

Hanham Redivivus— A Salvage Operation

LORRAINE ATTREED

SEVEN YEARS AGO, an article appeared in the *English Historical Review* which prompted a reinterpretation of the order and significance of events surrounding Richard Duke of Gloucester's accession to the throne. Its author, Alison Hanham, argued that the execution of the Lord Chamberlain, William Hastings, took place on Friday, 20th June, 1483, instead of the traditional date, 13th June. Such a change in the order of events, Dr Hanham argued, revealed more extensive planning of a usurpation on Gloucester's part. The basis for the interpretation was an entry in the sixteenth-century copy of the Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company of London, purporting to refer to the year 1483 and asserting that Lord Hastings was alive and still an influence in government as late as 15th June. To support her hypothesis, Dr Hanham examined contemporary letters and inquisitions *post mortem*, and built a persuasively clever case against the traditional date.

Her conclusions, and the material from which they stemmed, prompted responses and further investigations by other academics, as well as members of the Richard III Society. Professor Charles T. Wood in his 1975 *Traditio* study of Edward V, re-examined Richard's motives and abilities during the late spring of 1483. Although criticised for its reliance on Hanham's redating, the article's value is independent of the controversy, and lies instead in its insight into Gloucester's actions. Controversy is not too strong a word to use to describe the reaction Dr Hanham incited with her seminal article. Dr B. P. Wolffe, in his 1974 and 1976 *English Historical Review* responses to Dr Hanham, argued for a return to the traditional, Friday, 13th June date for Hastings' execution. He assigned the Acts of Court entry to 1479, and brought to light significant building accounts for Lord Hastings' residence at Kirby Muxloe. Six years after the publication of Dr Hanham's original article, its suppositions and the material from which they were argued were still persuasive enough to encourage two members of the Society to re-examine the Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company. Anne F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond's *Journal of the Society of Archivists* article may prove to be the most valuable addition to the controversy, in terms of research methods and interpretation.

As this introduction suggests, a great deal of work has resulted from an article whose arguments for redating and reinterpretation have been generally rejected by most historians. Less common has been praise for the attention Dr Hanham called to hitherto unexploited civic and economic sources of information about a controversial period. The Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company had

been known to scholars since 1933, when E. M. Carus-Wilson in an *Economic History Review* article used them to trace the development of the Merchant Adventurers' organisation. By 1936, the Acts were in print, with a comprehensive introduction by editors Laetitia Lyell and Frank D. Watney. The influence of these early explorers of London Company records shall soon be seen in the forthcoming edition of *The Coronation Records of Richard III*, currently being prepared by Anne F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond. This work will use civic material to establish a chronology of events during the short reign of Edward V and the tumultuous period of Richard's accession.

Without attempting to anticipate the *Coronation Records'* conclusions, a study seems to be in order of the controversy and its resultant renewal of interest in the deposition period. Seven years after the appearance of the first attempt at redating, it is time to summarise and re-examine the contributors' major points, and salvage what remains of value and inspiration. The works must be taken, for the most part, seriatim, to make clear from what points the various combatants were arguing, and to trace the development of themes and disputes. Finally, Dr Hanham's essential contribution should be recognised: the ways in which the material she examined can still illuminate the workings of the central government and the influence of its component members, are lessons too valuable to be ignored or forgotten.

Alison Hanham's original article, 'Richard III, Lord Hastings and the historians', attempted to change the date of the Lord Chamberlain's execution and, in turn, to change the nature of Gloucester's part in the affair. The evidence which she used to support her findings reminded readers of how little material survives from this period, and from the fifteenth century as a whole. Consulting the various accounts of Hastings' execution, the Duke of York's departure from sanctuary, and Gloucester's accession, Hanham attempted to correlate chronicle sources and Tudor historians to derive a valid sequence. Noting that many of the accounts placed the Lord Chamberlain's execution after the removal from sanctuary, an action known to have taken place on 16th June, 1483, she chose to interpret an entry in the London Mercers' Company records as supporting this chronology. The entry is dated 15th June, and is included under a heading for 1483.¹ On that occasion, an assembly of the Mercers' Company was summoned, meeting to decide that the 'efficiency with which foreigners in London prompted their own interests' should be matched by lobbying on the part of English merchants.² The Lord Chamberlain, Lord Chancellor John Russell, and the Bishop of Ely were noted to be approachable on this matter, and the Mercers' Company decided to send several of their fellowship to Bishop Morton. Hanham commented that she found it hard to believe that the influential and intelligent mercers could have been unaware of the arrest of Morton and the execution of Hastings if these events had occurred on the Friday before the meeting. Following this interpretation, Hanham argued that the recorded plans to increase the watch in London on 20th June, probably stemmed from panic following Hastings' execution earlier that day.³

