LANCASTRIAN LOYALISM IN KENT DURING THE WARS OF THE ROSES

MALCOLM MERCER

More than seventy years ago, an article was published in *Archaeologia Cantiana* in which it was suggested that leading Kentish gentry had supported Buckingham's rebellion against Richard III in October 1483 because of their close personal connections to the Woodvilles and the House of York.[1] Since then, scholars of the period have been happy to accept this interpretation. It has been argued that after the Lancastrian defeat at Tewkesbury in 1471 it was no longer possible, as Sir Thomas Tresham had previously done, to claim absolute loyalty to the dynasty in order to justify opposition to the Yorkists.[2] Current analysis of those new patterns of lordship which emerged after 1471 makes no allowance for surviving strands of Lancastrian loyalism whatsoever. In her comprehensive study of Richard III's reign, for example, Rosemary Horrox attributes Buckingham's rebellion to the backlash from within the Yorkist polity. She glosses over the Lancastrian backgrounds of the rebels, choosing to focus instead on their desire to settle outstanding personal grievances.[3]

The notion that individuals were motivated purely by personal considerations was recently affirmed by Colin Richmond who argued that principles were not applied in fifteenth-century politics. Accepting this premiss we must assume that in bastard feudal England, men felt little compunction about switching loyalties when it suited their own purposes. They felt no lasting commitment to a patron and were content to go their own way when circumstances dictated. Richmond's views are grounded very much in the tradition of K. B. McFarlane. Such a position denies the possibility of sustained loyalism. Indeed, McFarlane himself asserted that to 'speak of a Yorkist or a Lancastrian family, apart from the royal houses themselves, is almost impossible when successive generations changed sides with so much freedom'.[4]

However, in a re-examination of bastard feudalism Michael Hicks has argued that such structural deficiencies have been overstated. Concentrating their analysis on feed retainers, those individuals who

Fig. 1. Location of Kentish places mentioned in text

received a monetary fee from a patron in return for specific services, McFarlane and his successors concluded that such ties lacked durability. In fact, unlike these 'extraordinary retainers' who formed an unstable outer orbit of a magnate affinity, Hicks has identified the household and tenants as the stable core of every connection. Furthermore, he has demonstrated that the effectiveness of every bastard feudal affinity was determined by locality, loyalty, fidelity and heredity. The relative strength of each of these factors affected the way in which bastard feudal clients acted at any given time.[5]

In a study of the South-West, the author has also advanced the additional idea that 'affinity' existed on two levels, 'on the one hand, according to the force of circumstances at any given time; on the other hand, on a deeper, emotional level as a result of long-standing traditions of service'.[6] Evidence drawn from a study of this region suggested that Lancastrian sympathies were maintained by a network of gentry families closely connected to the Beauforts. The Beauforts were amongst the most partisan supporters of the Lancastrians, a feeling reinforced by Henry VI's own sense of family and dynasty. While it was possible to be a Lancastrian without following the Beauforts, it was impossible to support the Beauforts without also supporting the Lancastrians. The depth of Lancastrian loyalty in the South-West was such that it directly influenced the actions of certain families at moments of political upheaval during the later fifteenth century.

The following discussion will explore the nature of Lancastrian loyalism in Kent in the late fifteenth century. The structure of Kentish political society was different from that in the South-West. Although a number of magnates possessed lands in the County, it still lacked a resident, dominant peer. A strong monarch was therefore able to recruit the principal local gentry directly into his service; but when royal authority was weak, the local gentry tended to congregate around those who represented royal authority at that time. The following discussion will argue that this happened in early fifteenth-century Kent when the Beauforts emerged as a leading force in national politics. Moreover, it will suggest that connections forged by local families with the Beauforts were fundamental in determining the nature of Lancastrian loyalism later in the century. The analysis will begin by explaining the reasons which lay behind the growth of Beaufort influence in the County during the first half of the fifteenth century. It will then examine the conduct of Beaufort associates during 1460-61, 1469-71, 1483 and 1485. From this, it will become apparent that despite an underlying loyalty to the House of Lancaster, these men did not turn out for the Lancastrian cause without first

considering the likelihood of success at that point in time and the impact that it could have on their own future prosperity. Nevertheless, despite the cautious attitude adopted by specific families, the article will demonstrate the continued importance of Beaufort affiliations for achieving high office within the early Tudor polity.

When the infant Henry VI succeeded to the throne in 1422 the Lancastrian royal affinity was a declining force in the localities. After seizing the crown in 1399, Henry IV had deliberately recruited more members of the gentry into his service, especially in areas where the duchy of Lancaster was dominant. Henry V, while confirming the grants to many of his father's surviving retainers, had not sought to expand the royal affinity. He was content to work through existing local structures of power and rely on his military successes to ensure continued support. Following his death, a much reduced royal affinity then became a feature of the minority of his son, Henry VI. In the latter case, however, the minority government considered a large household establishment and substantial body of royal servants in the shires to be unnecessary.[7]

In the absence of strong royal leadership, the principal gentry gravitated towards those magnates dominating the minority government. Initially, the exercise of royal authority in Kent passed to the king's uncle, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. During the course of the 1430s, however, the political profile of Kent started to change as a result of the increasing prominence of the Beaufort family in national politics.[8] Beaufort contacts with the County can be accurately dated to 1398 following the appointment of John, first Earl of Somerset as Warden of the Cinque Ports.[9] Through a combination of inheritance and royal grants, a modest territorial presence was established during the opening decades of the fifteenth century in the north-west and the east of the County. In 1399 Somerset's brother, Thomas, Duke of Exeter, was granted the manor of Sentling in St Mary Cray, close to Dartford. Furthermore, between 1414 and 1419 he controlled the Roos properties situated in east Kent in his role as guardian of Thomas, son of William, seventh Lord Roos.[10] Somerset's other brother, Cardinal Beaufort, acquired a limited presence at Langley, near Maidstone, and at Brabourne, near Ashford.[11]

The principal Beaufort possession in Kent was the lordship of Dartford held by John, first Duke of Somerset, the son of John, Earl of Somerset and Margaret Holland, daughter of Thomas Holland, Earl of Kent. Dartford had in fact descended to Somerset through his mother. From her he also inherited the manors of Chislehurst, Cobham and Combe along with their appurtenances.[12] Upon his death in 1444 custody of his property and daughter, Margaret Beaufort,

was granted to the duke of Suffolk. In 1453 her wardship was then granted to Henry VI's half-brother, Edmund Tudor, Earl of Richmond, who became her first husband in 1455.[13] During the middle of the fifteenth century, the family acquired other possessions in Kent. The inquisitions *post mortem* of Henry, third Duke of Somerset show that he possessed the manor of Wilmington, alias Grandisons, close to Dartford; and parcels of land at Hucking and Dolly near Sittingbourne, and at Birchington and Monkton, in Thanet.[14]

Beaufort influence was reinforced by personal ties to key magnates with territorial interests in the County. The Beaufort-Roos connection was particularly close. Thomas, ninth Lord Roos, was the half-brother of Margaret, daughter of Eleanor Beauchamp by her second marriage to Edmund, Marquess of Dorset.[15] Another significant connection existed between the Beauforts and James Butler, Earl of Wiltshire. This culminated in his marriage during the 1450s to Eleanor, sister of Henry, Duke of Somerset. Through his first wife, Avice, daughter of Sir Richard Stafford, Wiltshire had acquired control of her lands in Kent situated near to Dartford.[16] The final tie was between the Beauforts and Staffords. Humphrey Stafford, Duke of Buckingham married Anne, the niece of Cardinal Beaufort, and his son, Humphrey, Earl of Stafford married Margaret, daughter of Edmund, Marquess of Dorset.[17]

Given the fragmentary nature of the Lancastrian affinity, the Beauforts were able to draw some of the principal Kentish gentry families into their orbit without coming into conflict with the crown. The Beauforts' network of contacts in Kent evolved in two ways. Some ties developed as a consequence of the family's territorial presence in north-west Kent. John Martyn of Dartford, the son of John Martyn, Justice of the Common Pleas, for example, became receiver of the lordship of Dartford under John, Duke of Somerset, then receiver-general to his brother, Edmund, Marquess of Dorset, and later acted as an agent for Dorset's widow, Eleanor, and for Margaret Beaufort's mother.[18] However, the Beauforts' landholdings in the County were certainly not extensive enough to attract large numbers of the gentry into their service.

