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[The story] says that a little boy fell into a well, and there he found a wonderland – a city with great surrounding walls and, as I recall, honey, rice pudding, toys …

(N. Kazantzakis, *Zorba the Greek*)
List of the Children of Richard and Cecily, Duke and Duchess of York

‘Sir aftir the tyme of longe bareynesse,
God first sent Anne, which signyfieth grace,
In token that al her hertis hevynesse
He as for bareynnesse wold fro hem chace.
Harry, Edward, and Edmonde, eche in his place
Succedid; and after tweyn daughters came
Elizabeth and Margarete, and afterward William.

John aftir William nexte borne was,
Which bothe be passid to goddis grace:

George was next, and after Thomas Borne was, which sone aftir did pace

By the path of dethe to the hevenly placev

Richard liveth yet: but last of alle

Was Ursula, to him whom God list calle’.

from ‘The Dialogue at the
Grave of Dame Johan of Acres’
Friar Osberne Bokenham OSA
Clare Priory, Suffolk, 1456
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Family Trees
No one could write about George, Duke of Clarence, without acknowledging a debt to Michael Hicks and the various material he has published on George over a number of years. Professor Hicks has done a huge amount of very valuable work.
on the surviving documentation relating to George’s property, associations and political roles. Without attempting to rival his work in these spheres, this new book on George tries to offer new insights into aspects of his character and attempts to deduce how these might have come about. At the same time, it offers exciting new information relating to
George’s death, burial and the ultimate fate of his physical remains – not to mention the fate of his posterity.

My thanks are also due to all those who helped me at Tewkesbury: Rev. Canon Paul Williams, the Vicar of Tewkesbury; Graham Finch, churchwarden; Dr Richard Morris, former archaeologist to Tewkesbury Abbey; Pat Webley, honorary archivist of Tewkesbury Abbey; Neil
Birdsall, former architect of Tewkesbury Abbey; Philip Comens, head verger; Andrew Moore, verger; Pat Horseley, assistant curator of the abbey’s archaeological collection; and Dr Joyce Filer. Dr Filer’s findings, based on her preliminary re-examination of the surviving bones, were, of course, tentative, but I hope that the interpretations offered here are consistent with her report.
My thanks also go to Maria Gilgar and Norrah Harris for their help with information about Dublin, to Annette Carson and Marie Barnfield, who read drafts of parts of the text and gave me their comments, and to Dave Perry, who checked the proofs. Richard Morris, Pat Webley, Annette Carson and Marie Barnfield are acknowledged in my notes as [RM], [PW], [AC] and [MB].
respectively.

Finally, I should like to thank the many descendants of the Duke of Clarence who have contacted me in connection with my discovery of Richard III’s mtDNA, and my work on the genealogy of the House of York – and most particularly the five people who kindly contributed details of their family background and their thoughts on George to this
book’s final chapter.
N TRODUCTION

One estimate of George, Duke of Clarence, penned about a century after his demise, suggested that he ‘was a goodlie noble prince, and at all times fortunate, if either his owne ambition had not set him against his brother, or the envie of his
enemies his brother against him’. Would this unsuccessful, would-be ‘Duke of York’, ‘Duke of Burgundy’ and ‘King of England’ have described himself as fortunate? It seems unlikely. But George is a mysterious figure, less well known – and less studied – than his brothers, Edward IV and Richard III. His relationship with those
brothers was varied and unpredictable, while his personality appears to have been very much his own.

Shakespeare tells us that George was murdered by his younger brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester (the future Richard III) – but this is drama, not history. The fifteenth-century rolls of Parliament show that George was openly arrested by King Edward IV, who had his
brother tried before Parliament, then ultimately executed him. Even George’s execution was extraordinary – he was drowned, it is said, in a barrel of wine. Since the late fifteenth century, historical writers have been struggling with this strange and unlikely-sounding tale of his death.

When he died, in February 1477/8, George, Duke of Clarence was a mere 28 years
old. Much activity had been fitted into his short but turbulent life. Conceived, perhaps, in France, and born in Ireland, during the course of his twenty-eight years he visited Eire, England, the Netherlands, Belgium and France (to use the modern terminology). At different times in his life he had apparently been both a Yorkist and a Lancastrian. For about six years, George
was the second highest-ranking person in the realm – the heir presumptive to the English throne. He attained that giddy height without having received any proper preparation for the role, at the early age of 11.

It has been said that ‘we scrape around in the lives of the famous dead, like squawking chickens pecking at every piece of gossip and
scandal.’ The historians who are responsible for such ‘scraping’ invariably have their own agendas. In my case, the motive for my interest in George has several facets. Richard III’s subsequent claim to the throne, based on Edward IV’s bigamy, has long been of interest to me. Was George the first to advance that claim? Another factor is my
ten years’ work on mitochondrial DNA of the royal House of York – George’s mtDNA. But in the final analysis, of all the Yorks, George is of most particular interest to me because some of my fifteenth-century Dorset ancestors appear to have been in his service. Presumably they wore his livery, and bore his bull or gorget badges. I have thus inherited an
obligation to him. I possess one of George’s bull livery badges but, frustratingly, I have been unable to establish for certain what livery colours he used in his adult life. Strange to think that this long-forgotten, simple and basic everyday detail of his household and military establishment was probably very well known to some of my forebears – as, perhaps, were some of the now
disputed elements of George’s life story. I am fascinated by what motivated the Duke of Clarence. How did he really feel about his brothers? Why did he sometimes betray his own family’s cause? What was his relationship with his sister, Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy? And why did she and the other women of his family apparently try so hard to protect him and to
reconcile him with Edward IV? What was his physical appearance; his hair colour and type; his height? Was he a drunkard, or is that simply a myth, inspired by the accounts of his death? Finally, how did he really die, and what then became of his mortal remains? Can the mtDNA sequence I discovered in 2004, first published in 2006, and which recently helped to identify the
remains of King Richard III, now be used once again to identify the bones of Clarence? These are some of the principal questions my book will attempt to answer.

NOTES

1. HCSP, p.175.
2. P. D. James, The Private
Patient.
The fourteenth-century king Edward III had several sons. Subsequent rivalry amongst his descendants was one of the factors that led to disputes over the crown in the fifteenth century. These
disputes are traditionally characterised as York versus Lancaster, but this is an oversimplification. The real dynastic contest – in which George, Duke of Clarence was to play a varied and vacillating role – was more complex, more nuanced.

Edward III’s direct heirs were his son and grandson Edward, Prince of Wales (‘the Black Prince’) and King Richard II. But the Black
Prince predeceased his father and, in spite of two marriages, Richard II produced no direct heirs. Richard was ultimately dethroned by one of his cousins, who then claimed the crown for himself, thereby founding the royal House of Lancaster. That cousin was King Henry IV, whose claim was by no means beyond dispute, as the family tree overleaf clearly shows.
Henry IV was the son of Edward III’s third surviving son, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. After Richard II, Henry was the senior male-line descendant of Edward III. But if female lines of descent also offered valid claims to the English throne, then Richard II’s heirs were not the descendants of John of Gaunt, but the descendants of John’s elder brother, Lionel of Antwerp, Duke of
Clarence. Since the founder of the Plantagenet dynasty, King Henry II, and his erstwhile rival, King Stephen, had both claimed the English throne on the basis of their maternal descent, and since Edward III himself had later laid claim to the throne of France through his mother, it is evident that in England female-line descent was widely regarded as offering a valid claim.
Within the royal family, attitudes to female-line claims varied at different times in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and there was no consistent official ruling on the matter. In fact, it is evident that the attitudes of individual princes at any given moment depended entirely upon the outcome they wished to achieve. As we shall see, when it suited them, Henry VI, Richard,
Duke of York, and the latter’s son George, Duke of Clarence, would all assert the primacy of male-line claims.
The heirs of Edward III (simplified).

In the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, however, it had suited the leaders of the House of Lancaster (John of Gaunt and his son, Henry IV) to accept the capacity of female members of the royal family to transmit rights to the crown. Thus the initial
Lancastrian claim was explicitly based upon Henry IV’s descent from Henry III, as Henry IV himself said in Parliament:

In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I, Henry of Lancaster, claim this realm of England, and the crown with all its members and its appurtenances, inasmuch as I am descended by right
line of the blood from the good lord King Henry the third.¹

Since Henry IV was Edward III’s grandson on his father’s side, the only possible reason for stating that he was claiming the throne based upon his descent from his much more remote ancestor, Henry III, has to be that his claim was based upon his *maternal* line descent.²
In the late fourteenth century, England saw the genesis of the dispute later – and inaccurately – called the ‘Wars of the Roses’. It was during the reign of the childless Richard II that the first signs of this dispute were discernible. Richard is said to have accepted the senior living (but female-line) descendant of Lionel, Duke of Clarence as his rightful
heir in October 1385, for in that year, ‘when Richard II was still a youth, Parliament had attempted to forestall trouble by declaring that his heir was his young cousin, Roger Mortimer, Earl of March’. How far Parliament, or the king himself, really went on this point is a matter of some dispute. Nevertheless, it is clear from the subsequent
conduct of Richard II’s uncle, John of Gaunt, that the latter did fear that Roger, his great nephew, might inherit the throne. Thus John of Gaunt attempted to assert not his own male-line claim to the throne, but the claim of his son, the future Henry IV. When referencing the male line of succession from Edward III, John took precedence over his son. Why, then, did he advance his
son’s claim rather than his own? Because his son enjoyed a different line of royal descent via Henry’s mother, John’s first wife, Blanche of Lancaster.

Blanche’s father, Henry, Duke of Lancaster, had been the direct male-line descendant and heir of the 1st Earl of Lancaster, Edmund, known as ‘Crouchback’, a son of King Henry III. For lack of male heirs, following
the death of Duke Henry in 1361, Blanche became her father’s co-heir (together with her elder sister, Maud). It was via Blanche, *jure uxoris*, that John of Gaunt acquired Lancastrian lands. Subsequently, in 1362, following the death of Maud, John’s father, Edward III, named him 1st Duke of Lancaster of the second creation. The inherited lands, the re-granted title and the
toponym ‘of Lancaster’, which all came to John as a direct or indirect result of his marriage to Blanche, were subsequently inherited by John and Blanche’s son Henry, and by the ruling dynasty he founded. From the assertions made by John during his lifetime and later repeated by Henry’s supporters, it is evident that the first Lancaster line, of which Blanche was ultimately
the sole heir, harboured an independent claim to the throne of England, which treated the then king, Richard II, and his three predecessors (Edward I, II and III) as usurpers.\textsuperscript{6}

This was spelled out in an argument in Parliament on the subject in 1394 between John of Gaunt and the Earl of March. The Lancastrian claim was that Edmund Crouchback
had actually been the *elder* son of Henry III, but that his younger brother had been crowned as Edward I. Reputedly, Edmund had been unfairly excluded from the succession because of his disability.⁷ In reality, this was a lie. But the fact that Henry’s claim was advanced in this form by John of Gaunt – and also later by Henry IV himself (or, at least, by his
party in its formal representations on his behalf) — shows clearly that they themselves were only too well aware of the weakness of any attempt to use a male-line claim through John of Gaunt to supersede the succession rights of living descendants of John’s elder brother.

The Lancastrian usurpation in 1399 did not resolve the
underlying conflict. Henry IV always viewed the Mortimer descendants of Lionel, Duke of Clarence as a potential threat. The marriage of Roger Mortimer’s daughter, Anne, to her cousin Richard of York, Earl of Cambridge was almost certainly one of the factors which led to the latter’s involvement in the Southampton plot, which aimed to depose the second Lancastrian king, Henry V,
and to replace him with the then Mortimer heir – the Earl of Cambridge’s brother-in-law, Edmund.\(^9\) However, the nervous Edmund revealed the conspiracy to Henry V. Thus the Earl of Cambridge was beheaded on 5 August 1415, and given a less-than-royal burial in the Church of St Julien, Southampton (then the chapel of the Leper Hospital of St Julien – or ‘God’s
House’).
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The Lancastrian claim to the throne.

The executed Richard, Earl of Cambridge, and his wife, Anne Mortimer, were the parents of Richard, Duke of York, and it was this little boy, born in 1411, who ultimately fell heir to the Mortimer/Clarence claim to the throne – a claim which, because of the little boy’s
title, has, rather misleadingly, become known to history as the ‘Yorkist’ claim. Of course, Richard, Duke of York was also (through his paternal line) the grandson of Edmund, 1st Duke of York, Edward III’s fourth surviving son. However, in its final form, the so-called ‘Yorkist’ claim to the throne was not based upon that descent, any more than the original Lancastrian claim had been
based on descent from John of Gaunt.

It is true that, as we shall see, from 1447 until 1453, Richard, Duke of York, accepting the status quo and the Lancastrian kingship of Henry VI, would seek recognition as heir presumptive to the throne, based on his male-line descent from Edmund of Langley. On the same basis, during the Readeption of
Henry VI (1470–71), George, Duke of Clarence would establish himself in the restored Lancastrian hierarchy as second-in-line to the throne (after Edward of Westminster, Prince of Wales). Nevertheless, the ultimate ‘Yorkist’ claim to replace the House of Lancaster, as asserted by Duke Richard in 1460 and as subsequently defended by his sons, Edward IV and Richard
III, depended on their *female-line* descent from Edward III’s second surviving son, Lionel, Duke of Clarence. Thus, the rivalry popularly perceived as York *versus* Lancaster might be more accurately described as the rivalry of the houses of Clarence and Lancaster. In that context, the Southampton plot – the first attempt to oust the usurping House of Lancaster and replace it with
the descendants of Lionel, Duke of Clarence – was the first act of the so-called ‘Wars of the Roses’. 10

The execution of his father following this plot left the almost 4-year-old Richard of Cambridge an orphan. He had never known his mother, for Anne Mortimer had died on 22 September 1411 – the day after she gave birth to her son. The boy’s closest
surviving relatives after his father’s execution were his two childless uncles, Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March and Edward, 2nd Duke of York. But his paternal uncle was killed fighting for Henry V at the Battle of Agincourt on 25 October 1415, only two and a half months after the Earl of Cambridge had been executed. As a result, the 4-year-old orphan Richard then inherited his uncle’s title, and
became the youngest Duke of York so far.  

Following his father’s execution, Richard was made a royal ward and placed initially in the charge of Sir Robert Waterton, ‘the Lancastrians’ leading gaoler’. In 1422, soon after the death of Henry V in France, Richard’s wardship and marriage were sold to a trusted Lancastrian, Ralph
Neville, Earl of Westmorland, whose second wife, Joan Beaufort, was half-sister to Henry IV – the founder of the Lancastrian dynasty. We shall have more to say about the Beaufort relatives of the House of Lancaster presently. Richard’s wardship and marriage were costly acquisitions for Ralph Neville, but the little boy was a wealthy heir, offering good prospects of future profit. To
ensure that the benefits of this inheritance accrued to Neville descendants, Richard was married to Ralph Neville’s youngest daughter, Cecily, in 1424. Subsequently, when his last surviving uncle, Edmund Mortimer, died childless, on 18 January 1424/5, the young Duke of York inherited the latter’s property and claim to the throne, making him an even
more interesting candidate than he had been previously for the hand of his guardian’s daughter.

When Ralph Neville died in 1425, the wardship of the young Duke of York was inherited by his widow, Joan Beaufort, youngest daughter of John of Gaunt, and half-sister of the dead King Henry IV. Through Joan, Richard’s bride was also his second cousin, and shared his descent.
from Edward III (see pp.208–9).

The potential clash between the Lancastrian claim to the throne of the reigning dynasty in the first half of the fifteenth century, and the Clarence/Mortimer/Yorkist claim to the throne of the young Richard, Duke of York was only part of the national conflict that affected England from the 1430s. There was
another aspect to the dynastic conflict, which is often overlooked, but which was very significant. Indeed, in the long run, it was to prove of prime importance. This second dynastic conflict embroiled the heirs of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster.

As we have already seen, John of Gaunt’s son by his first wife, Blanche of Lancaster, had assumed the crown in 1399 as King Henry
IV. Henry’s publicly expressed claim to the throne was not based on his paternal descent but his maternal descent. When Henry IV died in 1413 this claim passed to his sons: Henry V (d. 1422), Thomas, Duke of Clarence (d. 1421), John, Duke of Bedford (d. 1435) and Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester (d. 1447). On the death of Henry V, leaving an infant son to succeed him, the
most important of his brothers proved to be the Duke of Gloucester. Though not the most senior brother, Gloucester was assigned the office of Protector of England by the will of Henry V. However, this king’s bequest was complicated by the fact that Henry V’s will had also created a council comprising the Dukes of Bedford, Gloucester and Exeter and the Bishop of Winchester, while
the Duke of Exeter (Thomas Beaufort) had been given the personal guardianship of the young king. The council, the last two members of which were Beauforts (see below), was not inclined to allow Gloucester to wield unimpeded power as regent. The result was continuous wrangling between the council and the protector, a "blunt if fatuous soldier … [and] an ambitious
Unlike Henry V, Henry IV had no brothers. But he had several half-brothers – sons of John of Gaunt by his third wife and former mistress, Catherine de Roët. These were John Beaufort, Earl of Somerset, Henry Beaufort, Cardinal Bishop of Winchester and Thomas Beaufort, Duke of Exeter. Their sister was Joan
Beaufort, Countess of Westmorland – the mother of Cecily Neville. Originally born as bastards, the Beauforts had been declared legitimate by King Richard II, and subsequently also by Henry IV himself. However, the latter had specifically ruled that they had no right of succession to the throne. Indeed, since these half-siblings did not
share Henry IV’s mother, strictly speaking they were incapable of inheriting his officially asserted Lancastrian claim to the throne, which depended upon the fact that Henry IV was the son of Blanche of Lancaster. Initially, although this may have rankled a little with the Beauforts, it was probably considered of small significance, given the number of Henry IV’s living
sons. Later, however, as all but one of Henry IV’s sons died without leaving legitimate heirs, the Beaufort exclusion came to seem much more important. The effective leader of the Beaufort family was Henry Beaufort, Cardinal Bishop of Winchester, Chancellor of England and a very canny financier to whom the crown eventually found itself owing thousands of pounds.
After the death of John, Duke of Bedford in 1435, the only living Lancastrian male heirs were the young King Henry VI and his uncle, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. A rivalry for power had grown up between the Duke of Gloucester and his half-uncle, the Bishop of Winchester. Amongst his many ambitions, the bishop wished to advance the
prospects of his own Beaufort family. In particular, he sponsored his nephew, Edmund Beaufort (later 2nd Duke of Somerset). Edmund had earlier – and with considerable success – paid court to Catherine of France, the widow of Henry V and mother of Henry VI. In fact, he had aspired to marry the young queen mother. In this aim he had been supported in Parliament by his uncle the
bishop. Edmund’s high aspirations had ultimately been thwarted by the legitimate Lancastrian princes. Nevertheless, his relationship with the queen mother had lasting consequences, which we shall explore later.

Of course, the legitimate heirs to the throne of the childless young Henry VI were not the Beauforts, but the young king’s surviving
uncles. After them, in terms of blood right, the direct Lancastrian heir was the senior living descendant of the elder of Henry IV’s two sisters – Philippa of Lancaster, Queen of Portugal. Initially, this would have been Philippa’s son King Edward (Duarte) of Portugal (d. 1438). After 1438, Philippa’s grandson King Alfonso V was the rightful claimant. The Portuguese
royal family was certainly aware of its Lancastrian claim, and Philippa’s daughter Isabel of Portugal, Duchess of Burgundy, later asserted her own claim to the English throne, as did her son, Charles the Bold.

An alternative to the Portuguese and Burgundian descendants of Philippa of Lancaster was provided by Henry IV’s younger sister, Elizabeth of Lancaster, and
the advantage of her line of descent was that it had remained in England. Until his death in 1447, the Lancastrian claimant in this line was Elizabeth’s son, John Holland, 2nd (or 1st) Duke of Exeter – the first cousin of Henry V and his brothers. When he died, his claim passed to his son, Henry Holland, 3rd Duke of Exeter (died 1475) who was married
to the Duke of York’s eldest daughter, Anne. However, Henry Holland has been described as ‘cruel, savagely temperamental and unpredictable’.\textsuperscript{20} As a result, he was unpopular and enjoyed little support as a potential heir to the throne.

Even in the eyes of those who accepted the Lancastrian dynasty, after Henry V’s brothers, the Duke of York
was a strong contender as heir to the throne. By the reign of Henry VI the original Lancastrian female-line claim, based on the concept of the usurpation of Edward I, Edward II, Edward III and Richard II, seems generally to have been forgotten. Thus there is no indication that Henry VI seriously considered either Henry Holland or the King of Portugal as his heir. His mind
(such as it was) focused rather on the rival claims of the Dukes of York and Somerset. If male-line descent was given precedence – and given Henry IV’s exclusion of the Beauforts – then logically, after Henry V’s brothers, Duke Richard of York was the heir presumptive. Influenced, however, by his Beaufort great-uncle, the Bishop of Winchester, Henry VI looked
askance upon the claims of the Duke of York, preferring the claims of his closer, legitimised Beaufort relations as the Lancastrian heirs. Thus Henry VI’s government took a somewhat equivocal view of the Duke of York. Nevertheless, Richard spent much of the 1430s fighting in France on Henry VI’s behalf.

It is not clear how close Richard’s union with Cecily Neville was at first, because
although the couple probably married in 1424 no child seems to have been conceived by Cecily until 1438. Friar Osberne Bokenham characterised this childlessness as ‘barrenness’ in his poem, but in those days this was the standard male reaction to any lack of children. We have no way of knowing when Richard consummated the marriage. It
was normal at that period for marriages of minors not to be consummated until the female partner (Cecily in this case) had reached the age of either 14 or 16 (accounts vary). Cecily would have reached the age of 14 in 1429, and there are indications (such as the indulg to have their own altar) that Richard and Cecily shared a common household by the late summer of
1429’\textsuperscript{24} But Cecily would not have been 16 until 1431. Richard’s employment in France may also help to explain why about seven more years then elapsed before a child was in prospect. In spite of their early lack of children, all the surviving circumstantial evidence strongly suggests that the union of Richard and Cecily was a close one, and
that their marriage was very successful.

In the 1430s, Richard may have left Cecily in England while he was serving in France. By the 1440s, however, she seems to have accompanied him more or less everywhere as a matter of course. Between 1439 and 1449 the couple had, on average, a child a year. In 1445 (by which time the couple had four living
children – two sons and two daughters) the English government initiated negotiations for a marriage between the Yorks’ eldest surviving son, Edward, and one of the daughters of the increasingly victorious Charles VII of France. Charles VII’s then available daughters were Yolande (b. 1434) and Joan (b. 1435).\(^\text{25}\) Who was the intended bride,
and how far the French marriage negotiations progressed, is not clear, but both of Charles VII’s daughters subsequently found other husbands, and of course, young Edward – the future Edward IV – later found other wives.
The heirs of John of Gaunt in the 1430s
In 1445 Richard and Cecily left France and returned to England where, from 1446 to 1448, Richard regularly attended Council meetings. In fact, in October 1446 he was granted the abbey and town of Waltham because of his frequent need to be in or near London on the king’s business. Richard had already been using the guesthouse at
Waltham Abbey as his *pied-à-terre* for some time. The Yorks’ next child, Margaret (the future Duchess of Burgundy) was born at Waltham Abbey.26

Given the childlessness of King Henry VI, until 1446/7 his uncle, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, was the heir presumptive to the English throne. Following Humphrey’s death on 23
February 1446/7, York arguably succeeded him as heir presumptive. As we have seen, however, influenced by the opinions of the late Cardinal Beaufort, Henry VI himself, or perhaps his queen, was unhappy about this. The king or queen would have preferred the claims of Henry’s cousin, Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset. But Somerset was the head of
the legitimised (but originally bastard) Beaufort line – a family which Henry IV, founder of the royal House of Lancaster, had explicitly debarred from ever claiming the throne.  

The death of the Duke of Gloucester pushed the rivalry between the Duke of York and the Duke of Somerset to the forefront of the political scene. This rivalry was
scheduled to remain high on the agenda for as long as both candidates were alive. Moreover, it was exacerbated by the mutual personal dislike and hostility which the two rival cousins, York and Somerset, seem to have felt for one another. In the eyes of the queen and the Duke of Somerset, it was essential to remove York from the scene. But ‘what could the Beaufort party do with so important a
figure? He could not be murdered or attainted, for civil war had not yet begun. He was therefore appointed King’s Lieutenant in Ireland. The pretext was that Ireland was in rebellion and a vigorous governor was needed’. 29 Richard, Duke of York was given the appointment of Lieutenant of Ireland on 30 July 1447. He was to hold office for
ten years from 29 September 1447 [Michaelmas], with a salary of 4,000 marks for the first year and thereafter £2,000 per annum. In addition, all surplus revenues of the Irish exchequer were to be his, all Irish offices were in his gift, providing such appointments passed under the great seal of England, and the costs of his shipping were to be borne by the English
exchequer.30

NOTES


2. Henry III was the last reigning English king
from whom Henry IV was descended on his mother’s side, via Edmund Crouchback and the earls of Lancaster. For a more specific Lancastrian statement of this claim, see below.

3. The name ‘Wars of the Roses’ appears to be a nineteenth-century invention. It was certainly not used at the
time of the conflict. There is no doubt that members of the Plantagenet family used roses of various hues as personal emblems over a long period of time, nor that members of the House of York in the fifteenth century used the white rose as a badge. Evidence for the so-called ‘red rose of Lancaster’ prior to the
reign of Henry VII (‘Tudor’) is, however, hard to find. If it existed, the red rose may well have been a Beaufort badge (as portrayed by Shakespeare). See J. Ashdown-Hill, ‘The Red Rose of Lancaster?’, Ric. 10 (June 1996), pp.406–20.


Annette Carson for this reference – and others marked [AC].


9. Son of Roger, Earl of March, and brother of Anne Mortimer. Edmund Mortimer ultimately died childless, leaving Richard Duke of
York as his heir.

10. There had been earlier attempts to oust Henry IV, but these had not been in favour of the Clarence line descendants.

11. He lost this record in 1474 to his grandson, Richard of Shrewsbury.

In personal communication, Marie Barnfield stated: ‘Cecily is apparently referred to as Duchess of York in her father’s will, made in 1424, which suggests that she and Duke Richard had contracted an actual child marriage’.

At this time, the English
calendar year began on 25 March (Lady Day) – so that what in modern terms would be called January 1425 (the first month of that year) was at the time regarded as January 1424 (the antepenultimate month of the previous year).

16. It is sometimes stated that the Beauforts were also legitimised by the pope, but it is unclear what evidence exists to support this claim. I am grateful to Marie Barnfield for drawing my attention to this point – and others marked [MB].

17. His ambitions included the papacy.

18. Foreign birth was widely
perceived in England as more or less the equivalent of bastardy. In fact, it led to allegations of bastardy against John of Gaunt – and later against Edward IV. See below.

19. For the enumeration of the Holland Dukes of Exeter see below, chapter 2, note 8.

According to Barbara Harris, ‘Sixteen was the normal age for the consummation of a marriage in which one (or both) of the contracting parties had been a minor’ (B. J. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women, 1450–1550* (Oxford, 2002), p.45). On the
other hand, in a personal communication with the present writer, Marie Barnfield suggested that 14 was an acceptable age for the bride. Possibly the *groom* was expected to be at least 16.

24. Personal communication from Marie Barnfield.

25. Their two surviving elder sisters were already married.
26. See Appendix 1.

27. Humphrey left no legitimate children.

28. The exemplification of Henry IV, 1407, states: ‘... excepta dignitate regali ...’.


Despite receiving the appointment of King’s Lieutenant in Ireland in 1447, Richard did not actually travel to Ireland for almost two years. He had been empowered to appoint a deputy, a post to which he appointed his namesake,
Richard Nugent, Baron Devlin.

From what happened later, we can assume that on some winter’s night in late January or early February 1449, Richard lay in bed with his wife, Cecily, and the couple made love. Judging from the number of their offspring and their tendency to spend time together – and their apparent predilection for doing so – this was probably not an
unusual occurrence. Indeed, both the duke and the duchess may afterwards have been hard put to it to recall the precise date. But since Richard seems to have been in Rouen during the month of February 1449, the scene may well have been set in France. Wherever it took place, their act of love on this occasion had consequences. Five months later, in June 1449, when the duke once again left
England – this time to personally take up his post in Ireland – his young duchess, who once again accompanied him, was pregnant. A month previously she had celebrated her thirty-fourth birthday.

The Duke of York’s government appointment in Ireland was not a compliment. Contemporaries described it as an exile or banishment,\textsuperscript{1} and it compared
poorly with the command of France which had been taken from him and bestowed instead upon his rival the Duke of Somerset.\textsuperscript{2} York had inherited lands in Ireland from his Mortimer ancestors. Indeed, the last two Mortimer Earls of March had died there,\textsuperscript{3} and Queen Margaret and her coterie may well have hoped that York – the latest Mortimer heir – would follow
their example. Attempts were made to prevent him from ever arriving in Dublin. ‘Royal commands were dispatched to Cheshire, to the Welsh Marches and the seaports in Wales that the Duke was not to reach his destination. Among those sent to waylay him was Sir Thomas Stanley, of an old Cheshire family, whose sons would repeat the act against
York’s sons’. Fortunately, however, York was well armed and well attended and he evaded his enemies.

Officially, of course, the government was behind his appointment. ‘In April, 1449, the English Council gave orders for ships to be collected at Beaumaris for the conveyance of Richard and his suite, and finally on July 6 the Duke of York landed at
Howth “with great pomp and glory”, accompanied by his wife and a number of troops.’ Despite the fact that some might have viewed York’s new appointment as a demotion, the Irish seemed delighted to see him:

The Duke of York arrived in Ireland, and was received with great honour; and the Earls of Ireland went into his house, as did
also the Irish adjacent to Meath, and gave him as many beeves for the use of his kitchen as it pleased him to demand.  

York himself seems to have taken his role in Ireland very seriously. Holinshed later ascribed to him the boast that ‘it shall never be chronicled … by the grace of God that Ireland was lost by my negligence’. If York did
really say this, he may have been deliberately contrasting himself and his work with the completely disastrous command of his rival Somerset in France. At all events, he provided such effective and just rule in Ireland that he and his family were remembered there with affection.

It is not certain how many members of the duke’s family accompanied him and his
wife to Ireland. Since January 1445/6 his eldest daughter, Anne, had been married to her cousin, the young Henry Holland, 2nd (or 3rd) Duke of Exeter (1430–75). At his own request, since July 1447 the Duke of York had been the young man’s guardian. Thus, even if Anne had left her parents’ home on her marriage, she may subsequently have returned as
a result of her father’s guardianship of her husband. However, Henry Holland was granted livery of his land on 23 July 1450, which suggests that he and his wife may then have been in England. As for York’s two eldest living sons, Edward and Edmund, they were residing at Ludlow Castle. Elizabeth of York may have been boarding in another noble household and it has been suggested that the
infant Margaret may have remained in the nursery at Fotheringhay Castle, in the care of either the former nurse of the future Edward IV, called Anne of Caux, or the probable nurse of the future Richard III, called Joan Malpas.\textsuperscript{9} However, since the Duchess of York must have known that she was expecting another baby, maybe she had little Margaret (then aged 3)
and her nurses accompany her to Ireland, to ensure that experienced women would be on hand when her next baby arrived.

At the time of York’s appointment, the centre of English rule in Ireland still comprised most of Leinster and Meath, but its extent was gradually being reduced. By the end of the fifteenth century it would be restricted
to Dublin and its Pale, ‘an area along the east coast stretching from Dalkey, south of Dublin, to the garrison town of Dundalk’. The seat of the English government in Ireland – and the residence of the English governor – was Dublin Castle. This was the principal abode of the Duchess of York from the summer of 1449 until after her baby was born. Dublin
Castle was extensively reconstructed in later periods of its history, so that of the medieval building only one tower – the Record Tower (formerly the Wardrobe Tower) – now survives.
Dublin Castle: the thirteenth-century Record Tower (formerly Wardrobe Tower).

After a brief stay, the Duke of York left Dublin for Trim and then marched on through Ulster. He returned to Dublin by October, for a meeting of the Irish Parliament:

It was with great apparent
glory and triumph that Richard returned to Dublin, as it were the hero and hope of a united Ireland. We like to think that his beautiful wife, ‘the Rose of Raby’, had made an impression on the Irish heart, as when O’Byrne presented her with two hobbys. At least there can be no doubt that it was a highly popular event when on October 21, 1449, the
viceroys third son was born in Dublin, George, the future ‘false, fleeting, perjured Clarence’. The bond already formed between the House of York and Ireland was doubly strengthened by this event. The young prince was looked upon as ‘one of ourselves’, an Irishman by birth as well as descent, and the devotion to his name was shown years
later when Lambert Simnel was crowned king in Dublin in the belief that he was Clarence’s son, Edward of Warwick.12

Towards the end of September – the eighth month of her pregnancy – Cecily must have withdrawn from public view, closeting herself in her own chambers at Dublin Castle. This was standard practice for an
expectant mother, and a ritual with which the Duchess of York must already have been very familiar, given that this was her ninth experience of childbirth. Once the duchess had withdrawn into her chambers, the keyholes in her doors will have been blocked up. At the same time, all but one of her chamber windows will have been obscured in preparation for the coming birth. Thus, for the last three
or four weeks of her pregnancy the duchess will have remained shut off from the rest of the world, surrounded only by her female attendants.

It was in the third week of October that the Duchess of York’s latest pregnancy reached its term. At about noon on Tuesday 21 October 1449 she gave birth to her ninth child and sixth son. 13
After her safe delivery, Cecily will have continued for some weeks in seclusion. Indeed, at first she would have been expected to remain in bed. Then, little by little, she would have started to get up. Initially, she would have spent her time mostly sitting in her chamber, taking a little exercise every now and then by walking around her rooms. Finally, she would have emerged from her chamber to
appear in the rest of the castle, but even then she would not, at first, have gone outside, since it was popularly believed that, until she had been ‘churched’, a new mother was in danger of attack by evil forces if she ventured out of doors.

Meanwhile, her new-born baby would have been handed over almost at once to a wet nurse. Noble ladies did not normally breast-feed their
own children, since this might have reduced their capacity to reproduce – one of their principal *raisons d’être*. Probably the baby would have been removed from his mother’s chambers and shown to his father. Since the survival of a new-born child was not guaranteed, and the death of an un-baptised child might place the infant’s soul in jeopardy, baptism was seen as a priority. This ceremony
was therefore usually performed immediately – or at least within a few days of the birth – at a time when the child’s mother was still enclosed in her chambers and therefore unable to attend her infant’s christening.

Normally the father (if available), together with the godparents, the midwife and attendants, would carry the baby to the church. In this instance the Duke of York
was present in Dublin, where he had been attending Parliament. According to Worcester’s *Annals*, the newborn York baby was baptised in Dublin’s Dominican (‘Blackfriars’) Priory Church, dedicated to St Saviour. This priory church was situated approximately half a kilometre to the northwest of the castle gate, just across the River Liffey. If they walked
there, the christening party would most likely have covered the distance in about ten minutes.

A priest – perhaps in this instance the prior in person – would have met the party at the church door. First the priest would have checked that the baby had not already been baptised. Then he would have blessed the infant and put a few grains of salt, symbol of wisdom (sal
sapientiae), into his mouth. After that, he would have led the party through the church door, to the baptismal font. There the sponsors would have made a profession of faith on the baby’s behalf and one of the sponsors will have held the naked baby over the font while the priest poured holy water over his head, uttering for the first time the baby’s name: Georgi, ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et
Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. One of the godparents would then have received the baby and wrapped him in his white chrysom robe. When the short ritual was completed, they would all have made their way back to Dublin Castle, where the adults would have shared a christening feast while the baby was probably returned to his cradle and went to sleep.

There is still a Dominican
Priory dedicated to St Saviour in Dublin today. However, the present church is a nineteenth-century building. Owing to the vicissitudes of Ireland’s religious history from the sixteenth century onwards, it does not stand on the same site as its medieval predecessor – the church in which the York baby was baptised. That church and priory had stood just to the north of what was then the
only bridge across the River Liffey. It occupied the modern ‘Four Courts’ site, which is situated on the eastern side of Church Street, at the point where the road approaches the river.15

The name bestowed upon this boy at his baptism, George, was that of England’s patron saint. It was not at all a common name in the English royal family at
that period, but the cult of St George is said to have been fashionable amongst the nobility of England, France and Burgundy, so perhaps it was chosen for that reason. Medieval children were often named after their godparents. We know that two of this baby’s godparents – both of whom were actually present at his baptism – were rival Irish aristocrats: James Fitzgerald, 6th Earl of
Desmond and James Butler, 4th Earl of Ormonde. The Duke of York was using the occasion of his son’s baptism to bring together the Butlers and Fitzgeralds. Why, then, was the baby not christened James? Maybe George was chosen in honour of his mother’s nephew (and his own elder cousin) Canon George Neville (later Archbishop of York). George
Neville had been born in 1432, and was only 17 years old when his little cousin was born in Dublin. However, he had been a canon of Salisbury Cathedral since he was 9 years old, and in 1449 he was already well advanced on his way to a bishopric, which he attained in 1454–6, with the support of his uncle, the Duke of York. At the time of both George Neville’s episcopal elevation and his appointment
to the bishopric of Exeter, Richard, Duke of York was Protector of the realm, owing to the insanity of King Henry VI (see below, chapter 3). At the time of the baptism of York’s son in Dublin, George Neville is thought to have been a student at Balliol College, Oxford. He was later to prove an ally of his young cousin – then Duke of Clarence – when the latter opposed his own brother,
King Edward IV. 17
The baptism of a baby boy (fifteenth-century woodcut).

As for the baby’s mother, the final episode of the childbirth from her point of view was the ceremony of her churching. This was a short rite of purification and thanksgiving that marked a mother’s final return to normal life. It was normally
performed forty days after the birth, and until it was accomplished it was considered unsafe for the mother to venture out of doors. If Cecily Neville observed the usual timing, her churching probably took place on Sunday 30 November 1449 – the first Sunday of Advent. Accompanied by her midwives and female attendants, the Duchess of
York will have made her way to church bearing a lighted candle. There she was sprinkled with holy water, to cleanse her following George’s birth, and make it safe for her to resume her normal life. Once Cecily had re-emerged from her apartments at Dublin Castle, she and those of her children who were resident in Ireland settled at the Castle of Trim. This was part of her
husband’s personal property – an inheritance from his Mortimer ancestors, and one he seems to have liked, for he spent time and money on its restoration.¹⁸

According to a traditional rhyme, ‘Tuesday’s child is full of grace’. Since the grace in question is apparently
neither social nor religious but refers to agility, and possibly to an ability to wield weapons effectively, Tuesday may have been an appropriate birth day for this particular princeling. On the internet one can find a published horoscope for the baby, based on his birth date of 21 October. This assumes that his sun sign was Libra – a sign whose personality traits
have been characterised as ‘balance, justice, truth, beauty, perfection’.\textsuperscript{20} Unfortunately, this particular horoscope fails to take account of the difference between the Julian and the Gregorian calendars. George of York was indeed born on 21 October 1449 according to the old (Julian) calendar, then in use throughout Western Europe. But at the time of his
birth that old calendar was nine days behind the modern (Gregorian) calendar. Our modern system would make George’s birth date 30 October. Therefore, he was not born under the balanced sign of Libra, but under Scorpio, a sun sign said to engender a ‘transient, self-willed, purposeful, unyielding’ personality!21
The baby George of York spent almost the entire first year of his life in Dublin and Trim castles. The Duke of York was carrying out his office of Lieutenant of Ireland diligently. At the same time, he was also keeping a careful watch on the course of events in England. In January 1450 his faithful servant, Sir William Oldhall of Narford,
Bodney and East Dereham, Norfolk, who had been serving with York in Dublin, was sent back to England to gather news, returning to Dublin with his report in the summer. \(^\text{22}\)

As we shall see in more detail in the next chapter, it was in September 1450 – when the baby George was 11 months old – that his father suddenly decided to return to
England. Two basic motives underpinned this decision. First, York was trying hard to consolidate the English position in Ireland. For this he needed troops – and funds to pay them – but despite repeated requests to London, from the spring of 1450, no money had been forthcoming. Second, York, who was escorted on his return journey by between 4,000 and 5,000 men at arms, was incensed by
the increasing power and influence in government circles of his arch-rival, Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset.

While York had been winning the love of the Irish in Dublin, Somerset had been presiding over the collapse of the English cause in France. As a descendant (in a legitimised bastard line) of Edward III’s son John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster,
Somerset was a cousin both of King Henry VI and of the Duke of York. Earlier, he had been closely and amorously involved with Henry VI’s widowed mother, Catherine of France, by whom he may well have fathered the so-called Edmund ‘Tudor’ – who in turn engendered the future Henry VII and the so-called Tudor dynasty.23 And when York decided to leave
his post in Ireland and return to England, Beaufort was probably amorously involved with Henry VI’s wife, Queen Margaret – a relationship which produced further important consequences, as we shall see.

Since the Duke of Somerset seems to have been favoured by Henry VI over York himself as a potential heir to the throne of England, and since his elder brother,
John (1st Duke of Somerset, d. 1444), had previously been York’s rival in France, York and Somerset were inevitably rivals and enemies. In 1450, York – aware of some of Edmund Beaufort’s pretensions – was anxious to secure his own status as heir to the then still childless King Henry VI, in order to stave off any possibility of future dynastic competition from the
Beaufort family.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Notes}
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\textbf{3.} The fourth earl was killed, the fifth earl died
of the plague.
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Oldhaller was a Yorkist retainer who subsequently served as Speaker of the House of Commons 1450–51, and was later attainted for complicity in the rebellion of Jack Cade (see below). His brother was the Bishop of Meath in Ireland.
In 1450 the war in France was going badly for the English. Following the deaths of the Duke of Gloucester and Cardinal Beaufort in 1447, William de la Pole, a former close ally of Cardinal
Beaufort, \(^1\) had become the chief power-behind-the-throne of Henry VI. He had been created Duke of Suffolk, \(^2\) and had also held the appointments of Chamberlain and Admiral of England. William de la Pole had long been one of the leaders of the English forces in France. However, his negotiations with the Bastard of Orléans and other French
leaders were viewed with suspicion in England. When English defeats continued, Suffolk became an obvious scapegoat. He fell victim to renewed infighting within government circles, and was arrested in January and imprisoned in the Tower of London. A new military defeat in April 1450 led, about two weeks later, to Suffolk’s banishment for five years. However, his ship was
intercepted *en route* to Calais. It is said that Suffolk was beheaded (see chapter 14 below) and his body thrown overboard. It was widely believed that his chief enemy, Richard, Duke of York, was behind these actions.

Later, during the summer of 1450, the revolt known as ‘Jack Cade’s Rebellion’ broke out in Kent and Sussex. In the years leading up to ‘Cade’s Rebellion’ the weak,
corrupt and vacuous government of Henry VI had become increasingly unpopular, particularly in the south-east of England. However, the immediate cause of the revolt seems to have been a local sense of grievance, notably in Kent, where local people were being blamed – unjustly, as they themselves now stated – for the death of Suffolk. Another cause of the
rebellion was the unpopularity of the costly and ineffective war in France. Amongst other consequences, this war had led to French attacks on the south-east coast, making the coastal towns of Kent and Sussex unsafe.

In the spring of 1450 a man who is most often called Jack or John Cade (see below) issued The Complaint of the Poor Commons of Kent,
which attacked the king himself, his government, MPs, lords and magnates. A full rebellion against Henry VI was threatened unless the listed grievances were resolved. It was also recommended that the king should abdicate in favour of a better ruler. Simultaneous demands for the return from Ireland of Richard, Duke of York made it not too difficult to guess whom the rebels had
in mind as Henry’s potential replacement. Indeed, some see the Duke of York as the secret driving force behind ‘Cade’s Rebellion’.

During May, Cade’s supporters — who came chiefly from Kent and Sussex, and included a few minor landowners and gentry — began to rally in local meetings. In June about 5,000 marched with Cade towards London. They established
themselves at Blackheath. The king’s response was to decamp hastily in the opposite direction. Although the rebels captured and looted London, killing some lesser government servants whom they found still in situ, they were subsequently defeated in fighting on London Bridge, and many of the rebels were killed. Pardons and reforms were promised by Henry VI
and his government. Nevertheless, rebel leaders were subsequently declared traitors. A reward of 1,000 marks was offered for the capture or death of Cade, who was killed on 12 June near Lewes in East Sussex by a man named Alexander Iden, who went on to claim his reward. But the death of Cade did not end the rebellion. Campaigns against the government continued in
Sussex. Demands were still voiced for the return of the Duke of York from Ireland, and his appointment to a post of authority in the government remained a point of contention.

York’s precise position in relation to ‘Cade’s Rebellion’ is hard to determine. Was he involved in its outbreak? Did he hope to receive a central government appointment as a result of the rebel demands?
Or, alternatively, a government call for aid in response to the uprising? If he had expected something of this kind, he was destined to be disappointed. Instead of calling on York for help, Henry VI’s government appointed his rival, Somerset, as Constable of England in succession to the late Duke of Suffolk. This new sign of Somerset’s power and influence in government
circles must have set loud alarm bells ringing in the Duke of York’s head.

Contemporaries believed that there were connections of some kind between York and the rebellion. Although the leader of the rebels is generally known as ‘Jack Cade’, he was also called by various other names. Some of his supporters labelled him ‘John-Amend-All’.

Significantly, he was
described by some sources as an Irishman. Other sources said that he was an English physician whose real name was John Aylmere. However, the leader himself appears sometimes to have used the name John Mortimer. Moreover, he claimed quite explicitly to be related to the Mortimers of March. Thus his supporters described him as a cousin of Richard, Duke of York and his family, and the
Yorkist ‘falcon and fetterlock’ badge was reportedly one of the devices displayed by Cade’s followers. Against the Duke of York’s involvement, however, we have the fact that York himself declared that his own property was attacked by the rebels and that some of his jewels were stolen. Whether or not Cade was genuinely connected in some way to the Mortimer
family, his use of the Mortimer surname was certainly significant. Should his rebellion be seen as an early episode of the so-called ‘Wars of the Roses’?

As for York’s role (if any) in ‘Cade’s Rebellion’, given the confused nature of the evidence, any conclusions inevitably remain speculative. But whatever its real cause, the rebellion demonstrated very clearly that, even in
England, the control exercised by Henry VI’s government was teetering. Meanwhile, Henry’s other nominal kingdom of France was rapidly being lost completely. In August 1450 the forces of King Charles VII took Cherbourg, giving Charles overall control of the whole of Normandy.

It was partly in response to all these turbulent events and disturbances that, in
September 1450, the Duke of York left his post in Ireland. There is no surviving documentary evidence to show that he sought permission for this, although he wrote to Henry VI before he left Dublin. Probably specific permission for him to leave Ireland was not required. He had only to delegate authority to his deputy – which he did. York
was now preoccupied with other issues, and was very much concerned over the question of the succession to the throne. He was widely perceived as the senior living male prince of the blood royal. Ignoring female-line and legitimised (Beaufort) Lancastrian descendants, the Duke of York – direct male-line descendant of Edmund of Langley – had a strong claim to be heir presumptive to the
throne at this period. But his rights had not been officially recognised in government circles – nor, indeed, by the king himself.
The Duke of York’s
York returned to England to attack the alleged traitors in Henry VI’s government, and to formally assert his own claim as heir to the throne. He came backed by an army, and he marched towards London. His actions alarmed his younger cousin, the king. Henry did not know the Duke
of York very well on a personal level at this stage, and the two men had never been close. Henry VI – or more probably his advisers – may well have sought once again to have the duke arrested *en route*, but, if so, York evaded capture. He finally repaired to eastern England, where he spent his time and energy recruiting support. He also sought the endorsement of a higher
power. On Sunday 11th October he was expected at the Augustinian priory and shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham – though his delayed departure from London may have made his arrival at the Walsingham Holy House a little later than planned.

