ARTICLES

THE MISSING PRINCES PROJECT – a case study

The first part of this case study suggested the possibility that the key to the mystery surrounding the disappearance of the sons of Edward IV may lie with a person or persons outside Richard's government (and/or royal progress). In this regard, The Missing Princes Project is undertaking a number of significant persons-of-interest enquiries. However, as part of the wider-ranging investigation it is of the utmost importance that no potential avenues of investigation are ignored, or given undue weight, particularly where materials might suggest the need for a number of enquiries to run concurrently.

In Part 1 (*Ricardian Bulletin*, March 2020, pp 42–7) we highlighted Henry Tudor's post-Bosworth delay in securing London. In this final part Philippa Langley discusses Henry's hesitation in relation to Robert Willoughby's mission and considers the possibility that the sons of Edward IV were sent north during the reign of Richard III.

Part 4. The fate of the sons of King Edward IV: THE AFTERMATH OF BOSWORTH 22 August to 3 September 1485

PHILIPPA LANGLEY

The wider-ranging investigation (22 August–3 September 1485)

As a cold-case police enquiry, an important part of The Missing Princes Project is to attempt to recreate events without the potential contamination of hindsight. As part of its investigations there are a number of significant events that require forensic examination. One of these is the immediate post-Bosworth period, when the worlds of Richard III and Henry Tudor collided. What Henry and his forces discovered at this key moment may help to illuminate the mystery of the missing princes. A forensic examination considers all sources of information, allowing us to step back in time and ask significant questions.

Henry's delayed arrival into London

One of the project's key questions is Henry's delayed arrival into London and apparent change in strategy following King Richard's death. Securing the capital was a vital military objective, so why did Henry take 12 days to undertake a journey that should have been completed in three?[1] Moreover, why did Henry's focus turn north at this crucial moment? We are told that Henry (and his army) wanted to enjoy the progress and acclamation. This may be partly true.[2] However, in postponing his arrival the new (un-crowned and self-proclaimed) king risked finding the gates of London closed to his invading foreign army and rebel force. London had rallied for King Richard, providing him with 3,178 men[3] and imposing martial law to protect the city from the invaders.[4] The fact that London stood down and eventually welcomed Henry (following confirmed reports of Richard's death,[5] and a show of strength by Henry)[6] suggests no Yorkist force or heir was present in the capital at the time of Richard's defeat.

Post-Bosworth events under the microscope

Let us now examine in greater detail the key post-Bosworth period. It is important to note that Henry VII's historian, Polydore Vergil, devoted only two lines of text to this crucial time, describing it as a triumphant progress. The later Tudor chroniclers followed his lead. Therefore, we will use contemporary sources to shine a new light on this period.

Henry's focus on the North

In Leicester by the early morning of 23 August, Henry's immediate focus was York, signing arrest warrants for Robert Stillington, bishop of Bath and Wells, and Sir Richard Ratcliffe. Henry also sent a proclamation to the city detailing the death and defeat of King Richard and his supporters.[7] This was delivered by Windsor Herald.[8] As we have seen in Part 1, the proclamation included (incorrectly) the deaths of Francis Lovell, Thomas Howard and John de la Pole. Interestingly it also included (correctly) the death of Richard Ratcliffe. Forces were now despatched from Leicester, carrying these communications and arriving near York the following day (24 August), a distance of some 100 miles. Afraid to enter, Sir Roger Cotton[9] sent word to the city fathers to meet him on the outskirts of the city at 'the sign of the boar'.[10] They complied and the following day (the 25th) King Henry's proclamation was read throughout York. On the same day the city fathers sent a delegation to the new king with letters for diverse people. On the 27 August the arrest warrant for Stillington and Ratcliffe (signed four days

Young Henry VII, by a French artist, Musée Calvet, Avignon.
Image in public domain

earlier on the 23rd) was delivered to the city. By 30 August Sir Robert Halewell arrived, carrying an intriguing letter requesting the city's 'assistence and aide', for which it would receive Henry's 'especial thankes'. The letter had been signed by Henry at Leicester on 24 August, six days earlier.[11] What was this 'assistence and aide', and why did this letter arrive some considerable time after signature, along with the arrest warrants for Stillington and Ratcliffe? Moreover, where was Robert Willoughby? City of York records mention no visit by him or indeed any information regarding a mission to secure the children of the house of York and escort them to the new king. It seems that this information was on a need-to-know basis only.

