

BRITISH LIBRARY
HARLEIAN MANUSCRIPT
433

INDEX
EDITED BY
ROSEMARY HORROX
and
P. W. HAMMOND

VOLUME ONE

amen p^o lo

Confiduo de p^o lo

Am

Confiduo

Wyllm Thowp

Home with S^{er} Symon

R. Thowp. Home with Ten weeks

Grants of p^o lo of Edward I. & Rich III.

2

39. B. 18.

433

10
11

Thowp. Thowp. Thowp. Thowp.
p^o lo Thowp. Thowp. Thowp.
Thowp. Thowp. Thowp. Thowp.

No pardon for Thomas Thowp

**BRITISH LIBRARY
HARLEIAN MANUSCRIPT
433**

edited by
ROSEMARY HORROX AND P. W. HAMMOND

VOLUME ONE
Register of Grants for
the Reigns of Edward V and
Richard III

RICHARD III SOCIETY

© Introduction: Rosemary Horrox and Richard III Society, 1979
© Text: Richard III Society, 1979

ISBN 0 904893 04 9

Printed in Great Britain by
Redwood Burn Limited, Trowbridge & Esher

Produced by
Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, Gloucester
for
The Richard III Society, 65 Howard Road,
Upminster, Essex, RM14 2UE

FOREWORD

The bulky manuscript volume in the British Library known as Harleian MS. 433 is unique in more ways than one. Its special importance for the study of Richard III's reign has been recognized since quite soon after its acquisition by the British Museum in 1753, along with the rest of the astonishing library of Edward Harley, Earl of Oxford. With the growing appreciation of the importance of record material for historical research, which is a feature of nineteenth-century scholarship, awareness of its value was enhanced. Extracts from the MS. were printed as long ago as 1844 by Caroline Halsted in her two-volume *Richard III*, and it provided J.A. Nichols with his *Grants of Edward V* (1854). That admirable scholar, James Gairdner, printed some of the diplomatic documents contained in the MS. in his *Letters and Papers . . . of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII* (1861-3), and made considerable use of it for his biography of Richard III (1898). For some time thereafter historians were content to rely on these previously printed extracts, until we come to the next substantial biography of King Richard by Paul Murray Kendall, first published in 1955. Whatever one's judgement on Kendall's style and approach to his subject, he has received less than a full acknowledgement for his extensive and careful use of Harleian 433; his footnotes contain literally scores of references to the original MS. Meanwhile, the MS. had been used for purposes of specialist inquiries, not exclusively or even primarily concerned with Richard III, notably by Miss C. Otway-Ruthven in her study of the evolution of the position of king's secretary and of the signet office during the fifteenth century, and in Dr. B.P. Wolffe's thorough and invaluable studies, published between 1956 and 1971, into English royal finances and the management of the royal estates during the fifteenth century. Only more recently has the crucial value of this MS. been appreciated for the very important topic of Richard's exercise of his royal patronage, the monarch's most important weapon in winning or retaining the loyalty of the politically conscious classes of his realm. Much of the study devoted to this theme, by Dr. Horrox and others, has yet to appear in print. Thus, although the MS. has been quite extensively used by scholars for various purposes, the overwhelming bulk of Harleian 433 has remained unprinted.

The uniqueness of Harleian 433 in another and wider context only now becomes apparent with the publication of this edition. Dr. Horrox's analysis of its structure and composition, and her examination as to how and why its contents came to be combined into a single volume, for the first time makes clear the nature and purpose of its compilation, which has often been the subject of scholarly misunderstanding. It is, Dr. Horrox observes, 'the most complete collection of medieval signet material to survive', and provides

invaluable evidence of the range and volume of signet activity in the later fifteenth century. It was not, as she explains, an innovation. Similar registers existed in the reign of Edward IV, but only good fortune has preserved this example for posterity. The signet was a highly personal manifestation of the exercise of the sovereign's will. In the Yorkist period it was employed more frequently and with growing independent authority, as, for example, in the much disputed but perfectly valid grant under the signet of the other half of the Hereford estates to Duke Henry of Buckingham in 1483. This strongly reinforces what we already know about the immense dependence of Yorkist (and, indeed, early Tudor) government on the personal activity of the king.

Given the great historical importance of Harleian MS. 433 (only most summarily noticed in this Foreword), it is perhaps surprising that it has never been published in full before; but less surprising considering its sheer bulk. This will be only the first of four volumes needed to provide a complete text, together with an index. Not only members of the Richard III Society, but also historians in general and a wider public too, must, therefore, be grateful to the Society for its initiative in undertaking and financing its production. The Society has been fortunate in securing learned and perceptive editors in Dr. Horrox and Mr. Hammond. In publishing this edition, the Richard III Society may well claim to justify one of its declared major aims: 'to promote research into the life and times of Richard III, and to secure a re-assessment of the material relating to this period, and of the role in English history of this monarch'. The implications for Richard's reputation of the publication of this major source must be left to the judgement of its readers. It is safe to say that such judgements — as in all matters connected with Richard III — will not be unanimous.

Charles Ross

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people to whom thanks are due have been involved in this first complete edition of British Library Harleian Manuscript 433. First and foremost comes Mrs. V.B. Lamb, lately Honorary Archivist at the College of Arms, who spent four arduous years making the first complete transcript ever of the English portions of the manuscript and compiling name and place indexes to it (available in the British Library Manuscripts Students Room). Without her work this edition would never have appeared, and all possible praise is due to her initiative. Miss E.M. McInnes, lately Archivist at St. Thomas' Hospital, initially transcribed and translated most of the Latin portions, overseen by the late Miss Ida Darlington, Head Archivist at the Greater London Record Office. Miss Roberta Routledge of Research Associates transcribed and translated the remaining Latin passages.

All of these transcriptions, both Latin and English, were checked before publication by Dr. Horrox, who also wrote the Introduction, compiled the Indexes in Volume Four, and checked the proofs. The work was co-ordinated and the manuscript prepared for the press by P.W. Hammond.

Others who have helped in the production of this work are Miss Anne Sutton and Mrs. Carolyn Hammond.

The Publishers wish to thank Professor Charles Ross for help and encouragement at critical times, and the British Library for permission to publish the manuscript and to reproduce the illustrations.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword by Professor Charles Ross	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Editorial Procedure	viii
Introduction by Dr Rosemary Horrox	ix
B.L. Harleian MS. 433 ff. 1-105	1

EDITORIAL PROCEDURE

In transcription suspension marks have always been extended, even where they are apparently used indiscriminately by the writer. Thus, for instance, the barred *-ll* has been rendered *-lle* wherever it occurs. Terminal flourishes on *-c*, *-d*, *-f*, *-k*, *-r* and *-t* however have been taken to represent an omitted *-e* only where they are used with sufficient discrimination by the writer to suggest that an abbreviation was intended. The only exceptions to this are English Christian names, which have been kept in their simplest English form throughout: *Johñ* has accordingly been rendered as *John* rather than as *Johne* or *Johannes*. *Thorn* and *yogh* have been rendered as *th* and *y* or *g* respectively.

Heavily abbreviated proper names have been silently extended even where the writer has not used an abbreviation sign: thus *duc of Bukingham* for *duc of Buk*, or *king Edward* for *king E*. County names have been treated similarly, being extended to the usual form, Latin or English, used in that passage. Upper and lower case *u* and *v*, which are indistinguishable in manuscript, have been given their modern values in the printed text; so have upper case *I* and *J*, although the use of lower case *j* for terminal *i* has been retained. In Latin passages the abbreviated and contracted words have been extended, using the endings indicated in the manuscript. Errors in endings have not been corrected, the translations allow for any mistakes. Errors in the English passages, e.g. repeated words, are indicated by [sic], none have been silently corrected. All Latin passages have been translated, but not those in French. The solitary Spanish passage (folio 236) is followed by a contemporary translation.

The punctuation and capital letters follow the manuscript, *ff* used initially has been rendered as *F* throughout. In the case of *D*, *M* and *W*, where it is often difficult to decide whether a capital was intended by the writer, modern usage has been followed in doubtful cases. Capitalisation of the translations follows modern usage.

All editorial additions and notes, e.g. folio numbers and translations, are in square brackets, deletions are in round brackets. Marginal notes are in italics at the beginning of the passage to which they refer, marginal crosses are indicated by [cross]. A space in the manuscript is represented by a uniform space of 6 ems. Paragraph marks, which are of frequent occurrence, have been omitted, and interlineations are silently placed where they belong. Passages and sections bracketed together in a more or less complex manner are arranged as nearly as possible to the original, and in general the layout of this edition is intended to be as near as practicable to that of the original manuscript.

INTRODUCTION

'A Book in folio . . . being a Register of the Grants &c. passing the Privy Seal, Royal Signet or sign manual during the Reigns of K. Edward V. & K. Richard III. with some other entries, made upon other occasions, or in other Reigns.'¹ This was how Humfrey Wanley, librarian of Robert Harley, described manuscript 433 in the Harleian collection. Wanley was evidently much impressed by the manuscript for he went on to list 2378 of its entries, the most detailed treatment afforded to any of the manuscripts in his catalogue. It is appropriate that Wanley's description should head this introduction since his list of the manuscript's contents explains the speed with which the importance of Harleian MS 433 was recognised after Harley's library was acquired by the British Museum in 1753. Within fifteen years Horace Walpole, at the prompting of his friend Thomas Gray, had published two of the letters from the manuscript in his *Historic Doubts*.² There is however no evidence that Walpole had read the manuscript himself or indeed that he was capable of doing so.³

Walpole's *Historic Doubts* and the replies which it provoked were the last studies of the reign to rely primarily on rational argument unsupported by original sources. The nineteenth century brought a growing awareness of the value of contemporary material and subsequent historians of Richard III made much fuller use of Harley 433.⁴ The importance of the manuscript was acknowledged in two major editions of extracts from it. Nichols printed the sections relating to the reign of Edward V, and Gairdner included part of the diplomatic material in his *Letters and Papers*.⁵ Gairdner also used Harley 433 more thoroughly than any previous historian in his *Richard the Third*.⁶

For Gairdner and his contemporaries the great value of Harley 433 was the light which it shed on the events of 1483-5. Speaking primarily of the lists of Richard III's grants contained in the manuscript Gairdner commented, 'Of no other king have we so minute a record'.⁷ It is only in the twentieth century that the importance of the manuscript for the study of the wider issues of late medieval administration has become apparent. It is one of the best sources for the study of the signet office before the sixteenth century.⁸ More recently the financial entries have been used to provide details of Yorkist chamber finance.⁹

It will be clear already that the range of material included in Harley 433 is very wide.¹⁰ Early commentators tended to assume that the volume must therefore represent the work of a number of government departments gathered together in the hands of the chancellor:

The volume appears to have been a docket book kept by Russell, bishop of Lincoln, of all the letters and documents that passed through his hands in his official capacity as Chancellor during the reigns of Edward V. and Richard III. It may be considered

as divided into two sections. The larger consists of copies or minutes of formal documents, such as the grants and warrants which passed the Great Seal, the Privy Seal, or the king's Signet; the other is a letter book. . . .¹¹

The scope of the manuscript is, however, more limited and more coherent than this, as Dr Otway-Ruthven realised.¹² The bulk of the volume is made up of abstracts of material which passed the signet, the king's personal seal, in the reigns of Edward V and Richard III. For both reigns these abstracts were divided into two chronological lists, which contemporaries called registers.¹³ Richard III's registers both have contemporary titles. The first is headed 'Grants made by king Richard from June 28 in the first year of his reign to. . .'.¹⁴ No seal is mentioned in the title but it can only be a list of signet grants. A comparison with the patent rolls shows immediately that it is not a register of grants made under the great seal. Indeed, many of the grants were outside the competence of the chancellor. The register includes all the grants made upon the duchy of Lancaster, for instance, which were issued under the duchy's own great seal. Nor is it a register of grants which passed the privy seal. Many of the duchy of Lancaster grants listed bypassed the privy seal office and were warranted by signet letter rather than by privy seal writ.¹⁵ The second register poses no such problems. It is explicitly headed 'Certain things that pass by the king's signet' and contains other signet material, mainly letters and commissions relating to the royal revenues.¹⁶

The existence of parallel registers covering the same period and often related subjects does much to explain the confusion of earlier commentators about the manuscript's origins and purpose. The distinction between the two Richard III registers is relatively clear cut. It is very rare indeed for the same document to be noted in both.¹⁷ In several cases however different aspects of the same transaction are noted in each. In December 1483, for example, Nicholas Rigby was ordered to seize the castle of Bodiam on the king's behalf, and his signet commission was noted in the second register. In the following year he was made constable of the castle, and this entry is to be found in the register of grants. Similarly, Thomas Fouleshirst's appointment as constable of Chester is listed among the grants but a warrant ordering the payment of his wages appears in the other register.¹⁸

In the case of Edward V's signet material this distinction is blurred. The material is again divided into two registers, one of which includes all the king's signet grants. But in some details the scheme has evidently been upset. A letter to the sheriffs ordering them to ensure that suitable candidates take up knighthood is noted in the middle of the register of grants.¹⁹ It is perhaps not surprising that, without the analogy of Richard III's double register, Nichols failed to realise that he was dealing with two distinct registers and ascribed the odd arrangement of his material to 'the convenience of the clerks'.²⁰

Bound in with these registers is a variety of material which can best be described as reference material for the clerks of the signet, or for the king himself. Much of this provides a framework of reference for the making of grants. There are lists of office holders at the death of Edward IV, on some of which subsequent vacancies have been indicated. There is also a list of the fees due to officers on the royal estates and a glossary of legal terms occurring in royal letters, both necessary tools in the drafting of royal grants.

