

THE MAIDSTONE SECTOR OF  
BUCKINGHAM'S REBELLION. Oct. 18, 1483.

BY AGNES ETHEL CONWAY.

I do not think it is generally realized in Kent that Maidstone was once the residence of the father of a reigning English queen. The Lady Elizabeth Grey, whose secret marriage with the Yorkist king, Edward IV., in 1464, caused consternation in the country, was the daughter of Lord Rivers of the Mote, an old Lancastrian, whose father Sir Richard Woodville<sup>1</sup>, also of the Mote, had been Sheriff of Kent, and lies buried under a plain altar slab in the chancel of All Saints' Church, Maidstone<sup>2</sup>. The love match was kept secret for five months, until, under the pressure of Warwick the Kingmaker's plea for Edward IV.'s marriage with the sister-in-law of the King of France, it had to be disclosed. At a meeting of the Council, summoned to approve the French marriage negotiations, the king replied to Warwick "in right merry guise that he would take to wife Dame Elizabeth Grey, the daughter of Lord Rivers. But they answered him that she was not his match, however good and fair she might be, and that he must know well that she was no wife for such a high prince as himself; for she was not the daughter of a duke or earl, but her mother, the Duchess of Bedford, had married a simple knight,<sup>3</sup> so that though she was the child of a duchess, still she was no wife for him."<sup>4</sup> The deed was however done, and the natural jealousy of the nobles at the elevation of one lower in rank than themselves was increased by the favours of all kinds showered upon the Woodville family by the king. Five of the queen's sisters were married within a year of her cor-

<sup>1</sup> Will, Lambeth, 482, Chichele 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cave-Browne, *History of All Saints*, p. 47. *Arch. Cant.*, I., p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> For which she was fined £1000. <sup>4</sup> Oman, *Warwick the Kingmaker*, p. 162.

nation to the greatest in the land, leaving only two dukes in the kingdom still bachelors. Her brother of 21 married the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk, aged 70, which was considered a scandal even in those days of mercenary marriages. Lord Rivers, her father, was made Treasurer of England, in place of a friend of the Earl of Warwick. In 1466 he was created an earl, his remaining titles being Baron Rivers of Grafton, from his place in Northamptonshire, and De la Mote from Maidstone. When the Earl of Warwick, who had for several years practically governed England, saw his unique prestige with the king becoming undermined by the compact family group of peers, all related to the queen, who surrounded him in his Council, he turned into the greatest enemy of them all. As Warden of the Cinque Ports and Keeper of Dover and Sandwich Castles in the years when he had been struggling to put Edward IV. upon the throne, he had become exceedingly popular in Kent, and could always count upon a following there for any enterprise. On New Year's day, 1468, some of his men sacked the Mote, broke down the park, killed all the sheep, and stole the best things out of the house<sup>1</sup>. This was a matter of private vengeance only, but before long Warwick was diverted by disgust at the Woodville predominance into rebellion against the king of his own creation, and the "Kingmaker," who at first only wished to clear away the Woodvilles, finally bent his attention to the restoration of the Lancastrian, Henry VI., whom he had done more than anyone else to depose.

A stage in this evolution was the battle of Edgcott, won by Warwick's arms in 1469, after which Edward IV. became his prisoner. Warwick seized the opportunity to revenge himself upon the Woodvilles by causing Earl Rivers and his son John to be beheaded in cold blood at Grafton. Events moved quickly after this. Henry VI.'s restoration, Edward IV.'s flight to Burgundy and his new invasion of England, ending in the battle of Barnet and the death of both Warwick and Henry VI., took place within the compass of a single year.

<sup>1</sup> Wavrin, *Anciennes Chroniques d'Angleterre*. Ed. Dupont. Vol. iii., p. 186.

With the removal of Warwick's turbulent personality on Barnet field the stable portion of Edward IV.'s reign begins.

Sir Anthony Woodville, Lord Scales, had succeeded his beheaded father as Earl Rivers in 1469, and judging from his will he made the Mote his chief place of residence. "I will that my wyfe have all such plate as was geven hyr at our mariage, and the sparver of white sylke with 4 peyre of shetes, 2 payre of fustians, a feder bed, 1 chambring of gresylde, and (except that stuffe) all other stuffe of household in the Mote and at my place in the Vyntree<sup>1</sup> to be to my seid lord my fader's heyres."<sup>2</sup> A letter from him written in 1478 to "Daniell, maister mason with the Kyng, in alle hast" about work at the Mote, which Daniel was supervising, runs as follows:—

"Danyell, I pray you applye my worke well. And wher as I appoynted with you last that the steyses of my hught passe<sup>3</sup> schulbe vi fote, and ye may in ony wise lete to be half a foote more, and I schall reward you acordyngly . . . Moreover take hede to the vice<sup>4</sup> that Maundy makes, and loke ye the foundacion and the wallis be sufficiaunt, that the toret may rise xiiii fote from the lede, than lete him alone with his worke. And rather than ye schulde stande in ony daunger, take some other avise, and send me worde houghe ye doo in all goodly hast. Ye will leave a rome afore the comyng in at the yete in the newe wall, wher ye thynke it may be best seen, for a skochon of the armez of Wodevile and Scalys and a Garter about yt. Wright me as oftyn as ye can how ye doo, and Jesu spede you. Wretyn at Middilton this Tuesday in Whisson weke.

"Your frend,

"A. Rivieres.

"I pray you goo to the Mote the soner by cause of this wrightyng."<sup>5</sup>

This letter is bound up in a miscellaneous book of household papers belonging to the Earl, which contains several

<sup>1</sup> Possibly "Vinters," Boxley, which adjoins the Mote.

<sup>2</sup> Bentley, *Excerpta Historica*, p. 246.

<sup>3</sup> Hautepace—a raised floor.

<sup>4</sup> Circular winding-stair.