York’s return to England gave the 11-month-old George his first sight of his homeland. Although George
was the ninth child born to Cecily, Duchess of York, he did not, at this point, have eight older siblings living in his immediate family circle. It is not recorded when exactly his elder brothers, Harry, William and John, died. However, William and John were clearly dead by 1456 and probably both of them died soon after birth. As for Harry, he must have died before 1445, because in that
year the Yorks’ second son, Edward, was created Earl of March, and attempts were made to marry him to a French princess. It is therefore likely that George never knew Harry, William or John.

The family in which the new baby began to grow up probably consisted of five other children: Anne, Edward, Edmund, Elizabeth
and Margaret. Moreover, George’s eldest sister, Anne, was married in 1446. Her husband was York’s ward, so her marriage may not have led to her immediate departure, but at all events she must have left her family by 1453 at the latest. It is doubtful, therefore, how much the baby George will have seen of her. As for George’s younger siblings, the only other York child to
survive to adulthood was the future Richard III. But he was not born until 1452 (see below). By the 1450s, George’s elder brothers, Edward and Edmund, had graduated out of the family nursery and had their own establishment. Around the middle of the decade, Elizabeth of York left home to get married. Thus the siblings with whom George
grew up on a daily basis were usually not more than three: Elizabeth (until some time between 1455 and 1458), Margaret and Richard (from 1452 onwards).

During the nine years following the family’s return to England, it is assumed that George and the other younger children of the House of York resided primarily with their mother. No precise documentary evidence
survives relating to the York nursery in the 1450s. However, as we shall see later, Margaret, George and Richard were certainly living with their mother in 1460. The environment in which George lived and grew throughout the 1450s was probably similar to that which existed in 1460. From the age of about five his immediate circle would have comprised one slightly older sister,
Margaret of York, and one younger brother, the future Richard III. These are probably the only siblings with whom George experienced a close brotherly relationship. Moreover, in their nursery environment, George, as the senior surviving male child, would probably have been seen – and would have seen himself – as ‘king of the castle’. This may have significantly
affected the way in which he subsequently related to his much older brother, Edward.

It is an interesting fact that the subsequent relationship between Edward and George appears to have been very different in its nature to the relationship that later developed between Edward and his youngest brother, Richard. In Richard’s eyes, Edward was for many years a hero. Even when Edward
later proved to have feet of clay, Richard continued to serve him. Edward may also have been a kind of substitute father figure for Richard. The slightly older George, on the other hand, seems always to have perceived Edward as an intrusive older sibling – and a potential rival.

The Duchess of York was probably pregnant again when she sailed from Dublin
for at some point, either
towards the end of 1450, or
more probably in 1451, she
gave birth to a short-lived son
cchristened Thomas. During
1451, the Duke of York was
attending Parliament, and in
the summer of that year a
proposal was put forward for
his formal recognition as heir
presumptive to the throne.
This infuriated Henry VI – or
at least, the new power
behind his throne, his cousin,
Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset.

At about this time the fall of Bordeaux (June) and Bayonne (August) effectively brought English rule in Gascony to an end. In September the Duke of York received an official royal summons to answer to the king for his conduct in breaking the peace. He refused to obey the summons and withdrew to Ludlow
Castle, where he and his family spent Christmas with their two elder sons, Edward and Edmund. This may well have been George’s first meeting with Edward, but whether he was old enough at the time for it to make any impact upon him seems doubtful.

Towards the end of the following January, or very early in February, possibly at Ludlow Castle, the Duchess
of York conceived another child, so that she was pregnant again throughout the greater part of 1452. By 22 February the duke was not far from Northampton, preparing to march south and enter London. But Henry VI, who was then himself in Northampton, mistrusted York’s protestations that his aim was merely to remove traitors, and he gave orders that the duke should be
denied entry to the capital. Unable to enter London, York camped for three days at Kingston-upon-Thames. The king had also hoped to prevent him from entering Kent, the recent focus of Cade’s rebellion, but he failed in this. Heading, perhaps, for his estate at Erith, near Dartford in Kent, the Duke of York met Henry VI and his army at Blackheath. On this
occasion fighting was avoided. York was persuaded to come and put his complaints against Somerset to the king in person. This invitation proved merely a ruse. On arrival, York was disarmed and taken back to London under guard. At St Paul’s Cathedral, on 10 March, he was forced to swear not to rebel again.

In October 1452, probably at the York family’s castle of
Fotheringhay in Northamptonshire, but just possibly at Berkhamsted Castle in Hertfordshire, the Duchess of York gave birth to her last son, the future Richard III.\(^{11}\) It has been claimed that Berkhamsted Castle was a hereditary possession of the dukes of York, granted by Richard II to Edmund of Langley.\(^{12}\) Others, however, assert that
this castle belonged to the Duchy of Cornwall from 1356, which suggests that in 1452 it would effectively have been in the hands of Henry VI.\footnote{13} That would not necessarily make it impossible for Richard to have been born at Berkhamsted. Several of the York children were born at properties not owned by their father.\footnote{14} Nevertheless, the
Duke of York was at Fotheringhay in August and December 1452, though the more significant location of the duchess is not specifically recorded.

Despite later rumours, there is no evidence that Richard’s birth was in any way unusual, or that Richard was a sickly child. In all questions relating to Richard III, one must be wary of
crediting unsubstantiated later myths. The recent discovery of Richard III’s body on the site of the Greyfriars in Leicester has proved conclusively that legends about Richard have to be treated with scepticism.\textsuperscript{17} At the same time, it has witnessed the creation of new Ricardian legends!\textsuperscript{18} The birth of this latest (and last) son of the Duke and Duchess
of York was followed by what seemed to be a good omen for England. On 22 October the celebrated but elderly John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, recaptured Bordeaux. As a result, England suddenly and unexpectedly regained control of a large part of Gascony.

In London, however, the omens were not so good. During the weeks and months
following Richard’s birth, very serious, if surreptitious, Beaufort/Lancastrian machinations against the Duke of York’s claim to be heir presumptive to the throne were under way. In November 1452 Henry VI elevated his half-brothers, Edmund and Jasper, known as ‘Tudor’, to the ranks of the nobility. Edmund and Jasper were the sons of Henry VI’s widowed mother, Catherine
of France. Edmund had probably been born in 1430 and Jasper a year later, in 1431. Their father is usually stated to be Owen Tudor, but there is no proof of his paternity. In fact, it is much more likely that, in reality, Edmund and Jasper were fathered by Queen Catherine’s lover, Edmund Beaufort, who in November 1452 was the power behind Henry VI’s throne, and
therefore probably responsible for the government decision to ennable the ‘Tudors’ and to grant them differenced versions of his own coat of arms. Moreover, in March of the following year Edmund and Jasper were jointly given guardianship of the 10-year-old Lady Margaret Beaufort, the senior heiress of the Beaufort line. Margaret had
previously been married to the Duke of Suffolk’s son and heir, John de la Pole,\textsuperscript{21} but that still unconsummated marriage was now annulled,\textsuperscript{22} making Margaret available once again. This change in marriage plans was clearly countenanced by the government and, given Margaret Beaufort’s young age (she was either 9 or 11 years old, depending on her
disputed date of birth), probably the king (or those behind him) orchestrated it. The significance of this move – which ultimately led to the marriage of Edmund ‘Tudor’ to Margaret Beaufort and to the birth of the future King Henry VII – is obvious. The Duke of Somerset was advancing the prospects of an undercover Beaufort claim to the throne, despite Henry IV’s earlier attempt to
exclude the Beaufort family. Moreover, while persuading his cousin the king to thus advance the two young so-called ‘Tudors’ (probably his own bastard sons), the Duke of Somerset also had a second – and even more precisely targeted – string to his bow. He had already conducted a very successful liaison with one French-born English queen (Catherine). Now his sights
were set upon her successor. It seems that he became Margaret of Anjou’s lover towards the end of 1452. In February 1453, the queen (whose marriage to Henry VI may never have been consummated) finally fell pregnant. The real father of her expected child was probably the Duke of Somerset, who is named in her financial accounts for this year as her ‘most dear
cousin’, praised for the service he had performed for her, and commended particularly for ‘the great affection and kindness he had shown in matters vital to her’.  

It was probably in April 1453 that the Duke of York became aware of the queen’s pregnancy. In that month Margaret of Anjou made her own pilgrimage to the shrine
of Our Lady of Walsingham to give thanks for the anticipated birth of a Lancastrian heir to the throne. Margaret’s unborn child offered York’s enemies the best possible chance of excluding him from the crown of England. Even a daughter would render York’s claims doubtful. The birth of a son would cast him completely into the wilderness. Although
Margaret’s pregnancy was greeted with general astonishment, and was viewed – even, reportedly, by the king himself – as a miraculous event, it would have been virtually impossible, in the fifteenth century, to prove that the child she was carrying was not the king’s, particularly if Henry VI himself subsequently chose to grant
The remainder of 1453 brought mixed tidings for the York family and for England. First, on 17 July the Battle of Castillon in France brought another major defeat for the English, and the English commander, the aged and celebrated John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, was killed. In the same month, Henry VI fell ill. He was suffering from the insanity that had also
afflicted his grandfather, Charles VI of France. Despite opposition, and an initial attempt on the part of the queen and her supporters to conceal Henry’s illness, the king’s cousin and heir, Richard, Duke of York, was eventually appointed Protector (regent). Later that summer fighting broke out in the north of England between the rival noble families of Neville and Percy. This
fighting can be seen as an omen for England, presaging a future filled with conflict.

Meanwhile, the queen’s pregnancy was progressing uneventfully, and on 13 October, in the Palace of Westminster, she gave birth to a son. At the baby’s baptism, the godfathers chosen for him were Cardinal John Kempe, Archbishop of Canterbury and a former protégé of Cardinal Beaufort,
and his possible biological father, the Duke of Somerset. Perhaps significantly, the little boy was not given the name of his putative father, ‘Henry’, but was baptised ‘Edward’. He was thus endowed with the name of Edward III – probably the last king of England from whom he was truly descended. Six days after the birth, on 19 October,
the ‘Hundred Years War’ finally reached its close, with the French recapture of Bordeaux. From this point onwards, the only remaining English possession on the Continent was Calais.

Whatever doubts he may have had about the new-born heir to the throne of England, the Duke of York, in his capacity as protector of the realm, gave public support to the baby’s position. On 15
March 1454, ‘Edward of Westminster’, as he was known, was formally invested as Prince of Wales. Just over a month later, on 23 April, York’s distant cousin, Thomas Bourchier was enthroned as Archbishop of Canterbury, an office he would hold for almost thirty-two years, crowning Edward IV, Richard III and Henry VII. In June 1454, the Duke of York suppressed a
rebellion in the north of England led by his son-in-law, the Duke of Exeter. By the start of November, York’s wife had once again become pregnant, and in December Henry VI recovered from his mental instability, whereupon York promptly found himself dismissed from the post of Protector. Throughout this period, his son George, now aged 5, had been quietly growing up in the company of
his sister, Margaret, and his baby brother, Richard. But where had they been living, and how much contact had the children had with their parents?

Notes

1. He had married the cardinal’s cousin, Alice
2. William de la Pole had inherited the title of 4th Earl of Suffolk when his elder brother died childless in 1415. In 1444 his title was upgraded to marquess, as a reward for negotiating Henry VI’s marriage to Margaret of Anjou. In 1448 he became the 1st Duke of Suffolk.
3. The Duke of York’s Irish appointment is only briefly recorded, with a statement that he enjoyed the ‘usual powers and privileges’ (*CPR* 1446–52, p.185). However, his precursor, Sir John Sutton, had certainly been authorised to ‘come to England during his term of office, for great and urgent reasons, having
appointed a deputy with all powers’ (CPR 1422–9, p.426) [MB].

4. For details of this claim see Johnson, Duke Richard of York, p.99.

5. In the following year (1451) ‘an agent of his was to argue in parliament that the duke should be named as heir apparent’. See ODNB, J. Watts, ‘Richard of York, third duke of York
6. Some writers have suggested that Harry died after only a few hours. Curiously, however, Osberne Bokenham’s poem makes no mention of his death.

7. See Appendix 1.

8. Edward’s failure to help their sister Margaret in 1477 was, perhaps, the first indication Richard
received that his eldest brother might not be so great. Possibly the execution of George, the following year, helped to reinforce such doubts!


Later versions of the York genealogy in William Worcester’s Annals state that Richard was born at Fotheringhay, as does a note in Richard’s Book
of Hours. Sir George Buck, descendant of a Yorkshire family whose ancestors had served the House of York, said that Richard’s birthplace ‘was the Castle of Fotheringhay, or as some write, the Castle of Birkhamsteed’. Buck’s source for Berkhamsted as Richard’s birthplace was probably Stow’s Annales.


14. See Appendix 1.

15. P. A. Johnson, *Duke*
Rumours of Richard’s sickliness are based solely on Osberne Bokenham’s poem (see title page), which reports that Richard ‘liveth yet’, not because his life was precarious, but merely to contrast him with those of his siblings who had died young.
whose research into Richard’s burial was one important part of the evidence which led to the excavation of his grave site, remembers very clearly that on the first day of the dig people told him clearly that the excavation was a waste of time and money because Richard’s body had been dug up long since, and thrown into
the River Soar. This was despite the fact that I had already demonstrated clearly, and in print, that stories about the exhumation of Richard’s body were later nonsense.

18. The search for Richard III began in 2003, but the University of Leicester, which was not formally involved in the project until 2012, now
claims sole responsibility for the discovery. This is the first new legend. Also, the Church of St Mary de Castro appears to have recently invented a story that Richard’s body was taken there after the Battle of Bosworth, though actually it seems to have been taken to the neighbouring (and now
vanished) Church of the Annunciation.


20. Margaret Beaufort was probably born on 31 May 1443, though some authorities date her birth to 1441.

21. Later 2nd Duke of Suffolk, and the husband
of the Duke of York’s daughter, Elizabeth.

Personal communication from Marie Barnfield: ‘Margaret had been *infra annos nubiles* when she married Suffolk, so all that was needed was for her to “reclaim” the marriage, which is what she did; King Henry was merely giving royal licence to her (as she was a tenant-in-chief) to
change her marriage plans in a particular direction’.


24. Henry VI was suffering
from a bout of madness when the child was born. Later, when he recovered, he acknowledged the boy, while at the same time undermining his position by reportedly declaring ‘that he must be the son of the Holy Spirit’. See Kendall, *Richard the Third*, p.31, citing CSPM, I, p.58.

25. Wolffe, *Henry VI*, p.273,
citing Davies’ Chronicle, p.70.
It is difficult to know how much George saw of his parents while he was growing up, but during the first year of his life the baby had shared his place of residence with his mother – and for much of the
time also with his father. During this period he may well have seen both parents quite often, since they were all living together in Dublin or Trim Castle. If his sister Margaret had remained in England in the custody of a nurse, then George would probably have had no experience of siblings during his first year of life. On the other hand, both his young sister and other siblings
(perhaps including Anne of York) may well have been in Dublin to keep the baby company and help to care for him. George’s later relationship with his sister Margaret does offer circumstantial evidence that she had known George more or less from birth, and that they grew up together.

Later in his life, Anne of York exhibited concern for George’s well-being and
safety. George also seems to have enjoyed a close brotherly relationship with Margaret. This suggests that both sisters had been around when he was small and that he knew Margaret particularly well. The role-play of modern baby girls as ‘mothers’ of dolls is said to commence typically at about the age of 3, to develop fully between the ages of 4 to 6, and to cease at about 9 or 10
years of age. It would be logical to infer, therefore, that the 4-year-old Margaret of York enjoyed having not a doll, but a real, live baby brother to ‘mother’. Both she and George may have been lastingly affected by the resulting deep childhood relationship. This would account for their mutual closeness later in life – even when they were
geographically far apart. Later, perhaps, Margaret may also have ‘mothered’ her youngest brother, Richard. There are also signs that she cared deeply for him, too.\(^2\) However, she was already six and a half years old when Richard was born, so her maternal role-play in relation to him would have been of much shorter duration than that in respect of the older
Once the family sailed back to England, the picture of George’s closeness to both his parents may have changed somewhat. George’s mother, who was again pregnant when she returned, probably then stayed at home with her children. However, for much of the time we have no information about precisely where she and they were living. Sir George Buck, a
descendant of one of Richard III’s supporters at the Battle of Bosworth, writing in the seventeenth century, stated that the ‘children of Richard Duke of Yorke, were brought up in Yorke-shire, and Northampton shire, but lived for the most part in the Castle of Middleham in Yorke shire, until the Duke their Father, and his Sonne Edmund Plantagenet Earle of Rutland
were slaine at the battell of Wakefield’. \(^4\) However, Buck is not always correct in his statements. York’s youngest son, Richard, may have spent time at Middleham – but after his father’s death, for the castle at Middleham was held by the Neville family, not the House of York.

As for George’s father, as we have seen, following his return to England, at first he
manoeuvred to enter London. Later, he was taken into London as a captive. During his imprisonment he must inevitably have been absent for a time from his family circle. After being forced to promise to behave, the Duke—almost certainly accompanied by his wife and younger children—retired to Fotheringham Castle in Northamptonshire, where the family could enjoy time
together once again. The Duchess was probably at Fotheringhay by the late summer of 1452, since her last son, Richard, was reputedly born there (see above).

The Duke and Duchess and their younger children may have remained at Fotheringhay Castle for a time after Richard’s birth, though from December, and during the following year the
Duke spent much of his time in the vicinity of the capital. Whether he took his young family with him is not known. Even if he did, in the summer of 1454 the Duke would have been absent from his wife and children once again, since he was then obliged to campaign against his son-in-law in the north of England.

Of course, it was not unusual for fifteenth-century
noble children to spend time away from their parents. It was standard practice for them to be cared for by nurses when they were very young, and later they had tutors to educate them. Finally, when they were a little older, the general practice was for them to be lodged in another (and friendly) noble household as part of their education and training. For boys, the head of
the household in which they were lodged would then become a kind of role model for them.

However, this standard pattern did not always materialise in practice, and there were a number of instances in which children – particularly those who were left as orphans – ended up in the care of noblemen who were not at all the friends of their family, but who saw an
advantage of some kind to be gained in taking on their wardship. In a way, this had happened to the Duke of York himself – though on the whole he seems to have been fortunate in his guardians, and his relationship with the Nevilles with whom he was lodged developed into a strong one.

The elder York sons, Edward and Edmund, seem to have been brought up largely
by their father. In their early teens they were given a household of their own, under his supervision. The youngest York son, Richard, completing his education and training after his father’s death, was placed by his brother Edward under the guardianship of his cousin, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick. In general, this appears to have proved a happy experience for
Richard, and in some ways Warwick did become Richard’s role model. Like his father, young Richard also seems to have found a loving relationship within his guardian’s family, since he ultimately married his cousin’s daughter, Anne Neville.

However, George’s upbringing did not follow any of these patterns. Like Edward and Edmund, George
was never placed in another noble household as part of his education. When he was small he probably saw his father quite often, and came under the paternal influence to some extent. But the Duke of York was much more preoccupied during George’s childhood than he had been when his older sons were growing up. In consequence, he probably had less time to devote to the boy’s training.
Then, as we shall see presently, George was completely deprived of his father’s influence and training when he was only 11 years old. What happened to him after his father’s death was probably a traumatic and, in the long run, rather devastating experience. We shall explore these events, and their probable psychological impact, shortly. It is in May 1455 that the
so-called ‘Wars of the Roses’ are usually considered to have begun. On 22 May the Duke of York defeated the army of Henry VI at the First Battle of St Albans – a battle that shocked most of the troops who were caught up in it. They had expected another standoff followed by a peaceful resolution of some kind – rather like the one that had occurred in 1452 at Blackheath. The First Battle
of St Albans was a relatively small affair, but it constituted a major victory for the Duke of York. Henry VI himself was captured, and York’s arch-rival, the Duke of Somerset, was killed. He died at the Castle Inn, thereby fulfilling a prophecy. 5 Other deaths on the Lancastrian side included the Earl of Warwick’s northern rival, the Earl of Northumberland,
together with Northumberland’s nephew, Lord Clifford. Ironically, both Northumberland and Clifford shared the Duke of York’s royal Clarence/Mortimer descent, though they stood lower in the female line of succession than he did.

York was now in a commanding position. Together with his Neville relations, the earls of Salisbury and Warwick, he
escorted the king back to London. The duke and the two earls presented themselves as Henry’s loyal subjects – a presentation which seems, to some degree, to have convinced the king himself. Henry VI was now separated from his queen and her son Edward, who had taken refuge at Kenilworth. The absence of the bellicose Margaret, the loss of the Duke of Somerset, and the
apparently respectful proximity of the Duke of York may have combined to modify the mentally unstable king’s perceptions.

On the Sunday after the battle (the Feast of Pentecost) a crown-wearing ceremony for Henry VI was held at St Paul’s Cathedral. The king received his crown from the hands of Richard, Duke of York. The following day a Parliament was summoned in
the king's name. Meanwhile, York sought to ensure that the ailing king would be in a fit state to conduct the business of the realm. Surgeons were called in and consulted for this purpose. There seems to have been some concern that Henry VI's recent experience at St Albans (during which he had received a wound in the neck) might also have caused him some lasting mental damage. Throughout the last
five years of his first reign\textsuperscript{6} the king’s mental health appears to have been precarious. However, Henry VI was fit to open the new Parliament in July 1455.

Later that same month, on 22 July 1455, the Duchess of York gave birth to her last child, a short-lived daughter, christened Ursula. The Duchess had celebrated her own fortieth birthday three
weeks before the Battle of St Albans, and after Ursula’s birth her life may have entered a new phase as her long years of childbearing finally ended and she reached the menopause.  

By the autumn of 1455 the king was again showing overt signs of mental instability, and on 19 November the Duke of York was reinstated as Protector of the realm. But
this time, the king (who was obviously not completely incapacitated) committed governmental authority to the royal council. Thus the council, not the Duke of York, held ultimate authority. This time York was to hold power for only a couple of months. On 25 February 1456 the king relieved him of his special post and personally resumed his royal authority. Thereafter York was merely
the principal royal councillor. Even that post gave him too much power and prestige for the queen’s liking. Margaret of Anjou and her supporters were doing their best to make York ‘stink in the king’s nostrils even unto death; as they insisted that he was endeavouring to gain the kingdom into his own hands’. 8

The following spring the
Earl of Warwick took Carmarthen and Aberystwyth castles, in the process imprisoning Henry VI’s half-brother, Edmund ‘Tudor’. Hitherto the king had appeared to be developing some degree of trust and confidence in York. But Henry also perceived Warwick as the Duke of York’s subordinate, and his previously growing faith in York’s fidelity was now
damaged as a result of Warwick’s hostile actions. Shortly after Warwick’s campaign in Wales, Henry VI left both the Duke of York and London to rejoin his wife and her son at Kenilworth. It is uncertain whether he did this of his own volition, or because the queen came and took him away with her.

Henry had now largely abandoned any real interest in the government of his realm.
His attention seems now to have been focused on the horarium of the *Opus Dei* – the regular sequence of hours of prayer observed by priests and religious. He does not seem to have felt any personal hostility towards the Duke of York, despite his queen’s legendary animosity in that direction. Indeed, Margaret of Anjou may well have sought once again to attack the Duke of York at
this stage, were it not for the fact that the Duke of Buckingham acted as his defender.

On 25 March 1458 a ‘Love Day’ was held at St Paul’s Cathedral, as a public ceremony of reconciliation between the queen’s party and the supporters of the Duke of York. But this event was largely for show. Beneath the surface the antagonism between the two
opposing factions continued. At this time Margaret of Anjou is alleged to have been trying to persuade her husband to abdicate in favour of her son, Edward of Westminster. However, the queen herself had become very unpopular in some quarters, while the legitimacy of her son was now openly being questioned.\(^9\)

By 1459, thanks to the
unfailing efforts of his wife, Henry VI finally became convinced once again that the Duke of York was not, after all, to be trusted; that he aimed to make himself king. The queen was now preparing for open warfare. The king’s men were commanded to muster at Leicester in June 1459, but York, Warwick and their supporters flouted the royal summons, protesting that although they were loyal,
they feared for their own safety. While Henry VI now viewed York as a threat, York, for his part, saw the king as a mere puppet, manipulated by his queen.

The Duke, apparently accompanied by his wife and younger children, now installed himself at Ludlow Castle, where his elder sons, Edward and Edmund, resided. So far as we know, this was only the second occasion on
which George — now approaching his tenth birthday — had spent time with his two elder brothers. Since the first known meeting with them had occurred when George was only about 1 year old, this new encounter, in 1459, was probably a key event in determining the subsequent relationship between George and his brother Edward. It is a pity, therefore, that we do not have
any detailed day-to-day information about what took place, or about precisely how the 9-year-old George got on with Edward, Earl of March, who was now 17.

We can observe one obvious point, however. For nine years, George had been – and had seen himself as – the senior male member of his family in the context in which he had been living (after his father, of course).
Now, suddenly, he found himself eclipsed in that role. Eclipsing was to prove an experience that George would be forced to endure more than once. Unfortunately, on both the first and the second occasion, his demotion was attributable to Edward. It is highly probable, therefore, that in 1459 George may have begun to perceive his brother and supposed ally as a powerful rival and a threat.
The later repetition of this experience would have reinforced that impression. The encounter between George and Edward in 1459 could well have been a significant moment, therefore, which helped to determine the later course of their relationship. We should also note that this possibly uncomfortable meeting with his elder brother was followed by traumatic
experiences for George, which must have totally shattered the security of the privileged childhood he had hitherto experienced and enjoyed.

Meanwhile the Lancaster/York conflict now escalated once again into battle. On 23 September, at Blore Heath, a Yorkist force under the Earl of Salisbury defeated a Lancastrian army. This was followed on 12
October by a Lancastrian victory of a kind at the Battle of Ludford Bridge. Following this encounter, the Duke of York fled to Ireland, where, of course, his position was very strong. At the same time, his eldest son, Edward, Earl of March, accompanied by the earls of Salisbury and Warwick, made his way to Calais. As a result both, Ireland and Calais were now effectively out of government
control, and attempts by the Lancastrians to make appointments in both areas subsequently proved vain.

As a result of York’s defeat and flight, his young family fell into the hands of the enemy. Ludlow was pillaged and looted by the Lancastrians. Treated like an enemy town, its women were raped, and the castle was sacked. Either in the castle or in the town itself, the
Lancastrian forces found Cecily Neville, Duchess of York and her younger children. They were all taken prisoner and carried off to Coventry. The York children who were living with their mother in 1459 – and who were captured with her at Ludlow – were just three in number: Margaret, George and Richard. There is every reason to suppose that they constituted a closely united
family.

The queen now sought to attain the absent Duke of York in Parliament, but she was prevented by the duke’s cousin, Archbishop Bourchier of Canterbury. Nevertheless York’s property was confiscated by the crown. The king allocated 1,000 marks a year from the confiscated property and income to the Duchess of York to enable her to support herself and her
younger children. A decision was also made to hand Cecily over to her elder sister, Anne Neville, Duchess of Buckingham, a trusted Lancastrian in whose custody the duchess and her children were now to live. It has traditionally been stated that the York family was taken to one of the Buckingham manors in Kent.\textsuperscript{10} Subsequently, as we shall see,
Cecily and her children were reported to be approaching London via Southwark, which might imply that they had been living somewhere in the south-east. But wherever Cecily and her children lived with the Buckinghams, they were reportedly ‘kept full straight and [suffered] many a great rebuke’.  

In Calais, the earls of March, Warwick and
Salisbury made plans to return to England. They apparently had no aim beyond that of taking control of the king’s person and the government. Returning to England at the end of June 1460, at the Battle of Northampton they secured the person of Henry VI. Thereafter, power was in their hands. The Duke of York was then still in Ireland, and the Duchess of York and her
younger children were still apparently living with Cecily’s sister, the Duchess of Buckingham, in the south-east of England. It was not until September 1460 that York left Dublin and sailed back to England. The duchess received news of his planned return before it became an accomplished fact. Probably her husband wrote to her, although no such letter
survives. Nevertheless, the duchess and her younger children promptly left the custody of her sister, and headed in some state towards London.

It was probably not safe for the duchess to enter the capital and take up residence at Baynard’s Castle. As a result, in October 1460, John Paston II esquire, who was then residing at his home in
Norwich, received a letter from Christopher Hanson, a former archer of German extraction who had charge of the Pastons’ house in Southwark. Hanson’s letter, penned on Sunday 12 October 1460, reads as follows:

Right worshipfull ser and maister, I recommaund me unto you. Please you to wete the Monday after
Oure Lady Day\textsuperscript{13} there\textsuperscript{14} come hider to my maister ys plase my Maister Bowser, Ser Harry Ratford, Maister John Clay, and the h[ar]bynger\textsuperscript{15} of my lord of Marche, desyryng that my lady of York might lye heruntylle the coming of my lord of York, and hir [tw – crossed out] sonnys my lorde George and my lord Richard and my lady
Margarete hir dowtyr, whiche y graunt hem in youre name to lye here untyle Mychelmas. And sho had not ley here iij days but sche hade tythyng of the londyng of my lord at Chester. The Tewesday next after my lord sent for hir that scho shuld come to hym to Hartford, and theder sho is gone, and sythe y-left here bothe the
Based upon Hanson’s letter and other information we can deduce the following chronology:

Monday 8 September
(Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary)

The Duke of York landed near Chester.
Monday 15 September
Request from Edward, Earl of March, for his mother, the Duchess of York, and her younger children, to stay at the Southwark house. Situated near the southern end of London Bridge, this house was just outside London, and therefore probably safer for the York family than Baynard’s Castle would
have been. Permission was granted for them to stay for two weeks – that is, until Monday 29 September (see below), and the York family, who were doubtless already in the neighbourhood, probably actually arrived at the Southwark house on Monday 15 September (for details of how they travelled, see below).
Wednesday 17 September
News reached the Duchess of York that her husband had landed at Chester.

Tuesday 23 September
The duke summoned the duchess to join him in Hertford, and she left the same day, travelling in her carriage (see below).
Fastolf’s Place,
Southwark, where
George stayed in 1460 (after the ‘Agas’ woodcut map of London, c.1558).

**Sunday 12 October**

George, Margaret and Richard were still living at the Southwark house and their elder brother, Edward, Earl of March was visiting them there every day. The children had then been in
Southwark for four weeks.

The Southwark house in which George and his brother and sister were staying had been inherited by the Pastons from Sir John Fastolf, and it was called ‘Fastolf’s Place’. It stood a little to the east of the southern end of London Bridge, just across the Thames from the Tower of London, and at no great distance from the Priory of St
Mary Overy (now Southwark’s Anglican Cathedral). The site of the building, which today is occupied by Southwark Crown Courts and by parts of the ‘More London’ development, lies on the north side of Tooley Street, just to the west of City Hall, not far from HMS Belfast and the Shard (see illustrations):

By 1300, the site already
included several tidal mills and a large moated house, known as Dunley Place because it was owned by the prominent Dunley family of Southwark. Around 1324, Edward II obtained land to the east of the Dunley house on which he built a moated pleasure-house across the river from the Tower of London. Called the Rosary, this house was rarely visited by
Edward and was probably not finished when he was [sic] died in 1327. The famous architect/mason, Henry Yevele, acquired lands west of the Dunley house in 1388 and rebuilt the tidal mills there. In 1440, the well-known soldier of the Hundred Years War, John Fastolf, acquired both Dunley’s Place and the land on which the Rosary was
built. Not much remained of the two earlier moated houses even when Fastolf took possession; indeed, until recently, the location of Fastolf’s Place and its moated house was thought to be nearer to the Rosary, but the authors now argue that it was situated to the east, in Dunley’s Place. Later accounts of repairs to Fastolf’s property give us an idea of the residential
complex (including his counting house and the ‘Round Tabull’ in his chamber), which was surrounded by a large, buttressed brick wall pierced by at least two gatehouses and two causeways. The site also included a brewery (or perhaps a granary) as early as 1428 with its own inlet or dock.¹⁹
The Duchess of York seems to have left Southwark — and presumably had also arrived there — in a rather grand vehicle. An account survives which states that she drove to meet her husband ‘in a carriage covered with blue velvet, drawn by four pairs of horses’.\footnote{20} Blue and white were the Duke of York’s livery colours.\footnote{21} Presumably, when the family had arrived
at Fastolf’s Place, her daughter, Margaret, was sitting in the carriage with the duchess, while her two young sons, George and Richard, accompanied them on horseback.

We know that on Sunday 12 October 1460 George, Margaret and Richard were still at Fastolf’s Place in Southwark, though their mother had left about two weeks earlier to rejoin her
husband. The Duke of York entered London in a regal manner, accompanied by banners bearing the full royal arms of England, on Friday 10 October, but it is doubtful that his younger children witnessed his entry. 22
A fifteenth-century carriage, drawn by seven horses, similar to the ‘chare y-coveryd with blewe felewette’ used by
the Duchess of York at Southwark in September 1460.

Matters now came to a head. On his return to England, not only did the Duke of York begin to display undifferenced royal arms, he also formally laid claim not merely to the succession, but to the throne itself. He was now asserting not his male-line but his
female-line royal descent, which placed him higher in the order of succession than the House of Lancaster. This course of action was questioned by many of his own supporters, including his cousin, Warwick, and his own eldest son, the Earl of March. Finally, Parliament proposed a solution to this dilemma, namely that Henry VI should retain the throne for the duration of his life, but
that York, not Edward of Westminster, should succeed him when he died. Thanks to the persuasive powers of the papal legate, the king himself seemed willing to accept this compromise.

Predictably, his queen was furious. After escaping to Harlech Castle, she made her way to Scotland, where she offered to hand over Berwick to Scotland in return for military help. Her supporters
were gathering an army in the north of England. Two Yorkist armies marched out of London to confront this challenge. One was led by the Duke of York himself with his second son, Edmund, Earl of Rutland. This army marched northwards. The second army was led by York’s eldest son, the Earl of March, and this headed for Wales. Warwick was left in charge of the capital, where
the Duchess of York and her younger children remained in residence, probably at Baynard’s Castle. George therefore did not personally witness what happened to his father and his elder brother, Edmund. His only sources of information in this respect were the reports that subsequently reached his cousin Warwick and his mother.

Briefly, on 21 December,
the Duke of York established himself at his castle at Sandal. He remained at Sandal over Christmas, and it was not until the late afternoon of 30 December that the Lancastrian army suddenly appeared in front of the castle. York’s sortie to confront them has often been seen as an unwise move – and of course, in the event it did prove a mistake. However, the Lancastrian victory,
which took the Yorkists completely by surprise, was due chiefly to York’s overconfidence in the size of his army, and to his misplaced trust in John Lord Neville, brother of the Earl of Westmorland and York’s relative by marriage. Lord Neville had led him to believe he would join York’s strength, but instead he unexpectedly sided with the
queen’s army. After the battle, York’s head, adorned with a mocking paper crown, was sent to the city of York, where it was displayed on top of Micklegate Bar. The Duke of York’s overconfidence on this occasion presaged, perhaps, the similar overconfidence of his youngest son and namesake, Richard III, twenty-five years later at the Battle of
Bosworth.

In London, George, who had kept the Christmas feast with Margaret, Richard and their mother, received the news of his father’s death and of the post mortem insults inflicted upon his body on the morning of 2 January. 24

‘Cecily acted swiftly exhibiting a calmness in the face of serious crisis which [her daughter] Margaret
would later emulate. She sent her two youngest sons off to safety in Burgundy, “unto a towne in Flaundyrs namyd uteryk”. Despite later accounts, however, it is virtually certain that the Duchess of York did not send her sons directly to Utrecht, but rather to an unspecified port in the Low Countries. It was the Duke of Burgundy who, when he heard of their
arrival, made the decision to lodge them at Utrecht. Also, in spite of his mother’s reported calmness, this sudden reversal – the news that his father and brother Edmund had been killed, and that his father’s body had been insulted, together with his own sudden separation from his family and from his country – must have been an terribly traumatic experience for George, who was only 11
years old.

George’s childhood exhibits a number of unusual features. Male children of his class at this period were expected to be brought up in the chivalric tradition, trained in arms and in courtesy and taught to maintain a balance between loyalty to one’s lord and the proclamation of one’s own self-importance and prestige. For this training, a role model was important.
Sometimes that role model was the boy’s father, but often it was one of his father’s colleagues. For Edward, Earl of March, and Edmund, Earl of Rutland, their role model had been their father. For the future Richard III (who lost his father at the young age of 7), the ultimate role model was Warwick the Kingmaker – a model chosen for him by his elder brother, then King
Edward IV.

But George was given no role model. His father died when he was only 11 years old. At that time he was still living with his mother. Subsequently he was sent abroad, to a city whose principal language (Dutch) he was almost certainly unable either to speak or to understand.²⁶ On this journey he was accompanied only by
his younger brother, Richard, and by servants. If the sudden and violent death of his father had been traumatic for him, then his equally sudden separation from his family – dispatched to an alien environment in a strange land – may well have felt to George almost like a punishment.

When he returned to England, as we shall see in the next chapter, he suddenly
and unexpectedly found himself required to attend his brother’s court as a very young royal duke, a knight and, most importantly, heir to the throne. Still untrained, still without an older role model, he at first spent much of his time residing mainly at Greenwich Palace with his young siblings. From there, on his coming of age, he was thrust straight into the role of an independent magnate.
No one ever really prepared George for the life he was expected to lead, or for the roles he was required to fulfil. He lacked the experience of working with an older role model which had benefited both his older and his younger brothers. We shall now trace in greater detail first his experience of exile in the Low Countries, and subsequently the sudden, shattering elevation which
brought a still very young George into very close proximity to the throne, and also very much into the public eye.

NOTES

1. See, for example, http://onelovelivity.com/ Chat of doll-play-for-boys-
and-girls/ (consulted February 2013).

2. Margaret’s choice of her burial place is a case in point. Her request to be buried at the entrance to the choir of the Franciscan Priory Church of Mechelen very precisely paralleled Richard III’s burial location, just inside the entrance to the choir of the Franciscan Priory
Church in Leicester. This can hardly have been coincidental.

3. *ODNB*, A. Kincaid ‘Buck (Buc), Sir George’: ‘his great-grandfather John Buck supported Richard III at Bosworth and was executed and attainted after the battle’.


5. Margery Jourdemayne, ‘the Witch of Eye’, was executed in 1441 for her
alleged involvement with Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester in necromancy against Henry VI. She had earlier warned Edmund Beaufort to ‘avoid the castle’.

6. Henry VI was King of England from 1422 until 1461. He was then deposed by Edward IV. He reigned again briefly during the ‘Lancastrian
Readeption’ (1470–71).

7. The average age at which modern western women reach the menopause is 51, but in the third world the age is lower, as it was in Europe in the past. Aristotle, for example, cited the typical age as 40.


9. For her alleged attempt to replace Henry with Edward of Westminster and the talk of the latter’s illegitimacy, see *ODNB*, Margaret of Anjou.

10. Kendall (*Richard the Third*, pp.439–40) contests this, while Wilkinson (*Richard: The Young King to Be*
(Stroud, 2009), p.68) not only accepts that the Duchess of York and her younger children dwelt at a Kentish manor of the Buckinghams, but specifies their residence as Tonbridge Castle.

12. It is certainly on record that her husband wrote to Cecily ordering her to come and join him shortly afterwards (see below) though that letter does not survive.

13. Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary – Monday 8 September 1460.

14. Letters missing due to a hole in the paper.
15. Letters missing, as above.

16. 29 September.


18. ‘Fastolf Place’, former property of Sir John Fastolf, from whom the Pastons had inherited it. It stood close to the southern end of London.
Bridge – see below.


20. The account states: ‘hys lady the duchyes met with hym in a charedayd with blewe felewette, and iiij pore coursserys ther-yn’. See: J. Gairdner, ed., The Historical Collections of a London Citizen in the


22. Kendall assumes that York’s children witnessed his arrival in London, but there is no evidence to confirm this. See Kendall, *Richard the Third*, p.38.

Battle, December 1460 (York: Herstory Writing & Interpretation/York Publishing Services, 2010), p.83 [AC].

24. Kendall, Richard the Third, p.40.


26. There is no reason to suppose that George knew Dutch, which
would have been the main language of the population in Utrecht. However, the Bishop of Utrecht, an illegitimate member of the Franco-Burgundian royal House of Valois, must have spoken French, and since Richard (and probably George) had been brought up by the York family’s Norman nurse, Anne of Caux,
they may well have had some knowledge of that language. Edward IV could speak (or at least write) French.
Modern writers on the subject of what the death of a parent can mean for a surviving child may perhaps be able to help us begin to understand a little better certain features of the
character of George, Duke of Clarence:

The death of a parent is the most elemental loss that a child can experience ... The age and stage of development of a child at the time of his or her parent’s death will strongly influence the ways in which the child reacts and adapts to the loss ... Childhood grief and
development are interdependent: the early death of a parent affects a child’s development, and the child’s development affects how he or she will grieve and reconstruct his or her relationship with the deceased parent.\footnote{1}

It is hard to know precisely the nature of the relationships between the Duke and Duchess of York and their
children. Yet it is clear that subsequently some members of the family were close. This is shown by the concern of Cecily and her daughters to end the conflict between George and Edward in 1470–71. It is also interesting that, even in the reign of Henry VII, Edward IV’s daughter, Elizabeth of York, seems to have remained close to her aunt and namesake, the Duchess of Suffolk, despite
the fact that the duchess’ sons were leading rebellions against the new regime.

George, of course, was by no means an adult when the Duke of York was killed. He was 11 years old. The capacity of a child to comprehend what death means, and that it is irreversible, depends on his or her age and level of cognitive development at the time the death occurs. Children under
the age of 5 or 6, in what is known as the pre-operational phase of development, are generally unable to comprehend that the dead person will not come back. On the other hand, those entering their teens are usually old enough to understand that death is final, and that death is inevitable at some stage in every human life. But a child between about 5 or 6 and about 10 or
11 is in what is called the concrete operational phase of cognitive development:

A child in this *egocentric phase* also believes that his or her parent died because either the parent was bad or the child was bad, and that if the child is good, the parent can return. *This is thus seen as one of the most vulnerable and difficult developmental*
stages for adjusting to a parent’s death. The child at this stage needs someone who can clarify what the child is thinking and feeling, can reframe events to make them more understandable, can reassure and build self-esteem by praising the child’s accomplishments and by emphasizing the child’s importance.
George’s reaction to his father’s sudden and shocking death was perhaps that of a particularly egocentric pre-teen, hovering a little between the two stages of development. Yet, instead of receiving help and comfort from his mother, he suddenly found himself sent away from his home and family. A child in this phase might well suffer a loss of self-esteem. Were George’s subsequent
displays of lèse-majesté a kind of compensation technique?

The manner and context of his father’s death could have greatly increased George’s sense of trauma. Significant factors included:

The violent nature of the duke’s death

The fact that it was accompanied by the deaths of three other close
relatives, all at the hands of family enemies

His mother’s response to the bereavement

His mother’s response took the form of the belief that George and Richard were now themselves in grave danger and the drastic decision that they had to be rushed away from their family and their homeland, hustled onto a ship in the
middle of winter and in bad weather and sent to a strange country where they knew no one and faced communication problems.

George is unlikely to have seen his exile as a punishment inflicted on him by his mother, but he may have perceived it as divine punishment. The experience may also have robbed him completely of his sense of security, creating a huge gulf
between the settled world of his childhood and the rest of his life.

In the final analysis, however, the immediate experience must be coupled with the fact that George subsequently emerged from the frightening drama completely unscathed. He experienced a sudden recall to home and family. His own childhood sense of self-importance was then
confirmed and reinforced by his unexpected promotion to an astronomically high position for which he had not been prepared. Did the fact that he had come through the trauma of his father’s death and its sequels unscathed and promoted give George a sense of invulnerability? And was that the reason for his arrogant conduct when he subsequently experienced a humiliating demotion from
the very high rank to which he had been elevated? Significantly, the demotion which George suffered was, in effect, caused by his elder brother – a man to whom he probably felt no close personal ties (because they had spent very little time together while George was growing up) and whom – on the relatively rare occasions when they had met during his childhood – George had
probably perceived more as a powerful potential rival than as a friend and ally.

While the psychological trauma caused by the death of his father, together with its sequels, may in part have been responsible for the way in which George’s character subsequently developed, the Duke of York’s death may also have had physical consequences for George’s younger brother, Richard.
Recent examination of his remains has shown that Richard suffered from late-onset curvature of the spine. His condition has been described as idiopathic scoliosis — a rather opaque term, since ‘idiopathic’ means ‘without known cause’.\(^4\) A tendency towards idiopathic scoliosis may be inherited — particularly from the mother’s side — but
usually there are also other factors.\textsuperscript{5} One possible cause of scoliosis is a physical trauma of some kind – such as a fall from a horse.\textsuperscript{6}

A Channel or North Sea crossing\textsuperscript{7} in a small sailing boat in the middle of a late medieval winter cannot have been the most comfortable of experiences. Winter was reportedly colder in fifteenth-century Europe than it is
today, owing to the fact that Europe at this period was experiencing a climactic phenomenon known as the ‘little ice age’. At about this time, the English coast certainly suffered sometimes from the high seas. Modern calculations based on the recorded date of the Pinot Noir grape harvest in Burgundy indicate that the weather in France had been
cold during the summer and autumn of 1459, though in 1460 the temperature was probably about average for the fifteenth century.\(^\text{10}\) Nevertheless, contemporary sources also show that the weather in England during 1460 had been the worst for about a hundred years, with exceptionally heavy rainfall.\(^\text{11}\) Also, we know that there were strong winds and a
very heavy snowstorm in the north of England just a few weeks after George’s voyage across the Channel. This was on Palm Sunday – 29 March 1460 – at the Battle of Towton.\textsuperscript{12} In a letter from Brussels, written on 15 March, the Milanese ambassador, Prospero Camuglio, noted that ‘the sea between here and England has been stormy and
unnavigable ever since the 10th’. The weather in the Channel had also been stormy in February. Francesco Coppino, Bishop of Terni and Apostolic Legate, reported that he had encountered ‘a violent storm’ while crossing from Tilbury to Holland, where he had arrived on 10 February. George, accompanied by his little brother, Richard, and by
some of the family’s attendants, 15 was also forced to make the crossing to the Low Countries early in February 1461.

It is possible that stormy weather on this dangerous but unavoidable winter sea crossing, during which the two young princes of the House of York were under less adult observation and care than usual, caused the
young Richard to have a bad fall which damaged his spine. The consequent herniation of one or more of his discs could then have induced the onset of his spinal twisting. This is, of course, speculation, but some such cause for Richard’s spinal curvature is a possibility. As far as we know, this was Richard’s first sea voyage. George had crossed the sea at least once before, but since his only
recorded crossing – from Ireland to England – had taken place when he was barely a year old, sailing will probably have seemed like a new experience for him too.

Seven years later, when his sister, Margaret, sailed to the Low Countries to marry Charles the Bold, she embarked at Margate, and her voyage lasted one and a half days. But she sailed in the month of June, when the
weather would have been better. There is no record of the port from which George and Richard embarked in 1461, nor do we know exactly how long their journey took, the route they followed, where they landed or what the voyage was like.

Large parts of the Low Countries at this time were ruled by Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, a prince of the blood royal of France
and notionally a subject of the French king. However, the Duchy of Burgundy had traditionally taken an independent stance, and during the Hundred Years War had often sided with the King of England. As a result, the Burgundian court had enjoyed a close relationship with the House of Lancaster. Moreover, Philip the Good had married a Portuguese infanta, whose family –
descended from one of Henry IV’s sisters – had a very strong claim to be the next true Lancastrian heirs to the English crown after Henry VI and Edward of Westminster. The son of this marriage, the future Duke of Burgundy Charles the Bold, was definitely Lancastrian in his leanings at this period, as well as in his genealogy. On the other hand, the exiled Dauphin Louis of France,
who was also then living in Burgundy, favoured the Yorkist cause – mainly because his father, Charles VII, took the opposite view. Duke Philip himself sought to maintain a neutral middle position, between the opposing approaches of his son and the Dauphin.