The majority of ties were, in fact, forged through personal service to Cardinal Beaufort and his nephews. The close identification of the Beauforts with the young Henry VI and the Lancastrian dynasty acted as powerful incentives to some gentry families in Kent to obtain their patronage. The Cardinal was at the heart of English government and possessed tremendous influence at Court. Furthermore, both of his nephews, John, Duke of Somerset and Edmund, Marquess of Dorset, were closely involved with the war effort in France. The ties that were

forged there through shared experiences proved especially enduring.[19] During the 1430s and 1440s a number of leading members of the Kentish gentry, Richard Waller, Richard Frogenhall, John Cheyne, John Thornbury, John Kyriell, William Mareys, and John Yerde were all drawn into Beaufort service.[20]

Of this network, Waller, Frogenhall and Cheyne were the most significant. Richard Waller of Groombridge was a veteran of the French wars, having fought at Agincourt and Verneuil. He had held a number of captaincies but returned to England after 1431. Waller came from an influential local family and could count the Guildfords of Rolvenden, the Hornes of Appledore, the Darells of Little Chart and the Bamboroughs of Paddlesworth amongst his kinsmen.[21] Soon after his return he had entered Cardinal Beaufort's service. By 1439 he had become steward and master of his household.[22] Waller and his family subsequently developed a close association with Edmund, Marquess of Dorset. His kinsman, Simon Waller, apparently served with Edmund Beaufort's garrison at Harecourt. Richard Waller's close ties with the Beauforts were vividly demonstrated by the fact that he was entrusted with the custody of the duke of Orleans, prisoner of John, Duke of Somerset.[23]

Sir Richard Frogenhall of Teynham was one of Dorset's closest servants and saw considerable service in France. Frogenhall entered Dorset's service during the mid-late 1430s. His appointment as *bailli* and captain of Dorset's *comté* of Harecourt and chamberlain of his household indicated that he had become one of his master's most important servants as well as a key figure in the administration of Normandy. Moreover, Frogenhall married Mary, daughter of Margaret Beauchamp and Oliver St. John of Bletsoe in Bedfordshire. Mary was the half-sister of Margaret, daughter of Margaret Beauchamp by her second husband, John, Duke of Somerset.[24] John Cheyne of Shurland (Isle of Sheppey) became steward of the Beaufort lordship of Dartford during the course of the 1440s. Cheyne was related to some of the leading gentry families in the South-East. In addition, his marriage to Eleanor, daughter of Sir Robert Shottesbrook, made Cheyne and Somerset brothers-in-law. Through Somerset he was also related to Frogenhall.[25]

Amongst other Kentishmen who were drawn into the Beaufort orbit was John Thornbury of Speldhurst, a close friend of Waller, who became the cardinal's bailiff of the liberty of Winchester and keeper of Bishop's Waltham in 1442. He was recruited into Dorset's retinue in 1447 although it is not clear whether he departed with the retinue the following year.[26] John Kyriell, brother of the professional soldier, Sir Thomas Kyriell of Westenhanger, served under Edmund, Marquess of

Dorset in France. When Dorset was assigned compensation from the *quatrième* in Normandy for his loss of Maine, it was Kyriell who was appointed to act as his special receiver to gather the proceeds.[27] William Mareys of Faversham was the cardinal's treasurer of Wolvesey. His birthplace, Harrietsham, was close to Cardinal Beaufort's possessions at Langley.[28] Finally, John Yerde was the cardinal's harbinger in Kent in 1429. In 1443 he accompanied Somerset on his expedition to France.[29]

The Beauforts' associates were drawn from the most influential individuals in the County, who regularly served in local government. Richard Waller, John Yerde and William Mareys were all sheriffs: Waller in 1437-8, Yerde in 1440-1 and Mareys in 1442-3. Frogenhall served as escheator of Kent in 1437-8 and 1443-4.[30] The Beauforts took the interests of their Kentish clients seriously. John Yerde, for example, obtained the rents from Denton and Tappington in 1441 with Cardinal Beaufort's help.[31] Following his capture in France in 1449, Sir Richard Frogenhall was granted 500 marks by Edmund Beaufort to help pay for his ransom. He probably intervened on Frogenhall's behalf in 1453 to secure him the right to ship uncustomed wool to the value of 1,100 marks.[32]

The majority of Henry VI in 1437, however, signalled changes in the structure of power at Court and in the localities. A more coherent royal affinity began to emerge across the country which was not dependent on Beaufort patronage. Nevertheless, the family not only retained much of its influence in national politics; it was able to keep intact its own network in Kent, albeit within the broad umbrella of the royal affinity. In fact, many Beaufort clients realized that securing a position in the royal household was essential for their own future advancement, at the same time reinforcing the close identification of Beaufort and Lancastrian interests. Richard Waller and John Yerde both served in the royal household during the early 1440s.[33] When Cardinal Beaufort died in 1447, Edmund, Marquess of Dorset became head of the family and assumed a leading position at Court. His importance was recognized when he was appointed lieutenant-general of France that same year. The following year, before leaving to take up his duties across the Channel, he was created Duke of Somerset.

Following the cardinal's death and Somerset's absence in France from 1448-50, James Fiennes of Seal became the dominant royal servant in the County. His hegemony, though, was short-lived for he fell victim to Cade's rebels in July 1450.[34] Somerset's return to England in July 1450 soon restored Beaufort influence at Court and in Kent. Forming a close partnership with Queen Margaret, he took a

leading role in quelling the widespread instability that had spread across southern England. In 1451 it was one of Somerset's Kentish servants, Thomas Waryn, who was charged with the custody of the rebel captain of Kent, William Parminter.[35] Royal dominance in Kent was restored with the assistance of Somerset's kinsman, Sir John Cheyne, who added the stewardship of Queen Margaret's lordship of Milton and Marden to his existing stewardship of the lordship of Dartford,[36] and his close associate, Sir Gervase Clifton of Brabourne. Both were king's knights, members of the inner circle of the royal household, with close ties to Somerset and the Queen. The recruitment of three esquires, John Fogge, John Scott and Robert Horne, into the Kentish royal affinity during the 1450s must be seen in the context of their ties to Somerset and Queen Margaret: Fogge was a kinsman of John Kyriell; Scott was the step-son of Clifton and brother-in-law of John Yerde's son, Thomas; and Horne was the brother-in-law of John Guildford and Alice, daughter of Richard Waller.[37]