Analysis of Henry's communications with York (as above) suggests either some form of travel disruption on the northern roads, or more likely (considering Cotton and Windsor Herald's speedy arrival and the false content of Henry's proclamation) that Henry planned delivery to ensure the city was carefully managed and compliant, which may have been part of a wider strategy. Henry VII was a deeply suspicious and cautious man who, throughout his reign, ensured an extensive network of spies kept him fully informed at all times. It therefore seems logical for Henry to sign two key documents on 23 August and give them to two separate forces to deliver; each then able to keep tabs on the other and report back.

Moreover the actions of the city fathers suggest suspicions surrounding a drip-feed of information from the new king, which prompted an immediate deputation to him carrying letters for a number of people (including Northumberland[12] and Stanley[13]). The deputation would hope to secure Henry's good offices, but considering the city fathers' later actions,[14] might also serve as an urgent fact-finding mission.

Furthermore, events at this time also suggest that a number of forces may have been despatched from Leicester simultaneously, carrying similar communications for other key northern locations, and intended to ensure their compliance whilst gathering intelligence.[15] Does this intelligence gathering explain Henry's delayed arrival into London, and was he first ensuring he was as well informed as possible, particularly about the location of (all) the royal children? Certainly, Molinet's description of Henry's post-Bosworth proclamation in London would suggest as much (see Part 1). Is this what Halewell's letter requesting 'assistence and aide' alluded to? Was Henry sending this communication to the North in order to ensure its management but also discover the possible location of the sons of Edward IV? Moreover, Henry's delayed journey to the capital also suggests that possession of the royal nursery, or at least its secure control,[16] may have been a priority in helping ensure London's welcome, and compliance.

What did Henry do?

So what was Henry doing at this crucial time and how does this inform events? As we have seen, Henry signed a letter in Leicester on 24 August intended for York. Later that day he was in Coventry, 24 miles away. Coventry had been on King Richard's royal progress of 1483,[17] sent aid to the king for the battle[18] and fought in what seems the heaviest action.[19] The city's Annals also noted how Richard was 'shamefully Carryed to Leicester',[20] so Henry may have been anxious to quell any lingering loyalty to the Yorkist king by forcing the city to receive him.[21] Henry's tenuous claim to the throne, inferior to 30 or more Plantagenet claimants, may have been a factor. He may also have used the Dun Cow as a device for the visit.[22] Coventry was a known militia city,[23] with Henry's generals keen to secure it and their move south. Moreover, Coventry was also associated with the former Edward V as prince of Wales.[24] Ultimately, Henry's show of force was successful. After Coventry it is likely Henry returned to Leicester to witness King Richard's burial and the execution of Catesby and others. Distances to London (Shoreditch) from Leicester and Coventry were similar (98 and 93 miles respectively). This journey, as we have seen, should have taken Henry three days, entering London on or around 28 August. However, Henry arrived on 3 September, some six days later. Bernard André, who was present, tells us that Henry reached London after leaving St Albans on 3 September. Therefore, we will now assess the key eight-day period from 25 August to 2 September and ask if Robert Willoughby's activities in the North explain Henry's delay.

Robert Willoughby's mission

Henry's historian tells us that Willoughby's mission to secure the royal children from Sheriff Hutton Castle was

undertaken 'without delay'.[25] As Sir Roger Cotton and Windsor Herald arrived on the outskirts of York on 24 August, it is therefore likely that Willoughby took the same time, skirting York, and arriving at Sheriff Hutton the same day. With Willoughby's escort leaving the following day (the 25th), the journey to London (Shoreditch) from Sheriff Hutton (some 205 miles) would have taken about five days.[26] However, taking into account a chariot for the ten-year-old earl of Warwick would result in a journey time of six to seven days. This means Willoughby would have reached London between 31 August and 1 September and therefore well before Henry. It therefore seems likely that Henry deliberately paused so that he could rendezvous with Willoughby at either Northampton or St Albans. This way Henry would ensure he had possession of the royal children well before he entered the capital.