Further support for the redating came from a new interpretation of Simon Stallworth's 21st June letter to Sir William Stonor. Stallworth, a servant to John Russell, noted that 'on Fryday last was the lord chamberleyn hedded sone apone noon', a reference Hanham took to mean 'Friday yesterday, i.e. 20th June. The

article ended on a questioning note, having damned most inquisition *post mortem* material as unreliable, and like Markham casting doubt on the death date of 13th June, that most of the inquisitions assigned to Hastings.⁴

More certain was Hanham's belief that the redating permitted a reinterpretation of Gloucester's motives during June, 1483. Under the new chronology, Elizabeth Woodville's willingness to relinquish the Duke of York on 16th June made more sense if a man known for his loyalty to Edward IV was still alive at the time. Moreover, it was clear to Hanham that once Richard had both of the princes in his custody, he could sound out support for a usurpation, eliminating Hastings, Morton and Rotherham at the first signs of continued support for Edward V.

Hanham's interpretation proved influential in terms of subsequent scholarship. Maurice Keen's *England in the Later Middle Ages*, a set text for many English university undergraduates in history, accepted her sequence of events, concluding that '[t]he effect of this suggested chronology is thus to re-emphasize the shrewdness and the calculation of Richard's moves'.⁵ Geoffrey Wheeler's *Ricardian* article 'Who Is Forster?' discovered the identity of one John Forster as did Professor Roskell while discussing the Stallworth letter's report that Archbishop Rotherham, the Bishop of Ely, and possibly Edward IV's secretary Oliver King, were in the Tower. Wheeler focused on the identity of Forster, said to be 'in hold and mene fer hys lyffe'.⁶ Forster, whose identity puzzled Kendall,⁷ proved to be a Hertfordshire lawyer influential in royal service as well as local administration, and joint holder with Lord Hastings of the stewardship of the liberty of St Albans.⁸ This position was relinquished to William Catesby during Forster's long spell in prison, described by Forster himself to have begun on the day after Hastings' execution on 12th June, 1483.⁹

The new date for the Lord Chamberlain's death proved difficult to ignore or reconcile. The register of the Abbot of St Albans also noted that Hastings died on the Feast of St Basilides, 12th June.¹⁰ J. A. F. Thomson in his review of the controversy suggested that the traditional date of 13th June should stand, but that the Acts of Court entry noting Hastings' interest in the Mercers' problems could have been dated xij June and miscopied as xv June.¹¹ Isolde Wigram and P. W. Hammond both chose to wrestle with the problem of Forster's role in the sequence,¹² but proved to have anticipated Dr Hanham. A correction of her earlier identification of Forster was acknowledged, however it was not to be published before B. P. Wolfe's first response to her original article.

Wolfe's attack on Hanham's conclusions were based on the validity of the records of the Mercers' Company and Merchant Adventurers' organisation, and the extent to which the compiler in the 1520s edited his material. Wolfe's response examined the context of the 15th June Acts of Court entry deciding that such a decision was out of place in the context of problems with the subsidy which had been reconciled earlier in the month. On 2nd June, the Merchant Adventurers had sent their representatives to the Lord Protector, Lord Chancellor, and others of the council. On that date, they argued against continued payment of tonnage and poundage, which they claimed was valid only during the lifetime of Edward IV. The same day, the council decided that the subsidy had been voided on the King's death, thus making it improbable that the payments would still be a matter of concern for the Company thirteen days later.¹³ Wolfe

concluded that the 15th June entry was more likely to refer to 1479, when obtaining relief from the subsidy was actively discussed.