<sup>5</sup> Gairdner, *Richard III.*, Appendix.

pages of accounts for work done at the Mote. It includes one "for 45 fete of newe glasse, the fote 7½*d.*, summa 28*s.* 4*d.*," and one for "ix armis in the same, the fote 2*s.* 6*d.*, summa 22*s.* 6*d.*."<sup>1</sup>

Anthony, Lord Rivers, was the most cultured man of his day, and one of the foremost patrons of William Caxton. The first book printed by Caxton in England, in 1477, was *The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers*, translated by Rivers from a French version of a Latin original, which he read to beguile his voyage to Compostella on pilgrimage in 1473. Other translations by Rivers were printed by Caxton, who, in company with Sir Thomas More and Philip de Commines, left warm tributes to his memory. The appointment of Lord Rivers as guardian and governor of the household of his nephew, the young Prince of Wales, was therefore a good choice, and when Edward IV. died Rivers was at Ludlow in charge of the heir, who was not yet 13 years of age. But his paternal uncle Richard, Duke of Gloucester, was left guardian of the young king by his father's will, and history now resolves itself into a conflict between the paternal and maternal uncles for the custody of his person.

Lord Rivers at once left Ludlow for London with the boy and a retinue of 2000 men. The child was known to be devoted to his Woodville relations, and Richard was not unnaturally afraid that Lord Rivers might try to retain possession of his person, get him crowned king quickly, and make himself Regent of England. Richard was in Yorkshire when he received the news of Edward IV.'s death, and hurrying south as fast as he could, intercepted the party of the prince at Stony Stratford under the leadership of Lord Rivers. Richard was taking no risks, and the morning after the meeting he arrested Lord Rivers, Lord Grey, the eldest son of the queen, and Sir Richard Hawte of Ightham Mote, who was controller of the prince's household, on suspicion of treason. The young prince, deprived thus suddenly of his best friends, continued his journey to London with his

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., Augmentation Office, Misc. Books, vol. 486, No. 53.

other uncle, and was soon afterwards sent to the Tower for safety to await his coronation.

The amount of armour concealed in the baggage of the retinue of Lord Rivers looked suspiciously like a proposed *coup d'état* on the part of the Woodvilles, and Richard's wary action was publicly endorsed by his formal recognition as Protector. The queen, Elizabeth Woodville, had immediately taken refuge in the Sanctuary of Westminster with all her other children, although before long she was induced to allow her younger son Richard to join his brother at the Tower. Lord Rivers, Lord Grey, and Hawte were kept under arrest.

Interest now shifts to the proceedings of the king's Council, in which the factions of Gloucester, who wished to usurp the crown, and of those loyal to the young prince, were meeting separately, at Crosbie's Place and Baynard's Castle. Although all were ostensibly occupied in preparations for the prince's coronation, they were in reality plotting against each other. The Duke of Buckingham was Gloucester's strongest ally; Lord Hastings represented the party loyal to the prince, but suspicious of the queen's influence; and Morton, Bishop of Ely, an old Lancastrian, who had been the queen's friend when he was Master of the Rolls under Edward IV., gave the Woodvilles unstinted support.

It is from the account of the proceedings which Morton gave to his pupil, Sir Thomas More, who was brought up in his household, that we are in possession of the Woodville point of view in More's *History of Richard III.*, which again was used by Shakespeare as the main source of his play.<sup>1</sup>

By June 13, 1483, a month after the death of Edward IV., Richard had obtained evidence of the plot in the Council to wrest the possession of the person of the young king from him. On that day he summoned the full Council to meet at the Tower to consider the final arrangements for Edward V.'s coronation. Richard began proceedings in a friendly fashion

<sup>1</sup> In 1488 Morton, when Archbishop of Canterbury, bought 100 acres of land in the Mote Park from Lord Rivers, which he bequeathed to Christchurch, Canterbury. Woodhouse, *Life of Morton*, p. 134. Will, *Monumenta Vetusta*.

by remarking to Bishop Morton: "My lord, you have very good strawberries in your garden at Holborn. I pray you let us have a mess of them." But before noon Morton had been retained as a prisoner in the Tower, and Lord Hastings, the leader of the loyalist faction on the Council, lay dead, beheaded, on a charge of treason, without trial, on an improvised log of timber outside the window of the Council chamber. A fortnight later Lord Rivers, Lord Grey, and Sir Richard Hawte were executed at Pomfret, and on the same day Richard formally assumed the crown on the plea that the children of Edward IV. and Elizabeth Woodville were bastards.

There was now no Woodville party left upon the Council, but the plot was merely transferred from the Council chamber to the country, and within a few months took shape as "Buckingham's Rebellion."

The Duke of Buckingham had done more than any other man to put Richard III. on the throne, and had enjoyed his confidence to such an extent that it is conceivable that he may even have known of the murder of Edward V. and his brother in the Tower, which probably took place during the summer, but was not spread abroad by rumour till early in October. When the University of Oxford requested that Bishop Morton's imprisonment should be made less rigorous than it was in the Tower, Richard gave him over to Buckingham's custody in his castle at Brecknock. Here the Bishop and Buckingham had long conversations, and the acute Morton soon discovered that Buckingham's loyalty to Richard was weakening, either from disappointed ambition or from a desire to make a bid for the throne himself, or from a revulsion of feeling due to knowledge of the horrible crime at the Tower.

Buckingham had married Katharine Woodville, Elizabeth Woodville's sister, and was himself a first-cousin of Henry, Earl of Richmond (afterwards King Henry VII.), the male representative of the Lancastrian title to the throne through his mother, Margaret Beaufort. Morton gradually played upon his growing disloyalty until he had converted Bucking-

ham to the support of his own scheme for bringing Henry, Earl of Richmond, back from exile in Brittany to oust Richard from the throne. Before this Margaret Beaufort had conceived the idea that the promise of a marriage between her son Henry and Elizabeth of York (the eldest daughter of Edward IV. and Elizabeth Woodville), by uniting both Yorkist and Lancastrian claims to the throne in their offspring, might rally all the discontented factions in England to the support of Henry's invasion.