Sir Edward Woodville

There are further key questions about the immediate post-Bosworth situation. Why, as we briefly considered in Part 1, was Robert Willoughby chosen for the mission to the royal nursery? Indeed, it would seem that Henry had the perfect person with him at Leicester. Sir Edward Woodville (c.1454–28 July 1488)[27] knew the North, having taken part in the 1482 invasion of Scotland (made knight-banneret by Richard as duke of Gloucester) and was also uncle to Elizabeth of York (and King Edward's children) and therefore well known to them. Woodville fought bravely for Henry at Bosworth and, arguably, provided Henry with the ability to launch his ambition for the English throne.[28]

So why was Woodville passed over? It's possible he was injured. However, no contemporary account suggests this.[29] Woodville was a skilled soldier but his lack of advancement under Henry is significant. As C. P. Wilkins remarks, he possessed 'little or nothing by way of landed estates'. Indeed, Henry's only gift to Woodville suggests he wanted him out of the way. In September 1485 he awarded Woodville the captaincy of the Isle of Wight and restored his command of Portchester Castle, by the Solent. Woodville would only be recognised by Henry after fighting at Stoke Field in June 1487. Ten months later, on 27 April 1488, Woodville was admitted to the Order of the Garter. However, almost immediately he defied the king's orders by taking nearly 800 men to fight in Brittany. Woodville died on 28 July in a cavalry charge at the battle of St Aubin du Cormier, where all were killed except one boy.[30] Does this suggest a lack of respect for Henry, or perhaps a mistrust of Woodville? Was Henry keeping Woodville as a means to allay fears as he moved south, particularly through Northampton and Stony Stratford and the nearby Woodville manor of Grafton Regis? Might Grafton have been the rendezvous point with Willoughby, with Woodville a lure for a compliant Princess Elizabeth and any other siblings?

Were the sons of Edward IV taken north during Richard's reign?

Another significant question is why the royal children of the House of York were domiciled in Richard's heartlands of Yorkshire, yet it seems the sons of Edward IV, arguably the most significant members of the new nursery, were not.[31] So let us now consider a number of events which may suggest the sons of Edward IV were taken north. We know, for example, that in London on 18 July 1483[32] a significant number of Edward V's attendants were paid off just before Richard's royal progress left the capital (19 July).[33] Then, when a possible attempt was made to remove the boys from the Tower of London on or around 22 July, while Richard was in Reading, Richard failed to return. The event was treated seriously because the Earl Marshal, John Howard, was despatched to the capital,[34] but the king continued with his progress. Moreover, as we have seen in the first part of this study, the former tutor and president of Edward V's council, John Alcock, bishop of Worcester, was also on the royal progress.[35]

This inaction on Richard's part can only suggest three possibilities. The boys no longer resided in the Tower, the attempt to release them had failed, or the boys were successfully removed by the time news reached the king. In any of these scenarios, Richard's inaction is explicable. A further possibility is that the boys were dead prior to Richard's coronation (the Continental view). However,

Above: Francis Lovell, blue plaque, Mottram in Longendale (as Lord of Longendale). Ancient Parish of Mottram. Image courtesy of Philippa Langley. Below: **St Michael's Church, Mottram in Longdendale, Greater Manchester, England.** © Stephen Burton, Images covered by the Creative Commons Licence.

Howard's immediate return and the accounts of Vergil and Crowland, the lack of testimony from those at Richard's court (see Part 1) and the later actions of the boys' mother, Elizabeth Woodville (see below) all contradict the Continental position.[36]

The wider-ranging investigation – the whereabouts of King Edward's sons

In support of a wider-ranging investigation we must now consider a number of traditions surrounding the possible whereabouts of Edward IV's sons during the reign of Richard III. Perhaps the most famous is the Tyrell family tradition that the boys stayed at Gipping Manor in Suffolk with their mother (Elizabeth Woodville) 'by permission of the uncle.'[37] At this remove the tradition sounds plausible as a story that may have been recounted by generations of the Tyrell family following Sir James's execution and Thomas More's story about his later confession to the boys' murder.[38] Certainly the form and language suggests its possible veracity.

Other possible locations include Llandovery in Wales with its connection to Tyrell (and Buckingham),[39] Barnard Castle in County Durham with its connection to Richard Ratcliffe, its constable,[40] Scarborough Castle,[41] Bedale in North Yorkshire[42] and Mottram in Longdendale, Lancashire.[43] Longdendale is particularly interesting, once in the ownership of Francis Lovell, the king's close friend and Chamberlain, it was later granted to Sir William Stanley.[44] Sir William, victor at Bosworth who became Henry's Chamberlain, rebelled ten years after the battle in the name of Edward IV's youngest son. William was summarily executed after many of the rebels had been brought by deception to the Tower of London.[45] As Vergil and Buck confirm, the rebellion in 1495 in the boy's name was extensive and included a number of leading nobles from Henry's court under Sir William's titular leadership.[46]