Consequently, there can be little surprise that Beaufort clients monopolized local government throughout this period: Horne was sheriff in 1451-2, Fogge in 1453-4; Cheyne 1454-5; and Clifton in 1458-9. In addition, Cheyne, Clifton, Waller, Fogge and Horne regularly served as justices of the peace.[38] The strength of these ties in the County apparently prompted Cheyne to resist electoral pressure brought to bear by Somerset's enemy, Richard, Duke of York, during the parliamentary elections in July 1455. Despite Somerset's recent death at the battle of St Albans in May 1455, Cheyne felt sufficiently secure to tamper with the returns and ensure the election of Clifton as one of the knights of the shire.[39] In all likelihood, this state of affairs continued into the later 1450s as the crown sought to consolidate its own authority and combat the increasing popularity of York and the Nevilles. Cheyne was appointed keeper of Queenborough castle 'by advice of the Council' in February 1458. In addition, it seems probable that Somerset's son, Henry, Duke of Somerset started to assume a more prominent position in the County. Somerset's grant of the reversion of the wardenship of the Cinque Ports on 5 May 1459 is usually seen in the context of his subsequent departure to Calais in the following November. However, it could equally be interpreted as an indication of the importance with which the Beaufort family was regarded by the crown in maintaining royal authority in Kent.[40]

The first half of the fifteenth century therefore marked the point at which the Beauforts emerged as a significant force in Kentish politics. In the absence of strong royal leadership, the Beauforts' close relationship to Henry VI, their influence at Court, and their

ability to provide patronage and protection, combined to draw some of the most prominent local gentry families into their orbit. Even the re-emergence of a royal affinity during the 1440s and the brief hegemony of Fiennes at the end of the decade did not seriously undermine Beaufort direction of Kentish affairs, enabling the family to remain the leading force in the County until 1460.

Yet why did the Beauforts' position in Kent disintegrate in 1460-1? The most likely explanation would seem to be that the continuing success of the Yorkists forced all the local gentry to weigh carefully their traditional loyalties against more practical considerations of survival. On the one hand, John Fogge, John Scott and Robert Horne defected to the Yorkist rebels; while long-standing royal servants like Sir Gervase Clifton and Sir Thomas Browne of Tonford, a former steward of Milton and Marden, joined Lords Hungerford and Scales in the defence of the Tower of London. On the other hand, by far the largest section of the gentry, including Richard Waller, Sir Richard Frogenhall and Sir John Cheyne, adopted a pragmatic approach and avoided taking up arms for either side.[41] This was mirrored in the South-West where similar practical considerations of survival prompted the Stourtons, Carents and Newburghs to remain neutral rather than following the example of their Beaufort patrons in fighting for the Lancastrian cause.[42]

The change of dynasty appeared to signal the complete collapse of the Beauforts' position in Kent. New patterns of lordship developed to fill the gap. Local leadership of the royal affinity now passed to the principal defectors of June 1460: Sir John Fogge became treasurer of the Edward IV's household, and Sir John Scott was made controller of the household. Furthermore, in an attempt to secure their loyalty the king recruited substantial numbers of the local gentry into royal service by granting a large quantity of annuities and re-distributing local crown offices and lands confiscated from Lancastrian rebels.[43]

In addition, Somerset's final disgrace in 1463 and death in 1464, and the exile of his brothers, Edmund and John, marked the point at which the two branches of the Beaufort family divided. Each Beaufort line pursued its interests in the manner it saw most appropriate. While her Beaufort kinsmen were closely identified with the Lancastrian court-in-exile, Margaret Beaufort and her second husband, Henry Stafford, were gradually drawn into the Yorkist regime and benefited from their links to the Court. In 1466, for instance, they obtained a royal grant of the former Beaufort manor of Woking in Surrey.[44] Unlike her exiled kinsmen, Margaret Beaufort also continued to provide as much assistance as she could for the family's clients. Sir Richard Frogenhall's children, for instance, were undoubtedly

taken into her household establishment during the 1460s. Frogenhall had not only demonstrated himself to be a loyal adherent of the family in the past, he appeared to have been suffering genuine financial difficulties since his capture in France in 1449.[45]

It was not a case, though, of the influence previously exercised by the Beauforts and Queen Margaret being replaced simply by that of Fogge and Scott. Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, for example, had attracted widespread support in Kent during the late 1450s as a consequence of his sea-faring exploits undertaken from Calais. His brother, Lord Abergavenny, was already a powerful local force with lands at Birling and Mereworth. During the early 1460s Neville influence was augmented further. Warwick's uncle, William Neville, Earl of Kent was granted Somerset's manor of Wilmington in 1462; while Warwick himself secured custody of the lands of his idiot uncle, George Neville, Lord Latimer, including the manor of Nevill's Fleet near Sandwich. The real prize, though, was Warwick's appointment as Warden of the Cinque Ports in 1461, an area of the County where he was especially popular.[46]

Nevertheless, by the late 1460s the exercise of power in Kent had passed primarily to Fogge and his Haute kinsmen, cousins of Edward IV's Queen, Elizabeth Woodville. At the same time, Neville influence had steadily declined. This presented John Brokeman of Ashford, one-time servant of Henry, Duke of Somerset, with a dilemma. Realizing the importance of acquiring a new patron, he had gravitated towards the Nevilles during the early-mid 1460s. It had probably been through Warwick's influence that Somerset's lands in Thanet were granted to Brokeman in 1466. At this time, Brokeman had needed alternative lordship as a matter of urgency. Ashford was also the home to Sir John Fogge and relations between the two men appeared to have deteriorated completely by the late 1460s.[47]

As tension between Edward IV and Warwick increased towards the end of the decade, former Lancastrians, including Brokeman, with less of a stake in the survival of the Yorkist regime, seemed to become more responsive to traditional Lancastrian loyalties. Signs of Lancastrian activity in Kent first emerged in 1468. In June of that year a Lancastrian agent, John Cornelius, was captured at Queenborough (Isle of Sheppey). He was found to be carrying letters from Queen Margaret to supporters across England. Despite being the principal family on the island, the Cheynes were not implicated in any way. Nevertheless, many arrests followed, including that of Sir Gervase Clifton. Clifton had been excluded from Kentish affairs throughout the 1460s, due no doubt to his continued links with the Lancastrian underground. As a result of the events of 1468, he was

indicted for treason but fled before he could be tried. There is no evidence that the case was continued.[48]

Opposition to Edward IV remained muted until 1469-70 when Warwick and Clarence turned against the King. As a result of internal Yorkist dissension, some Lancastrians were more willing to take a risk. While Warwick and Clarence held the reins of power during the summer and autumn of 1469, Margaret Beaufort for instance, entered into negotiations with Clarence in an attempt to secure the future of her son, Henry Tudor. Moreover, certain individuals were also sufficiently encouraged to join Warwick and Clarence's opposition to Edward IV again in early 1470. Amongst this disparate group of gentry was John Brokeman, the former client of Henry, Duke of Somerset and more recently the Nevilles.[49] When the alliance between Warwick, Clarence and Queen Margaret culminated in the restoration of Henry VI in October 1470, those Lancastrians who had hesitated to throw in their lot with the rebels now came forward to support the new regime.