Wolffe also examined the inquisition *post mortem* data, asserting that records made during ten different sittings in various parts of the country made it unlikely that there had been collaboration on a manipulation of death dates. He also noted that Hastings' fees as the king's lieutenant and captain of Calais, paid by the treasurer of Calais and rarely interfered with by the Crown, terminated 13th June.¹⁴ Moreover, Wolffe noticed that only the last six lines of the seventeen-line Stallworth letter were penned by the signatory himself on 21st June. The first part had been written by an amanuensis, probably before the noted date, thus making 'Fryday last' a reference to 13th June.¹⁵ This initial response to Hanham's work presented its own interpretation of Richard's actions based on the sequence of events, arguing that the execution of Hastings was a 'typically impulsive and irreversible action' designed to eliminate 'the only powerful layman in the council attendant to refuse to underwrite the continuation of Richard's powers as protector beyond the coronation'.¹⁶

Two critiques of the growing controversy soon appeared after Wolffe's response. Isolde Wigram criticised his omission of Stillington's story of the precontract, and viewed Dominic Mancini's sequence (of delivery from sanctuary, followed by execution of Hastings, and usurpation) as deliberate falsification.¹⁷ On the whole, Miss Wigram's opinion is not so very far removed from Wolffe's own view that belief in Richard's guilt about the usurpation and the murder of the princes probably affected Mancini's ideas about the delivery from sanctuary. Quoting A. R. Myers, Wolffe admitted that subsequent accounts of the June events were affected by 'retrospective revulsion from a man whom [Mancini] believed to be a usurper and murderer'.¹⁸ J. A. F. Thomson's review of the controversy saw Mancini's dating more as an example of blundering than of deliberation. He noted that Edward IV's death date was also wrong in the Italian's account, and that he had misunderstood the details of the 13th June council meeting and arrest as well.¹⁹

Thomson's review was most valuable for the questions he asked concerning the actions that could possibly have been taken during such a short span of time. Re-examining the Stallworth letter, Thomson decided that the change in loyalty of Lord Hastings' men to the Duke of Buckingham could not have been accomplished in one day if the Lord Chamberlain was killed on 20th June. British Library MSS. Harleian 433 also lends support to the traditional dating, as its record of registration of signet letters and other grants declines in early June, probably the sign of a crisis which culminated on Friday the 13th.²⁰ Similarly, the 10th June letter to the mayor of York asking for armed support also seems to confirm the existence of a threatening situation early in the month.

Alison Hanham's book, *Richard III and his early historians* appeared in 1975, with the stated regret that she had not had access to Dr Wolffe's response to her article before it went to press. Her own response to Wolffe, published under the title 'Hastings Redivivus' in the *English Historical Review*, handled in detail a defence of her conclusions which had been merely sketched in the book.²¹ Hanham conceded that Wolffe had been correct in noting that the Merchant Adventurers had gone before the council as early as 2nd June to settle the problem of the subsidy. However, Hanham chose to interpret the 15th June

meeting as one called to discuss the problems that would arise if Edward V's 25th June parliament chose to reimpose the tax.²² So excited were the Adventurers by the possibility that Hastings, Russell and Morton were prepared to help them, they called a special Sunday meeting to plan their approach.

Dr Wolfe was to have the last word, at least in print, in his second response to Alison Hanham. In 'Hastings Reinterred', Wolfe chose to see the erasures that Hanham had noticed on Hastings' inquisitions *post mortem* as unexceptional, and too obvious to be part of concealment or deception.²³ The *Croyland Chronicle's* veracity was also asserted, in the belief that the continuator's 'inside knowledge' would have prompted him to state if there had been an attempt to conceal the real date of Hastings' death (dated in the *Chronicle* to 13th June). Wolfe also argued that the compiler of the Acts of Court had himself admitted to having made a selection of the material, and to have come across information which he included out of its proper context.²⁴ The best evidence was saved for last, when Wolfe brought to light building accounts for Hastings' castle at Kirby Muxloe. In print since the early part of this century, the accounts showed that the work force on the castle had ended their labour on Tuesday, 17th June. Wolfe postulated that news of their master's execution on 13th June, must have reached the Leicester area by 16th or 17th June, and suspicions of attainder and forfeiture had ended plans for the construction.²⁵

Wolfe's evidence seemed to put an end to the controversy, but not to the problems that reinterpretation had created. Hanham's findings have not been generally accepted as valid, and those who support her conclusions have found themselves the object of criticism. Charles T. Wood's study of the events of April to June, 1483, in his *Traditio* article has received some censure for its support of Alison Hanham's views. More important is Wood's contradiction of her assertion that 'the various operations involved [in Richard's accession] do seem to have been carefully planned'.²⁶ A close reading of Professor Wood's work reveals the irrelevance of the dating controversy to his arguments, while pointing out the value of Hanham's study of old and new material. The most valuable lesson to be learned from Wood's work is that historians should not, and do not have to be, dependent only upon chronicle sources for their understanding of what was happening in these crucial months.