Much of the volume, therefore, relates in some way to the exercise of royal patronage. There are in addition two other important categories of material: a group of diplomatic letters, and various financial records and accounts. Diplomatic negotiations were an area of activity associated with the signet throughout the century and a number of the letters in Harley 433 were specifically given under the signet. This section also includes letters received by the king, for which there is a precedent among signet material of the fourteenth century.²¹ The financial material takes two forms. The second register, which is explicitly signet material, includes numerous references to chamber finance, including the issue of letters of acquittance for royal receivers and warrants for payments of various types. The volume also includes a number of separate financial entries, covering such subjects as commissions for loans, household assignments and the administration of the crown lands. Most of these are in the form of memoranda, with no mention of an originating department, but they are all subjects which came within the sphere of chamber finance and this, as the second register shows, was closely identified with the use of the signet.

Harley 433 thus includes examples of all the major uses of the signet in this period: in authorising grants and issuing royal letters, and in chamber finance. Not all the entries in the volume can be positively linked with the signet office: the list of oaths, in particular, would not have been out of place in any government department. There is however nothing in the manuscript which can be identified as an intrusion from another government office. The conclusion must be that Harley 433 represents papers from the signet office of Edward V and Richard III, not only the department's registers but memoranda and general reference material.

This conclusion is supported by internal evidence.²² The volume is remarkably uniform in appearance, suggesting that its contents were produced in a single department over a limited period of time. The volume was the work of a large number of hands but these recur throughout the various sections. The list of *corrodies* in the king's gift and the list of fees for office on the royal lands which follows it are almost certainly in the same hand as the page of signet warrants of the duke of Gloucester (ff.323, 335 *et seq*). The same clerk was perhaps also responsible for entering Edward V's grant to Thomas Fouleshirst (f.11). The distinctive hand of the letter requesting loans for the king (f.275b) can also be seen in the opening section of a licence to a Hull merchant (f.184b) and probably also in the letter concerning Thomas Lynom at the end of the volume.²³ As a final example, and a particularly useful one since it links the undated list of oaths with the rest of the manuscript, the oaths were copied out by the clerk responsible for noting the instructions given to Bernard de la Forssa, the king's ambassador to Spain (ff.244b, 301 *et seq*).

The range of paper used in the volume is limited. Most of it is of the same type, although slight variations in the watermark suggest that more than one batch of paper was in use. Other watermarks do occur, but only within Richard III's registers.²⁴ There is therefore no evidence that any of the material was intruded at a later date or from another source. However, neither the paper nor the handwriting can date the production of the volume precisely. It is theoretically possible that the volume is an early Tudor copy, compiled from

the originals at some date before about 1520. There are, however, strong arguments in favour of dating the volume to the reign of Richard III. Some of the manuscript is visibly not a fair copy, notably the scribbled list of horses at grass (f.4). Many of the deletions and alterations elsewhere in the manuscript could be ascribed to careless copying of whatever date, but some look like attempts to bring the document up to date within Richard III's reign itself. The lists of gentry in each county, for instance, have been altered to take account of deaths before the early months of 1485.²⁵ The list of fees and wages granted by Edward IV includes marginal indications of grants which lapsed at the beginning of Richard III's reign, whether by death, forfeiture or replacement by another grant.²⁶ The irregular compilation of the registers also suggests that they are the original registers rather than a later copy. In places each entry is in a different hand while elsewhere several pages were entered up at one sitting.²⁷

The handwriting suggests that if the volume is indeed a copy it must have been made within a generation of the original, and it is difficult to imagine the circumstances in which such a copy could have become necessary. Parts of the volume certainly remained in use under the Tudors, including the list of fees due to royal officials, but other sections would have had no place in a Tudor compilation. It is unlikely that a Tudor copyist would have included the full text of Richard III's proclamation against his rival.²⁸ It is hard to see, also, what use Henry VII would have made of the list of signet grants. Unlike Richard III who, at least initially, honoured most of his brother's grants, Henry VII began the reign with a wholesale resumption of his predecessor's grants.²⁹ Any dispute which subsequently arose over Richard's grants would in any case have been referred to the patent rolls, which preserved the text of the grant in full, rather than to the brief and occasionally inaccurate entries in the signet register.³⁰

The form as well as the content of the volume argues against its being a later copy. The volume includes a number of blank pages which are explicable if the volume is made up of a number of original documents bound together, but less so if it is some form of precedent book or book of record compiled from the original documents at a later date. In this case one would also have expected the fragmentary entries in the final third of the volume to be omitted.

The most convincing explanation of Harley 433, therefore, is that it is made up of various documents from the signet archives which were collected and bound together at some point after the end of the reign. The most substantial documents so preserved are the four registers discussed above but the final third of the manuscript is made up of other signet material. The arrangement of these constituent parts within the volume, particularly the order of the individual memoranda which are collected at the end of the volume, is likely to have been more or less arbitrary. However, on the whole there are no indications that the manuscripts had become seriously disordered before or during binding, apart from some instances at the beginning and again towards the end of the volume, notably the inclusion of various incomplete and undated documents on ff.296-8. None of the major entries breaks off unexpectedly or shows signs of lost or misplaced folios. Even the placing of the Edward V material is less clumsy than appears at first sight. The register of grants for this reign stands

immediately before the list of Richard III's grants, which is logical. The second register of Edward V was probably also intended to stand before the comparable register for Richard III's reign. However the final folio of the signature which ends Edward V's register was used to note lord Dynham's letter to the chancellor concerning affairs in France and this seems to have led whoever ordered the documents to place the whole register in front of the diplomatic correspondence on the assumption that the Dynham letter belonged with the other diplomatic letters.³¹

Although the manuscript contains no obvious lacunae, it does not follow that the volume represents the complete signet archive of the two reigns. There is no internal evidence of how many categories of material were omitted from the volume altogether and subsequently lost. For this, one is dependent on the few contemporary references to signet records and on the survival of original signet material and references to signet warranty in the records of other bodies. These sources normally refer only to letters and warrants which passed the signet. Any number of memoranda could have disappeared without trace, although some specific losses may be suspected. Harley 433 includes a note of the number of letters sent out to request loans for the king but there is no record of the names of those who lent money although such a list must have been compiled in order to facilitate repayment.

Fifteenth century references to the signet archive imply that the signet office, in common with other departments, kept a copy of each document which passed the signet together with the royal authorisation for its issue.³² Such authorisations are not preserved among the material in Harley 433 although their existence is sometimes mentioned.³³ More important, the collection does not include all the letters and warrants known to have passed the signet during the reign of Richard III. A high proportion of the signet warrants which survive among the chancery records receive no mention in Harley 433.³⁴ The records of other bodies present a similar picture. A number of the signet letters preserved in the York records have no corresponding entry in Harley 433, nor has Richard's letter to Henry Vernon which survives among the Rutland papers.³⁵

However, the registers preserved in Harley 433 are not merely a random or careless selection from the total signet output. Comparison with grants made under the great seal and the duchy of Lancaster seal suggests that the register of grants provides a full and reliable list of grants which passed the signet in the course of the reign. The entries in the second register, too, consist of abstracts on a common theme. They are almost all concerned with the administration of the crown lands and with other sources of royal revenue. A few of the entries do not fit into these categories, including the first five in the register, but this is not surprising among so much material. What is more, none of the omitted letters which can now be traced is concerned with the royal revenues, suggesting that within its terms of reference the second register is complete.

It has to be accepted that a whole category of signet letters has been lost. The form taken by this material can only be surmised. Dr Otway-Ruthven believed that the signet office did not usually enrol the documents which it issued in full, an argument which she based mainly on the brief entries in the Harley 433

registers themselves.³⁶ If this was so the missing material was presumably in the form of a third register similar to the two which survive. However, there is reason to doubt that all signet records were in the form of brief abstracts. Harley 433 itself contains a number of signet letters which fall into the missing category and which are not entered in either register. The most substantial group are the diplomatic letters but there are also individual examples scattered throughout the miscellaneous material which makes up the final third of the volume, including a letter to the chapter of Salisbury and another to the chancellor concerning the reformation of morality.³⁷ All are given in full and there are no grounds for assuming that they were isolated departures from the norm. The individual examples, at least, appear to be bound up in Harley 433 more or less by accident. For example, the letter to the chancellor occupies the back of the final page of a section devoted to arbitrations of local disputes. This element of accident and the diversity of their contents makes it probable that these letters are representative of a much larger collection of enrolled letters which is now lost.

This raises the problem of the relationship of such enrolled material to the registers preserved in Harley 433. Were all the letters and warrants which passed the signet enrolled in full and certain categories then abstracted for ease of reference, or did the registers provide the only record of the documents noted within them? The evidence is slight and unfortunately inconclusive. The registers in Harley 433 were evidently compiled at some point after the documents had been drawn up in the signet office. Most of the documents entered in Richard III's second register are dated. Their order, although roughly chronological, is not exactly so. On f.148, for instance, the entries are dated February 6, February 5, January 27 and February 5. This seems to rule out the possibility that the clerk who issued each document made an immediate note of its content in the register. But it does not follow that the register was abstracted subsequently from copies enrolled in full in the signet archives. The register could have been compiled from the originals before they were despatched but after they were drawn up, implying a delay of about a week before the original left the signet office.

Another explanation is put forward by Dr Otway-Ruthven, who suggests that the registers were not compiled from the signet letters themselves but from the royal authorisations for such letters, so that Harley 433 is a record of the instructions issued to the clerks of the signet.³⁸ This view gains some support from the register of Richard III's grants. Many of the entries in this register speak of 'your' castle or town, strongly suggesting that the details had been copied from a petition rather than from the signet warrant authorising the grant.³⁹ The comparable register for the reign of Edward V does indeed include complete petitions.⁴⁰ In such cases the king had presumably passed the petition, suitably endorsed, to the signet office where the appropriate warrant was then issued. This is directly analogous to examples preserved among the chancery records of petitions endorsed with the sign manual acting as sufficient warrant for letters patent.⁴¹ The fact that the clerks who compiled the register took their details direct from the petition itself suggests that the signet office did not keep full copies of the signet warrants in such cases, although they retained the signed bills.⁴²

This procedure can, however, only have been used for letters and warrants originating as signed bills. It does not explain what happened to letters produced by the king himself. In such cases a variant of the same method may have been used, with the secretary producing a draft which the clerks then copied and despatched, retaining the draft in the signet office. Against this it should be noted that the signet letters in Harley 433 do not look like rough drafts. Most have a full dating clause, with the place and date of issue, which seems to suggest that they were copied from the full version rather than acting as a draft for it. If this is the case, the signet archive consisted of two main types of document: signed bills and full copies of any material which did not originate as a signed bill. The two surviving registers include material from both sources. The second register, in particular, includes references to letters which cannot have originated as signed bills.⁴³ It is, however, unclear whether in such cases the register entry is the signet archive's only version of the letter or whether the register entry was abstracted from a full copy of the letter which then remained in the archive. In the absence of complete signet records it is impossible to give a positive answer but it is more likely that the register entries were taken from full copies of the letters preserved elsewhere in the signet archive. This would mean that, as far as the registers were concerned, the treatment of signet letters was analogous to that of signed bills. That is, the signet office retained all its signed bills and copies of all the letters which it sent out which did not originate in a signed bill, and the registers were abstracted from both. There may have been a third register into which letters not abstracted in the two surviving registers were abstracted, so that all the signet business was recorded in two places, but this seems unlikely. It would be difficult to abstract diplomatic or political letters successfully and it is probable that the full copies retained by the signet office were allowed to stand as their sole record. Most of these letters have now been lost but it is possible that ff.263-72, a single signature which contains a chronological sequence of signet letters noted in full, represents part of the missing collection of letters.

The signet office procedure outlined here can be no more than inference. It does, however, explain the relationship of Harley 433 to the rest of the signet archive. The categories of record known to be lost, signed bills and enrolled letters, together made up the bulk of the signet records. Harley 433 is a subsidiary collection of reference material: abstracts of the main archive arranged by subject, memoranda and explicit reference works such as the lists of office holders. This collection is heavily biassed towards patronage and financial matters but it would be unsafe to argue from this that it represents some form of chamber finance archive. There is no suggestion elsewhere that chamber finance, although evidently of considerable importance, had secured the departmental status which this would imply. If it had, it would hardly have vanished so thoroughly during the early years of Henry VII's reign. The scope of the collection is also considerably wider than this. Not only does it include diplomatic correspondence and presentations to benefices, for example, but a number of entries in the list of grants are of warrants to the Exchequer and thus explicitly outside the sphere of chamber finance. This variety of material makes it probable that the collection was drawn from the signet office as a whole,

although it does demonstrate the amount of work which the operation of chamber finance generated within the signet office.