Do the northern strongholds where Richard imprisoned Rivers, Grey and Vaughan[47] in 1483 (Sheriff Hutton, Middleham and Pontefract respectively) offer any clues? Certainly, the three men were held separately and it's interesting that the younger (Grey) was sent to Middleham with his attendants.[48] Middleham, situated in King Richard's heartlands, was a significant distance (136 miles) for Henry's men to travel and may have been considered a likely Yorkist rallying point. Sheriff Hutton we have considered (as above). This leaves Pontefract. Pontefract Castle was located on the main northern route within easy distance of Leicester (84 miles). Did Henry despatch a force here to gather intelligence and was Halewell given instructions to head to a number of northern locations carrying his letter for 'assistence and aide', thus explaining his tardy arrival at York (six days after the letter for York was signed)?

Moreover, is there any contemporary evidence to suggest that one or more of the sons of Edward IV had been kept at Pontefract Castle? Searches are ongoing but with space limitations let us now consider one overlooked contemporary source.

The following excerpt comes from the travel diary of Niclas von Popplau, a Silesian envoy who met Richard III in York in early May 1484.

> Ten miles away from Doncaster, when you travel towards York, there is also a stronghold castle. In there, the king keeps his treasure, also all noble Lords, such as the king's children and sons to the princes just like you keep prisoners. The castle itself is called in Latin *pons fractus*, which was confirmed to me later by word of the king himself, whose name is Richard King of England, who had been Duke of York [sic] before.[49]

This source will be analysed in the December *Bulletin*.

Conclusion

This four-part analysis has taken one previously overlooked but significant event and analysed it forensically in terms of what it might tell us about the fate of the sons of King Edward IV. It has also highlighted the many lines of investigation, person-of-interest enquiries and related questions. Current analysis indicates that members of Richard's court were ignorant of the boys' possible whereabouts and/or fate, and that Henry's post-Bosworth northern focus indicates an immediate and extensive search of the region whilst ensuring local compliance. As Henry's (northern) prisoners included the earl of Northumberland, Warden of the Eastern and Middle Marches, his intelligence in the north should have been wide-ranging and straightforward,[50] yet his delay suggests otherwise. At this remove, the results of this line of investigation suggest that we cannot dismiss the possibility that on or by 22 August 1485 the boys were thought to be alive by those at Richard's court, but that no one could say where they were. As a result, Henry was forced to delay his entry into London because of the apparent need to make enquiries in the North.

Needless to say, the investigation continues.

Notes and references

1. Men returning from the battle reached London (c. 100-mile journey) within two days on the 24th (see Note 3 below). The three-day journey is calculated using a number of factors, including Henry's journey from Leicester to Coventry on 24 August, a distance of c. 24 miles in a day. See *Coventry Leet Book* below, Notes 18 and 21, for the bread and wine provided for Henry's forces. A mounted force could travel 40 miles a day, as evidenced by Richard Ratcliffe's journey from London to York on 10 June 1483, a distance of some 195 miles in four to five days. See Lorraine C. Attreed, *York House Books 1461–1490* (1991), Vol. Two, pp 713–14. The force despatched from Leicester on 23 August (Cotton and Windsor Herald) covered a distance of some 100 miles to the outskirts of York in time to meet with the city fathers the following day (the 24th). If Henry decided to take heavy ordnance to London the journey time may have been in the region of

four to five days, covering up to 20 miles a day. However, as evidenced during the Napoleonic Wars, an army with ordnance could march up to 30 miles a day. John Sponer arrived in York from the battlefield on the same day, a distance of some 108 miles: see Attreed, Vol. 1, pp 368–9. For more information on medieval travel and gaited (ambling) horses that travel comfortably at 15 mph, see: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ orses_in_the_Middle_Ages and https://petticoatsandpistols.com/tag/how-far-a-horse-can-travel-in-a-day.