The restored regime of Henry VI, commonly referred to as the Readeption, secured the appointment of its supporters to various local government offices, remaining careful, however, not to offend moderate Yorkists by confiscating their post-1460 acquisitions. Edmund Beaufort, erstwhile Duke of Somerset since the death of his brother Henry, returned to England at the end of January 1471. Based in London it is more than likely that he sought to re-establish contact with Beaufort clients throughout southern England. It is known, for instance, that Somerset visited his kinswoman, Margaret Beaufort, at Woking on 3 March.[50] However, Margaret and Henry Stafford remained non-committal, more concerned with looking to their own interests than the long-term survival of the regime. Nevertheless, Somerset would have been especially keen to make contact with the new authorities in Kent where one Beaufort client in particular had become an integral element of the Readeption regime. This was his father's trusted lieutenant, Sir Richard Frogenhall, who had been appointed to the commission of the peace. The other principal backers of the regime in the County were Sir John Guildford and his kinsman, John Digges, both of whom were appointed to the commission of the peace, and Guildford's son-in-law, Henry Aucher, who was appointed sheriff.[51] Yet, despite their connections to the Beauforts, other families appeared reluctant to come forward to support the Readeption. The Cheynes, in particular, were conspicuous by their absence. Sir John Cheyne had taken no part in Kentish affairs before his death in 1467. His eldest son, William Cheyne, had received an annuity in 1462 before being appointed bailiff of the

king's stannary of Penwith and Kerye in Cornwall in 1465. Yet he played no part in Kentish affairs whatsoever.[52]

When Edward IV invaded in March 1471, the Readeption government swiftly collapsed. Somerset did his best to gather support across southern England for the rapidly crumbling Lancastrian regime. On 23 March, for example, he again visited Margaret Beaufort and Henry Stafford in the hope of obtaining their backing. Whatever Margaret Beaufort's position, Stafford remained reluctant to commit himself to the Lancastrians. Somerset was forced to continue on to Salisbury without any firm assurances of assistance.[53] By delaying her return to England until 14 April, however, Margaret of Anjou allowed Edward IV to defeat Warwick at the battle of Barnet. Despite this setback she still chose to confront Edward IV at Tewkesbury on 4 May. In the event, the Lancastrians were routed and suffered considerable losses, including Henry VI's son, Prince Edward, Somerset's brother, John, Marquess of Dorset, and John Courtenay, Earl of Devon. Edmund Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, who had done his utmost to gather support for the Readeption, was beheaded after the battle along with Sir Gervase Clifton.[54]

Tewkesbury was a severe blow to the Lancastrian cause and its impact should not be underestimated in any analysis of subsequent bastard feudal loyalties. In the aftermath of the battle, gentry from all quarters rushed to demonstrate their loyalty to Edward IV. There were probably some who now decided that the Lancastrian cause was completely hopeless and threw in their lot with the Yorkists. Amongst those who remained loyal to the memory of their Lancastrian patrons, discretion seemed the better part of valour. Consequently, the most substantial gentry in the County remained neutral during Fauconberg's rebellion in May 1471. The two key figures of the Readeption in Kent, Sir Richard Frogenhall and Sir John Guildford, refused to act. When the rebellion broke out, Canterbury's mayor, Nicholas Faunt, sent a rider to Guildford's son, Richard, and Henry Aucher, presumably to ascertain how they would respond. In the event, Fauconberg's rapid desertion of the Kentishmen after failing to gain entry into London justified such circumspection.[55] Yet, as an extra precaution Sir John Guildford obtained a general pardon by 'advice of the Council' on 18 May, just three days before Edward IV's return to London.[56] Despite the caution displayed by the principal Readeption supporters in the County, there is a suggestion that some elements loyal to Queen Margaret and the Beauforts did support the rising. One rebel, William Brokeman of Ashford, was a kinsman of John Brokeman. Another, Thomas Frogenhall of Buckland, was the son of William Frogenhall, a former ward of

Queen Margaret. His wife, Jane, was the daughter of William Appuldrefield, a former receiver of the queen's lordship of Milton and Marden. Thomas Frogenhall was also a nephew of Sir Richard Frogenhall.[57]

Having witnessed the destruction of the senior line of the royal dynasty, many remaining Lancastrians probably followed the example of Margaret Beaufort who recognized the need to come to terms with the Yorkist regime. Despite her intimate connections to the House of Lancaster, Margaret and her relatives were spared the king's anger. In 1472, following the death of her husband the previous October, she married Edward IV's supporter, Lord Stanley, and acquired beneficial ties to the Woodville family.[58] Meanwhile, her son, Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, her brother-in-law, Jasper Tudor, Earl of Pembroke and possibly Charles, the illegitimate son of Henry, Duke of Somerset, lived as exiles in Brittany.[59] Having managed to protect her immediate interests, as the head of the family Margaret Beaufort was able to provide support for former Beaufort clients. Sir Richard Frogenhall's children had already been taken into her service during the 1460s. It was also during the early 1470s that links between Margaret Beaufort and the Guildfords first became apparent. The notebook of Reginald Bray, Margaret Beaufort's receiver-general, for example, contains references (for Michaelmas 1474) to money lent to Guildford, and to other sums paid by him for Bray's own marriage.[60]

Kent was for now dominated completely by Sir John Fogge, Earl Rivers, the Queen's brother, and their Haute relatives. However, in June 1483 the Yorkist polity was thrown into turmoil once more when Richard, Duke of Gloucester seized the throne after the death of Edward IV. In the following months a general conspiracy was formed against Richard III. According to Rosemary Horrox this brought together disaffected Yorkists and those seeking to regain lost inheritances and influence. Heading the latter group was Margaret Beaufort. In the aftermath of the King's accession, she had sought to come to terms with Richard and continued negotiating for her son's return to England. Nevertheless, once the scale of the opposition to the King became clear, she threw in her lot with the conspirators. Although the initial aim of the conspiracy had been to restore Edward V, following the rumours of his death, Margaret Beaufort's son, Henry Tudor, was quickly adopted as a rival claimant to Richard III.[61]

Full-scale rebellion began in Kent in early October, gradually spreading westwards across England during the course of November. Woodville connections were particularly prominent in Kent and certainly explain the involvement of Sir John Fogge, Sir William

Haute, John Pympe and Reginald Pympe. Woodville ties are also used by Horrox to account for the participation of the Guildfords.[62] However, Philip Morgan has recently suggested that the rebels in south-eastern England were particularly well-informed of events at Court in the lead up to the rebellion. This view is given extra weight by the participation of John Cheyne, second son of Sir John Cheyne of Sheppey, and Richard Guildford of Rolvenden. They were both part of the inner circle of conspirators led by Margaret Beaufort and were clearly in an ideal position to communicate developments to their own contacts in the localities.[63]