Although Harley 433 represents only part of the signet archive for the reign of Richard III it is still the most complete collection of medieval signet material to survive. The destruction of the signet archive in the Banqueting House fire of 1619 means that for earlier reigns signet activity must be reconstructed almost entirely from signet letters and warrants surviving among the records of their recipients. Many of the records of the main recipient of signet warrants, the keeper of the privy seal, were destroyed in the same fire.⁴⁴ The destruction of these two archives raises problems for the study of Richard III's signet also, particularly in the field of signet office procedure, but the survival of the registers in Harley 433 offers invaluable evidence of the range and volume of signet activity. Nothing comparable to these registers has survived from an earlier period.

It is unlikely, however, that the registers in Harley 433 were an administrative innovation. The division of signet material into registers can be seen in the Edward V sections of the volume, which were compiled under the influence, if not the supervision, of Edward IV's secretary, Oliver King. King was removed from office and imprisoned in the middle of June 1483, which is after the date of the Edward V material included in Harley 433.⁴⁵ His authority may have been eclipsed before this. The inclusion of some of Gloucester's own signet letters in Harley 433, apparently entered in the same hand as part of the Edward V material, suggests some overlap between the secretariats of protector and king. This may have meant that in practice Oliver King's functions as secretary were being taken over by Richard's own secretary, John Kendale. However, Edward IV's signet clerks remained in office and much of the routine work no doubt continued to devolve on them.⁴⁶ Under these conditions it is likely that signet office procedure followed lines which had already been established.

The register devoted to financial matters was probably introduced in the reign of Edward IV. Edward's development of a system of chamber finance meant that for the first time the signet was used extensively in the administration of the royal revenues. Before his reign a separate register for such matters would hardly have been necessary. There is however no evidence to show whether he also initiated the register of grants or whether this was already in existence and served as a precedent for the second register. Edward IV was certainly aware of the possibilities for financial and political control offered by a careful use of patronage, and a readily accessible list of grants would have been of obvious use.⁴⁷ But the advantages of such a list might have been recognised earlier. A council ordinance of the early 1440s considered that one of the functions of the signet archive was to ensure that 'no thinge be writene contrary to that that passeth before', a principle of particular relevance to the making of grants.⁴⁸

The survival of Harley 433 casts considerable doubt on Professor Chimes' argument that the signet was still subordinate to the privy seal in most matters as late as the reign of Edward IV and was used mainly for diplomatic correspondence.⁴⁹ As far as royal grants were concerned the privy seal was already

well on the way to becoming a merely formal stage between the signet and the great seal. A comparison of Harley 433 and the patent rolls show that almost all Richard III's grants were initially warranted by the signet. This, however, is not made clear by the chancery records themselves. The grants also passed the privy seal as an intermediate stage and are accordingly noted as warranted by privy seal in the patent rolls, which include no grants specifically warranted by the signet.

In some cases letters patent warranted by the king himself represent signet transactions. In 1448, when Thomas Danyell was made constable of Rising, the king sent a signet letter to the chancellor, notifying him of the appointment and requesting letters patent to be made out. The letter enclosed the original petition and a draft of the letters patent in Latin. The letters patent were accordingly issued and warranted by the king.⁵⁰ A similar procedure can be seen in Richard III's reign, slightly simplified. In September 1483 the king sent a signet warrant to his chancellor to make out letters patent to John Savage, granting him an annuity of 40 marks for life. The warrant was noted in the register of grants and the signet office probably retained the petition as their warrant. The grant was delayed by Buckingham's rebellion but the letters patent were finally issued in the following February, warranted by the king.⁵¹

The Savage grant is, however, unusual. By the reign of Richard III, if not earlier, it had become much more common to send the petition itself to the chancellor, endorsed with the sign manual and without any covering warrant.⁵² The grant of an annuity to William Morland is a typical example. Morland, a chancery clerk, petitioned the king for an annuity of £20 until he was promoted to a benefice worth £40 *per annum*. His petition, endorsed by the king and with the figures amended to £10 and £20 respectively, reached the chancellor on 26 April, 1484, and letters patent were duly issued for the revised amount.⁵³ Many of these signed bills, although evidently not all, survive among the chancery records.⁵⁴ Letters issued in response to such bills were warranted in the patent rolls as by the king. However, the issue of letters patent in this way not only bypassed the privy seal, it bypassed the signet office too. Whereas an endorsed petition would normally be passed to the signet office for the details to be noted and a warrant issued, it was here being sent directly to the chancellor. Such grants do not therefore appear in Harley 433 and presumably had no place elsewhere in the signet archives.⁵⁵

There is no shared characteristic among the grants treated in this way. Morland, as a chancery clerk himself, was well placed to take a signed bill direct to the chancellor, as was John Clerk, whose confirmation as chafewax was warranted by signed bill.⁵⁶ But this is not true of all recipients. A number, such as Robert Copley, a Scot who was made denizen, were insignificant figures, indistinguishable from the recipients of similar grants whose grants made the full journey from signet office to privy seal to chancery.⁵⁷ In other cases a single grant, out of a number made to the recipient in the course of the reign, would be warranted by signed bill while the remainder were processed in the normal way.⁵⁸ The conclusion seems to be that, while the usual procedure was for a signed bill to go to the signet office and thence to the privy seal, the king was

prepared to hand it straight to the chancellor if he happened to be in attendance.⁵⁹

The warranty of letters patent 'by the king' does not necessarily mean, therefore, that the signet had been used to bypass the privy seal. Indeed the contrary is normally true since in such cases the signet itself was rarely used, the bills being warranted by sign manual. The diminishing importance of the privy seal is better demonstrated by the usual procedure for processing grants. By this date the signet had come to be an invariable stage between the king and his keeper of the privy seal, instead of being employed primarily when the keeper was out of court.⁶⁰

In the financial sphere also the signet was steadily gaining ground at the expense of the privy seal. In theory the privy seal's pre-eminence here was ensured by the Exchequer's unwillingness to accept any warranty other than that of privy seal.⁶¹ In practice it was under attack from two directions. Under the Yorkist kings it was becoming increasingly common for warrants to the Exchequer to be authorised by signet or sign manual. Twenty-two of the fifty-seven warrants for issues surviving from the first year of Richard III did not pass the privy seal.⁶² There is no visible distinction in the subject matter of the two types of warrant and here again the determining factor may have been no more than the king's convenience. At the same time the growth of chamber finance was taking a whole area of activity away from the Exchequer and thus away from the privy seal in favour of the signet.

This is reflected in the political eclipse of the keeper of the privy seal and the rise of the secretary, a process which culminated under the Tudors. Dr Otway-Ruthven argues that although the late fifteenth-century secretary had grown in importance he was still subordinate to the keeper of the privy seal; the keepership was the preserve of established figures, while the secretaryship was a mere step towards promotion. She points out that although many keepers of the privy seal were bishops, secretaries attained a bishopric, if at all, only after they had ceased to be secretary.⁶³ This political relationship between the two posts does not seem, however, to be borne out by their holders under Richard III.

John Gunthorpe, the keeper of the privy seal, does not emerge from the records as a particularly imposing figure under Richard III. During the reign of Edward IV he had been for a time chaplain and secretary to the queen. In June 1471 he was made clerk of the parliament, an office he held for the rest of the reign, and by 1478 he was dean of the king's household.⁶⁴ He was an obvious candidate to succeed John Russell as keeper when Russell was made chancellor under Edward V. This was at a time when Gloucester, as protector, was anxious to win the support of his brother's men by retaining them in office.⁶⁵ Perhaps in Gunthorpe's case he subsequently regretted the decision for although Gunthorpe remained in office throughout Richard's reign he received few signs of royal favour beyond a gift of swans in Somerset.⁶⁶ This is in marked contrast to John Kendale, the secretary, who received an impressive array of royal grants. Ecclesiastical office, the traditional source of reward for royal clerks, was closed to Kendale as a layman and his reward had to be drawn from other sources. He accumulated other government offices: controller of the mint, keeper of the exchange within Calais and keeper of the rolls of common bench. He was also given a variety of local offices and a sizeable land grant.⁶⁷

Such grants must have brought his income close to that of Gunthorpe, in spite of the fact that the secretary received no fee for his office whereas the keeper received twenty shillings a day.⁶⁸

Socially the keepership carried more standing than the secretaryship, particularly when associated with high office in the church: Gunthorpe, although never made a bishop, was dean of Wells.⁶⁹ Most fifteenth-century secretaries came from relatively humble backgrounds although Kendale was apparently a member of the lesser Gloucestershire gentry.⁷⁰ The closeness of the secretary to the king, however, meant that the balance of political power was shifting in the secretary's favour. In Kendale's case this may well have been helped by his close association with Richard before his accession.⁷¹ In the latter part of his reign Richard showed himself more willing to trust men in his service before 1483 than men with a background of service to his brother, particularly when, as with Gunthorpe, service to Edward IV had also involved links with the Woodvilles.⁷²

The increase in the signet's importance not only enhanced the standing of the secretary, it must have necessitated considerable growth in the signet office. Apart from the secretary himself the formal complement of the office in the fifteenth century was about seven: four senior clerks and a group of apprentices.⁷³ Few of Richard III's clerks can be identified with certainty. One was William Herbert, who was appointed secretary to Richard's son but probably returned to the signet office after the prince's death.⁷⁴ Another was probably Richard Skipton.⁷⁵ Various other names occur as signatures to the warrants for issues sent from the king himself rather than via the privy seal office, but here a difficulty arises. A number of the signatures are of known chancery officials. Several of the warrants are signed 'Broun', probably the John Brown who had formerly been clerk of the little bag in chancery.⁷⁶ Brown may have transferred to the signet office but other warrants are signed by men still in the chancery, including Thomas Barowe, Richard Ive and Henry Sharpe; keeper of the rolls, clerk of the crown and protonotary respectively.⁷⁷ There are also warrants signed 'Curteis' presumably the William Curtis of the Chancery, but few of the other names can be identified.⁷⁸ The implication is that such warrants were prepared by anyone available.

If all the unidentified names in the warrants are taken as signet clerks it brings the known signet establishment to nine, excluding Kendale. Even this seems very low given the amount of work passing the signet by this date. It is probable that the signet clerks were augmented by a number of non-established clerks who were responsible for the routine jobs of enrolling and abstracting signet material while the more senior clerks drew up the warrants, and letters. Certainly Harley 433 was the work of more than nine people. Unfortunately the entries in the volume are not signed although a few entries are followed by monograms. The most common apparently represents Th, which cannot be identified with any known signet clerk, and some are little more than flourishes, although none as elaborate as the flourishes which follow the signatures in the warrants for issues.

Harley 433 is not a precedent book or book of remembrance in the terms defined by Hubert Hall. Most of the types of document which he considered

typical of such books: charters, statutes, *placita*, private deeds, correspondence, chronicles, treatises, topographies and genealogies, have no place in Harley 433.⁷⁹ The volume consists of the daily records of the signet office rather than a collection of precedents and as such ceased to be of much relevance after the death of Richard III.⁸⁰ The major exception seems to have been the list of fees for royal officials. This was certainly in use under Henry VII, as a note at the end makes clear, and possibly even later as the scale of fees for office changed only slowly.⁸¹ As a result the volume came to be regarded as a book of remembrance, a concept with which the sixteenth century, like the fifteenth, was thoroughly familiar.⁸² This explains why material from the reign of Henry VIII was copied into the manuscript. The entries, a description of the reception of the papal legate and a list of a French embassy and its English counterparts, have nothing in common with the rest of the volume but do represent the type of information considered appropriate for entry in a book of remembrance.⁸³

This misconception probably accounts for the survival of the volume. The manuscript was purchased by Robert Harley from John Strype, the rector of Leyton (Essex). It had reputedly formed part of the collection of William Cecil, lord Burghley, some of which Strype had acquired from Sir William Hicks, a grandson of Burghley's secretary.⁸⁴ Burghley had a particular interest in collections of historical material which may well have led him to add the volume to his own collection.⁸⁵ In this context it is interesting to note that Harley 431, also purchased from Strype, is another medieval collection: John Prophete's *Registrum Epistolarum*. Prophete was secretary and then keeper of the privy seal to Henry IV and although the provenance of Harley 431 cannot be traced beyond Strype it seems likely that it had followed a similar descent to Harley 433, and for similar reasons.⁸⁶

The importance of Harley 433, however, lies mainly in the abstracts of documents issued daily under the signet, which would have had no place in a true book of remembrance. None of the earlier formularies embodying signet material can offer so detailed a picture of signet activity. Collections such as Prophete's *Registrum* were by their very nature highly selective compilations. Most, moreover, date from periods when the signet was still a relatively minor part of the government process.⁸⁷ The survival of Harley 433 provides a uniquely detailed account of the signet at a crucial period in its development, when its growing importance at the expense of the privy seal foreshadowed the pre-eminence which it was to enjoy under the Tudors.

