

because they supported John of Northampton, but because of bitter disagreements over the location of the wool staple. Brembre may well have been the scapegoat for the failure of government policy and of economic difficulties that put the small men on the side of the rebels. But, that is the price of playing politics in a brutal age and quite clearly there were many in the city who did not feel that what was good for the Grocers was necessarily good for them. One company's hero could easily be another's villain.

That sums up the main problem with this extraordinarily complex study; it takes partial view, be it upon Brembre or on strictly monetarist and bullionist explanations for economic change, almost to the exclusion of all others. Does that negate its worth? Not at all, provided this important caveat is borne in mind. Dr Nightingale has produced one of the most challenging books on medieval London for many years. Let us hope that it only begins, rather than ends, debate.

Research Notes and Queries

Richard in Utrecht

Livia Visser-Fuchs writes:-

A recent issue (May/June 1996, pp. 60-61) of a Dutch local historical journal, *Oud-Utrecht*, contains two notes about Richard, entitled a little erroneously 'Richard III in Utrecht' – I am grateful to Dr Jan Willem Verkaik for bringing them to my attention. In the first a reader relates how she was given a copy of Josephine Tey's *Daughter of Time*, which she had never heard of, and she very briefly explains its contents. It is clear she went through the stages of surprise and indignation that Ricardians know so well and, having asked an 'expert', she progressed to Kendall's *Richard III*. She ends her note with expressing her interest in the fact that Richard is said to have visited Utrecht and says that the town archives at Utrecht were unable to help her with more information.

The second note is a response to the first from a slightly more knowledgeable reader, who consulted the *Dictionary of National Biography* and knows about Richard's and George's flight to the continent, dating it – like Charles Ross and Michael Hicks – to shortly after 17 February 1461, the day of the second battle of St Albans. Research has shown, however, that it is more likely the boys were sent to safety immediately after Wakefield, at the very beginning of the year, as Sir George Buck has it.

The interesting information in the second note in *Oud-Utrecht* is the discovery of an entry in the town accounts concerning payment of wine served to the 'two sons of the duke of York'. The entry is only partially given in the note, but the full text reads:

Item des manendages na oculi geschenct bij beveell der overster des
hertogen twee zonen van Iorck iij aem wijns min v taec die aem xvij
wijnsilde maect, S[umma?] xlvj lb. xv s.

(Item on the Monday after Oculi served by order of the *oversten* to the
two sons of the duke of York 3 aem wine less 5 taec, at 17 wijnsilde per
taec this makes, £46 15 s.)

The entry is from the accounts of the *Tweede Kameraar* (the Second Chamberlain, the second of the two town chamberlains) covering the years 1461-62, and occurs among other payments for wine served to guests of the town council in the first three months of 1461, Gemeentearchief Utrecht, Inv. nr. 626, 2e Kameraar's rekeningen, 1461-62, f. 43. *Oculi* refers to the introit of the mass celebrated on the third Sunday in Lent, which in 1461 fell on 8 March. The author of the note assumes that 9 March is too early a date for the English in Utrecht to have been informed of the accession of Edward IV on 4 March. In fact the same news was already known in Bruges on or even before 9 March, when people there knew that the earl of Warwick had written to Calais to report Edward's taking of the throne on the day it happened. It is very likely that Warwick also sent a messenger to George and Richard and their retinue, staying with David of Burgundy, Bishop of Utrecht. Utrecht is only twenty-five miles from the port of Dordrecht and such important news could easily have travelled across sea and rivers in four or five days. News of Towton (29 March), which had much further to go, was to reach Calais in some form on or before 3 April and Duke Philip of Burgundy knew about it at Ghent on that same day.

The *oversten* of Utrecht, by whose order the wine was served, were the eight 'headmen' in whose hands was the daily running of the town. It is likely the boys were staying at the palace of Bishop David, who was one of Duke Philip's bastard sons, but that the news of their brother's accession made it imperative for the notables of the town, and especially the merchants among them, to consider the future and their own advantage and treat the boys with particular respect. Eight years later, when the merchant community of Utrecht needed English help, they and Bishop David himself wrote several letters to the dukes of Clarence and Gloucester, reminding them of the honour that had been paid to them in the past.

The Utrecht town council was very generous and the quantity of wine served on the occasion was considerable. Similar entries in the same section of the accounts show that usually two, three or four 'townjugs' (each the equivalent of

about twenty-five modern bottles) were spent on more ordinary visitors such as the council of Amsterdam, the mayor of Delft, or the count of Bentheim. When a magnate like the count of Nassau was feasted as much as three *aem* less four *taec* was consumed, but he, like George and Richard, must have had a large following and was probably received by a numerous gathering of town notables. Judging by the price, the count and the English princes were served wine of the same quality. The quantity consumed by the 'English' party amounts to almost 489 litres or 655 bottles of today (one *aem* being c. 170 litres, and one *taec* 4.25 litres) and it must be asked how many people were present that so much was required. A month later, when Edward's victory at the battle of Towton had made the boys sufficiently important to be invited to Bruges by Duke Philip, they had a retinue of twenty-three people. This may have included some of the bishop's and the duke's servants who perhaps accompanied them, but it does give an indication of the size of the English company itself. The wine at Utrecht was, of course, also drunk by the town council – which was large as it consisted of past and present officials, 156 persons in all. Presumably several, if not all, members of Bishop David's court also attended and perhaps English merchants, whose presence in the town is mentioned in the bishop's letters of 1468 and 69, also had a share in these first festivities on foreign soil celebrating the accession of the house of York.