Professor Wood turned instead to examine grants recorded in the *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, looking at how participants in the struggle for power were titled, in order to draw tentative conclusions about their power, influence, and objectives. The grants from the Crown during Edward V's short reign were examined to note to what extent Richard's own purposes were clear in the young king's writs.²⁷ The 10th June letter to York was also examined and used as a basis for a conjectured sequence of events. According to this sequence, Wood argued that it seemed most unlikely that the northern troops could have been intended for anything except a show of strength at the time of parliament, when the issue of the continued power of the protector would have arisen.²⁸ Wood's reference to the terms of Richard's letter to Calais and the sequence of issued writs of *supersedeas* cannot be examined here: their relevance to the chronology of coronation plans has been discussed elsewhere and will form a part of a work now being prepared.²⁹ It is enough to state that Wood's interpretation of Richard as one quick to move but slow to see the consequences of his actions, is one based firmly on undisputed

material, and forms a significant contribution to our knowledge about fifteenth-century constitutional issues.³⁰

This present study of the Hastings controversy and the research prompted by it, is particularly concerned with the nature of the material used to support the various conclusions. It was hardly without purpose that Alison Hanham included a chapter on 'Some documentary evidence and modern problems of interpretation' in her book of historiographical essays about Richard III. Hanham maintained that most of the sources had been implemented to provide greater detail about the events of 1483, to check chroniclers' accounts, and to fill out the details given in Stallworth's letter. She concluded without optimism that '[i]n general it would be safe to say that our picture of English history in the late fifteenth century is often deceptively clear because there are so few details to confuse the eye'.³¹ A similar argument has been presented by Audrey Williamson, who blames much of the problem on John Morton's nephew, Robert, who became Master of the Rolls in the Tower under Henry VII, and could have been responsible for destroying documentation about the June 1483 council meetings.³² It seems more likely, however, that May to June was a confused period, and the machinery of government was not working as it should have been, perhaps because of doubts about the nature and extent of the power wielded by the protector at such meetings. Nevertheless, historians are forced to broaden their search for material relevant to the period. Records from the Cinque Ports promise to assist in the construction of a new chronology of events in 1483, helping to determine the dates of postponements and arrangements for coronations and parliaments of two monarchs. Moreover, Dr Hanham was correct in shaming historians for ignoring the Mercers' and Merchant Adventurers' records which have been in print for over forty years. However, her use of the material they contain was rather limited. It can be argued and proved that the value of the London Companies' records does not lie solely in supporting or deflating arguments about the chronology of the usurpation. Rather, they are vital in enlightening historians about its participants' movements, alliances, economic concerns, and influence within both the city and the central government.

The relationship between London's leading merchants and the monarchy has a long history. Wool merchants were one of the first groups to take part in national government, when they were consulted by Edward I about the nature and extent of subsidies and the formation of syndicates during wars with France. Other merchants gained influence with their offers of loans to the Crown, as well as the supplies of goods for the royal family: Richard Whittington was a primary example of such a merchant, as was Goldsmith Company member Edward Shaa, court supplier and lender to Edward IV, and supporter of Richard III.³³ Other Merchants participated in diplomatic missions and represented the City in parliament, with administrative experience based on service in civic offices.³⁴

It is in the records of the mercantile fellowships that men of similar profession formed for commercial and social benefits, that the most valuable evidence is to be found. Anne F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond's 1978 review of the Mercers' Company Acts of Court attempted to remind historians of the information to be gained from the sixteenth-century copy of the Acts of Court, while arguing for caution in any perusal of it. Such caution is never the easiest or most exciting virtue to cultivate during historical investigation, but Sutton and

Hammond are to be praised for the care taken in their discussion of New and Old Style dating, and the calculation of regnal years.³⁵ With their warnings in mind, examination of the Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company and Merchant Adventurers reveals information about both the history of the Company and the political history of the time.