When news reached him that the late Duke of York’s two youngest sons had just landed in his dominions as
exiles, his welcome was, therefore, less than effusive. In fact, strictly speaking, the boys’ presence in his territory could not be tolerated. Duke Philip had no wish to antagonise the Lancastrian government, which at that moment had, to all appearances, just convincingly smashed the cause of the Yorkist rebels and resoundingly reasserted its own authority. He
therefore ordered that the two boys should be sent to Utrecht. This was a clever move on his part, because Utrecht did not constitute part of his duchy. It was a small, independent principality, ruled by its own prince-bishop, David of Burgundy, one of Duke Philip’s bastard sons.

In Utrecht, George and Richard were placed in the care and custody of Prince-
Bishop David of Burgundy. As was not unusual in the case of prince-bishops of Utrecht, David was at that moment embroiled in a dispute with his cathedral city. As a result, since 1459 he had actually been living not at the Bishop’s Palace in Utrecht itself, but at his castle of Wijk bij Duurstede. However, in February 1461, at Bishop David’s behest, major rebuilding work at the
castle was in progress. It is not clear, therefore, where precisely he would have housed the two young York princes who had now been unexpectedly placed in his care, one of whom might possibly have been suffering from a back injury sustained on the voyage from England.
David of Burgundy, Prince-Bishop of Utrecht, 1456–96 (redrawn by the author after a fifteenth-century portrait).

A surviving letter from Prince-Bishop David, written to Edward IV in 1468, recalls that ‘I and my subjects have, as far as we were able, given hospitality to [your] famous
brothers and moreover to merchants, subjects of your royal majesty, who betook themselves to our city of Utrecht and elsewhere in our lands for a while’.¹⁶ This suggests that both the city and the surrounding countryside were visited. Unfortunately, however, it does not make clear who stayed where. Perhaps the young princes stayed in the city, while
visiting (or refugee) English merchants stayed in the surrounding countryside (or vice versa). It seems plausible, though, that the two boys did dwell in the city of Utrecht itself, rather than at the prince-bishop’s castle/building site. After all, they had no quarrel with the bishop’s opponents in the city.

Assuming that they did live in the city of Utrecht, the next
logical deduction would be that the two young Yorkist princes probably resided at the now vanished but then vacant episcopal palace, which in the fifteenth century stood near the cathedral. This in turn would imply that although officially they were living in the bishop’s household, actually they did not spend a huge amount of time with their host in person, which would have allowed
both the bishop and his father, the Duke of Burgundy, to publicly maintain a convenient distance from these potentially embarrassing Yorkist refugees. This might explain why later letters from the prince-bishop, referring to George and Richard, appear to reveal that Prince-Bishop David did not know (or remember) his two young charges very well. In one
letter written in January 1469, for example, he refers to 
germane vestro Georgio Eboracensi duce illustrissimo ('your brother the illustrious George, Duke of York') while an accompanying note in the archives refers to *duces klossestrie et Eboracensem* ('the Dukes of Gloucester and York').\footnote{17} It is curious that the bishop did not know George's correct title –
though of course in 1461, when he had been their host, neither George nor Richard held any noble title.

Previous writers have assumed that George and Richard received some form of education while they were in Utrecht. This may be true, although no contemporary evidence survives to confirm the suggestion. The notion seems
to have been put forward first in the seventeenth century by Sir George Buck, who stated that George and Richard were brought to ‘Utrich, the chiefe City then in Holland, where they had Princely and liberall education’. Buck’s account may be correct on this point, though his writing contains some errors, and must be treated with a degree of caution.
What we do know is that the two boys lived quietly in exile for about eight weeks, largely ignorant of what was happening in England. Probably they heard no details of the Lancastrian victory at the Second Battle of St Albans, nor of the Yorkist victory of their elder brother, Edward, Earl of March, at Mortimer’s Cross. They were not present on Monday 2 March, when
Edward and Warwick entered London in triumph, nor did they witness their brother’s proclamation as King Edward IV on Wednesday 4 March.

The news of Edward’s accession to the throne on 4 March was known at Bruges on the 9th or slightly earlier, but apparently did not make Philip the Good change his attitude towards the ‘children of York’. 
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Only after Edward’s bloody victory in a snowstorm at Towton, on 29 March (Palm Sunday), did the Lancastrian cause finally and obviously lie in ruins. News of the Yorkist victory was ‘rumoured at Calais on 3 April’. 22 The rumour reached Duke Philip’s court on the same day (Good Friday), and this did change his attitude to George and Richard. A week
later, on Friday 10 April, it was being reported in London ‘that the Duke of Burgundy is treating the brothers of the King with respect’. 23

The rumours of a Yorkist triumph had probably been transmitted to the new king’s young brothers very soon after they reached the ducal court – that is to say about Easter – but we have no information about how they
received these tidings. Nevertheless, within a few days, George and Richard were transported to Sluys on Duke Philip’s orders, where they arrived on Thursday 9 April, accompanied by an escort of twenty-three attendants. The party was accommodated at an inn called the *Teste d’Or*, kept by one Baudouin du Moustier. By Sunday 12 April, one
week after Easter, firm confirmation of their elder brother’s victory finally reached Bruges. About Thursday 16 April George and Richard moved from Sluys to Bruges, where, shortly afterwards (perhaps on Sunday 19 April 1461), Duke Philip the Good finally received the now highly significant young Yorkist princes in person, entertaining them to dinner.
Interestingly, Burgundian observers who encountered George and Richard at about this time made errors in estimating their ages. In reality, George was approximately eleven and a half years old, while Richard was about eight and a half. However, the chronicler Jehan de Wavrin, having seen the two young Yorkist princes, guessed their ages as
9 and 8 respectively.\textsuperscript{26} This suggests that George, who apparently looked at least two years younger than his true chronological age and who only appeared to be about a year older than Richard, was probably of below average height. Richard, on the other hand, whose apparent height had evidently not yet been noticeably affected by his late-onset scoliosis, was
perceived in 1461 to be of about the correct average height for his chronological age.

Modern (twenty-first-century) average height measurements for boys are said to be:

- 8 years 4ft 3in (129.54cm)
- 9 years 4ft 5in (134.62cm)
- 10 years 4ft 7in (139.70cm)
- 11 years 4ft 9in (144.78cm)
Recent research has indicated that the difference in height between medieval and modern individuals was quite small. ‘Medieval English men and women were only about an inch shorter than those measured in 1984 ... indicating that nutritional status was sufficient for near modern height.’ All this
would suggest that in the spring of 1461 George was some five inches below the height expected for a boy of his age, and may have been only an inch or two taller than his younger brother, Richard. The reason for George’s low stature is unknown, but one possibility is that he inherited this characteristic from his mother, who has been described as ‘a woman of small stature but of moche
honour and high parentage’. Some modern historians have tried to suggest that George’s father was ‘short and small of face’, but no contemporary source is cited to support this conjecture. In fact, in a poem of about May 1460, York was described as ‘manly and myrtfulle’, implying that he had a strapping figure of above average height and build.

The fact that George was
of below average height has not really been noted by previous writers, but it may have been a significant factor in determining aspects of George’s personality and conduct. People of below average height are typically reported to encounter problems that include ‘lower social competence, increased behaviour problems, and low self-esteem … there is stigma attached to height, and thus
short people are seen as easier to dominate’.\textsuperscript{32} The last of these points can sometimes engender an over-compensatory reaction, inclining the short man to be particularly self-assertive and possibly even aggressive. These are certainly features that appear to have comprised aspects of George’s character during his adult life.

In the wake of the new-
found friendship between the houses of York and Burgundy, there were rumours that there may have been some discussion in 1461 of a possible union between one of the princes — most probably George — and Marie of Burgundy, daughter of the Count of Charolais, and Duke Philip the Good’s granddaughter. If so, nothing came of the idea at
this point – though, as we shall see, the project was to resurface subsequently – and on more than one occasion.

On Wednesday 22 April the Duke of Burgundy left Bruges to attend the feast of his chivalric Order of the Golden Fleece at St Omer. George and Richard remained in Bruges for two more days at the duke’s expense. On Friday 24 April they set off,
travelling westwards 22 miles (35.4km) to the coastal town of Nieuwpoort. On Saturday 25 April their party journeyed approximately 18 miles (29km) to the town of Dunkirk. On Sunday 26 April there seems to have been little serious travelling. The two boys and their attendants made no further progress westwards, but instead rode south some 5 miles (8.5km) from Dunkirk to Bergues,
possibly to spend their weekly holy day visiting the abbey and shrine of St Winoc. Winoc, the founder of Bergues’ Benedictine abbey, was said to have been a king’s son of the Dark Ages, and of British royal blood. He might, therefore, have been seen as an appropriate local patron whose intercession the two Yorkist princes would do well to seek on the eve of their journey back to
England. On Monday the party resumed its westward journey, covering some 20 miles (32km), to Gravelines. Finally, on Tuesday 28 April they completed their land journey by riding the last 15 miles (24km) from Gravelines to the English town of Calais, which they no doubt approached via the English-held outpost of Marck. 35
From Calais, in due course George and Richard set sail for England, which they reached about the beginning of May, landing possibly at Margate. A day or so later they were greeted by a feast held in their honour at Canterbury. Seven years later, in 1468, the wedding procession of their sister, Margaret, took approximately a week to travel from London to Margate, spending nights
on the way at Stratford, Dartford, Rochester, Sittingbourne and Canterbury. It is reasonable to suppose that George and Richard’s journey in May 1461 would have taken about the same length of time – travelling, of course, in the opposite direction. The two princes probably reached London, therefore, about the end of the first week, or the
beginning of the second week in May.
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Edward Hall was born in about 1498, so he cannot have seen Cecily, who died in 1495, but he could have spoken to people who had seen her.
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35. For details of the princes’ route, see Visser-Fuchs,
'Richard in Holland, 1461', p.188. The day-by-day details of the journey have been inferred by the present writer from the towns named on the route, and from the dates of their departure from Bruges and their arrival at Calais.

In London, the dowager Duchess of York and her unmarried daughter, Margaret, are thought to have been residing at Baynard’s Castle during the first days of the reign of the new king,
Edward IV. Initially, when they arrived home from the Low Countries, George and Richard probably joined their mother and sister there, because the new king, their elder brother, was absent from the capital, and was not therefore on hand to make other arrangements for housing them.

In the long run, however, different arrangements were destined to be put in place.
After all, George and Richard were now persons of considerable dynastic significance. Indeed, George, astonishingly, now found himself transformed from a virtually unknown child into a person of national importance. In the new order he was officially recognised as the heir presumptive to the throne of England. Edward IV was as yet unmarried – at least officially – and had not
yet fathered an heir apparent to inherit his newly acquired throne.

It was probably shortly after his two younger brothers returned from the Low Countries to England – and before he had welcomed them back – that Edward IV contracted a secret marriage with Lady Eleanor Talbot, daughter of the late Earl of Shrewsbury by his second wife, Lady Margaret
Beauchamp. Eleanor, whom evidence suggests was a beautiful brunette, had probably been born in February or March 1436. Thus she was a little older than Edward. She had been married at an early age to Sir Thomas Butler, son and heir of Lord Sudeley, but Thomas’s death in 1459 had left her a young and childless widow. Although she
maintained a good relationship with her father-in-law,² Eleanor eventually left the Warwickshire manors she had received from him as her jointure, and moved to East Anglia, where she spent her last years within, or in close proximity to, the household of her sister, Elizabeth.³ Both Eleanor and Elizabeth Talbot appear to have been deeply religious
Edward may have first met Eleanor during the summer of 1460, before he gained the crown, as he was with John Howard in Suffolk at that time, and Eleanor may perhaps have been staying with her sister, and with Howard’s cousin the Duke of Norfolk, at Framlingham, in the same county. Accounts survive telling us that when
Edward met Eleanor, he became infatuated with her, but the virtuous and high-born Eleanor absolutely rejected any idea of becoming Edward’s mistress. As a result, the deeply smitten Edward subsequently contracted a secret marriage with her. This secret wedding must have taken place after Edward became king, because Canon Robert Stillington – previously a
servant of Henry VI’s government – was reportedly present. One account suggests that Stillington merely witnessed the contract. Another version reports that he acted as the clerical celebrant – clearly implying that although the marriage was secret it employed the church’s formal liturgy. The fact of Stillington’s priesthhod
makes it inherently more likely that he acted as celebrant. Moreover, according to Catholic teaching, the priestly celebrant at a wedding is, in fact, merely a witness. (Since the sacrament is self-conferring, the true celebrants are the couple involved.) Hence there is no contradiction between the two accounts.

Many historians have
expressed doubts as to whether a secret marriage between Edward and Eleanor ever really took place. Their attitude has been greatly influenced by Henry VII’s subsequent careful and systematic rewriting of history in the ‘Tudor’ interest. But Henry VII was by no means impartial on this point. His urgent need was to represent his bride, Elizabeth of York (daughter of Edward
IV’s later ‘marriage’ to Elizabeth Woodville), as the Yorkist heiress. Therefore Henry made a very determined effort to suppress any evidence that Edward IV had married Eleanor. What motivated him was the fact that the Talbot marriage would have made Edward IV’s subsequent Woodville marriage bigamous – with the result that all Elizabeth Woodville’s children by the
king would have been illegitimate.

Despite Henry VII’s later enactments, the fact remains that the marriage of Edward IV and Eleanor Talbot was officially recognised by Parliament in 1484. Indeed, in parts of Europe free from the influence of ‘Tudor’ political correctness, their marriage continued to be recognised until at least the
In this book the marriage of Edward and Eleanor is accepted because, as we shall see, it makes the ultimate execution of George, Duke of Clarence more comprehensible.

The most likely venue for a secret marriage between Edward and Eleanor is somewhere in the vicinity of Warwick – most probably either Eleanor’s manor of
Fenny Compton or her manor of Burton Dassett – and the most plausible date is around 8 June 1461. It is quite likely that the marriage took place at one of the two manor houses – just as Edward’s subsequent wedding with Elizabeth Woodville was contracted at her family manor (see below).

Though Edward probably married Eleanor in early June
1461, this was not made public. Also, the king remained without a son and heir. Thus, for the time being, Edward IV’s brother George was unquestionably the heir presumptive to the throne, and therefore a personage of great importance in the eyes of the king. It was perhaps on Tuesday 12 June – or more probably on Wednesday 13 June (approximately one month after their arrival in
London) that George and Richard were formally received by their elder brother. The delay was simply due to the fact that, up until this point, Edward had been slowly travelling back from Newcastle, riding via Durham, York, Lincoln, Coventry and Warwick, and probably marrying and bedding Eleanor Talbot on the way. On Tuesday 12 June
he reached his Palace of Sheen. But it may not have been until the following day that Edward IV had the leisure to send for his two younger brothers.

Incidentally, it is unlikely that when he first slept with Eleanor Talbot the 19-year-old Edward was still a virgin. As we have already seen, for some years he and his now deceased brother, Edmund, had been living, under
supervision, in their own household at Ludlow Castle. This lifestyle would have given Edward easy access to women of the lower classes, and although we have no knowledge of what took place, an older serving woman (or women) of his household may well have begun inducting him into the possible pleasures of sexual encounters. One interesting point about Edward is that –
at this stage of his life, at least – he seems to have had a preference for older women, and for women who were themselves not virgins.\textsuperscript{12} Eleanor Talbot (Butler), Elizabeth Wayte (Lucy) and Elizabeth Woodville (Grey) had all been married before Edward began his relationships with them. Indeed, the same also applies to his later mistress, Elizabeth
Lambert (often but erroneously known as ‘Jane Shore’).

We have no information as to how George behaved when he re-encountered his elder brother. Nor do we know how Edward received him. However, Edward must have been very well aware that as things then stood, George was his heir. Secure in his own new position, Edward would have had nothing to fear from
his little brother, whom he had probably last encountered in a guardian-type role, while George, Richard and Margaret had been staying at Fastolf’s Place in Southwark. We may suppose that he treated George in a normal and friendly – if perhaps somewhat superior and parental – kind of way. Below-average-height George, on the other hand, once again confronting his
more-than-six-foot-tall elder brother,\textsuperscript{13} who had now definitively assumed the role of ‘king of the castle’, may have viewed this encounter rather differently. Amongst his possibly mixed emotions, even at this early stage, there were perhaps elements of jealousy.

The ceremonial preparations for Edward’s coronation began on Friday
26 June, when Edward made a formal state entry into London, where he was received at the Tower by his brothers and others. That evening George and Richard, together with twenty-six companions, began a lengthy ritual (including a night of vigil) which culminated the following day when they were created Knights of the Bath. Sunday 28 June
witnessed the coronation ceremony itself, celebrated at the Benedictine abbey of Westminster, founded by the new king’s precursor and namesake, Edward the Confessor. This coronation attempted to make a suitably impressive show at minimum cost, since the royal treasury was empty. Edward was aided in this objective by the fact that he was celebrating a solo coronation. There was no
thought of crowning Eleanor Talbot at his side. George had been formally appointed Steward of England for his brother’s coronation, but since he was ‘yonge and tender of age’, Lord Wenlock was designated to assist him.  

On the day after the coronation – Monday 29 June – George accompanied Edward IV to the Bishop of
London’s Palace, where a banquet was given in George’s honour. During this banquet he was formally created Duke of Clarence, a title which, for the House of York, had a special significance, since it recalled the ancestry from which the family derived its right to the throne. Some weeks later his younger brother Richard was created Duke of Gloucester, and both George and Richard
were made Knights of the Garter, and were provided with lands and offices. 16 Clarence was subsequently ‘appointed lord lieutenant of Ireland in 1462 and JP in many counties, and granted extensive estates, including very briefly the whole county of Chester’. 17 Significantly, his appointment as the Irish lieutenant meant that, in one role at least, he succeeded his
late father. George retained the Irish post until his execution in 1478, when he was succeeded by his brother-in-law, the Duke of Suffolk. The official residence of George, Richard and Margaret was henceforth the Palace of Pleasaunce at Greenwich.\textsuperscript{18} It is possible that at this stage in their career, the livery of both of the king’s younger brothers
was of green fabric.

After the Duke of York’s death, no full-time guardian was ever appointed for George. Instead, he found himself catapulted straight from his childhood and his incomplete education into a
very visible and hugely important public and official role. He suddenly became the second highest-ranking person in the kingdom. This was a position which he had never been expected to occupy; a position, therefore, for which he had received no real preparation in the past, and for which he was given no proper training now. Had his father not been killed, the Duke of York, not Edward
IV, would now have become king, and George would have been only third-in-line to the throne. Even if his elder brother Edmund, Earl of Rutland had not been killed, he, rather than the much younger George, would now have become the heir presumptive. Therefore, everything about George’s new position was unexpected – both for himself and for those around him.
Even worse for the young boy in the long run was the fact that this magnificent new role into which he had suddenly and unexpectedly been projected was to prove completely ephemeral. He would subsequently find himself equally suddenly – and ignominiously – demoted as a result of the announcement of his elder brother’s second secret marriage, followed by the
birth of Edward’s children. However, that part of George’s story comes later. We shall trace the course of events that forced the still very young George through this new series of traumatic and disastrous experiences in our next chapter. First, we should review exactly what role George played in the new Yorkist regime in the period during which he was officially recognised as the
heir to Edward IV’s throne. Although George had been nominally the Steward of England at Edward IV’s coronation, actually the real, practical work of that office was performed for him by his assistant, Lord Wenlock. In the view of Michael Hicks, a similar situation probably continued for several years in all George’s political and ceremonial appointments. The young prince was
granted titles and offices, but other and older heads did the real work. Meanwhile, George’s official public role – and his household – both gradually grew in size and importance.

Being only a child, he neither enjoyed the income from the lands nor exercised his offices in person, but lived mainly with his brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester and sister Margaret at
Greenwich Palace. Initially an offshoot of the royal household funded by Edward IV’s coffer, Clarence’s establishment included a chancellor (John Tapton) in 1462, a surveyor of his livelihood in 1463, and was described as a multitude early in 1466, by which point the duke was leading a more public life.  

Hicks’ suggestion that the
young George exercised no real political power until later sounds eminently credible. However, there is in fact some contrary evidence indicating that from a very early period in Edward IV’s reign, George actually was expected and required to exercise real authority, despite his youth. For example, in a letter which is believed to date from 7 January 1462, Margaret
Paston, in Norfolk, dictated a message, to be sent to her husband, John Paston I. Margaret was illiterate, so she could not actually write the letter herself. Thus the document is in the handwriting of her younger son, John Paston III. In her letter Margaret reported that:

pepyll of this contré begyneth to wax wyld, and it is seyd her þat my lord of
At first sight, this letter appears to suggest that the talk of the day in the eastern counties was recommending that powerful aristocrats should visit the region and take matters in hand. However, Margaret Paston
was not talking about men of advanced years – or even men of middle age. John de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk – the husband of Elizabeth of York since about 1457 – had been born on 27 September 1442. Thus he was 19 years of age when this letter is thought to have been written. His brother-in-law, George, Duke of Clarence, was still only 12! Nevertheless, they were respectively the brother-in-

law and the brother of England’s new king, and the younger of the two was the heir presumptive to the throne. It certainly sounds from her letter as though Margaret expected the two dukes to come and take real action of some kind. Clearly, she was not simply advocating the ceremonial presence of royal figureheads. It therefore appears that in 1462 the 12-year-old George
may already, in some respects, have been acting – or been expected to act – as a ruling figure. 22

In East Anglia, the Duke of Suffolk was a local magnate, and was thus an obvious choice if the government needed action taken in that region. The choice of the young Duke of Clarence is more intriguing because George was never a
prominent East Anglian magnate. Possibly his family connections with the Dukes of Suffolk and Norfolk may explain why his name is mentioned. It is a pity that documents do not survive which would tell us more of the relationship between Clarence and Suffolk, but in February 1463 the two dukes, together with the Duchess of Suffolk (George’s sister, Elizabeth) attended the
funeral of their uncle, the Earl of Salisbury (see below).

The Paston letters also allow us to see that Clarence had, in the long run, important connections with another East Anglian relative – the Duke of Norfolk. John Mowbray, the 4th Duke of Norfolk, was George’s first cousin once removed, since Norfolk’s grandmother, Catherine Neville, was an elder sister of Cecily,
Duchess of York. The 4th Duke of Norfolk had been born on 18 October 1444, so he was just five years older than the Duke of Clarence. He had succeeded to his title on 6 November 1461, following the early death of his father, not long after the latter had officiated as Earl Marshall at Edward IV’s coronation. Potentially even more significant for George’s future was the fact that the
young John Mowbray’s wife was Elizabeth Talbot. During the 1460s her elder sister Eleanor lived with the Norfolks – or at least on one of their estates. It was with Eleanor that Edward IV had contracted a secret marriage in 1461. This marriage was eventually to have disastrous consequences for the Duke of Clarence, and in the longer term for the entire House of York. At this stage, however,
it is obvious that George knew nothing whatever about it.

Meanwhile, George had been provided with henxmen – probably teenaged lads with whom he continued some basic education, together with military training, and whom (thanks to his unique social position) he would have been able to dominate. At the same time, as we may deduce from Margaret Paston’s letter, he
was receiving requests to play a dominant political role – and he may have been playing such a role in reality, at least at a regional level. How would such situations have affected him, and what aspects of his character might we expect to have emerged as a result?

We have suggested that as a boy George had learned to think of himself as the most important person in his
immediate family. Subsequently, he had suffered feelings of insecurity and possibly guilt as a result of his father’s death and exile. Finally, he had once again been forced to encounter his much taller and little-known elder brother, whose dominance he viewed with resentment and jealousy. If this is an accurate picture of his growing up, we might expect the 12-year-old
George – now officially heir to the throne – to begin to conduct himself in a rather ostentatious and arrogant manner. Moreover, he had now been provided by his resented elder brother with all the necessary means of expressing himself: a household, financial resources, horses, splendid clothes, weapons and publicly acknowledged status.

The somewhat limited
surviving record of George’s conduct during this period tends to confirm that he did indeed behave as suggested. On 15 February 1463 the 13-year-old George attended the interment of his maternal uncle, Richard Neville, Earl of Salisbury. Because of his rank, George was the guest of honour. In April 1463, George attended for the first time a chapter of the Order of the Garter. Four months later,
on a visit to Canterbury Cathedral, George had a sword carried before him, point upwards, even when he was entering the Cathedral to attend high mass. This has been taken as a sign of his arrogance, and one writer has noted that although Richard accompanied George on the Canterbury visit, Richard’s name was not recorded by chroniclers, so much was he overshadowed by his elder
Incidentally, it is possible that about this time George and Richard lived for a short time under the guardianship of their cousin, Archbishop Bourchier. If so, however, the archbishop’s authority over the young princes, and his care for them, were both of very short duration.

From 1464 until 1469, the youngest prince, Richard,
Duke of Gloucester, probably lived mainly in the north of England. He had been officially consigned by his brother, the king, to the guardianship of his much older cousin, the Earl of Warwick. However, no one ever exercised such a role in respect of George, who was now rapidly becoming independent. In 1464, as we shall see, he acted once again as Steward of England, at a
second coronation (that of Elizabeth Woodville). As early as 10 July 1466 – when he was still only 16 years of age – the Duke of Clarence officially came of age, did homage in person for his lands, and took personal control of his own affairs. Shortly afterwards, George set off for his own castle of Tutbury, a magnate now in his own right, despite his youth. As Hicks has
remarked, at this stage – unsurprisingly, perhaps – ‘events suggest that he was precocious and his conduct adult’. 

NOTES

1. Certainly her younger sister, Elizabeth Duchess of Norfolk, was later
described as a beauty. See H. Beaune and J. d’Arbaumont, eds, Mémoires d’Olivier de la Marche vol. 3 (Paris, 1883–8), p.107. For Eleanor’s hair colouring and complexion, see Eleanor, p.102.

2. See Eleanor, chapter 13.


5. For evidence of

6. *Eleanor*, p.105. See also *ODNB*, M. Hicks, ‘Stillington, Robert’: ‘In 1448 Stillington was appointed a commissioner to
negotiate with Burgundy over recent breaches of a truce, and in the next thirty years he took part in several foreign embassies. In 1449 he became a royal councillor.’

8. For fuller details on these points, see *Eleanor*, pp.162, 190, 209, and *RMS*, p.84.
9. After the Battle of
Towton, Edward IV spent April in the north of England. Previously, I suggested \((Eleanor, p.101)\) that the marriage might have taken place in May, in Norwich, based on the fact that \(CPR\ 1461–1467,\ p.13,\) indicates that Edward may have been in Norwich on 20 May, which appeared to accord with the
statement that ‘the king returned southwards and eastwards [to] his manor of Sheen’ (K. Dockray, Edward IV A Source Book (Stroud: Alan Sutton, 1999), p.23, citing Hearne’s Fragment). However, Scofield (vol. 1) suggested a different route for Edward, which passed westwards after leaving Lincoln. This
was based on evidence from the Privy Seals (C 81). On this basis, Clive (This Sun of York, pp.50–51) produces a detailed itinerary, which suggests that Edward was in Coventry on 7 June, Warwick on 8 June and Daventry on 9 June.

10. The alternative possible date for a secret marriage between Edward and Eleanor is
in October 1461, by which time Eleanor may have been staying either at East Hall, Kenninghall, near Norwich (her sister’s dower house) or at the Duke of Norfolk’s residence in Norwich when Edward reportedly passed through Norwich, on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham. See J


12. ‘This preference may have been moral rather than sexual, i.e. tempting a widow to fornicate was regarded as less wicked than deflowering a virgin or seducing a
married woman to commit adultery’ [MB].

13. Edward IV’s bones indicate that he was probably about 6ft 4in tall.

14. For a full description, see Wilkinson, Richard: The Young King to Be, pp.88–9.

15. FFPC, p.7.

16. On Edward IV’s accession, ‘his two younger brothers,

17. *ODNB*, M. Hicks, ‘Clarence’.

The palace, built by Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, was originally named ‘Bella Court’. After Humphrey’s fall it was taken over by Margaret of Anjou, who renamed it ‘The Palace of Pleasaunce’ (or ‘Placentia’). It was an important royal residence throughout the ‘Tudor’ period, but was
eventually demolished by Charles II, who built Greenwich Hospital on the site.

19. There is a record that gowns of green cloth were purchased for both princes on one occasion (Wilkinson, Richard: The Young King to Be, p.92). It is also worthy of note that when Howard received Richard in the eastern
counties he attired his followers in green, despite the fact that the Howard livery at that period was black (J. Ashdown-Hill, “‘Yesterday my Lord of Gloucester came to Colchester ...’”, Essex Archaeology & History 36 (2005), pp.212–17; ‘Beloved Cousyn’, p.22ff). The future Edward IV and his
brother Edmund, Earl of Rutland had also written to their father during their youth to ‘thank your noblesse and good fatherhood of our green gowns now late sent unto us for our great comfort’ (Halstead, *Richard III* vol. 1, p.419). Later, George and Richard’s nephew, the future Edward V, may have had green and
blue livery for his household as Prince of Wales (Ashdown-Hill, “Yesterday my Lord of Gloucester came to Colchester …”).

20. ODNB, Hicks, ‘Clarence’.

21. Davis 1, p.279.

22. George’s first recorded appointment to a commission of the peace for Norfolk was in 1466. However, on 12 August
1461 he was appointed to a commission to enquire into all treasons, insurrections and rebellions in South Wales. See CPR 1461–1467, p.38.

23. Wilkinson, Richard: The Young King to Be, p.95, citing the chronicler John Stone.


25. FFPC, p.15.
Edward IV’s relationship with Eleanor Talbot, which may have started with an initial meeting in 1460, nevertheless seems to have lasted only quite a short time.
As we have seen, they were probably married in June 1461. But towards the end of 1461 or early in 1462 the king became involved in an affair with Elizabeth Wayte (Lucy), a girl from an aristocratic Hampshire family who bore him an illegitimate daughter – Edward’s first known child.¹ The fact that Elizabeth Wayte rapidly became pregnant by the king
while Eleanor did not, coupled with the knowledge that Eleanor had also borne her previous husband no children, may have been significant for the future of Edward IV’s relationship with his secret bride.

No public statement was ever made by the king about his wedding with Eleanor, and there are several possible explanations for this. Perhaps the king feared the reaction of
his family – in particular, that of his mother, the dowager Duchess of York. A second possibility is that he always merely intended to dishonourably deceive Eleanor – in which case, their secret marriage may have been little more in his eyes than a means of getting her into his bed. There is absolutely no doubt that Edward IV was deceitful on
occasion. However, the third, and perhaps most significant, possibility is that the king was following the ancient tradition of coupling first and awaiting results. According to this premise, had Eleanor become pregnant, he would then have acknowledged their marriage. Interestingly, his subsequent secret contract with Elizabeth Woodville may well have
followed precisely this pattern (see below).

Eleanor, however, did not conceive. Like her first, her second marriage remained childless. Meanwhile, in terms of public awareness, since there had been no official announcement of the Talbot marriage, the young king apparently remained available. Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick (Edward
IV’s cousin and Eleanor Talbot’s uncle) unaware of any commitment on the part of the king, therefore commenced negotiations for a royal diplomatic alliance with the King of France’s sister-in-law, Bona of Savoy. Warwick, who was one of Edward’s strongest supporters at this stage, evidently thought to use his power to influence the important choice of a royal
bride, and he worked assiduously on this project during 1463 and 1464. Warwick may have been dimly aware that his wife’s niece, Eleanor, had attracted the king’s attention soon after the latter’s accession but, owing to a dispute over the Beauchamp inheritance, the relationship between Richard Neville and his Talbot relatives-by-marriage was not a close one. At all events, it is
obvious from his conduct in 1463–4 that the earl had absolutely no notion that the king might have contracted a marriage with Eleanor. In itself, of course, that proves nothing. After all, Warwick also remained completely ignorant of Edward’s second secret ‘marriage’ – with Elizabeth Woodville – until the king publicly announced it. It is absolutely clear that Warwick was taken
completely by surprise by the king’s eventual announcement of the Woodville marriage, and that the revelation infuriated him. Edward’s statement that he was already married to Elizabeth Woodville, when it came, was a major embarrassment for Warwick, because it made the earl look a fool at the French court.
Edward IV and his signature (centre), Eleanor Talbot (left) and Elizabeth Woodville (right).

It was probably in mid to late September 1464, at a meeting of the royal council in Reading, when Warwick was urging the king to conclude his proposed dynastic alliance with Bona,
that the king responded by announcing that he was already married. One contemporary source claims that the announcement was made somewhat later, on All Saints Day (1 November), but this appears to be an error. On hearing the news, the whole council was flabbergasted. As for Warwick himself, as we have seen, the earl was reportedly
furious. Curiously, however, despite his anger, it was Warwick, together with George, Duke of Clarence, who formally presented Elizabeth Woodville to the nobility and people as queen. Later evidence implies that Edward IV may have asserted his authority in this matter by forcing the most outspoken opponent of his Woodville marriage and his existing heir to jointly take on the role of
the new queen’s patrons. In the longer term, it may have been an error on Edward’s part thus to push his younger brother and his cousin Warwick together. Nevertheless, the immediate result was that ‘on Michaelmas day [29 September 1464] at Reading the Lady Elizabeth was admitted into the abbey church, led by the Duke of
Clarence and the Earl of Warwick, and honoured as queen by the lords and all the people.’ 

The few people who were aware of the king’s attachment to Eleanor Talbot may well have found themselves even more astonished than Warwick, because of the identity of the secret bride whom the king was now acknowledging.
This group presumably included Canon Stillington, together with certain members of the Talbot/Butler households, families, and client networks, some of whom we shall be meeting later. Members of Eleanor’s family who knew of the relationship probably included her sister, Elizabeth, Duchess of Norfolk, and possibly also Elizabeth’s husband, John Mowbray. At
this point Canon Robert Stillington was Edward IV’s Keeper of the Privy Seal. However, he was also an expert in canon law, and if he sought fuller details of the king’s Woodville wedding then he must have been worried by what he discovered. Since Edward’s secret marriage to Elizabeth Woodville had reportedly been solemnised several months previously, on 1 May
1464, it apparently post-dated by approximately three years the king’s marriage to Eleanor.\textsuperscript{9} It was therefore bigamous. Under canon law it would have been considered invalid by a church court – a decision that would have automatically rendered illegitimate any children born of the Woodville union.\textsuperscript{10} The king, who was not an expert in canon law, may
have assumed that his public acknowledgement of the Woodville wedding sufficed to establish its validity; if so, he was in error.

Some historians have voiced astonishment that Canon Stillington took no action in respect of Edward IV’s marital muddle. This merely demonstrates how very widespread is the modern misunderstanding of the practice of medieval
canon law in such situations. Stillington had no *locus standi* in the case. Only Eleanor – the supposedly wronged party – could have cited Edward IV before the church courts. But while many medieval English women in similar disputed marital circumstances successfully sought legal remedy in the church courts – thereby substantiating their married status – Eleanor took
no such action. For her, this may never have seemed a realistic option.\footnote{11}

It was probably late in 1463 – or possibly very early in 1464, according to modern dating – that Edward IV first met Elizabeth Woodville. She was the eldest child of Jacquette of Luxembourg, dowager Duchess of Bedford, by her second husband, Richard Woodville (Lord
Rivers). Elizabeth, who is thought to have been born in 1437, possibly in France, may even have been conceived before her parents were married. Like Eleanor Talbot, she was slightly older than Edward IV, and she has also been described as a beauty. She is sometimes said to have had very fair hair, and some manuscript illustrations do depict her with golden hair. However, a portrait believed
to be from life at Queens’ College, Cambridge, appears to show dark auburn hair,\textsuperscript{12} so the details of her colouring remain doubtful. When she met the king, Elizabeth (like Eleanor before her) was a widow. Unlike Eleanor, she was also already a mother.\textsuperscript{13}

It is widely believed that Elizabeth’s motive for coming to see the king was to ask him to return land he had
confiscated following the death in battle of her Lancastrian first husband. However, this is incorrect. Despite his Lancastrian allegiance, Sir John Grey’s land had not been confiscated by the new king. The truth is that there was an acrimonious ongoing dispute over the property between Elizabeth Woodville and her mother-in-law. To improve her chances of success in this family
quarrel, Elizabeth sought the help of her distant relative, Lord Hastings, who agreed to present her and her case to the king, in return for a share of the property if and when she won.  

Sir Thomas More offers the most complete surviving account of the story of Edward IV’s first meeting with Elizabeth Woodville. More reports that Edward,
captivated by Elizabeth’s beauty, asked her to sleep with him. In return, he promised to grant her suit in respect of her jointure. However, Elizabeth rejected the king’s illicit sexual advances. Edward therefore decided to contract a secret marriage with her as a means of getting his way. The enormous similarity between this story and the surviving accounts of Edward’s earlier
relationship with Eleanor Talbot is obvious.

The Woodville secret marriage is said to have been contracted at the manor house of Grafton Regis, Northamptonshire – the home of Elizabeth’s parents. The marriage is often said to have been celebrated in the presence of the bride’s mother, Jacquette, Duchess of Bedford. However, there are alternative versions, which
report that the ceremony took place ‘in the presence only of the priest, two gentlemen, and a young man to sing the responses’, the celebrant having been ‘the Dominican Master Thomas Eborall’.\textsuperscript{15} The wedding is traditionally dated to Tuesday 1 May 1464, but in reality the date of the wedding – like the identity of the witnesses – is uncertain. In the fifteenth
century ‘1 May, or May Day, was already associated with romantic love.’\textsuperscript{16} Since we have no definite information as to what exactly took place or when, or who witnessed the marriage contract, in actual fact the details of the Woodville marriage are just as uncertain as those of the Talbot wedding.\textsuperscript{17} Indeed, had the Woodville marriage remained secret throughout
Edward IV’s lifetime, there is very little chance that later historians would have believed in it. As with the Talbot marriage, its authenticity would have been questioned.

However, there are two important differences between the Talbot and Woodville marriages. The first is that Elizabeth Woodville bore Edward IV many children, while Eleanor...
produced none. The second important difference is that – possibly because Elizabeth became pregnant (see below) – after a few months of silence, Edward IV gave the Woodville marriage his public recognition. Of course, if Edward had previously contracted a secret marriage with Eleanor, then his later Woodville ‘marriage’ was always a bigamous contract, with the result that his
children by Elizabeth Woodville were all illegitimate. It is clear, however, that at this stage Elizabeth Woodville had no notion that Edward might have contracted an earlier secret marriage with someone else. As we shall see, Elizabeth only found out about Eleanor some thirteen years later, in about 1477.

Precisely why Edward should initially have kept his
Woodville marriage a secret and then decided to publicly reveal and acknowledge it is yet another of the many mysteries in this complex case. Speculation regarding his motives for finally deciding to acknowledge the Woodville union has included witchcraft (Elizabeth Woodville’s mother was prosecuted on these grounds in 1469–70 – see below), or that Edward was eager to
avert the proposed marriage with Bona of Savoy (but surely he could simply have said ‘no’), or that Elizabeth Woodville may have been pregnant in September 1464 (but in that case she must subsequently have miscarried, since her first recorded child by the king was not born until February 1466). The mystery of what prompted the king to act as he did in September
1464 cannot now be resolved for certain. It is interesting, however, to note that, while Elizabeth was acknowledged as queen in September 1464, she was not crowned until May 1465 – eight months later. Maybe this delay was caused by the fact that the newly acknowledged queen was pregnant in autumn 1454, but that, in the end, her first pregnancy by Edward IV did not run to its full term, or the
child was stillborn.\textsuperscript{19} The story of the Woodville marriage very clearly shows that Edward IV’s marital conduct was consistent only in its irrationality and unpredictability. Apparently his behaviour in this respect owed absolutely nothing to any of the normal, politically correct considerations that underpinned royal marriage policy and its related
diplomacy. However, Edward’s strange conduct with Elizabeth Woodville makes the possibility of similar and equally strange conduct earlier, in the case of Eleanor Talbot, all the more probable. Edward IV may have been a consistent victim of his own libido.

Whatever Edward’s motivation, in September 1464, at the royal council held in Reading, he formally
recognised Elizabeth Woodville as his queen. His brother, George, Duke of Clarence, was then rapidly approaching his fifteenth birthday. The king’s announcement carried with it an implicit warning to George that his role as heir to the throne was approaching its end. What was George’s reaction to this, and how did he feel about the Woodville family?
Domenico Mancini, an Italian secret agent of the French government writing nineteen years after the event, reported:

Though Edward’s brothers, two of whom were then living, were both seriously concerned at the deed – nevertheless, the Duke of Clarence, the one born second after Edward, clearly showed his ill
humour, openly denouncing the obscurity of Elizabeth’s family, while proclaiming that the king’s marriage to a widow (when he should have married a virgin) was contrary to ancestral practice. But the other brother, Richard (who was then Duke of Gloucester, and who reigns now), both because he was more capable of disguising his
feelings, and also because he had less influence (being the younger), neither did anything nor said anything which could be held against him.\textsuperscript{20}

The facts behind Mancini’s sometimes colourful language appear to be that Richard said nothing against the Woodville marriage in 1464. George, on the other hand, openly displayed his displeasure. It is
true that there is no strictly contemporaneous evidence to back up Mancini’s slightly later account. Nevertheless, it is absolutely certain that, whatever he may have done when he first learned of Edward’s Woodville union, in the longer run, George, like much of the old aristocracy, deeply resented the new queen’s \textit{parvenu} family, and clearly displayed his resentment. Moreover,
whatever George felt about Elizabeth Woodville’s background in 1464, he can hardly have been unaware of her potential threat to his position as heir to the throne. Since her royal marriage had now been publicly acknowledged, and since no legal question had as yet been raised against it, as things stood in 1464, if Elizabeth produced children for Edward, logically these
would displace George in the order of succession.

The general reaction to the announcement of Edward’s Woodville marriage seems to have been widespread disapproval. In political terms, the marriage served no useful purpose – offending foreign royalty (in Castile and in France) and effectively throwing away Edward’s most valuable playing card, the English consort’s crown,
which could otherwise have been used (as indeed Warwick had been trying to use it) in foreign policy negotiations. The new queen’s numerous and ambitious but impoverished relatives were seen as another significant disadvantage. The fact that the queen was not a virgin was viewed askance, and from the first there were suspicions in some quarters that it was only by witchcraft...
that Elizabeth could have ensnared Edward. The initial secrecy of the marriage contract was also a cause for concern.

Later it became clear that significant members of the royal family were strongly opposed to the Woodville match. Edward’s cousin Warwick was against it from the start. As we have seen, Mancini later reported that George, Duke of Clarence
was of the same opinion as Warwick in 1464. Whether or not Mancini is correct, there is no doubt that by 1469 George and Warwick were as one on this point. While George may not have shared Warwick’s concern that in international politics the marriage announcement made him look a fool, nevertheless he must have seen his brother’s marriage as a threat to his own status. If he was
too young and inexperienced in 1464 to perceive this point for himself, then Warwick – or his own mother – probably enlightened him.

For George’s mother, Cecily, Duchess of York, was also opposed to the Woodville union. Mancini’s account, written nineteen years later, goes so far as to say that the furious Cecily ‘asserted that Edward was not the offspring of her
husband’. 21 No clear evidence of this, or of her opposition, survives from 1464–5. Nevertheless, ‘it is very likely that Duchess Cecily had a blazing row with her son … and it is difficult not to believe that her other children took their mother’s view of the king’s new wife’. 22

As Mancini later indicated, initially Richard Duke of
Gloucester probably took no stance against the union. After all, he was still not quite 12 years old when the marriage was announced: very young to express – or even have – an opinion. Later, Richard seems to have been close to Sir John, Lord Howard, and there is some evidence that, to begin with, Howard accepted the Woodville marriage. The draft of a letter from him to
the queen’s father, Lord Rivers, survives. It was written a week after the announcement of the marriage in Reading, and in the letter Howard reported that he had been sounding out opinions on the marriage in the eastern counties, ‘to feel how the people of the country were disposed; and in good faith they are disposed in the best wise and glad therof’.
It is perhaps not surprising that when landowners were directly questioned, face-to-face, as to their views of the new queen, they were inclined to express polite approval! However, Howard reported that there was one great estate in the eastern counties that was not well disposed to Elizabeth Woodville. He does not name the household in question, but it may well have been that of
Howard’s own cousin, the Duke of Norfolk, whose sister-in-law was Eleanor Talbot. Later, Howard himself was also to change his mind about the new queen. In fact, even on ‘New Year’s Day’ (1 January – see below) 1464/5, Howard’s gift to the new queen was not notably generous, and he seems to have received nothing from her in return. 24
Eight months after Elizabeth Woodville’s acknowledgement as queen, on 26 May 1465, George, now aged 15, once again held the title of Steward of England for her coronation. On this occasion, however, he fulfilled the role in person. The queen’s coronation was announced by Edward IV in a letter to the ‘Maire of oure Citie of London’ dated 14
April 1465\textsuperscript{25} It began with a procession, during which Elizabeth was greeted on London Bridge by persons representing St Elizabeth and St Paul in honour of her given name and the title of her mother’s family (St Pol). Thirty-eight noblemen had been created Knights of the Bath prior to the coronation, and they led the queen’s procession. It is not certain
whether Edward IV attended the ceremonies. No mention of his presence survives, but is it possible that, like Henry VII at the coronation of Elizabeth of York, Edward witnessed the actual coronation from a space in Westminster Abbey enclosed by tapestry for the occasion, to make it private and concealed.

Led by George, Duke of Clarence, the coronation
procession assembled in Westminster Hall:

the Duq of Clarance Stywarde of Englund ryding in the hall on horsebak his courso\r
rychely trapped hede & body to the grounde w\t Crapsiur rychely emboidered & garnyst w\t spangyls of golde.\textsuperscript{26}
Elizabeth Woodville processed into Westminster Abbey via the north door (the entrance closest to the Palace of Westminster), escorted by the bishops of Durham and Salisbury – the see of Bath and Wells being vacant at the time. 27

At a modern coronation of a queen consort of England, she is traditionally anointed with holy oil while kneeling.
Then, seated on her throne, she receives a ring, her crown, a gold sceptre in her right hand, and an ivory rod surmounted by a dove in her left hand. A similar procedure was observed at Elizabeth Woodville’s coronation, followed by the celebration of the mass. As usual at coronations, the church ceremonies ended with the abbey choir singing
Te Deum laudamus. In one surviving manuscript illustration, Elizabeth Woodville is depicted in coronation robes wearing a closed (arched) crown, possibly made especially for her, and holding a sceptre and orb. But the presence of the orb is, in this case, almost certainly incorrect for, unlike a king or a queen regnant, a queen
consort receives no orb at her coronation. In the surviving documentary evidence, Elizabeth is specifically reported to have received the sceptre of St Edward in her right hand, and another royal sceptre in her left hand. This second sceptre was ‘a rode septre of ivory w[ith] a dove of gilte’ (see above) which had been borne to the abbey in the pre-coronation procession by the Duke of
The coronation itself was followed by a banquet. Elizabeth Woodville had meanwhile changed into ‘a surcote of purpull’, and before eating she washed her hands while the Duke of Suffolk and the Earl of Essex held her sceptres, standing one on either side of her. The Duke of Clarence held the washbasin, while the Earl of

Suffolk.
Oxford poured water over the queen’s hands.\textsuperscript{32} When the food was served, the courses were led into the hall by the Duke of Clarence, the Earl of Arundel, the Duke of Norfolk and their attendants, on horseback. There were three courses, comprising respectively seventeen, nineteen and fifteen dishes.\textsuperscript{33} The ceremonies ended with a tournament the following
day. In Elizabeth’s case, this tournament probably lasted only one day (shorter than the usual three-day tournament for a medieval English queen’s coronation).

Earlier we looked briefly at evidence of John Howard’s relationship with Elizabeth Woodville, based on the evidence from his surviving household accounts. It is also interesting to explore what these accounts reveal about
Howard’s relationship with the Duke of Clarence in the 1460s. Howard was a loyal supporter of Edward IV and also had a close relationship with the king’s youngest brother, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, both in the 1460s and subsequently. Although Richard was not a major East Anglian landowner, he figures quite frequently in the Howard accounts. Curiously, however, George, Duke of
Clarence appears in the surviving accounts very rarely. It would be reasonable to deduce from this that John Howard was probably not especially close to Clarence. Possibly this fact was linked to Howard’s loyalty to Edward IV – and also to his friendship with the future Richard III.