See also my 'Richard in Holland', *The Ricardian*, vol. 6 (1982-84), pp. 182-89, where I discussed the other evidence for the boys' visit to Utrecht, some of which has been included above.

Lathom Park Chapel, Ormskirk

Jean M. Gidman writes:

The Chapel is situated in the parish of Ormskirk and about three miles from the parish church. It is in parkland and adjacent to the remaining wing of the second Lathom House. It is still used by the inhabitants of the area and regular Sunday services as well as weddings are held there. It was founded as a chantry and the cottages of the 'bedesmen' are still attached to the chapel and lived in. The date and the name of the founder are what are of interest here.

According to *The Victoria County History of Lancashire* (vol. 3, p. 257), 'A chantry was founded in the new chapel at Lathom, to which a hospital was attached, by Thomas second earl of Derby in 1500'. The source for this statement is Rev. F.R. Raines, ed., *A History of the Chantries within the County Palatine of Lancaster being the Report of the Royal Commissioners of Henry VII, Edward VI, Queen Mary* (Chetham Society, vols 59 and 60, 1862). The full text of the charity commissioners provides more information:

The Chantry or hospitall in the chapel of Lathom

John Modey preste incumbent there of the foundation of Thomas late Erle of Derby by his writing indented dates the xxviijti day of Aprill anno regnis regis Henrici vijmi xvo ordered to be one hospitall or almeshouse and the said preiste to celebrate there for the sowlez of him and his antecessors and viij olde men to be beidmen there to pray for the sowlez biforsaide ...

The statement in the Victoria County History can thus be demonstrated to be incorrect on two counts. First the date of the fifteenth year of Henry VII gives a date for the foundation of 27 April 1501 and not 1500 as hitherto assumed. Secondly the second earl did not succeed to the title until the death of the first earl in 1504. The second earl, also Thomas, was the grandson of the first, his father having died in 1503. The second earl was born in c. 1484 and was not only *not* the earl in 1501 but was only about seventeen years old (J.J. Bagley, *The Earls of Derby 1485-1985*, London 1985, p. 27)

The first earl of Derby would be a more obvious founder. As Thomas, second Lord Stanley he had managed to trim during the civil wars, seldom coming out for the houses of York or Lancaster until it was impossible to do otherwise. He had married as his first wife Eleanor Neville, sister of the earl of Warwick and had supported Warwick's rebellion in 1470 and had been in the train of the restored Henry VI. From that date he avoided taking part in any conflict leaving the fighting to his brother Sir William Stanley. Eleanor Neville died in 1468 and he subsequently married Margaret, Countess of Richmond and mother of the future Henry VII. Lord Stanley took no part in the fighting at the battle of Bosworth but in order to ennoble his mother Henry VII created Thomas Stanley earl of Derby in November 1485. He began to improve the family home of Lathom House in 1495 when he undertook extensive building work including an eagle tower which was visited by Henry VII in the summer of 1495. In 1500 he was getting towards the end of his life (he was born in c. 1433) and it is possible that he wished to leave a lasting memorial to himself and his family. A chantry would be a charitable act and the souls thus prayed for could have included that of Sir William Stanley who had been executed for treason in 1495. The first earl of Derby died in 1504 and was buried in Burscough Priory. After the reformation his bones and effigy were removed to Ormskirk parish church where they still lie.

The second earl of Derby, born in c. 1484, had been brought up as the heir presumptive to his grandfather and it was only the early death of his father, Lord Strange, (possibly of poison) in 1503 which caused him to inherit the title in 1504. Therefore he would not have had the same incentive to found the chapel as his grandfather and certainly not in 1500 when he was a boy of about seventeen years.

The dates and attribution of the foundation of Lathom Park Chapel are found

in Raines's footnotes, many of which are inaccurate, and so an error was made which has been repeated in the Victoria County History, which, being an important source, means that it will be perpetuated continuously, for example in the Chapel guide book.

Book Reviews

THE REIGN OF HENRY VII. Edited by Benjamin Thompson. 1995. Harlaxton Medieval Studies V. Paul Watkins, Stamford, £40. ISBN 1-871615-79-8

Early volumes in the Harlaxton series looked at a century apiece; future volumes are to take a more thematic approach. The present volume bridges the transition by having a single reign as its subject; appropriately, since Henry VII's reign has always suffered by being at the turn of a century: neither early modern nor medieval, and hence skimpily treated by medievalists and Tudorists alike. As Christine Carpenter points out in her paper, the *sources* for Henry's reign are essentially those with which medievalists are familiar, and which do not address the sorts of questions which Tudorists are used to asking of the later period.

Given the reign's uncomfortable position on the cusp of two very different historical traditions, it is hardly surprising that this volume does not create a new consensus overnight. The political contributors, in particular, give very different readings of the reign and of the perennial question of whether it represents any sort of new beginning. For Carpenter, who is primarily concerned with the practical relationship of centre and localities, Henry is the quintessential outsider making a very poor fist of a system which had functioned smoothly under Edward IV. Change, if it occurred, was accidental and not usually for the better. Watts, by contrast, is prepared to argue for radical and self-conscious change in perceptions of the king's role, deriving ultimately from the mid-century writings of John Fortescue; although he, like Carpenter, seems inclined to see this as happening independently of Henry and as suggesting, to a degree, at least, a king who was not fully in control of his own realm.

The other 'political' contributor, Dominic Luckett, takes a narrower topic, but one with important implications for the reign as a whole. His study of the royal escheators in the south west supports the traditional view that the reign saw increased intervention in local office from the centre, but this is presented as a ramshackle and inefficient affair: a reading which gives no support to the familiar