THE CONTENTS

Edward V Entries

The Edward V material in Harley 433 is in two groups: ff.3, 6-19b and ff.221-232. It was printed, together with the signet letters of the duke of Gloucester (f.323), as *Grants Etc of King Edward the Fifth* by J.G. Nichols, who attempted to rearrange the entries in chronological order, not with

complete success as he himself admitted.⁸⁸ The two sections were evidently planned as two separate registers. The early entries in both are arranged in chronological order, with a heading for each day's business, and the dates in the two sections overlap. The sections correspond roughly to the two registers of Richard III. The first includes Edward V's grants, together with some entries which in Richard's reign would have gone into the second register, such as the letter to the inhabitants of Tilney announcing the appointment of a steward and letters to the royal auditors in Wales concerning the wages of the duke of Buckingham.⁸⁹ The second section, like Richard's second register, is largely made up of material concerning the royal lands and their issues but also includes some unrelated material such as diplomatic correspondence and letters referring to the military preparations against the Woodvilles.⁹⁰

In both sections the entries are given in more detail than in the comparable registers for Richard III's reign, with some documents enrolled in full. This led Nichols to believe that some of the entries represented letters patent. It was not, however, unusual for signet warrants to include a draft of the letters required, and there is no reason to suppose that the registers include anything other than signet material. The full entries were cases where the clerk had enrolled the entire text of the letters authorised by signet warrant, just as some petitions were enrolled in full.⁹¹ This explains the apparent inclusion of privy seal material, such as the indenture between Edward V and Northumberland concerning Berwick, which was almost certainly taken from the warrant sent to the keeper of the privy seal rather than being a true privy seal enrolment.⁹² A similar ambiguity occurs in the Richard III registers with entries such as 'N hath a privy seal to the treasurer'.

The two registers, as far as it can be checked, include most of the signet output of the reign. There is an apparent break in the first register. The early entries were made chronologically, with daily date headings. May 14-16 and 19-22 occupy ff.6-11.⁹³ The order then breaks down for the rest of the register, as the job of abstracting the documents fell behind their issue. There is also, however, a single Edward V entry on f.3, headed May 5. It is possible that similar entries once existed for May 6-13 but there is no evidence for this. The Edward V entry occupies only the top of f.3, the rest is filled by a letter from Richard III's son as prince of Wales, and the dorse is blank. If this were a stray survival from a longer run of entries one would expect Edward V material to occupy both sides of the page. There is, moreover, no trace in the patent rolls of a group of grants corresponding to this gap. The only entries in the patent rolls which are otherwise unaccounted for date from later in the reign when the register is apparently intact: the appointment of Hastings as master of the mint and John Kendale's appointment as keeper of the rolls of common bench.⁹⁴ Both are noted as warranted by privy seal and must have originated with the king. Their omission from the register may have been accidental or the warrant to the keeper of the privy seal may have been warranted by the sign manual alone.

It is probable that the entry on f.3, letters of presentation for John Geffrey, was planned as the beginning of a third register devoted to ecclesiastical appointments. No other presentations were made under the signet and the rest

of the page remained empty until it was used to note a letter early in the next reign. There are signs that a similar register was planned under Richard III although it was not consistently maintained. A list of benefices granted between January 1485 and the end of the reign is preserved on f.20, but most presentations were simply noted in the register of grants.

The Edward V entries in Harley 433 are confined to the period May 5—June 11, that is, from the king's arrival in London to shortly before the arrest of Hastings at the Tower. The earliest grant is that to Geffrey which was made at St Albans but probably enrolled shortly after the king's arrival in London, when he had the resources of his father's signet office at his disposal. Signet activity did not, however, get thoroughly under way for a further four days, with the first entries in the second register dating from May 9 and in the register of grants from May 14. It then seems to have remained at a fairly steady level until the first week in June, when it began to slacken off, ceasing altogether after the crisis of June 13.⁹⁵ This abrupt end to signet activity may be the result of the imprisonment of Oliver King, the king's secretary, but it must also reflect the political uncertainty of the time. The arrest of Hastings and the removal of the duke of York from sanctuary made it clear to contemporaries that Richard had designs on the crown and the second Stallworth letter paints a vivid picture of the situation in London: 'I hold you happy that ye ar oute of the prese, for with huse is myche trobull, and every manne dowtes other'.⁹⁶

The cessation of signet activity was paralleled elsewhere. The last letters to pass the great seal were the routine appointments of the chief baron of the Exchequer and two serjeants at law on June 14 and 15.⁹⁷ This was not only because royal initiative had ceased. There were a number of grants in the pipe line which had been warranted by the signet but now failed to pass the great seal. Most of these were subsequently issued early in Richard III's reign after new signet warrants had been prepared. A slowing down of government processes at a time of crisis was not unusual. Richard's own reign shows a similar hiatus during Buckingham's rebellion. The completeness of the shut down after June 13, however, strongly suggests that men were tacitly waiting for Richard's accession before resuming government business.

As Nichols realised, the entries for this reign reflect the policies and decisions of the duke of Gloucester rather than of the young king himself.⁹⁸ A number of the signet letters explicitly embody Gloucester's advice, but even where this is not stated there can be little doubt that the protector was responsible for issuing the letters. The relative importance of king and protector is suggested by three of the latter's own signet letters preserved in Harley 433 (f.323). Two authorised the recipients to seize forfeited Woodville land and the third was a grant of office. They were evidently intended to have the force of a royal signet warrant but, although all three include the clause 'on the king our soverayn lordes behalve', they were essentially the protector's private warrants. Obedience was enjoined on pain of forfeiting Gloucester's favour and one was specifically made during the duke's pleasure.

Gloucester undoubtedly used his power as protector to consolidate his own position. The recipients of grants in this period include a number of his own followers, notably the duke of Buckingham whose massive grants dominate the

first register. But Richard was not attempting to surround the young king with his own men. The immediate circle around Edward V after his arrival in London was apparently composed of former servants of his father. The two men stated in Harley 433 to have been in Edward V's household, Walter Hungerford and John Norreys, had both been servants of Edward IV.⁹⁹ Gloucester's relative weakness in the south made it essential for him to retain the support of his brother's followers if he was to widen the basis of his power. He accordingly allowed most of his brother's grants to stand and filled the few vacancies which did occur with men from Edward IV's service as well as with members of his own northern affinity.¹⁰⁰

The only group to suffer seriously by Richard's assumption of the protectorship were the Woodvilles and their immediate circle, Gloucester's main rivals for power after the death of Edward IV. Gloucester was understandably anxious to limit their power and, although the council overruled his claim that Rivers and his associates had been guilty of treason, he immediately treated their possessions as forfeit.¹⁰¹ Both registers provide examples of the redistribution of their royal grants. Robert Bell, a former member of Edward IV's household, was given the manor of Woodham Martin which Rivers had been granted by Edward IV. Lord Lovell took over Rivers' office of chief butler. Richard Williams replaced Rivers and Rivers' son in law Robert Poyntz as constable of St Briavels, although Thomas Baynam, a local man, shared the office in both grants. Alfred Cornburgh received Thomas Vaghan's office of controller of the coinage of tin. There were also minor changes at a lower level.¹⁰² At the same time Richard took steps to seize their family lands. Lovell was ordered to enter Thorpe Waterfield, one of the manors which had belonged to the duchess of Exeter and which had been settled by parliament on Dorset's infant son.¹⁰³ William Malyverer and Thomas Wortley seized the manors of More End and Mote.¹⁰⁴

This policy met with no opposition. Most of Edward IV's servants were prepared to cooperate in the attack on the Woodvilles. Even bishop Russell of Lincoln, who was rumoured to have accepted the chancellorship unwillingly, was prepared to make pointed and unfriendly allusions to Earl Rivers in his draft speech for the opening of Edward V's parliament.¹⁰⁵ The clearest demonstration, however, is provided by Richard's countermeasures against Edward Woodville, whose fleet was threatening the south coast. Richard's first step was to give the key castles of Carisbrooke and Portchester, held by Robert Poyntz and Edward Woodville himself, to two local members of Edward IV's household, William Berkeley and William Uvedale respectively. The next day, May 10, Thomas Fulford and John Halwell were ordered to sea against Woodville, then reported to be standing off the Downs. On May 14 Richard authorised further action and again looked to former members of his brother's household. Berkeley and Uvedale, together with Roger Kelsale, one of Edward's yeomen of the crown, were ordered to victual a fleet under Edward Brampton, John Welles and Thomas Grey.¹⁰⁶

The episode suggests that Gloucester could call upon the support of a large part of his brother's establishment and that he could accordingly exert authority in areas outside the scope of his own affinity. Part, at least, of this

support was however due to him as protector of Edward V rather than in his own right, and it was jeopardised by his usurpation in June 1483. Although many of Edward IV's servants remained loyal to Richard III others made common ground with the Woodvilles. Of the eight men involved in the measures against Edward Woodville no fewer than six, Berkeley, Uvedale, Kelsale, Fulford, Halwell and Welles supported the Woodvilles five months later in their rebellion against Richard III.¹⁰⁷ Edward V's grants in Harley 433 paint the same picture. Alongside grants to men like John Sapcotes and Thomas Fowler, former servants of Edward IV who transferred their loyalty to Richard III, there are grants to Walter Hungerford and William Clifford, who subsequently rebelled.¹⁰⁸

The Register of Richard III's Grants

The register occupies ff.22-105 of the volume, and includes abstracts of the grants which passed the signet in the course of the reign. It was intended to provide a more accessible list of grants than the signed bills and enrolled letters which made up the bulk of the signet archive, and information was kept to a minimum. Most entries are little more than statements that N has received X for a given period. Very few give any indication of the date of the warrant or of its recipient, although in most cases this would have been the keeper of the privy seal. An approximate date of issue can usually be reached by a comparison with other stages in the processing of the grant. In addition, it became more common in the course of the reign for the clerks to note each new month in the margin, presumably for their own ease of reference since the register was becoming a substantial document. The changes of month were apparently noted accurately: in one case a clerk has taken the trouble to squeeze in an additional entry at the end of one month after the next month's entries had been commenced.¹⁰⁹ The analogy of the second register, however, suggests that within each month the order of the entries may have varied within a few days.

The register provides a particularly clear picture of the range of Richard III's patronage. Virtually all the king's known grants passed the signet, the major exceptions being the signed bills which went straight to the chancellor or to his counterpart in the duchy of Lancaster, and the grants initiated by other officers of state. The chief butler, for instance, appointed his own deputies and their letters patent were warranted by his bill. The chancellor had the right to make certain routine confirmations and to present to minor benefices in the king's gift.¹¹⁰ Such patronage was in any case not strictly 'royal' patronage and its omission from Harley 433 does not seriously distort the picture of the king's patronage. The signed bills are a more serious omission but the numbers involved are small.

The majority of grants noted in this register can be found elsewhere. Most are enrolled in the patent rolls or in the rolls of the duchy of Lancaster, a few in the French rolls. Some survive among the exchequer series of warrants for issues, such as the Christmas grant of £100 to the grooms and pages of the chamber.¹¹¹ It is, however, much easier to trace the development of Richard's

patronage through the register than by attempting to collate the final versions of the grants. Although the order in the register may vary by a few days from the order in which the grants were initially authorised, this variation could grow to months by the time the final stages of the grant were reached. The entries on f.28b, for instance, are all grants which passed the signet in September 1483. The group of duchy of Lancaster offices given to Thomas Molyneux were authorised at York on 17 September and his letters patent bear the same date.¹¹² The grant to William Shoter passed the great seal on 25 September. Other grants made at the same time, however, became caught up in the administrative delays which accompanied Buckingham's rebellion. The grant to Sir John Savage passed the great seal in the following February, and the grant of the Langley wardship did not pass the great seal until March 1485.¹¹³

The register does, however, include notes of some grants which have not survived elsewhere. Often this was because the grant was in the form of a warrant sent directly to a local receiver or auditor rather than to the exchequer. The grant of a reward of £20 to Leonard Thornburgh (f.31), for instance, to be paid by the auditors of the Richmond lands, is only recorded in Harley 433. This does not, however, explain all the grants which appear only in the register. Several are indistinguishable from grants which were subsequently embodied in letters patent. In a few cases a grant may have been blocked after it had passed the signet. The grant of office to Walter Hungerford (f.27b), for instance, was probably cancelled before it reached the great seal because of his implication in Buckingham's rebellion.¹¹⁴ In most cases, however, there is no reason to suppose that the grant was not meant to be effective. The fee of 50 marks granted to Richard Middleton as an esquire of the body never passed the great seal. Middleton was a close associate of Richard; had his grant been thought likely to be invalid it would certainly have been emended.¹¹⁵

The acceptability of a signet warrant as the official version of a grant may have been a corollary of the growth of chamber finance. The main practical purpose of a written grant was to authorise the payment of the wages or annuity granted. Letters patent issued some time after the recipient had taken up office would thus include a clause backdating the payment of wages or, in some cases, the king would grant a lump sum to cover the period between the recipient's taking up of office and the date of his grant. This also explains why so few appointments to household office were made the subject of a written grant. The main exceptions are the offices, notably the posts of yeoman of the crown and serjeant at arms, which carried a fixed fee payable from an outside source. Offices paid on a daily basis from the general household assignments are hardly ever embodied in a written grant.¹¹⁶ As soon as receivers and auditors became accustomed to the idea of accepting a signet warrant as their authority for payment much of the need for letters under the great seal was removed, although most recipients of patronage continued to secure letters patent.