In the year which witnessed Queen Elizabeth Woodville’s coronation, we
have already found some interesting evidence in John Howard’s list of ‘New Year’s Day’ gifts. The list also includes an indirect mention of the Duke of Clarence:

Item, the same day my master gaff to my lord Clarence man, viijs. iiii jd. [= 100d.]^34

However, it does not sound as though Howard sent a gift to
George himself. Later in the same year we also find an undated reference in the Howard accounts to the fact that George owed a little money to John Howard:

Item, my lord off Clarence owyth hym xx. 35

The only other reference to the Duke of Clarence in 1465 probably dates from about 11 November:
Item, to remember the vere of the Kenge and the xj day of November, Brame delyverde my gowene of my lord of Klarenses to my taylor in Fletestrete to kepe.  

Obviously this means that Howard had at some point received the green (?) livery of the Duke of Clarence.  

This may have been earlier in the year, in connection with
the queen’s coronation. However, it would seem that Howard was no longer wearing George’s livery, since he now deposited the garments in the keeping of his tailor.

Where was George socially and psychologically at the end of 1465? On the one hand, he had once again been given a prestigious public role to perform in connection with the new queen’s
coronation – and this time he had carried out the office himself. On the other, he was on the verge of being displaced as heir to the throne. The new queen may already have been pregnant by Edward IV once, as we have seen. And although in that case, she must have lost her first royal child, by the summer of 1465 another baby was already on its way.\textsuperscript{38} At
the same time, George had found himself to some extent pushed into the camp of his much older cousin, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick – who in turn was now slowly distancing himself from Edward IV. This was to have important repercussions for George’s future.

Not surprisingly, recent psychological research focused upon employment has shown that ‘job insecurity
[is] associated with decreased personal well-being and deterioration of work behavior and attitudes.’

Knowing that his elder brother’s wife was expecting a child must have placed George in just such a position of ‘job insecurity’ towards the end of 1465. In theory he had known, of course, that as heir presumptive to the throne he risked being replaced at
any time by the birth of an heir *apparent*, but when he was confronted with the actual situation his nose was probably put seriously out of joint. In the modern world, where a threatened demotion becomes a fact of life, this appears to lead more or less inevitably to a bruised ego on the part of the person who has been demoted. George’s ego suffered such a bruising on 11 February 1465/6, when his
niece, Elizabeth of York, was born. Nowadays such a bruised ego often expresses itself in angry words which tend to burn bridges, making it difficult for the downgraded employee ever to regain a sense of security, or to rebuild his or her relationship with colleagues in the same workplace. Modern industrial employees who experience demotion are therefore warned particularly
to ‘be careful of how you verbally respond to the news … [because] if you sound bitter or angry, it could make the situation worse’. Unfortunately, there was probably no one on hand in February 1465/6 to give such advice and warnings to George, Duke of Clarence.

NOTES
1. J. Ashdown-Hill, ‘The Elusive Mistress: Elizabeth Lucy and her Family’, *Ric.* 11 (June 1999), p.498. This article also gives details of the chronology of the relationship. Later, ‘Tudor’ rumours that Edward may have been married to Elizabeth Wayte – probably politically motivated –
appear to confirm that the couple’s relationship must date from the early period of Edward’s reign, and certainly prior to 1464.

2. Cecily Neville strongly opposed Edward’s later relationship with Elizabeth Woodville and may have disapproved of his relationship with Elizabeth Wayte. For
Cecily’s disapproval of Elizabeth Woodville see *ODNB*, M. Jones, ‘Elizabeth (née Woodville)’ (consulted March 2012). However, the story of her disapproval of the relationship with Elizabeth Lucy is later, and could be a ‘Tudor’ invention.

3. For example, in 1471, on Edward IV’s return from
exile, it was said that ‘the lies that he told were mere “noysynge”, necessary to fulfil his true intention, which was in itself validated … by his true claim to the throne.’ See P. Maddern, ‘Honour among the Pastons: Gender and Integrity in Fifteenth-Century English Provincial Society’, Journal of Medieval
4. Her sister, Elizabeth, Duchess of Norfolk, also appears to have experienced some difficulty in conceiving, and made several pilgrimages to Walsingham to this end. See J. Ashdown-Hill, ‘Norfolk Requiem: The Passing of the House of Mowbray’, Ric. 12
(March 2001), pp.198–217.


7. See chapter 8. In 1468 Warwick was forced by Edward IV to publicly escort Margaret of York on the first stage of her
wedding journey to the Low Countries, despite (or because of) Warwick’s known opposition to this alliance.


9. Evidence of the date of Edward’s marriage to Eleanor has been offered in the previous chapter.

11. B. J. Harris points out
that noblewomen ‘were at a particular disadvantage when they disagreed or quarrelled with their husbands’ (*English Aristocratic Women 1450–1550*, p.15). If the man in question was the king, the disadvantage would have been greater.

12. The college has three later copies of the portrait – some of which
show different hair colour – a sign perhaps of later influence. See http://www.quns.cam.ac.uk/Queens/Misc/Elizabeth.html

13. In about 1456, at the age of 20 or 21, she had married Sir John Grey (c. 1432–61), the eldest son and heir of Lord Ferrers of Groby. During the four or five years of their marriage, the fertile Elizabeth bore Sir John two sons, Thomas Grey
(later Marquess of Dorset), and Richard Grey. When she met Edward IV she was the dowager Lady Grey. Indeed, she was later to become known to those who disliked her as ‘the Grey Mare’. 


15. *Ibid*. Eborall himself
seems to have claimed, in the reign of Henry VII, to have been the priestly celebrant of the wedding.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid. Hicks states specifically that while the details of the story of Edward IV’s Woodville marriage may be believable, they cannot actually be confirmed, and some may be
fictional.  

18. Edward had no apparent difficulty in simply turning down Warwick’s proposed French alliance for his sister, Margaret of York.  

19. It has been claimed that the delay was ‘almost certainly due to the king’s wish to ensure that her uncle, St Pol, attended’ (A. Crawford, *The Yorkists*).
History of a Dynasty (London and New York: Hambledon, 2007), p.69). However, it was only in January 1464/5 (four months before the coronation) that Edward IV requested the Duke of Burgundy to arrange for Elizabeth’s uncles to attend (J. Laynesmith, The Last Medieval Queens: English Queenship 1445–1503
20. Mancini writes: *Fratres vero Eduardi, qui duo tunc vivebant, etsi graviter uterque eandem rem tulerunt; alter tamen, qui ab Eduardo secundo genitus erat et dux Clarentinorum, manifestius suum stomachum aperuit; dum in obscururn Helisabette acriter et palam*
inveheretur; dumque contra morem maiorem [sic] viduam a rege ductam predicaret, quem virginem uxorem ducere opportuisset. Alter vero frater, Riccardus qui nunc regnat tunc Closestriorum dux, tum quia ad dissimulandum aptior erat, tum quia minor natu, minus auctoritatis habebat nihil egit aut dixit quo

21. Mancini, p.61. See also chapter 9, below.


24. J. Ashdown-Hill, Richard III’s ‘Beloved Cousyn’, p.75ff. Although 1 January was called ‘New Year’s Day’, and gifts were exchanged on that occasion, the medieval English New Year actually began on 25 March.

25. G. Smith, ed., The Coronation of Elizabeth

Smith, The Coronation of Elizabeth Wydeville, 1975, p.7. Traditionally, the bishops of Durham and of Bath...
and Wells escorted English sovereigns to their coronations, but Edward IV was in the course of appointing Canon Robert Stillington to Bath and Wells, possibly as an encouragement to Stillington to keep his mouth shut in respect of Edward’s earlier Talbot marriage. See *Eleanor*, pp.113–14.


30. The Skinners’ Company, Guild Book of the London Skinners’ Fraternity of the Assumption of the Virgin
Mary, c. 1472.


34. *HHB 1*, p.482 – early evidence of decimalisation?


37. For the livery colour, see above.

38. Elizabeth Woodville conceived Elizabeth of York in about May 1465.

On 22 March 1466 Edward IV issued letters of instruction to his ambassadors to Burgundy. These included a project for ‘our dearest brother George Duke of
Clarence’ to marry Marie of Burgundy, the infant daughter and heiress of Charles, Count of Charolais, who in turn was heir to the dukedom of Burgundy. Marie was just 9 years old at the time, while George was fourteen and a half. French and Aragonese princes had already made bids for Marie’s hand, despite her youth. Had Edward’s project succeeded, George would ultimately have
become *jure uxoris* second-in-line for the Burgundian dukedom – or at least for those territories and titles of the honour of Burgundy that were exempt from the salic law.\(^1\) Presumably, such a marriage would have removed George from England, taking him back to the Low Countries and basing him at the court of Philip the Good or at that of the Count
of Charolais – or perhaps at a Low Countries court of his own. It was somewhat unusual for English kings to arrange marriages for close male relatives which would take a prince abroad in this way. However, as we have already seen, Edward IV’s ideas about royal marriage policy were very individual and owed little to precedent.

Of course, there is no surviving contemporary
evidence of how George had reacted at this stage to his brother’s recognition of the Woodville marriage, nor of how he took the birth of his niece, Elizabeth of York, and his own resulting removal from pre-eminence as heir to the throne. But, doubtless, Edward IV knew more of George’s reactions at the time than we do today. Perhaps, as Mancini later indicated, he had perceived that George
was jealous and angry. In the event, however, the Burgundian court proved much more interested in a possible marriage between Edward’s sister, Margaret, and the Count of Charolais. Thus the idea of a marriage between George and Marie was quietly dropped at this stage – although it resurfaced later, as we shall see in due course.

Significantly, however, the
possibility of George acquiring territory in the Low Countries was raised again the following year – albeit in a different context, and by completely different means. This suggests that, even as early as 1466, George aspired to completely independent status, either through an advantageous marriage or by acquiring territory in his own right. It is important to note, however, that his aspirations
were apparently not, at this point, focused upon the crown of England, but rather on creating a principality for himself on the mainland of Europe. In some ways, George’s outlook seems to have been more international than those of his surviving brothers – possibly as a result of his close relationship with his sister, Margaret, whose future probably lay somewhere on the European
mainland.

In July 1466, although he was not yet 17 years of age, George officially came of age. On Thursday 10 July 1466 he did homage to his brother, the king, for the lands he held, after which he formally embarked upon his career as an adult and independent member of the royal family. It is probable that George’s early coming of age was not unconnected with
the change in his official status, following the birth, five months earlier, of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville’s first living child.
Having gained his independence, George left at once for his castle of Tutbury in Staffordshire, which now became his principal residence. Probably he was already in close contact with his much older cousin, Richard Neville, Earl of
Warwick, who was increasingly unhappy with the policies of Edward IV. In the long run, the relationship between George and his cousin Richard Neville was highly significant for George. Unlike his younger brother, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, George never lived in Warwick’s household as his ward. Nevertheless, Warwick seems to have become something akin to a father
figure for him. They shared a dislike and distrust of the Woodville family and its influence on Edward IV. Moreover, Warwick appeared to want to promote George’s importance – which George must inevitably have found appealing.

Warwick was not only opposed to recognition of the king’s marriage with Elizabeth Woodville; he was also opposed to Edward’s
Burgundian marriage plans for Margaret of York. Warwick would have preferred to arrange a French royal marriage for Margaret – just as he had previously for Edward himself. In April–May 1467, he reached a tentative agreement with King Louis XI, under the terms of which the territory of Burgundy was to be divided, Holland, Zealand and Brabant going to George, Duke of
Clarence, Louis XI repossessing the remainder. Edward IV rejected this idea, but — not surprisingly, perhaps — his brother George welcomed it with delight. By the spring or early summer of 1467 at the latest, therefore, we find George siding with Warwick and at odds with his brother, the king. Evidence of George’s discontent at this time, and of his desire for a clear and independent status,
is to be found in the English land disputes in which he engaged — often unsuccessfully.

It was also at about this time that George began toying with the idea of a marriage with Warwick’s eldest daughter, Isabel. Indeed, the Burgundian chronicler Wavrin suggests that a marriage between George and Isabel had been proposed earlier, and angrily
rejected by Edward IV.\textsuperscript{2} In general, Wavrin is a useful source on the Duke of Clarence and on the Earl of Warwick, having met both more than once. In this instance, however, it seems possible that Wavrin (or his modern editor) has confused the chronology slightly. Wavrin appears to be referring to discussions between Warwick and the
king’s younger brothers which took place in 1467 (see below). But, whenever the marriage was first mooted, Wavrin is certainly right in saying that Edward IV opposed it. Warwick, on the other hand, viewed the prospect of a marriage between Isabel and George with great favour. According to Vergil’s later account:

therle of Warweke, being a
man of most sharpe wit and forecaste, conceaving before hand that George duke of Clarence was for some secrete, I cannot tell what cause, alyenatyd in mynde from his brother king Edward, made first unto him some murmure and complaint of the king, therby to prove him how he was affectyd; then after whan the duke dyd to him the lyke, explaining many
injuryes receavyd at his brothers hands, he was the more bold to enter into greater matters, and discoveryd to the duke his intent and purpose, praying him to joigne therein ... Finally, after many faire promises, he affyancyd unto the duke his daughter, which was then mareageable.³

Perhaps Vergil ‘cannot tell
what cause’ had alienated the Duke of Clarence from his elder brother, but we have already explored several possible explanations. These include the age difference between the two brothers; the details of George’s upbringing away from Edward, enjoying the misleading experience of being the most important member of his childhood household; his lack of
training; his sudden elevation followed by an equally sudden demotion; and his resulting resentment of the queen’s family.

Had he known of the dubious validity of his brother’s marriage with Elizabeth Woodville, George would of course have had even stronger reasons for feeling ‘alyenatyd’. In the end, George must have discovered this issue – but not
as early as 1467. We shall see, as we trace his story, that while George was always ambitious — although he always sought power and influence for himself — it was not until 1477 that he focused his attention on the aim of dethroning his brother, ousting the latter’s Woodville offspring from the succession and crowning himself as king of England. That fundamental change in his aim, together
with the desperate response to it which Edward IV – egged on by his panic-stricken queen – found himself forced to make, pinpoints very clearly at what late stage in George’s career he finally became aware of the question hanging over his brother’s marriage.

Meanwhile, the summer of 1467 saw the arrival in London of an important Burgundian delegation led by
Duke Philip’s bastard son, Antoine. The Burgundian envoys came to finalise the marriage negotiations for the union between Margaret of York and Charles, son and heir of Duke Philip the Good. At the same time, they were also to take part in an impressive tournament organised by the kindred of Elizabeth Woodville. Significantly, it was the queen’s brother, Anthony
Woodville Lord Scales, who was to represent England in this tournament and challenge his Burgundian namesake.

The Earl of Warwick – still anti-Burgundian and pro-French, and now clearly at odds with Edward IV’s foreign policy – either chose to absent himself in France, or was sent there by the king. He arrived in Rouen on 6 June 1467, where he was welcomed by King Louis XI.
Richard, Duke of Gloucester may not have been in London at the time of the Smithfield tournament. However, George, Duke of Clarence was undoubtedly there, because he performed a ceremonial role. Moreover, on Monday 8 June, his namesake, Warwick’s younger brother George Neville, Archbishop of York, who had been serving the
king as his chancellor, was taken by surprise when he found Edward IV arriving unannounced on his doorstep to demand the surrender of the great seal. With the king on this mission came various lords, including the Duke of Clarence. The latter’s presence may have been at the behest of the king, who perhaps had a particular motive for wanting George to
witness this action. The fact that Warwick’s brother had now been dismissed from office made public the rift between the king and his Neville cousins.
Richard Neville and Anne Beauchamp, Earl and Countess of Warwick (after the Rous Roll), together with the earl’s signature.

On Monday 15 June 1467 the situation in Burgundy suddenly changed, with the death of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. He was succeeded by his son, the
Count of Charolais, who now became Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy. When this news reached the English court, the Burgundian delegation made hasty preparations to return to their homeland. They were escorted on their journey by Sir John Howard. It was on 24 June (Feast of the Nativity of St John the Baptist) that Antoine, Bastard of Burgundy, embarked from
On the very same day the Earl of Warwick, returning from France, landed at Sandwich, where he learnt that his brother the Archbishop of York had been dismissed from the chancellorship. Warwick returned to London, accompanied by French ambassadors, including the bastard of Bourbon, the
Bishop of Bayeux and Master Jehan de Poupincourt. These men came with proposals for a French alliance. However, once again this achieved nothing. Indeed, no member of Edward IV’s court even came to greet Warwick, with the single exception of the Duke of Clarence. When Warwick finally managed to see the king, the latter showed little interest in his
trip to France. Nevertheless, the French ambassadors were received at Westminster. The Duke of Clarence, accompanied by Lord Hastings, was sent to greet them: ‘When the Earl of Warwick caught sight of the Duke of Clarence he greeted him very warmly, as he wanted to speak to him. The said duke received the ambassadors most honourably, as he very well
knew how to do.’

When plague broke out in London, the wise left for the countryside. Edward IV departed to Windsor, while Warwick, accompanied by both of the king’s younger brothers, apparently set off on a visit to the eastern counties. His party’s prime geographical objective was Cambridge, but Warwick’s personal objective on this trip
was to woo George, Duke of Clarence and to form a close alliance with him. Wavrin records a conversation which took place in the summer of 1467 between Warwick and his cousin George, though he makes no mention of where it occurred.

The talk reportedly began with Warwick’s complaint about how little attention the king had paid to the French ambassadors. When George
explained that he was not to blame for the king’s behaviour, Warwick replied that he was already well aware of that. The conversation then turned to the government that now surrounded the king, and the predominance of the queen’s father and siblings. George, who by this time clearly disliked the government situation, asked his cousin what could be done about it,
whereupon Warwick suggested that the solution was for the Duke of Clarence to take over the government. The Earl also presented to the Duke his elder daughter, Isabel, and offered her hand to him in marriage. Afterwards Warwick conveyed news of his new agreement with the Duke of Clarence to the French ambassadors, who subsequently took leave of
the king (now back from Windsor) and set off on their return to France. 10

What was the real basis of the growing relationship between the Earl of Warwick and the Duke of Clarence? On one level the two men had aims, and opinions concerning the politics of Edward IV, in common. Yet their relationship went deeper than that. Did Warwick
simply see Clarence as a useful tool? Did Clarence merely see Warwick as a means of establishing his own importance? Again, these were real aspects of their relationship, yet there was something more. Perhaps Clarence, who had lost his father at a difficult age, and who had never afterwards had an official guardian, perceived Warwick as a kind of father figure, while
Warwick, who had no son, was happy to take on a surrogate father role in relation to his young cousin. At all events, the two men do seem to have found that they liked each other.

As for the Duke of Gloucester, Wavrin does not refer to him as taking any part in the exchange between Warwick and Clarence, and it is not clear whether he was actually present during the
discussion. For Gloucester, however, the trip to Cambridge appears to have been merely the start of a more extended eastern counties excursion, prolonged at the invitation of Sir John Howard. While Warwick was cultivating Clarence, Howard seems to have had his eye set on the younger prince as a future ally.  

Howard had been in
London on Thursday 11 June, officiating at the Smithfield Tournament, but a week later he had left for Dover and then Calais, accompanying the Burgundian envoys on the first stages of their journey home. It may have been to do the honours during this return journey that Howard had occasion to borrow some trumpeters from the Duke of Clarence. Howard arrived back in England on Sunday
28 June, but since the plague had by then erupted in London, he wisely avoided the capital. Soon after his return, on Thursday 2 July 1467, ‘my mastyr [Sir John Howard] gaffe to my lord of Clarense trumpetes, xxs.’

And three weeks later, Howard, who had obviously made his own way back to the eastern counties by that time, received Richard, Duke
of Gloucester in Colchester. This visit took place on 21 July in a year which is not specified in the surviving record. However, as the present writer has previously shown, it can only have taken place on Tuesday 21 July 1467.\textsuperscript{13} This conclusion is confirmed by evidence from the surviving manuscript which contains the draft of John Howard’s letter,
recording Richard’s visit: ‘The folio which bears the original of the letter on its recto, has on its verso material dated 1466, 1467 and 1468. This strongly suggests that the letter must be assigned to one of those three years.’

Richard was alone when he came to Colchester. His brother George and their cousin Warwick had
presumably departed elsewhere, for they did not accompany him. After visiting Colchester, Richard travelled on with Howard via his manor at Stoke-by-Nayland, to Sudbury, home of the miracle-working shrine of Our Lady of Sudbury, of which Howard was a patron. From Sudbury they continued to Lavenham, where they hunted with the Earl of Oxford. Then they proceeded
to Bury St Edmunds and Ipswich.

Subsequently, however, when everyone had decided that it was safe to return to London, both George and Richard found themselves summoned into the presence of their furious elder brother, the king, to account to him for the conversation which had reportedly taken place while they had been in Cambridge. Edward IV was
livid when he heard that Warwick had offered George his daughter’s hand in marriage. It is not clear whether Edward also had any knowledge of other aspects of the discussion, but at all events he is said to have briefly arrested both his younger brothers for apparently conniving with Warwick’s plans. The effect of the king’s rage on the
undersized but jealous George was in the end to prove quite considerable – though its final outcome was perhaps not quite what Edward IV had intended.

In a meeting with his brother, the Archbishop of York, Warwick reportedly planned an uprising in the north of England, to be led by ‘Robin of Redesdale’. Warwick and the Duke of Clarence then embarked
secretly for Calais. From Calais, Warwick proceeded into France, where he was splendidly received by Louis XI. There is no report that George accompanied him into France. Such a visit to the French court by the brother of the English king could hardly have escaped the notice of contemporary observers, who had taken full note of the rapprochement between the
duke and the earl, and of its implications. By 14 February 1467/8, for example, an envoy from Milan was reporting that ‘the Earl of Warwick has drawn a brother of the king against the king himself. They have not yet come to open hostilities, but are treating for an accommodation’. 17 Meanwhile, Warwick, well aware that no marriage could
legally take place between Isabel and George without a papal dispensation, owing to their close blood relationship, was already seeking such a dispensation. This was not an easy task, since the marriage lacked the support of the king, and therefore also the support of his officials in Rome.

At some point towards the end of 1467 or early in 1468, both Clarence and Warwick
must have returned to England. Warwick had been reconciled with Edward IV by January 1467/8, for in that month he attended a royal council meeting in Coventry.\textsuperscript{18} But while cultivating his friendship and relationship with George, Duke of Clarence, and also seeking to reassure Edward IV, the Earl of Warwick was busy emphasising his hatred
of the queen and her Woodville family: ‘Early in 1468, the Rivers estates were plundered by Warwick’s partisans.’

Both the Earl of Warwick and the Duke of Clarence were not only in England, but back at court, in the summer of 1468. In June of that year, the marriage of Margaret of York to Charles the Bold, the new Duke of Burgundy,
finally took place. Interestingly, it was the Earl of Warwick who escorted Margaret on the first stage of her wedding journey, from the Palace of the Royal Wardrobe, through the streets of London. Given his known opposition to the marriage, this is very enlightening. It suggests that Warwick was compelled by the king to conduct himself in this way, in an outward display of
public approval. Retrospectively, it also suggests that Warwick’s (and Clarence’s) earlier public roles in respect of Elizabeth Woodville’s acceptance as queen had probably been performed under compulsion – as the king’s way of forcing them to publicly accept something which he knew they privately opposed.

George, Duke of Clarence subsequently accompanied
his sister and other members of the royal family on the next stage of Margaret’s wedding journey, from London into Kent. But neither he nor his brothers left England. Once again, it was the queen’s brother, Anthony, Lord Scales, who performed the key role, of accompanying Margaret across the sea, and presenting her to her new husband.

While the wedding party —
which included Elizabeth Talbot, Duchess of Norfolk and her brother, Sir Humphrey Talbot – was in the Low Countries, an important event took place very quietly in Norfolk. There Eleanor Talbot died in June 1468. Superficially, perhaps, her death made things easier for the king, who must have greeted this news with a sense of relief. Once the Duchess of Norfolk returned to England
in July, and Eleanor was safely buried in the choir of the Norwich Carmel, Edward probably thought he was now safe on the matrimonial front. Meanwhile, his government took quiet but firm action during the inquests into Eleanor’s land holdings which inevitably followed her demise, to conceal the fact that in the early stages of their relationship, Edward IV had apparently granted
Eleanor royal estates.

NOTES

1. The term ‘salic law’ really means the early medieval Frankish law code as a whole. However, in English (as here) this term is often used to refer to a single
item of the code: the rule of patrilineality, or agnatic succession.

2. Wavrin, pp. 458–9. The date of 1464 in the margin of the published edition is the date assigned by the editor, not Wavrin’s own date. Nevertheless, it does seem that Wavrin has confused the dates of events slightly at this point.
3. Ellis, *Polydore Vergil’s English History*, p.120.


7. *Ibid*.

8. Wavrin writes: *Quant le comte de Warewic vey le duc de Clarence il lui fist tres grant chiere car*
il desiroit de parler a luy. Lequel duc recheut les ambaxadeurs moult honnourablement comme bien le scavoit faire (Wavrin, pp.544–5).


11. Howard’s initial interest in Richard may have been inspired by Edward IV’s temporary grant to Richard of de Vere
estates. Elizabeth Howard, dowager Countess of Oxford was Howard’s cousin, and he seems to have been closely involved in her business interests [MB].

12. _HHB_ I, p.409.


17. CSPM, p.122.
18. ODNB, ‘Neville, Richard, 16th Earl of Warwick’.
Edward IV’s bigamy was not the only matrimonial problem which was (in a sense) resolved at about this time. On Tuesday 14 March 1468/9, the essential papal dispensation allowing George, Duke of Clarence to marry Isabel Neville was
finally granted in Rome, thanks to the assistance of the king’s proctor at the papal curia, Dr James Goldwell – a man whom we shall meet again later. The document delivered George and Isabel from their relationships in the second and third and in the third and fourth degrees, and also from the fact that the Duchess of York was Isabel’s godmother:
Dispensatio Pauli PP iii [sic for ii] de matrimonio contrahendo inter nobilem virum Georgium Ducem Clarencie & Isabellam filiam nobilis viri Ricardi Nevill Comites Warwici, licet ipse Georgius & Isabella secundo & tertio & tertio & quarto consanguinitatis gradibus coniuncti sunt, Ac etiam licet mater ipsius Georgij eundem Isabellam de sacro
fonte levavit. Datum Rome apud sanctam Petrum pridie Idus Martij Anno 1468 7o Edwardi 4ti.²

In April 1469 the Earl of Warwick requested Edward IV’s leave to reside in Calais, and campaign against the Channel pirates. The king consented, and initially the outcome appeared positive, for Warwick conducted a vigorous campaign against
the pirates. But, as Polydore Vergil (with the benefit of hindsight) was later to explain:

...to thintent that this so huge sedition, wherewith England was tossyd and tormoylyd many yeres after might once at the last have a beginning, he requyryd his tharchebysshop of York and the marquyse, to
procure some uprore to be made in Yorkshire, anone after his departure, so that cyvill warre might be commenced the while he was farre absent. These things thus determyned and his devyses approvyd, therle transportyd with the duke unto Calyce; and here, after the duke had sworne never to breake the promyse which he had made, therle placyd unto
him in maryage his eldest daughter, Isabel, betrouthyd to the duke as is before sayd; which busynes dispatchyd, they began both two to delyberate more depely, and to conferre betwixt them selves of the maner and meanes howe to deale in this warre.
Once he was established in Calais, the earl also requested safe conduct so that he might visit his neighbours, Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, and his new wife, Margaret of York. Since Warwick had previously been a great opponent of the Burgundian
alliance, Edward IV was delighted. The meeting between Warwick and Charles the Bold took place at St Omer, and Charles also seemed inclined to believe that Warwick had turned over a new leaf. Jehan de Wavrin, who was present, tells us that Warwick was:

warmly received and greeted by the duke and by the lords attending on him,
who went before him and conducted him to his place of residence. Then he came before the duke, who was staying at the Abbey of St Bertin, where the duke greeted him heartily. And two days later he went to Aire[-sur–la-Lys] to see his cousin, the duchess, who received him sweetly – for no one would ever have guessed what he was up
Of course, Edward IV had overlooked one important fact. The Earl of Warwick had long been the Captain of Calais, with the result that he was able to use the town as a most effective power base.

Meanwhile, in the wake of Warwick’s plans, as reported by Vergil, ‘to procure soome upprore to be made in Yorkshyre’, back in England
in April 1469 ‘Robin of Redesdale’ raised a rebellion against Edward IV in the north. This rebellion – which, as we have seen, was said by Vergil to have been planned by Warwick the previous year – was initially defeated by Warwick’s brother, John Neville, Earl of Northumberland, and as a result the first ‘Robin of Redesdale’ was killed.
However, a second ‘Robin’ took over his mantle,\textsuperscript{6} and the trouble continued. The specific demands of the rebels included the removal of the Woodville family from power. From this we can see clearly where Warwick and Clarence’s aims were focused at this time, and their subsequent actions bear this out. They had probably not addressed all possible
contingencies in their minds, but their main objective was to oust the Woodville family from power so that Warwick and his son-in-law-to-be, the Duke of Clarence, could dominate Edward IV’s government. There was no immediate plan to remove the king himself – though possibly they had not determined their course of action if Edward proved unwilling to abandon the
Woodvilles.

Although George, Duke of Clarence seems not to have accompanied the Earl of Warwick on his visit to the Duke and Duchess of Burgundy, George had certainly sailed to Calais with his cousin and the latter’s family, just as Vergil later related. Indeed, for the next two years, approximately, George was a more or less inseparable part of Warwick’s
family. Following Warwick’s return from the Burgundian court (accompanied by the chronicler Jehan de Wavrin), arrangements rapidly went ahead for the marriage of George and Isabel. Their wedding took place on Tuesday 11 July 1469. Wavrin had left Calais five or six days earlier, so he was not present at the ceremony, but he tells us that ‘there were not many people, so the
festivities only lasted two days – for he was married on a Tuesday and on the following Sunday he crossed the sea, since he had received news that the Welsh were in the field in great numbers.’

Almost immediately after George’s marriage to Isabel, he and Warwick issued their own manifesto against the Woodville family, criticising their ‘disceyvabille covetous
The bridegroom then accompanied his new father-in-law across the Channel from Calais to Sandwich. Having landed, they rode first to Canterbury, where, with some success, they mustered the men of Kent to their support. On about Tuesday 18 July they left Canterbury and continued to London, ‘where they waited for their men and sometimes got news of the
progress of the northerners’. They subsequently rode on towards Coventry. On Wednesday 26 July 1469 both Clarence and Warwick were present at the Battle of Edgecote:
George and Isabel, Duke and Duchess of Clarence (after the Rous Roll) together with George’s signature as Duke of Clarence. Note Isabel’s elongated face. The object above the helmet in the centre is George’s gorget badge, which he probably chose because ‘gorget’ sounds like a play on the name
The erle of Warweke ... sent with owt lingering unto the duke of Clarence, who was hard by with an army, that he wold bring his forces unto him, signyfying withal that the day of battayle was at hand. Uppon this message the duke reparyd furthwith to the earle, and so they
both having joygnyd ther forces marchyd to a village caulyd Banbery, wher they understooode ther enemyes to be encampyd. Ther was a feyld fowghte,¹¹ Therle of Pembrowghe was taken, all his army slane and discomfytyd. Emongest this number was killed Rycherd earl Ryvers, father to Elyzabeth the queen, and his soone John Vedevill.¹²
Meanwhile, an anxious Edward IV had been seeking advice as to whether he should himself take up arms against the rebels. Strangely, Lord Hastings, Lord Mountjoy, Sir Thomas Montgomery and others reportedly advised the king to do nothing. Possibly the clear focus of the rebellion upon the removal of the Woodville family from
power, rather than the removal of Edward IV, was an aim which these lords felt they could live with. It is also reported that the king himself could not believe that his brother, George, and his cousin, the Earl of Warwick, were out to ruin him.\textsuperscript{14}

Nevertheless, some foreign observers were voicing suspicions (possibly hopeful suspicions on their part) that
Warwick planned to dethrone Edward IV by declaring him illegitimate, thereby transferring the crown to Warwick’s own new son-in-law, the Duke of Clarence. In chapter 7 (above) it was noted that in 1483 Mancini reported that the Duchess of York had herself declared that Edward IV was a bastard. According to Mancini, this outburst had occurred in
1464, at the time of Edward’s acknowledgement of his Woodville marriage. There is no English source confirming such remarkable behaviour on the part of the king’s mother – a lady whom Mancini himself probably never met. Indeed, much later, on her deathbed, Cecily explicitly contradicted the story. However, an allegation of illegitimacy was undoubtedly
one of the weapons which was being used against Edward IV in France: ‘A strong rumour circulating in the courts of Burgundy and France in the second half of Edward’s reign had it that Cecily’s liaison was with an archer named Blaybourne.’  

In 1469, of course, both Warwick and Clarence had recently returned to England from the Continent, so they
may well have been aware of this story. Certainly Edward IV later accused George of using the allegation of bastardy against him, and this was one of the factors that eventually contributed to George’s downfall.

Meanwhile, the lawless situation prevailing in England allowed disturbances to spread. The Duke of Norfolk, who had less income than he needed, and who
coveted Caister Castle, decided this might be a good moment to use force to remove the Paston family, who were then residing in the castle. In August 1469 Norfolk besieged Caister with a large force said to number 3,000 (though this may be an exaggeration). The Paston defenders of the castle reportedly comprised a mere twenty-seven men. The ensuing private battle loomed
much larger in John Mowbray’s mind than the wider conflict going on elsewhere in England, in which Edward IV was confronting the Duke of Clarence and the Earl of Warwick. During the next two months Norfolk was solely occupied with taking Caister Castle. He took no part in the larger battle for power – though it is interesting to note that, while
he seems to have been in close contact with the Duke of Clarence and with Archbishop Neville, we hear nothing in August or September 1469 of any communication between Norfolk and the king. Evidently, in John Mowbray’s eyes the real power now lay in the hands of Warwick and Clarence.

Caister Castle had originally been built by Sir
John Fastolf, who had died there in November 1459. After his death, the castle – together with other Fastolf property, including Drayton Lodge, just outside Norwich, and Fastolf’s Place in Southwark, where George, Richard and Margaret had stayed with their mother, the Duchess of York, in 1460 – was inherited by Fastolf’s close friend, John Paston I (1421–66). But this came
about as the result of a deathbed alteration to Fastolf’s will in Paston’s favour – an alteration which gave rise to subsequent disputes. As a result, John Paston spent much of the rest of his life trying to make good his claim to the inheritance. The expensive legal fees nearly ruined the Paston family, and John I found himself imprisoned in the Fleet gaol on three
occasions. While John was in London, his wife Margaret had to assume responsibility for the family’s affairs in Norfolk. Her regular letters to her husband kept him up to date with what was going on, and fortunately their correspondence has been preserved. Meanwhile, despite the fact that she actually preferred the family’s house at Oxnead, Margaret Paston took up
residence at Caister Castle.

The Paston ownership of Drayton Lodge was contested by the Duke of Suffolk, brother-in-law of the king and his brothers. Four years previously, on Tuesday 15 October 1465, some 500 of Suffolk’s men had attacked the lodge and the following day, having captured the house, they had sacked and burned it. In the summer of 1469 arrangements were
made by John Paston III to show the ruins to Edward IV and Richard, Duke of Gloucester. The king and his brother did indeed view the burnt-out remains on Wednesday 21 June 1469, as they passed through Drayton, riding from Norwich on a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham. However, if the Pastons had hoped for sympathy and recompense, Edward IV’s
response to what he saw must have disappointed them. 18

When the Duke of Norfolk subsequently laid siege to Caister Castle, he appears to have sought the support of his cousin, the Duke of Clarence. George and his father-in-law were now the new power in the kingdom. Edward IV had not been deposed, he was still king in name, but since August he had effectively
been their prisoner. On Sunday 10 September 1469 Sir John Paston II wrote to Walter Writtle, one of the Duke of Clarence’s men, about plans for a meeting between Writtle’s master and (probably) the Duke of Norfolk. Writtle himself seems to have been present at that time at the siege at Caister, and presumably he was there as the
representative of the Duke of Clarence. Two days later, on Tuesday 12 September 1469, Margaret Paston reported to her son, Sir John Paston II, that ‘the Duke [of Norfolk] hath be more fervently set her-upon, and more cruell, sith þat Wrettyll, my lord of Claraunce man was ther than he was before.’ She therefore urged her son to ‘desire writing from my lord of Clarens, if he be at
London’. Presumably she was hoping that a letter from Clarence would urge his cousin Norfolk to desist, or show mercy. Margaret, like the Duke of Norfolk, clearly believed that the real power now lay in the hands of George, rather than in the hands of his brother, the prisoner-king.

Margaret Paston’s plan produced no immediate result
because on Friday 15 September 1469 her son wrote back to tell her that Clarence was not in London. At the same time he mentioned that King Edward IV was currently in York. In fact, had they but known it, this was the first sign of Edward’s reassertion of his authority. Meanwhile, however, there was no hope left for the vastly
outnumbered Paston defenders of Caister Castle, and they were forced to surrender.

Margaret Paston’s request does, nevertheless, seem ultimately to have been forwarded to the Duke of Clarence by some means or other, and to have received the desired response. On Tuesday 26 September 1469 a safe conduct allowing the surviving Paston defenders to
depart the castle unmolested was issued by the Duke of Norfolk. Norfolk informed his opponents that he had granted them this safe conduct at the urging of ‘the right noble prince my lord of Clarence, and other lordes of oure blood’.  

One thing which might have tended to encourage the Duke and Duchess of Norfolk to view Clarence and
Warwick as potential friends – and caused Edward IV to doubt their good faith – may well have been the execution of Earl Rivers, father of Elizabeth Woodville, by the Earl of Warwick at Kenilworth on 12 August 1469. As the sister of Eleanor Talbot, the Duchess of Norfolk had no reason to view the Woodville family favourably. As for her husband – whose battle for
Caister was part of a desperate attempt to improve his precarious financial situation – Norfolk must have been delighted to learn that, together with the Queen’s father, her much younger brother, John Woodville, had also been beheaded. Despite his relative youth, John had been the Duke of Norfolk’s step-grandfather! An extraordinary arranged marriage had united him to
the Duke’s grandmother, Catherine Neville, sister of the Duchess of York, and the senior dowager Duchess of Norfolk.

Two Woodville executions may have seemed like a good start to the process of cleaning up the administration, but by September 1469 the queen’s mother, Jacquette, Duchess of Bedford and Countess Rivers, was also in trouble. Thanks to
Warwick and Clarence’s execution of her second husband, Jacquette was now a widow for the second time, but Thomas Wake, one of the Earl of Warwick’s followers, aimed to ruin her completely. He came to Warwick with a damning piece of evidence against her: an ‘image of lede made lyke a man of armes, conteynyng the lengthe of a mannes fynger, and broken in the myddes, and made fast
with a wyre'.  

The use of small human figurines for the casting of spells has a very ancient history. Often such figurines were made of wax, but in fifteenth-century England the surviving evidence suggests that lead was frequently employed for this purpose. Such figurines were supposed to represent the objects of the magic
spells. They could be used to inflict harm – as had been alleged some years earlier, in the case of Jacquette’s sister-in-law, Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester – or they could be employed to influence behaviour. One common application was to entangle the spell-victims in love. Allegations had already been whispered that it was only by the use of such magic that Elizabeth Woodville
could have ensnared Edward IV.

However, the figurine which Thomas Wake had obtained was obviously not for love magic. It was intended to inflict injury, since it had been broken in the middle, and also ensnared in wire. The surviving records do not state specifically whom this figurine was intended to represent, but the assumption seems to have
been that its target was the Earl of Warwick. In addition to producing the lead figurine, Wake also cited John Daunger, a parish clerk from Northamptonshire, who, he said, would testify that the Duchess of Bedford had also made images both of the king and of her daughter, the queen. This was clearly intended to prove that Edward IV had been entrapped into his secret
Woodville union by sorcery. For the first time we see that both Warwick and Clarence now wished to undermine Edward IV’s marriage to Elizabeth. Therefore, had either of them possessed evidence of Edward IV’s prior Talbot marriage, they would have undoubtedly have produced it at this stage. The fact that neither of them did so clearly indicates that in 1469 they were unaware of it.
Unfortunately, owing to the ultimate failure of Warwick’s schemes against Edward IV, the only surviving accounts of the case against Jacquette date from the period after the king had freed himself and re-established his authority. Indeed, they relate to Jacquette’s petition to the king for the case against her to be quashed. Not surprisingly, given the
changed circumstances, her petition was successful and she was cleared of all charges. As a judgement, of course, this is meaningless. The king was hardly likely to support the view that his mother-in-law had seduced him into a dubious marriage with her daughter by witchcraft. At the same time, Warwick and Clarence had also been partial when the case was first brought. They
had then only recently made Jacquette a widow, and they were clearly her enemies. Moreover, as we have seen, the allegation of sorcery against her offered them a wonderful opportunity to undermine Elizabeth Woodville’s marriage with Edward IV.

It is probably impossible now to achieve an accurate evaluation of the case against Jacquette — though we shall
review the surviving evidence in a moment. Despite her (unsurprising) vindication by the now re-established Edward IV, we cannot simply assume that the case against Jacquette was invented. Suspicions that sorcery lay behind Elizabeth Woodville’s marriage contract with Edward IV had been whispered since 1464, and they resurfaced in 1483, as part of the official
fifteenth-century evidence against the marriage.

In fifteenth-century England, witchcraft and sorcery were by no means uncommon. The most widespread use of the occult was for benign purposes, such as divination (finding lost objects, etc.) or to obtain cures or procure other propitious circumstances or events (e.g. to influence the weather). In higher circles
there was much casting of horoscopes, together with patronage of alchemic experiments and other types of natural magic. Love spells were not necessarily a negative activity, and did not always involve black magic. Until the fifteenth century the Church often took quite a tolerant view. However, some kinds of love magic were condemned by ecclesiastical authorities as early as the
eleventh century, and by the early sixteenth the increasing use of love spells involving the desecration of sacred objects, and the use of menstrual blood, led to a change in ecclesiastical attitudes. The fifteenth century also seems to have witnessed a growth in the practice of sorcery using figurines as a means of bringing down enemies – or,
at least, a growth in accusations of the use of such techniques. When the aims of magic were criminal, or if satanic forces were believed to have been summoned, the attitudes of both church and state were more severe. In particular, the unsanctioned use of the occult in any of its forms (including the casting of horoscopes) in relation to the king was extremely perilous and could result in a
charge of treason. Jacquette’s sister-in-law, Eleanor, Duchess of Gloucester, had been condemned on such evidence some years earlier, and associates of George, Duke of Clarence were to be similarly condemned not long after the case against Jacquette foundered.

It was very soon after the allegation of sorcery was made against Jacquette that
the state of affairs in the kingdom changed in Edward IV's favour. In October 1469, Sir John Paston II wrote to his mother telling her that the king, the Duke of Gloucester and their supporters had returned to London, and had ridden through Cheap. At the same time he reported that Clarence, Warwick, Oxford and Archbishop Neville of York were seeking to reassure the king that they
were his friends – but that the men of the king’s household seemed to think otherwise. Nevertheless, at this time the king still seemed bent on reconciliation with his former enemies.

However, Edward IV’s conciliatory approach did not extend to accepting their case against his mother-in-law. Jacquette petitioned the king for his help, and on 19
January 1469/70 she was formally exonerated. As part of the proceedings initiated by the king, the key witnesses against Jacquette withdrew their testimony. In the new political climate they probably had little option. The final official verdict was communicated to the Lord Chancellor – none other than Bishop Robert Stillington. Since various modern speculations have been
published about this case, it is important to look at the surviving contemporary sources, particularly the report sent by Edward IV to Stillington:

Edward by the grace of God, kyng of Englond and of Fraunce, and lord of Irland, to the reverent fader in God Robert byshope of Bathe and Wells, oure chaunceller, greting.
Forasmoche as we send unto you within these oure lettres the tenure of an acte of oure grete counsail, amonge othir things, remaynyng in thoffice of oure prive seal, in fourme as folowith: In the chambre of the grete counsaill, callid the parliment-chambre, within the kyngs paleis att Westminster, the x. day of Februarie, the ixth yere of the regne of
oure soveraygne lord the kyng Edward the IIIth, in the presence of the same oure soveraigne lord, and my lordis of his grete counsail, whos names ben under writen, a supplicacion addressed unto oure said soveraygne lord, on the behalf of the high and noble princesse Jaquet duchesse of Bedford, and two sedules in papier annexed unto the
same supplicacion, were openly, by oure saide soveraygne lordis commaundement, radde; and afterward his highnes, by thavis of my said lordis of his grete counsaill, acceptyng eftsones the declaracion of my said lady specified in the said supplicacion, accordyng to the peticion of my said lady, commaunded the same to be enacted of
record, and therupon lettres of exemplification to be made under his grete seal in due fourme; the tenure of the supplicacion and cedules, wherof above is made mention, hereafter ensue in this wyse.

To the kyng oure soveraygne lord; shewith and lamentably complaineth unto your highnes your humble and true liegewoman Jaquet
duchesse of Bedford, late the wyf of your true and faithfull knyght and liegeman Richard late erle of Ryvers, that where shee at all tyme hath, and yit doth, treuly beleve on God accordyng to the feith of Holy Chirche, as a true cristen woman owith to doo, yet Thomas Wake squier, contrarie to the lawe of God, lawe of this land, and all reason and
good consciens, in the tyme of the late trouble and riotous season, of his malicious disposition towards your said oratrice of long tyme continued, entendyng not oonly to hurt and apaire her good name and fame, but also purposed the fynall distruction of her persone, and to that effecte caused her to be brought in a comune noyse and
disclaundre of wychecraft thorouout a grete part of this youre reaume, surmytting that she shuld have usid wichecraft and sorcerie, insomuch that the said Wake caused to be brought to Warrewyk atte your last beyng there, soveraigne lord, to dyvers of the lords thenne beyng ther present, a image of lede made lyke a man of armes, conteynynge the
lengthe of a mannes fynger, and broken in the myddes, and made fast with a wyre, sayyng that it was made by your said oratrice to use with the said wichcraft and sorsory, where she, ne noon for her ne be her, ever sawe it, God knowith. And over this, the said Wake, for the perfourmyng of his malicious entent abovesaid, entreted oon John Daunger,
parishe clerk of Stoke Brewerne, in the counte of Northampton, to have said that there were two other images made by your said oratrice, oon for you, soveraygne lord, and anothir for oure soveraigne lady the quene, wherunto the said John Daunger neyther coude ne wolde be entreted to say. Wheruppon it lykid your highnesse, of your noble grace, atte
humble sute made unto your highnesse by your said oratrice, for her declaracion in the premisses, to send for the said Wake and the said John Daunger, commaundyng them to attende upon the reverent fadir in God the bishop of Carlisle, the honorable lord therle of Northumberland, and the worshipfull lords lord Hastynge and
Mountjoye, and mayster Roger Radclyff, to be examined by them of such as they coude allege and say anenst your said oratrice in this behalf; thaxaminacions afore them had apperith in wrytinge herunto annexed; wherof oon bill is conteyning the sayings of Wake, and writte with his owne hand; and anothir shewyng the saiyngs of the said
Daunger, and wrete in the presence of the said lords; which seen by your highnesse, and many othir lords in this your grete councell, the xx day of January last passed, then beyng there present, your said oratrice was by your grace and theime takyn clerid and declared of the said noises and disclaundres, which as yet remaygneth not enacted;
forsomuch as divers your lords were then absent. Wherfor please it your highnesse, of your most habundant grace and grete rightwisnesse, tenderly to consider the premisses, and the declaracion of your said oratrice had in this behalf, as is afore shewid, to commaunde the same to be enacted in this youre said grete counsaill, so as the same her declaration
may allway remaigne there of record, and that she may have it exemplified undir your grete seall: And she shall continually pray to God for the preservacion of your most royal estate.