Margaret Beaufort lived near Brecknock Castle, and her steward, Reginald Bray, acted as liaison officer between Morton, the Duke of Buckingham, and herself in the organization of what grew into "Buckingham's Rebellion." In a plot to depose Richard and make Elizabeth Woodville's daughter the future queen, the Woodvilles and their friends were necessarily to the fore, and the residence of Earl Rivers at the Mote made it only natural that Maidstone should be the rallying ground of the rebellion in the east of England. Bishop Morton escaped from Brecknock Castle to Ely, and thence to Flanders, while the negotiations were in progress between Margaret Beaufort and Buckingham. Had he, with his great ability, remained on the spot to mature the scheme himself, the outcome might have been different. Reginald Bray, however, drew into the organization of it the ablest men he knew, and according to the almost contemporary historian, Polydore Vergil, chose Giles Daubeney, Richard Guildford, John Cheney, Hugh Conway, and many not mentioned by name as chief dealers in the conspiracy. Sir Richard Guildford and Sir John Cheney were Kent men, destined to be privy councillors and important administrators when Henry VII. came to the throne.

The rebellion, nevertheless, proved a failure. The eastern section of it was timed to break out at Maidstone on October 18th, but knowledge of the murder of the princes leaked out early in the month and caused premature riots in the Weald of Kent on October 10th. The following letter from the Duke of Norfolk to John Paston establishes the date.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Paston Letters. Gairdner. No. 876.

“To my right well-beloved friend John Paston be this delivered in haste.

“Right well-beloved friend, I commend me to you. It is so that the Kentish men be up in the Weald and say that they will come and rob the city, which I shall let (prevent) if I may. Therefore, I pray you, that with all diligence you make ready and come hither, and bring with you six tall fellows in harness; and ye shall not lose your labour, that knoweth God, who have you in His keeping. Written at London, the 10th day of October.

“Your friend,

“J. Norfolk.”

By October 12th Richard was raising an army. The rebellion broke out at Maidstone on the 18th of the month, at Rochester on the 20th, at Gravesend on the 22nd, and at Guildford on the 25th. Simultaneously Henry, Earl of Richmond, was to arrive in the west from Brittany with his fleet, under the command of Sir Edward Woodville, the brother of the queen. The Duke of Buckingham himself raised his standard at Brecknock, and intended to march eastwards to meet the other risings timed to break out at Exeter, Salisbury, and Newbury. But terrible October storms brought all plans to nought, for the floods, known until long afterwards as “Buckingham’s water,” were so deep that Buckingham was never even able to cross the Severn; he was caught in Shropshire and beheaded at Salisbury. Henry never landed. His own ship was separated from the rest owing to the storm, and he only got back to Brittany with the greatest difficulty after he had been given up for lost.

Sir Richard Woodville of the Mote, the third and last Earl Rivers, brother to the queen, was attainted and fled to Brittany. There many of the conspirators, including Sir Edward Woodville, his brother, and the Marquis of Dorset, his nephew, were able to join Henry, Earl of Richmond, and to prepare for the successful invasion of eighteen months later, which placed him and the Tudor dynasty upon the throne.

Only one short description of the Kentish sector of the rebellion has been preserved to us in Stowe’s *Annales*<sup>1</sup>: “At the same time that the Duke of Buckingham was up in the West Country ther were many up in Kent; to wit Sir George Broune, Sir John Gilford and his sonne, Foge, Scot and Hauts, after Clifford, Bonting, yeoman of the Crowne, with many other to the number of five thousand. These made a fray at Gravesend in the faire, where Bonting slewe Master Mowbray with divers other, but when they heard the Duke of Buckingham was dead they were fain to fly to save themselves.”

The 5000 men from Kent, Surrey and Sussex probably rallied their forces on Penenden Heath and marched thence through Rochester to Gravesend, following the same plan as the Wyatt rebels seventy years later. In the following December, in preparation for his visit to Kent after the New Year, Richard issued a proclamation in Kent<sup>2</sup> offering 300 marks or £10 of land to anyone capturing Sir John Gilford, Sir Thomas Lewkenor, Sir William Haute, William Cheyne, Richard Gilford, or John Pimpe; and £100 or 10 marks of land for the capture of Edward Poynings, Thomas Fenys, William Brandon, John Wingfield, Anthony Kene, Nicholas Gaynsford, John Isley, Ralph Tikhill, Anthony Brown, Robert Brent, Long Roger, Richard Potter, Richard Fissher, and Sir Markus Hussy, prest.

On January 16th, 1484, the sheriff was ordered to cause all the temporal inhabitants of Kent between 16 and 60 to swear an oath of allegiance to the king,<sup>3</sup> and on January 23rd the Parliament, which met at Westminster, passed an Act of Attainder, convicting the conspirators throughout England of high treason and the forfeiture of all their estates. The following persons are mentioned by name in the Act of Attainder in connection with the Maidstone outbreak<sup>4</sup>:—

Sir George Broun, late of Becheworth, Surrey.

Sir Thomas Lewkenor, late of Trattoon.

<sup>1</sup> p. 465. I have not been able to trace the contemporary source presumably used by Stowe.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in Gairdner, *Richard III.*

<sup>3</sup> B.M., Harl. MSS., 433, p. 141<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Rolls of Parliament, vi., 245<sup>b</sup>.