E. M. Carus-Wilson studied the records of the Mercers' Company in the early 1930s, and published her findings in an *Economic History Review* article.³⁶ She was chiefly concerned with finding the records of the Merchant Adventurers, searched for in vain during the last century and given up for lost. Merchant Adventurer was a term used to describe a merchant engaged in overseas trade of English cloth, most often centred on the Antwerp market. The vitality of this market had been assisted by the grants of privileges from the Dukes of Brabant, the additional trade it received when Bruges' port silted up, and the industrial and commercial services it provided merchants.³⁷ The relationship between the overseas merchants and the Mercers, the parent group from which they sprang, had been noted in the 1860s, when a biographer of William Caxton used the Mercers' Acts of Court to trace Caxton's career as Governor of the Merchant Adventurers.³⁸ Until Carus-Wilson examined the sixteenth-century copy of the Acts, the import of the biography's source was not recognised.

Carus-Wilson in many instances anticipated the problems and the riches later historians would find within the Acts of Court. She noted that the compilation was 'from a number of earlier books, some of which had been mislaid but were found during the process of copying. Hence the entries are not all in chronological order . . .', a point with which Sutton and Hammond would concur.³⁹ Her study of the growth of the Adventurers or overseas merchants in the Mercers' and other Companies led to a discussion of the Grocers of London, who by the fifteenth century had acquired the privilege of nominating two important public officers, namely the weigher of the King's beam and the garbeller or cleaner of spices.⁴⁰ As seen in this example of delegation of power, the central government came to rely increasingly on the knowledge and ability of London merchants. Some Companies' members were appointed for their ability to oversee commercial offices, while the overseas traders in particular were relied upon to give advice on Anglo-Burgundian relations. The politics of England and the Low Countries intimately involved trade, and many Merchant Adventurers, like Caxton, were consulted or sent overseas as ambassadors when treaties were made. The Goldsmiths took a vital interest in the balance of trade, always anxious to increase supplies of their raw material: this concern brought them in contact with the Crown as often as their petitions to control rivals, punish offenders, and set their own standards for coinage that affected the entire realm. It is on these occasions that the Companies' records are likely to reveal the most information about the personal relationships within both the mercantile fellowships and the central government. Chiefly in those cases in which the Crown's need was expected to be met primarily by the experience of its commercial subjects, are there likely to be revelations about the nature of power, the men who held and wielded it, and the contacts possible and probable.

A good example of the diverse information of this sort to be gained from Company records is the problem of the Mercers' subsidy. The details have been rehearsed by Hanham and Wolffe in their *English Historical Review* articles, and

discussed at some length by Laetitia Lyell and F. D. Watney in their 1936 edition of the Acts of Court. Edward IV had been granted the subsidy of tonnage and poundage in 1465 for the term of his life, and in fifteen years the Mercers' were in arrears for it. Their offer of 500 marks, to settle the debt of £2,000, was rejected by the king, who later accepted £1,000 and granted a pardon.⁴¹ After Edward's death, the Customers continued to levy the subsidy, and although a common fund was opened to which each company member was expected to contribute, a petition was made to Gloucester early in June, 1483. The Lord Protector and the Lord Chancellor thereby ordered the termination of the subsidy.⁴² Richard III also received a grant of tonnage and poundage for his life in January, 1484 but the problem did not arise again until the first parliament of Henry VII. Henry was reluctant to impose a subsidy before his parliament ruled on the legality of the issue, preferring to discharge the Merchant Adventurers from all subsidies on goods landed before the autumn of 1485.⁴³ It does not seem too much to suggest that this mercantile example is suggestive of Tudor's early approach to government, casting light on a constitutional as well as an economic issue.

Henry Tudor's subsequent reliance on the Merchant Adventurers is also revealing of the monarchy's priorities in international situations. Unruffled commercial relations between England and the Low Countries were always considered advantageous to the Crown, yet Anglo-Burgundian trade was deliberately terminated in order to punish continental support of Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel. Such a reaction can perhaps be interpreted as a measure of the threat Henry thought the pretenders could be to his carefully constructed government.⁴⁴ Less supposition is involved in tracing the development of a royal navy and the re-affirmation of 'ancient tolls', assisted by the counsel of the Merchant Adventurers and recorded in the Mercers' Acts of Court.⁴⁵

The occasions on which the London Companies were reluctant to have anything to do with the Crown, are equally revealing of the national power structure, or its absence. Somewhat less information of national import than usual was recorded for the early years of the Wars of the Roses, gaps which probably reflect the Companies' reluctance to take sides. Previously, they frequently exhibited the ability to take advantage of a monarch when he found himself in a weak position, as evidenced by the charters gained from Henry VI, Edward IV in the early 1460s, and the privileges granted by Richard II upon the return of governmental offices from York.⁴⁶ However, during the years of dynastic conflict, the Mercers even withdraw their overt support from their own wardens, in refusing to pay for a dinner that had been given for Yorkist lords a few months before the Lancastrians returned to power.⁴⁷