Thomas Wakes bille. Sir, this ymage was shewed and left in Stoke\textsuperscript{28} with an honest persone, which delyverid it to the clerk of the said chirche, and so
shewid to dyvers neighbours, aftir to the parson in the chirche openly to men both of Shytlanger and Stoke; and aftir it was shewed in Sewrisley a nounry, and to many other dyvers persones, as it is said, &c. And of all this herd I nor wist no thyng, till after it was sent me by Thomas Kymbell from the said
clerc, which I suppose be called John Daungers, which cam home to me, and told me as I have said to my lord of Carlille and to your maistershipp, from which saying as by herdsay I neither may nor will vary. And yf any persone will charge me with more than I have said, I shall discharge me as shall accord with my trouthe and dutee.

John Daungers bille.
John Daungar, of Shetyllanger, sworn and examined, saith, that Thomas Wake send unto hym oon Thomas Kymbell, that tyme beyng his bailly, and bad the said John to send hym the ymage of led that he had, and so the said John sent it by the said Thomas Kymbell, att which tyme the same John said that he herd never noo
wichecraft of my lady of Bedford. Item, the same John saith, that the said ymage was delyvered unto hym by oon Harry Kyngeston of Stoke; the which Harry fonde it in his owne hous after departyng of soudeours. Item, the same John saith, that the said Thomas Wake, after he cam from London, fro the kyng, send for hym and said that he had excused
hymself and leyd all the blame to the said John; and therfor he bad the said John say that he durst not kepe the said image, and that he was the cause he send it to the said Thomas Wake. Item, the same John saith, that the said Thomas Wake bad hym say that ther was two othir ymages, oon for the kyng, and anothir for the quene; but the said John denied to say soo.
Present my lords whos names foloweth; that is to say, my lordis the cardinall and archebishop of Caunterbury, tharchebishop of York, the byshops of Bathe, chauncellor of Englond,\textsuperscript{32} Elye, tresorer of Englonde,\textsuperscript{33} Rouchester, keper of the privie seall,\textsuperscript{34} London,\textsuperscript{35} Duresme,\textsuperscript{36} and Karlill;\textsuperscript{37} therls of
Warrewyk, Essex, Northumberland, Shrewsbury, and Kent; the lords Hastings, Mountjoye, Lyle, Cromwell, Scrope of Bolton, Say, &c. 38

In order to ensure that the politically correct version was thoroughly placed on record for posterity, a further report of the proceedings and their outcome was also inscribed in the Patent Rolls:
Feb. 21. Exemplification, at the supplication of Jaquetta, duchess of Bedford, late the wife of Richard, earl of Rivers, of the tenour of an act in the great council, remaining in the office of the privy seal in the chamber of the great council called ‘le Parlment chambre’ within the palace of Westminster, made on 10 February, 9 Edward IV. In the presence of the king
and the cardinal archbishop of Canterbury, the archbishop of York, the bishops of Bath, chancellor, Ely, treasurer, Rochester, keeper of the privy seal, London, Durham and Carlisle, the earls of Warwick, Essex, Northumberland, Shrewsbury and Kent, and the lords Hastinges, Mountjoye, Lyle, Cromwell, Scrope of
Bolton, Saye and others a supplication addressed to the king on behalf of the said duchess and two schedules in paper annexed were openly read, and afterwards his highness by the advice of the said lords of the council accepting the declaration of the said lady commanded the same to be enacted of record and letters of exemplification to be made. The tenours of
the supplication and schedules above mentioned ensue in this wise. The duchess complains that Thomas Wake, esquire, in the time of the late trouble caused her to be brought in a common noise and slander of witchcraft throughout a great part of the realm, insomuch as he caused to be brought to Warwick to divers of the lords present when the king
was last there an image of lead made like a man of arms of the length of a man’s finger broken in the middle and made fast with a wire, saying that it was made by her to use with witchcraft and sorcery, and for the performing of his malicious intent entreated one John Daunger, parish clerk of Stoke Brewerne, in the counte of Northampton, to say that there were two
other images made by her, one for the king and one for the queen, whereunto the said John Daunger neither could nor would be entreated, and the king commanded the said Wake and John Daunger to attend upon the bishop of Carlisle, the earl of Northumberland, the lords Hastynges and Mountjoye and Master Roger Radcliff to be examined, and their
examination is here annexed, and in the great council on 19 January last she was cleared of the said slander, wherefore she prays that the same may be enacted of record. Thomas Wake says that this image was shown and left in Stoke with an honest person who delivered it to the clerk of the church and so showed it to divers neighbours after to the
parson in the church openly to men both of Schytlangener and Stoke and after it was shown in Sewrisley, a nunnery, and to many other persons, and of all this he heard or wist nothing till after it was sent him by Thomas Kymbell from the said clerk. John Daunger of Schytlangener said that Thomas Wake sent to him one Thomas Kymbell, then his bailiff,
and bad the said John send him the image of lead that he had and so he sent it, at which time he heard no witchcraft of the lady of Bedford, and that the image was delivered to him by one Harry Kyngeston of Stoke, who found it in his house after the departing of soldiers, and that the said Thomas Wake after he came from London from the king sent for him and
said that he had excused himself and laid all the blame on John and bad him say that he durst not keep the image and for that cause sent it to Thomas and also bad him say that there were two other images, one for the king and one for the queen, but he refused to say so.\textsuperscript{39}

Some historians have chosen to interpret all this as proof
positive that the Duchess of Bedford had never been guilty of sorcery. Such an interpretation is extremely naïve. It has also been suggested that the only outcome of all the legal proceedings against her was that the duchess was found innocent. That is also naïve. It is, of course, true that we have no surviving record of the proceedings initially undertaken against Jacquette
by Warwick and Clarence. However, it is almost as certain that they would have had her found guilty as that Edward IV (once he was at liberty) would ensure that she was declared innocent. In fact, Jacquette’s concern to have herself exonerated by her son-in-law strongly suggests that she had previously been judged guilty by those employed by Warwick and Clarence. The
recorded verdict of both sides will inevitably have depended not on the truth of the matter, but on their political objectives.

Nevertheless, certain facts do emerge from a careful examination of the surviving record of the evidence. As one might expect, the Duchess of Bedford denied the charge of witchcraft and asserted her Christian faith. As for the evidence presented
for the royal review of the case, that was all taken from Daunger and Wake. The extant recorded testimony of these two witnesses must be understood and interpreted in the context in which it was given.

The first fact that emerges, even from this revised evidence, is that John Daunger was evidently acquainted with the Duchess of Bedford, whose manor of
Grafton Regis was less than 2 miles from his home in Shutlanger. The second fact is that Daunger had been handed a lead figurine which resembled the kind used for magic purposes, and which he was later instructed by Thomas Kymbell to send to Thomas Wake. Wake confirmed that he received this figurine from Daunger, via Kymbell. Although Daunger’s recorded
testimony for Edward IV’s judges stated that the lead figurine had simply been left at Harry Kyngeston’s house in Stoke Bruerne by a passing troop of anonymous soldiers, the original version of the story may well have been different.

Perhaps not surprisingly, under the new circumstances in which he found himself, Daunger now declared that he had never heard the Duchess
of Bedford casting spells. However, the making of such a statement suggests that the opposite might previously have been said. Daunger also now claimed that he had never mentioned other figurines representing the king and queen, though he had been told to do so by Thomas Wake. He claimed that Wake, who seems to have been targeted by Edward IV’s court as the
scapegoat in this case, had invented the story of these other figurines.

However, Wake’s testimony did not accord with Daunger’s on this point. From the record of Wake’s testimony it emerges that he did not actually know Daunger personally. Moreover, Wake denied that he had any prior knowledge of the broken lead figurine before it was sent to him by
his bailiff, Thomas Kymbell. According to Wake, Kymbell had told him that a number of people in Shutlanger and the surrounding area had seen the lead figure, and that it had been examined by religious officials, including the parish priest and the nuns of Sowardsley Priory. Wake denied having played any greater role in the matter. Moreover, his testimony as officially recorded contains
no mention of other figurines representing the king and queen. This means that, in spite of his denial, the only person who actually referred to those figurines before the appeal judges (albeit to deny that he had ever mentioned them) was in fact John Daunger.

One very intriguing point that emerges from the surviving evidence is that the key person who made the
connection between the Duchess of Bedford, the broken lead figurine and the allegation of sorcery was Thomas Kymbell. It was Kymbell who had the evidence sent to Wake. One cannot help wondering, therefore, why Thomas Kymbell was not interrogated by Edward IV’s judges.

When the witchcraft accusation against the Duchess of Bedford was
revived in 1483, it was raised in the context of Edward IV’s alleged prior marriage to Eleanor Talbot. On that occasion the charge of sorcery against Jacquette was specifically linked with her desire to win the king’s hand for her daughter. However, the surviving records of the review of Jacquette’s case for Edward IV in 1470 contain no mention of his marriage to Eleanor. In 1469–70 the
Talbot marriage was still a secret and, with Eleanor now dead, Edward IV had every intention of doing his best to ensure that it forever remained so.

Notes

1. ‘The Ryvers been soo hie’ was an ironic
comment by Edward IV’s fool, Woodhous, on the influence of the queen’s family, cited in Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p.200.


4. Wavrin writes: ... grandement recheu et festoie du duc et des seigneurs qui entour lui estoient, lesquelz luy furent audevant et le conduiserent jusques son hostel puis vint devers le duc qui lors estoit logie en labaye Saint Bertin, ou le duc luy fist moult
bonne chiere, et deux jours aprez sen alla a Aire veoir la duchesse sa cousine qui doulcement le recoeilla, car jamais on neust pense a ce a quoy il contendoit (Wavrin, p.578).

5. Because of the date of his death, the first ‘Robin’ was probably Sir William Conyers of Marske (d. 1469).

6. Probably Sir William
Conyers’ brother, Sir John Conyers of Hornby (d. 1490).

7. Wavrin writes: ... *il navoit gueres de gens, si ne dura la feste que deux jours, car il epousa ung mardy et le dimence ensievant passa la mer pour ce quil avoit eu nouvelles que ceulz de Galles estoient sue le champs a grant puissance* (Wavrin,
8. Laynesmith, *The Last Medieval Queens*, p.201, citing Warkworth’s *Chronicle*.


11. The battle called ‘of
Edgecote Moor’. The site was at Danes Moor in Northamptonshire (6 miles north-east of Banbury) and the battle was fought on 26 July 1469.

12. Ellis, *Polydore Vergil’s English History*, p.123. Rivers and his second son John were taken prisoners at Chepstow, and beheaded at Kenilworth on 12
August 1469.


15. Ross, Edward IV, p.133.

16. The will of Cecily Neville, dowager Duchess of York: ‘I, Cecille, wife unto the right noble prince Richard late Duke of Yorke, fader unto the most cristen prince my Lord and son King
Edward the iiiijth ... Also my body to be buried beside the body of my moost entierly best beloved Lord and housbond, fader unto my said lorde and son, and in his tumbe within the collegiate church of Fodringhay’ (J. G. Nicholls and J. Bruce, eds, Wills from Doctors’ Commons. A Selection from the Wills of


19. Davis 1, p.403. The text is a little unclear as to whether the meeting was between Clarence and Norfolk or Clarence and the Archbishop of York.

20. Davis, 1, p.344.

21. Davis 1, p.405.

22. Davis 2, p.432.

23. RP 9, Edw. IV (see below).

28. Stoke Bruerne, a mile to the east of Shutlanger (see below).
29. Shutlanger, a small village in south Northamptonshire, five miles east of Towcester, 7 miles south of
Northampton, 11 miles north of Milton Keynes, and less than 2 miles north of the Woodville manor at Grafton Regis.

Sewardsley Priory – originally a small but independent house of Cistercian nuns in Showsley, just north of Shutlanger, but from 1460 a cell of the Cluniac abbey of St Mary de la pré,
Northampton.

31. Shutlanger.
32. Robert Stillington.
33. William Grey.
34. Thomas Rotherham (alias Scott).
35. Thomas Kempe.
36. Lawrence Booth.
37. Edward Story.
38. RP 9, Edw. IV, as published in J. Strachey, ed., Rotuli Parliamentorum ut et Petitiones et Placita in

On Tuesday 6 March 1470 George met his brother the king at their mother’s house, Baynard’s Castle in London. Superficially, the meeting was friendly and it ended with them going to St Paul’s
Cathedral together to make an offering. Beneath the outward harmony, however, there was much plotting. Both sides had been attempting to gain support. One of the targets of the Earl of Warwick and the Duke of Clarence had been Richard, Lord Welles. They thought they had succeeded in winning his backing. What they did not know was that
Edward had captured his son, Sir Robert Welles, who had broken down and confessed everything. As a result, on Sunday 18 March Warwick and Clarence received a summons from the king to appear before him and answer certain charges. Their request to Edward for safe conduct was probably naïve, and it received short shrift in response. As a result, Clarence and Warwick chose
not to obey the summons.

In a letter written on Tuesday 27 March, an unknown cousin of the Paston family informed them that on Monday 19 March the king had reached Doncaster, where Sir Robert Welles and another unnamed captain were beheaded. While he was at Doncaster, the king heard that Clarence and Warwick were at Austerfield, just 6 miles (10km) to the south-
east. Expecting a battle, the following morning at 9 a.m. Edward IV mustered his army. However, no battle was fought because Clarence and Warwick departed hastily, riding westwards to Manchester. They were hoping desperately to cash in the support they had been promised by Lord Stanley, but when they arrived, no such support materialised. On Thursday 22 March Edward
IV rode north to York, where he was joined by ‘all be gentilmen of the shire’, and there, in York, on Sunday 25 March Edward IV restored to the Percy family the earldom of Northumberland, which had previously been bestowed upon Warwick’s brother, John. Although John had been loyal to Edward (up to this point), the king needed to conciliate the Percys.
By April 1470, Warwick and Clarence, now in a very weak position, had made their way to the West Country together. As Philippe de Commynes reports, Warwick:


told his intimate friends what to do and put out to sea in his own time with the duke of Clarence, who had married his daughter and was supporting his cause, despite the fact that
he was King Edward’s brother. They took their wives, children and a large number of people and appeared before Calais [on 16 April 1470].

It was a very difficult situation. The Duchess of Clarence was heavily pregnant and close to her term. This was a bad time for her to be travelling, but she could hardly be left behind.
Embarking from Exeter on Tuesday 10 April, the entire family set sail for the Continent. Since he was the Captain of Calais, and since the garrison was commanded by his lieutenant, Lord Wenlock, Warwick expected to be well received there. But, once again, Edward IV was one step ahead of him. Only hours before Warwick and Clarence arrived off the coast at Calais a messenger from
the king had instructed the Calais garrison in the strongest possible terms not to admit them. Lord Wenlock, hedging his bets, decided to obey the royal command:

In the town was Warwick’s lieutenant, Lord Wenlock, and several of his domestic servants. Instead of welcoming him they fired several cannon shots at
him. Whilst they lay at anchor before the town the duchess of Clarence, the earl of Warwick’s daughter, gave birth to a son [sic daughter]. It was only with a great deal of difficulty that Lord Wenlock and the others could be persuaded to allow two flagons of wine to be brought to her. This was great harshness for a servant to use towards his
master for it must be presumed that the earl was expecting to be equipped from this place, which was England’s greatest treasure store and the world’s, or at least, Christendom’s, finest captaincy, in my opinion. I went there several times during these quarrels …

The king of England was very pleased with Lord Wenlock’s refusal to his captain and sent him letters
appointing him personally to hold the office because he was a very experienced and mature knight and was already a member of the Order of the Garter. The duke of Burgundy, who was then at Saint-Omer, was also very pleased with him and sent me to Lord Wenlock and gave him a pension of a thousand crowns, requesting him to remain steadfast in the love
which he had shown to the king of England. I found that he was very determined to do this and he swore an oath at the Staple house in Calais, placing his hands in mine, to be true to the king of England against all others; so did all those of the garrison and the town. For two months I was employed going backwards and forwards keeping him
to this agreement and for most of the time I stayed with him, whilst the duke of Burgundy was at Boulogne.⁶

The child did not survive. Actually a daughter, Anne of Clarence, she was born on Friday 16 April and died more or less immediately – a terrible blow in already difficult circumstances.⁷ Isabel, dragged away from
her home and travelling aboard ship, can hardly have observed all the standard ritual normally required of an expectant mother, and her labour may have been difficult. Her little girl must have been born alive, for the baby survived long enough to be baptised. Significantly, the name she was given – Anne – was the first name of Isabel’s mother, the Countess of Warwick. It was the first
name also of Isabel’s younger sister. It seems likely that one or other of these close relatives – and perhaps both – stood as godmother to the baby. When the infant died there was nowhere to inter the little body. The only solution available was to bury the baby at sea.

As for John, Lord Wenlock, he has been called ‘the prince of turncoats’. He is an interesting figure.
Members of a family called Wenlock were faithful and longstanding servants of the Talbots of Shrewsbury. A John Wenlock had been steward and receiver to the 1st Earl of Shrewsbury, and had subsequently served his widow, Margaret Beauchamp, the elder half-sister of the Countess of Warwick. His son, John Wenlock the younger, also served the dowager Lady
Shrewsbury, and when she died he transferred to the service of her surviving son, Sir Humphrey Talbot. These Wenlocks had undoubtedly known Eleanor Talbot very well indeed.

The John, Lord Wenlock who first served Henry VI’s bride, Margaret of Anjou, who later served the Earl of Warwick, and who in April 1470 kept Warwick out of
Calais may have been a relative of the Talbot Wenlocks. Was it not John Talbot, 1st Earl of Shrewsbury, who delivered Margaret of Anjou to Henry VI as his bride? And the 1st Earl of Shrewsbury had been the brother-in-law of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick. Lord Wenlock’s behaviour in April 1470, when the ships containing Warwick, Clarence, and their family
arrived off the coast at Calais, was an example of fence-sitting *par excellence*. He openly obeyed the instructions he had received from Edward IV, while at the same time giving helpful advice to Warwick and Clarence. A confused Philippe de Commynes recorded contradictory impressions of Wenlock’s attitude. Whatever Wenlock’s
underlying motivation, it was obvious to all concerned that Warwick and Clarence had failed to establish themselves in Calais. As a result, they considered the possibility of returning home to England. Indeed, Sir John Paston II wrote to his brother, John Paston III, on Sunday 5 August 1470:

Item, that þe Lordes Clarance and Warwyk
wooll assaye to londe in Ingelonde evyrye daye, as folks feere.\textsuperscript{9}

But, despite his cannon shots at their ships, and his reluctance to provide the Duchess of Clarence with wine, Lord Wenlock had different advice to offer:

When the earl of Warwick stood off Calais, hoping to enter the town as his
principal place of refuge, Lord Wenlock, who was very clever, sent him word that if he entered he would be lost … The best thing he could do was to withdraw to France. He told him he should not worry about Calais because he would give him satisfaction at the right time. 10

Commynes called this ‘a ruse’ on the part of Wenlock.
But he also said that in doing this Wenlock was serving Warwick very well – but his king very badly. Following Wenlock’s advice, the Earl of Warwick sailed to Normandy, where he landed with all his family (including his son-in-law, the Duke of Clarence) in the territory of his friend King Louis XI of France.

The French king, who genuinely had a high personal regard for Warwick, had been
feeling rather at sea with the complex political situation in England. At one point he had been hopeful that his friend Warwick was in power. However, he had then seen Edward IV reassert his authority. Now Warwick, Clarence and their families had arrived at Honfleur. Moreover, astonishingly, the earl was now proposing to restore King Henry VI to the throne! Charles the Bold,
Duke of Burgundy, a cousin, and theoretically a subject, of the French king, agitatedly demanded Warwick’s extradition. But Louis XI thought the earl’s plans were worth exploring. He therefore sent messengers to the exiled Margaret of Anjou and her son, suggesting that they might like to come and see him at Amboise, to discuss Warwick’s ideas. Margaret, who hated Warwick, was
initially unenthusiastic, but Louis XI persevered with her. It began to look at though Warwick’s latest initiative might succeed.

How did the Duke of Clarence fit into the new plans? Hitherto, Warwick had sought to ensure that his cousin, Edward IV, would conduct the affairs of England in a proper manner. He wanted the king to pay due attention to the wishes of
the traditional aristocracy – himself in particular – and to remove from positions of power and authority the parvenu family of Elizabeth Woodville. There is no real evidence that Warwick had previously planned to dethrone Edward. Of course, in the longer term, the setting aside of the Woodvilles might well have also removed Edward IV’s Woodville offspring from the line of
succession, thereby restoring the Duke of Clarence to the role of heir to the throne. The happy corollary would then have been that George, followed in due course by Warwick’s own descendants, would wear the crown.

Now things had changed. Warwick was planning to dethrone Edward IV and restore Henry VI. The earl still hoped that eventually his own descendants would wear
the English crown, but his new scheme to ensure that outcome was reached via Margaret of Anjou’s son, Edward of Westminster, Prince of Wales. Accordingly, ‘a marriage contract was made between the prince and Lady Anne, the Earl of Warwick’s younger daughter’. Certainly, Warwick’s discussions with the
Lancastrians included provision for the Duke of Clarence to be recognised as Duke of York, and as next-in-line for the crown should Edward of Westminster die childless. Nevertheless, in George’s eyes this new plan must have seemed like yet another demotion. In the reality of the re-established Lancastrian order, he would be further from the throne than he had been in the
previous plans. Although the personal relationship between George and his father-in-law had not broken down, George must have felt that there was a growing gulf between them in terms of their political goals. When Warwick actually met Margaret of Anjou face-to-face at Angers, on Sunday 22 July, George, ‘now an embarrassing encumbrance’,12 did not
accompany him.

As Philippe de Commynes, servant of the Duke of Burgundy, reports the situation, it was Louis XI who had carried out the preliminary negotiations for:

a marriage between the prince of Wales and the earl of Warwick’s second daughter. The prince was the only son of King Henry of England, who was still
alive and imprisoned in the Tower of London. This was a strange marriage! Warwick had defeated and ruined the prince’s father and then made him marry his daughter. 13

This ‘strange marriage’ was agreed in June 1470, and once the necessary dispensation had been obtained, it was celebrated at Bayeux, on or about
Thursday 13 December – by which time both the Earl of Warwick and the Duke of Clarence had already long since departed for England. On the insistence of Margaret of Anjou, even after the church ceremony, her son’s wedding with the younger daughter of her ancient enemy was not to be consummated, until the Earl of Warwick had succeeded in re-establishing the
Lancastrian regime in England. If Warwick should fail, Margaret did not want her son irrevocably tied to Anne Neville when he might, at some future stage of his career, find an opportunity to make a better marriage. Although Edward of Westminster was already 17 years of age, Anne Neville was only fourteen and a half years old at the time of the church wedding. Since this
may have been regarded as too young for consummation, it is possible that custom supported Margaret’s reluctance in this matter. In point of fact, the marriage of Edward and Anne never was consummated. Commynes goes on to reveal an intriguing secret:

Now I was at Calais negotiating with Lord
Wenlock … He told me moreover that it would be easy to reach a settlement because that day a lady had passed through Calais, on her way to my lady of Clarence in France. She was bearing an offer from King Edward to open peace talks. He spoke the truth, but as he deceived others he himself was deceived by this lady, for she was going to carry out
a series of negotiations which in the end were prejudicial to the earl of Warwick and all his supporters.

Assuredly you will never learn more from anyone than from me about all the secret schemes or ruses which have been carried out in our countries on this side of the channel since then, or at least about those which have happened in
the last twenty years. This woman’s secret business was to persuade my lord of Clarence not to be the agent of the ruin of his family by helping to restore the Lancastrians to authority, and to remind him of their ancient hatreds and quarrels. He should consider very carefully whether Warwick would make him king of England when the earl had married
his daughter to the Prince of Wales and had already done homage to him. This woman exploited the situation so well that she won over the duke of Clarence who promised to join his brother, the king, as soon as he came back to England.

This woman was not a fool and she did not speak lightly. She had the opportunity to visit her
mistress and for this reason she was able to go sooner than a man. And however cunning Lord Wenlock was this woman deceived him and carried out this secret assignment which led to the defeat and death of the earl of Warwick and all his followers. 15

The identity of the woman sent by Edward IV to persuade George to desert his
father-in-law remains a mystery. Could she perhaps have been Lady St Amand, sister-in-law of the Bishop of Salisbury, cousin by marriage of Lord Powick and of the Duchess of Clarence, and the wife of Sir Roger Tocotes?Sadly, given the complete lack of evidence, any attempt to identify her can be nothing more than speculation. But, whoever she was, she clearly
carried out her role very effectively, as subsequent events were to show.

Towards the end of August preparations were under way for Warwick’s return to England in the Lancastrian cause. However, his troops were unhappy about the earl’s new plans and he had some problems controlling them. On Sunday 9 September Warwick, accompanied by the Admiral of France, by the
‘Earl of Pembroke’ (Jasper Tudor) and by the Earl of Oxford, embarked for his homeland. Naturally, George, Duke of Clarence also sailed with them, and it would be particularly interesting to know how he got on with Jasper, the uncle, and future supporter and guide, of Henry VII. Jasper was about eighteen years older than Clarence, but had been living in exile (in Scotland and then
in France) for most of the reign of Edward IV. As a youth, at the court of Henry VI, he may have met Richard, Duke of York, but he had probably never previously encountered any of York’s sons. Certainly neither he nor his nephew, the future Henry VII, ever had any opportunity to get to know personally Richard Duke of Gloucester (the future Richard III).

However, Jasper was the
mentor of Henry VII both before and after his usurpation of the throne. It is intriguing, therefore, to note that the ‘Tudor’ propaganda image of Richard III appears to contain certain features which more accurately reflect the character and attributes of the Duke of Clarence than those of the real Richard III. For example, George appears to have been sometimes quick-tempered and
manipulative. Unlike Richard, he clearly felt no sense of loyalty to Edward IV, and he may well have felt a personal resentment towards Edward’s Woodville offspring. George also seems to have been ambitious, arrogant and given to plotting in the interests of his own advancement. He may also have felt a sense of inadequacy and resentment over his physique (in respect
of his height). None of these characteristics is recorded as associated with the real Richard III, yet all of them became part of Richard’s ‘Tudor’ propaganda image. Could Jasper, Earl of Pembroke – who never met Richard, but who for nearly a year (from the summer of 1470 until the spring of 1471) knew and worked with the Duke of Clarence – have been the source for such
characteristics of George, which were later imported by ‘Tudor’ writers into descriptions of his brother, Richard III?

On the night of Thursday 13 September the invaders landed unopposed in the West Country. A joint proclamation was issued in the name of the four English lords, naming Henry VI as king. As they marched northwards and eastwards
Lord Stanley and the Earl of Shrewsbury came to join them.

Edward IV was in the north. Marching south from York, he summoned John Neville, Marquess of Montague, the Earl of Warwick’s brother. The marquess dutifully set out, but then halted his men and declared to them that Edward IV had treated him badly by taking from him the earldom
of Northumberland. He proclaimed his allegiance to his brother, Warwick, and most of his soldiers followed him. Panic-stricken, Edward IV fled to safety with his brother Gloucester, his brother-in-law, Earl Rivers, Lord Hastings and a small band of loyal supporters. He made for the north coast of East Anglia, and sailed from Bishop’s [King’s] Lynn to the Low Countries. In London,
Elizabeth Woodville, who was eight months pregnant, took sanctuary with her mother and children at Westminster Abbey. It seems to have been Archbishop George Neville who freed a rather grubby Henry VI from the Tower of London and led him to the royal apartments, but Philippe de Commynes gave the credit to Warwick, who reached the capital on Saturday 6 October:
When the earl [of Warwick] arrived in London he went to the Tower and released King Henry from where he had imprisoned him on another occasion a long time before, proclaiming before him that he was a traitor and guilty of treason. Yet at this moment he called him king and led him to his palace at Westminster where he restored all his
royal prerogatives in the presence of the duke of Clarence, who was not at all pleased by this. 17

George, Duke of Clarence was given the Erber, a former home of the Earl of Warwick’s father, as his London residence. 18

However, in reality, he had no role to play in the Readeption. Fortunately, Margaret of Anjou was still in
France, as was her son, Edward of Westminster (now George’s brother-in-law). Nevertheless, his relationship with the Lancastrian royal family and with its supporters was far from easy.

It was the women of the House of York – George’s sisters and his mother – who reportedly finally won him back to the side of Edward IV when the latter returned to recapture his crown:
George’s sister, Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy, receiving a book from William Caxton (redrawn by the author from an engraving of 1475).

In the meantime the Duke of Clarence, King Edward’s brother, was
quietly reconciled with the king through the mediation of his sisters, the duchesses of Burgundy and Exeter. The former, from without the kingdom, had been encouraging the king, and the latter, from within the kingdom, the duke to make peace. The duke then came to the king’s assistance with a large army from the western parts of the realm; the number of the royal
forces increased daily so that the earls in Coventry did not dare either to challenge the king to fight or to take up his challenge to them on the field of battle. 19

The expedition led by Edward IV and Richard, Duke of Gloucester, who had been in exile in the Low Countries since October 1470, 20 set sail back to
England on 10 March 1470/71, landing first at Cromer in Norfolk. By 18 March, Edward was in the city of York, and on 25 March he was approaching Coventry, into which Warwick withdrew, fortifying himself. Unable to bring the earl to battle, Edward IV established himself at the town of Warwick, and on about 28 March a meeting was arranged between the
king and the Duke of Clarence just outside the town: ‘His brother the duke of Clarence … came with a fair company of men to surrender himself according to previous arrangements between them, and they made their peace there in the field with their banners displayed.’

Early in April 1471, James Gresham, writing to Sir John Paston,
informed him:

As for tydyngges here in þis cuntre be many tales and non accorth with other. It is tolde me by the undirshireve that my lord of Clarence is goon to his brother, late Kyng; in somche that his men have the gorget on their breestes and þe rose over it. And it is seid that þe Lord Howard hath proclaimed
Early in April Edward made his way south-east to London, where he took possession both of the Tower, and of the person of King Henry VI. However:

Edward only spent two days in the city because on Easter Saturday [13 April 1471] he left with the
troops he had been able to gather and marched out to meet the earl of Warwick, whom he encountered next morning, that is on Easter day [at Barnet]. When they found themselves face to face, the duke of Clarence, King Edward’s brother, deserted to him with more than twelve thousand troops, which greatly distressed the earl of Warwick and greatly
reinforced the king who had few men.  

At the Battle of Barnet (14 April 1471) George was injured, fighting on the side of his brother, Edward IV. Precise details of the injury are not recorded, but Gerhard von Wesel noted that, of those who took part in the battle, many ‘were wounded, mostly in the face or the
lower half of the body’. It is intriguing, therefore, to note that the male skull now preserved in the Clarence vault at Tewkesbury belongs to a man who had suffered a cut towards the front of the left side of his head several years before his death. This sword(?) cut had penetrated the surface of the cranium, but the bone structure had subsequently healed.
successfully (see plate 28). More will be said on this point later. Von Wesel also records that George’s brother, the Duke of Gloucester, was slightly injured in the fighting. As for George’s father-in-law, the Earl of Warwick was killed in the battle, together with ‘the marquis his brother and many knights, squires and other people who strongly fought
against the king for the space of three hours’. 27
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In September 1470, when Warwick and Clarence sailed back to England, the ladies of their family remained in France. Anne Neville was betrothed to Edward of
Westminster, and was awaiting a papal dispensation so that she could be married to him. She thus had to stay in France. Her mother and her elder sister the Duchess of Clarence remained with her. The Countess of Warwick was required to take care of her younger daughter. It seems certain that Isabel also remained in France. No other ladies of their families formed part of the expedition.
to England. Moreover, Isabel did not conceive her next child until 1472, suggesting that she and her husband spent some time apart from one another.

The Warwick ladies joined Margaret of Anjou and her son in Normandy. There, at Bayeux, on about 13 December 1470, Anne and Edward were married.\(^1\) The following spring they all
embarked for England, but the royal Lancastrian party travelled in one ship, while the Countess of Warwick – probably accompanied by her daughter, the Duchess of Clarence – travelled in another. The weather was bad when they set off, and the winds were against them. It took them two weeks to beat their way across the Channel. The vessel carrying the Countess of Warwick reached
England first, landing at Portsmouth in Hampshire. Margaret, her son, and his bride, landed somewhat later. As originally planned, apparently, this second group docked further west, at Weymouth in Dorset, where they arrived on the evening of Easter Sunday (14 April). That very morning the Earl of Warwick had been killed at the Battle of Barnet. Margaret
of Anjou, her son and her daughter-in-law were accommodated at the Benedictine abbey of Cerne. It was there that Edmund Beaufort, titular 4th Duke of Somerset, brought them the news of the disaster at Barnet the following day.

Meanwhile, the Countess of Warwick’s party had set off from Portsmouth soon after landing, travelling
north-westwards to Southampton. Their aim was to regroup with Margaret of Anjou’s contingent. At Southampton, however, the Countess also received the shocking news of her husband’s death. Immediately she abandoned any further thought of seeking Margaret. Instead, she hastily travelled the 6 miles (9.5km) from Southampton to the Cistercian abbey of Beaulieu,
where she took sanctuary. She was to remain at Beaulieu Abbey for the next two years.

Meanwhile, Edward of Westminster encouraged his mother to keep fighting. He aimed to join his Lancastrian forces with those of his ‘Tudor’ relations, so he and Margaret pressed on towards Wales, taking with them Edward’s young wife, Anne Neville. Prevented from
crossing the River Severn at Gloucester, they headed instead for Tewkesbury, closely pursued by Edward IV and his army, who cornered them and forced them to make a stand outside the town. Margaret of Anjou wished to avoid battle, but the Duke of Somerset (son of her former lover) and her own son, both urged her to fight. The result was the disastrous Battle of Tewkesbury.
‘Somerset’ and Edward of Westminster both died as a result. ‘Somerset’, captured, was executed. Accounts of the fate of Edward of Westminster vary. Philippe de Commynes wrote that ‘the prince of Wales was killed on the battlefield, together with several other great lords and a very large number of ordinary soldiers. The Duke of Somerset was captured; next
day he was beheaded.’

Commynes’ contemporary and countryman, Jean de Roye, also reported that ‘there died, and was killed the said Prince of Wales, which was a great shame, for he was a handsome young prince.’

Although later versions of the story suggest that the prince was put to death after the fighting, and that George was one of those who took a hand
in killing him, there is no reason to credit these accounts, since a letter survives written by George himself, in which he states clearly that ‘Edward, late called Prince … [was] slain in plain battle.’[7] Margaret of Anjou sought refuge in a convent, where she was discovered three days later.

Precisely how Isabel travelled from France, and
with whom – and what she did following her arrival in England – is unclear. It seems likely that she travelled with her mother, landed at Portsmouth, and subsequently took sanctuary with the countess at Beaulieu Abbey. The other possibility is that she travelled with Margaret of Anjou, Edward of Westminster, and her sister Anne. When and where Isabel rejoined her husband is not
recorded. He may have sent to Beaulieu, summoning her to come to him. Alternatively, it may have been at Tewkesbury, in the aftermath of the battle, that the Duke of Clarence found her. Either way, the Countess of Warwick and her younger daughter, Anne, were now both widows – and widows of traitors. Isabel Neville, on the other hand, was the wife of the king’s brother. It is
understandable, therefore, that Isabel – and her husband – should have been in a better position than her mother and her younger sister to claim possessions formerly held by her mother’s family. It is also understandable that George, who had inherited no estates of his own, should have been deeply concerned to maximise his and his wife’s tenure of such property.

One consequence was that
George and Isabel took the widowed Anne Neville into their care (or charge). George felt considerable concern over any question of Anne’s remarriage, given that under the law she was Isabel’s co-heir. He was particularly unhappy about the fact that a relationship pre-dating Anne’s arranged marriage to Edward of Westminster apparently existed between her and his own younger
brother, Richard. As the Crowland chronicler puts it:

After King Henry’s son (to whom the earl of Warwick’s younger daughter, the lady Anne, was married) had fallen at the battle of Tewkesbury … Richard, duke of Gloucester sought to make the same Anne his wife; this desire did not suit the plans of his brother, the
duke of Clarence ... who therefore had the girl hidden away so that his brother would not know where she was, since he feared a division of the inheritance ... The Duke of Gloucester, however, was so much the more astute, that having discovered the girl dressed as a kitchen-maid in London, he had her moved into sanctuary at St
Not surprisingly, the outcome of all this was a quarrel between George and Richard. On Tuesday 17 February 1472, Sir John Paston II reported to his brother, John Paston III, that:

Yisterdaye the Kynge, the Qween, my lordes off Claraunce and Gloucester went to Scheen to pardon,
men sey nott alle in cheryté. What wyll falle men can nott seye. The Kynge entretyth my lorde off Clarance for my lorde off Glocester, and as itt is seyde he answerythe that he maye well have my ladye hys suster in lawe, butt they schall parte no lyvelod, as he seythe; so what wyll falle can I nott seye.⁹
Following George’s agreement, Richard, Duke of Gloucester is thought to have married Anne Neville in May or June 1472. However, disputes over aspects of the Warwick inheritance continued long after the wedding, as the Paston correspondence shows:

There are many of the king’s men and of the Duke of Clarence’s men in
London. There are rumours of a forthcoming war with the Scots.

Item, how that the Countesse off Warwyk is now out of Beweley seyteware, and Syr James Tyrell conveyth hyre northward, men seye by the Kynges assent, wherto som men seye that the Duke of Clarance is not agreyd. 11

Trouble is brewing and
men are arming themselves … it [is] seyd for serteyn that þe Duke of Claraunce makyth hym bygge in that he kan, schewyng as he wolde but dele with the Duke of Glowcester. But the Kyng ententyth in eschyewyng all jnconvenyentys to be as bygge as they both, and to be a styfffelere atwyen them. 12
I trust to God that the i j Dukes of Clarans and Glocester shall be sette att on[e] by the adward off the Kyng.\textsuperscript{13}

One thing that is clear from all this is that George was back in his family circle, and that he accepted the authority of Edward IV to adjudicate disputes between himself and his younger brother, Richard. The precise relationship
between George and Edward at this period is, however, hard to determine. Moreover, whatever public show was made in respect of George’s relationship with his elder brother’s partner, at a private level there must now have been mutual dislike and distrust between them. From Elizabeth Woodville’s point of view, George was one of those responsible for the deaths of her father and one
of her brothers. Indeed, he had openly campaigned to bring her and her family down. George’s subsequent support of Edward IV cannot have altered the fact that in Elizabeth’s eyes he was an enemy.

The main residence of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence was now Warwick Castle, though, as with all such fifteenth-century magnates, they travelled a
good deal. On 5 February 1471/2, ‘George, Duke of Clarence, arrived after vespers at Salisbury Cathedral, and was received and honourably incensed and lodged at the Precentor’s.’

During the winter of 1472/3, Isabel became pregnant for the second time, and on 14 August 1473 her daughter Margaret was born at Farleigh Hungerford Castle in
Somerset, an estate actually held by George’s younger brother, the Duke of Gloucester,\textsuperscript{15} which suggests that in practical terms a good relationship had been re-established between George and Richard. Later, on 25 February 1475, at Warwick Castle, Isabel bore her husband an ill-fated son and heir, who was christened ‘Edward’ after his godfather
and uncle, the king, but who seems to have been destined to spend the greater part of his life in that same Tower of London where his father was executed. ¹⁶

Since his return to the Yorkist fold, led by his sisters, George seems to have maintained a reasonable relationship with Edward IV for several years. Meanwhile, in some ways, Edward
himself was changing. Philippe de Commines, who saw him in 1470 and again in 1475, reports that while Edward was still tall, slim and handsome in 1470, by 1475 he had put on a good deal of weight and, as a result, had lost some of his looks.\textsuperscript{17} There are also suggestions that Edward’s character and view of the world had changed.
somewhat.

The reason why Philippe de Commynes saw Edward IV again in August 1475 was the English king’s ‘invasion’ of France. This led to a meeting between him and Louis XI, and ultimately, to the Treaty of Picquigny. Both of Edward IV’s brothers accompanied him on the French ‘invasion’, but where the Duke of Gloucester took the expedition seriously, and
was displeased by the subsequent accommodation with the ‘enemy’ represented by the treaty, George, Duke of Clarence – who, of course, knew the French king personally – happily participated with his elder brother in the peace arrangements, as Commynes reports: ‘The king of England came along the causeway … and was well attended. He appeared a truly regal figure.
With him were his brother, the duke of Clarence, the earl of Northumberland and several lords including his Chamberlain, Lord Hastings, his Chancellor and others.'\textsuperscript{18}

Commynnes tells us that Edward IV spoke quite good French, so there is every reason to suppose that George, who had spent more time than his elder brother in French-speaking territory,
also had this ability.

Sadly, although he saw him on several occasions, Commynes tells us nothing about George’s appearance. Based on earlier comments by Jehan de Wavrin, it has already been suggested that George was of below average height, and therefore noticeably shorter than Edward IV. More will be said on this point later. Michael Jones has asserted that
George’s father, Richard, Duke of York, had been ‘short and small of face’, but he cites no contemporary source for this assertion. However, there is, as we have seen, a contemporary source which states that the Duchess of York was short. As for George’s colouring, some previous writers have made confident but rather questionable statements.
For George’s colouring we have only one possible piece of evidence: the manuscript of Wavrin’s *Chronicle*, which the author presented to Edward IV. The miniature which shows Wavrin giving his book to the king also depicts figures which have traditionally been identified as Gloucester and Clarence: ‘The figure on the left [of Edward IV], wearing the garter, is undoubtedly the
unfortunate Clarence, whose vague expression appears curiously in accordance with his vacillating character. Gloucester stands boldly forward on [Edward IV’s] right near the front of the picture, also wearing the garter.’\textsuperscript{21} Although the representation of the Duke of Gloucester was questioned at the end of the twentieth century,\textsuperscript{22} we can now see
that its profile corresponds very precisely with that of Richard III as revealed by his facial reconstruction, and also with that of an image of his father, the Duke of York, whom Richard III was said to resemble closely (see plate 2). We already know that Edward IV was tall, Richard was just above average height and George was shorter than average, and the Wavrin miniature confirms this. On
the basis of the Wavrin depiction, Edward IV and the dukes of Clarence and of Gloucester all had brown hair. Edward IV’s hair was perhaps a darker brown, and seems to have been straight. Portraits of him usually depicted brown or hazel eyes. However, the ‘Paston’, National Portrait Gallery and Wavrin portraits of Richard of Gloucester all depict wavy hair, and the first two show
grey eyes. The portrait head on the chancel arch of St Mary’s church, Barnard Castle, which is believed to represent Gloucester, depicts hair that is definitely wavy. The portrait of Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy in the Louvre suggests that she too had grey eyes. On balance, therefore, George is also likely to have had grey eyes and mid-brown, wavy hair (see plates 10 and 11). In fact,
George and Richard were probably quite similar in appearance, although George was shorter than Richard, and the Wavrin miniature shows George’s hair as a somewhat lighter shade of brown than Richard’s. Both had the pointed nose and chin of their father (see plate 2), though in George’s case these features were less pointed – a mixture of his father’s and his mother’s genes. Cecily
Neville’s nose was not pointed, but probably *retroussé*: a feature which was apparently inherited by her son Edward (plate 1).\(^{23}\)

The year after the Treaty of Picquigny, Isabelle once again found herself pregnant:

The Duchess of Clarence brought her third [actually her fourth] child Richard into the world on October 6 [actually 5], 1476, in a new
chamber of the infirmary of Tewkesbury Abbey, but no reason is given by the chronicle for her residence in the monastic buildings at the time. The infant was baptized the next day ‘in ecclesia parochiali’, that is, in the nave of the abbey, and on a later day was confirmed at the high altar. The Lord George [as the duke was called] and the Lady Isabel removed to
Warwick on November 12, and it is noted that she was then in mortal sickness \textit{infirmata}, though nothing is said of the common belief that both she and her infant were suffering from poison. Whether they were poisoned or not, both died very shortly afterwards, the duchess on December 12 \textit[sic for ?22]. Then the fair young mother of 25 was brought back again to the
abbey on January 4, 1477, and after lying under a hearse in the midst of the choir for thirty-five days, was buried in a vault which was made eastward of the high altar. 24

It is often reported that Isabel had been attended during Richard’s birth by a lady called Ankarette Hawkeston (Twynyho) but, as we shall see, modern accounts of
Ankarette’s involvement with Isabel need to be treated with caution. The surviving documents relating to the Twynyho case do not actually record that Ankarette served Isabel in the role of midwife, nor as nurse to her new-born son.
Ankarette Hawkeston m William Twynyho of Keyford (Frome), Somerset d. 1472

Edith Twynyho m Thomas Delalynde

John Twynyho b. c. 1430

William Twynyho MP for Weymouth 1472–5, b. c. 1432, d. 1497

Roger Twynyho b. c. 1450

The Twynyho/Hawkeston family.

Ankarette was a widow,
probably in her early sixties in 1476. She may have come originally from Cheshire or Staffordshire, where there were gentry families bearing the surname Hawkeston. She was probably born in about 1412 and married William Twynyho of Keyford (Frome), Somerset. They had at least two sons and one daughter (see family tree on p.131). She and her family were undoubtedly in the
service of the Clarences in the 1470s.

Obviously, if Ankarette attended Isabel during her lying-in, this must have been at Tewkesbury, since Richard of Clarence was born there on 6 October. Somewhat confusingly, however, according to the later account of the Duke of Clarence, on 10 October 1476 Ankarette had been in Warwick, in the service of the Duchess of
Clarence. According to the evidence produced, ‘Lady Isabel, the late wife of George, duke of Clarence, was … physically healthy, on 10 October in the sixteenth year of the reign of King Edward IV since the conquest [1476]’. The date cited would have been only four days after Richard’s birth, and it seems highly unlikely that Isabel could have
travelled home to Warwick so soon after the delivery. Indeed, it is usually stated that she made the journey on 12 November. It seems likely, therefore, that in George’s subsequent account either the duke made a mistake in the date, or the date was erroneously recorded. Nevertheless, George subsequently alleged that on 10 October 1476 Ankarette:
falsely, traitorously and feloniously gave the same Isabel a venomous drink of ale mixed with poison to drink, to poison and kill the same Isabel; of which drink the said Isabel sickened from the aforesaid 10 October until the Sunday next before the following Christmas; on which Sunday the aforesaid Isabel then and there died
because of it’. 27

Following her death, Isabel’s embalmed body was transported from Warwick Castle back to Tewkesbury Abbey, where it lay in state on a hearse in front of the high altar while behind the altar screen, facing the entrance to the eastern Lady Chapel, a vault for her burial was constructed. Details of the vault will be fully
explored in a later chapter. Once the vault was ready, Isabel’s splendid funeral was conducted by Abbot John Strensham of Tewkesbury, who was a friend of the Clarence family and one of the godfathers of the young Edward of Clarence, Earl of Warwick. 

In the immediate aftermath of his wife’s death, George was caught up in arranging
her burial, and coping with a second blow – the subsequent death, and burial in Warwick, of his infant son, Richard. George claimed that Richard’s death was also from poisoning, but in his case the poison was allegedly administered by a servant called John Thursby (not by Ankarette – which reinforces the point that, despite what was said later at her trial, Ankarette probably did not, in
reality, accompany the family back from Tewkesbury to Warwick). It is possible that the pain of his bereavements accounts for the fact that, while George apparently suspected that Isabel and Richard had been murdered, he did nothing about this for some three months. Another possible explanation is that George was not in his right mind during this period. However, there is also a third
possibility. George was still Lieutenant of Ireland, having been reappointed to this post for a further 20 years in 1472. 29 One eighteenth-century writer refers to him as having been in Ireland in 1477. 30 Interestingly, later, at his trial, Edward IV accused George of plotting to send his son to Ireland or Flanders (see below). Since George was definitely in Warwick in
April, and in London in May and June, while from June onwards he was a prisoner in the Tower of London, if he did visit Ireland in 1476/7, it must have been in February–March – just after the deaths of his wife and younger son – deaths which George viewed as suspicious. Certainly, his conduct at this time seems strange. Some modern writers have suggested that George believed Elizabeth Woodville
was behind the deaths of his wife and son. No such contemporary allegation is documented, though at least one of the accused could possibly have had Woodville connections (see below).

