

Part 1. THE FATE OF THE SONS OF KING EDWARD IV: Robert Willoughby's urgent mission

PHILIPPA LANGLEY

Robert Willoughby (1452–1502, made 1st Baron Willoughby de Broke c.1491) is a person of interest for The Missing Princes Project. He commanded the force despatched north by Henry VII immediately following the defeat of Richard III at the battle of Bosworth. Willoughby was charged with securing the children of the House of York, domiciled in the former king's Yorkshire heartland, and escorting the Yorkist heir (or heirs) to London. As his lands lay in the south-west, Willoughby was not the most obvious choice for this mission, but his later interest in the northern Neville Latimer patrimony might suggest a motive.¹ Willoughby had proved himself in military affairs and in 1501 was given command of a similarly significant commission when he conducted the 15-year-old Princess Catherine of Aragon from Plymouth to London for her marriage to Henry VII's heir, Prince Arthur.²

At this remove we have no information regarding Willoughby's orders at Leicester other than that offered more than 30 years later by Henry VII's historian Polydore Vergil:

After Henry had obtained power, from the very start of his reign he then set about quelling the insurrections. Accordingly, before he left Leicester, he despatched Robert Willoughby to Yorkshire with instructions to bring back Edward, the fifteen-year-old [sic]³ earl of Warwick, sole survivor [sic]⁴ of George, duke of Clarence, whom Richard had held hitherto in the castle called Sheriff Hutton. For indeed, Henry, not unaware of the mob's natural tendency always to seek changes, was fearful lest, if the boy should escape and given any alteration in circumstances, he might stir up civil discord. Having made for the castle without delay, Robert received the boy from the commander of the place⁵ and brought him to London, where the wretch, born to misery, remained in the Tower until his death, as will be recounted elsewhere. Detained in the same fortress was Elizabeth, elder daughter of King Edward ... This girl too, attended by noble ladies, was brought to her mother in London. Henry meanwhile made his way to London⁶

Vergil's account was, of course, written well after the events it describes. Its perfunctory style suggests that Willoughby himself was not Vergil's source. Willoughby's death on 23 August 1502, the year Vergil arrived in England, suggests as much. Where Vergil obtained his information is difficult to ascertain⁷ and he may have been fed no more than the party line. Perhaps Vergil was led to believe that Willoughby's mission was merely a matter of routine business. Such an interpretation, however, does not reflect its importance in the immediate aftermath of Bosworth.

So, what may we deduce from Vergil's account? Most striking are the factual inaccuracies. First, Edward of Warwick was ten in 1485, not 15. Tantalisingly, the Edward who would have been 15 at this time was the former Edward V, the elder 'prince in the Tower'. An age discrepancy of this order constitutes a significant error. A boy of ten is very different in appearance to a young man of 15. It is therefore of interest that those

informing Vergil, who had potentially seen the boy (and/or knew his age), were so profoundly mistaken. Indeed, the eldest son of Edward IV would have reached his majority on his fourteenth birthday,⁸ 2 November 1484,⁹ and, as a result, would have been considered an adult. So was this rather obvious mistake simply a scribal error, or were Vergil's informants describing an entirely different individual, five years older than the real Edward of Warwick? Another significant inaccuracy concerns Vergil's description of Warwick as the 'sole survivor' of George of Clarence. Warwick's sister, Margaret, was 12 at the time and by



Above: Sheriff Hutton as it might have appeared in the fifteenth century. © Geoffrey Wheeler Below: Sheriff Hutton today. Photo courtesy of Marion Moulton



1509 had not only married Henry's cousin, Sir Richard Pole,¹⁰ but had been made countess of Salisbury and lady-in-waiting to Queen Catherine. Does this further error suggest that Margaret resided elsewhere in the summer of 1485, or was she absent from court and out of favour when Vergil composed his account? Clearly, Vergil's testimony raises some intriguing questions about the fidelity or otherwise of his sources.