The contribution that Company records have made to social history has been less ignored by historians, but should be noted here. The plans and orders for 'ridings' to meet important personages are equally informative about the public lives and budgets of civic leaders as they are about the power struggles occurring at the same time as feasts, processions, and activities of the Midsummer Watch. The long history of the London Companies' contributions to the repair of the City's walls has much to say about the merchants' concepts of civic responsibility. Reports of rumours, riots, and subsequent arbitrations reveal the nature of public opinion in times of crisis, while providing details of alliances and factions within the Companies and the government.

A great part of this study has dealt with economics, from the building accounts of Kirby Muxloe to the overseas commerce of the Merchant Adventurers. With this theme in mind, it is perhaps more understandable if one asks economically what can be salvaged from Alison Hanham's contributions to historical inquiry. Although they have not persuaded most historians of the period, her methods of investigation and the materials she explored are touched more by inspiration than by failure. The sources Dr Hanham rediscovered, and the rich information they contain about political power struggles and their combatants, must stand as a valuable contribution to fifteenth-century history.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Alison Hanham, 'Richard III, Lord Hastings and the historians', *English Historical Review*, LXXXVII (1972), p.236, citing *Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company, 1453-1527*, eds. Laetitia Lyell and F. D. Watney (Cambridge, 1936), pp.154-5.
2. Hanham, 'Richard III, Lord Hastings and the historians', p.236.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*, p.242; C. R. Markham, *Richard III*, London (1906), p.214.
5. Maurice H. Keen, *England in the Later Middle Ages*, London (1973), p.489.
6. J. S. Roskell, William Catesby, *Bulletin of John Rylands Library*, Vol. 42 (1959), p.161. Geoffrey Wheeler, 'Who Is Foster?' *The Ricardian* (March, 1973), p.16, citing C. L. Kingsford, *The Stonor Letters and Papers*, Camden Society, 3rd series (1919), pp.160-1.
7. Paul Murray Kendall, *Richard the Third*, London (1955), pp.213, 474 n. 1.
8. Wheeler, 'Who Is Foster?', 18, in reference to *Regista Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, Ed. H. T. Riley (Rolls Series, 1873), ii. pp.255-7.
9. *Ibid.*, citing *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, vi. p.332-3, a petition to Henry VII's parliament of October, 1485.
10. *Ibid.*, pp.18-19, citing *Regista Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*.
11. J. A. F. Thomson, 'Richard III and Lord Hastings—A problematical case reviewed', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XLVIII (1975), p.23.
12. P. W. Hammond, 'Research Notes and Queries', *The Ricardian* (June, 1973), p.14.
13. B. P. Wolfe, 'When and why did Hastings lose his head?' *English Historical Review*, LXXXIX (1974), p.837.
14. *Ibid.*, p.839.
15. *Ibid.*, pp.840-41. On linguistic grounds, Wolfe conjectured that it is highly probable that the ordinary term 'yesterday' would have been used if Stallworth had been writing on 21st June and referring to an execution on 20th June.
16. *Ibid.*, pp.842-3.
17. Isolda Wigram, 'The Death of Hastings', *The Ricardian* (September, 1975), pp.27-9.
18. Wolfe, 'When and why did Hastings lose his head?', 841, citing A. R. Myers, 'The Character of Richard III', *History Today* (August, 1954), p.710.
19. Thomson, '... a problematical case reviewed', p.25.
20. *Ibid.*, p.29. This is the view taken by Dr Rosemary E. Horrox in her introduction to the forthcoming edition of British Library Harleian MS. 433 (her note 95).
21. Cf. P. W. Hammond's review of *Richard III and his early historians*, Oxford (1975) in *The Ricardian*, (December, 1975), pp.32-3.
22. Alison Hanham, 'Hastings Redivivus', *English Historical Review*, XC (1975), pp.821-2. Cf. P. W. Hammond's review of the article in 'Research Notes and Queries', *The Ricardian* (March, 1976), p.27, which concentrates on the evidence provided by Harleian MS. 433.
23. Wolfe, 'Hastings Reinterred', *English Historical Review*, XCI (1976), p.814.
24. *Ibid.*, p.819.
25. *Ibid.*, p.824.

