

## Lambert Simnel and the King from Dublin

GORDON SMITH

Throughout his reign (1485-1509) Richard III's supplanter Henry VII was troubled by pretenders to his throne, the most important of whom were Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck.<sup>1</sup> Both are popularly remembered perhaps because their names have a pantomime sound to them, and a pantomime context seems a suitable one for characters whom Henry accused of being not real pretenders but mere impersonators. Nevertheless, there have been some doubts about the imposture of Perkin, although there appear to have been none before now about Lambert.<sup>2</sup> As A.F. Pollard observed, 'no serious historian has doubted that Lambert was an impostor'.<sup>3</sup>

This observation is supported by the seemingly straightforward traditional story about the impostor Lambert Simnel, who was crowned king in Dublin but defeated at the battle of Stoke in 1487, and pardoned by Henry VII. This story can be recognised in Francis Bacon's influential history of Henry's reign, published in 1622, where Lambert first impersonated Richard, Duke of York, the younger son of Edward IV, before changing his imposture to Edward, Earl of Warwick.<sup>4</sup> Bacon and the sixteenth century historians derived their account of the 1487 insurrection mainly from Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia*, but Vergil, in his manuscript compiled between 1503 and 1513, said only that Simnel counterfeited Warwick.<sup>5</sup> The impersonation of York derived from a life of Henry VII, written around 1500 by Bernard André, who failed to name Lambert.<sup>6</sup> Bacon's York-Warwick imitation therefore looks like a conflation of the impostures from André and Vergil. Yet neither of these two chroniclers detailed the change of fraud found in Bacon, and both disagreed with an even earlier chronicle, written by Jean Molinet about 1490! Not only did Molinet fail to name Lambert, but he also regarded the king crowned in Dublin as genuinely Warwick and not an impostor at all.

Thus three chronicles written within a generation of the crowning of 1487 give three different identities for the king from Dublin: Molinet's Warwick, André's false York, and Vergil's false Warwick. The survival of the traditional story, in spite of this fact, owes much to the high reputation of Polydore Vergil, as reflected for example in Wilhelm Busch's classic treatment of Henry VII's reign.<sup>8</sup> The deception of Lambert Simnel as Warwick which Vergil related seems so patent, that this story has been constantly repeated, usually with Bacon's additions. The traditional story says that an Oxford priest, Richard Simons, taught his pupil, Lambert Simnel, to imitate Richard, Duke of York, son of Edward IV, who, with his brother Edward V, was said to have been murdered in the Tower of London by his uncle Richard III. Simons and Lambert escaped to Ireland, where a conspiracy developed around them which came to the attention of Henry VII at the end of 1486. By the time Henry's council met at Sheen (now Richmond, Surrey) in February 1487, Lambert's imposture had become that of Edward, Earl of Warwick. The real Warwick was exhibited by Henry VII, who deprived his own mother-in-law Elizabeth Woodville, widow of Edward IV, of her property. Lambert, supported by, rebel Yorkists and Margaret of Burgundy, sister of Edward IV and Richard III, was crowned Edward VI in Dublin in May 1487, but his invading army, composed mainly of Irish and German mercenaries, was finally defeated at East Stoke, near Newark on Trent in Nottinghamshire, on 16 June 1487. Lambert and Simons were both captured but spared, and the English rebels were attainted by parliament in November 1487. The Irish rebels later submitted to Henry VII, but Margaret of Burgundy continued to oppose him by supporting Perkin Warbeck as Richard, Duke of York.

This traditional story has seldom attracted investigation. Since Pollard's biographical essay on the supposed deceiver in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, investigations devoted solely to Simnel have included Mary Hayden's on Lambert in Ireland, and the publications to commemorate the quincentenary in 1987 of the battle of Stoke. The only full-scale study among these publications was Michael Bennett's book about Lambert and the battle, and he was the first author conveniently to collect the key sources of the 1487 rebellion, arranged in an appendix in chronological order, through to Vergil.<sup>9</sup> Bennett was sceptical about some of the evidence on the rebellion, especially concerning Simons and Simnel themselves. Pollard had already pointed out a discrepancy over Lambert's age, and this and other discrepancies led Barrie Williams in 1982 to question specifically the reliability of Vergil's account about Lambert Simnel.<sup>10</sup>

Recently, doubts have also begun to emerge about the identity of the pretender himself. In 1935 G. W. suggested that Lambert Simnel was really York, whose place was later taken by Perkin Warbeck. Williams's paper could be read as implying that the Irish king might genuinely have been Warwick. Bennett believed that it was unfathomable who the pretender was, or whom he was impersonating, but thought the pretender was a fake because he survived at the court of Henry VII. On the other hand, Henry himself claimed that the pretender was Lambert Simnel impersonating Edward, Earl of Warwick.