On Saturday 12 April 1477 (the Saturday in the octave of Easter), having perhaps just returned from Ireland, George suddenly dispatched a force of twenty-six men, led by Richard Hyde of Warwick
and Roger Strugge, clothier, of Beckington (near Frome) to the manor of Keyford, at Frome in Somerset. Ankarette was living quietly there in her late husband’s home. George had her seized and hauled off to Bath. The following day (Low Sunday – 13 April), his men dragged her to Cirencester, and on Monday they brought her to Warwick, where she arrived
at about eight o’clock in the evening. The following morning (Tuesday 15 April), George had her brought to trial at the Guildhall in Warwick. She was not the sole defendant. John Thursby stood with her in the dock. Sir Roger Tocotes was also accused. In fact, George seems to have considered him the organiser of the two murders, with Ankarette and Thursby merely his tools.
However, it seems that Tocotes had not been apprehended.

Who were the other two accused? Sir Roger Tocotes was a leading member of the Wiltshire gentry. His wife, Elizabeth, was the widow of Sir William Beauchamp, brother of Richard Beauchamp, Bishop of Salisbury. (The Beauchamp brothers were cousins of the Duchess of Clarence.) Sir
Roger had been with Clarence and Warwick in France, and was one of those who accompanied Clarence when the duke defected to Edward IV before the Battle of Barnet. He had been a member of Clarence’s council from 1475, and Hicks considers that ‘his career suggests that he was the duke [of Clarence]’s friend as well as his servant and one of his leading officials. A more
improbable object of Clarence’s hostility it is difficult to imagine.’

Nevertheless, Tocotes does appear to have been a man of variable loyalty. He served Edward IV as well as George and, in the months following George’s execution, he would continue to be appointed to royal commissions. It is not clear what stance he adopted on Edward IV’s death, but in
September 1483 he was one of the leaders of Buckingham’s Rebellion, as a result of which he was attainted — though subsequently pardoned. About two years later, he is believed to have fought on the side of Henry ‘Tudor’ at the Battle of Bosworth. This record implies possible connections with Dr John Morton and perhaps with
members of the Woodville family. Maybe George was right to doubt Tocotes’ trustworthiness. As for John Thursby, he was a local yeoman in George’s service. On the basis of the evidence presented (whatever that was), the court in Warwick found Ankarette and John Thursby guilty, and ruled that Ankarette ‘should be led from the bar to the said lord king’s gaol of Warwick
aforesaid, and drawn from that gaol through the centre of that town of Warwick to the gallows at Myton, and be hanged there on that gallows until she is dead’.\textsuperscript{34} Thursby was also sentenced to death, and the sentences were duly carried out. The trial and executions were over in less than three hours in total.\textsuperscript{35}

There is no indication in the surviving records that the
legal proceedings against Ankarette were in any way untoward. Nevertheless, there are oddities about the case. We have noted the confusion over the location and date of Isabel’s alleged poisoning, and the delay of three months before any action was taken. A third odd feature is the fact that this case has been linked by most historians with the subsequent arrest and execution of the Duke of
Clarence. There seems to be no justification for making such a link. Ankaretté’s trial was never mentioned by Edward IV in his case against his brother. It is true that Ankaretté’s grandson (taking advantage, perhaps, of George’s arrest) presented a successful formal petition at the Parliament of 1478 for the verdict against his grandmother to be overturned. Indeed, he – or
possibly Sir Roger Tocotes – may have approached the king on the subject earlier, because on 20 May 1477 Edward IV asked for the records of the Twynyho trial to be sent to him. However, this does not mean that the trial of Ankarette was ever cited against the Duke of Clarence in the legal proceedings which led to his execution. It is not mentioned
in any of the surviving material relating to George’s trial.

Meanwhile, the death of Isabel had left George a young widower. It is not surprising that he considered the possibility of remarriage. His former ambitions to marry the now orphaned Marie of Burgundy resurfaced, supported by his sister, Margaret (Marie’s stepmother), but were once
again opposed by Edward IV:

the Duke of Burgundy, Charles ... was defeated and killed on the open field in the year of Our Lord 1477, according to the Roman reckoning. I have inserted this foreign history at this point because, after Charles’ death it was common knowledge that his widow, the duchess, Lady Margaret, who was
more fond of her brother Clarence than of anyone else in the family, devoted all her effort and all her attention to uniting in marriage Mary, the only daughter and heiress of the deceased Duke Charles, and the Duke of Clarence whose wife had recently died. Such an exalted destiny for an ungrateful brother was not to the liking of the king. He
therefore threw all the obstacles he could in the way of any such marriage taking place; he urged rather that the heiress should be given as a wife to Maximilian, the emperor’s son, as it afterwards happened.

The duke’s indignation was probably further increased by this. Each one now began to look upon the other with not
altogether brotherly eyes. You might have seen (as such men are found in the courts of all princes) sycophants running to and from the one side and the other carrying the words of both brothers backwards and forwards even if they had been spoken in the most secret chamber.37

There was also talk of a possible marriage between
George and a Scottish princess. Edward IV directed his emissary to thank the Scottish king, who ‘desireth a marriage to be had betwixt our brother of Clarence and a suster of the said king of Scotts; and another marriage also, to be had between our sustre the duchess of Bourgonne and the Duc of Albany his brothr’, ‘and promised that ‘when we shall finde tyme convenable we
shall feel their disposicions’. However, he seems to have taken no further action.
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According to the traditional view of the situation, the downfall of the Duke of Clarence finally came about as a result of prophecies regarding the fate of Edward IV and his offspring, together
with various allegations of black magic and of conspiracies to kill, which led to trials and executions preceding those of the duke himself. As we have seen, however, one of these trials and executions – Ankarettée’s – was not directly linked to the other conspiracies, and there is no clear evidence to connect it with George’s downfall. Therefore, no more will be said about the story of
Ankarette. The other aspects of the story of George’s downfall are, by themselves, sufficiently complex.

In the 1470s a noble lady in Warwickshire was suspected of having attempted to do away with her husband for selfish reasons. Two or three years later, details leaked out of an alleged conspiracy to oust the king. These two events and the links between them
involved two Oxford academics: Dr John Stacy (also known as Stacey and Stace) and Thomas Blake, a Warwickshire esquire called Thomas Burdet (Burdett), and members of the noble Beauchamp family of Powick.

The story of the case against Burdet and Stacy is reported, briefly and in part, by the author of the Crowland Chronicle continuations.
However, as we shall see, his report of the case is at best inaccurate, and at times possibly deliberately misleading. In the standard modern translation, the Crowland account reads as follows:

A certain Master John Stacey, called the Astronomer, though he had rather been a great necromancer, examined
together with one Burdet, a squire in the duke [of Clarence]’s household, was accused, among many charges, of having made lead figures and other things to get rid of Richard, Lord Beauchamp, at the request of his adulterous wife and during a very sharp examination he was questioned about the use of such a damnable art; he confessed to many things
both against himself and against the said Thomas [Burdet]. He and Thomas were therefore arrested together. Sentence of death was eventually passed upon them both in the King’s Bench at Westminster in the presence of almost all the lords temporal in the kingdom along with the justices. They were drawn to the gallows at Tyburn
and permitted to say anything they wished, briefly, before they died; they declared their innocence, Stacey, indeed, faintly, but Burdet with great spirit and many words, as though, like Susanna, in the end he was saying ‘Behold I die, though I have done none of these things.’

First, this account focuses
solely on the alleged plot against Lord Beauchamp of Powick. It says not a word about the far more significant allegations of plots against the king and the Prince of Wales, which, as we know from other sources, were also brought against the accused. Why the Crowland author chose to suppress these more important accusations is a mystery. He can hardly have been ignorant of them.
However, the fact remains that his account merely adds, in the vaguest possible way, that Stacy, when tortured, confessed to ‘many things’.

Second, the Beauchamp allegation, as related by the Crowland author, appears to be inaccurate. In April 1475 John, 1st Lord Beauchamp of Powick, died and was succeeded by his son, Richard, the 2nd Lord Beauchamp (c. 1435–
Richard’s wife had been Elizabeth Stafford, but she is reported to have died comparatively young, on 26 January 1466, more than nine years before Richard Beauchamp succeeded to his father’s title. She could therefore not have conspired in the 1470s with Stacy and others to bring about her husband’s death. Was it perhaps the wife of John, 1st Lord Beauchamp, who was
unfaithful to her husband, and who conspired to bring about his death? The fact that the 1st Lord Beauchamp did actually die in April 1475 makes this probable, since it would explain how the case against Lady Beauchamp came to light. The Lady Beauchamp in question would then have been Margaret (née Ferrars or Ferrers), who certainly outlived her husband,
surviving until about January 1487.²

Whatever the true identity of the Beauchamp wife accused of plotting against her husband, the lady in question was reportedly a relative of Thomas Burdet, and it was by conspiring with Burdet – and through him, with John Stacy and Thomas Blake – that she sought to bring about the death of her
husband by necromancy, using images made of lead. If the first Lady Beauchamp was the real accused, the plot may have been successful, since the 1st Lord Beauchamp died in the right period. According to detailed evidence of the chronology as subsequently recorded in respect of the trial, the plot against Lord Beauchamp was discussed by the relevant
Lady Beauchamp with her relative, Thomas Burdet, prior to April 1474. On 20 April of that year, Thomas Burdet approached Stacy and Blake at Westminster, and drew them into the plot. The black arts were reportedly employed, and, either as a result of this sorcery or from natural causes, the 1st Lord Beauchamp duly died about a year later.
However, the plot against Lord Beauchamp did not immediately give rise to criminal prosecutions. It was not until 1477, two years later, that legal proceedings began. From the surviving accounts it is not clear what precisely brought this about. However, it seems possible, from the chronology, that the direct cause of the trial may have been other, quite separate actions on the part of
Thomas Burdet. These comprised the publication and distribution in Holborn and Westminster of poems or ballads that challenged the right to the throne of Edward IV and his son by Elizabeth Woodville. Although Burdet’s verses have not been preserved, there is ample evidence that verses of this kind were circulated during the ‘Wars of the Roses’ for
political ends.\textsuperscript{5} Suggestions as to the possible content of Burdet’s verses will be offered later. Their publication and distribution is dated to 6 March, and to 5 and 6 May 1477.\textsuperscript{6} At all events, in the spring of 1477 Dr John Stacy of Merton College, Oxford and his colleague Thomas Blake, chaplain of the same college, were both arrested for misuse
of magic. Thomas Burdet was also arrested at about the same time.

John Stacy, a ‘gentilman’, originally of the diocese of Worcester, had obtained his bachelor’s degree in 1462 and his MA in 1467, by which time he was a fellow of Merton College. He was a nobilis astronomus (famous astronomer), a layman, and was married to a Mary or
Marion, who came from London. Thomas Blake was more or less Stacy’s contemporary, but was reportedly a greater astronomer than Stacy. For reasons which will become clear later, it is perhaps worth mentioning at this point that Canon (later Bishop) Stillington, who had reportedly officiated at the marriage of Edward IV to
Eleanor Talbot, was also an Oxford academic (albeit of Deep Hall and Lincoln College). Stillington is known to have maintained close links with his alma mater, and he may therefore have known Stacy and Blake. Rightly or wrongly, outsiders such as Edward IV, who later became aware of what Burdet, Stacy and Blake had allegedly been doing, may have considered this Oxford
connection significant.
A bishop (from a fifteenth-century woodcut).

Questioned under torture, Stacy reportedly confessed to having also attempted to use the black arts to bring about the death of the king and his eldest son, and admitted casting their horoscopes to ascertain the likely dates of their deaths. Stacy’s
confession also specifically implicated Thomas Burdet – then a member of the Duke of Clarence’s household, and also a relative of (?the dowager) Lady Beauchamp of Powick. We shall trace further details of Burdet’s background and history presently. However, the charges subsequently brought against Thomas Burdet in the trial were not merely that he had been involved in the
activities of Dr John Stacey. He was also said to have incited rebellion against Edward IV by publishing and circulating treasonable writings aimed at dethroning the king and removing his eldest son from the order of succession. Precise details of Burdet’s publications are not quoted in any surviving reports of his case, but one can presume that his aim was to replace Edward IV and his
Woodville offspring. The logical beneficiary would have been Burdet’s employer, the Duke of Clarence.

Thomas Burdet (c. 1425–77) was a landowner of Arrow, Warwickshire. Left fatherless as a child, he had been the ward of Humphrey, Earl of Stafford until 1446. He subsequently served John, 1st Lord Beauchamp of Powick (to whose wife, as we
have seen, he was possibly related). However, he had also served Lord Sudeley, the father-in-law of Lady Eleanor Talbot. It was the first of these two client connections that had later led him into the client network of the Earl of Warwick, whence he subsequently progressed into the service of Warwick’s son-in-law and heir, the Duke of Clarence. It also led to the
allegations of his involvement in a plot against Lord Beauchamp (or his son and heir).

However, Burdet’s second client connection is significant in a different way. Although no previous author has noted this point, when Thomas Burdet was in his thirties, he must have been personally acquainted with Eleanor Talbot and her first husband, Sir Thomas Butler
(Lord Sudeley’s son and heir). Subsequently, during the 1460s, he must also have known of Edward IV’s unexpected kindness to the former Lancastrian Lord Sudeley. Burdet may also have been aware of the motivation behind this unexpected royal generosity – namely Edward’s intimate connection at that time with Eleanor Talbot (who had maintained a good
Thus, Burdet himself could well have been one of those dangerous people who possessed knowledge of the precise nature of Eleanor Talbot’s relationship with Edward IV. This suggests interesting guesses regarding the possible content of Burdet’s treasonable publications against Edward
IV and his son. If Burdet’s publications did contain references to Edward’s Talbot marriage, that would explain why the salient details were not quoted when the publications were cited as evidence.

Once Edward IV heard what Burdet had been publishing, the possible link between Burdet’s Oxford University associates, Stacy and Blake, and Bishop Robert
Stillington seems to have been enough to land the bishop in trouble as well, even though he may not actually have committed any indiscretions. It was apparently assumed that it must have been Stillington who revealed details of the king’s Talbot marriage. At some point between Clarence’s later condemnation in Parliament and his subsequent execution,
Stillington was arrested – probably on about 15 February. He remained in the Tower for two months, and was only released on payment of a fine. He was not formally granted a pardon until Saturday 20 June 1478. However, that pardon exonerated him, with a ‘declaration that Robert, Bishop of Bath and Wells, has been faithful to the king
and done nothing contrary to his oath of fealty, as he has shown before the king and certain lords’. Edward IV was apparently finally convinced that the bishop had not given away his secret.

Given his links with the astrologers Stacy and Blake, Burdet’s verses may also have contained a prophecy of the downfall of Edward IV and his progeny. It is
interesting, therefore, to note that a factor closely related to the fate of the Duke of Clarence, and very well known from Shakespeare’s play, *Richard III*, is the story of the prophecy of ‘G’. In Shakespeare’s version, Clarence reports of Edward IV that he ‘says a wizard told him that by G / His issue disinherited should be’.¹⁷ Shakespeare did not invent
this story. Earlier references to it are preserved, though none survives which dates back as far as the fifteenth century. A poem about Clarence, believed to date from about 1547, includes the lines:

A prophecy was found, which sayd, a G
Of Edward’s children should destruction bee.
Mee to bee G, because
my name was George,
My brother thought, and therefore did me hate. \(^\text{18}\)

At about the same time, Edward Hall’s *Chronicle* also reported:

> The fame was that the king or the Quene, or bothe sore troubled with a folysh Prophesye, and by reason therof begâ to stomacke & greuously to grudge
agaynst the duke. The effect of which was, after king Edward should reigne, one whose first letter of hys name shoulde be a G. and because the deuel is wot with such wytchcraftes, to wrappe and illaqueat [ensnare] the myndes of men, which delyte in such deueleyshe fantasyes they sayd afterward that that Prophesie lost not hys
effect, when after kyn Edward, Glocester vsurped his kyngdome.  

Although no fifteenth-century account of this prophecy survives, it is entirely possible that the prediction was current in 1477, that the source of the prophecy was Stacy and Blake, and that it was disseminated via Burdet’s verses.

Whatever Burdet’s
publications contained, on 12 May the king appointed a commission of *oyer* and *terminer* to try him, together with Stacy and Blake.\(^20\) It was perhaps no accident that this commission was presided over by the Marquess of Dorset, eldest son of Queen Elizabeth Woodville, and that it included other members of the queen’s family.\(^21\) The fullest surviving account of
Jurors present, that THOMAS BURDETT esquire, late of ARROW, in the county of WARWICK, not having God before his eyes, and thinking little of the debt owed to his allegiance, seduced by the instigation of the devil, on the twentieth day of April in the fourteenth year of the
reign of KING EDWARD THE FOURTH, after the Conquest, and at various times thereafter, in the town of WESTMINSTER, in the County of MIDDLESEX, falsely and treacherously, against the debt of his allegiance, plotted to encompass the death of the king, and he falsely and traitorously proposed to kill the king himself, then and there,
and to fulfil his false and nefarious purpose, he falsely and treacherously laboured and procured one JOHN STACY, late of OXFORD, in the county of OXFORD, a gentleman, and THOMAS BLAKE, late of OXFORD, in the county of OXFORD, cleric, in the aforesaid town of WESTMINSTER, on the twelfth day of November next following,
to calculate and work on the birth of the said lord king and of EDWARD his first-born son, Prince of Wales, and on the death of the same lord king and prince, to know when the same king and his son Edward shall die. And as for the said JOHN STACY and THOMAS BLAKE, knowing the false and wicked purpose of the aforesaid THOMAS
BURDET, the same JOHN STACY and THOMAS BLAKE, on the twelfth day of November, in the aforesaid town of WESTMINSTER, falsely and treacherously planned to encompass the death of the king and prince, and then and there plotted to kill the same king and prince. And afterwards, on the sixth day of February, in the same fourteenth
year, in the said town of WESTMINSTER, the aforesaid JOHN STACY and THOMAS BLAKE to fulfil their false and treasonous purpose, falsely and traitorously laboured to calculate by means of the magic art, the black art, and astronomy, the death and final destruction of their king and prince. And afterwards, to wit, on the twentieth day of May, in
the fifteenth year of the reign of the said king, in the said town of WESTMINSTER, the aforesaid JOHN STACY and THOMAS BLAKE falsely and traitorously laboured by the above-mentioned arts, which is forbidden by the laws of Holy Church, by the teaching of various doctors, by the fact that each of them was bound to
the lord king, and by the fact that the investigation of kings and princes, in the form described above, is not permitted without their consent. And afterwards, the same JOHN STACY, and THOMAS BLAKE, and the aforesaid THOMAS BURDETT, at the above-mentioned town of WESTMINSTER, on the twenty-sixth day of May, in the same fifteenth
year, falsely and traitorously expressed themselves to a certain ALEXANDER RUSSETON, and to other subjects of the lord king, saying 'that by means of the aforesaid calculation and arts, carried out in the said form by the said JOHN STACY and THOMAS BLAKE, the same king and prince will not live long, but should
die within a short time’, with the intention of that by the revelation of this information, the people of the king should withdraw their heartfelt love from the king, and that the same lord the king, on perceiving this, might fall into sadness, and his life be cut short. And that the aforesaid THOMAS BURDET, to the death and destruction of the said
king, his sovereign lord, and the said lord prince, and to subvert their rule by war and discord between the king and his lieges in the aforesaid realm, on the sixth day of March, in the seventeenth year of the reign of the said king, in HOLBORN, the County of MIDDLESEX, falsely and treacherously plotted, conspired, and went about to kill the same king and
prince. And to fulfil that false, heinous end, the aforesaid THOMAS BURDET composed and made various notes and writings in seditious rhymes and ballads inciting treasonable riots, made in HOLBORN, and in the said town of WESTMINSTER. These he falsely and traitorously gave out, scattered abroad, and sowed on the said sixth
of March, and on the fifth and sixth days of May, in the said seventeenth year, with the intention that the people of the king should withdraw their heartfelt love from the king, and should desert him, and war should break out against the same king, to the final destruction of the king himself and of lord prince and all their supporters, as well as against the crown.
Despite their protestations of innocence, on Monday 19 May 1477, Stacy, Blake and Burdet were condemned for having committed high treason. Stacy and Burdet were taken to Tyburn on the following day, and there they were hanged, drawn and quartered. As we have seen, on the scaffold Burdet, in
particular, reportedly protested against his condemnation – which was to have dire long-term consequences for the Duke of Clarence.

Thomas Blake was not executed. Instead, although he seems to have been condemned with the others, he was pardoned on 3 June, at the request of another Oxford graduate, James Goldwell,
Bishop of Norwich. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Bishop Goldwell was a devout priest and bishop. Interestingly, he also had links with the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. Having served in Rome as the king’s proctor from 1467 until 1471, it was he who had obtained the papal dispensation that permitted their marriage in 1469.
As for the executions of John Stacy and Thomas Burdet, their final declarations of innocence were somehow recorded, and found their way into the hands of the Duke of Clarence. While Edward IV was at Windsor Castle, George burst into a meeting of the royal council at the Palace of Westminster, accompanied by Dr William Goddard, the Father
Provincial (head) of the Franciscan order in England. Dr Goddard had completed his doctorate at Oxford University, and probably knew Stacy and Blake. On the Duke’s instructions he now read to the royal council the alleged protestations of innocence of Stacy and Burdet. Dr Goddard was, perhaps, not the most diplomatic choice of a reader in this context, since the very
same man had been selected by the Earl of Warwick in September 1470 to preach in favour of Henry VI’s Readeption at St Paul’s Cross. When Edward IV learned of what had been done he was furious.

The Crowland author’s account of these events contains further questionable statements, suggesting that either he was extraordinarily
ill informed or that he wished to deliberately conceal something. First, he tells us that Stacy and Burdet were permitted to speak ‘briefly’ before they died. However, he then contradicts this with the statement that Burdet used ‘many words’. He also tells us that virtually all the lords temporal of the kingdom were present at the trial – thereby implying that most of the English nobility
were well aware of the accusations that had been brought and what precisely had been the evidence in the case. However, the surviving commission of the king specifies a quite specific group of people to hear the case. Moreover, if almost all the lords temporal already knew what had been said, it is hard to understand why Edward IV should have become so angry when his
brother had Burdet’s defence statement read to the royal council – for they would have already been familiar with the contents. One is also left wondering which medieval journalist or shorthand expert took down Burdet’s precise words on the scaffold. It seems likely that what was read to the council was a paraphrase – or a re-write – or a script prepared for Burdet in advance – or an
invented version – of Burdet’s defence.

Clarence’s only direct connection with the case of Burdet, Stacy and Blake was through Thomas Burdet, a member of his household. However, Burdet’s verses of spring 1477 were aimed at ousting Edward IV and his children – presumably in favour of Clarence’s accession as the new king (hence, perhaps, the prophecy
of ‘G’). No direct evidence survives of the reason the verses put forward for removing Edward IV and his Woodville heirs, and it is often assumed that the continental story of Edward IV’s own illegitimacy was the sole basis of Burdet’s case. However, it has been noted here for the first time that Burdet had a close connection with Eleanor Talbot’s family by her first marriage. It may
therefore be that the case (or part of it) as put forward by Burdet in 1477 – and as subsequently airbrushed out of his narrative with great care by the Crowland author – was identical to the one reportedly presented by Bishop Stillington to the royal council six years later, in the summer of 1483, namely that Edward IV was a bigamist and that his children by Elizabeth Woodville were
illegitimate.
So was the Duke of Clarence aware of Edward IV’s Talbot marriage in 1477? Were Burdet’s publications on this topic the source of Elizabeth Woodville’s sudden alarm, in that very same year, about her own marital status? Her anxiety was reported in writing only a few years later by the Italian diplomat and spy, Domenico Mancini:
The queen then [1477] remembered the insults to her family and the calumnies with which she was reproached, namely that according to established usage she was not the legitimate wife of the king. Thus she concluded that her offspring by the king would never come to the throne unless the duke of
Clarence were removed.  

Mancini’s clear and explicit account of Elizabeth Woodville’s sudden misgivings about her status and her children’s future is specifically connected to the fate of the Duke of Clarence. Although no supernatural reason for Elizabeth Woodville’s fears about her children’s future is specified by Mancini, his account is not
inconsistent with the surviving later reports of the prophecy of ‘G’. The queen’s fear of Clarence strongly suggests that by 1477 Clarence had finally somehow discovered the hitherto secret history of Edward IV’s marriage to Eleanor Talbot. How did he find this out? The king seems to have assumed initially that Robert Stillington was the source, and thus punished the
bishop. However, the king may have been wrong. There were other potential sources, and the most likely one now appears to be George’s own servant – Thomas Burdet.

One possible explanation of what took place – and of course, since none of Burdet’s publications survive this can only be speculation – is that Thomas Burdet then produced, printed, and distributed in London verses
which contained specific references to the invalidity of Edward IV’s marriage to Elizabeth Woodville, allegations of bastardy against the couple’s children, and prophecies (aimed originally at promoting the cause of the Duke of Clarence) which stated that the next true king of England would bear a name beginning with the letter ‘G’. Sadly, for the Duke of Clarence, the
chief result of these publications – and of the subsequent trial and execution of Burdet and his associates – was that ‘loe sudaynly [Edward IV] fell into a fact most horrible, commanding rashly and upon the suddane his brother George of Clarence to be apprehendyd’.
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On 19 January 1477/8, Stillington was appointed to a commission of the peace for Southampton (CPR 1476–1485, p.572). However, by Friday 6 March he had been imprisoned in the Tower of London. See: J. Gairdner, History of the Life and Reign of Richard the Third (Cambridge, 1898),
p.91, n.1, citing the letter of that date from Elizabeth Stonor. The precise date on which Stillington entered the Tower is not recorded, but Gairdner estimates that it was between 13 and 20 February.

On Tuesday 14 April 1478, Stillington was appointed to a commission of the peace for Berkshire, which
implies that he was free again (CPR 1476–1485, p.554).
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member, as were Sir Thomas Stanley, and the earls of Arundel and of Essex.

22. The present writer’s translation of Croke ... Select Cases, pp.121–2.

23. Burdet’s property was inherited by his son, Nicholas, a minor who was placed under the guardianship of Sir Simon Mountfort (CPR 1476–1485, p.102).
Subsequently, Sir John Grevyle was appointed to head commissions to examine what Burdet had held in the counties of Warwickshire, Worcestershire and Gloucestershire (CPR 1476–1485, p.50).

Goldwell held the see of Norwich 1472–99. For Blake’s pardon, see CPR 1476–1485, p.43. Even after receiving his royal
pardon, Thomas Blake evidently experienced some problems in re-establishing himself, as his surviving subsequent petition to Edward IV shows (TNA C81/1512/52).

25. ODNB, ‘James Goldwell’. Despite holding the Norwich see, Bishop Goldwell is unlikely to have known Eleanor Talbot, who
died four years before he received that appointment. Of course, he must have known Eleanor’s sister and brother-in-law, the Duke and Duchess of Norfolk.

26. There were two brothers, both named William Goddard, and both Franciscans, but despite arguments over who did what, it seems fairly certain that the Goddard
who preached in favour of Henry VI and the one who defended Burdet and Stacy was the same man.

The Crowland chronicler agrees with Vergil’s later account, for he too reports that ‘when [the king] heard the news he was greatly displeased’. The Crowland writer implies that the
immediate cause of the king’s displeasure was George’s reading of Burdet’s statement to the council. However, he hints at other causes, stating that Edward IV also ‘recalled information laid against his brother which he had long kept in his breast’. This information was probably a message from Louis XI:

Through the mouth of an envoy the King of France
sent word that, according to reliable information, one of the reasons Edward’s treacherous brother George of Clarence, aided by his sister Margaret, had hoped to secure the hand of Marie of Burgundy was in order to make himself King of England … According to the interpolator of Jean de Roye’s Parisian chronicle, usually reliable and here quite circumstantial,
Edward IV, on receiving Louis’ report, immediately dispatched an envoy to France to ask what, in the king’s opinion, he should do about Clarence. Louis asked one question: ‘Do you know for certain that my brother the King of England has the Duke of Clarence in his power?’ ‘Sire, yes’, was the reply. The king then quoted a line of Lucan: *Tolle moras,*
sepe nocuit differe paratas. (Avoid delay — postponement of a planned course of action often causes harm.) The ambassador asked for an explanation, ‘but he was unable to get anything more out of the king’. ³

As a result, ‘the duke was summoned to appear, on a fixed day, at the royal palace of Westminster in the
presence of the mayor and aldermen of the city of London’. These officials may have been involved because Burdet’s verses had been published in Holborn as well as Westminster. Hicks suggests that the hearing was scheduled for 10 June or very soon after. Once the group was assembled, and George stood before them:

the king, from his own lips,
began to treat the duke’s action already touched upon [i.e. causing Burdet’s statement to be read to the council], amongst other things [not specified], as a most serious matter, as if it were in contempt of the law of the land and a great threat to the judges and jurors of the kingdom. What more is there to say? The duke was placed in custody and was not found
at liberty from that day until his death.\textsuperscript{6}

Of course, a great deal more could have been said but unfortunately this is all we have. In (probably) mid-June 1477 George was placed under arrest in the Tower of London, where he remained for about six months. Meanwhile, Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville were preoccupied with the plans
for the splendid wedding of their 4-year-old second son, Richard, to Eleanor Talbot’s niece, Anne Mowbray, heiress of the late Duke of Norfolk. The marriage was to take place at the Palace of Westminster in January 1477/8. At about the same time, however, a Parliament was to assemble, to try the Duke of Clarence.

In fact, Parliament was opened on 16 January, two
days after the royal wedding, and Edward IV himself presented the case against his brother. The text of the Act of Attainder which was finally passed against George is quoted in full below, each section of the medieval English text preceded by a brief modern English summary. Essentially, the case put by Edward IV begins by recalling how he had confronted various earlier
attempts to overthrow him. It then goes on to say that there was now a new and particularly dangerous and malicious plot against not only the king, but also the queen and all their children. This plot was led by the Duke of Clarence. Despite all the kindness Edward IV had shown George, the latter was now protesting that his servant Thomas Burdet had wrongly been put to death.
The Duke’s underlying aim was to make himself king. Clarence was protesting that the king had deprived him of his livelihood. He had also preserved a document from the time of the Readeption that declared that if Henry VI and Edward of Westminster died without heirs [as, of course, they both subsequently had died], Clarence should become king. Moreover, Clarence had
been plotting with the Abbot of Tewkesbury and others to send his son and heir, the Earl of Warwick, out of the kingdom, to Ireland or Flanders. Because of all his plotting the king was now forced, despite their close relationship, to seek the conviction of the duke for treason:

Act of Attainder against George, Duke of
General introduction – how with God’s help the king has survived various plots and rebellions against him in the past.

The Kyng, oure Sovereigne Lorde, hath called to his Remembraunce the manyfold grete Conspiracies, malicious and heynous Ttresons, that
hertofore hath be compassed by dyverse persones his unnaturall Subgetts, Rebelles and Traytoures, wherby Commocions and Insurrections have been made within this his Royaulme, for entent and purpose to have destroyed his moost Roiall persone, and with that to have subverted the state, wele publique and politic of all
his said Royaulme; ne had so been, that by th’elp of Almyghty God, with the grete laboures and diligences and uttermost explette of his persone by Chevalrye and Werr, he had mightly and graciously repressed the same. Wherthrogh grete nowmbre of the said his Rebelles and Traytours he hath at dyverse tymes punysshed, as well by
sward as other punishshments, in exemple to others to have been ware of suche attempting hereafter. And yet as a benigne and a gracious Prince moeved unto pitie, after his grete Victories sent hym by God, not oonly he hath spared the multitudes in theire feldes and assembles overcomen, but thaym and certeyn other, the grete movers,
sturters and executours of suche haynous Tresons, at the reverence of God, he hath taken to his mercy and clerly pardoned, as may not be unknown to all the Worlde.

However, he has recently become aware of a particularly unnatural and wicked plot, directed against himself, his queen, his son the Prince of
Wales, and all his other children by the queen. This plot has been orchestrated by the one person who more than any other owed the king loyalty and gratitude.

This notwithstondyng, it is comen nowe of late to his knowlage, howe that agaynst his mooste Royall persone, and agaynst the persones of the blessed
Princesse  oure  alther  soveraigne  and  Liege  Lady  the  Quene,  of  my  Lorde  the  Prince  theire  son  and  Heire,  and  of  all  the  other  of  thaire  moost  noble  issue,  and  also  against  the  grete  parte  of  the  Noble  of  this  Lande,  the  good  rule,  politike  and  wele  publique  of  the  same,  hath  been  conspired,  compassed  and  purposed  a  moch  higher,  moch  more  malicious,
more unnaturalll and lothely Treason than atte
eny tyme hertofoern hath been compassed, purposed
and conspired, from the Kyng’s first Reigne hiderto; which Treason is,
and must be called, so moche and more henyous,
unnaturelll and lothely, for that not oonly it hath
proceded of the moost extreme purpensed malice,
incomparably ... excedyng
eny other that hath been afoern, but also for that it hath been contrived, imagined and conspired, by the persone that of all erthely creatures, beside the dutie of ligeaunce, by nature, by benefette, by gratitude, and by yeftes and grauntes of Goodes and Possessions, hath been moost bounden and behalden to have dradde, loved, honoured, and evere
thanked the kyng more largely, than evere was eny other bounden or beholden, whom to name it gretely aggruggeth the hert of oure said Sovereigne Lorde, sauf oonly that he is of necessite compelled, for the suertie, wele and tranquillite of hym and all this Royaulme, which were full neer the poynt of perdicion, ne were the help and grace of Almyghty
God:

This plotter was his brother, George, Duke of Clarence, whom the king has always loved and cared for and endowed very generously.

He sheweth you therefore, that all this hath been entended by his Brother, George, the Duke of Clarence. Wherein it is to
be remembered that the Kynges Highnesse, of tendre youthe unto now of late, hath evere loved and cherysshed hym, as tenderly and as kynderly, as eny creature myght his naturell Brother, as well it may be declared, by that that he beyng right yonge, not borne to have eny lifelode, butt oonly of the Kynges grace he yave hym soo large porcion of
Possessions that noo memorie is of, or seldom hath been seen, that eny Kyng of Englanede hertofoern within his Royaulme yave soo largely to eny his his Brothers. And not oonly that, butt above that, he furnyssed hym plenteously of all manere stuff, that to a right grete Prynce myght well suffice; so that aftre the Kynges, his lifelode and richesse
notably exceeded any other within his Lande at thatt tyme.

The king had raised Clarence to a higher position than anyone else, trusting that their relationship, and Clarence’s gratitude and loyalty to the kingdom would make him the king’s most faithful servant.
And yet the kyng, not herewith content, butt beyng ryght desirous to make hym of myght and puissance excedyng others, caused the greate parte of all the Nobles of this Lande to be assured unto hym next his Highnesse; trustyng that not oonly by the bond of nature, butt also by the bondes of soo grete benefitt, he shulde be more than others loving,
helping, assisting and obeissaunt to all the Kyngs good pleasures and commandments, and to all that myght be to the politik wele of his Lande.

Nevertheless, Clarence had rebelled against the king in the past, depriving him of liberty, forcing him abroad, and aiding usurpers – but had been forgiven.
All this notwithstandyng, it is to remember, the large grace and foryevnesse that he yave hym uppon, and for that at dyverse tyme sith he gretely offended the Kyng, as in jupartyyng the Kyngs Royall estate, persone and life, in straite warde, puttyng hym thereby from all his libertie, aftre procuryng grete Commocions, and sith the voydaunce outhe of
his Royaulme, assistyng yevyng to his enemies mortall, the usurpers, laboryng also by Parlement to exclude hym and all his from the Regalie, and enabling hymself to the same, and by dyverse weyes otherwyse attemptyng; which all the Kyng, by nature and love moeved, utterly foryave, entendyng to have putte all in perpetuell oblivion.
Despite this, Clarence had hatched new plots to destroy and disinherit the king and his children. He had campaigned to induce the king’s subjects to withdraw their loyalty, sowing sedition and arguing that his servant Thomas Burdet had been wrongfully condemned and executed.

*The said Duke, nathelesse*
for all this, noo love encreasyng, but growyng daily in more and more malice, hath not left to consedre and conspire newe Treasons, more haynous and lothely than ever aforne, how that the said Duke falsly and traitrously entended, and puposed fermely, th’extreme distruction and disherityng of the Kyng and his Issue, and to
subverte all the polityk rule of this Royaulme, by myght to be goten as well outewarde as inward, which false purpose the rather to brynge aboute, he cast and compassed the moyans to enduce the Kynges naturell Subgetts to withdrawe their hearts, loves and affections from the Kyng, their naturell Sovereigne Lorde, by many subtill, contruyved weyes, as
in causyng dyverse his Servauntes, suche as he coude imagyne moste apte to sowe sedicion and aggrugge amonge the People, to goo into diverse parties of this Royaulme, and to laboure to enforme the People largely in every place where they shulde come, that Thomas Burdett, his Servaunte, which was lawefully and truly atteynted of Treason, was
wrongefully putte to Deth; to some his Servauntes of suche like disposicion, he yave large Money, Veneson, therewith to assemble the Kynges Subjects to Feste theym and chere theym, and by theire policies and resonyng, enduce hem to beleve that the said Burdett was wrongfully executed, and so to putte it in noyse and herts of the People;
Clarence alleged that the king had used the black arts to corrupt his subjects.

he saide and laboured also to be noysed by such his Servauntez apte for that werk, that the Kyng, oure Sovereigne Lorde, wroght by Nygromancye, and used Crafte to poyson his Subgettes, suche as hym pleased; to th’entent to desclaundre the Kyng in
the moost haynous wyse he couth in the sight and concept of his Subgetts, and thefore to encourage theym to hate, despice and aggrugge theire herts agaynst hym, thynkyng that he ne lived ne dealid with his Subgettes as a Christien Prynce.

Clarence had now specifically claimed the throne for himself and his
heirs on the grounds that Edward IV was illegitimate. He induced some of the king’s subjects to swear on the Blessed Sacrament to support his claim to the throne. He promised people to restore to them the lawful inheritance of which Edward IV had allegedly deprived them.

And over this, the said
duke beyng in full purpose to exalte hymself and his Heires to the Regallye and Corone of Englande, and clerely in opinion to putte aside from the same for ever the said Corone from the Kyng and his Heirez, uppon oon the falsest and moost unnaturall coloured pretense that man myght imagine, falsely and untruely noysed, published and saide, that the Kyng
oure Sovereigne Lorde was a Bastard, and not begotte to reigne uppon us; and to contynue and procede ferther in this his moost malicious and traytorous purpose, after this lothely, false and sedicious langage shewed and declared amonge the People, he enduced dyverse of the Kynges naturall Subgetts to be sworne upon the blessed
Sacrament to be true to hym and his heires, noon exception reserved of theire liegeaunce; and after the same Othe soo made, he shewed to many other, and to certayn persones, that suche Othe had made, that the Kyng had taken his lifelode from hym and his men, and disheryed theym, and he wolde utterly endevoire hym to gete hem theire
enheritaunce as he wolde doo for his owen.

Clarence argued that the king intended to dispossess and break him. Wherefore he made an agreement with Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou which recognised Clarence as next-in-line to the throne after Edward of Westminster. Clarence had secretly preserved this document.
He shewed also that the Kyng intended to consume hym in like wyse as a Candell consumeth in brennyng, wherof he wolde in brief tyme quyte hym. And overe this, the said Duke continuynng in his false purpose, opteyned and gate an exemplificacion undre the Grete Seall of Herry the Sexte, late in dede and not in right Kyng of this Lande,
wherin were conteyned alle suche appoyntements as late was made betwene the said Duke and Margaret, callyng herself Quene of this Lande, and other; amonges whiche it was conteyned, that if the said Herry, and Edward, his first begoton Son, died withoute Issue Male of theire Bodye, that the seid Duke and his Heires shulde be Kyng of this Lande;
which exemplificacion the said Duke hath kepyd with hymself secrete, not doyng the Kyng to have eny knowlegge therof, therby to have abused the Kynges true Subgetts for the rather execucion of his said false purpose.

Clarence had requested the Abbot of Tewkesbury, John Tapton and Roger Harewell to bring a child to
Warwick Castle, to impersonate his son the Earl of Warwick, while sending the real Earl of Warwick to Ireland or the Low Countries, to provide a focus for rebellion against Edward IV.\textsuperscript{10} Clarence’s servant John Taylour was sent to take the earl abroad, but Tapton and Harewell refused to hand the boy over.
And also, the same Duke purposyng to accomplisse his said false and untrue entent, and to inquiete and trouble the Kynge, our said Sovereigne Lorde, his Leige People and this his Royaulme, nowe of late willed and desired the Abbot of Tweybury, Mayster John Tapton, Clerk, and Roger Harewell Esquier, to cause a straunge childe to have be
brought into his Castell of Warwyk, and there to have beputte and kept in likeliesse of his Sonne and Heire, and that they shulde have conveyed and sent his said Sonne and Heire into Ireland, or into Flaundres, oute of this Lande, whereby he myght have goten hym assistaunce and favoure agaynst oure said Sovereigne Lorde; and for the execucion of the same,
sent oon John Taylour, his Servaunte, to have had delyveraunce of his said Sonne and Heire, for to have conveyed hym; the whiche Mayster John Tapton and Roger Harewell denied the delyveraunce of the said Childe, and soo by Goddes grace his said false and untrue entent was lette and undoon.
Clarence sent his servants to various parts of the kingdom to incite rebellion and to muster armed forces to support his uprising, the aim of which was to utterly destroy Edward IV and his children, and to enthrone Clarence and his heirs.

Over all this, the said Duke, compassyng subtelly and trayterously to brynge this his trayterous purpose
to the more redy execucion by all meanes possible, and for to putte these said Treasons fynally to pleyn execucion, falsely and trayterously he commaunded and caused dyverse of his Servauntes to goo unto sundry parties of this Royaulme to commmove and stirre the Kynges naturall Subgetts, and in grete nowmbre to be redy in harnays within an
Houre warnyng, to attend uppon hym, and to take his parte to levy Werre agaynst the Kynges moost Royall persone, and hym and his heirez utterly to destroye, and therby the Corone and Royall Dignite of this Royaulme to obteigne, have, possede and enjoye to hym and to his heirez for evere, contrarie to all nature, ryght and duetie of his
Because of their blood relationship and the love he had felt for him in his youth, Edward IV would be inclined to forgive Clarence, if the latter had not now proved himself incorrigible, had not risked bloodshed on a large scale, and if Edward were not sworn to preserve himself, his children, the Church
and the welfare of all in the kingdom.

The Kyng, remembryng over, that to side the neernesse of Blode, howe be nature he myght be kynde to his Brother; the tendre love also, whiche of youthe he bare unto hym, couthe have founden in his hert, uppon due submission, to have yet foryeven hym estsones, ne
were, first that his said Brother by his former deeds, and nowe by this conspiracye, sheweth hymself to be incorrigible, and in noo wyse reducible to that by bonde of nature, and of the grete benefices aforne reherced, he were moost soveraynly beholden of all Creature: Secondly, ne were the grete juparty of effusion of Christien blode, which most likkely shulde
therof ensue: And thridenly and principally, the bond of his Conscience, wherby and by solempne Othe, he is bounden anenst God, upon the peryll of everlastyng dampnacion, to provyde and defende, first the suertie of hymself and his moste Royall Issue, secondly, the tranquilite of Goddes Churche within this, his Royaulme, and after that, the wele
publique, peas and tranquilite of all his Lordez, Noblemen, Comens and others of every degree and condicion, whiche all shulde necessarily stande in extreme jupartie, yf Justice and due punyshement of soo lothely offencez shulde be pardoned; in pernicious example to all mysdoers, theves, traytours, rebelles and all other suche as
lightly wolde therby bee encoraged and enbolded to spare noo manner of wikkednesse.

Therefore, for the sake of justice, the king in Parliament had convicted and attainted Clarence of high treason, and all Clarence’s property was forfeit.

Wherfore thof all [sic]
the Kynges Highnesse be right sory to determyne hymself to the contrarie, yet consideryng that Justice is a vertue excellently pleasying Almyghty God, wherby Realumes stande, Kynges and Pryncez reign and governe, all goode rule, polyce and publique wele is mayteigned; and that this vertue standeth not oonly in retribucion and
rewarde for goode dedes, butt also in correccion and punysshement of evil doers, after the qualitees of theire mysdoyngs. For whiche premissez and causez the Kyng, by the avyse and assent of his Lordes Speretuell and Temporell, and by the Commons, in this present parliament assembled, and by the auctorite of the same, ordeyneth, enacteth and
establith that the said George, Duke of Clarence, be convicte and atteyntit of Heigh Treason commyttet and doon agaynst the Kynges moost Royall persone; and that the same Duke, by the said auctorite, forfett from hym and his heyres for ever the Honoure, Estate, Dignite and name of Duke. And also that the same Duke, by the said auctorite, forfett
from hym and his heyres for ever, all Castelles, Honoures, Maners, Landes, Tenements, Rents, Advousons, Hereditaments and Possessions that the same Duke nowe hath by eny of the Kynges Lettrez Patents to his owen use, or that any other persone nowe hath to the use of the same Duke by eny of the Kynges Lettrez Patents, or that passed to hym fro the
Kyang by the same: And that all Lettrez Patents made by the kyng to the said Duke bee from henseforthe utterly voyde and of noon effecte.

Property which the Duke held jointly with others is not forfeit, but Clarence’s share shall now pass to his co-holders.

And that it be also
ordeigned by the same auctorite that noo Castelles, Honoures, Maners, Landez, Tenementz, Rents, Advousons, Hereditaments or Possessions that the same duke nowe hath joyntly with other, or sole to hymself, to the use of eny other persone, be forfett, nor conteyned by or in this present Acte; but that by the said auctoritte, every
other persone to whose use the said Duke is sole seised in eny Castelles, Honoures, Maners, Landez, Tenements, Rents, Advousons, Hereditaments and Possessions, otherwyse than by the Kyngs Lettres Patents, have power and auctorite by this present Acte lawefullly to entre into theym, and theym to have and holde after the entent and trust that the said
Duke nowe hath theryn. And also where the same Duke is joyntly seased with any other persone in any Castells, Maners, Landez, Tenementz, Rents, Hereditaments or Possessions to the use of any other persone, otherwyse than by the Kyngs Lettrez Patents: that by the said auctorite, the said joynt feffez stonde and be feoffez to the same use
and entent as they nowe arre and be; and that suche right, interest and title as the same Duke nowe hath with theym in the same premyssez, by the said auctorite, be in his cofeffeze to the same entent as the same Duke nowe ys: Savyng to every of the Kynges Liege people, other than the said Duke and his Heyrez, and all other persone and persones that
clayme or have eny tytell of interest in eny of the premyssez by the same Duke, suche right, tytle and interest as they owe or shulde have in eny of the premyssez, as if this Acte had never been made.

A cest Bille les Comunez sont assentuz.

Le Roy le voet.

This Act of Attainder is a carefully worded but
somewhat curious document. It establishes two important facts about George’s latest plot. First, this was directed not only against the king, but against Elizabeth Woodville, and against Edward’s children by her. Second, unlike his earlier plots (which had imprisoned Edward, depriving him of real power, or had forced him into exile, giving the throne to usurpers) the latest plot had the specific
aim of destroying Edward and his family, and making George himself king.