The exercise of royal patronage is a central issue in the reign of Richard III, accounting for much of the hostility which he aroused. At the outset of his reign Richard continued the policy which he had adopted as protector. Most of his brother's men remained in office and the limited amount of patronage available was given not only to Richard's own followers but to former sup-

porters of Edward IV.¹¹⁷ This policy was overturned by the rebellions of autumn 1483, involving men from most of the southern counties. The forfeitures which followed placed a massive amount of patronage at the king's disposal. Richard's response can be seen clearly in the register. Grants made in the first four months of 1484, after parliament had attainted the rebels, occupy over a third of the whole register, roughly ff.32-64. The main beneficiaries were members of the king's own affinity. The involvement of several of Edward's household men in the rebellions had shaken Richard's policy of conciliation. Rather than using the patronage at his disposal to build up a new affinity among the gentry of southern England he chose to 'plant' trusted members of his northern affinity in the areas most badly affected by the rebellions.¹¹⁸ The resulting influx of northerners into the southern counties was enormously unpopular.¹¹⁹

Had the rebellions of 1483 been followed by a period of secure rule, Richard's reliance on his own affinity would probably have slackened and the basis of his power have begun to widen again. This, however, was not the case. From the summer of 1484 the king was faced by a series of minor risings, as well as by the threat of invasion from abroad. As a result he was driven to rely upon a narrowing circle of associates. The closing pages of the register demonstrate very clearly that major grants, at least, were almost all going to men who had already benefited from royal patronage. In other words, the grants were not securing new support for the king but strengthening the influence of his existing affinity. The result became apparent at Bosworth, when Richard III faced Tudor with much the same group of men who had brought him to power two years earlier.¹²⁰

Richard III's Second Register

The register occupies ff.107-219, virtually the whole of volume II of the present edition. The final folio of volume II, f.220, although following on chronologically from the register, was probably not intended to form part of it. It is occupied by commissions of array and an incomplete proclamation against Tudor and separated from the register itself by the blank dorse of f.219. The register ends in the final week of June, 1485 when Richard was in the Midlands awaiting Tudor's invasion. The fact that the end of f.219 and f.219b are blank indicates that the register genuinely stopped at that point, rather than that subsequent folios have been lost.

The register entries are mainly concerned with the royal revenues, and they cast considerable light on the operation of chamber finance under Richard III.¹²¹ Many of the entries are straightforward warrants for payment, including assignments for household expenses. There are also a number of receipts for money paid into the chamber. The register is also concerned with the administration of the crown lands, which generated most of the income handled by the chamber. It therefore includes some details of grants made from the royal estates and also more peripheral aspects of their administration, such as the letter to the bailiff of Ware who was to ensure that the inhabitants practised archery instead of playing unlawful games.¹²²

The administration of land forfeited after the rebellions of 1483 also comes within the scope of the register. The initial signet commissions to seize forfeited land and levy the revenues on the king's behalf are noted, as are subsequent charges on the estates including the payment of debts owed by the rebels. The register provides the names of several rebels who are not mentioned in the 1484 act of attainder but whose lands and chattels were none the less forfeit, such as James Bonythen in Cornwall and Robert and John Redeness in Holderness.¹²³ This concern with the possessions of the rebels probably explains the inclusion of items relating to the rebels but not of immediate relevance to the royal finances, for example the letter on behalf of Sir Thomas Delamare explaining that the king has pardoned him and his friends are therefore free to provide him with food without incurring the royal displeasure.¹²⁴ The inclusion of this and of other items related only tenuously to the main subject matter of the register perhaps indicates that the selection of material was left to the discretion of the signet clerks.

The register is also an important supplement to the register of grants. In several cases it includes warrants authorising payments for grants noted in the first register. The register of grants, for instance, includes the grant of an annuity of 40 marks to Sir John Ferrers from the lordship of Warwick, which passed the great seal in March 1484. In January the following year Ferrers was given a warrant to John Agard, the receiver of Warwick, authorising the payment of the annuity.¹²⁵ Many of the warrants noted in the second register, however, do not match grants recorded elsewhere. Grants made solely by signet warrant in this way also occur in the register of grants and the decision to enter them in one register or the other must have been more or less arbitrary. Each warrant was at once a royal grant and a charge on the royal revenues. On the whole the second element appears to have been regarded as dominant and the majority of such warrants were entered in the second register.

Other grants noted in the second register take the form of letters to local officials notifying them of grants within their area. As in the case of warrants for issues some of these letters parallel grants recorded elsewhere while others do not. In February 1485 the officers of the lordships of Skipton and Carlton in Craven were ordered to assist John Vavasour, who had been appointed receiver during the king's pleasure at 10 marks *per annum*.¹²⁶ There is no other record of Vavasour's appointment and the signet letter, which incorporates all the information normally found in a grant, may have been his sole authority. As receiver Vavasour was responsible for paying his own wages, which removed much of the need for a more formal grant. The same consideration explains why so few of the receivers named in Harley 433 are known to have been appointed by a written grant.

The survival of the second register confirms the impression that the late fifteenth century attitude to grants was much less formal than is often supposed. While many grants went through the full process of issue under signet, privy seal and great seal others were issued only under the signet and a considerable number do not seem to have been formally issued at all but are recorded only in the form of letters or warrants to third parties. This rather casual treatment of grants is confirmed by the occasions on which a grant was made, and operative,

long before it passed even the signet. The patent rolls contain several examples of grants made by word of mouth some time before they were embodied in a formal grant.¹²⁷ The second register contributes other examples. Sir William Houghton received the grant of steward of Chadsey, master of the forest of Hay and parker of Petherton in March 1485. The grant was in force, however, at least as early as the previous January, when the local officials were ordered to aid him.¹²⁸ Sometimes the delay was even more marked. Ralph Bigot was acting as Richard's master of the ordnance in March 1484 but a grant of the office did not pass the signet until the very end of the reign, and never passed the great seal.¹²⁹

In the light of this it is not difficult to accept that some grants may have escaped record altogether, particularly when no payment was involved or when it could be made at source by the recipient. Land grants fall into the first category and of the list of Richard's land grants preserved as ff.282-9 no fewer than 20% are otherwise unrecorded. Taking this list of land grants, discussed in more detail below, and the two registers together it is unlikely that a significant proportion of Richard's patronage has been lost. The survival of Harley 433 does demonstrate, however, how much of Richard's patronage is not recorded in the traditional sources for royal patronage, letters patent and exchequer warrants. The same is probably true of Edward IV's reign also, as the signet gained in acceptance.

Other Financial Material

There are various financial entries in Harley 433 apart from the contents of the second register. They fall into three main groups: entries relating to chamber finance and the household; accounts and valuations; and details of the king's attempts to raise loans.

The first group has been discussed, and largely printed, by Dr Wolffe.¹³⁰ The household material includes details of the assignments made for the king's main household and also the regulations and financial provisions for the household set up at Sandal under Richard's nephew, the earl of Lincoln, in July 1484.¹³¹ The new household was intended to replace that of the prince of Wales, who had died that spring, as the centre of royal authority in the north. At the same time that authority was given a more institutionalised form with the setting up of the council of the north, again headed by Lincoln.¹³² The two northern households apparently shared the same personnel. John Dawney, treasurer of the Sandal household, had also been the prince's treasurer and is often referred to simply as the treasurer in the north parts.¹³³

The volume also contains two important documents concerning the administration of the crown lands which summarize the aims and principles of chamber finance. One is a general document, with the contemporary heading 'A remembrance made, as well for the hasty levy of the king's revenues growing out of all his possessions and hereditaments, as for the profitable estate and governance of the same possessions.'¹³⁴ As the title suggests, it sets out the principles upon which the king could secure the best financial return from his land. The second document translates these principles into a set of

instructions for the administration of a single honour, that of Tutbury, where Marmaduke Constable of Flamborough, one of Richard's knights of the body, was steward.¹³⁵

Both documents were counsels of perfection. The royal lands were not only the source of much of the crown's income, they also provided much of its patronage in the form of office and annuities. Taken to extremes the two elements were incompatible. Over generous patronage seriously impoverished the crown but patronage could not be abandoned altogether since it offered the main method of exerting political control in the provinces. A medieval king had to balance the two. The *Remembrance* was vitiated by the assumption that patronage should be subordinated to the crown's financial benefit. Its suggestion that stewardships should be the preserve of men learned in the law rather than of uneducated knights and squires would have removed one of the most desirable forms of local patronage from the reach of its traditional beneficiaries. In this the memorandum was seriously out of step with contemporary opinion.¹³⁶ So was the instruction to Constable to replace any incompetent deputies of local office holders, which struck at the cherished right of office holders to appoint their own deputies.¹³⁷ In practice the king could not afford to insist on such recommendations and although the growing importance of chamber finance brought a reorganisation of central government procedures it had little impact on local patronage.

The volume does not include many valuations or accounts. The most extensive is the valuation of the lands of the archbishopric of York, drawn up in the last year of Edward IV's reign (ff.324-7b). The crown no doubt had similar valuations for all bishoprics but there seems no obvious reason for the inclusion of this one in Harley 433. The last vacancy had been at the death of George Neville in 1474 and there was no immediate prospect of another. The valuation is followed by the account of the receiver of the forfeited Staffordshire lands of the duke of Buckingham (ff.328-329). The account is undated but must refer to the financial year before Richard acquired the land since he subsequently regranted some of the offices mentioned in the account. The parker of Stafford and the bailiff of Stafford Green, for instance, are named as Humphrey Whitegreve and Reynold Hassall, whereas the offices were granted to Thomas Belle and Robert Wortley respectively in March 1484.¹³⁸

The commissions to raise loans (ff.275b-277b) date from late February 1485. By this date Richard was evidently in some financial difficulty. The Croyland chronicler, the main source for the king's financial problems, regarded the king's difficulties unsympathetically. His assumptions, however, are coloured by his conviction that Edward IV had left a large treasure which Richard must have squandered in the early months of his reign.¹³⁹ It is likely that the chronicler was taking an unduly rosy view of Edward's finances. At the time of Edward's death England had been at war with Scotland for three years and the end of the French pension was not only a financial blow in itself but the prelude to expenditure on the war with France. The situation was aggravated by the Woodvilles' seizure of the royal treasure after Edward's death, at least some of which must have been permanently lost to Richard.¹⁴⁰ This, taken in conjunction with the heavy expenses of the reign, makes Richard's difficulties more explicable.¹⁴¹

The loans which Richard attempted to raise should be distinguished from the benevolences which had created so much ill feeling under Edward IV and which Richard had condemned in parliament in the previous year. The main difference was that repayment of the loan was guaranteed, in this case by June 1486.¹⁴² Legally, Richard was completely within his rights. The Croyland chronicler is wrong in insisting that the loans were benevolences under another name and that Richard was thus breaking his own word.¹⁴³ But his violent attack on the king's attempts to raise money shows how much ill-will was created by the loans.

The commissioners were almost all household men, a number of whom combined chamber office with the post of royal receiver, such as Nicholas Spicer and John Greenhill, who were jointly responsible for Gloucestershire and Herefordshire.¹⁴⁴ Wherever possible Richard III used men native to the counties concerned, partly for their local knowledge but probably also as a concession to local feeling. The commissioners do not, however, seem to have been particularly successful. Gairdner estimated the return as £20,000 but the exchequer records for this half year show an income of only £4,500 from loans.¹⁴⁵ It is possible that the commissioners managed to raise more but paid all or part of the money directly into the chamber. However the material in Harley 433, although it gives no indication of who lent money, does imply that the commissioners met with opposition. The commissioners for each area were provided with a selection of unaddressed letters for various amounts, which they had to place as well as they could, and in addition with a few letters in which the recipient was also named. Three weeks after these original instructions, the collectors in a number of counties were supplied with much fuller lists of men to be asked for specified sums, which suggests that attempts to bargain with potential lenders had not proved successful.

The List of Land Grants

The list occupies a single signature (ff.282-9b) and is the work of one hand. The contemporary title states that it is a list of the manors, lordships, lands and tenements granted to various people and their heirs male by king Richard III. In other words, it is a list of land grants which were intended to be permanent alienations. It is also a list of new grants only. It does not include confirmations of grants made by Edward IV even when, as in the case of Nicholas Baker, they involved new letters patent.¹⁴⁶ Nor does the list include the restoration of land to pardoned rebels, such as John Fogge and Walter Hungerford.¹⁴⁷

The list, however, is not complete, even within its stated limitations. Forty eight grants of land are known to have been omitted, of which at least a third were made to the recipient and his heirs male and thus came within the scope of the list. These omissions include a number of major grants, notably the extensive land in Wales and the Marches granted to William Stanley.¹⁴⁸ On the other hand, the list includes several grants, such as the eight on f.287, which were made for the lifetime of the recipient only, or during the king's pleasure. It also includes some examples where only the farm of the manor, not the manor itself, had been granted. The apparent grant of Oswaldkirk to John

Pikering falls into this category, although the list gives no indication that it was not an outright grant.¹⁴⁹

The source of the list is unclear. It was clearly not compiled at any stage in the processing of the grants. It includes a large number of grants not recorded elsewhere, as well as omitting grants known to have been made under the signet or great seal. Where the same grant appears in both the list and the patent rolls the versions sometimes differ, which again suggests that the list was not compiled from signet or chancery records. The land grant to lord Ferrers, for instance, appears elsewhere in Harley 433 and in his letters patent as a grant of the manor of Cheshunt (Hertfordshire) with appurtenances in Cheshunt and Waltham. According to the Harley 433 list, however, he held the reversion of the manor of Maidcroft, not mentioned elsewhere, and the manor of Waltham near Cheshunt.¹⁵⁰ Moreover, the list is not in chronological order, which one would expect had it been copied from the signet or chancery records.