Our investigation must also consider the later Tudor narrative which places Elizabeth of York's arrival in London after Edward of Warwick, escorted by 'many noblemen and ladies'.¹¹ This, however, is at odds with Vergil, who states that Elizabeth was brought to London at the same time. It is Vergil's version that makes political and military sense. Willoughby was heading deep into enemy territory and Henry would have been extremely anxious to prevent the possible involvement of Edward's daughters in a Yorkist rebellion. Perhaps Willoughby's detachment of men-at-arms, ominously fresh from battle, allayed fears that they were staging a royal abduction by allowing the children's attendants to accompany them, a strategy that might also neutralise any potential rescue attempt on the road south. Such reasoning is, of course, supposition, but is included here to give some sense of the many questions an investigation must ask. In Part 4 we will broaden our enquiry by considering some of the other locations in the north that may have held the children of the House of York.

Whatever the truth, the one fact we can glean from Vergil's brief report is that Willoughby was the man tasked, and trusted, by Henry Tudor to carry out this urgent incursion into the former king's northern

heartland. It will presently become clear that Henry's rather uncertain strategy regarding the fate of the sons of Edward IV indicates that Willoughby may well have been instructed to make additional enquiries about the missing boys. To do otherwise, in the absence of bodies or definitive information, would amount to uncharacteristic negligence on the part of the new king.

Widening the enquiry

In connection with Henry's search for authentic evidence concerning the so-called 'princes in the Tower', our investigation now focuses on the fate of three key contemporary figures. All were important members of King Richard's council: William Catesby (b. in or before 1446–1485), Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey (1443–1525) and Thomas Bourchier, archbishop of Canterbury (1404–30 March 1486).¹² First we will examine what became of these individuals in the immediate aftermath of King Richard's death and then we will discuss what their respective and collective destinies might reveal about the fate of the sons of Edward IV.

William Catesby was one of Richard III's closest advisors. He was captured after fighting for his king at Bosworth¹³ and would be executed (beheaded) in Leicester on 25 August. It is inconceivable that Catesby was not interrogated. He was certainly permitted to write a new will.¹⁴ What information did Catesby provide and did he make a full confession? Richard III was dead and the contents of Catesby's will prove beyond doubt that he was doing whatever he could to survive whilst simultaneously atoning for previous transgressions.¹⁵

It is interesting to note that Vergil also records a

'Henry's rather uncertain strategy regarding the fate of the sons of Edward IV indicates that Willoughby may well have been instructed to make additional enquiries about the missing boys.'

Robert Willoughby's tomb and effigy in St Mary's Church, Callington, Cornwall. Photos courtesy of Rose and John Bailey





Standard of Baron Willoughby de Broke, College of Arms MS I. 2 f 34r.
Reproduced by kind permission of the Kings, Herald and Pursuivants of Arms.

From Peter O'Donoghue, *York Herald*: Robert Willoughby's standard is known from certain manuscripts that date from the early part of the 16th century. Unfortunately it is not easy to date them precisely but is likely that this dates from the 1520s or 1530s. The details of the manuscript do not help in identifying which Lord Willoughby de Broke is intended, as the manuscript could easily be a compilation that includes standards of deceased persons or be a copy of a much earlier compilation. The Willoughby family used a moor's head device for a long time. It might have been a reference to the Crusades – many families liked to position themselves as having supported the Crusades, even when they hadn't, and this made moor's heads popular in heraldry. The ducal crown, or crest coronet, is simply a coronet that is in the repertoire of heraldic devices, very popular in crests. The crescent is a mark of difference: the Willoughby de Broke line was a junior branch of the family and this crescent shows that status. The head without a crescent was used by the senior line represented by Willoughby de Eresby. The rudder is another badge used by the family of Willoughby de Broke. It is said to have been the device of the Paveley family, that was transmitted to their successors the Cheyney and Willoughby families. Again it has no known significance. The number is simply how many the artist thought looked right – on the standards from this period we usually have a large device with a powdering of smaller ones around it.