The Act also states that in his latest plot George had sought to achieve his objective by having his servants spread seditious stories. Although Thomas Burdet is not specifically said to have taken part in this activity, Burdet is named, and the sedition is then said to have been spread by George’s
servants ‘of similar disposition’. Mention of Thomas Burdet was apparently considered important by the crown. The phrasing employed is vague, but it implies that Burdet spread sedition – presumably via his verses. Not surprisingly, the content of the verses is not cited – but contemporary members of Parliament may have been familiar with them.
The lack of clarity in explaining who exactly spread George’s seditious stories (whatever they were), and how Thomas Burdet was connected with that activity, leads on to a further lack of clarity in respect of the means George had sought to employ to oust his brother. George is accused of possessing a document bearing the seal of Henry VI, which recognised him as heir to the throne if
Henry and Edward of Westminster both died heirless. George probably did possess such a document. However, he is not accused in the Act of having used it in any way. Reference to it therefore seems rather like scraping the bottom of the barrel on the part of the crown, in order to produce evidence against George that could safely be cited in public. George is also said to
have accused Edward of being a bastard. Surprising though it may seem that the king mentioned this publicly in Parliament, Edward (and Elizabeth Woodville) may have felt that this was the least dangerous accusation to publicise, because evidence could be produced to disprove it. George is not said to have accused the king of bigamy. But, of course, if he had raised this issue, both
Edward and Elizabeth Woodville would have done everything in their power to suppress the fact.

The Act also invites questions on three other points:

Why is reference made to the many previous problems and disturbances of the king’s reign, and to earlier conspiracies against the king? Did Edward IV
wish to present his reign as a series of disasters – or is this simply an example of the standard practice in such documents (see, for example Richard III’s titulus regius of 1484).

Why is George said to have accused the king of using the black arts against his subjects?

Strong circumstantial
evidence (with named witnesses) is cited to show that George attempted to send his son out of the country – but did not succeed in this. Why was it considered important to mention this attempt – and to establish publicly that it had not succeeded?

Finally, while the Act is very specific about what is to be done with George’s
possessions, it says nothing about the proposed fate of the Duke himself. Indeed, there is no mention of George being sentenced to death – but presumably he was, since Edward IV was later asked by the Speaker of the Commons to take action in this respect. Parliament may therefore have sentenced George to the usual, rather brutal form of execution for a traitor – hanging, drawing and
quartering – followed by a clause allowing the king to commute this sentence if he so desired. Evidence to this effect is cited in the next chapter.

It is often stated that the Act of Attainder was passed on Friday 16 January 1477/8. That was the date on which Parliament was opened, but the surviving text of the Act itself contains no date. Once the Act had been passed (and
depending on the precise date of that event) it is possible that no further action was taken immediately – except perhaps by Cecily Neville (see below). However, on Saturday 7 February Edward IV appointed his cousin, Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, to the post of Steward of England with specific reference to the recent judgement against the Duke of Clarence. The king
explained that:

despite the close blood ties and the inner feelings of love, which We had and practiced to the aforesaid George in his tender age, and which naturally move Us in a contrary direction, as We understand it, the Office of the Steward of England (whose presence is required here for the execution of a Judgement
which has yet to be carried out) is currently vacant.  

He then instructed Buckingham, as the new steward, to execute the recent judgement against his brother. Buckingham had hitherto been out of favour. However, he was married to Catherine Woodville, a younger sister of the queen, who had recently borne him a son and heir, to whom the
king had stood as godfather. Buckingham obviously acted efficiently in the role assigned to him, for on 11 February he was rewarded with the grant of a manor in Wales.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{NOTES}

\textsuperscript{1} Crowland, p.145.
2. Ibid.
5. FFPC, p.126.
6. Crowland p.145, my emphasis.
7. George may have visited Ireland in February/March 1476/7, just after the death of his wife and younger son – see above, chapter 11.

9. John Strensham, or Streynsham. He was abbot until 1481, but it is not known precisely in which year he succeeded John de Abingdon (abbot 1442–?). ‘Abbot Strensham was godfather to Clarence’s

10. In the light of later events, in the reign of Henry VII, this allegation is particularly intriguing. For more on
this, see my forthcoming sequel: J. Ashdown-Hill, *The Dublin King* (Stroud, 2014).

11. Perhaps: ‘Wherfore therof, although the kynge’s Highnesse …’?


George’s death has long been listed amongst the murders attributed to his younger brother, Richard, Duke of Gloucester (later Richard III). But of all Richard III’s imaginary
crimes, this is probably the most ridiculous allegation. George was not murdered, for a legal procedure was followed. He was arrested, tried before Parliament, found guilty and attainted. The person officially responsible for his death was the king. As George Buck reported in the first half of the seventeenth century, ‘it was not the Duke of Gloucester, but the Kings implacable displeasure for his
malice and treasons that cut him [Clarence] off, who could not think himself secure whilst he lived.’

Holinshed’s *Chronicle*, published in 1577 (almost a century after the event) claimed that Edward IV regretted his brother’s death, both at the time and afterwards:

Although king Edward were *consenting* to
[Clarence’s] death, yet much did he both lament his unfortunate chance & repent his sudden execution: insomuch that when anie person sued to him for the pardon of malefactors condemned to death, he would accustomable saie & openlie speake: ‘Oh infortunate brother, for whose life not one would
Holinshed’s use of the word ‘consenting’ implies that the real initiative came from someone else. We shall return to this point presently. Of course, Holinshed is hardly a contemporary source. However, a contemporary letter from Dr Thomas Langton also implies that the king regretted his brother’s death (see below).
George’s execution took place privately on Wednesday 18 February 1477/8. In an account published first in 1516, Robert Fabyan states simply:

Anno xvii [1477–78]
This yere, that is to meane þe xviii daye of February the duke of Clarence and [second] brother to the kynge, thanne being
prisoner in þe Tower, was secretly put to dethe & drowned in a barell of maluesye within the sayd Tower.⁴

Polydore Vergil, writing in 1512–13, reports:

Clarence … was drowned (as they say) in a butte of malmesey; the woorst example that ever man cowld remember. And as
touching the cause of his death, though I have enquiryd of many, who wer not of leest authorytie emongest the kings cownsaylle at that time, yeat have I no certaintie therof to leave in memory. 5

Two aspects of George’s fate apparently intrigued Vergil: first, the reason which lay behind it (which may deliberately have been partly
concealed); second, the form of George’s execution.

Richard III seems to have believed that someone other than Edward IV bore the ultimate responsibility for George’s execution. In 1483, in his instructions to the Bishop of Enachden, his envoy to James, 8th Earl of Desmond, in Ireland, Richard III linked the death of James’ father, Thomas, the previous (7th) Earl of Desmond, with
the death of his own brother, Clarence:

the said bisshop shall ... shewe that albe it the fadre of the said erle, the king than being of yong age, was extorciously slayne and murdred by colour of the lawes within Ireland by certain persons than havyng the governaunce and rule there, ayenst alle manhode, reason, and good
conscience; yet, notwithstanding that the semblable chaunce was and hapned sithen within this royaume of Eingland, as wele of his brother the duc of Clarence as other his nigh kynnesmen and gret frendes.
An artist’s interpretation of the death of Clarence (redrawn by the author).
Since responsibility for the Earl of Desmond’s execution was attributed to Elizabeth Woodville it seems likely that Richard III also believed that she was behind George’s death. 7

In the same year, the foreign agent and spy Domenico Mancini also sought information regarding Clarence’s execution – and discovered that contemporary
opinion did indeed ascribe the ultimate responsibility for the Duke’s death to Elizabeth Woodville. As we have already seen, writing in November 1483, he reported that:

the queen … concluded that her offspring by the king would never come to the throne unless the duke of Clarence were removed; and of this she easily
persuaded the king … [thus Clarence] was condemned and put to death. The mode of execution preferred in this case was that he should die by being plunged into a jar of sweet wine.\textsuperscript{8}

Mancini’s report regarding the manner of Clarence’s execution was confirmed by Jean de Roye, writing about six years later.\textsuperscript{9} De Roye gives a very full and complete
account of what took place, though he left blank the name of George’s burial place, and he mistakenly reported that his father-in-law, the Earl of Warwick, had been killed at Coventry (presumably meaning Tewkesbury) rather than at Barnet. Interestingly, de Roye’s account, written from a continental viewpoint, assumed that the prime cause of George’s death was his desire to intervene in
Burgundian politics on behalf of his sister, Margaret. According to de Roye’s account, Clarence was initially sentenced to the normal death of a traitor. However, the sentence was later commuted as a result of the urgent pleading of his mother: 10

In the said year 77 [1477/78] it came about in the kingdom of England
that, because King Edward learned that one of his brothers, who was the Duke of Clarence, intended to cross the sea into Flanders to give aid and assistance to his sister, Duchess in Burgundy, widow of the said deceased last duke, this made King Edward arrest his brother and imprison him in the Tower of London, where he was detained as a
prisoner for quite a long time while the said King Edward assembled his
council, by whose deliberations he [Clarence] was condemned to be led from the said Tower of
London, being dragged on his buttocks to the gibbet of the said city of London, and there to be cut open
and his entrails thrown into a fire, and then his neck should be cut and his body
made into four quarters. But afterwards, by the great prayer and request of the mother of the said Edward and Clarence, his sentence was changed and moderated, so that in the month of February of the said year, Clarence being a prisoner in the Tower of London was taken and brought out of his said prison, and after he had been confessed, was thrust
alive in a cask of Malmsey opened at one end, his head downwards, and there he remained until he had given up the ghost, and then he was pulled out and his neck was cut, and afterwards he was shrouded and borne to burial in [BLANK] with his wife, sometime daughter of that Earl of Warwick who died at the Battle of Coventry [sic for
Tewkesbury] with the Prince of Wales, son of the sainted Lancastrian King Henry [VI] of England.¹¹ That George died by drowning is also confirmed by Philippe de Commynes. Writing some ten years after Mancini, in about 1495–96, Commynes reported that ‘King Edward had his brother, the duke of Clarence, put to death in a pipe¹² of
malmsey because it is said he wanted to make himself king.’\textsuperscript{13} Thus we have four independent contemporary or near-contemporary sources who agree as to the manner of Clarence’s execution.\textsuperscript{14} And since what they all tell us appears to be highly unusual, there must surely be some substance underlying their accounts.

There is genuine evidence
of execution by drowning on the mainland of Europe in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Later, drowning in the River Loire was used as a method of execution at Nantes during the French Revolution. We also have accounts of pirates killing their victims by making them ‘walk the plank’ – though this was probably much rarer than is popularly imagined.
Also, drowning was long used as a means of execution in Scotland, where it was a form of capital punishment generally reserved for women. This was:

because it was a less violent death ... Although drowning was generally reserved for females, being the least brutal form of death penalty, at times a male was executed in this
way as a matter of favour, for instance in 1526 a man convicted of theft and sacrilege was ordered to be drowned ‘by the queen’s special grace’. 17

The motivation behind the Scottish practice is significant, because execution by manual beheading was bloody and sometimes took several attempts. Before the introduction of the guillotine,
decapitation was neither rapid nor painless. By contrast:

drowning is quick and silent, although it may be preceded by distress which is more visible. A person drowning is unable to shout or call for help, or seek attention, as they cannot obtain enough air. The instinctive drowning response is the final set of autonomic reactions in the
20–60 seconds before sinking underwater, and to the untrained eye can look similar to calm safe behavior. 18

The allegation that the Duke of Clarence was drowned is not the only report of a death by this means ascribed to King Edward IV. Henry Holland, Duke of Exeter who, like Clarence, was a member of the royal family, since he...
was Edward IV’s brother-in-law and cousin,\textsuperscript{19} may have been executed by drowning in 1475, possibly on Edward’s orders.\textsuperscript{20} Moreover, earlier we encountered the death – possibly at the instigation of Edward IV’s father – of William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk. It is usually stated that Suffolk was killed on a ship in the English Channel, and the general assumption is
that he was first beheaded and then his body was thrown overboard. However, Suffolk’s body was found later on an English beach, and he was reportedly buried, possibly at Wingfield church in Suffolk, on the orders of his widow. No account suggests that his body was found without a head (which might have made it difficult to identify). Perhaps the Duke of Suffolk was also executed
by drowning.

What emerges is a possible scenario whereby Edward IV may have regarded drowning as a less violent and more genteel form of execution than the gruesome and bloody practice of beheading. Impelled (perhaps somewhat reluctantly) to put George to death, he may have chosen not to spill his brother’s blood, in the belief that he himself would feel less guilty,
and that his brother would die more quietly and gently by drowning. This is the interpretation arrived at in the nineteenth century by James Gairdner, who wrote:

I think it is clear that Edward’s feelings were severely tried, and that, while he consented to sanction his brother’s death, he shrank from inflicting on him the shame
of a public execution, which, in fact, would have reflected on the whole family. He therefore preferred a secret assassination.\textsuperscript{21}

The person immediately responsible for George’s death was his cousin, the Duke of Buckingham – Steward of England – who has also been accused by some writers of responsibility
for the subsequent deaths of Edward IV’s sons, the so-called ‘princes in the Tower’. Of course there is no proof that these boys were killed, or that Buckingham was responsible, but, intriguingly, they too are rumoured to have died by being deprived of oxygen – possibly drowned in Malmsey. 22

Apparently no public statement was ever made
about the nature of Clarence’s execution. Even members of the king’s council seemed to have been ignorant of what exactly had been done. But the Tower servants probably gossiped about the strange event, so that unconfirmed reports circulated. If these reports had no basis in fact, it is difficult to imagine who would have dreamed up such an unlikely story.

One unfortunate outcome
seems to have been the creation of a myth that George was a drunkard. Another potentially unfortunate outcome is that no trace of such a means of execution would now be discernible on George’s physical remains – particularly if these have been reduced to mere bones. As the rediscovered remains of Richard III and of Edward II’s lover, Hugh Despenser,
have recently demonstrated, more violent deaths are more easily verifiable. It is the fate of Clarence’s mortal remains in 1478 and subsequently that we shall explore in the following chapters.

**Notes**

1. Myers/Buck, p.83.
2. *HCSP*, p.140, my emphasis.

3. John Rous, using the calendar then in use – according to which 1478 did not begin until 25 March – ascribed Clarence’s death and burial to February 1477 (see below: chapter 15 and Appendix 2).


8. ‘Regina ... estimavit nunquam prolem suam ex rege iam susceptam regnaturam, nisi dux Clarentie aufferretur: quod et ipsi regi facile persuasit ... Condemnatus fuit: et ultimo supplicio affectus. Supplicii autem genus illud placuit, ut in dolium mollissimi falerni mersus vitam cum morte commutaret’ (Mancini,
Mancini states at the end of his text that he finished writing it on 1 December 1483.

9. The surviving MS dates from between 1498 and 1503, and contains some interpolations, but the original text may have been completed in about 1489.

10. Rather similarly, Anne Boleyn, having been accused of witchcraft
among other things in the following century, was sentenced to be burned to death – but with the proviso that the king could commute her sentence to beheading.

11. Oudit an LXXVII, advint ou royaume d’Angleterre que pour ce que le roy Edouard dudit royaume fut acerténé que ung sien frère, qui estoit duc de Clairence,
avoit intension de passer la mer et aler descendre en Flandres pour donner aide et secours à sa seur duchesse en Bourgongne, vesve dudit defunct le derrenier duc, fist icellui roy Edouard prendre et constituer prisonnier sondit frère et mettre prisonnier en la tour de Londres, où il fut depuis détenu prisonnier par certaine longue
espace de temps pendant lequel ledit roy Edouart assembla son conseil, et par la deliberacion d’icellui fut condempné à estre mené depuis ladicte tour de Londres traynant sur ses fesses jusques au gibet de ladicte ville de Londres, et ilec estre ouvert et ses entrailles gecter dedens ung feu, et puis lui copper le col et mettre le
corps en quatre quartiers. Mais depuis, par la grant prière et requeste de la mere desdiz Edouard et de Clairence fut sa condamnacion changée et muée, tellement que, ou moys de Février ouldit an, icellui de Clairance estant prisonnier en ladicte tour, fut prins et tiré de sadicte prison, et après qu’il ot esté
confessé, fut mis et bouté tout vif dedens une queue de Malevoisye defonsée par l’un des boutz, la teste en bas, et y demoura jusques à ce qu’il eust rendu l’esperit, et puis fut tire dehors et lui fut le col coppé, et après ensevely et porté enterrer à ... avecques sa femme, jadis fille du conte de Waruik, qui mourut à la

12. ‘A cask of wine, or sometimes a measure of capacity, usually equal to half a tun or two hogsheads or four barrels’ (from Commynes, p.89).

13. Commynes, p.89.
Holinshed, whose account was published in 1577, also reports that Clarence had been ‘privily drowned in a butt of malmsie’, though he erroneously gives the date as 11 March (HCSP, p.139).


2013).


19. He was descended from John of Gaunt, and married to Edward IV’s eldest sister, Anne.


The Clarence vault at Tewkesbury Abbey was probably constructed in 1476/7. Precise dates are not recorded, but since the body of the Duchess of Clarence lay unburied on a hearse in
the abbey church for thirty-five days, the work probably took place during this five-week period. The vault must have been completed by Saturday 8 February 1476/7, since on that date it received Isabel’s body.

Although it is usually known as ‘the Clarence vault’, Julian Litten has suggested that it might more accurately be described as a stone-lined grave with access steps. It was constructed by being dug out, given a stone
roof, and lined with stone walling and floor tiles. The location is behind – i.e. to the east of – the reredos of the high altar of Tewkesbury Abbey church. At the time of its construction, the vault lay ‘in front of the door of the chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the opening of the tomb was made opposite the entrance of the chapel of Saint Edmund the Martyr’.
As the original Latin words of the Abbey chronicle state, the vault was:

\[ \text{artificialiter facto retro altaro majus, ante capellam Beatae Mariae ecclesiae conventualis, et ostium sepulturae positum est ex opposite ostii capellae Sancti Edmundi martyris.} \]

The eastern Lady Chapel no
longer exists. It was destroyed just over sixty years after the burial of the Duke of Clarence, following the dissolution of Tewkesbury Abbey. One writer has noted that:

the fourteenth century stone screen-work round the choir side of the ambulatory, particularly at the back of the reredos and the north-east portion
adjacent to it, is very interesting work. The lower part is panelled with tracery in low relief, with the arches springing from diminutive heads. All the shafting is ornamented with a small ball-like enrichment. Above the panelling is some open tracery of beautiful design. By reference to the plan it will be seen that much of this original screen-work
has been set back several feet, possibly to make room for the Clarence vault.  

This setting back of the stonework was probably the initial preparation for a projected Clarence chantry chapel above the vault. However, it appears that the plan was never completed.

The vault had been dug out of the ground in the centre of
the eastern end of the ambulatory, directly behind the high altar and its reredos. In fact, measurements indicate that the western wall of the vault is located approximately ten inches west of the screen work at the back of the reredos. The vault is rectangular: approximately 9ft from north to south and 8ft from east to west. The ceiling is covered by a flattened arched vault, 6ft 6in
high at the centre. Just as the western wall of the vault extends behind the eastern wall of the reredos screen, so also ‘the crown of its arch rises a few inches above the [modern] pavement level’. This is currently concealed by a stone platform constructed in 1878 by Sir George Gilbert Scott.

The vault is entered by means of six and a half steps
of slightly variable size leading down from a large rectangular opening on its northern side. The present opening is 5ft by 3ft, and although the surrounding stonework was modified in the nineteenth century, it is probable that the original opening was of similar dimensions.

The floor of the vault is covered by tiles of fourteenth- and fifteenth-
century date, probably brought from the reserve stock either of the abbey itself, or of the local tilers. There is every reason to suppose that this tiled floor formed part of the original construction of the vault. The tiles were certainly in place prior to 1709 (see below). Originally, the tiles were glazed, though many of them have now lost their glaze. In the centre of the floor there is
a cross, formed originally of thirty-seven encaustic tiles, each approximately 5.5in square. This cross was surrounded by plain glazed tiles, most of which are approximately 6in square, though down the southern side of the cross 7in square tiles have been employed, some of which were cut or broken to fit the space. Amongst the 6in tiles,
thirteen encaustic patterned tiles pepper the floor in what appears to be a random manner. Some of the 6in and 5.5in patterned tiles bear designs found also in other parts of the Tewkesbury Abbey flooring. Others appear to be unique to the Clarence vault. In the north-eastern corner a roughly rectangular area just at the foot of the stairs was covered in larger tiles, each
approximately 7in square, most of these seem to have been plain, with an olive-green glaze. However, one of the broken half-tiles in this section, at the very foot of the stairs, is patterned with a yellow and green glaze. Apart from the central cross, which divided the vault into two sections, north and south – presumably to delineate the spaces for the two coffins of the Clarence couple – there
appears to have been no special plan to the pattern of the flooring. Normally, of course, it would not have been visible after the burials.

Just over a year after the interment of the duchess, on Wednesday 25 February 1477/8, the Duke of Clarence was also buried at Tewkesbury Abbey. Several records survive of this. One of our most important witnesses for George’s burial
at Tewkesbury – and also **against** the burial there of his baby son, Richard – is the fifteenth-century Warwickshire priest and chronicler, John Rous. Further evidence for the duke’s burial at Tewkesbury Abbey will be presented shortly. It is true that none of the surviving documentary evidence states precisely *where* in the abbey George was buried. However, since
the Clarence vault certainly existed at the time of his interment, and since it was large enough to contain two burials, and had apparently been planned to do so, it is virtually certain that he was buried there.

As we have seen, Clarence was put to death on Wednesday 18 February. The duke’s body must have been prepared for burial almost immediately after he was
killed. This was the normal practice in the case of a royal death. Embalming usually took about a day, after which royal bodies normally lay in state for about a week. In Clarence’s case, however, there can have been no lying in state. By the evening of Thursday 19 February the duke’s body, embalmed and wrapped in cere cloth, probably lay in its coffin.
ready for his last journey. Instead of a royal lying-in-state in the capital, Clarence’s body was destined to make the 125-mile (200km) journey to Tewkesbury, a journey which must have taken about three days.¹¹
The Office of the Dead in the fifteenth century.

The usual pattern for royal burials in the late fifteenth century was that the embalmed corpse was first wrapped in cere cloth and then sealed in lead sheeting, which formed an inner coffin or ‘anthropomorphic shell’. This was then placed in a thin outer wooden coffin. This
seems to have been done in 1481 for Edward IV’s daughter-in-law, Anne Mowbray, Duchess of York and Norfolk, and it was done in 1483 for Edward IV himself. A similar pattern was employed by Richard III for the reburial of the remains of Henry VI at St George’s Chapel, Windsor, in 1484. On that occasion a full-sized outer wooden coffin was used
for cosmetic purposes, while the small inner coffin that contained Henry’s disarticulated bones was made of lead. Elizabeth Woodville was given no lead inner coffin. She had only a coffin made of wood. It is known from other sources that Henry VII was giving his mother-in-law a deliberately cheap funeral.  

Subsequently, Henry VII
himself, Edward VI and James I were all buried in cere cloth, lead and wood according to the standard pattern. It is probable, therefore, that this pattern was also followed in the case of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence.\(^{14}\) Today, however, no trace of cere cloth, of lead coffins, or of wood, survives in the Clarence vault. Cere cloth and wood would have
perished in the water that regularly invades the vault. As for lead, it was a valuable substance, inviting the attention of plunderers when the Clarence vault was later opened and workmen were employed within it.  

The only possible trace of any Clarence coffins that survives today comprises six iron coffin handles, a piece of thin iron plate, and an iron
nail about 2.5in in length. When the surviving bones from the vault were examined in 1982, this metalwork was found with them, and it is now preserved in the Parvis chamber at Tewkesbury Abbey. Julian Litten, who examined the best-preserved handle, together with the nail and the iron plate, in 1986, considered that this metalwork could be fifteenth-century in date, and that it
certainly pre-dated the eighteenth century (when the only other known burials in the Clarence vault took place). It is possible, therefore, that these six coffin handles were originally attached to one of the wooden Clarence outer coffins. Medieval wooden coffins did not always have handles, but since the body of the Duke of Clarence had to be transported to Tewkesbury
from London, handles may have been attached to his outer wooden coffin in order to make it easier to move. However, they could have come from a pre-eighteenth-century coffin which belonged to someone other than the Duke or Duchess of Clarence (see below).

On Friday 20 February, in a letter written by the royal councillor, Dr Thomas Langton, we hear that the
king had ‘assignyd certen Lords to go with the body of the Dukys of Clarence to Teuxbury, where he shall be beryid; the Kyng intendis to do right worshipfully for his sowle’. The lords in question are not named by Dr Langton. Nevertheless, it appears that Clarence was being given a respectable funeral. It is conceivable that one of the lords escorting the
body was Clarence’s younger brother, Richard, Duke of Gloucester. Gloucester had certainly been in London and Westminster since soon after Clarence’s arrest the previous summer. He had reportedly been striving to persuade Edward IV to show clemency. Gloucester is then said to have left Westminster soon after Clarence’s execution. Subsequently, he slowly made his way back
north to Middleham Castle, where he arrived before the end of March.\textsuperscript{17} He could have travelled via Tewkesbury.

Clarence’s coffin and its escort probably left the capital on 20 February, and the funeral party may perhaps have paused that night at the Cluniac abbey of Reading, where Clarence’s distant ancestor King Henry I lay
buried. After a second night’s repose at some other religious house – possibly the Augustinian abbey at Cirencester – the little cortege will finally have arrived at Tewkesbury Abbey some time on the evening of Monday 23 February. In the course of Tuesday 24 February – just one week after Clarence’s death – the offices of vespers and matins for the dead were probably
celebrated for the abbey’s deceased patron in its choir. Then on the morning of Wednesday 25 February, requiem masses would have been sung for him, at the end of which Clarence’s body will almost certainly have been carried down the steps to join the remains of his late wife in the vault behind the high altar.  

Edward IV may also have
made arrangements to commemorate Clarence’s burial in some way, but if so, no documentation survives. Evidence does exist to suggest that further work on Clarence’s tomb may have been carried out several years later. On 4 August 1483 Clarence’s younger brother, the former Duke of Gloucester – then King Richard III – visited Tewkesbury. While he was
there, Richard made arrangements to discharge a debt which Clarence had left owing to the abbot and monastery of Tewkesbury. Perhaps this comprised payments due for the construction of the Clarence vault and chantry. Although no medieval funerary brasses now cover the Clarence vault, a brass memorial did once exist. In
At the back of the high altar, beneath a large flat blue stone, bearing evident marks of once having been inlaid with brass or other similar metal, is a flight of eight stone steps,\textsuperscript{21} which leads to a fine arched vault, wherein the remains of Isabel Duchess of
Clarence, eldest daughter of Richard Neville Earl of Warwick, were deposited in 1477; and where, also, her illustrious husband, George Duke of Clarence, brother to King Edward the Fourth, most probably, after his mysterious death in the Tower, found that repose which was denied to him in his lifetime.22

Thus, despite the fact that the
vault had been opened in the eighteenth century, the original brass matrix was still in place in 1826. It must once have borne brass figures representing George and Isabel, together with representations of their arms and suitable inscriptions. For a tentative reconstruction of the possible appearance of such a monument, see plate 23.

George himself would have
had little time or opportunity to arrange for Isabel’s commemoration in this way—and even had he done so, someone else would later have needed to add his own figure and inscription to the stone. The most probable explanation therefore appears to be that the matrix was made and installed in 1483, at the behest of Richard III, following the latter’s visit to Tewkesbury, and his financial
outlay on behalf of his dead brother, Clarence. The surviving description of the Tewkesbury Clarence vault matrix sounds very similar to the slab which was installed – presumably also by Richard III – over the Westminster Abbey tomb of Richard’s queen, Anne Neville (younger sister of Isabel, Duchess of Clarence). Queen Anne Neville’s Westminster matrix must have been
ordered, made and installed in 1485, but ‘To-day all that remains of her tomb is a bluish-grey marble slab in the pavement … Brass nails can still be found, showing that once a “brass” marked [her] last resting place.’

Since both matrices were of blue stone and both held brasses, it is not unreasonable to suggest that both were commissioned at about the same time.
(1483/85), and by the same person—Richard III.

Richard may also have planned to complete the Clarence chantry, but his unexpected death in 1485 prevented it. From the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, the Clarence tomb was marked by a blue stone matrix, originally containing brasses. Despite the fact that the vault was subsequently opened on a number of
occasions, it appears that this blue stone matrix was consistently replaced over the vault entrance up until April 1876. However, it probably lost its brass insets in the sixteenth or seventeenth century.
1. Former Research Assistant Administrator, Department of Design, Prints and Drawings, V&A; report of a meeting with Dr Richard Morris, then Hon. Archaeologist at Tewkesbury Abbey, in 1986. I am grateful to Dr Morris for a copy of the report of this discussion.

2. MAT, p.62.

3. Quoted in Blunt, TA,
4. MAT, p.63.

5. Hicks suggested that an engraving of the Clarence tomb, in a much more complete state than today, exists in R. Atkyns, *Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire*, but Atkyns had been in error. What he had illustrated was not, in fact, the Clarence tomb.
Atkyns does indeed suggest that statues of Clarence and Isabel survived at Tewkesbury in his day. However, when he wrote ‘on the North side of the Choir are two Statues carved in Marble with great Art, for George Duke of Clarence Brother to King Edward the Fourth, and for Isabel his Dutchess; she was
buried in a Vault behind the high Altar 1479’, he was mistaken. The statues he describes were part of the neighbouring Despenser tomb. These images were never intended to commemorate Clarence and his wife. See R. Atkyns, *Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire* (London: 1712, 1768;
reprinted 1974), p.722. See also TA4, p.36.

6. The height was double-checked for me by Neil Birdsall, former Tewkesbury Abbey architect, on June 2013, and proved consistent and accurate.

7. ‘Restoration of Tewkesbury Abbey’, Tewkesbury Register, 20 July 1878. I am grateful to Pat Webley, Hon.
Archivist at Tewkesbury Abbey, for this, and for other information marked [PW].

8. Four tiles at the end of the southern arm of the cross were removed at some point – probably in 1709, as part of the preparations for the burial of Samuel Hawling.

9. See, for example the later funeral arrangements for

10. Linen coated in wax to make it waterproof.

11. For comparison, see the evidence of the time required for the shorter journeys between London and Stoke-by-Nayland in Suffolk in 1483, each of which took Edward IV’s

12. This was to give the outward appearance that the body was still intact, whereas in fact the corpse had decayed, and comprised disarticulated bones.

13. *RMS*, p.94.
14. The empty and broken stone coffin that now lies in the vault dates from an earlier period than the Clarence vault, and is a later intrusion – see below.

15. In 1335 (before the Black Death), surviving records show that 1 fodder (approximately 1,000kg) of lead purchased to repair the roof of Portchester
Castle cost 3 shillings (J. Blaire and N. Ramsey, eds, *English Medieval Industries* (London: Hambledon Press, 1991, 2001), p.64). It is very difficult to convert this precisely into modern currency, but using a conversion rate based on 1337 property values, 1kg of medieval lead would probably have cost about £15 in
modern money.


18. The *Rous Roll* records: ‘he died in the towr of London and is buryed at twokysbury the xxv day of feverel in the yere of

20. Hicks (*FFPC*, p.185) claimed that one of the encaustic tiles forming the cross laid on the floor of the Clarence vault commemorated Richard III as king, but this is not correct.
Although the tile immediately to the east of the square pattern in the centre of the cross on the floor of the Clarence vault does contain a (slightly erroneous) representation of the late Plantagenet royal arms (England quartering France modern) there is nothing to connect this tile specifically with Richard III.
21. Sic. Presumably the writer was counting the ground level as the first step and the half step at the top of the flight as a whole step.


To summarise the evidence of its early history, the Clarence vault was probably constructed for Isabel’s burial in 1476/7, and reopened for George’s interment in 1477/8. After about 1484 there is no
documentary evidence that it was opened again until 1709. Disturbance unquestionably took place in the vicinity of the vault in about 1540, when the adjacent eastern Lady Chapel of the former abbey church was demolished.\(^1\) One writer has therefore assumed ‘that the tomb was desecrated and pillaged soon after the Dissolution, and again later on in Commonwealth times’.\(^2\)
It is important to stress that no written evidence supports this hypothesis – though the Clarence brasses could well have been ripped out of their stone matrix in either of these two periods. But although there is no written evidence that the Clarence vault was opened – let alone desecrated – in either the sixteenth or the seventeenth century, there is some circumstantial evidence
that the vault may have been opened in about 1540. If the vault was opened at that time the reason was probably to reinter there human remains from a tomb in the eastern Lady Chapel which was then being demolished (see chapter 17).

In 1709 the Clarence vault was definitely opened again, to allow the interment of a local alderman, by name Samuel Hawling, a member
of the Tewkesbury Corporation. It was then reopened in 1729 to receive the remains of Hawling’s widow, Mary. In 1753 the vault was opened a third time, for the burial of Hawling’s son, John.\(^4\)

If the first recorded opening, in 1709, really was the first time the vault had been accessed since the 1480s, at that time the
Clarence burials should have been substantially intact. The wooden outer coffins would probably have decayed, due to the damp conditions in the vault, but the inner lead coffins should still have been lying where they had been placed in the fifteenth century, on either side of the central cross on the floor of the vault. On the other hand, if the vault had been opened in 1540 it is possible that the
lead from the coffins had been stolen at that early date, in which case, by the eighteenth century the surviving remains of George and Isabel would probably have been no more than two piles of bones.

Either way, in order to introduce the coffin of Samuel Hawling it would have been necessary to move the Clarence remains. It is therefore certain that in 1709
the contents of the vault must have been rearranged. Moreover, perhaps because it was evident that the Clarence burials had suffered from damp, it was apparently decided not to place Samuel Hawling’s coffin directly on the floor of the vault. Therefore three large pieces of broken stonework were brought in to support the new burial. These were placed on the southern side of the vault.
Since the stones were of unequal heights, holes were dug in the floor to receive the bases of the easternmost one, and the one in the centre, thus creating a level surface to bear Samuel Hawling’s coffin. To achieve this it was necessary to break up the original floor tiles in those areas.

During his discussion on the possible date of the iron
coffin handles found in the Clarence vault (see above), Julian Litten pointed out that it was a common practice in vault-type burials to have a charnel pit in the floor, on the far side of the vault, opposite the entrance. In the case of the Clarence vault, such a charnel pit, if it ever existed, would have been on the southern side. There is no evidence that a charnel pit was created during the
original construction of the Clarence vault. However, it is possible that something of this kind was added during the 1709 digging on the southern side of the vault in preparation for the reception of Samuel Hawling’s coffin. In that case, some of the Clarence bones may have been buried under the stones introduced to support Samuel Hawling’s coffin.

Of the three stone supports
added to the vault in 1709, the western one appears to be cemented into place. However, the eastern and central stones are not cemented. During our examination of the vault in April 2013, Dr Richard Morris, Dr Michael Donmall and I did not move the western stone. However, we lifted the eastern and central stones to briefly look beneath them. Under the eastern stone
was found loose soil, together with broken pieces of floor tiles (including part of a decorated tile). The central stone has some loose soil beneath it, and also some solid material resembling concrete, at the western end of its hole, which appears to hold part of another floor tile. No digging was done, and both stones were simply replaced. However, if an opportunity were to arise in
future, it would be interesting to excavate beneath these three stones to check whether any of the holes in the soil beneath them were used as charnel pits in 1709, in which some of the Clarence bones may have been buried, in order to reduce the quantity of material in the vault.

In 1729, when the vault was re-opened for the interment of Mary Hawling, her coffin was placed above
that of Samuel on a newly constructed shelf. Traces of the outline of this shelf can still be discerned on the eastern, southern and western walls, and the mortar for the supports on its northern side can still be found on the tiled floor. Later written accounts confirm that the coffins of Samuel and Mary had been disposed on the southern side of the vault, enclosed behind a brick wall. Since the
subsequent burial of the Hawlings’ son, John, was eventually enclosed by a second and separate wall further to the north, it is logical to assume that the first (southernmost) brick wall was already in place before he was buried. Therefore it must have been built at the time of Mary’s interment, in 1729.

Traces of the mortar where the 1729 brick wall met the
stone walls of the vault at its eastern and western ends can still be discerned, as can marks showing the line of bricks on the floor. These indicate that the brick wall stood approximately 2ft to the north of the original southern wall of the Clarence vault. Thus, from 1729 the open space in the Clarence vault was reduced from 9ft by 8ft to approximately 6ft 6in by 8ft (allowing for the width of
the bricks). Workmen would have spent some time in the vault, constructing the brick wall to enclose the Hawling coffins. They could well have taken the opportunity to explore any other human remains which then lay in the vault, and even to make off with the valuable lead from the earlier coffins.

In 1753 the vault was opened again, for the burial of John Hawling, son of
Samuel and Mary. Remains of any pre-Hawling bodies still lying in the vault – by this time almost certainly robbed of their protective lead coffins – must have been lying in the open, north of the brick wall enclosing the first two Hawling burials. Water must long since have reduced them to bones. That the vault had suffered from flooding between 1729 and 1753 is evidenced by a coating of
pitch which was now added to the floor of the vault, on top of the medieval floor tiles – presumably in an attempt to prevent future damage by flooding – before John Hawling’s body was brought in.

When the floor was coated in pitch, all loose material (including loose human bones) must have been moved. Subsequently, the remains were apparently
dumped back in the north-west corner of the vault, leaving space for the new Hawling coffin. Once again, bones and other material might have been lost from or added to the pile. If *post*-medieval intrusive remains were introduced, that may well have happened at this stage.

Following John’s funeral, workmen erected a second brick wall to enclose his
coffin. The 1753 wall was two feet to the north of the wall of 1729, reducing the open space in the vault to approximately 4ft by 8ft. John Hawling’s burial is recorded in the Churchwardens’ Accounts as follows:

31st August 1753 To Ground in the outbounds of the Chancel & Bell for Mr Hawling £2/12/6.
It seems that the church authorities were charging for the ground space taken up by the new burial, even though it was inside the Clarence vault! Interestingly, the next entry in the accounts, dated 3 September 1753, is:

To Cash rece'd for bricks – 4/8.6

These were presumably the
bricks used to build the new northern wall in the Clarence vault, sealing off John Hawling’s burial. The natural curiosity of the bricklayers may have led them to explore the pile of material in the corner of the vault – another opportunity for bones to have been removed.

After 1753, what had originally been the Clarence vault had more or less been transformed into two small,
sealed Hawling vaults, containing the coffined remains of Samuel, Mary and John Hawling. The three Hawling burials were commemorated by a stone bearing the following inscription: 7

Here lieth the body of Samuel Hawling, Gent,
who died December 17, 1709, Aged 72
Also Mary, his Wife,
who died December 2, 1729, Aged 96
Also John Hawling, Gent,
In his *Tewkesbury Yearly Register and Magazine* for 1848, Bennett lists the full inscriptions on some of the Tewkesbury gravestones, including that of the Hawlings. Moreover, in a footnote he states that ‘these inscriptions were copied from the grave stones, by the editor of this Miscellany, in the year
1830’, and in another footnote he reveals that the stone bearing the Hawling memorial inscription ‘was placed upon the arch of the Clarence vault’. This tells us that the Hawling memorial lay not over the entrance to the vault, but in the centre of the floor behind the high altar of the church and its reredos. As we have already seen, the vault entrance was
apparently still covered at this period by the Clarence brass matrix of c. 1483 – albeit robbed of its brasses. The next recorded opening of the vault occurred in 1826, in the presence of the vicar and the churchwardens. A feeling seems to have been growing that the Hawling family had behaved rather outrageously. Probably the 1826 opening was therefore in the nature of an
investigation of the current situation. A graffito of 1826 can still be seen on the eastern wall of the vault, between the entrance steps and the former site of the second eighteenth-century brick wall, enclosing the burial of John Hawling. It was inscribed by Thomas Witherington Junior, a local bricklayer born in 1771. Following the inspection of
the vault, it was reported that Samuel and Mary Hawling ‘lie inclosed by a brick wall at the south end of the vault and that of John Hawling is placed to the northward of his parents and cased in another brick wall’. These facts could only have been established by piercing, or partially dismantling, the Hawling brick walls – which presumably is why a
bricklayer was employed. In the churchwarden’s accounts for 1826 a sum of £21/2/4 was paid to Thomas Witherington in August, probably for the work he had carried out in the Clarence vault. 10

Three years later, in 1829, the Clarence vault was opened again. This time the purpose was clear. The three Hawling bodies were
extracted, and ‘removed to another grave, southward of this vault . . . and bones which were supposed to be those of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence were then gathered together and placed in a stone coffin brought from a grave beneath the Trinity Chapel and the vestry’. It is generally assumed that the stone coffin was empty when the Clarence vault bones were
inserted within it, but in fact there is no evidence to this effect. Obviously, if the stone coffin already contained some bones, that would have affected the subsequent contents of the Clarence vault. One alternative account of this coffin reads as follows:

An ancient stone coffin was then taken into the vault, the supposed bones
of the royal duke and duchess were deposited in it, and here they were securely inclosed, by placing a large stone upon the top of the coffin ... The coffin ... was dug up by the sexton, whilst he was making a grave for Mr Samuel Jeynes, between the vestry door and the Trinity chapel, in 1773; and from the situation in which it was found, it is
supposed to have been that of one of the Despenser family.  

Bennett tells us that once the Hawling bodies had been transferred to their new burial site, ‘their grave stone was afterwards laid upon it’.  

This presumably refers to the inscribed Hawling slab which had previously lain over the centre of the arch of the vault.
The eighteenth-century brick walls in the Clarence vault were completely removed during the relocation of the Hawling burials. It would have been impossible to remove the Hawling coffins without first demolishing them. Moreover, there is no subsequent record of their existence. In 1830, the vault was then reported to
in the most perfect state, and measured nine feet long, eight feet wide, and six feet four inches high. The arched roof and walls were of Painswick freestone, and must have been chiefly hewn from large masses of solid material [sic]; the floor was paved, and in the centre was the representation of a cross,
extending almost the whole length and breadth of the vault, formed with painted bricks; on some of these were the arms of England, of the Clares, &c, and on some were ornamented letters, birds, fleurs de lis, and various other devices, similar to bricks which are frequently found about the church; and of which, it would seem, the members of the convent kept a store,
to be used as embellishments as occasion might require. In the northwest corner of the vault were found two skulls, and other bones; these were evidently the remains of a man and woman, and although there was nothing to prove that they were relics of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence, there are some circumstances which
render it by no means improbable. 15

On 26 April 1876 the Clarence vault was opened once again, ahead of the planned re-flooring of the ambulatory, which was then about to begin. At that time the entrance to the vault was still closed by a large stone slab. The surviving account of the opening does not state specifically that this was the
original blue stone brass matrix, but there is no reason to suppose that it was not.\textsuperscript{16} When the vault was opened, the stone coffin within which the putative Clarence bones had been placed was found to be full of water. The surviving account of this opening also implies that the medieval stone coffin was then found to contain one small but complete skull, and
the occiput of a second skull, with an assortment of bones. It was probably at this stage that the bones were cleaned and some of the long bones repaired with wooden dowelling. Subsequently, it is possible that the bones were not replaced in the stone coffin, but transferred to a wooden-framed case (see below). 17

The blue stone matrix was
never put back, and there is no record of what was done with it subsequently. It now appears to be lost. In its place, about three months later, plans were made to commission the iron grille which closes the vault today. Early the following year, after the floor level above the arch of the vault had been raised slightly, a small brass memorial
inscription was inserted in the new floor, just to the west of the grille. The Latin inscription on this brass was composed by Mr J. T. D. Niblett:

\begin{verbatim}
Dominus Georgius Plantagenet dux Clarencius et Domina Isabelle Neville, uxor ejus qui obierunt haec 12 Decembris, A.D. 1476, ille 18 Feb., 1477.
\end{verbatim}
The nineteenth-century brass also bears two Yorkist badges of suns in splendour.\textsuperscript{19} In the following year (1878), the present iron grille was installed.

During the late 1930s some kind of further examination of the vault and of the remains took place, but no
detailed account of this survives. Sir Gavin de Beer, sometime Director of the Natural History Museum, and Professor E. B. Ford FRS, were the principal investigators on this occasion, and may be responsible for the notes inscribed on some of the surviving bones in ink. It was later stated that ‘Sir Gavin had been able to draw out of the bones a skull to which two vertebrae were
attached, indicating that the owner of the bones had been executed.’ This recalls Jean de Roye’s reference to George’s neck being ‘cut’ after the drowning (see above, chapter 14). However, there is no confirmation from any other source that there had been articulated portions of skeleton in the vault. Nevertheless, this hearsay account appears to confirm
the statement of 1876 that in relatively recent times the skeletal remains included an *intact* skull. There is no indication of what subsequently became of it, or of how it relates to the two craniums (bereft of facial bones) which *now* constitute part of the remains, but the most likely explanation would seem to be that the male skull may have been intact until about 1940.
It was probably following the examination of the bones in the late 1930s that a metal-framed glass case was introduced to contain them. We can tentatively suggest that, following the investigation, the bones were transferred into this new case, which is reported to have been made during the incumbency of Canon Gough (1930–42). It may also have
been at this point that the stone coffin which had held the bones since the nineteenth century was removed from the vault. Its subsequent fate is unknown.

Surviving graffiti dating from the 1940s on the south wall of the vault show that there was easy and unsupervised access during this period. A living parishioner of Tewkesbury church recalls ‘that her father,
who was headmaster of a local school, used regularly to show people into the vault, which was not locked. Visitors could simply let themselves in, apparently',\footnote{23} and it was probably at this time that further damage was done to the bones. It may have been during this period that the complete skull was broken, and since the facial bones of both skulls are now
missing, presumably more bones were also either removed or destroyed at this time.

Until the present (2013), the only fully recorded detailed physical examination of the remains contained in the Clarence vault is that conducted in 1982. The vault was opened on 13 June 1982, in the presence of the vicar of Tewkesbury, Rev. Michael Moxon, and the entire glass
and metal case was then removed to a room above the sacristy for an examination by Dr Michael Donmall. No scientific testing (carbon dating, DNA sampling, scanning or use of X-rays) took place on this occasion, but the surviving bones were listed, photographed, and tentatively assigned to two individuals, one male and the other female. Following this
examination, a detailed report of the findings was prepared.\textsuperscript{25} There is further reference to the contents of this report in the next chapter. Unlike the recently discovered remains of Richard III, which were left more or less undisturbed from 1485 until 2012,\textsuperscript{26} the bones of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence certainly endured a disturbed history. Moreover,
in terms of evidence of identification, there was much testimony to support the identification of the remains of Richard III. This included Richard’s physical appearance in life and the manner of his death.

In the case of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence, such supporting evidence is lacking. We have already seen that, apart from the reported cut to his neck after
his drowning, the mode of death traditionally attributed to the Duke of Clarence would have left no mark on his skeleton. The death of the Duchess of Clarence (whether it was the result of poison or of childbirth) would likewise have left no mark on her bones. The only other thing in the history of the couple which might have left visible evidence upon the bones was the wound reportedly suffered
by the Duke of Clarence at the Battle of Barnet in 1471.

Moreover, unlike the physical appearance of Richard III – clear indications of which were still visible in his skeletal remains – absolutely nothing specific has been recorded regarding the physical appearance of either George or Isabel. The only point about Isabel’s appearance that has been suggested here is that she
may have had a somewhat long and thin face. At least two surviving depictions of her appear to suggest this, and similar facial features are depicted in a portrait of her daughter, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury (see illustrations). But, of course, we cannot be certain that the surviving images of Isabel and Margaret are accurate in this respect.

We do have some
information about the appearance of George’s relatives, which might suggest some indication of his physical appearance. However, this evidence is neither clear nor conclusive. We have noted that Edward IV and Richard III both had brown hair, and that their brother George is likely to have had hair of a similar colour. But since no hair survives today amongst the
Clarence vault bones, this point is of no help to us. Edward IV was tall – a little over 6ft in height – and slim in his youth, although he grew fat later. From a depiction of Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy, which shows her receiving a book from William Caxton, we can deduce that she too may have been tall and slim. The picture shows her as approximately the same
Some previous writers have therefore assumed that George, Duke of Clarence might also have been tall and slim. While the reasoning behind this opinion is understandable, in fact it now appears unlikely that the children of the Duke and Duchess of York were all tall. Richard III’s height is now known to have been about
average or slightly above (approximately 5ft 8in). However, we have seen evidence to show that, in his late childhood, George was small for his age. We shall explore the issue of height in more detail in the next chapter.