As such, the involvement of certain rebels might be explained better by prior connections to the Beauforts. Yet Horrox makes no attempt to analyse their connections in any depth, assuming that pre-1471 ties no longer exerted any meaningful influence on the actions of the participants. Rebel participation is analysed purely in the context of their immediate connections. William Cheyne of Sheppey and Anthony Kene of Woolwich are both cases in point. The involvement of William Cheyne is explained by the Yorkist service connections of his younger brother, John Cheyne, who by 1479 had married into the Stourtons and had become Edward IV's Master of the Horse.[64] Yet particularly close ties had existed between the Cheynes and the Beauforts during the early and mid-fifteenth century. Moreover, after 1460 the Cheynes made no impact in Kentish politics. Although the family, through John Cheyne, was rehabilitated after 1471, it did not re-emerge as a force in Kentish politics. On the other hand, Anthony Kene is simply ignored by Horrox despite the family's clear connections to the Beauforts. Possessing some lands at Woolwich in Kent, the Kenes were originally from Martock in Somerset, a Beaufort property and maintained strong ties with the West Country. One member of the family, Stephen Kene, had served as bailiff of Corfe castle in 1435. Furthermore, Anthony Kene's grandfather, Hugh Kene, had fought in the earl of Somerset's retinue in 1440. Nevertheless, Horrox fails to identify the significance of the Kenes.[65]

If, as was suggested at the beginning of this article, we are to accept that ties of loyalty were not discarded lightly and were carried from generation to generation, then it is unlikely that families like the Cheynes or Kenes had forgotten their long-standing attachment to the Beauforts over the course of a mere twelve years. However, in this instance Beaufort, Lancastrian and Yorkist loyalties could all be combined against the common enemy: Richard III. In the event, the rebellion failed to gather momentum. The duke of Norfolk and Lord Cobham easily tackled the rebels in south-eastern England, while

Richard's prompt action in the South-West snuffed out the insurrection there before it became a threat. Sensing failure, the rebels scattered in all directions. Some were quickly captured and executed. Others, like Sir John Guildford, only managed to avoid capture for a short time. However, some rebels, including Richard Guildford and John Cheyne, escaped to join Henry Tudor in exile.[66] Rebel motivation in the South-East was therefore more complex than previously imagined. Immediate ties to the Court and the Woodvilles no doubt provided one reason for rebelling amongst that section of the Kentish gentry led by Fogge and the Hautes. It is also possible that the involvement of Margaret Beaufort as an active political leader in the rebellion re-awakened alternative attachments to the Beauforts and Lancastrians amongst families such as the Cheynes, Kenes and Guildfords.

Despite suppressing the rebellion, Richard was increasingly plagued by hints of conspiracies involving Henry Tudor during 1484-5. His support finally crumbled when Tudor invaded in August 1485. On 22 August, Richard was defeated at the battle of Bosworth and a member of the Beaufort family, so long the principal bastion of the House of Lancaster, ascended the throne. Henry VII united former Yorkists and Lancastrians under one regime. As such his overriding political concern was pragmatism as he sought to accommodate the different strands that had brought him to power. He chose to portray himself both as a symbol of continuity as the rightful successor of Edward IV, but also as the legal heir of Henry VI. Nevertheless, loyalty to the Lancastrian dynasty was a key factor employed by certain dispossessed families during the early years of Henry VII's reign seeking to regain lost inheritances. Petitioners at Henry's first Parliament which assembled in November 1485 were especially careful to stress his blood-link with Henry VI through the Beaufort family. Indeed, Henry VII was so concerned to appear as the sole Beaufort heir that he forced his kinsman, Sir Charles Beaufort, son of Henry, Duke of Somerset, to change his surname to Somerset.[67] Moreover, an examination of the backgrounds of a number of these servants demonstrates a continuing influence of his Beaufort heritage over the King.

The Guildfords, for instance, had moved into the family's orbit during the second half of the fifteenth century and had taken a leading role in the opposition to Richard III.[68] Sir John Guildford was now too old to take up an active role in the king's service although he was appointed to the Council.[69] Sir Richard Guildford, however, had been intimately involved in the 1483 conspiracy and had subsequently joined Henry in exile after the rebellion's failure. He was prominent at Court from the moment of Henry's accession. Beginning as a king's

knight in 1485, Guildford swiftly rose through the ranks until his appointment as Controller of the Household in succession to Sir John Spelman sometime in 1493-4. He remained in office until his disgrace and resignation in 1505/1506.[70] Guildford directed affairs in Kent for most of the reign. Moreover, his household influence enabled him to acquire a number of local offices in Kent, Surrey and Sussex. Between 1485 and 1487 he was granted the keepership of the manor of Kennington in Surrey and the lordship of Higham in Sussex; in 1496 he was made steward of Duchess Cecily of York's lands in Kent, Sussex and Surrey; and in 1506 he was appointed bailiff of Winchelsea.[71]

Guildford became one of the king's chief military and security advisers. Amongst his principal associates was Sir Charles Somerset, captain of Henry VII's Guard.[72] Like Guildford, his rise was equally swift. By 1498 he had become Vice-Chamberlain of the Household. In 1504 he was created Lord Herbert.[73] The Guildford-Somerset relationship was also close and the two families were to become connected by marriage at the beginning of Henry VIII's reign. Guildford's son, Edward married Eleanor, daughter of Thomas West, Lord de la Warre. Somerset's second wife, Elizabeth, was another of de la Warre's daughters. Through the de la Warres, the Guildfords could claim another connection to the Tudors for Edward Guildford became the brother-in-law of Sir Henry Owen, son of Henry VII's half-uncle and carver, Sir David Owen.[74]

Beaufort connections were particularly prominent amongst the membership of the Kentish royal affinity. Richard Waller's son, John Waller, for example, was made keeper of Penshurst in 1485.[75] Anthony Kene was granted the keepership of all mansions within the palace of Westminster in 1485, while his brother, George Kene, was made keeper of the manor of Plesaunce in East Greenwich in 1486.[76] Then there was the revival of the Cheyne family. Sir John Cheyne's son, John Cheyne of Falstone-Cheyne in Wiltshire, became Lord Cheyne in 1487, constable of Barnard's castle in 1488 and was appointed a feoffee to the king's will in 1491. Meanwhile, in Kent, his brother and nephew, William and Francis Cheyne, also benefited. William Cheyne was granted the stewardship of Milton and Marden and the constableship of Queenborough castle from 1485-7.[77] Francis Cheyne went on to become an esquire of the body by 1503 and obtained the stewardship of Milton and Marden and the constableship of Queenborough castle in 1506.[78] Of course, Guildford connections also prospered. John Darell, James Isaak and Robert Aucher all obtained appointments in the new regime. John Darell was an esquire of the body between 1486 and 1492. He was knighted at Blackheath in 1497 after which he became a king's knight. James Isaak became

marshal of Dover castle and keeper of the artillery in 1487, bailiff of Sandwich in 1489, and an esquire of the body in 1500. Robert Aucher was made constable of Tonbridge castle in 1485.[79]

Until recently, historians have largely assumed that Lancastrian loyalties were finally discarded after the traumatic events of 1471. With the Yorkist grip on the throne secure, it is generally agreed that maintaining such sympathies from this moment onwards was completely pointless. Yet is this true in all cases or is the picture, as so often, much more blurred around the edges? With the current review of bastard feudalism, and the suggestion that it was much stronger and more durable than many have given it credit for, historians also need to reconsider other issues, including the nature and strength of Lancastrian loyalism. The evidence presented here has suggested that these feelings of loyalty to the Beaufort family and through the Beauforts to the Lancastrian dynasty itself, were extremely durable and passed from one generation to the next. When the tide of events favoured the Lancastrians, past loyalties prompted many traditional followers to reassess their neutrality. However, these individuals did not support the Lancastrians without first considering a number of factors. Despite maintaining an underlying loyalty to the Beaufort family, individuals weighed this against the likelihood of success and their own chances of survival should the venture fail. Thus, in early 1470 while John Brokeman was prepared to support insurrection against Edward IV, the Cheynes, Wallers and Frogenhalls remained quietly on the sidelines. Nonetheless, when Henry VI was briefly restored between October 1470 and March 1471, Sir Richard Frogenhall came forward to support the Readeption regime; while his kinsman, Thomas Frogenhall, was implicated in Fauconberg's rebellion in May 1471. However, it is in 1483 and 1485, when Yorkist and Lancastrian could unite against Richard III, that the strength of these ties becomes most apparent. The Cheynes, Kenes and Guildfords supported opposition to Richard III and went on to forge successful careers in the early Tudor state.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Dr Sean Cunningham of the Public Record Office and Dr David Grummitt of the University of Oxford for their helpful comments on this article. His special thanks also to Dr Michael K. Jones and Mr Jim Bolton, Senior Research Fellow at Queen Mary and Westfield College, for their advice and guidance on the arguments presented here.