The list is probably related to the schedule of reserved rents which survives in the Public Record Office.¹⁵¹ The aims and layout of the two documents differ, although the list of grants in each is very similar. The Harley 433 list is arranged more or less at random, but the land held by each recipient is listed in full. The schedule of reserved rents is arranged by shrievalty, although this is misleading since for each recipient only a single manor is named, even when the recipient held other manors elsewhere in the country. The purpose of the schedule, as the title suggests, is to provide details of the money due to the king from the land, and the name of the manor attached to each sum is little more than a reference to the full grant. Thus the reserved rent of £8 6s. 8d. is attached to the manor of Wickham, granted to Robert Carre, whereas it derived from a much larger grant made to Carre, including two other manors and associated land.¹⁵² The schedule omits completely most land grants to which a reserved rent was not attached.

The exact relationship of the two lists is not entirely clear. There are some marked similarities. They share details of a number of grants not recorded elsewhere. Both describe John Talbot as 'of Scarborough' although neither usually goes into details of this sort. The lists, however, are not exactly parallel, even allowing for their stated omissions, and there is one major difference. The schedule records the manors of Glutton and Farnham (Somerset) as granted to Percival Thirlwall while the Harley 433 list assigns them to Thomas Markenfield.¹⁵³ It seems likely that both lists were drawn from a series of inquisition returns, now lost, although not from exactly the same returns or at the same time.¹⁵⁴ This would explain a number of the puzzling features of the Harley 433 list, notably the random order of entries and also the fact that a number of the names are incorrect or only partially remembered, a strange slip if the list had been compiled from royal grants. It does, however, make dating the list more difficult. The only guide is that the last grant to be included was apparently one to the duke of Norfolk made in late February 1485.¹⁵⁵

The list of land grants, particularly when the omitted grants are added in, is striking evidence of the lavishness of Richard's patronage. The grants did not, however, seriously deplete the crown's income since virtually all of them were made from land forfeited by the rebels of 1483. The main exceptions are the

grants which Richard made of land which he or Clarence had held under Edward IV, and much of this was land which had been initially forfeited by Lancastrian opponents of Edward IV. An important part of the duke of Norfolk's endowment was made up of land held by the duke of Gloucester in the previous reign, much of it former de Vere land.¹⁵⁶ Northumberland was given the Brian lands, which Clarence had held until his death in 1478.¹⁵⁷ There were also minor beneficiaries. Plympton, granted to Thomas Malyverer, had been held by Clarence as part of the earldom of Devon. Robert Percy received land in Cambridgeshire which had been held by Gloucester.¹⁵⁸

In spite of his grants Richard III almost certainly enjoyed a greater landed endowment than his brother. His accession brought the remaining share of the Neville lands to the crown and these were kept more or less intact, apart from the grant of Aldborough and Catterick to Sir John Conyers.¹⁵⁹ Richard also retained part of the Mowbray estates, in spite of recognising John Howard and William Berkeley as the heirs of the last Mowbray duke. William Berkeley was persuaded to part with his share of the inheritance in return for a life annuity.¹⁶⁰ John Howard received his share, augmented by further grants of land in East Anglia and elsewhere. As further Mowbray land was released by the deaths of the dowager duchesses it apparently passed to the crown. Certainly when the dowager duchess Katherine died Richard immediately appointed an auditor for her lands.¹⁶¹ Richard also retained a considerable amount of the forfeited land in his own hands, including virtually all the Stafford lands apart from the lordship of Holderness.¹⁶² Furthermore Richard, unlike his predecessors, was careful to retain a financial interest in the land which he granted away. Most of the permanent alienations were charged with a rent of one shilling in the mark, giving the crown an annual return of one thirteenth the nominal value of the land. This was even levied on grants to his closest associates, including Norfolk who paid £100 for his land.¹⁶³

Lists of Office Holders and Fees

The lists in Harley 433 fall into two groups. First, occupying ff.310-323b, is a group of lists in the same hand giving the fees and wages granted by Edward IV and in force at his death. Distinct from these is an undated list of offices with their fees (ff.336-9b) in the same hand as the list of corrodies which preceeds it and probably produced at the same time.

There are three main lists in the first category: fees and wages granted from the crown lands by Edward IV; duchy of Lancaster officers, but not annuitants, in the last year of Edward's reign; and offices on 'foreign' lands, that is, lands in the crown's possession which were not part of the royal desmesne. The third list includes the former Clarence estates, both land which he held by royal grant, such as the earldom of Devon, and his wife's inheritance which the crown held during the minority of the earl of Warwick. It also includes the land and offices formerly held by Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers. All these lists were drawn up early in the reign of Richard III to provide the new king with a readily accessible list of his brother's patronage and in particular to show which grants

were available for redistribution. Grants which had lapsed since Edward's death are indicated by marginal signs. Such notes only refer to the very beginning of the reign; offices forfeited by the rebels of autumn 1483, for instance, are not marked. In the Kent list (ff.312b-313) the offices of George Brown and the Hautes, who were under suspicion from the period of the usurpation, are marked but the fees of Thomas Borghchier, Thomas Seintleger and William Clifford, all lost in the aftermath of the rebellions, are not.

The emphasis throughout is on the recipients of the grants. There are very few offices for which a holder is not named and these are mostly offices within the central government with which the king would be fully conversant. This emphasis is sometimes at the expense of order. The list of grants made from the crown land is nominally arranged by county but all an individual's grants are entered at his first mention, regardless of their location. Thus under Norwich Edward Hardgill's fee of £9 2s. 6d., payable from the town's fee farm, is followed by other offices of his which were in fact in Oxfordshire and the New Forest and were payable there, details which the list does not make clear.¹⁶⁴ The argument behind this arrangement was probably that if Hardgill lost one office he would lose them all and that it was therefore more useful to have them grouped together.

The sources of the Edward IV lists vary. The Devonshire list was explicitly drawn from the ministers' accounts for the last year of the reign, and so probably were the earldom of Warwick and duchy of Lancaster lists. They are characterised by the arrangement of offices within each lordship in an approximate order of status and by their apparent completeness. Where minor offices have been omitted it was probably because they were in the gift of one of the office holders rather than of the king himself. The list of fees payable on the royal demesne cannot, however, have been compiled in the same way since the entries are not grouped entirely according to the source of payment. Stephen Fryon, for instance, received an annuity of £20 made up of £10 from the fee farms of York and Northampton. The list enters the full £20 under York, with no indication that York was not, in fact, responsible for it all.¹⁶⁵ It is more likely that the details of fees and wages were drawn from a list of royal grants, possibly a register of signet grants similar to Richard's own. This must have been a considerable undertaking, particularly since the lists were probably compiled at short notice. The document certainly shows some signs of haste. On f.312, for example, the clerk has written Gloucester for Colchester as the source of John Shutte's fee as yeoman of the crown, although the grant is listed correctly under Essex. There are also numerous omissions. In the Northamptonshire section (f.313b) the grants to the Hastings brothers and the corresponding payments are far from complete and a related office, the rangership of Cliff, Brigstoke and Rockingham, held by John Pylton, is omitted altogether.¹⁶⁶ So is William Porter's fee of the crown, payable on the farm of Northampton.¹⁶⁷

Even taken together, the Edward IV lists do not provide a complete account of his patronage. Some important sources of patronage are omitted altogether, notably the duchy of York. Various categories of grant are omitted explicitly. No land grants are included, nor are charitable benefactions. Moreover, the list

of fees charged on the demesne lands is the only one to include annuities. The other lists confine themselves to offices and their fees, although the duchy of Lancaster in particular was an important source of annuities.

The undated list differs in a number of ways from the lists considered above. The heading, 'Officers with their Salaries pertaining to the King's house, Lordships and Castles', is a much later addition and not a particularly helpful description. The list, as a list of officers, is markedly incomplete and badly arranged. Some lordships are omitted entirely, others are included with only a partial list of their officers, such as the Queensborough list which notes only the minor officials.¹⁶⁸ The undated list, unlike the others, is concerned primarily with the fees attached to each office rather than with the office holders, who are hardly ever named. It is arranged by the source of the fee rather than by the location of the grant. Thus there is no section for the offices in the Tower of London. The keeper of the wardrobe there is listed under Hertfordshire, because his fees were paid from the county revenues, while the keeper of the armoury is listed under Kent for the same reason. The list also distinguishes between the Windsor offices which were paid from the lordship itself and the office of Bagshot baillif in the forest of Windsor which was paid from the revenues of the county of Oxford.¹⁶⁹ This emphasis on the source of the fees makes it probable that the list was compiled from exchequer records rather than from a list of grants.

The list is a copy of one compiled under Henry VI. William Standard, listed as porter at Windsor, was appointed in 1418 and confirmed in 1422. Richard Ludlow, Bagshot baillif, held the office alone from 1437, although he had shared it earlier with John Hargreave.¹⁷⁰ Such lists could remain in use for several generations. A similar exchequer list, compiled in 1377, was still being cited as authority for fees granted by Richard III.¹⁷¹ The fees noted in the Henry VI list are on the whole the same as those in the Edward IV lists. There are, however, a few striking differences. The Henry VI list gives a fee of £20 for the combined offices of constable and porter of Tickhill, compared with £9 14s. 0d. in 1482/3. The receiver of the same lordship received £25 from Henry VI against £5 from his successor.¹⁷² These figures may represent a genuine change in the fees paid to the officials but it is more likely that the compiler of the Henry VI list has noted the total payment made to the constable and receiver, including an element for something other than their wages, such as the wages of their subordinates or the costs of their office. If this is the case it probably represents an error rather than common policy since the Tickhill fees are considerably higher than comparable fees elsewhere in the Henry VI list.

The Gentry Lists

The lists occupy ff.330-2b and provide the names of the upper gentry resident in about half the English counties. From internal evidence they seem to have been revised up to the early months of 1485, but there is no heading or other indication of their purpose.¹⁷³ The men named under each county do not correspond exactly to the personnel of any of Richard III's commissions. On

the other hand, almost all the men in each list did serve on commissions of some sort in the course of the reign. In some cases all the men listed were JPs, as in the Huntingdon list. In the long Suffolk list, by contrast, thirteen of the twenty seven men named were JPs and a further eleven were commissioners of array. The lists apparently represent a pool of local gentry upon which the king could draw for commissions or other administrative functions. Inclusion thus presupposes a certain degree of loyalty to the crown. The only 1483 rebels to be noted are the two Gaynesfords under Surrey and by this date they seem to have been making their way back into favour.¹⁷⁴

The lists, unlike most commissions, are confined to men resident in the county concerned. This does not necessarily mean that all the men were natives. The Hertfordshire list includes three men from northern families, all of whom had a landed interest in the county. Richard Scrope was a younger brother of lord Scrope of Bolton and the family, although primarily northern in its interests, had held Sawbridgeworth (Hertfordshire) for most of the century.¹⁷⁵ Edward Goldesburgh had acquired interests in the county by his marriage to Joan Walys, the widow of Ralph Grey the younger.¹⁷⁶ Nicholas Leventhorpe was a member of the West Riding family, of which the main branch had moved south under the Lancastrians, possibly as a result of a connection with the Scropes, from whom they held land in Sawbridgeworth. Nicholas held extensive royal office in the north but in 1476 he married the widow of lord de la Ware, the head of one of the leading Hertfordshire families.¹⁷⁷ The lists also differ from commissions in entering each name under one county only, although this must have entailed some arbitrary decisions. Thomas Wortley is deleted under Derby but entered under Stafford and Thomas Cokesay is removed from the Gloucestershire list in favour of the Warwickshire list, although he served on commissions for both.

Gentry lists in some form must have been a standard reference work in medieval government. The selection of commissioners presupposes a fairly detailed knowledge of the local gentry, as do the financial expedients of late medieval kings. Richard's commissioners for loans were not left entirely to their own devices: the crown was able to supply them with the names of the local gentry and the amount they were thought able to lend. Henry VII, when checking on the men eligible for knighthood who had not yet taken up the honour, was able to call on an extremely detailed list of lords, knights and gentlemen.¹⁷⁸ A surviving Yorkist list of the Hertfordshire gentry may also have had a financial origin.¹⁷⁹ The Harley 433 gentry lists, by contrast, are political or administrative compilations. They are accordingly more selective than the examples cited above. The Hertfordshire list in Harley 433 provides nine names, compared with seventy eight in the Yorkist list and twenty one in the Henry VII list. All, however, testify to the importance for a fifteenth-century king of a detailed knowledge of the gentry.

