published as 'Short English Chronicle' in 'Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles', *Camden Soc. N.S. XXVIII* (1880), pp.73, 78-9.

Lambeth M.S. 448, published in 'Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles', *Camden Soc. N.S. XXVIII* (1880), pp.157, 160.

J. Stow, *Annales* (first published 1615).

J. Warkworth, 'Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the Reign of King Edward IV', *Camden Soc. X* (1839) p.13.

J. Whethamstede, *Chronicle*, ed. H. T. Riley, Rolls Series (1872-3).

C Other published Primary Sources

J. Payne Collier, (ed.), *Household Books of John Howard, Duke of Norfolk and Thomas, Earl of Surrey temp. 1481-90*, (Roxburghe Club 1894).

J. Gairdner (ed) *Paston Letters* (3 vols 1896). A new edition is in course of publication as *Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century*, ed. Norman Davies, (vol. I 1971).

William of Worcester, *Itineraria* (published 1778), for lists of principal besiegers of Caister Castle 1469, at pp.321-5. New edition ed. and trans. J. H. Harvey (1969).

Visitation of Norfolk 1563 (published in 2 vols with notes and additions by Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society 1878, 1895).

'Visitations of Norfolk 1563, 1589 and 1613' (Harleian M.S. 1552), *Harleian Soc. XXXII*.

Visitations of Suffolk 1561, 1577 and 1612 (ed. W. C. Metcalfe, 1882)

'Visitations of Essex 1552, 1558, 1612 and 1634', *Harleian Soc. XIII*

'Visitation of Yorkshire 1564', *Harleian Soc. XVI*.

II Secondary Sources

F. P. Barnard, *Edward IV's French Expedition of 1475* (1925)

J. M. W. Bean, *Decline of English Feudalism 1215-1549* (1968)

F. Blomefield *History of Norfolk* (2nd edn., 11 vols, 1805-10).

Burke's *Landed Gentry* (17th and 18th Edns.)

Burke's *Peerage* (1963 Edn.)

Complete Peerage

W. A. Copinger, *Suffolk Manors*, 7 vols (1905-11).

H. L. Gray, 'Incomes From Land in England in 1436', *English Historical Review XLIX* (1934)

G. L. Harrison, 'Notes on the Lovells of E. Harling', *Norfolk Archaeology XVIII* (1914).

T. B. Pugh and C. D. Ross, 'English Baronage and Income Tax of 1436', *Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research XXVI* (1953).

E. C. Robbins, 'Cursed Norfolk Justice' [Sir William Yelverton], *Norfolk Archaeology XXVI* (1936)

W. Rye, *Norfolk Families* (1911-15).

W. A. Shaw, *Knights of England*, II (1906).

R. L. Storey, *End of the House of Lancaster* (1966).

R. Virgoe, 'Three Suffolk Parliamentary Elections of the Mid-Fifteenth Century', *Bulletin of Institute of Historical Research XXXIX* (1966).

R. Virgoe, 'Divorce of Sir Thomas Tuddenham', *Norfolk Archaeology, XXXIV*.

J. C. Baron Wedgwood, *History of Parliament 1439-1509*, 2 vols (1936, 1938).