NOTES

[1] A. E. Conway, 'The Maidstone sector of Buckingham's rebellion', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xxxvii (1925), 97-120.

[2] M. A. Hicks, 'Edward IV, The Duke of Somerset and Lancastrian loyalism in the north', *Northern History*, xx (1984), 33-5; D. A. L. Morgan, 'The King's affinity in the polity of Yorkist England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, xxiii (1973), 7.

[3] R. Horrox, *Richard III: a Study of Service* (Cambridge, 1989), 167-70.

[4] C. Richmond, 'Patronage and polemic' in *The End of the Middle Ages*, J. L. Watts (Ed.) (Stroud 1998), 65-87; K. B. MacFarlane, 'Bastard feudalism', *Historical Research*, xx (1945), 169; idem, 'The Wars of the Roses', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, I (1964), 105.

[5] M. A. Hicks, *Bastard Feudalism* (1995), 27-33, 59, 69-109 *passim*. See also C. Carpenter, 'Gentry and community in Medieval England', *Journal of British Studies*, xxxiii (1994), 360 and R. Horrox, 'Local and national politics in fifteenth-century England', *Journal of Medieval History*, xviii (1992), 391.

[6] M. Mercer, 'Lancastrian loyalism in the South-West: the case of the Beauforts', *Southern History*, xix (1997), 43.

[7] C. Carpenter, *The Wars of the Roses: Politics and the Constitution in England, c. 1437-1509* (Cambridge, 1997), 67, 70, 72. For the decline of the royal affinity see S. Payling, *Political Society in Lancastrian England: The Greater Gentry of Nottinghamshire* (Oxford, 1991), 147-8 and S. M. Wright, *The Derbyshire Gentry in the Fifteenth Century* (Derbyshire Record Society, 8, 1983) 83-6.

[8] Beaufort influence in Kentish politics was first suggested in M. Mercer, 'Kent and National Politics, 1437-1534: The Royal Affinity and a County Elite' (University of London Ph.D., 1995), 26-7, 30.

[9] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1396-9, 289. The Beauforts subsequently developed a close association with Canterbury Cathedral: M. K. Jones and M. G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby* (Cambridge), 1992, 25.

[10] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1399-1401, 176, 549-50; 1413-16, 235-6; PRO, C 139/50/48/22.

[11] G. L. Harriss, *Cardinal Beaufort: A Study of Lancastrian Ascendancy and Decline* (Oxford, 1988), 409.

[12] PRO, C 139/101/73/8, C 139/114/19/14. There was a suggestion that Dartford subsequently passed to Somerset's brother, Edmund, and, upon Edmund's death, to his son, Henry. This is incorrect. However, Edmund did possess the manors of Woking and Sutton in Surrey: E. A. Webb, G. W. Miller and J. Beckwith (Eds.), *The History of Chislehurst: Its Church, Manors and Parish* (1899), 103; E. Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 12 vols. (Canterbury, 1797-1801), ii, 3-5, 296-7; PRO, C 139/160/38/1-15.

[13] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1452-61, 78-9.

[14] Henry Beaufort's first inquisition post mortem, taken at Stroud on 25 October 1465 (PRO, C 145/322/4/3), stated that he only possessed lands at Birchington and Monkton. It was clearly regarded as unsatisfactory and further inquisitions were held at Margate on 22 October 1468 and Dartford on 25 February 1469 (PRO, C 140/30/54/2-3). It is unclear how Somerset got Wilmington. The subject of a dispute at the turn of the fifteenth century, it apparently came into crown hands and was granted to Somerset during the later 1450s: Hasted *op. cit.* (note 12), ii, 332; *Calendar of Inquisitions*

Post Mortem, 15-23 Richard II, xvii (1988), 195; *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, 1392-9, vi (1963), 60-2; J. Strachey *et al.* (Eds.) *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, 6 vols. (London, 1767-70), iii, 229.

[15] G. E. Cokayne, *The Complete Peerage*, new edition revised by V. Gibbs and later H. A. Doubleday, 13 vols. (1910-49), xi, 105.

[16] *Ibid.*, xii, 128; PRO, C 139/164/16; E. A. Fry and G. S. Fry (Eds.), 'Dorset Feet of Fines, 1327-1485', *Dorset Records* (1910), 322.

[17] Cokayne, *op. cit.* (note 15), 389.

[18] Westminster Abbey Muniments, 5100-1, 5103; Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 45; *The Forty-Eighth Annual Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records* (1887), 390 (DKR). The Appultons of Dartford also developed ties with the Beauforts: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1405-8, 171; *Calendar of Fine Rolls*, 1452-61, 154.

[19] M. K. Jones, 'The Beaufort family and the war in France, 1421-50' (University of Bristol PH. D. thesis, 1983),136-7.

[20] Waller, Frogenhall, Thornbury and Kyriell all had ties with the Beauforts' network in the West Country. This supports Harriss's assertion that the Beauforts were influential throughout Southern England: Harriss, *op. cit.* (note 11), 145, 151, 271. Thornbury's wife possessed lands in Wiltshire, while he served as escheator of Hampshire and Wiltshire in 1437-8: PRO, C 139/178/53; *Calendar of Fine Rolls*, 1437-45, 54. Frogenhall was granted joint-custody of John Hill of Spaxton, a kinsman of the Beauforts' Stourton clients in 1435: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1429-36, 496. Kyriell's brother, Sir Thomas, was married to Cecily, daughter of the Beaufort client, John Stourton of Preston Plucknett: J. S. Roskell *et al.* (Eds.), *The History of Parliament: The House of Commons*, 4 vols. (Stroud, 1993), iv, 492; PRO, C 67/46 m. 9, PRO, B 11/6 fols. 68-9.

[21] The Waller-Guildford relationship was especially close. Waller later acted as executor of Edward Guildford's will. The Thornbury's and Guildford became considerably closer during the course of the fifteenth century as well as when Guildford's son, John, married Thornbury's daughter Philippa, widow of Sir William Tyrell: Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 32, 103-4.

[22] Harriss, op. cit. (note 11), 361; J. Greatrex (Ed.), *The register of the Common Seal of the Priory of St Swithun Winchester, 1345-1497* (Hampshire Record Society, 2, 1978), 73, 93; N. H. Nicolas (Ed.), *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England, 1386-1542*, 7 vols. (Royal Commission, 1834-7), v, 340; N. H. Nicolas (Ed.), *Testamenta Vetusta*, 2 vols. (1826), i, 252.