2. Denys Hay (ed.), *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485–1537*, Camden Series Vol. LXXIV (1950), Book XXIV, pp 3–5. Vergil says: 'in the places through which he passed was greeted with the greatest joy by all. Far and wide the people hastened to assemble by the roadside, saluting him as king and filling the length of his journey with laden tables and overflowing goblets.'
3. *London Journal IX* and contemporary London Guildhall records. Also: www.british-history.ac.uk/london-record-soc/Vol.22/pp1-11. My thanks to Mike Ingram for alerting me to this source. It has been suggested that the London men, although professionally mustered into a well organised fighting force, may not have been sent. However, London's description of Henry as the realm's 'rebell', the martial law immediately imposed, the speed at which men had returned to confirm the death of the king and the enormous sums of money paid to Henry by the city on his arrival, and again at his coronation, strongly support the men of London being present at Bosworth to fight for Richard.
4. Mike Ingram, *Richard III and the Battle of Bosworth* (2019), pp 51, 207. From the contemporary *London Journal IX* and Guildhall records. Also: Ralph A. Griffiths and James Sherborne, *Kings and Nobles in the Later Middle Ages* (1986), pp 193–4.
5. Margaret M. Condon, 'More Than the Sum of Its Parts. The London Customs Accounts 1400–1510, a major new resource', *The Ricardian*, 2019, Vol. XXIX, p. 109. On 28 August 1483 the Common Council of London sent several of its members to meet the new king. The day before, Henry had granted himself London's customs and subsidies.
6. Ingram, *Bosworth*, p. 207. Also Hay, *Anglica Historia*, p. 5. Vergil writes: 'as he [Henry] entered the city: trumpeters went in front with the spoils of the enemy, thundering forth martial sounds'.
7. For the immediate post-Bosworth events in York and a copy of King Henry's Proclamation, see: Attreed, *York House Books*, Vol. Two, Appendix V, Francis Drake, *Eboracum* August–September 1485, pp 734–9.
8. Bob Pritchard, *Battle of Bosworth: nobles and knights' profiles* (2018), p. 54. At Bosworth with King Richard and believed to be Richard Slack (d. 1502). The *York House Books* (p. 736) record a reward to Windsor Herald from the city fathers for his 'comforthable words'. Slack was made Keeper of Claverdon Park in Warwickshire.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 38. Sir Roger Cotton (Cotam) is believed to have fought for King Richard and was knighted by him (as duke of Gloucester) on the Scottish campaign of 1482. For the knighting: W. C. Metcalfe, *A Book of Knights Banneret, Knights of the Bath and Knights Bachelor made between the fourth year of King Henry IV and King Charles II* (London 1885), p. 7: https://archive.org/details/bookofknightsban00metcuoft/page/n10. My thanks to Dr Sandra Pendlington for alerting me to this source.
By 21 September 1485 Cotton was made sheriff of the counties of Glamorgan and Morgannock and by 17 December, Master of the Horse to 'the queen' (Elizabeth of York). By June 1486, he was also awarded the constableship, stewardship and Honour of the Lordship and Castle of Clare, a significant Yorkist property in the ownership of Cecily, duchess of York. See: William Campbell, *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII*, (1873), Vol. 1, pp 36, 220, 479.
10. This would seem to be King Richard's boar device and battle standards possibly retrieved from the battlefield by Windsor Herald, and could be a direct reference to Vergil's 'spoils of the enemy' in Note 6 above.
11. Attreed, *York House Books*, Vol. 2, *Eboracum*, p. 738.
12. For Northumberland's imprisonment after Bosworth, his oath to Henry for his release on 6 December 1483, see Campbell, *Materials*, Vol. 1, pp 198–9. For his son and heir being taken into Henry's custody see A. J. Pollard, *North-Eastern England During The Wars of the Roses: lay society, war and politics 1450–1500* (1990), p. 362. However, I've been unable to find a source for this and Pollard may have confused Northumberland with the earl of Westmoreland and his heir being taken into Henry's custody on 5 December 1485; see Campbell, *Materials*, Vol. 1, p. 196, also p 311, and *Calendar of Close Rolls Henry VII 1485–1500* (1955), p. 22. For Northumberland's release by 18 December see Attreed, *York House Books*, Vol. 1, p. 391.
13. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 735.
14. *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp 373, 392, for 14 October 1485 and the Council's openly recorded description of Richard as 'King' and as the 'moost famous prince of blissed memory' and for 18 December and the refusal of Council members to elect King Henry's chosen candidate to the office of Recorder of York.
15. With Sandal Castle (the official royal nursery) equidistant with Pontefract Castle from Leicester (castle) at c. 83 miles, it seems highly likely that Henry would send a force (or forces) to both locations to ensure compliance and gather intelligence. See Note 11 above for Henry's delayed communications
16. Campbell, *Materials*, Vol. 1, p. 311. The children were placed directly into his mother's care. On 24 February 1486 Henry granted £200 to Margaret Beaufort for her late 'keeping and guiding' of the ladies, daughters of King Edward IV and also the young lords, the duke of Buckingham and the earls of Warwick and of Westmoreland (see Note 12 above). Henry trusted his mother implicitly. Could the 'guiding' have included securing their trust whilst listening to any private conversations in order to gather further intelligence? It seems Henry's mother kept all the children for a few months (September to December/January). See Campbell, *Materials*, p. 532, for her custody of Buckingham's sons, Edward and Henry (3 August 1486). It's been suggested that Henry's delayed arrival into London was due to the sweating sickness; see Robert C. Hairsine, 'Oxford University and the Life and Legend of Richard III', in