Sir John Gildeford, late of Rolvenden.  
 Sir John Fogge, late of Asheford.  
 Edward Poynings, late of Marsham, squyer.  
 Richard Haute, late of Ightham, squyer.  
 Richard Gildeford, late of Cranbroke, squyer.  
 John Pympe, late of Nettelstede, squyer.  
 Thomas Fenys, late of Hurst Mounceaux, squyer.  
 Nicholas Gaynesford, late of Cressalton, squyer.  
 John Gaynesford, late of Alyngton, squyer.  
 William Clifford, late of Iwade, squyer.  
 John Darell, late of Calehill, squyer.  
 Anthony Kene, late of Woolwiche, squyer.  
 Thomas Ryder, late of Lynstede, squyer.  
 William Brandon, late of London, squyer.  
 John Wyngfeld, late of London, squyer.  
 Alexander Culpeper, late of Godeherst, gent.  
 James Horne, late of Westwell, gent.  
 Raynold Pympe, late of Nettelstede, gent.  
 Robert Brewis, late of London, gent.  
 John Boutayne, late yeoman of the Crown.  
 Roger Long *alias* long Roger, late of Southwark, yeoman.  
 Richard Potter, late of London, yeoman of the Crown.  
 Richard Fisser, late of Lye, yeoman of the Crown.  
 William Loveday, late of London, yeoman of the Crown.  
 William Strode, late of London, yeoman of the Crown.  
 John Hooe, late of London, yeoman.

From these three sources, therefore, all supplementing each other, we have the names of thirty-six conspirators from Kent, Surrey, and Sussex, out of a total of 5000 men engaged. An analysis of their status, as far as it can be made, shows that the outstanding rebels were relations or connections by marriage of the Woodvilles, the Hautes, and the Guildfords. Some of the others seem to have been friends of Bishop Morton, whose interest he presumably enlisted. The execution of Sir Richard Haute of Ightham Mote at Pomfret, with Lord Rivers, would naturally have consolidated his Kentish relations against Richard III. Sir

John Guildford, the father of Richard Guildford, was a friend of the second Earl Rivers, as appears by the earl's will,<sup>1</sup> in which he is mentioned. Richard Guildford, besides being one of the four main organizers of the whole rebellion throughout England, was also the local leader of the Maidstone rising. Hall's *Chronicle* relates:—

“In Kent, Richard Gyldeforde and other gentlemen collected a great company of soldiers and openly began war.”

Let us take them one by one, beginning with those for whose persons the highest ransoms were offered, and tracing their subsequent fate:—

SIR JOHN GILFORD OF ROLVENDEN.—There is an inscription in Cranbrook Church, on a monument of the Roberts family, to one “Walter Roberts” of Glassenbury, “the victim of his loyal protection of his friend and neighbour Sir John Guildford in the reign of Richard III.” This Walter Roberts was attainted for having harboured Sir John Gildeford and other of the king's rebels and traitors on February 10th, 1484, contrary to the king's proclamation.<sup>2</sup> John Guldeford, who was presumably captured on that date, was sent to Newgate gaol, from which he was delivered in the following March.<sup>3</sup> Walter Roberts fled to sanctuary with his second wife Isabel, and his lands were granted by Richard III. to Sir Robert Brakenbury,<sup>4</sup> the murderer of the princes.—Sir John Gilford survived until 1493, and is buried at Canterbury.<sup>5</sup> A certain John More of Tenterden left him and Thomas Linacre a bequest of books by will.<sup>6</sup>

RICHARD GUILDFORD OF CRANBROOK.—He was the son of Sir John, and managed to escape to Brittany, where he joined Henry, Earl of Richmond, in exile, and was made a knight two years later on his way to Bosworth. His lands were granted by Richard to Ralph Assheton. He died in

<sup>1</sup> Bentley, *Excerpta Historica*, p. 246.

<sup>2</sup> Rolls of Parl., 1 Richard III.

<sup>3</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, March 1, 1484.

<sup>4</sup> Historical Society Transactions, 1902, Leadam.

<sup>5</sup> Will, P.C.C., Dogett, xxix.

<sup>6</sup> *Arch. Cant.*, XXXI., p. 215.

Jerusalem on pilgrimage in 1506 (see D.N.B.), being the last English pilgrim but one to make the journey.

**SIR THOMAS LEWKENOR OF TRATTON.**—This Sir Thomas Lewkenor was the grandson of Sir Thomas Lewkenor, who had married Philippa Dalyngruge, the heiress of Bodiam Castle, and himself held Bodiam as a stronghold for the Buckingham rebels in the Weald of Sussex. In spite of the quick collapse of the rebellion, the castle was still holding out on November 8th, for on that date the king issued a commission from Exeter to Richard Leukenore of Bramebilty, William Scote, Esq., and others, "to summon the men of the counties of Kent and Sussex to besiege the castle of Bodyam, which the rebels have seized."<sup>1</sup> Richard Lewkenor was Sir Thomas's uncle, and with his brother, Sir Thomas Lewkenor of Goring, who had been made Knight of the Bath at Richard III.'s coronation, remained loyal to the king.<sup>2</sup> The castle then fell quickly, for in the following August, 1484, a grant of it for life was given to Nicholas Rigby "as from December 12th last."<sup>3</sup>

We find on the Close Roll of May, 1484,<sup>4</sup> that Thomas Lewkenor owed the king 1000 marks, and was not to go into the county of Kent without a licence. On May 31st, 1484, he was pardoned, and died in the same year.

It is probable that Bodiam Castle ceased to be inhabited after Buckingham's rebellion.<sup>5</sup>

**SIR WILLIAM HAUTE OF BISHOPSBOURNE.**—He was the son of Sir William Haute of Bishopsbourne, who had married Joan Woodville, sister of the first Earl Rivers, in 1429.<sup>6</sup> He was, therefore, a first-cousin of the queen, and a brother of Sir Richard Haute of Ightham Mote who had been beheaded at Pomfret. His son, another Sir William Haute, afterwards married a daughter of Sir Richard Guildford.

<sup>1</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, Nov. 8, 1483.