See also: Pritchard, Bob (ed.), *Medieval Battle and Tournament Standards: John Cocke – Lancaster Herald* (2018), pp 6, 36.

number of other executions: 'Two days after at Leycester, William Catesby, lawyer, with a few that wer his felowys, were executyd'.¹⁶

In the eighteenth century, local historian John Throsby added what may have been a local tradition, that the executions were conducted 'without any ceremony or decency'.¹⁷ Failure to reveal the names of the other executed prisoners suggests they were not of any political or local significance. This helps inform events surrounding the investigation's second key contemporary figure.

Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, was steward of Richard III's household and a leading supporter of the king. According to Crowland and the later Tudor narrative he was captured at Bosworth,¹⁸ and therefore an interrogation in Leicester must have also taken place. Unlike Catesby, however, Howard was a seasoned soldier¹⁹ and may not have been as forthcoming with information. Indeed the execution of his retainer John Buck²⁰ in Leicester on 24 August might suggest a rather sinister attempt to 'encourage' Howard to talk,²¹ or a warning about what might await his family and affinity should he decide not to co-operate or to attempt to actively work against the new regime.²²

The latter explanation seems most likely considering what we know about Howard from Sir George Buck.

Buck makes it clear that although 'sorely hurt and wounded', Howard managed to escape the battle and 'came by night to the house of a gentleman not far from Nottingham' where he was given (secret) succour whilst his wounds were 'cured'. Only after hearing of an amnesty²³ (and possibly the execution of his retainer) did Howard give himself up.²⁴ This, we are told, was after the November 1485 parliament, a timeline supported by materials from Henry's reign.²⁵ As a fugitive, Howard could not protect his family and affinity. In addition, the new king issued a proclamation listing those who had perished in battle, and it must have seemed that the Yorkist cause was all but over.²⁶ Moreover, Henry's proclamation supports Buck's assertion that Howard escaped the battle because he was listed amongst the fallen. If Howard had been captured and held prisoner in Leicester (as Crowland and the later Tudor histories would have us believe) it would have stretched credulity to list him among the dead.²⁷

The investigation's third key contemporary figure was Thomas Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury. On 16 June 1483 Bouchier gave Elizabeth Woodville (the mother of the 'princes in the Tower') a commitment to return her youngest son, Richard, to her following the boy's release from Westminster sanctuary.²⁸ But at no

point after the death of King Richard, Henry's arrival into London, Bouchier's crowning of King Henry, or the sitting of parliament, is it recorded that this greatly respected cardinal either reported or repented of any former transgression, or made reparation before God, or Elizabeth, for any murder or even for the boy's disappearance.²⁹

In addition, it is important to note that the new regime made no explicit³⁰ proclamation accusing Richard III of the death or murder of the sons of Edward IV, nor was any unequivocal statement of Richard's guilt offered at Henry's parliament only a few months later.³¹ If any of these key contemporary figures had provided certain knowledge of the boy's 'murder', or revealed their suspicions, it is inconceivable that Henry's government would have kept secret such vital intelligence. We may therefore propose that on the 22 August 1485, the date of Richard III's death at Bosworth, these key members of Richard's council either knew the sons of Edward IV were alive, or believed they were alive, or simply didn't know what had happened to them. The certainty of murder or even death is strikingly absent.

Such a deduction is further supported by two intriguing reports. The first occurs in Jean Molinet's *Chroniques*:

The Count of Richmond seeing the King trampled on³² [vanquished], and that God gave him victory over a tyrant, took the oath in towns near London where he entered as a victor; and was received in a great triumph; and had a proclamation before his coronation published everywhere, that if there were a claimant to the crown by descent from the King Edward. He was to show himself; and he would help him to get crowned; but no soul appeared,³³

Henry's pre-coronation proclamations have been thought to reveal a sense of self-confidence. However, when we consider Willoughby's urgent mission northwards, together with Henry's delayed arrival in London following his victory,³⁴ and his delayed marriage to Elizabeth of York,³⁵ an insecurity surrounding the fate of the sons of King Edward becomes apparent. Indeed, Henry's pre-coronation proclamations betray a tangible uncertainty – 'if there were a claimant ... by descent of King Edward' [my emphasis]. This in turn tells us that Willoughby's intelligence also failed to reveal anything definitive. The request 'that he was to show himself' [my emphasis] similarly indicates a tacit admission that one or both of the boys might be alive.