[23] A. E. Marshall, 'The role of English war captains in England and Normandy, 1436-61' (University of Wales MA, 1974), 122-3; *Calendar of Close Rolls*, 1441-7, 441; 1447-54, 264; 1454-61, 20; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1452-61, 61; PRO, CP 25(1)/115/318/601.

[24] Marshall, *op. cit.* (note 23), 117-9; Jones, *op. cit.* (note 19), 218, 327-8; Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 33.

[25] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 38-9; Marshall, *op. cit.* (note 23), 126.

[26] Greatrex, *op. cit.* (note 22), 94, 222; PRO, C 67/39 m. 42, C 67/41 m. 20; *DKR 48* (see note 18), 378.

[27] John Kyriell was captured along with his brother by the French at Formigny in 1450 and remained a prisoner for twenty-two years: Marshall, *op. cit.* (note 23), 151, 292-3; M. K. Jones, 'Somerset, York and the Wars of the Roses', *English Historical Review*, civ (1989), 293 n. 5.

[28] Greatrex, *op. cit.* (note 22), 228; Nicolas, *Testamenta Vetusta*, i, 252; S. Robertson, 'Preston church, next Faversham', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xxi (1895), 130-1.

[29] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1422-9, 555; Nicolas, *Proceedings and Ordinances of the*

Privy Council, v, 293-4, 409-14. Yerde was bequeathed some silver dishes in the cardinal's will: Nicolas, *op. cit.* (note 28), i, 255.

[30] *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales*, PRO Lists and Indexes 9 (1898), 68; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1429-36, 619; 1436-41, 584; 1441-6, 472; 1446-52, 590; *List of Escheators for England and Wales*, PRO Lists and Indexes 72 (1971), 67.

[31] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1436-41, 559.

[32] Frogenhall was captured at Harecourt when the garrison surrendered to the French in September 1449. In the later 1450s he was accused of failing to secure the release of those who had stood surety for him when he returned to England: Marshall, op. cit. (note 23), 117-8.

[33] PRO, E 101/409/9, fols. 36, 37; E 101/409/11 fols. 37v, 38v; E 101/409/16 fols. 34-34v, E 101/410/1 fols. 29v, 30v; E 101/410/3 fols. 30, 31, 31v.

[34] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 35-6, 38, 46-9; R. A. Griffiths, The Reign of King Henry VI (1981), 284-5; D. A. L. Morgan, 'The house of policy', in D. Starkey (Ed.) *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (1987), 41; Harriss, *op. cit.* (note 11), 306; Carpenter, *op. cit.* (note 7), 94; J. Watts, *Henry VI and the Politics of Kingship* (Cambridge, 1996), 162, 164.

[35] Marshall, *op. cit.* (note 23), 135.

[36] WAM (see note 18), 5101, 5103; PRO, DL 29/75/1495. John Thornbury was the receiver of Milton and Marden during the 1450s: PRO, SC 6/893/17.

[37] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 56-8.

[38] *Sheriffs* (see note 30), 68; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1446-52, 590; 1452-61, 668.

[39] Nicolas, *op. cit.* (note 29), vi, 246-7; PRO, E 13/146 mm. 11-11v. John Thornbury's Beaufort background had probably accounted for his election as a knight of the shire in 1453: *Return of the Name of Every Member of the Parliament of England, Scotland and Ireland, 1213-1702*, 1 vol. in two parts, (Kraus reprint, 1980), I, i, 348.

[40] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1452-61, 415, 516.

[41] M. A. Hicks, *Warwick the Kingmaker* (Oxford, 1998), 180; J. S. Davis (Ed.), *An English Chronicle of the Reigns of Richard II, Henry VI, Henry V and Henry VI* (Camden Society, old series, 64, 1856), 95-6. Browne was captured and executed after the Tower's fall: PRO, E 163/8/10.

[42] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 6), 48.

[43] For Fogge and Scott, see Morgan, *op. cit.* (note 2), 6-7, 9; A. R. Myers, *The Household of Edward IV* (Manchester, 1959), 252-3; J. C. Wedgwood and A. D. Holt, *History of Parliament: Biographies of the Members of the House of Commons, 1439-1509* (1936), 339-42, 750-2. See also Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 91-2, 94-6 which refers to grants on the Patent Rolls made to Fogge, Scott and other Kentishmen.

[44] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 47; PRO, C 139/160/38/9.

[45] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 166. During the early 1460s Frogenhall was outlawed and had goods and chattels seized to the value of 3*s.* 4*d.*: PRO, E 357/75 m. 16v. The author is particularly grateful to Dr Jones for discussing the importance of the Frogenhall-Beaufort connection with him.

[46] Davis, *op. cit.* (note 41), 84, 91; 'Bale's chronicle' in R. Flenley (Ed.), *Six Town Chronicles* (Oxford, 1911), 149; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1461-67, 45, 71, 225; Hasted, *op. cit.* (note 12), ix, 210; M. A. Hicks, *op. cit.* (note 41), 193.

[47] Brokeman was actually in possession of the lands in Thanet from 1464. These lands remained in the family's hands until the sixteenth century: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1461-67, 447; PRO, C 140/30/54/3, C263/2/2/10 (formerly C 47/64/16/548); PRO, CP 40/836 rot. 137v.

[48] Wedgwood and Holt, *op. cit.* (note 43), 195; PRO, KB 9/319, nos. 16, 25, 26, 32.

Clifton was not fined with the other alleged participants: PRO, C 244/106-110, C 251/21, E 404/74/1/54. For a discussion of the events of 1468 see M. A. Hicks, 'The case of Sir Thomas Cook, 1468', *English Historical Review*, xciii (1978), 82-96; A. F. Sutton, 'Sir Thomas Cook and his "troubles": an investigation', *Guildhall Studies in London History*, iii (1978), 85-108; P. Holland, 'Cook's case in history and myth', *Historical Research*, lxi (1988), 21-35.

[49] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 49-50; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1467-77, 218; Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 109. Brokeman's name was omitted from the original commission ordering the seizure of the possessions of Warwick and Clarence's associates. This might suggest some initial doubt about his involvement: PRO, C 81/150/4.

[50] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 54.

[51] For a general account of the Readeption, see C. D. Ross, *Edward IV* (1974), 154-8; Hicks, *op. cit.* (note 41), 296-307. For a discussion of the Readeption in Kent, see Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 104. Frogenhall could have been motivated to act by his precarious financial position (see note 45). The Readeption was the first indication of Guildford dissatisfaction with the Yorkists. Sir John Guildford had been a royal annuitant since 1461 and Warwick's lieutenant of Dover Castle from about 1465. Significantly, he had not been included amongst Warwick's supporters in 1470 despite his identification with the Earl in 1469. This might indicate that Guildford ties to the Nevilles were born out of necessity and not by a strong sense of loyalty: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1461-67, 49; PRO, E 372/313-15 *sub* Kantia; F. Hull (Ed.), *A Calendar of the White and Black Books of the Cinque Ports, 1432-1955* (Kent Records, xix/ HMC Joint Publications 5, 1966), 55; M. A. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence: George Duke of Clarence, 1449-78* (Gloucester, 1980), 45.