<sup>2</sup> For Lewkenor pedigree see Sussex Archæological Collections, vol. iii., p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, Aug. 15, 1484.

<sup>4</sup> P.R.O., Close Roll, 1 Richard III., 336.

<sup>5</sup> M. A. Lower, *Bodiam and its Lords*, p. 19.

<sup>6</sup> Bentley's *Excerpta Historica*, p. 249, for marriage settlement.

**RICHARD HAUTE OF IGHTHAM, SQUYER.**—He was probably the executed Sir Richard Haute of Ightham's son, and the nephew of Sir William Haute the rebel. On March 7th, 1484,<sup>1</sup> Richard granted the manor of the Mote in Ightham to James Hawet for "his good services against the rebels," James, possibly, being another brother of Sir William and Sir Richard, and one who had remained loyal to the king. Sir Richard Haute was pardoned on March 14th, 1485.

**WILLIAM CHENEY OF SHEPPEY.**—He was the brother of John Cheney of Shurland in Sheppey, who with Richard Guildford was one of the original four chief conspirators collected by Sir Reginald Bray. John had been present at Morton's installation as Bishop of Ely, and was probably Morton's friend.<sup>2</sup> The taste for rebellion may have been hereditary, as their father had been the most prominent gentleman in Jack Cade's rebellion. John Cheney was the ringleader of Buckingham's rebellion in Wiltshire, and escaped to Brittany with William Cheney and another brother Humphrey. Two years later he was made a knight on landing at Milford Haven, and killed Richard III.'s standard-bearer at the battle of Bosworth. William was afterwards made the first sheriff of Kent under Henry VII., and constable of Queenborough Castle. The Cheney lands were granted by Richard III. to Sir Robert Brackenbury and George Nevill.<sup>3</sup>

**JOHN PYMPE OF NETTLESTEAD COURT, ESQ. REGINALD PYMPE OF NETTLESTEAD COURT, GENT.**—John and Reginald were brothers, and their step-mother, Philippa St. Leger, was the second wife of Sir John Guildford. Their sister Anne had married Richard Guildford before Buckingham's rebellion; Reginald's wife, Elizabeth Pashley, was cousin to Elizabeth Woodville, and John's wife was a niece of Sir

<sup>1</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>2</sup> Woodhouse, *John Morton*, p. 66. (The list of men present at Morton's installation is taken from a black letter book at the Herald's College, printed in Bentham, *History and Antiquities of Ely*.)

<sup>3</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, July 1, 1485.

John Cheney. The Duke of Buckingham was also the feudal overlord of Nettlestead, and his arms can still be seen in the windows of the church. From many different angles, therefore, they were naturally drawn into the rebellion. Three letters from this John Pympe to John Paston are among the Paston Letters, and his elaborate will of 1496 has been printed.<sup>1</sup> Both brothers afterwards served under Edward Poynings in Ireland.

EDWARD POYNINGS OF MARSHAM, SQUYER.—He was the son of Elizabeth Paston, of the Paston Letters, and Robert Poynings, who had been one of the chief Kentish men implicated in Jack Cade's rebellion. After Buckingham's rebellion he escaped to join Henry in Brittany, landed with him at Milford Haven, and was made a knight banneret on the field of Bosworth. For his subsequent career as viceroy in Ireland and the enactment of "Poynings' Law," see the D.N.B.

THOMAS FENYS OF HURSTMONCEAUX.—This Thomas Fenys had been an esquire of the body to Edward IV., who granted him the manor and lordship of Polstede Hall in Burnham, Norfolk, on February 10th, 1480.<sup>2</sup> In February, 1484, Polstede Hall, "lately belonging to Thomas Fynes, Esq., and now in the King's hands by reason of the rebellion," was granted to Thomas and Agnes Lovell.<sup>2</sup> A general pardon to Thomas Fenys *alias* Fynes *alias* Fynys of Hurstmonceaux, Esq., of all offences committed by him before June 26th was issued on July 18th, 1484.<sup>2</sup>

This Thomas Fenys must not be confused with Thomas Fenys of Hurstmonceaux, the 8th Lord Dacre, who was aged 12 or more in 1484 (see G.E.C.). In 1489 Thomas Fenys, Esq., had a grant of lands to hold during the minority of Thomas Fenys Lord Dacre.<sup>2</sup>

WILLIAM BRANDON OF LONDON.—He was the son of Sir William Brandon of Norfolk and Elizabeth Wyngfield.<sup>3</sup> His

<sup>1</sup> *Arch. Cant.*, VI., p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>3</sup> Will of Elizabeth Brandon, *Testamenta Vetusta*, p. 432.

father had sat at the high daïs on the right-hand side of Morton when he was installed Bishop of Ely,<sup>1</sup> and one William Brandon had been Master of Balliol College when John Morton was an undergraduate at Oxford.

William Brandon, the rebel, escaped to Brittany, and was pardoned on March 28th, 1484,<sup>2</sup> but the manors of his wife Elizabeth Bruyn, in Essex and Beckenham, were forfeited owing to the rebellion and granted by Richard III. to her brother-in-law.<sup>3</sup>

Two years later William Brandon was Henry VII.'s standard-bearer at the battle of Bosworth, and while defending the standard in the hottest part of the battle Richard III. killed him with his own hand. His infant son Charles was brought up at Court with Henry VIII., became Duke of Suffolk, and married the king's sister Mary Tudor.

JOHN WINGFIELD OF LONDON.—He was the son of John Wyngfield, Esq., late of Letheringham, Suffolk, and was in all probability a first-cousin of William Brandon through his mother Elizabeth Wingfield.<sup>4</sup> Pardons were issued to John Wyngfield the elder, esquire, and the younger, gentleman, both late of Letheringham, on February 24th, 1484.<sup>2</sup>


ANTHONY KENE OF WOOLWICH.—He was probably a descendant of Sir William Kene, Sheriff of Kent in 26

<sup>1</sup> Woodhouse, *Life of Morton*, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>3</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, May 27 and July 7, 1485.