The second report to cast doubt on the murder of the sons of Edward IV is found in Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* and records a public declaration of innocence made by King Richard around the time of his parliament in January 1484, the sincerity of which almost certainly explains Elizabeth Woodville's decision in March 1484 to place her daughters in Richard's care:

For what with purging and declaring his innocence concerning the murder of his nephews toward the world, and what with cost to obtain the love and favour of the communality (which outwardly glossed, and openly dissembled with him) ...³⁶

Case review

Do the post-Bosworth activities of Robert Willoughby, William Catesby, Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, and Thomas Bouchier, archbishop of Canterbury, offer a potential solution to the mystery of the fate of the sons of Edward IV? The evidence presented here suggests that whatever happened to the boys was beyond the control or knowledge of Richard and his council. Such a hypothesis is supported by the lack of statements or evidence from other key figures such as John Alcock³⁷ (former President of Edward V's council, who joined Richard III on his 1483 progress) and the Stanley brothers. Might this suggest the possibility that the key to the mystery lies with a person or persons outside Richard's government? Needless to say, the investigation continues.

Notes and references

1. Philippa Langley, 'Robert Willoughby: a short biography', *Ricardian Bulletin*, March 2020 (this issue, pp 48–51), fn 22, 23. It is interesting to note that in his early career as a lawyer William Catesby had been the legal advisor to Elizabeth, Lady Latimer. See: Daniel Williams, 'The Hastily Drawn-up Will of William Catesby, Esquire, 25 August 1485', *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society (LAHS)*, (1975–6), vol. 51, pp 43–51 (p. 44).
2. James Gairdner, *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII* (1863), vol. 1, p. 406. Willoughby's later escorting duty began on 17 October 1501 and continued into November, see pp 411–16.
3. Edward of Warwick was ten at the time. Edward V was 15. See: Gordon Smith, 'Lambert Simnel and the King From Dublin', *The Ricardian*, vol. 10, no. 135, December 1996, pp 498–536; specifically p. 502, fn10. The age discrepancy was first raised by Barrie Williams, 'Lambert Simnel's rebellion: how reliable is Polydore Vergil?', *The Ricardian*, vol. 6 (1982–4), pp 118–123.
4. Margaret (1473–1541), made countess of Salisbury in 1509, was a daughter of Clarence.
5. Rosemary Horrox, *Richard III: a study in service* (1989), p. 50. The constable of Sheriff Hutton castle is believed to have been Sir Thomas Gower of Stittenham, Also, Rosemary Horrox and P. W. Hammond (eds), *British Library Harleian Manuscript 433* (1983), vol. 2, p. 25. However, Sir Thomas died with King Richard at Bosworth, and possibly in the king's fatal charge. See: Bob Pritchard, *Battle of Bosworth: knights and nobles profiles* (2018), p. 20. It is not known who the commander-lieutenant of Sheriff Hutton was at this time. Sir Ralph Bulmer of Wilton was closely associated with it (Horrox, *Richard III*, p. 51). He also fought for King Richard at Bosworth but survived the battle. Sir Ralph Bigod of nearby Setterington in Yorkshire also survived the battle