Additional factors which were used to help to identify the remains of Richard III were the place of his burial, his social status, his age at
death, the date of his death, and his mtDNA sequence. Here we may be on firmer ground in respect of the Clarence vault bones. We know for certain that the Duke and Duchess of Clarence were buried at Tewkesbury Abbey. Thus those bones preserved in the Clarence vault today indubitably lie in the right place. We also know the social class of the Clarence
couple; we know when they died; and we know that Isabel was 25 years old and George 28 at the moment of their respective deaths. All of these are features against which the surviving Clarence vault bones might be tested.

As we have seen, the previous examination of the bones, in 1982, led to the formulation and publication of certain conclusions in respect of the number and sex
of the individuals represented by the remains. It was considered that at least two adult individuals were represented, including one male and one female. The report also gave assessments of the age at death of the two proposed individuals, and compared the height of the male remains with what was then thought to have been the likely height at death of the Duke of Clarence (based on
the known height of his brother, Edward IV). In general the conclusions reached as a result of the 1982 examination were negative. The remains were thought to belong to individuals of the wrong heights and ages to have been the Duke of Clarence and his wife. However, a preliminary new examination of the remains was carried out by Dr Joyce Filer in April 2013.
Based on this new examination, in the next chapter we shall attempt to re-assess the identity of the surviving remains.

**NOTES**

1. I have dated this event to 1540 rather than 1539 (when the abbey was
dissolved) because in 1540 Forthampton Court was granted to the former abbot and he moved a tomb there from the eastern Lady Chapel (see chapter 17).

2. MAT, p.62.

3. Similar theft of brasses took place in many churches, both at the Reformation and during the Civil War.

4. MAT, p.62; Blunt, TA,
During his examination of the vault in April 2013, the present writer, with the assistance of Neil Birdsall, former Architect of Tewkesbury Abbey, tested these stones and discovered that they had been laid in such a way as to produce a level upper surface.

In his *Historical*,
Monumental and Genealogical Collections Related to the County of Gloucestershire, written c. 1740 onwards, and published posthumously in instalments between 1791 and 1899, Ralph Bigland, who died in 1784, records the full Hawling inscription. It was copied down again from the original.


10. For help in tracing details of Thomas Witherington and his work at the abbey in 1826 my thanks to [PW].
It is not known what later became of this stone coffin. It is not in the Clarence vault today. The small and broken stone coffin of a child which does at present lie in the Clarence vault cannot be the coffin in question. First, the child’s coffin is too small to have held the bones. Second, its
broken condition would not permit it to fill with water (the coffin containing the bones was found filled with water in 1876). Third, a photograph in the abbey archives, taken in 1923, shows the Dean of Winchester holding the Compotus Roll of Tewkesbury Abbey, which Winchester Cathedral presented to
Tewkesbury Abbey to mark the 800th anniversary of its consecration. This photograph was taken in what is now the chapel of St John the Baptist and St Catherine, but was then used as a museum, containing various items discovered by Scott during his restoration of the Abbey – including the small
coffin that is now in the Clarence vault [PW].


14. However, what subsequently became of this commemorative stone is a mystery. It is not to be found within the church today.


16. ‘It was also thought desirable that the
Clarence vault should be opened before the commencement of arrangements for laying the new pavement. On removing the large slab behind the altar a flight of steps was disclosed …’ ‘Tewkesbury Abbey Restoration, ‘Interesting Discoveries’, Tewkesbury Register, 29 April 1876 [PW].

17. TA4, p.38.
18. ‘Should it be desired to keep the approach to the vault open a stone curb should be placed round the staircase level with the pavement (which must be completed), and a hinged iron grating fitted to the opening’.

‘Restoration of Tewkesbury Abbey’, Tewkesbury Register, 20 July 1878.

19. ‘Lord George
Plantagenet, Duke of Clarence, and Lady Isabelle Neville, his wife, who died, she on Dec. 12, 1476, he on Feb. 18, 1477. I came in my might like a sun in splendour, Soon suddenly bathed in my own blood’.

20. MAT, p.62.
21. Based on a later hearsay report of a dinner conversation with Sir
Gavin de Beer, by Dr J. R. L. Highfield, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. I am grateful to Dr R. Morris, former Archaeologist at Tewkesbury Abbey, for this information (and copies of the surviving correspondence) – and other information marked [RM].

22. TA4, p.38.
23. Personal communication
from Graham Finch, churchwarden, April 2013. I am grateful to Graham for his research on this point. I think Neil Birdsall, former architect of Tewkesbury Abbey, believes that the present padlock, which now locks the grille and prevents casual access to the vault, was added in the late 1970s.

25. 1985 report by Dr M. Donmall, submitted to the vicar and the PCC [RM].

26. The only disturbance was the cutting of a small trench in the nineteenth century, which accidentally removed the feet.

27. The original version of this picture also shows Margaret as taller than any of her female
attendants.
First, it now seems possible to offer clearer and more accurate information than was hitherto available in respect of the adult heights of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. In attempting to
predict the height at death of George, Duke of Clarence, we should consider the following evidence:

1. Towards the end of March 1461 George (future Duke of Clarence) was aged 11 years 5 months. His younger brother, Richard (III), was aged 8 years 5 months. The Burgundian chronicler, Wavrin, who
saw them at this time, estimated their ages as 9 and 8 respectively.¹ This suggests that while Richard was of about average height for his age, George was smaller than normal, a characteristic which, as we have seen, he may possibly have inherited from his mother.

2. The modern average
height for a boy of 11 is about 4ft 9in, and for a boy of 12 about 5ft. This suggests that an average boy aged 11 years 5 months would be about 4ft 10in in height.

3. The average modern height for a boy of 9 is 4ft 5in.

4. These figures suggest that in March 1461
George may have been 4 or 5 in below the average height for his age.

5. In March 1461 Richard (III) was of about average height for his age.

6. At the time of his death in 1485, at the age of 32, Richard III’s height (ignoring any possible effect of his scoliosis)
was about 5ft 8in, based on measurement of his bones as found in August 2012. This is considered slightly above the average height for a man of his age, social class and period.

7. *If* George had remained shorter than his brother, his height at the time of his death (in 1478, at the age of 28) could well
have been 4 or 5in less than the height at death of his brother Richard.

8. In this case, at the time of his death we might tentatively predict George’s height to have been of the order of 5ft 3in or 5ft 4in.
Graph showing growth rates of two modern boys, which approximately correspond to the apparent growth rates of Richard III and George, Duke of Clarence.

9. A graph (the relevant curve of which is reproduced here,
labelled ‘G’) which shows the growth rates of modern boys who were of similar height to George at the age of eleven and a half, indicates that their adult height (aged 20) is likely to be about 5ft 5in.²

10. The same graph (curve ‘R’) indicates that modern boys who share Richard III’s estimated
height at the age of 8 are likely to be about 5ft 9in at the age of 20.

11. Since we know that Richard III’s true adult height would have been 5ft 8in it is not unreasonable to conclude that George’s adult height would also have been about an inch less that the height indicated by modern
statistics (curve ‘G’) – i.e. about 5ft 4in.

12. There are many possible causes of below average height. It can be genetic (inherited). The fact that Edward IV and Richard III were of above average height while their mother was reputedly of short stature makes it difficult to generalise about the
likely height of members of the House of York.

13. Another possible cause of low height can be arthritis: ‘there is often a more generalized growth reduction in children with active arthritis’. ³
ESTIMATED COMPARATIVE HEIGHTS OF THE YORK BROTHERS

Edward IV  George  Richard III
Duke of Clarence
Comparison of the respective adult heights of the brothers, Edward IV, George, Duke of Clarence and Richard III.

There is no surviving direct documentary evidence relating to the height of the Duchess of Clarence at any stage of her life. However, it
is possible to make a rather tentative and approximate prediction of Isabel’s height at the time of her death, based on illustrations from the Salisbury and Rous Rolls. First we have an illustration showing Richard III and his wife, Anne Neville, standing side by side. Anne’s head is lower than Richard’s, and also her feet appear to be slightly higher than his.
ESTIMATED COMPARATIVE HEIGHTS OF RICHARD III AND ANNE NEVILLE
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Richard III  Anne Neville  Richard III
Comparison of the adult heights of King Richard III and Queen Anne Neville, based on an illustration in the Salisbury Roll.
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Isabel Neville  George Duke of Clarence  George Duke of Clarence
Comparison of the respective adult heights of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence, based on an illustration in the Rous Roll.

Since we know that Richard’s adult height was approximately 5ft 8in, we can deduce that this image implies that Anne Neville
was several inches shorter than her husband. Therefore, her height may have been in the region of 5ft 4in (see illustration).

The Rous Roll shows the Duke and Duchess of Clarence standing side by side. Having now deduced from other evidence that George’s adult height may have been in the region of 5ft 4in, one would conclude from the nineteenth-century
engraving of this image which we reproduced earlier, that Isabel Neville was a little shorter than her husband, and that her height may have been somewhere between 5ft and 5ft 4in.

However, it is important to consult contemporary sources as far as possible. Interestingly, when the nineteenth-century engraving of the Rous Roll image of the Duke and Duchess of...
Clarence is compared with the original fifteenth-century drawing, it emerges that, while the engraving is generally accurate, in respect of the height of Isabel Neville it is slightly misleading. When the engraved image is superimposed over the original drawing it can be seen that the fifteenth-century image actually depicts Isabel as having been of about the same height as her husband.
As a very rough approximation, we could therefore predict Isabel Neville’s height at death as having been in the region of 5 ft 4 in. This suggests that Isabel was probably of approximately the same adult height as her younger sister, Anne.

As we have seen, the remains lying in the Clarence vault in the second half of the twentieth century were given
their first systematic modern examination in 1982 by Dr Michael Donmall. A mixed assemblage of variably preserved human bones was revealed: parts of two skulls, an assortment of long bones, pelvic and shoulder girdle fragments, parts of the spinal column and some foot bones. There were no remains of teeth or hand bones. From the first it was clear that the remains, of at least two
individuals, were very incomplete. The fragments had been arranged for display, with the two crania resting on the largest long bones. Six iron coffin handles, a fragment of flat metal and a nail were also found amongst the bones.

After cleaning, necessary reconstruction of the skeletons was attempted using a water-soluble adhesive. The bones were
formally assessed (i.e. morphologically) in order to assign where possible sex, the number of individuals, their pathology, and an estimate of age and stature at death. No scientific tests were undertaken.  

The male remains were estimated by Dr Donmall to be in the age range 40–60+ years, and the female remains 50–70+ years. The putative
male was described as being ‘rather short’ – about 5ft 3in. The height of the putative female was estimated as about 5ft 4.5in. The male bones were described as showing ‘mild age-related arthritic changes’. The female bones were said to show ‘more advanced arthritic change’. Obviously, the heights estimated in 1982 accord quite well with the
new evidence offered here for the probable heights at death of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. However, the suggested ages do not correspond.

Dr Donmall’s 1982 report observed of the male skull that ‘the cranial sutures are mainly fused (or fusing) but not generally obliterated’. This point was not further analysed, nor evaluated as a possible indicator of the age
at death of the male individual. Probably this was due to the fact that there is much debate about the value of cranial suture obliteration in assessing adult age. However, the male skull from the Clarence vault could perhaps belong to an individual who died at a somewhat younger age than that estimated by Dr Donmall for the other male bones. As
we have seen, George, Duke of Clarence was 28 when he died, while his wife Isabel Neville was 25 at the time of her death.

The April 2013 re-examination of the Clarence vault bones by Dr Joyce Filer suggested that the remains of more than two individuals are present. In respect of the majority of the limb and body bones, and also the female cranium, the 2013 assessment
of the ages of these individuals at death agreed in general terms with the 1982 findings. *These* bones therefore appear to represent the partial remains of a male and a female who are too old to be the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. Their possible identification will be considered shortly.

However, the damaged male skull which is preserved today in the Clarence vault
may not belong with the other male bones. Some differences of colour and preservation were observed between the skull and the post-cranial male remains. The skull may therefore represent a different – and possibly younger – male. The person concerned had suffered a cut to the front of his head several years prior to his death, which had healed. This is potentially consistent with the report that
George suffered an injury at the Battle of Barnet about six and a half years before his death (see above, chapter 10). As we saw in the previous chapter, there is also some written evidence that the male skull remained intact until the mid-twentieth century, and may have been articulated with two neck bones. In the 1930s this was thought to suggest that at some point this head had been cut off – a
point potentially consistent with Jean de Roye’s account of the final stages of George’s execution. It is therefore possible that the partially surviving male skull may be that of the Duke of Clarence.

As for the older male remains, they could possibly belong to William de la Zouche, 1st Baron Zouche, who was born c. 1284 and died 28 February 1336/7. Although his date of birth is
not precisely recorded, William’s age at death would probably have been about 53, which is consistent with the age of the male body and limb bones from the Clarence vault, as estimated in both 1982 and 2013.\textsuperscript{8} William de la Zouche was originally interred in the eastern Lady Chapel of Tewkesbury Abbey – a chapel commissioned by his wife. However, following
the Dissolution, when the eastern Lady Chapel was demolished, his tomb superstructure was rescued and re-erected at Forthampton Court (a former residence of the abbots), probably by John Wakeman, last Abbot of Tewkesbury, and first Bishop of Gloucester. Forthampton Court was granted to former Abbot (soon-to-be Bishop) Wakeman by the crown in
1540. It is possible that when the tomb superstructure was moved, William’s corpse was also rescued, and reburied in the Clarence vault, which had the space to accommodate further burials, and which lay just opposite the entrance to the eastern Lady Chapel which was then under demolition.

It would therefore be tempting to conclude that the
accompanying female bones and the partial skull which appears to belong with them might be those of William de la Zouche’s wife, Eleanor de Clare (Despenser), born 3 October 1292, who died on 30 June 1337, at the age of 45.\footnote{Eleanor, an ancestress of the Duchess of Clarence, was the founder of the eastern Lady Chapel at Tewkesbury, where she was buried beside}
her second husband, William. Her body, too, might therefore have been removed to the Clarence vault when the Lady Chapel was demolished. Unfortunately, however, the main collection of female remains in the Clarence vault today appears to belong to a woman older than Eleanor is reported to have been when she died. In addition to the partial
remains of a woman who apparently died aged about 60, the Clarence vault also contains very fragmentary remains of another female, of slender build, who appears to have died in her twenties. These female remains (which include a mastoid process in no way associated with the surviving female cranium) are few in number, but are completely different in colour compared to the remains of
the older female. They may comprise surviving fragments of the body of Isabel, Duchess of Clarence.

There is no immediate prospect of using DNA testing in an attempt to further clarify the identity of the remains in the Clarence vault. At present no mtDNA sequence is available for the Duchess of Clarence, for her ancestress, Eleanor de Clare, or for the latter’s second
husband, William de la Zouche. Nor are Y-chromosome details available for William. Thus, at the present time there is nothing with which to compare DNA from the two sets of female remains or the older set of male bones. George, of course, would have had the same mtDNA sequence as his mother and siblings. I published the full details of this sequence (J1c2c) in 2007,
following my discovery of Anne of York’s all-female-line descendant, Joy Ibsen, and in 2013 Dr Turi King of Leicester University confirmed that this sequence matched that of the bones from Richard III’s grave. But, unfortunately, the partially surviving skull of the younger male in the Clarence vault is incomplete. It has, for example, no surviving teeth –
which would have offered suitable material for DNA testing. There remains the possibility that Carbon 14 dating could be considered, in an attempt to substantiate or disprove the tentative identities proposed here for the surviving Clarence vault remains, based upon the dates of death of the individuals concerned.
1. See above, chapter 5.
4. TA4, p.32.
5. TA4, p.36.
6. Ibid.
9. J. Bettey, chapter 7, p.73 in Morris and Shoesmith
(eds), *Tewkesbury Abbey*.


12. Though Eleanor had eleven children by her
two husbands, and she spent a total of about five years in prison in the Tower of London and elsewhere.

By a strange irony of fate, George, Duke of Clarence, the middle surviving brother of the House of York, who never managed to become King of England, or Duke of Burgundy, or even Duke of
York, and who was put to death by Edward IV, has a very large number of living descendants today. The marriage of George and Isabel produced four children (though only two of these outlived their parents). Their four children were:

Anne of Clarence (16 April 1470 – c. 17 April 1470), who was born and died in a ship off Calais.
Margaret of Clarence (Pole), 8th Countess of Salisbury, born Farleigh Hungerford Castle, 14 August 1473,¹ executed 27 May 1541, who married Sir Richard Pole. This couple had a number of children. Margaret was ultimately rather brutally killed by Henry VIII in the course of his religious and marital upheavals. Three and a half
centuries later she was beatified as a Catholic martyr (‘Blessed Margaret Pole’) by Pope Leo XIII on 29 December 1886. Her feast day is celebrated annually by the Catholic Church on the day after her execution – 28 May – because 27 May was already the feast day of St Augustine of Canterbury. Today, all the known living descendants of the Duke
and Duchess of Clarence are also descendants of Margaret.

Edward of Clarence, born Warwick Castle, 25 February 1475, godfathers: Edward IV and John Strensham, Abbot of Tewkesbury, created 17th Earl of Warwick, executed 28 November 1499. There are questions about his life (see below). According to
the traditional account, he was cared for and promoted by Richard III, but subsequently permanently imprisoned in the Tower of London by Henry VII, since he had a far better claim to the throne than the ‘Tudor’ king. He was finally executed by Henry VII for allegedly attempting to escape from the Tower of London. Edward is reputed
to have suffered from some kind of mental deficiency – possibly as a result of the kind of life he was forced to lead.

Richard of Clarence, born in the infirmary at Tewkesbury Abbey, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, 5 October 1476 and baptised in the parish church (nave of the abbey) on 7 October, died
1 January 1477 at Warwick Castle, Warwick, Warwickshire. Buried in Warwick. His father believed that he had been poisoned by John Thursby, acting on the instructions of Sir Roger Tocotes, and possibly at the behest of Elizabeth Woodville.
George’s children, Edward of Clarence, Earl of Warwick, and Margaret, later Countess of Salisbury (after the Rous Roll).

George is generally considered to have been a faithful husband. His reaction to Isabel’s death could certainly be interpreted as
implying that he had been close to her. Indeed, the bereavement may have unhinged his mind – though it is also possible that he saw what he interpreted as her murder as some kind of personal affront.

No records exist which refer unequivocally to George as having fathered any bastard children (unlike his brothers Edward IV and Richard III). It is true that,
long after George’s death, in 1487, 1491 and 1493, there were widespread and persistent rumours relating to each of the two Yorkist pretenders which suggested that one or other of these was George’s son. However, these rumours seem not to have been meant to imply that the pretenders were Clarence bastards, but rather that one or other of them was
George’s *legitimate* son and heir, the genuine Earl of Warwick. According to these rumours, Warwick had been secretly smuggled out of England to the Low Countries by the Duke of Clarence shortly before his death, and the young man of reputedly limited intelligence imprisoned by Henry VII in the Tower of London was an imposter. In fact, as we have seen, in 1477/8 the attempted
smuggling abroad of his heir was one of the accusations levelled against George by Edward IV. Although the Act of Attainder against George claimed that this attempt had been unsuccessful, subsequent events do open certain questions about this. The only independent evidence that the Duke might either have produced a bastard son, or have succeeded in smuggling his
legitimate son, Edward, out of England, is to be found amongst the Malines household accounts of his sister, Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy. The record in question dates from 1486. In that year Margaret paid for eight flagons of wine for a person who is not named, but who is described as ‘the son of Clarence from England’. The terminology is
frustratingly vague, but the date is interesting. Could this have been a visit from ‘Lambert Simnel’? The Earl of Warwick would have been only 11 years old in 1486 – about the same age as George himself when he had first visited the Low Countries. On the other hand, if George had fathered a bastard in the Calais region in the winter of 1467, such a boy could have
been about 18 in 1486. Given the lack of any clear and firm evidence as to the age and identity of the young wine drinker, however, we are left guessing.

The standard account tells us that George’s only surviving legitimate son, Edward, Earl of Warwick, was put to death by Henry VII in 1499. But, of course, Henry VII had never seen the
Earl of Warwick before seizing the throne in 1485, and would have had no independent means of verifying the authenticity of the boy presented to him under that title. According to George’s Act of Attainder, his attempt to send Warwick out of England, either to Ireland or to the Low Countries, was made in order to provide a future focus for rebellion. And there is no
doubt that in 1487 precisely such a focus for rebellion did materialise in Ireland, in the form of the person generally known as ‘Lambert Simnel’, but who reputedly claimed to be Warwick. This boy’s identity remains uncertain, since, according to a contemporary herald, his real name was John,8 while Henry VII referred to him merely as ‘some illegitimate boy’.9
Henry VII’s historian, Polydore Vergil, tells us that the boy was an imposter who merely assumed the identity of the 12-year-old Edward of Clarence, Earl of Warwick. On the other hand, the contemporary French historian Jean de Molinet states equally firmly that the boy was the genuine Earl of Warwick and no imposter. Interestingly,
the boy in Dublin enjoyed the full support of key members of the House of York, the most prominent among them being Warwick’s first cousin, John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln. Other things being equal, Lincoln, then aged about 27, probably had a superior claim to the English throne than the Earl of Warwick (owing to George’s Attainder, which had never been repealed). Yet Lincoln
chose to give his backing to the boy in Ireland, attending that boy’s coronation, at Christ Church Cathedral on 24 May 1487. It is said that the boy crowned in Dublin took the royal title of ‘King Edward VI’, and that Irish coins were issued in his name. I shall say more on all these issues in my forthcoming sequel to the present volume: a new book entitled *The Dublin King*. 
Henry VII later claimed to have established beyond doubt the pretender’s real identity. Moreover, according to Vergil’s account, Henry paraded through the streets of London a prisoner from the Tower of London whom he claimed was the real Earl of Warwick. Since it is highly questionable how many people in London would have been in a position to recognise the real Earl of
Warwick if they saw him, in reality the latter ruse proves absolutely nothing. Moreover, the subsequent well-orchestrated ‘Tudor’ account of the pretender’s supposed real identity, and his employment in Henry VII’s kitchens, though it all sounds (and was intended to sound) believable, is undermined by confusion about the age of the alleged pretender. Also, Irish peers
who had supported the pretender and who subsequently saw the kitchen boy apparently failed to recognise him. 12 Then there is the intriguing fact that after the Battle of Stoke Henry VII expressed regret at the death of the Earl of Lincoln, who might otherwise have been able to explain to the king what had been going on.

So was the pretender of
1487 the real Earl of Warwick? Had his father actually succeeded in secretly sending him abroad in 1477? He certainly enjoyed the support of Gerald Mór Fitzgerald, 8th Earl of Kildare, who in 1477 had succeeded his father, the 7th Earl, as the Duke of Clarence’s Deputy Lieutenant of Ireland. Had Gerald received George in Ireland in February–March 1476/7, at
the very time when the Duke is said to have been plotting to send his son to Ireland in secret? Did he therefore know that the pretender was probably genuine? There are no simple answers to these questions. But when studied carefully, the ‘Tudor’ accounts of this pretender do contain inconsistencies. Moreover, after George’s execution his (alleged) son
was consigned to the guardianship of Elizabeth Woodville’s son, the Marquess of Dorset – who probably didn’t know the real Earl of Warwick from Adam. Yet, in 1483, Richard III (who might possibly have known the real Earl) took charge of this boy, promoted him as of noble and royal status, and apparently accepted his identity.

Possibly, then, the real Earl
of Warwick remained in England from before his father’s death in 1477, until 1485. Whether he could then have escaped; whether the prisoner who reportedly suffered from mental deficiency, held (and later executed) by Henry VII, was or was not the real earl, is impossible to say for certain. It is also impossible to establish beyond question the true identity of the 1487
pretender. But if he was not the Earl of Warwick then the support accorded to him by the Earl of Lincoln is extraordinary and difficult to explain.

Assuming that the Earl of Warwick (whatever finally became of him) left no living heirs, all the known surviving lines of Clarence descent are via George’s daughter, Margaret, Countess of Salisbury. She was also
executed eventually, by Henry VIII, but not before she had given birth to a number of children. Perhaps unfortunately, she is generally referred to by the Church under her married name, as ‘Blessed Margaret Pole’. One of her sons, Cardinal Reginald Pole, was the last Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury, and came close to becoming the second English Pope.
The senior living line of descent from George and Isabel, Duke and Duchess of Clarence, leads to the Earl of Loudoun. His lineage, and that of the other Clarence descendants who are mentioned here, is outlined below. All of the many living Clarence descendants have their first two generations in common, since all of them share George, Duke of Clarence and his daughter,
Margaret, Countess of Salisbury as the sources of their royal descent. A small selection of living Clarence descendants kindly agreed to briefly introduce themselves and their families, and to say a little about the stories they have heard about George, and how they view this Plantagenet royal ancestor whom they share. In order of seniority of descent, these living Clarence descendants
are Hon. Pericles Plantagenet Wyatt (whose half-sister, the well-known journalist, Hon. Petronella Wyatt, has contributed her thoughts on the family and its ancestry), Carole Latimer, Elizabeth Drake (Colsell), Nicholas Hyde Duder and Vanessa Roe.

**THE HON. PETRONELLA**
I come from a family of eccentrics. I was born in 1969, and christened Petronella Aspasia. My father was a well-known Labour politician, broadcaster and writer, Woodrow Wyatt, who was later elevated to the Lords by Margaret Thatcher. I was christened in the crypt.
at the Palace of Westminster. My father had chosen Aspasia as my middle name because my brother, who was born in 1963, was named Pericles after Pericles of Athens. Aspasia had been Pericles’ favourite mistress. History was a topic of conversation at our dinner table. Many of the Wyatts had been celebrated architects, including James Wyatt, whose houses are still
some of the finest in England, despite his being drunk a good deal of the time, and Sir Jeffrey Wyatville, who designed all of Windsor Castle that can be seen from the skyline and who is the only commoner to be buried in the Chapel Royal.

Then there were the Plantagenets. I was 14 when my father told me that my brother was the rightful heir to the English throne. I burst
out laughing. Somewhat irate, he explained that Pericles was the male descendent of George, Duke of Clarence, brother to Edward IV and Richard III. From that moment, I became an ardent supporter of both those kings, much to the surprise of my teachers. When I became a journalist, at first on the *Daily Telegraph*, I wrote a stinging attack on the *Dictionary of National Biography* for its
entry on Richard III, saying it was a piece of blatant Tudor propaganda. My brother, though, took less of an interest in history, absconding from Harrow when he was 17. He now lives in Arizona where he owns a highly successful RV Park.

Like most people, the only thing I knew about George, Duke of Clarence was the manner of his death – allegedly drowned in a butt of
Malmsey after being convicted of treason. I began reading. To my annoyance, I discovered that the Attainder passed against him barred his heirs from the succession – though Richard III considered reversing the act and might have done so had he survived Bosworth. Clarence must have been a difficult man to resist. Handsome, likeable and charming, he seems an extreme example of younger
brother syndrome. His mother, Cecily, Duchess of York appeared to encourage his resentment, favouring him above her eldest living son. Edward’s surprise marriage to the widowed commoner Elizabeth Woodville incensed them both. For George, the elevation of the new queen’s no-account relatives to the highest positions in the land was a direct affront. He may even have believed the absurd
rumour that Edward was the son of an archer, and not the Duke of York. At any rate, when the equally irate Warwick dangled the prospect of a crown in front of the impressionable and frustrated young man, it must have been hard to resist. Sadly, he failed to learn his lesson and after Warwick’s fall continued to campaign against the queen. I think he thought Edward would
forgive him anything, but Elizabeth Woodville was made of harder stuff. She and her family appear to have driven the king to finally execute his brother. Largely amiable, faithful to his wife Isabel and a loving father, I cannot help but be sorry for him. I am also sorry for my brother Pericles, who, but for the Attainder, would not have been barred from the throne!
My link to George, Duke of Clarence comes through my father’s mother, who was the daughter of Florence Lee and Rev. Charles Eden. The story goes that Florence married against her parents’ wishes and was cut off without a shilling. The Lees had substantial homes in both
Yorkshire – Grove Hall, Knottingley – and another in Kent. (I have a painting of Grove Hall, Knottingley in Yorkshire where my great grandmother, Florence, was brought up.) They spent the winters in Yorkshire and the summers in Kent. My great great grandfather, Richard Thomas Lee, is the last of our direct family to be listed in the Peerage.

My grandmother married
Hugh Latimer, who was a descendant of Bishop Hugh Latimer burnt at the stake by Mary I with Cranmer and Ridley. She was a good sculptress, but was unable to sell her work as ladies did not work in her day. My father, Hugh Latimer, was a leading actor in the theatre and then designed objects and jewellery in silver and gold. I am a professional portrait photographer. It was my step-
grandfather, Sir Alexander Anderson, who had the family tree traced at Somerset House.

I see George as an extremely handsome, tall, blonde young man similar in looks to Edward. The sibling rivalry would be quite normal in any time between siblings in their twenties when George was at the height of his power; he died at 28. In defence of George, they had
no paternal guidance as their father was executed when George was young. He appears to have been witty, charming, stylish, all qualities that he shared with Edward. I think that the three brothers were like pawns on a chessboard; the real schemers were the Woodvilles and the Earl of Warwick, who was an older man and a genius at manipulating others to suit his own ends.
George Duke of Clarence m Isabel Neville, 1451–1475, 1445–1478, daughter of Richard, Earl of Warwick (the 'Kingmaker')

Margaret Countess of Salisbury m Sir Richard Pole, KG

Henry Pole, 1st Baron Montagu 1492–1539

Catherine Pole, Countess of Huntingdon

line leads to

Simon Abney-Hastings 15th Earl of Loudoun

Hon. Pericles Plantagenet Wyatt

Carole Latimer

Winifred Pole, Lady Barrington

line leads to

Elizabeth Randolph Meade Drake (Colsell)

& Nicholas Hyde Duder

Vanessa Maria Roe

Ursula Pole, Lady Stafford

line leads to

Albert I, King of the Belgians
Some living descendants of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence.

George shared the opinion of his mother, brother Richard, and the entire court in their dislike of the Woodvilles. He merely voiced his opinion strongly, which rather dispels the notion that he was weak. He was ambitious and
duplicitous and easily led by Warwick, but it is easy to judge in retrospect. Edward was weak when it came to women. Richard, vilified by Shakespeare (we have to remember that he was writing under a Tudor queen), ironically, appears to have been the purest soul of the three brothers, always trying to keep the peace between them.

If it is true that the
Woodvilles schemed the death by poisoning of George’s wife, Isobel, then I think he showed courage in continuing to vilify them publicly. There is no evidence to support the belief that Ankarette Twynyho poisoned his wife, but George, having acted above the law, was certainly hot-headed and it cost him his life. The fact that Richard visited him frequently in prison and
retired to the north of England after his death merely makes me feel that George was not all a sinner.

Elizabeth Drake (Colsell)

My family began to migrate from England to the Virginia colony when Jamestown was
young – in 1609. John Rolfe of Heacham in Norfolk was shipwrecked on Bermuda, providing Shakespeare with inspiration for *The Tempest*. Rolfe survived and continued to Virginia where, in 1618, he married the princess Pocahontas, from whom I am directly descended. Their great granddaughter married into the Isham/Randolph family of Virginia and added another inheritance line, that
of Lady Godiva and Earl Leofric of Mercia. In the next century, Sir Richard Everard of Langleys in Essex came to the New World to be governor of North Carolina. He was a direct descendant of George, Duke of Clarence, and Isabel Neville. Sir Richard’s daughter Susannah remained in America when his governorship ended. She married David Meade and their offspring married the
Randolphs, thus combining three very interesting family lines. This is my inheritance: Pocahontas, Lady Godiva and Plantagenet royalty. I returned to England after 361 years, have married here and taken British citizenship. My husband Paul and I live in Old Windsor and in our retirement we enjoy visiting places significant in the lives of my ancestors.

In terms of George, Duke
of Clarence, I know only what I read, but gather that the whole of the cousins in the ‘cousins’ war’ were fatherless, unstable, self-aggrandising, acquisitive people. The time was marked by interference in dynastic lines, in marriage choices, in land and property inheritance. Changes of allegiance might look treasonous but could be considered principled as there were so many claims and
counter-claims of Richard of York, Henry VI and Edward IV, with the Earl of Warwick meddling at all points, changing sides, raising hopes and breaking promises. Warwick even said that Edward IV was not the son of Richard of York – which would have made George the rightful heir to the throne. George was certainly tossed about by bad influences and confused in loyalty between
his own family and his wife’s family. I read that he was a likeable man and fond of his brothers, but inclined to avarice and drunkenness. Poor man. He was dead by age 29.

Nicholas Hyde Duder

I was born in Kenya in 1960,
the younger brother to Michael and son of Alexander Hyde Duder and Jean Violet Barrington-Kennett. I was educated initially in Kenya and then the United Kingdom. I started my working career in Kenya and then proceeded to join the Royal Hong Kong Police in 1983, eventually resigning in 1992 to help establish a security and risk mitigation consultancy. In 2004, I
married my wife Nolita and we have two sons: Alexander Barrington C. Duder and Adam Kennett A. Duder. I currently reside and work in Indonesia.

George, Duke of Clarence is my 14th great-grandfather, connected through my mothers’ line, the Barringtons, Poles and Margaret, Countess of Salisbury. My perception of George is that he was
probably easily swayed and by Richard Neville, the ‘Kingmaker’, in particular, who showed exceptional determination to do what he thought was right. George’s desire to see himself on the throne, coupled with his disapproval of King Edward’s private marriage to Elizabeth and subsequent marriage of his other brother Richard to Anne Neville, thereby threatening his own
livelihood and status, may have resulted in him becoming increasingly disenchanted, despite efforts by others including Edward to appease him.

Vanessa Roe

The marriage in 1723 of Andrew Roe of Grantstown
and Mount Bruis, Tipperary, to Frances Westropp of Ballysteen, Limerick, brought the direct descendant of George Plantagenet, the Duke of Clarence, into the Roe family. Andrew’s grandfather, James Roe, who came to Ireland in 1645 was a cavalier in Lord Inchiquin’s Regiment of the Horse. The regiment were originally fighting for Charles I, but, fortunately, switched sides to
Cromwell. Cromwell rewarded James Roe with a fine estate called Ballymacdonofin in Co. Wexford.

The Roes were an ancient merchanting family from Kent and James was descended from Sir Thomas Roe, Lord Mayor of London (1568) they were also early dissenters. James’ eldest son, Andrew, became a very wealthy merchant in Dublin
and purchased many properties there; he also gave each of his four sons a large estate in Tipperary, purchased from the Duke of Ormonde. Andrew, who married Frances Westropp, was his third son. Frances Westropp was directly descended through her mother, Elizabeth Bury, from George, the Duke of Clarence.

My father, a direct descendant of Andrew Roe
and Frances Westropp, grew up in Calcutta, India. His great-great-grandfather, Captain Richard Andrew James Roe, went to India with the East India Company in 1810 from Ireland. Our family subsequently resided in India until 1957, when my father came back to Britain.

I live in York, North Yorkshire, while my parents, sister, and two nieces live in Sandal, Wakefield, West...
George, Duke of Clarence seems in my mind to be rebellious, ambitious, jealous, and generally unstable: a very tragic figure in the War of the Roses. He had a very volatile nature, and was probably prone to being a drunkard. He made a lot of wrong choices in his life for which he was to pay dearly. I do not think that his brothers disliked him, but they could not control his
incorrigible nature. After a final rebellion against his brother, he was imprisoned in the Tower of London and came to a grisly end, reputedly, drowned in a butt of Malmsey wine. This may be true as when his body was exhumed he was not headless – beheading was the normal execution form for those of noble birth. After his death, his children were cared for by their aunt Anne Neville. His
wife Isabella having died of maybe consumption or childbed fever in 1476, her lady in waiting was believed by Clarence to have poisoned her and she was judicially murdered (she was given a posthumous pardon by Edward IV).
Albert I ruled Belgium from 1909 to 1934. He was a king, the ruler of territory which George once hoped would be his – and a descendant of George and Isabel on his mother’s side.

I am very grateful to Petronella, Carole, Betty, Nick and Vanessa for having
helped me conclude my history of the Duke of Clarence by revealing something of the history of George and Isabel’s descendants, and by explaining how they see George. If the Duke’s own life was not a success, his posterity offered his unlucky genes a chance to try again – and, curiously, through one line of his descendants, George has, in a way, attained
two of the goals which eluded him during his own lifetime. In person, he never obtained the royal crown he longed for. Nor did he attain those lands in the Low Countries to which he aspired. Yet George’s living descendants today include HM the King of the Belgians!¹⁴

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.


7. Interestingly, it may have been in the summer of 1467 that Richard III, then Duke of Gloucester,


9. Henry VII called the pretender ‘*spurium quemdam puerum*’. See *Rerum Britannicarum*...


13. There are two different ‘Tudor’ versions of who the pretender claimed to be, and apparent inconsistencies about his age.

The information listed here is derived from the Annals of William Worcester, and from the Joan of Acre poem of Friar Osberne Bokenham OSA of Clare Priory. Those children who died young are
Those listed as dead by 1456 are named as dead in the Joan of Acre poem, written in that year.

William Worcester's earliest surviving list of the York children was obviously written in about 1450, because it ends with the birth of George.¹ Worcester subsequently produced later copies of his list, extended to
include subsequent children – and also to include more information about the earlier births, including calculations of the days of the week on which the children were born. Unfortunately, the later versions of the list are often inaccurate – changing, for example, Elizabeth’s date of birth from September to April, and changing Margaret’s place of birth from Waltham Abbey to
Fotheringhay. The later versions also miscalculate the days of the week on which the children were born.

The earliest surviving Worcester list mistakenly omits Henry and erroneously attributes Henry’s date (and perhaps also place) of birth to Anne.

b. Hatfield

(manor of the
1. Anne (Exeter)² Bishop of Ely),³
(?or possibly Fotheringhay Castle?),
between 5 and 6 a.m. (or at 5 p.m.) on Monday 10 August 1439,⁴ married January 1446, d. Sunday 14 January 1476. b. Hatfield (as
1. *Henry (Harry)* above), 5 a.m., Friday 10 February 1441, d. before 1445. 5

2. *Edward (IV)* b. Rouen, 2.45 p.m., Friday 27 April 1442, 6 became Earl of March 1445, d. Wednesday 9 April 1483.

b. Rouen, 7 p.m., Friday 17 May
3. Edmund (Rutland) 1443,\(^7\) created Earl of Rutland before 1454, d. Wednesday 31 December 1460.

2. Elizabeth (Suffolk) 1444,\(^8\) married after 1453 and before 1458, d. 1503/4.

b. Rouen, 2 p.m., Monday 21 September
b. Waltham
3. Margaret Tuesday 3 May (Burgundy) 1446, married 1468, d. Thursday 23 November 1503.

4. William b. Fotheringhay Castle, Friday 7 July 1447, d. before 1456.

b. Neyte (manor of the Abbot of Abbey, \(^9\))

6. George (Clarence) b. Dublin Castle, 12 noon, Tuesday 21 October 1449, d. Wednesday 18
February 1478.
b. 1450/1451, d. before 1456.

7. Thomas
b. Fotheringhay Castle (or possibly Berkhamsted Castle?), Monday 2 October 1452, d. Monday 22 August 1485.

8. Richard (III) (Glos.)
4. *Ursula* July (Feast of St Margaret) 1455, d. before 1456.

**NOTES**

1. T. Hearne, *Liber Niger Scaccarii nec non Wilhelmi Worcestrii*
2. A daughter called Joan, b. 1438, d. 1438, was listed as the Yorks’ first child in A. Weir, *Britain’s Royal Family: A Complete Genealogy* (London, 1989), p.135. However, Joan is mentioned neither by Friar Osberne
Bokenham (see title page) nor by William Worcester, and Alison Weir told me that she now believes that there is no evidence for the existence of Joan, who will be removed from any future editions of her book (personal communication 6 December 2012).

3. ‘in quodam manerio Domini episcopi Eliensis
nuccupato [sic in MS] Hatfeld’.

4. In later copies of his list, Worcester says 9 August, or Tuesday 10 August.

5. In 1445 Edward was given the title ‘Earl of March’. It is clear that he was then the Yorks’ eldest son, and it was his marriage with a French princess which was being negotiated, so
Henry must have been dead by then.

6. In other versions of the list, Worcester gives Edward’s date of birth as Monday 28 April – which is impossible.

7. Elsewhere, Worcester says Monday 17 May, which is impossible.

8. Elsewhere, Worcester says Tuesday 22 April, but 22 April was not a Tuesday, and details of
arrangements for Elizabeth’s baptism show that she must have been born in September.

9. Later versions of the list (possibly confusing Margaret with William) incorrectly state that Margaret was born at Fotheringhay.

10. William Worcester’s original list (probably written down in about 1450) ends with George.
Later versions of the list give brief details of Richard and Ursula, and include additional – and often erroneous – information regarding the births of the earlier children. But none of Worcester’s lists mentions Thomas.
Mottos of the Family of George, Duke of Clarence

ex Honore de Clare (Of – or from – the honour of

George, Duke of Clarence
Clare).\(^1\)

Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers: *nulle la vault* (Nothing is worth it)

Edward IV (brother): 1. *modus et ordo* (Method [or manner] and order).\(^2\)

2. *comfort et liesse* (Comfort...
and joy). 3

Elizabeth of York junior (niece) san removyr (Without changing). 4

Margaret of Clarence (Pole), Countess of Salisbury (daughter of God). 5
Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy

(b sister) (May good come of it)

Richard III (brother)

1. loyaulte me lie (Loyalty binds me)
2. a vo me ly'
(= a vous me lie =

[It] binds me to you)

3. I have
desired it so
much.⁶

Richard
Neville, Earl
of Warwick
(father-in-
souleatement une
(Only one)).⁷


5.  http://books.google.co.uk/id=Dg1FAAAAAYAAJ&\t (consulted January

GEORGE, DUKE OF CLARENCE FAMILY TREES
The patrilineal ancestry of George, Duke of Clarence – Table 1.
The patrilineal ancestry of George, Duke of Clarence – Table 2.
The matrilineal ancestry of George, Duke of Clarence.
Relatives of George, Duke of Clarence – the Beaufort line (simplified).
Ralph Neville m Joan Beaufort
Earl of Westmorland

Richard
Earl of Salisbury

Catherine
Duchess of Norfolk

Eleanor
Countess of Northumberland

Anne
Duchess of Buckingham

Cecily
Duchess of York

Richard Neville
Earl of Warwick

John Mowbray
3rd Duke of Norfolk

Henry Percy
3rd Earl of Northumberland

Humphrey Stafford
Earl of Stafford m Margaret Beaufort

George
Duke of Clarence m*

*Isabel Neville
Anne Mowbray

Henry
Duke of Buckingham

1 daughter of Edmund, Duke of Somerset, and first cousin of Eleanor Talbot (wife of Edward IV)
2 first cousin of Eleanor Talbot (wife of Edward IV)
3 niece of Eleanor Talbot (wife of Edward IV)
Relatives of George, Duke of Clarence – the Neville line (simplified).
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PLATE SECTION
1. George’s mother, Cecily, Duchess of York (left), redrawn from the Neville Book of Hours. Copyright Geoffrey Wheeler. Cecily and her son Edward IV (right) seem to have shared a *retroussé* nose, but Cecily was short while Edward was tall (see text). Probably Cecily was a brunette – like her
father, brothers, and sons.
2. George’s father, Richard, Duke of York (right), BL MS Royal 15 E VI, fol. 3 (public domain image). The Duke of York had an aquiline nose and a prominent chin, similar to those of his youngest son, Richard (upper left: Richard III facial reconstruction; lower left: Richard Duke of...
Gloucester, Wavrin image). But where Richard III’s hair was brown, his father’s was golden in colour.
3. Trim Castle, Meath, Ireland, where George spent much of the first year of his life. (© Tourism Ireland)
4. Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset. (Beauchamp Chapel, Warwick)
5. The arms of Jasper Tudor from the reverse of his seal. (Photograph published in W.G. De Birch, *Catalogue of Seals in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol. 2, no. 6483, 1892)
The site of Fastolf's Place
6. The site of Fastolf’s Place in Southwark, where George stayed in 1460.
7. The view across the river Thames as George might have seen it in 1460 from the northern windows of Fastolf’s Place. A prominent feature is the Tower of London, where George was to die in 1478.
8. Model of the vanished Bishop’s Palace, Utrecht, where George and Richard may have stayed during their exile in the Low Countries.
9. Jehan de Wavrin, a Burgundian courtier who met George on a number of occasions, after a miniature from the copy of his *Chronicle* which Wavrin presented to Edward IV.
10. Isabel, Duchess of Clarence from the sanctuary arch, Toller Porcorum Church, Dorset. Note the elongated face and chin.
11. George, Duke of Clarence:  a) badly damaged effigy, c. 1470, from the sanctuary arch, Toller Porcorum Church, Dorset;  b) miniature from Wavrin’s *Chronicle*, c. 1475;  c) eighteenth-century engraving, source unknown;  d) eighteenth-century engraving, after a sixteenth-century
portrait formerly in the collection of the Earl of Huntingdon. Overall, these images suggest that George had wavy hair, and a somewhat pointed chin and aquiline nose, similar to those of his father, but less prominent.
12. Modern images of George and Isabel, based on the surviving portraits. © Mark Satchwill)
13. Warwick Castle was the principal residence of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence in the 1470s.
14. Reproduction of the Middleham Jewel, with its pearl border restored. (© George Easton, Danegeld Jewellery.) An illustration of Isabel, Duchess of Clarence from the Rous Roll indicates that she may have owned a very similar pendant (see illustration 11).
15. George’s rather apt emblem, the Black Bull of Clarence, a reproduction of one of his livery badges. West Country ancestors of the present author, who were in the service of the Duke of Clarence, probably wore such badges.
16. George’s seal as Duke of Clarence. (© Colchester and Ipswich Museum Service)
17. The former Abbot’s Residence at Tewkesbury. It was perhaps here that George stayed in 1477, while Isabel gave birth to her last child in the abbey infirmary.
18. Gallows Hill, Myton. Here Ankarette Twynyho was hanged. (© David Stowell, Geograph® Britain and Ireland Creative Commons Usage License)
19. The site of the Clarence vault, behind the high altar of Tewkesbury Abbey church. The dotted lines indicate the dimensions of the underground vault.
Plan of the surviving patterned encaustic tiles on the floor of the Clarence Vault, Tewkesbury Abbey
20. The floor design of the Clarence vault showing the pattern of the tiles. Note the cross in the centre. The tile immediately to the east of the square in the centre of the cross displays the royal arms of England.
The Clarence Vault in 1478, with the coffins of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence in place
22. Reconstruction of how the Clarence vault might have looked in 1478, after George’s burial.
23. Conjectural reconstruction of the likely appearance of the blue stone matrix and brasses commemorating the Duke and Duchess of Clarence, possibly commissioned by Richard III in 1483.
24. Reconstruction of the southern end of the Clarence vault in 1729, with the coffins of Samuel and Mary Hawling in place.
25. Reconstruction of the Clarence vault as it was found when reopened in 1826.
26. The south-eastern corner of the Clarence vault, showing how the tiled flooring was partly destroyed in 1709; the easternmost of the three stones introduced to support the coffin of Samuel Hawling, and the sites of the two brick walls constructed in 1729 and 1753 to enclose the Hawling
burials.
27. The Witherington
graffito of 1826, from the eastern wall of the Clarence vault.
28. The male skull from the Clarence vault, showing a healed head wound.
30. George’s daughter, Margaret of Clarence, Countess of Salisbury. Note the elongated face, which she seems to have inherited from her mother, and the bracelet on her right wrist with a small pendant barrel, recalling the manner of her father’s execution. (© National Portrait Gallery)
32. Vanessa Roe, 16th great-granddaughter of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. (© Vanessa Roe)
33. Nicholas Hyde Duder, 14th great-grandson of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. (© Nicholas Hyde Duder)
34. Carole Latimer, 15th great-granddaughter of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. (© Carole Latimer)
35. Elizabeth (Betty) Drake (Colsell), 15th great-granddaughter of the Duke and Duchess of Clarence. (© Rebecca McMains)
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