<sup>4</sup> Conjectural Pedigree (A. E. C.) :—



\* Will of Elizabeth Wingfield, died 1500. Sede Vacante, Canterbury, Register F., No. 923.



Henry VI., who lived at Wellhall in the Hundred of Blackheath.

JOHN ISLEY OF SUNDRIDGE.—He had been Sheriff of Kent in 1475, and lived at Coombe Bank, Brasted. His son Thomas married Elizabeth, the daughter of Sir Richard Guildford, after the rebellion. A pardon was granted to John on February 16th, 1484, and he died in 1494<sup>1</sup> and lies buried under a canopied altar-tomb in Sundridge Church.

NICHOLAS GAYNESFORD, LATE OF CRESSALTON.—Nicholas Gaynesford was a regular Vicar of Bray. He had been Sheriff of Sussex and Surrey in 1460 under Henry VI., but seems to have taken the part of Edward IV., and was rewarded with the grant of a manor by that king on his accession. But before the end of the year a writ was issued against "the rebel and traitor Nicholas Gaynsford," and his manors of Carshalton and East Shalford were seized. He got back Carshalton, and was twice made sheriff under Edward IV., but never recovered Shalford.<sup>2</sup> After Buckingham's rebellion he owed Richard III. 100 marks on the Close Roll,<sup>3</sup> and received a general pardon on July 14th, 1484.<sup>4</sup> Under Henry VII. he was in high favour, being reappointed sheriff immediately after Bosworth, and was one of those who attended the queen on her procession from the Tower to Westminster before her coronation. They rode with the Lord Mayor of London, "well horsed in gowns of cremysene velvett, having mantells of ermyne and on their hedes hatts of rede clothe of golde."<sup>5</sup> He lies buried in Carshalton Church, in an elaborate tomb.

RALPH TIKHILL.—Unidentified. Ralph Tykell was Justice of the Peace for Surrey in 1487, 1488, 1493 and 1494,<sup>6</sup> and a certain Ralph Tikill was overseer of John Smyth of Reigate's will in 1489.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Will, P.C.C., 21, Vox.

<sup>2</sup> Manning and Bray's *Surrey*, ii., 511.

<sup>3</sup> Close Rolls, 1 Richard III., 336.

<sup>4</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>5</sup> Lysons' *Surrey*, p. 128.

<sup>6</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>7</sup> Surrey Record Society, vol. vi., p. 89.

ANTHONY BROWN.—He was the eldest son of Sir Thomas Brown by Eleanor, daughter of Sir Thomas Arundel. In his will, dated September 25th, 1505,<sup>1</sup> he left silver-gilt cups to Sir Edward Poynings and Sir Hugh Conway, his colleagues in the rebellion. He was probably a relation of Sir George Browne of Betchworth, the stepfather of Edward Poynings and leader of the rebellion in Kent.

ROBERT BRENT.—Robert Brent, "late of Wyvelesbergh, Kent, yeoman, *alias* gentelman, *alias* late one of the yeomen of the crown of the present King and of Edward IV., *alias* reeve of the town of Middlesex," received a general pardon on February 25th, 1484.<sup>2</sup> After the death of John Gaynesford, in 1486, who owned Allington Castle through his wife Joan Moresby, this same Robert Brent became her second husband and lived at Allington. His own property, as shown by his will,<sup>3</sup> consisted of land at Willesbrugh, Bylliam, and a manor called "Le More." I do not think the Buckingham rebel, who, judging by his will, was not a rich man, can have been the same Robert Brent who was keeper of Sandwich Castle in 1 Richard III. and paid £15 for the custody of the manor of Huntingfield,<sup>4</sup> but he may have been his son.

LONG ROGER OF SOUTHWERK, YEOMAN.—Not identified.

RICHARD POTTER OF LONDON, YEOMAN OF THE CROWN.—On March 6th, 1484, a general pardon was granted to Richard Potter of Sussex.<sup>2</sup> This may be the same Richard Potter of Westerham who died in 1511, and was a friend of the Isley family of Sundridge, Mistress Isley being the god-mother of Elizabeth Potter, his granddaughter.<sup>5</sup>

RICHARD FISSHER OF LYE, YEOMAN OF THE CROWN.—On March 4th, 1484, Richard Fisser of the county of Kent, yeoman, late yeoman of the Crown, received a general par-

<sup>1</sup> *Testamenta Vetusta*, p. 489.

<sup>2</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>3</sup> P.C.C., 12, Dogett.

<sup>4</sup> Pipe Roll, 1 Richard III., Kent.

<sup>5</sup> Will, P.C.C., 6, Fetiplace.

don.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that he may be the Richard Fisser of Maidstone who died in 1523, was buried at St. Faith's, Maidstone, and left £100 by will to his brother John.<sup>2</sup>

SIR MARKUS HUSSY, PRIEST.—Unidentified, but probably of the family of Sir William Hussey, who was executor of Cardinal Bouchier, Archbishop of Canterbury in 1486.<sup>3</sup>

This completes the list of rebels for whom rewards were offered in the December proclamation. The following additional rebels are mentioned by name in the Act of Attainder:—

SIR GEORGE BROUN OF BECHEWORTHE.—He had been Sheriff of Kent in 1481 and married Elizabeth Paston, the mother of Edward Poynings. He must have been the ring-leader of the Maidstone section of the rebellion, as he was the only man on the Kent, Surrey and Sussex lists who was executed. His lands were granted to Sir Ralph Assheton.