- (fighting for Richard) and went on to become a servant of Margaret Beaufort. See Glenn Foard and Anne Curry, *Bosworth 1485: a battlefield rediscovered* (2013), p. 32. It is therefore pure conjecture whether Bulmer or Bigod was captured and taken north with Willoughby's force to Sheriff Hutton. See Part 4 of this series, to come. Certainly Gower would have left someone in charge there.
6. Denys Hay (ed.), *The Anglica Historia of Polydore Vergil A.D. 1485–1537*, Camden Series Volume LXXIV (1950), Book XXIV, p. 3. Original ms written c.1512–13, first edition to 1509 published 1534.
 7. It is believed that Vergil probably began writing his account in around 1506–7. With Henry a small number of his close adherents from Bosworth (and Leicester) were still alive at this time: John de Vere (d. 1513), Thomas Lovell (d. 1524), Giles Daubeney (d. 1508), Roger Machado (d. 1510), Gilbert Talbot (d. 1517), Edward Courteney (d. 1509), Rhys ap Thomas (d. 1525).
 8. Josephine Wilkinson, *The Princes in the Tower* (2013), p. 13. Also Michael Hicks, *Edward V: the prince in the Tower* (2003), p. 83. His brother, Richard of Shrewsbury, would not reach his majority until 16 years of age, on 17 August 1489. See Ann Wroe, *Perkin: a story of deception* (2003), p. 60, from Edward IV's will of 1475.
 9. Rosemary Horrox, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (ODNB)* (Oct 2013), [accessed 9 May 2019]. Henry Stafford, duke of Buckingham, was executed on 2 November 1483, on what may have been Edward's 13th birthday. The Crowland Chronicler records Edward's birth date as the Feast of All Saints, 1 November. See: Pronay and Cox (eds), *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations 1459–1486* (1986), p. 123.
 10. With Pole's death in 1505, Margaret was a widow with five children and treated poorly. Left with little income by Henry VII, she went to live at Syon Abbey but on the accession of Henry VIII returned to court and favour.
 11. Henry Ellis, *Chronicle of John Hardyng 1543* (1812), p. 548, Edward Hall, *The Union of the Two Noble Houses of Lancaster and York*, c.1550, p. 422, Grafton's *Chronicle 1569*, vol. 2, p. 157 and Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 1586 (1808), vol. III, p. 479.
 12. Linda Clark, *ODNB* (September 2004). Whether through age or his nephew's role in the October rebellion, it appears that Bourchier did not serve on King Richard's council after 8 December 1483.
 13. PRO E 154/2/4, 10 December 1484, for a list of Catesby's armour and weaponry, including two helmets (sallets), two pairs of gussets and aprons of mail and standard mail, two gauntlets, a pair of cannons and bombard guards and a gift of 13 bills from Lord Ferrers. In his original will, Catesby refers to himself as a knight and appears in some contemporary records as a knight. See: Angela Moreton, 'A Crafty Lawyer' – a study of William Catesby', *Blanc Sanglier*, vol. 52, No. 2 (April 2018), pp 22–5, specifically pp 23–4. For Catesby recorded as a knight on 2 March 1486, see: *Calendar of the Patent Rolls of Henry VII*, vol. 1, 1485–1494, (HMSO, London, 1914), p. 78.
 14. Williams, 'Will of William Catesby', *LAHS*, vol. 51, pp 43–51.