26. Hanham, 'Richard III, Lord Hastings and the historians', p.244.
27. Charles T. Wood, 'The Deposition of Edward V', *Traditio*, XXXI (1975), p.251, citing *Grants, Etc. from the Crown During the Reign of Edward the Fifth*, Ed. J. G. Nichols, London (1854), pp.46, 54, 57.
28. Wood, 'Deposition', pp.258–9, citing *York Civic Records*, Ed. Angelo Raine, Yorkshire Archaeological Society (1939), i. pp.73–4.
29. Cf. Anne F. Sutton, 'Richard III's "tytyle and right"', *The Ricardian* (June, 1977), pp.2–7, and the response by Charles T. Wood, under the same title, *The Ricardian* (December, 1977), pp.27–8. The chronology will be discussed by Anne F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond in their forthcoming edition of *The Coronation Records of Richard III*.
30. Cf. Charles T. Wood's unpublished *addendum* to the *Traditio* study, in which he recognises the validity of the 13th June date for Hastings' execution, and argues that the exact date and sequence of events are independent of his view of Richard's nature and the effect of his actions on the constitution. There is a copy in the Society's Library.
31. Hanham, *Richard III and his early historians*, p.31.
32. Audrey Williamson, *The Mystery of the Princes: An investigation into a supposed murder*, Gloucestershire (1978), p.70.
33. Anne F. Sutton, 'The City of London and the Coronation of Richard III: Points of Interest', *The Ricardian* (December, 1978), pp.2–8.
34. Sylvia L. Thrupp, *The Merchant Glass of Medieval London* (1948; rpt. Michigan, 1977), pp.53–5, and see also the helpful, if dated, bibliography, chiefly of manuscript sources, from the London Companies and the central government: pp.393–6, 43 n. 96. Cf. W. F. Kahl, *The Development of London Livery Companies*, Boston (1960), p.2, for a description of the benefits that incorporation granted to the Companies. Many of the fellowships received their privileges in charters during the reign of Henry VI, a conjunction of events that comments on the weakness of the Crown and its willingness to confer authority that it could no longer retain to the realm's advantage.
35. Anne F. Sutton and P. W. Hammond, 'The problems of dating and the dangers of redating: the Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company of London, 1453–1527', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, VI (1978), pp.87–91.
36. E. M. Carus-Wilson, 'The Origins and Early Development of the Merchant Adventurers' Organization in London as Shown in their own Medieval Records', *Economic History Review*, IV (1933), pp.147–76.
37. J. A. Van Houtte, 'The Rise and Decline of the Market of Bruges', *Economic History Review*, XIX (1966), pp.29–47; H. van der Wee, *The Growth of the Antwerp Market and the European Economy*, The Hague (1963); 3 Vols.
38. Carus-Wilson, 'Merchant Adventurers' Organization', pp.148–9, citing W. Blades, *Life and Typography of William Caxton* (London, 1861). Caxton's relationship with the separate Court of the Merchant Adventurers was misdated to 1465 by Carus-Wilson: see the discussion in Sutton and Hammond, 'The problems of dating and the dangers of redating', pp.88–9, n. 7.
39. *Ibid.*, p.151.
40. Sylvia L. Thrupp, 'The Grocers of London: A Study of Distributive Trade', *Studies in English Trade in the Fifteenth Century*, Eds. Eileen Power and M. M. Postan, London (1933), p.257.
41. Lyell and Watney, *Acts of Court of the Mercers' Company*, pp. xix–xxii, 122, and citing *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, 1476–85*, p.243. And see C. Ross, *Edward IV*, London (1974), p.349.
42. *Ibid.*, pp.149, 153.
43. Carus-Wilson, 'Merchant Adventurers' Organisation', p.158.
44. Lyell and Watney, *op. cit.*, pp.xix–xxi; Carus-Wilson, p.164.
45. Carus-Wilson, pp.163–4.
46. Kahl, *The Development of London Livery Companies*, p.2; T. F. Reddaway and Lorna Walker, *The Early History of the Goldsmiths' Company, 1327–1509*, London (1975), pp.45, 139.
47. Lyell and Watney, *op. cit.*, pp.xviii, 46. Cf. Reddaway and Walker, *Goldsmiths' Company*, p.131.