SIR JOHN FOGGE OF ASHFORD.—He had been keeper of the wardrobe to Henry VI. in the last year of his reign, and treasurer and comptroller of the household to Edward IV. His second wife, Alice Hawte, was a first-cousin of Elizabeth Woodville, being the daughter of Sir William Hawte of Bishopsbourne and Joan Woodville. Sir John Fogge had been made a Knight of the Bath at her coronation. Richard III. sent for him after his own coronation and made a special effort to secure his loyalty, but the Woodville connection was doubtless too close.<sup>4</sup> On August 17th, 1484, his lands were granted to William Malyverer; on Feb. 24th, 1485, he was pardoned and received a regrant of the manors of Dymchurch, Valence, Tonford<sup>5</sup> and Dane.<sup>1</sup> His very fine altar-tomb is in the collegiate church of Ashford, of which he was the founder.

WILLIAM CLIFFORD OF IWADE.—Unidentified, but pro-

<sup>1</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>2</sup> P.C.C., 16, Bodfelde.

<sup>3</sup> *Arch. Cant.*, Vol. XXIV., p. 247.

<sup>4</sup> Gairdner, *Richard III.*, 97—100.

<sup>5</sup> In Thanington parish, near Canterbury.

bably a relative of the Cliffords of Bobbing, one of whom, Lewis, married the sister of Sir Richard Guildford.<sup>1</sup>

In 1478 Edward IV. granted one William Clifford the office of receiver of the lordship and hundred of Middleton and Merden in Kent,<sup>2</sup> which grant was repeated by Richard III. on May 26th, 1483.<sup>3</sup>

In the reign of Richard, one "Richard Hansard hath divers manors, etc. (late of William Clyfforde), to hold by knight's service, viz., the manors of Chedhamwiche, Segill, Greinstede, Alwerbury, Abbetstone, etc., in co. Wilts, and lands at Farnham, co. Surrey, of the yearly value of 33/4<sup>d</sup>."<sup>4</sup> William Clifford must have been the "Clifford" mentioned by Stowe.

JOHN DARELL OF CALEHILL.—For an article about him and his tomb in the Darell Chapel in Little Chart Church see *Arch. Cant.*, Vol. XXXVI., p. 131. He was a first-cousin of Sir Richard Guildford.

THOMAS RYDER OF LYNSTEDE.—Unidentified, but probably the Thomas Ryther of Lynsted, Kent, mentioned in 1499 as "late escheator of Yorkshire."<sup>5</sup>

ALEXANDER CULPEPPER OF GOUDHURST, GENTILMAN.—He was the son of Sir John Colepeper who was buried at Goudhurst in 1480. Sir Alexander Colepeper outlived all the other Buckingham rebels, and died in 1541.<sup>6</sup>

JAMES HORNE OF WESTWELL, GENTILMAN.—For the branches of the Horne family at Appledore, Lenham and Westwell, see *Arch. Cant.*, XIV., p. 366.

ROBERT BREWIS OF LONDON.—Unidentified.

JOHN BOUTAYNE, LATE YEOMAN OF THE CROWN.—He was probably "Bonting, yeoman of the Crown," mentioned by Stowe as having killed Mowbray in the fair at Gravesend.

<sup>1</sup> Hasted, ii., 412, 636.

<sup>2</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, Nov. 10, 1478.

<sup>3</sup> B.M., Add. MSS., 11,269, p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> B.M., Harl., 433, p. 94<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, Dec. 3, 1499.

<sup>6</sup> Will, P.C.C., 30, Alenger.

WILLIAM LOVEDAY OF LONDON, YEOMAN.—Unidentified.

WILLIAM STRODE OF LONDON, YEOMAN.—Unidentified.

JOHN HOGE LATE OF LONDON, YEOMAN.—Unidentified.

Scot.—This one additional name is mentioned by Stowe. We have already seen that a certain William Scote received Richard III.'s commission on November 8th, 1483, to take Bodiam Castle from the rebels.<sup>1</sup> This was the future Sir William Scot of Scot's Hall, who succeeded his father, Sir John, in 1485. But the biographer of the family<sup>2</sup> says that William Scot was a rebel in the Kentish rebellion, and also received Richard III.'s commission to retake Bodiam. He is either confusing two different people, or else he had access to further information among the family records. William Scot received a pardon from Henry VII. in 1485. His sister and Sir John Scot's daughter, Isabel, married Edward Poynings before 1485, as Sir John's will refers to him as "my son." She may have married him before Buckingham's rebellion, in which case it is probable that Poynings secured some member of his wife's family as a helper.

JOHN GAYNSFORD OF ALLINGTON CASTLE.—I have left him till the end, as more ample information as to the way in which his debts and lands were handled by Richard III. after the rebellion have come down to us.

He was the son of Nicholas Gaynsford of Carshalton, and kneels in effigy on a brass, above his father's tomb, with his three brothers. Both father and son were involved in Buckingham's rebellion and attainted. It appears from a commission that John Kendale, Richard III.'s secretary, and receiver-general with Robert Brakenbury of all lands, rents, possessions and goods coming into the king's hands by attainder, forfeiture, or otherwise in the counties of Sussex, Kent and Surrey, had entered into the manor of Allington after the forfeiture to take possession for the king and to levy the rents on the king's behalf.<sup>3</sup> But on April 13th,

<sup>1</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>2</sup> *Scott of Scot's Hall*, p. 131. J. R. Scott.

<sup>3</sup> B.M., Harl. MSS., 433, p. 143<sup>b</sup>.