No-one has yet discovered who the Irish king's supporters claimed he was.<sup>11</sup>

The king from Dublin, then, could have been York, Warwick, or someone else, and might have been a fake or genuine. How does one decide? If only one candidate is considered as king, one can easily proceed to interpret the events of the 1487 rebellion, as can be most clearly seen in Vergil's narrative. Considering all the possible candidates, however, means that the identity of the Irish pretender must be regarded as an open question. One cannot fruitfully proceed with all the candidates together in the same way as with a single one, but the procedure can be reversed: first one examines what happened in the rebellion, and then one tries to see how what happened might suggest the suitability of each candidate. This can be done by comparing both the main events of the story outlined above and the candidates given by Molinet, André, Vergil and Bacon, not only with each other, but also with other sources from the appendix to Bennett and elsewhere. If the king from Dublin was an impostor (like the Lambert Simnel of Vergil and Bacon), whom was he impersonating: York (André), Warwick (Vergil), or both (Bacon)? If he was genuine (like Molinet's Warwick), who was he?

### **York and Warwick before 1486**

Ignoring whether they were genuine or impersonated, there are two candidates in the chronicles for the pretender from Dublin: York or Warwick. Richard, the younger son of the Yorkist king Edward IV and his queen Elizabeth Woodville, was born at Shrewsbury in August 1473, and created duke of York the following May.<sup>12</sup> The other candidate Edward was born at Warwick Castle in February 1475, the only son of Edward IV's brother George, duke of Clarence, and his wife Isabel, daughter of Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, known as the Kingmaker.<sup>13</sup> The death of Isabel in December 1476 was followed by the last treason of Clarence against his brother the king, during which Clarence tried to send his infant son abroad.<sup>14</sup> While Clarence was being detained, there took place the childhood marriage of York to Anne Mowbray, heiress to the duchy of Norfolk who later died. By this marriage Edward IV confirmed the dignity and the estates of the Mowbrays in his son York as duke of Norfolk. A month later, in February 1478, Clarence was finally executed, allegedly at the prompting of Edward IV's queen and her Woodville clan, and against the wishes of the king's surviving brother Richard, Duke of Gloucester.<sup>15</sup> Bacon wrote that touched with remorse for his brother's death, the king created Clarence's three-year-old orphan son earl of Warwick and kept the boy honourably at court. Warwick actually became the ward of the grasping Thomas Grey, Marquess Dorset, son of Elizabeth Woodville and Edward IV's stepson.<sup>16</sup>

When Edward IV died in April 1483, he was succeeded by his elder son, the prince of Wales, as Edward V, the younger son York becoming heir presumptive. In the ensuing power struggle Gloucester seized the boy king, and the boy's mother Elizabeth Woodville fled to sanctuary in Westminster Abbey with the duke of York and her daughters. In June, after the failure of an alleged plot involving her and Lord Hastings, Edward IV's queen surrendered her son York to Gloucester, and the flight of Dorset delivered Warwick into Richard's hands. Gloucester then assumed the crown as Richard III, and his *titulus regius* stated that Edward IV's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville had been invalid and therefore their children were illegitimate, and that the young earl of Warwick was excluded from the throne because of his father Clarence's attainder for treason.<sup>17</sup>

Richard III's heir apparent was his only legitimate child, Edward of Middleham, who died in April 1484. According to Rous, Warwick then became heir presumptive, but the terms of the *titulus regius* make this appear doubtful, and Rous's statement is uncorroborated. Richard seems to have chosen as heir presumptive his nephew John, Earl of Lincoln, son of his sister Elizabeth, Duchess of Suffolk.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, Bacon wrote that although Warwick was honourably treated by Edward IV, and was brought up at court till nearly ten years old, Richard III confined him. When Edward IV died in April 1483, however, Warwick was only eight; it was York who was nearly ten.<sup>19</sup>