J. Petre (ed,), *Richard III: crown and people* (1985), pp 317–18. However, the sweating sickness arrived in Oxford at the end of August and early September. By 3 September Henry was already in London. Moreover, during the month of September we are told the sickness then took hold in the capital; see Richard Firth Green, 'Historical Notes of a London Citizen, 1483–1488', *The English Historical Review*, Vol. XCVI, Issue CCCLXXX, July 1981, p. 589. If the sickness had been in the capital by the 3rd it's unlikely that Henry would have entered then. My thanks to Dr Judith Ford for alerting me to these sources.

17. Nicholas Pronay and John Cox (eds), *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations 1459–1486*, (1986), p. 161.
18. *Coventry Leet Book or Mayor's Register*, p. 531. Payment to diverse persons for 'stuff sent to the field of King Richard', https://archive.org/details/coventryleetboo00unkngoog/page/n554.
19. Anne F. Sutton, 'Camera Principis: good government, industry and ceremony in Richard III's Coventry', *The Ricardian,* 2019, Vol. XXIX, pp 66, 78, 83, for leading citizens Robert Coleman and Thomas Maideford, who fought for Richard; Thomas was injured and may have captained the Coventry contingent (p. 83).
20. Griffiths and Sherborne, *Kings and Nobles*, p. 194.
21. *Ibid.*, pp 194–5. Henry received a gold cup and £100 from the city, and money was paid for 512 penny loaves of bread, 110 gallons of red wine but only 4½ gallons of ale. See also: Philippa Langley and Michael Jones, *The King's Grave: the search for Richard III* (2013), p. 217; the red wine to please the large contingent of French mercenaries in Henry's army.
22. Henry's army carried three banners to London: St. George, the Welsh Dragon and the Dun Cow. The Dun Cow was the banner for Coventry and Warwickshire. As Coventry was the nearest city in Warwickshire to the site of the battle (and had supported Richard), Henry's visual imagery told a clear story of victory and capitulation. Whether the Dun Cow banner had been retrieved from the battlefield or from the city during his visit, it would seem to offer an explanation for the detour: to secure the militia city's open capitulation. The places Henry's forces would later pass through would have been in no doubt as to what this banner meant and the story it told. For the Dun Cow being associated with Coventry and Warwickshire, see Griffiths and Sherborne, *Kings and Nobles*, p. 197. It also had a very slight association with Henry's mother's Beaufort family.
23. Sutton, 'Richard III's Coventry', pp 63, 67.
24. *Ibid.*, pp 50, 69–70. Also for the young Edward V (as prince of Wales) asserting himself as a warrior in 1481.
25. Hay, *Anglica Historia*, p.3.
26. See Note 1 above for this journey time to York (195 miles) at 40 miles a day.
27. C. P. Wilkins, 'Edward Woodville' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (*ODNB*), 22 September 2011. Woodville was probably the youngest child of Richard Woodville, earl Rivers, and Jacquetta de Luxembourg and has incorrectly been called Lord Scales. This mistake seems to have arisen from some lands his eldest brother, Anthony, had bequeathed to him from Anthony's first wife, Lady Scales. Following Anthony's execution, Lord Scales was undoubtedly Edward's elder brother, Richard Woodville. Richard had been pardoned by Richard III by March 1485 and took part in the delegation to Portugal for the marriage of Princess Joanna of Portugal to King Richard, and the Duke of Beja to his niece, Elizabeth of York. See Barrie Williams, The Portuguese Connection and the Significance of 'the Holy Princess', *The Ricardian*, March 1983, Vol. VI, No. 80, pp 138–45. For the delegation, p. 141.