1484, the king allowed "the same John Molle" to gather the rents there in spite of this, and to have the keeping of the manor.<sup>1</sup>

On May 24th, 1484, John Gaynesford, with three others, state on the Close Rolls that they each owe the king 100 marks on the next feast of St. John the Baptist. "The condition of this recognisance is that if the above-named John Gaynesford from henceforth during his life naturall be true and of good aberyng towards our soverayn lorde King Richard the thridde and his heires Kinges of England and hym serve as well in tyme of werre as of peas to his power whensoever the said John Gaynsford shalbe by our seid soverayn King thereto commanded and that he come not within the Countie of Kent without license of our seid soveraign lord, that then the recognisance to be void or elles to stande in his strength and virtue."<sup>2</sup>

This hundred marks was therefore a bond for good behaviour, and on July 16th, 1484, Nicholas and John were pardoned.<sup>3</sup>

The final stage is seen in another commission of April 5th, 1485, by which John Molle, receiver of the lordship of Allyngton, was to pay to Nicholas and John Gaynesford all the revenues of the lordship during the king's pleasure.<sup>4</sup> I think that John Molle may have had "the keping of the said manor of Allington" for John Gaynsford before Buckingham's rebellion, and that the continuity in personnel and revenue was therefore complete. He was one of Richard's yeomen of the Crown,<sup>5</sup> and in May, 1485, a certain Thomas Molle, presumably a relation, was presented to the parish church of Allington. In 1488 John Molle was "escheator

<sup>1</sup> B.M., Harl. MSS., 433, p. 170. "That a commission directed to the fermours, tenants and other occupiers of the lordship of Alyngton and of all the lands in Kent late apperteyning to John Gaynesford, that albe it John Kendale late by the king's commandement entered in the said manors, lands and tenements, and shuld have leveyed thissues thereof. Yet nathelesse the kings grace wol that the same John Molle have the keping of the said manor of Alington and from hensforth to gader the Rente charging them to content aswele unto him al the Arrerage and duties growen at this Ester as that hereafter shall growe, geven at Nottingham the xiii day of Avril Anno primo."

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O. Close Rolls, 1 Richard III., membrane 1. <sup>3</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls.

<sup>4</sup> Harl. MSS., 433, p. 212<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, Feb. 19, 1485.

of Kent."<sup>1</sup> Finally, Robert Gaynesford, the son and heir of John, married John Molle's daughter Margaret in 1493, during his nonage, while Robert was in the custody of his grandfather Nicholas Gaynsford. The conditions of the feoffment for her joynture exist.<sup>2</sup> Thus in one case at least the story of a Buckingham rebel is complete.

It is probable that this gentle procedure lies behind most of the other cases whose records are more summary. In a cursory survey of the Pipe Rolls of Richard III. for Kent, I have found no payments of fines from Buckingham rebels over and above the confiscation of their lands, and no sign of imprisonment except in the case of Sir John Guildford. Even Morton received a pardon on December 11th, 1484. Richard obviously wished to conciliate the rebels, and to wean them away from further plots for the invasion of the Earl of Richmond. His reign, after Buckingham's rebellion, was spent in agony of mind over the murder of the princes, and terror of the future. In eighteen months Nemesis came at Bosworth; and in the thickest part of the battle, after killing Sir William Brandon, unhorsing Sir John Cheney, and seeking Henry Tudor in personal combat, Richard threw away his life.

NOTE.—It will be observed that, in the above article, Miss Conway, like Mr. James Gairdner, adopts the commonly received view of Richard III. It is only fair, however, to say that there is an alternative view of Richard's character. The late Sir Clements Markham, in *Richard III.: his life and character reviewed in the light of recent research* (1906), offers a complete vindication of the last sovereign of the noble line of Plantagenet. The most serious charge against Richard III. is, of course, that of having murdered his two nephews, the "little Princes in the Tower." The point, however, admits of determination, and certainly is one


<sup>1</sup> Cal. of Patent Rolls, July 2, 1488.

<sup>2</sup> P.R.O., Ancient Deeds, B. 11,252.

which, in the cause of historic truth and justice, ought to be determined once for all.

The elder boy, Edward V., was born in November, 1470; the younger, Richard, Duke of York, in 1473. Therefore, if the princes were murdered by Richard III., as is alleged, in August, 1483, they would have been aged respectively 12½ and 10 years at the date of their death.

But if, on the other hand, they were not put out of the way until June or July, 1486, under Henry VII., as Sir Clements Markham maintains, they would then have been three years older, or 15½ and 13 years of age respectively. Now three years make so much difference in the stature of growing boys, that there could be no mistaking the ages of the princes if their sarcophagus in Westminster Abbey were to be opened and their bones, laid there in 1678, subjected to expert examination. It is surely time that the guilt or innocence of Richard III., in respect of his nephews' death, should be put to the test.—ED.



NOTE.—Buckingham rebels are printed in capitals.

THE CHRONICLE OF WILLIAM GLASTYNBURY, MONK OF THE PRIORY OF CHRIST CHURCH, CANTERBURY, 1419—1448.

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES BY  
C. EVELEIGH WOODRUFF, M.A.

It is some years since the Rev. H. Salter, F.S.A., contributed a Note to the XXIXth Volume of *Archæologia Cantiana* (p. lxxxv) on an unpublished MS. relating to Christ Church, Canterbury, preserved in a college library at Oxford. Mr. Salter wrote (1911) as follows: "Future historians of Christ Church, Canterbury, should not overlook a volume in the library of Christ Church College (*sic*), Oxford, numbered MS. 256. It is a note-book made of paper containing extracts about Christ Church, Canterbury, for the first half of the fifteenth century, but the blank leaves and spaces have been used by someone in the sixteenth century for totally extraneous matter."

Mr. Salter then gives a brief epitome of the contents of the book.

I had long been desirous of seeing this MS., but it was not until the summer of 1923 that an opportunity occurred of visiting Oxford. A search, however, in the library of Christ Church met with no success, and guessing that the missing volume might form part of the Twyne MSS. at Corpus Christi College, I turned my steps thither and found that my surmise was correct.\*

By the courtesy of Mr. Livingstone, the College librarian, the volume was deposited temporarily in the Bodleian library for my greater convenience, and I am now able to give a detailed account of its contents.

\* By what mischance the mistake in the reference occurred it is now impossible to say. At any rate it is unlikely that Mr. Salter, whose accuracy of statement is well known to antiquaries, is responsible for the error.