 15. *Ibid.*, 'My lordis Stanley Strange and all that blod help and pray for my soule for ye haue not for my body as I trusted in you'. Catesby also refers to Henry as king, adding for his family that 'I doute not the king wilbe good and gracious Lord to them for he is called a full gracious prince ... and I have ever loved him'. Sadly Henry would not be the Catesby family's 'gracious Lord' and Catesby's will was disregarded. Catesby atoned for half-a-dozen land grabs in his second will. Perhaps in an attempt to honour him or distance themselves from his execution, Catesby's family gave the date of his death on his memorial brass as 20 August 1485. Catesby's attainder would not be reversed until October 1495, by which time his wife, Margaret, had died. Although his son and heir, George, married the daughter of Henry VII's notorious advisor Sir Richard Empson, he fell foul of the new Tudor regime, having to pay an annuity to the crown of £100 a year with his lands held by tenants including Empson and John Morton. As Angela Moreton writes, the family went from 'Clogs to clogs – almost'. For the above see: Moreton, *Blanc Sanglier*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp 23–4.
 16. Henry Ellis, *Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, 1534* (1844), pp 224–5. Stow follows Vergil: John Stow, *The Annals of England* (1592), p. 783, Catesby executed with 'diverse others'.
 17. John Throsby, *The History and Antiquities of the Ancient Town of Leicester* (1792), p. 63.
 18. Pronay and Cox, *Crowland Chronicle*, p. 183. Polydore Vergil, see: Ellis, *Three Books* (as above), p. 225.
 19. Howard fought for the House of York at Barnet in 1471, where he was wounded and was unable to fight at Tewkesbury three weeks later. In 1482 he took part in the invasion of Scotland and also helped quell the rebellion against Richard III in October 1483. In 1513, he commanded the English army at Flodden.
 20. Arthur Kincaid (ed.), *The History of King Richard the Third by Sir George Buck Master of the Revels* (original ms 1612) (Alan Sutton, 1979), p. xii. At the time of Bosworth, John Buck may have been a retainer of Thomas Howard's wife, Elizabeth Tilney. See the Buck family's earlier connection with the Tilney family. John Buck was Sir George's great-grandfather. Following Bosworth, Buck's children were taken into Howard's protection and brought up in Howard's manor house in Suffolk. Robert Buck (Sir George's grandfather) knew Howard well and fought for him at the battle of Flodden. Also see p. 116. John Buck is listed amongst those attainted for high treason in Henry VII's first parliament on 7 November 1485. See: 'Henry VII: November 1485, Part 1', in *Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, ed. Chris Given-Wilson, Paul Brand, Seymour Phillips, Mark Ormrod, Geoffrey Martin, Anne Curry and Rosemary Horrox (Woodbridge, 2005), British History Online, www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/parliament-rolls-medieval/november-1485-pt-1 [accessed 18 November 2019].
 21. *Ibid.*, p. xii.
 22. *Ibid.*, pp 107–8. Thomas Howard was attainted for high treason at Henry VII's first Parliament, losing his title and lands. All those who fought against Henry at Bosworth could now (technically) be indicted for treason following Henry's backdating of his reign to the 21 August, the day before the battle. Howard was the third person to be