28. *Ibid.* In May 1483, Woodville had taken two royal ships that included 200–300 soldiers and archers and £10,201 in gold coin from the treasury. This figure amounted to 15% of the royal revenues, with a similar figure having financed 20,000 soldiers and the invasion of Scotland the previous year.
29. *Ibid.*, also Pronay and Cox, *Continuations*, p. 181. Woodville is described as 'a most valiant knight'. He is also listed as one of the 'chief men' of Henry's army, and is listed before Willoughby.
30. *Ibid.* The disaster brought about the end of an independent Brittany. It is somewhat ironic that Woodville's death would mirror that of King Richard.
31. Peter Hammond, *The Children of Richard III* (2018), p. 33. At the time of Edward of Middleham's investiture in York on 8 September 1483, Edward, earl of Warwick and John of Gloucester (the king's bastard son) were knighted with him. This confirms that these three male children were either domiciled in the north, or sent north at the time of the royal progress or travelled north within the progress. From the extant records of the coronation of Richard III, Edward of Middleham was not present in London for the ceremony, and this is confirmed by the Middleham accounts for this period (see Hammond, p. 22). Also see Rosemary Horrox and P.W Hammond (eds), *British Library Harleian Manuscript MS 433* (1983), Vol. 3, p. 114, for the ordinances for the royal household in the North (24 July 1484) and the 'Children togeder at oon brekefast'. This includes the teenager Henry Lovell, Lord Morley.
32. Horrox and Hammond, *Harleian MS 433*, Vol. 2, p. 2.
33. Rhoda Edwards, *The Itinerary of King Richard III 1483–1485* (1983), p. 4.
34. John Ashdown-Hill, *Richard III's 'Beloved Cousyn': John Howard and the House of York* (2009), pp 98, 122. Also Ashdown-Hill, *The Mythology of the Princes in the Tower* (2018), p. 118, and Edwards, *Itinerary*, p. 5.
35. Alison Hanham, *Richard III and his Early Historians 1483–1585* (1975), p. 122 (John Rous).
36. The Continental position that the sons of Edward IV were murdered before Richard was crowned comes from: Rochefort (French, January 1484) – see Langley, *Ricardian Bulletin*, June 2019, pp 34–6; Diego de Valera (Spanish, March 1486) – Valera stated that the boys had been murdered by Richard when Edward IV was still alive; Niclas von Popplau (Silesian, May 1485) – see Langley, forthcoming *Ricardian Bulletin*, December 2020; and Caspar Weinrich (German, before 1496). However, this position is contradicted by a number of factors: the lack of information on the boys' death at this time in England (both the Crowland Chronicler and the Mayor of Bristol's marginal note being written after King Richard's death: Crowland in November 1485 and the Bristol note in September 1485 at the earliest); also the actions of the boys' mother, Elizabeth Woodville, in early 1484, when she released her daughters into King Richard's care; the