In the first weeks of Richard III's reign, a plot was formed to release Edward V and York from the Tower of London, but rumours were spread that these little princes had already been killed by the new king their uncle. The rumours about this crime spread amongst the rebels planning to overthrow Richard III, and later abroad. The dates for the crime vary from June 1483 to April 1484, and the earlier date could mean that York was killed before his title of duke of Norfolk was bestowed on John, Lord Howard, on 28 June 1483. The supposed murder of Edward V and York led to the recognition of their sister and Edward IV's eldest daughter Elizabeth as the heiress of the house of York. The pretender Henry Tudor, as heir to the house of Lancaster, promised to marry Elizabeth of York and thus unite the warring royal houses. Her mother, Elizabeth Woodville, was induced to approve the match, and the plot originally to release the princes became part of a larger rebellion against Richard III, led by the king's former ally Henry, Duke of Buckingham.<sup>20</sup>

Buckingham's revolt failed in October 1483, and the duke was executed. Surprisingly, by March 1484 Elizabeth Woodville had reached an agreement with Richard III under which she and her

daughters left sanctuary, and she later persuaded her son the Marquess Dorset to try abandoning Henry Tudor. Furthermore, the rumoured proposal of marriage between Richard III and his niece Elizabeth of York in the spring of 1485 may have had her mother's approval. Her *rapprochement* with the king could be seen as evidence that Elizabeth Woodville accepted that Richard III was not responsible for the death of her sons Edward V and York, or indeed that she believed that the boys were still alive. Their survival in secret could explain the disappearance of the sons of Edward IV during the reign of Richard III, which ended when Richard was killed at the battle of Bosworth in August 1485 by the forces of Henry Tudor.<sup>21</sup>

Immediately after the battle the victorious Henry ordered a force to Richard's castle at Sheriff Hutton to seize Elizabeth of York and a boy whom Vergil described as 'Edward, the fifteen-year-old earl of Warwick, sole survivor of George duke of Clarence'. As Barrie Williams was the first scholar to point out, the boy was not fifteen but only ten.<sup>22</sup> Warwick was destined for the Tower of London, and his cousins York and Edward V were supposedly missing. Henry Tudor was proclaimed Henry VII, and a parliament called in his name in November 1485 confirmed his title and repealed the *titulus regius* of Richard II unread.<sup>23</sup> The marriage of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville was thus validated and their children legitimized, and therefore Henry married Elizabeth of York in January 1486. One of the papal bulls, confirming dispensation for the marriage, prohibited disturbances about the succession to the throne under pain of *ipso facto* excommunication and the greater anathema.<sup>24</sup> The bull strengthened Henry's claim to the throne, although many supported him because of his wife's.<sup>25</sup> If the claim of Elizabeth of York was legitimate, however, then so were the superior claims of her brothers Edward V and York, if they were still alive.

### **The Conspiracy in Favour of York**

Some people did not believe that Richard III had murdered Edward V and York in the Tower, and André linked rumours of the survival of the sons of Edward IV with what seems to have been a plot to impersonate York.<sup>26</sup> It has been suggested that André confused Lambert Simnel with Perkin Warbeck, a later alleged impersonator of York.<sup>27</sup> Bacon also linked the plot, however, with whisperings that at least one of Edward IV's sons was still living.<sup>28</sup> Even Polydore Vergil admitted, not indeed in his earliest narrative from the manuscript of 1512-13 but in printed texts from 1534 onwards, that it was rumoured that the boys had escaped abroad, and that the Oxford priest, Richard Simons, hoped that his pupil Lambert Simnel might imitate Warwick or one of Edward's sons.<sup>29</sup> André's version of the 1487 rebellion seems thus to have persisted after Vergil's first version was circulating, and could have influenced Vergil's revisions for later printed texts. It would therefore be unwise to dismiss a conspiracy surrounding one of the two supposedly murdered princes out of hand.