- named on the Act of Attainder (after Richard III and Howard's father John, duke of Norfolk), see *Rot. Parl.*, vol. VI, pp 257–8 (fn. xxix). He would be imprisoned for more than three years, most of this time in the Tower of London. At his death, Howard's epitaph told how the Lieutenant of the Tower (probably Sir James Radclyf) offered him his freedom in 1487 during the Yorkist rebellion in support of the boy crowned King Edward in Ireland. Howard did not take up the offer, probably fearing it was a trap. In January 1489, Howard was finally released and in May was restored to the earldom of Surrey. The dukedom would not be restored until Howard's victory at Flodden some 14 years later. It seems that Howard's loyalty to the Yorkist kings remained long in the memory of the new Tudor regime. For Sir James Radclyf as Lieutenant of the Tower, see: William Campbell (ed.), *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII* (1873), vol. 1, p. 207.
23. Hay, *Anglica Historia*, pp 5,7.
 24. Kincaid, *History of Richard III*, p. 108.
 25. William Campbell, *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII* (1873), vol. 1, pp 208, 392. Payment for Howard, as the earl of Surrey, for his imprisonment in the Tower of London is dated 9 December 1485, and 8 March 1486 for a special pardon so that he may be detained in any prison at the Crown's pleasure.
 26. Lorraine C. Attreed, *York House Books 1461–1490* (1991), vol. Two, Appendix V, Francis Drake, Eboracum August–September 1485, pp 735–6. Henry Tudor's proclamation after the battle (read in York on 25 August) also lists viscount Lovell and the earl of Lincoln amongst the dead, when both clearly survived. It is not known if Lincoln fought at the battle. The proclamation was a particularly clever ruse in immediately presenting the Yorkist cause as without hope but also in flushing Howard out. A dead man could not protect his family and affinity, or hope to retain his lands and titles.
 27. Kincaid, p. 108. Interestingly, Buck makes it clear that according to his grandfather, Robert Buck (a friend of Howard's), many of the Yorkists were executed in Leicester and had Howard been captured he too would have suffered the same fate. This seems to accord with Throsby and suggests there were more executions at Leicester than is currently supposed. The Brecher father and son being hanged directly after the battle: *Crowland*, p. 183.
 28. C.A.J. Armstrong, *Dominicus Mancinus De Occupatione Regni Anglie per Riccardum Tercium* (1969), p. 89. '... she surrendered her son, trusting in the word of the cardinal of Canterbury, that the boy should be restored after the coronation. Indeed the cardinal was suspecting no guile, and had persuaded the queen to do this ...'
 29. Horace Walpole, *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* (1768, reprint 1974), pp 59–61.
 30. In November 1484, Henry Tudor penned a letter from exile in France, the first he signed as king, in which he called King Richard a 'homicide and unnatural tyrant'. See Annette Carson, *Richard III: the maligned king* (2013), p. 284, fn. 28, p. 361, British Library Harleian MS 787, f.2; also a Welsh poem believed to have been written immediately prior to or after Bosworth in praise of Henry and characterising Richard as the murderer of the boys. See Annette Carson, 'Dafydd Llwyd's poem', *Ricardian Bulletin*, Autumn 2008, Correspondence, pp 35 and 49. Also available at: www.annettecarson.co.uk/357052364.
 31. *Rotuli Parliamentorum* (Strachey ed.), vol. vi, p. 276. The end of Henry VII's Act of Attainder against Richard III includes an obscure mention of the 'shedding of Infants blood' but offers nothing further. This would seem, at this remove, to be a standard accusation against a 'tyrant'.
 32. Isabelle Lloyd writes: '*Suppediter* is an old French (*ancienne langue française*) verb meaning *vaincre* or *fouler aux pieds* in modern French. The adjective *suppedité* in the text, means either "vanquished" or "trampled on by one's feet" in English. Both meanings could be used in the translation. At this remove it's difficult to know what Molinet meant. Using "vanquished" may be more neutral. However, the description of the demise of Richard is quite physically descriptive, hence I opted for "trampled on".' With thanks to Isabelle Lloyd, TMPP, 20 September 2019.
 33. Jean Alexandre C. Buchon, *Chroniques de Jean Molinet*, tome 1 (Paris, 1827), chapter 101, p. 409. Molinet's account covers the years 1474–1504. He died in 1507. Translation thanks to project member, Isabelle Lloyd, 5 September 2019. Isabelle is a French national and has remained as close to the Old French as possible. It's also important to note that no pro-Tudor history records these early post-Bosworth proclamations. See: Vergil, Hall, Holinshed, Grafton, More et al.
 34. Henry took his time and arrived in London on Saturday 3 September 1485, 12 days after the battle. See: Gairdner, *Henry*, pp 32–3, and Daniel Hobbins, *Bernard André. The Life of Henry VII, 1500* (2011), p. 31. André, who was present, correctly records the date as a Saturday, which a contemporary confirms as 3 September, which was a Saturday. Henry waited until 6 September for his first grant to be presented: see Campbell, *Materials*, p. 6.
 35. P. D. Clarke, 'English Royal Marriages in the Papal Penitentiary in the Fifteenth Century', *English Historical Review*, vol. 120, no. 488 (September 2005), p. 1025.
 36. Raphael Holinshed, *The Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (1577), vol. 2, p. 1405. My very grateful thanks to Michael Alan Marshall for alerting me to this original source (6 July 2015). Following Holinshed's death in 1580, an extended edition of his *Chronicles* was published in 1587. See: *The Third Volume of Chronicles by Raphael Holinshed augmented to the Year 1586* (London, 1808), p. 422.
 37. Interestingly, John Alcock, bishop of Worcester, was one of the men chosen by William Catesby to be an executor of his will. See: Williams, *LAHS*, vol. 51, p. 49. Alcock had also been tutor to Edward V as prince of Wales. For Alcock on Richard III's progress see: Peter Hammond, *The Children of Richard III* (2018), pp 29, 65–66 (Appendix III), Bedern College Statute Book, Late C15th, York Minster Library. Alcock also opened Henry VII's first Parliament on 7 November 1485 with a sermon. See: R. J. Schoeck, *ODNB* [accessed 15 March 2016].