THE MANUSCRIPT

Harleian MS 433 is a collection of material from the signet archives of the reigns of Edward V and Richard III. It is made up of a number of distinct elements: four separate registers of abstracts and a quantity of individual memoranda and letters. Although the volume is strictly speaking a compilation it was nonetheless the work of a single department over a limited period of time and the overall impression it gives is one of considerable uniformity. Apart from their subject matter there is little distinction between the various elements of the volume. They are all written on similar paper and the same hands recur throughout the manuscript. The only major variation in paper type occurs not between sections but within the two registers from Richard III's reign, which are partially written on smaller sheets of paper. These are watermarked with variants of the gothic P whereas the more common paper type bears a non-representational watermark, reproduced in volume IV.

The present binding is modern, but the page order dates back at least to the eighteenth century, when Wanley compiled his calendar, and probably much earlier. There is evidence that the two Richard III registers, at least, were in their present relationship by the reign of Henry VII or VIII. The register of grants is followed by a blank page (f.106) on the dorse of which are various jottings including a copy of the first entry of the register of financial matters. The same hand has then noted the opening of a grant made by Henry VII or his son. Moreover if, as was argued above, the volume survived because parts of it remained in use under the Tudors it seems probable that it was already bound by that date or the extraneous sections, in Tudor eyes, would have been separated from the parts still in use. The picture which emerges is of an unbound collection of signet abstracts and memoranda left in the signet office at Richard III's death, which were gathered together and bound soon after that, probably as a matter of signet office routine. An early, routine binding would help to explain the absence of a formal title page. The first folio of the volume is little more than a collection of scribbles and jottings on the blank side of a page of miscellaneous memoranda (see frontispiece to volume I).

The volume is a substantial one, measuring 8½" × 12" and including 340 folios. Most of the pages are now single sheets and there is no indication how many of these were originally grouped in signatures. Thirteen signatures do, however, still survive, and their position is noted in the summary of contents which follows. Most occur within the registers and accordingly shed little light on the compilation of the manuscript. One, however, does link the end of Edward V's second register with some early signet material of Richard III. Another demonstrates that the ordinances for the household in the north were entered immediately after the diplomatic correspondence. These taken together form a chronological sequence and the signature may represent part of the collection of signet letters enrolled in full, the existence of which was suggested above.¹⁸⁰

Summary of contents

All entries are *temp.* Richard III unless otherwise stated.

Volume I

f.1	Jottings of various dates	
1b	Plate received from Henry Horne; bonds (deleted); a cure for the stone	
2	The knighting of Geoffrey de Sasiola	
2b	Letter to the duchess of York	
3	Letter of presentation <i>temp.</i> Edward V; letter of the prince of Wales	
3b	Blank	
4	Horses at grass	
4b	Blank	
5	Rewards to sheriffs ND	
5b	Blank	
6-19b	First register of Edward V	sig. 8-11
20	Letters for benefices	
20b	Blank	
21-21b	Letters and ecclesiastical precedents	
22-105b	Register of Richard III's grants	sigs. 26-33, 46-53, 65-74

Volume II

106	Blank	
106b	Jottings <i>temp.</i> Henry VII or VIII	
107-219	Second register of Richard III	sigs. 113-20, 133-42, 156-61, 175-182
219b	Jotting	
220-220b	Commissions of array and an incomplete proclamation against Tudor	

Volume III

221-232	Second register of Edward V	sig. 227-34
232b	Blank	
233	Early Richard III signet material	
233b-234	Lord Dynham to the chancellor	
234b	Blank	
235-255	Diplomatic correspondence	sig. 245-50
255b-261	Primacy of York over Scotland	
261b-264	Diplomatic correspondence	sig. 263-72
264b-265	Council of the north	
265b-268b	Letters concerning Ireland	
269-270	Household in the north	
270-271	Instructions to Marmaduke Constable	
271-272	Instructions for hasty levy of revenues	
272-272b	Berkeley inheritance	

272b-273	Letter concerning order of St John	
273	Letter to Salisbury chapter	
273b-275	Proclamation against Tudor	
275b-277b	Commissions for loans	
278-281	Settlement of Plumpton and Eltoft disputes	
281b	Letter concerning amendment of morality	
282-289b	List of land grants	sig. 282-9
290-292b	Household assignments	
293-294	Reception of the papal legate <i>temp.</i> Henry VIII	
294b-295	French ambassadors and their counterparts <i>temp.</i> Henry VIII	
295b	Blank	
296	Indenture concerning St Bartholomew's hospital ND c. 1463 ¹⁸¹	
296b	Blank	
297-297b	Hugh ap John to be denizen ND	
298	Incomplete pardon for R.C. ND	
298b-299	Blank	
299b-300	Trade with Brabant	
300	Liberties of Pembroke	
300b	Blank	
301-305b	Oaths of royal officials ND	
306-306b	A Salisbury land grant, 1435	
307-308	Incomplete lease to Robert Harding, 1470	
308b	Proclamation concerning Elizabeth Woodville	
309	Blank	
309b	William earl of Nottingham to John Kendale	
310-316	Fees granted by Edward IV from the crown lands	sig. 311-8
316b	Blank	
317-321	Fees from the duchy of Lancaster	
321b	Blank	
322-322b	Fees from foreign lands	
323	Signet letters of the duke of Gloucester <i>temp.</i> Edward V	
323b	Blank	
324-327b	Valuation of the archbishopric of York, 22 Edward IV	
328-329	Receipt of the receiver of the former Stafford lands ND c. 1482/3	
329b	Blank	

- 330-332b Gentry lists
- 333-333b Glossary of legal terms ND
- 334 Appointment of soldiers in Calais ND
- 334b Blank
- 335-336 Corrodies in the king's gift ND
- 336-339b Fees of royal officials ND (copy of Henry VI list)
- 340 As above, in rape of Pevensey
- 340b Letter concerning Thomas Lynom; jottings

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (4 volumes, 1802-12) I p.256. My thanks are due to Professor C. Ross and Dr. G. Harriss for reading this Introduction in draft.
2. *Historic Doubts on the Life and Reign of King Richard the Third* in *The Works of Horatio Walpole, Earl of Orford* (6 volumes, 1798-1818) II pp.132, 174-5. The letters are to the duchess of York and the bishop of Lincoln: British Library, Harleian MS 433 ff.2b, 340b. References to this manuscript are henceforth cited by folio number only.
3. In March 1768 Walpole was lent a copy of an illustrated roll of the lords of Warwick and wrote to Gray: 'Mr Astle is to come to me tomorrow to explain the writing': *Horace Walpole's Correspondence* ed. W.S. Lewis (39 volumes, Oxford 1937-74) XIV p.178.
4. A.R. Myers 'Richard III and Historical Tradition', *History* 53 (1968) pp.194-8.
5. *Grants Etc from the Crown during the Reign of Edward the Fifth* ed. J.G. Nichols, Camden Society 60 (1854); *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII* ed. J. Gairdner, Rolls Series (2 volumes, 1861-3). Gairdner calendared, but did not print in full, the diplomatic letters which had already been printed elsewhere: *ibid* I pp. lxxv-lxxix.
6. J. Gairdner *History of the Life and Reign of Richard the Third* (revised edition, Cambridge 1898).
7. *Ibid* p.145.
8. J. Otway-Ruthven *The King's Secretary and the Signet Office in the XV Century* (Cambridge 1939) pp.2, 117-8.
9. B.P. Wolffe *The Crown Lands 1461-1536* (1970) pp.59-65
10. The main categories of material included in the volume are discussed in detail in the second part of the Introduction. A summary of contents is printed at the end of the Introduction.
11. *Letters and Papers* I p. xiv; and compare *Grants Etc from the Crown* p.vi.
12. *The King's Secretary* pp.117-8. The most detailed discussion of the manuscript is, however, provided by Dr Wolffe *loc cit*.
13. f.23, Buckingham's grant of the justiciarships ends with the words *ut antea in Regestro* (as earlier in the register) which must refer to Edward V's register of grants.
14. f.22.
15. Public Record Office, Duchy of Lancaster, DL 42/20, enrolments of material passing the duchy great seal *temp.* Richard III.
16. f.107.
17. An exception is a signet warrant directed to the keeper of the privy seal, ordering him to make out letters to the treasurer authorising the payment of £14 11s. 5d. to John Belle. The warrant is entered in both registers: ff.34b, 138b. The privy seal warrant also survives: PRO Warrants for Issues, E 404/78/2/24.
18. Rigby: ff.71b, 132. Fouleshirst: ff.84, 187b.
19. f.9

20. *Grants Etc from the Crown* p.xxvii.
21. *The King's Secretary* pp.122-3.
22. I am most grateful to Professor T.J. Brown and Dr H.V. Baron for discussing the manuscript with me. In fairness to them both I should add that the conclusions which follow are my own.
23. The Lynom letter (f.340b) is followed by a note that Thomas Drury was paid 6s. in 9 Henry VII for searching the records for a copy. This, however, almost certainly refers to the fragment of a concord made in the reign of Edward II which follows. For this page, see the frontispiece to volume III.
24. For this point see the section on the manuscript at the end of this Introduction.
25. Sir John Wode, who died in August 1484, has been deleted, but Richard Scrope, who died in June 1485, has not: f.331-331b; J.S. Roskell 'Sir John Wood of Molesey' *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 56 (1959) pp.27-8; *Testamenta Eboracensia* III Surtees Society 45 (1864) p.299.
26. For example, on f.313 grants to George Brown and to William and Edmund Hawte, all implicated in the 1483 rebellions, have crosses beside them. On f.313b John Howard's fee as one of Edward IV's carvers, superseded when Richard made him duke of Norfolk, has a cross in the margin, as have two grants to lord Hastings who was executed in June 1483.
27. In places one script spans a change of month, as on f.60b where *Aprile* is entered in the margin but the entries continue without a break.
28. ff.273b-274.
29. *Rotuli Parliamentorum* VI pp.336-9.
30. It is not always made clear, for instance, that a grant is an *inspeximus*, on f.37 the grants to Swift and Roo are both confirmations: PRO DL 42/20 ff.13, 14v-15.
31. The dorse of Dynham's letter is blank, suggesting that it was not the first in the series of diplomatic letters but was placed with them later.
32. *The King's Secretary* pp.114-7.
33. A number of entries in the register of grants conclude with a variant of *prout plenius patet in billa* (as appears more fully in the bill), for instance ff.22, 27. In one case the entry is more specific and refers to a signed bill: f.22 (licence to de Nigrono).
34. PRO Signet warrants *temp.* Richard III C 81/1392. Of the twenty six warrants in this collection, fifteen do not appear in Harley 433.
35. *York Civic Records* I ed A. Raine, Yorkshire Archaeological Society 98 (1938) pp. 109, 115-6; *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Rutland* I (1888) pp.7-8.
36. *The King's Secretary* p.116.
37. ff.273, 281b.
38. *The King's Secretary* pp.116-7.
39. For instance in the grant to John Stokes on f.27b, where it has been allowed to stand, and in the grant to Thomas Tunstall (f.30) where it has been deleted.
40. ff.15b, 16b-17.

41. PRO Signed bills C81/1530-1 contains a number of such petitions. In one case, Northumberland's petition for the office of great chamberlain, the secretary has added a request that the signed bill be taken as sufficient warrant: C 81/1530/4.
42. *The King's Secretary* p.116.
43. For example, the king's letters to the towns of Southampton (f.115b) and Gloucester (f.127b).
44. *The King's Secretary* p.115
45. The last dated entry for Edward V's reign is June 11 (f.231). King was in the Tower by June 21: *The Stonor Letters and Papers 1290-1483* ed C.L. Kingsford, Camden Society third series 19-20 (1919) II p.161.
46. *The King's Secretary* pp.158-9. William Herbert certainly remained in the signet office after the death of Edward IV: PRO C 81/1392/1. So probably did Richard Decons, although references to him in Richard's reign are in other contexts: ff.195b, 199.
47. *Historia Croylandensis Continuatio in Rerum Anglicarum Scriptorum Veterum* I ed W. Fulman (Oxford 1684) p.564.
48. *The King's Secretary* p.115.
49. S.B. Chrimes *An Introduction to the Administrative History of Mediaeval England* (Oxford, 2nd ed 1959) p.259.
50. H.C. Maxwell-Lyte *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal in England* (1926) pp.123-4; *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1446-52* p.203.
51. f.28b; PRO C 81/1392/5; *CPR 1476-85* p.413.
52. The signet warrants include only two orders to make out grants under the great seal: PRO C 81/1392/2, 5. The signed bills contain forty-eight petitions for grants, including pardons: C 81/1530-1.
53. PRO C 81/1531/36; E 404/78/3/2; *CPR 1476-85* p.449.
54. The appointment of John Elrington as constable of Windsor in October 1483 is warranted 'by the king' but no signed bill survives: *CPR 1476-85* p.367.
55. The duchy of Lancaster records shows that an occasional signed bill was noted in Harley 433. The appointment of Thomas Metcalfe as chancellor of the county palatine and duchy, warranted by signed bill, does appear in Harley 433 (f.5b) although subsequent grants warranted by signed bill do not: PRO DL 42/20 f.3.
56. PRO C 81/1530/36.
57. *Ibid*/18.
58. Viscount Lovell and William Catesby, for instance, were made constable of Rockingham in a grant authorised by signed bill, although their numerous other grants went through the usual channels: *ibid* /28.
59. A.L. Brown 'The Authorization of Letters under the Great Seal' *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 37 (1964) pp.145-7 for the king's willingness to bypass the privy seal on occasion.
60. *Ibid* p.137.
61. *The King's Secretary* p.54.
62. PRO E 404/78/2.
63. *The King's Secretary* pp.75, 87.