actions of other Woodville relations such as Dorset and Richard Woodville ('Lord Scalus'), who in the late spring of 1485 helped negotiate Richard's marriage to Joanna of Portugal and Elizabeth of York to the duke of Beja); those at Richard's court (see Part 1); the City of London's support of Richard; and the ability to keep the deaths secret in and around the Tower of London, a busy royal palace of 600–1,000 people. If Richard was to kill the boys then he would have done this before his coronation and anointing. The act of anointing cleansed a monarch of sin to allow God to enter the body. This is a further factor for the (devout) king having not engaged in the potential killing of innocents after his anointing.

37. Audrey Williamson, *The Mystery of the Princes* (1978), p. 91. The tradition records: 'that the princes and their mother Elizabeth Woodville lived in the hall by permission of the uncle' and goes back 'well before the eighteenth century and was handed down from generation to generation'. In 1973 it had been revealed to Williamson during her researches by a relative of the Tyrell family, Kathleen Margaret Drewe.
38. Annette Carson, *Richard III: the maligned king* (2013), pp 183–4. As Carson reveals, More's story about Tyrell's confession does not stand up to scrutiny. See also Matthew Lewis, *The Survival of the Princes in the Tower* (2017), pp 28, 58–9.
39. Tyrell was made steward of Llandovery Castle by Richard III following Buckingham's rebellion. In 1485 Richard also gave the town a royal charter. See: *Harleian MS 433*, Vol. 1, pp 160, 256. Also 'Presentation of Freedom of the Borough of Llandovery to HRH the Prince of Wales' (June 1985), Barton Library downloads, topographical. My thanks to project member Christine Forbes for this information (21 July 2017).
40. Pollard, *North-Eastern England*, p. 357.
41. In the spring of 1485 Richard's remarkable charter to Scarborough made it into a 'shire incorporate'. See Charles Ross, *Richard III* (1981), p. 58. Ross adds that this was 'a dignity only previously enjoyed by such major towns as London, Bristol and Norwich.' Scarborough lost its county status when Henry VII became king. Also for Scarborough under Richard III, see *Harleian MS 433*, Vol. 1, p. 249. The original vellum document is held in the Scarborough Collections. Scarborough Castle was heavily fortified and located on the coast. Its constable was William Tunstall; see Pollard, *North-Eastern England*, p. 387.
42. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Francis_Lovell,_1st_Viscount_Lovell. In 1474 Lovell inherited a large estate, including the feudal barony of Bedale, a possession of the Stapleton family. The arms of the Stapleton family appear on his Garter stall plate in St George's Chapel. Bedale was adjacent to Middleham and might therefore be the source for the tradition. My thanks to Dr A. J. Hibbard for this source.
43. An information panel on display at the Portland Basin Museum in Ashton-under-Lyne records: 'A persistent local story claims that the two "Princes in the Tower" were not murdered but were secretly moved to Longdendale by Francis Lovell, Lord of Longdendale, who was Chamberlain to Richard III.' Project members Karen Griebling and Dean Morris are investigating this intriguing tradition.
44. Campbell, *Materials*, Vol. 1, p. 322, Grant made on 25 February 1486. A significant question for the project is whether Sir William Stanley discovered information regarding the fate of one or more of the sons of Edward IV during his tenure as Lord of Longdendale, following Sir Francis Lovell's lordship.
45. Hay, *Anglica Historia*, pp 73–7.
46. *Ibid.*, pp 73, 79. Also Arthur Kincaid (ed.), *The History of King Richard the Third by Sir George Buck, Master of the Revels (original ms. 1612)*, (1979), p. 161.
47. Hanham, *Early Historians*, p. 118. Also Pronay and Cox, *Continuations*, pp 157, 161. Although Rous and Crowland record Vaughan's arrest and execution at Pontefract, it's interesting that this is not recorded in *Harleian MS 433* with the expenses for Rivers and Grey. See *Harleian MS 433*, Vol. 2, p. 25. Analysis of the Honour of Pontefract also fails to record any expenses for Sir Thomas Vaughan. My thanks to project member Christopher Tinmouth for the Honour transcription and analysis, 31 December 2019.
48. *Harleian MS 433*, Vol. 2, p. 25.
49. Doris Schneider-Coutandin, *An Extended Translation of the Travel Diary of Niclas von Popplau: March 1484 to April 1485, on Behalf of The Missing Princes Project* (23 February 2017), p.11 [available shortly]. From: Piotr Radzikowski (ed.), *Reisebeschreibung Niclas von Popplau, Ritter, bürtig von Breslau* (1998), p. 53;
50. Northumberland's control of the Eastern Marches may explain Willoughby's urgent mission. Northumberland's chief seat was at Leconfield, within c. 34 miles of Sheriff Hutton, so the earl would have been well versed in which children were domiciled there. Moreover, if the account of Diego de Valera, from 1 March 1486 (within six months of Bosworth), is to be believed, the 'Lord of Tamorlant' (Northumberland) aimed to marry his daughter to Warwick and for the boy to become king. This position may be borne out by Northumberland's delay in reaching the Battle of Stoke Field to support Henry against the newly crowned 'King Edward'. For the identification of Northumberland as 'Tamorlant' see Anthony Goodman and Angus Mackay, 'A Castilian Report on English Affairs, 1486', *English Historical Review* (January 1973), Vol. 88, No. 346, pp 95–6. For a translation of Valera's letter see Elizabeth M. Nokes and Geoffrey Wheeler, 'A Spanish Account of the Battle of Bosworth', *The Ricardian*, March 1972, No. 36, pp 1–5. Valera was a Spanish nobleman and servant of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. My thanks also to Marie Barnfield for her translation of 23 July 2018. For Northumberland's part at Bosworth, it's interesting to note that his will is dated 27 July 1485 so it seems he intended to take part in the battle. Of the 17 knights named in his will, ten are known to have fought for Richard III and the remaining seven seem not to have taken part, or aren't named in any extant sources. For Northumberland's will, see *A Selection Of Wills from the Registry at York*, Vol. III, The Surtees Society (1865), pp 304–10. My thanks to Dr Heather Falvey for alerting me to this source. For Henry VII's personal interrogation of prisoners, see Thomas Penn, *Winter King: the dawn of Tudor England* (2011), p. 82.