[52] William Cheyne had based himself in Sussex during the 1460s, especially while his father was still alive: PRO, C 67/45 m. 7; Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 94-5. However, Cheyne joined the Calais garrison in February 1470, just before Warwick and Clarence's break with Edward IV and was subsequently pardoned in November 1471. It is possible that this pardon was granted as a result of suspected involvement in Fauconberg's rebellion: PRO, C 140/26/45; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1461-67, 76 461, 574; PRO, C 81/1309/28; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1467-77, 196, 247, 303.

[53] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 55-6. Edmund Beaufort possessed some lands in the South-West; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1467-77, 179; Carpenter, *op. cit.* (note 7), 179.

[54] G. L. Harriss and M. A. Harriss (Eds.), 'John Benet's chronicle for the years 1400-1462' in *Camden Miscellany*, 24 (Camden Society, fourth series 9, 1972), 233; C. L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913), 377.

[55] Canterbury Cathedral Archives, Chamberlains' Accounts F/A 5 f. 112; Historic Manuscripts Commission, *9th Report*, 2 vols., 1883-4), I, i, 141. For a general account of the rising see C. Richmond, 'Fauconberg's Kentish rising of May 1471', *English Historical Review*, lxxxv (1970), 673-92.

[56] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1467-77, 259; PRO, C 81/1502/22.

[57] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 116-7; Marshall, *op. cit.* (note 23), 117; E. Foss, 'Hackington or St Stephen's Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, i (1858), 89; PRO, C 138/41/67, C 139/139/24, C 67/42 m. 17; A. R. Myers, *Crown, Household and Parliament in Fifteenth-Century England* (1985), 177. P. W. Fleming, 'The Lovelace dispute: concepts of property and inheritance in fifteenth-century Kent', *Southern History*, xii (1990), 16, fn. 21. Fleming has identified William Brokeman as a follower of Clarence. It is possible, therefore, that different branches of the family found alternative lordship after being deprived of Beaufort leadership.

[58] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 57-60.

[59] Somerset's mother, Joan Hill, was probably a member of the Hills of Spaxton in Somerset, relatives of the Stourtons: 'Pedigrees showing the relationship between many of the nobility and gentry, and the blood royal; compiled about the year 1505', printed in *Collectanea, Topographica et Genealogica*, I (1834), 313; Wedgwood and Holt, *op. cit.* (note 43), 454.

[60] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 166; WAM (see note 18) 32407, fols. 3r, 3v.

[61] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 119-22, 124; Horrox, *op. cit.* (note 3), 167-70; Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 61-3.

[62] Strachey, *op. cit.* (note 14), 246; Horrox, *op. cit.* (note 3), 142; Conway, *op. cit.* (note 1), 107, 120; Carpenter, *op. cit.* (note 7), 213-6. Carpenter stresses firmly that this was in no way a Lancastrian rising and that Henry Tudor must be seen as a Yorkist candidate. Consequently, she concentrates on the reaction against Richard III from within the Yorkist polity. Yet, by accepting that Sir William Brandon was able to exploit previous loyalties to the earls of Oxford in East Anglia, she is implicitly acknowledging that former loyalties could act as motivating factors on the behaviour of some individuals.

[63] P. Morgan, ' The death of Edward V and the rebellion of 1483', *Historical Research*, lxviii (1995), 229-232; E. Hall, *Chronicle* (Ed. H. Ellis (1809), 391-2; H. Ellis (Ed.), Polydore Vergil, *Three Books of English History* (Camden Society, old series, 29, 1844), 196-7; R. Holinshead, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols. (1807-8), iii, 414.

[64] R. Horrox and P. W. Hammond (Eds.), *British Library Harleian Manuscript* 433, 4 vols. (Gloucester, 1979-83), ii, 48-9; Horrox, *op. cit.* (note 3), 171; Wedgwood and Holt, *op. cit.* (note 43), 182.

[65] PRO, B 11/5 fol. 152; *Sheriffs* (see note 30), 68; PRO, SC 2/169/12; DKR 48 (see note 18), 333; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1436-41, 433.

[66] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 138; Horrox, *op. cit.* (note 3), 159-60, 293.

[67] Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 68-9; Cokayne, *op. cit.* (note 15), xii, i, 846.

[68] Guildford's second wife, Jane, served in Margaret Beaufort's household after 1485. She was the sister of Nicholas, Lord Vaux who had been raised in Margaret Beaufort's household: Jones and Underwood, *op. cit.* (note 9), 121-2, 275.

[69] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1485-94. 150; C. G. Bayne and W. H. Dunham (Eds.), *Select Cases in the Council of Henry VII* (Seldon Society 75, 1958), 11-13.

[70] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1485-94, 18; J. R. Hooker, 'Some cautionary notes on Henry VII's household and chamber system', *Speculum*, xxxiii (1958), 74-5. In 1486 Guildford became joint-master of the Ordnance and keeper of the Armoury in the Tower, with his son, Edward. By 1487 he was Master of the Horse and a king's councillor. In 1488 he was one of Henry's knights of the Body: *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1485-94, 467; PRO, E 404/79/176; E 404/79/38. In 1500 he was made a knight of the Garter: W. A. Shaw, *Knights of England*, 2 vols. (1906), i, 19. Fleming's suggestion that Guildford was Duchess Cecily's household controller is a misreading of this grant. Her household controller and/or steward seems to have been Sir Henry Heydon: P. W. Fleming, 'The Hautes and their "circle"', in D. Williams (Ed.), *England in the Fifteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1986 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge, 1987), 99; M. Gregory, 'Wickham court and the Heydons', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, lxxviii (1963), 12; J. G. Nichols and J. Bruce, *Wills from Doctor's Commons* (Camden Society, original series 83, 1863), 8.

[71] *Calendars of Patent Rolls*, 1485-94, 18; 1494-1509, 56, 472. Guildford's relative, Henry Aucher, had been the previous bailiff of Winchelsea: W. Campbell (Ed.), *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII*, 2 vols., Rolls series 60 (1873-7), i, 67; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1494-1509, 11.

[72] S. Gunn, ' The courtiers of Henry VII', *English Historical Review*, cviii (1993), 30-1; Campbell, *op. cit.* (note 71), i, 327.

[73] Bayne and Dunham, *op. cit.* (note 69), 32,34, 37-8, 40, 42-4, 46; T. Rymer (Ed.), *Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae...et Acta Publica*, 20 vols. (1704-35) V, part iv, 124-5.

[74] Cokayne, *op. cit.* (note 15), XII, i, 850. W. H. Rylands (Ed.), *Pedigrees from the Visitation of Hampshire...1530* (Harleian Society 64, 1913); W. B. Bannerman (Ed.), *The Visitations of the County of Sussex...1530*,...1633-4 (Harleian Society 53, 1905), 95; Wedgwood and Holt, *op. cit.* (note 43), 654.

[75] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1485-94, 43.

[76] *Calendars of Patent Rolls*, 1485-94, 22; 1494-1509, 83. Anthony Kene did not long enjoy office. He died sometime before 8 November 1485: *Calendar of Fine Rolls*, 1485-1509, no. 3.

[77] Campbell, *op. cit.* (note 71), ii, 175.

[78] PRO, LC 2/1 fol. 72; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1494-1509, 506.

[79] Mercer, *op. cit.* (note 8), 156-8.