64. A.B. Emden *A Biographical Register of the University of Cambridge to 1500* (Cambridge 1963) pp.275-7; C.L. Scofield *The Life and Reign of Edward IV* (2 volumes, 1923) II p.205.
65. R.E. Horrox *The Extent and Use of Crown Patronage under Richard III* unpublished Cambridge PhD thesis (1977) pp.29-31, 43-5.
66. f.217b.
67. *CPR 1476-85* pp.367, 418, 454, 463, 506, 539, 540; ff.101, 289.
68. *The King's Secretary* pp.84-5; *CPR 1476-85* p.460.
69. *Historical Manuscripts Commission: Wells II* (1914) pp.692-3.
70. *The King's Secretary* p.81. In 1485 Kendale was seised of the manors of Pedington, Avonscourt and Wick in the parish of Berkeley (Gloucestershire): *Inquisitions post mortem* Henry VII volume III no 654; and compare f.309b. It is usually assumed, for example by P.M. Kendall *Richard the Third* (1955) p.488, that Kendale was killed at Bosworth, but the inquisition states only that he had been attainted, not that he was dead. He survived to marry Elizabeth, the widow of the Richard Charlton who died on Richard's side at Bosworth: *CPR 1485-94* p.439; *Inq.p.m.* Henry VII volume I no. 51, volume III nos. 732, 917. Kendale should not be confused with his three namesakes: Richard III's yeoman of the crown; Edward IV's controller of the works; and a brother of the order of St. John, one of Richard's councillors.
71. Kendale was in Gloucester's service, as clerk if not secretary, by December 1474: C.H. Hunter Blair 'Two Letters Patent from Hutton John near Penrith, Cumberland' *Archaeologia Aeliana* 39 (1961), although Hunter Blair mistranscribes his name as Randale. He was secretary by 1482: *Household Books of John duke of Norfolk and Thomas earl of Surrey 1481-1490* ed J. Payne Collier, Roxburghe Club (1844) p.161; see also *Stonor Letters and Papers II* p.82.
72. Horrox *op.cit.* pp.221-4.
73. *The King's Secretary* pp.112-3.
74. *Ibid* p.158; PRO C 81/1392/1, 5; ff.34, 100b. The secretary should not be confused with his two namesakes, one 'of Raglan' and the other an esquire of the body: f.30.
75. *CPR 1476-85* p.541 where he is described as 'king's clerk'; PRO C 81/1531/68, expediting a signet letter; A.B. Emden *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to 1500* (3 volumes, Oxford 1957-9) III p.1708. It is not clear whether the royal clerk can be identified with a namesake who was clerk of the lead mines in the Neville lordship of Middleham in 1465: G.M. Coles *The Lordship of Middleham, especially in Yorkist and early Tudor times* unpublished Liverpool MA thesis (1961) p.177.
76. In January 1484 Brown was paid arrears as late clerk of the little bag: PRO E 404/78/2/29.
77. *CPR 1476-85* pp.410, 412, 438.
78. *Calendar of Close Rolls 1476-85* nos. 295, 314.
79. *The Red Book of the Exchequer* ed Hubert Hall, Rolls Series (3 volumes 1886-96) I p.iv.

80. A few entries are in the form of precedents, such as the entry *pro prebendo* on f.79b, but these, scattered at random throughout the volume, must have been all but useless for reference purposes. The only group of precedents is the list of religious precedents on f.21b.
81. f.339; the note refers to money received from John Heron, Henry VII's treasurer of the chamber. This page is reproduced in volume IV.
82. *Red Book* I p.ii.
83. ff.293-5.
84. C.E. Wright *Fontes Harleiani* (1972) p.321; Wanley's introduction to the calendar of the manuscript seems to imply some doubt on the connection with Burghley: *Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts* I p.256.
85. B.W. Beckingsale *Burghley, Tudor Statesman 1520-1598* (1967) pp.250-2; Burghley may have come across the volume during his time as secretary.
86. A.L. Brown *The Early History of the Clerkship of the Council* (Glasgow 1969) p.27; *The King's Secretary* pp.163-4.
87. *Ibid* pp. 118-23.
88. *Loc cit* p.xxvii.
89. ff.11-12, 17b, 18b.
90. f.221-221b.
91. *Grants Etc from the Crown* p.vi; *The King's Secretary* p.117.
92. ff.228b-229b.
93. The gap was due to the vigil and feast of Pentecost, which fell on May 17-18 that year.
94. *CPR 1476-85* pp.348, 349.
95. The cessation of signet activity gives some support to the traditional view that Hastings was executed on June 13, and not, as Mrs Hanham has argued, on June 20. For the dispute over the dating of his execution see: A. Hanham 'Richard III, Lord Hastings and the Historians' *English Historical Review* 87 (1972); B.P. Wolffe 'When and Why did Hastings lose his Head?' *EHR* 89 (1974); Hanham 'Hastings Redivivus' *EHR* 90 (1975); Wolffe 'Hastings Reinterred' *EHR* 91 (1976); J.A.F. Thomson 'Richard III and lord Hastings' *BIHR* 48 (1975); Anne F. Sutton and P.W. Hammond 'The Problems of Dating and the Dangers of Re-dating: the Acts of Court of the Mercers Company of London 1453-1527' *Journal of Society of Archivists* 6(1978).
96. *Stonor Letters and Papers* II p.161.
97. *CPR 1476-85* p.351.
98. *Grants Etc from the Crown* p.vi.
99. ff.16b, 225b; 'An Extract relating to the Burial of K. Edward IV' *Archaeologia* I (1770) p.350; *CPR 1467-77* p.548.
100. Horrox *op cit* pp.29-30.
101. Dominic Mancini *The Usurpation of Richard III* ed C.A.J. Armstrong (2nd ed, Oxford 1969) pp.84-5; compare J.S. Roskell 'The Office and Dignity of Protector of England' *EHR* 68 (1953) p.227.
102. ff.10b, 14b, 223, 226; for other examples see ff.13b, 14b, 17, 221.
103. f.323; *Rot Parl* VI pp.242-3.

104. f.221.
105. *Stonor Letters and Papers* II p.161; *Grants Etc from the Crown* pp.xl-xli.
106. f.221.
107. *Rot Parl* VI pp. 245-6; Fulford was attainted by lord Scrope at Exeter but was back in favour by autumn 1484 when he was made sheriff of Devon: R. Holinshed *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland* (6 volumes, 1807-8) III p.421; *Calendar of Fine Rolls 1471-85* no. 860.
108. ff.8b, 16b, 18, 19.
109. f.86.
110. Brown 'Authorization of Letters' p.115.
111. f.30b; PRO E 404/78/2/18.
112. PRO DL 42/20. f.9-9b.
113. *CPR 1476-85* pp.413, 461, 541.
114. *Rot Parl* VI p.246.
115. f.29; Middleton was in Gloucester's household by 1480: *Test Ebor* III pp.209-10.
116. This distinction is partly recognised by the Black Book of Edward IV's household which states that serjeants at arms, unlike most household men, were appointed by letters patent and received fees from county issues: A.R. Myers *The Household of Edward IV* (Manchester 1959) p.131.
117. This phase occupies approximately ff.22-29 of the register.
118. Horrox *op cit* chapter 5.
119. A.J. Pollard 'The tyranny of Richard III' *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977) pp.157-62.
120. The ballad of *Bosworth ffeilde* apparently includes a contemporary list of those who fought at Bosworth: *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript* ed J.W. Hales and F.J. Furnivall (3 volumes, 1868) III pp. 233 *et seq.*
121. For the relevance of this register to chamber finance see Wolffe *op cit* pp.60-1.
122. f.215.
123. ff.123, 149b; for the identification of the Redeness family with Holderness see M.G.A. Vale *Piety, Charity and Literacy among the Yorkshire Gentry 1370-1480*, Borthwick Papers 50 (1976) p.26. Holderness was a Stafford lordship.
124. f.209b.
125. ff.42, 199b; *CPR 1476-85* p.390.
126. f.204b.
127. *CPR 1476-85* pp.367, 368, 372, 375, 381.
128. *Ibid* p.528; ff.99, 201b.
129. *CPR 1476-85* p.387; f.105.
130. Wolffe *op cit* pp.60-6, Document 14.
131. ff.269-70, 290-2b; Wolffe Document 14 (30, 33).
132. ff.264b-5; R. Reid *The King's Council in the North* (1921) pp.59-61.
133. ff.182b, 183, 184, 212b.
134. ff.271-2; Wolffe Document 14 (32).
135. ff.270-1; Wolffe Document 14 (31).

136. Compare, for instance, Caxton's *Order of Chivalry*, dedicated to Richard III, which states that local office should go to knights, because they are worthy to have authority over others: *The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry* ed Alfred T.P. Byles, Early English Text Society, original series 168(1926) p.29; M. Kekewich 'Edward IV, William Caxton, and Literary Patronage in Yorkist England' *Modern Languages Review* 66 (1971) p.487.
137. *Plumpton Correspondence* ed Thomas Stapleton, Camden Society old series 4 (1839) pp.32-3.
138. f.55b; Hassall was subsequently restored by Henry VII: *Rot Parl* VI p.380.
139. Croyland pp.567, 571-2.
140. Scofield *Edward IV* II p.333; C. Ross *Edward IV* (1974) p.386; Mancini pp.78-9.
141. A. Steel *Receipt of the Exchequer 1377-1485* (Cambridge 1954) pp.317-20.
142. G.L. Harriss 'Aids, Loans and Benevolences' *Historical Journal* 6 (1963).
143. Croyland pp.571-2.
144. Spicer, an esquire of the body and gentlemen usher of the chamber, held numerous receiverships in Wales and the south west; Greenhill was a yeoman usher.
145. Gairdner *Richard the Third* p.198; Steel *op cit* p.319.
146. *CPR 1476-85* p.507.
147. ff.95, 98.
148. *CPR 1476-85* p.516.
149. *Ibid* p.372; f.287.
150. ff.73, 168, 285; *CPR 1476-85* p.513.
151. PRO Special Collections, SC 11/827, schedule of reserved rents. The schedule was drawn up under the privy seal in May 1485 for the information of the Exchequer.
152. *Ibid*; f.287b.
153. f.282. Neither grant appears in the patent rolls. The Harley 433 list apparently reflects the situation of March 1484 when Thirlwall received Bastendon (Berkshire) and Markenfield Glutton. In February 1485, however, Thirlwall was described as the holder of Farmham and Glutton as well as of Bastendon ff.45, 161b, 208v.
154. Neither list can be related to the surviving inquisitions into the lands of attainted persons, which do not provide adequate details of the grants subsequently made of the land: PRO Chancery Inquisitions, C 145/330.
155. ff.97b, 288b.
156. *CPR 1467-77* pp.297, 466-7, 560; *ibid 1476-85* p.359.
157. ff.124b-125; B.P. Wolffe *The Royal Desmesne in English History* (1971) p.193.
158. *CPR 1476-85* pp.434, 531.
159. *Ibid* p.450.
160. f.272-272b; although this arrangement was not finalised until October 1484 the crown was using the Mowbray lands as a source of patronage

- from the outset of the reign: *CPR 1476-85* pp.376, 414, 422, 438, 445, 511, 542-3; J. Smyth *Lives of the Berkeleys* ed J. Maclean (3 volumes, Gloucester 1883-5) II pp.126-7.
161. f.117b. This page forms the frontispiece to Volume II.
162. f.31.
163. PRO SC 11/827.
164. f.311b; *CPR 1461-7* p.24; *ibid 1467-77* p.90.
165. *Ibid 1476-85* p.221; f.311b.
166. *CPR 1467-77* p.599; *ibid 1476-85* pp.139-40.
167. *Ibid 1461-7* p.293
168. f.339.
169. ff.336, 337.
170. *CPR 1422-9* p.43; *ibid 1434-41* pp.49, 124.
171. *Ibid 1476-85* p.36, a grant to Roland Thornburgh of the keeping of the gate of Carlisle.
172. ff.318, 338.
173. For the dating of this list see note 25 above.
174. f.331b; A. Conway 'The Maidstone Sector of Buckingham's Rebellion' *Archaeologia Cantiana* 37 (1925) pp.116-8.
175. *Victoria County History of Hertfordshire* (4 volumes, 1902-14) III p.337; *Test Ebor* III p.299.
176. *VCH Hertfordshire* II p.197; IV p.82.
177. *Ibid* 111 pp.102, 337, 340; R. Clutterbuck *The History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford* (3 volumes, 1815-27) III pp.206-7; *CCR 1476-85* no. 75.
178. BL Harleian MS 6166 pp.95-123.
179. BL Harleian MS 1546.
180. The entries relating to the household in the north are not dated, although the household is said to have been set up in July 1484. The context, however, suggests that the entries were not made until Michaelmas that year: ff.264b-265, 269-70.
181. *VCH Middlesex* (5 volumes, 1911-76) V p.329. This is one of the few private deeds included in the manuscript and its presence in the signet archive is perhaps explained by the fact that Richard Sturgeon, the donor of the land conveyed to St Bartholomew, had been a royal clerk.