Because, unlike Warwick, the princes in the Tower apparently disappeared in late 1483 or early 1484, a conspiracy to imitate one of them could have begun in the reign of Richard III. This would provide a time-scale conveniently long enough to accommodate comfortably Bacon's account of Simnel's initial impersonation of York and a change to that of Warwick.<sup>30</sup> Knowing nothing of such a change, however, André merely said that seditious men put up a son of a baker or a shoemaker as the son of Edward IV, and did not mention Lambert, Simons, Oxford, nor an escape to Ireland, all found in Vergil.<sup>31</sup> Indeed André's pretender, like Molinet's Warwick, may have been in Ireland for some time.<sup>32</sup> André related that once the conspiracy had started, a rumour was circulated that Edward IV's second son had been crowned in Ireland. This chronicler only mentioned 'second son' in connection with this coronation, and the son was not actually named as York; elsewhere the pretender was simply dubbed Edward's son. Busch identified this coronation with that of May 1487, and therefore regarded André's statement as incorrect, but the crowning was only rumoured, and clearly did not happen so early in the conspiracy.<sup>33</sup>

André said that Henry VII sent various messengers across to Ireland, including a herald who failed to trap the pretender when he questioned him on his knowledge of the times of King Edward. The chronicler admitted that the boy was accepted as Edward's son, and that many died for this belief. Nevertheless André insisted that the Irish pretender was an impostor under instructions, but did not explain who in Ireland would have had the detailed knowledge of English court life necessary to deceive a herald. The failure of the herald's trap suggests that the pretender may have been genuine, and a detailed knowledge of the times of Edward IV may suggest he was an older boy or young man.<sup>34</sup>

Bacon confused the age of Warwick in 1483 with that of York, and York's age rather than Warwick's would suit his Lambert Simnel better. For his Lambert was about fifteen years old, which would have made him about a year older than York would have been in 1487. This calculation was perhaps the basis for A.F. Pollard's statement that Bacon gave Lambert's age as fifteen in 1487, but the mention of the lad's age at the beginning of Bacon's 1622 narrative of the rebellion might lead one to suppose that his Simnel was fifteen when the plot began in 1486 or even 1485.<sup>35</sup> Bacon's age for the

Irish pretender of sixteen or seventeen in 1487 would be consistent with Molinet's description of Warwick as being nearly full grown and in the flower of manhood. It also fits Vergil's mistaken age for Warwick of about fifteen at the time of Bosworth and this age, as Barrie Williams has pointed out, corresponded closely to that of Edward V, who was born in November 1470.<sup>36</sup> Edward V would also fit the older boy or young man suggested by André's narrative.

Why, then, did André's conspirators suborn their pretender to impersonate York rather than the deposed monarch himself, and why did they spread a false rumour that York had been crowned? It was not in their interest to do either, and André's evidence must therefore be looked at in a new way. A false rumour would benefit Henry VII and not the conspirators, and the English government would encourage it because a crowned pretender would discourage others, especially those with a better claim. The only better claimant than York, however, was Edward V.<sup>37</sup> The deposed monarch should therefore be added beside York and Warwick to the list of candidates for the Irish king.

### **The Start of the Conspiracy in favour of Warwick**

Molinet regarded the Irish claimant as truly Warwick, but this chronicler's mistake about the age of the earl, who was only twelve in 1487, tends to confirm the traditional imposture of Warwick related by Vergil and Bacon.<sup>38</sup> Both stated that the impostor Lambert Simnel was the pupil of Richard Simons, a priest at Oxford, and Bacon also agreed with André that the pretender was the son of a baker.<sup>39</sup> According to Bacon, Simons caused the lad to impersonate the second son of Edward IV (York), but changed his mind while the plot was in progress.<sup>40</sup> According to Vergil's earliest account, however, Simons made Lambert imitate Warwick, and then both mentor and pupil went to Ireland.<sup>41</sup> If there had been a previous impersonation of York, then following Vergil's chronology, it would have been confined to England. The imposture would therefore have probably been unknown to the Irish, and this could explain their mistaken support for Vergil's false Warwick. The chronicler did not make this telling point; on the contrary, he insisted that the Irish knew their pretender was an impostor.<sup>42</sup> By contrast, André's York or 'son of Edward IV' was already in Ireland, and therefore a change to the false Warwick would have had to occur there. Consequently the Irish could have known that this Warwick was an impostor, and this would reduce the chances of a successful change of imposture from a son of Edward IV to Warwick, if indeed such a change was made.

Why should any new impersonation have been thought necessary? A false imitation of York would be more likely to succeed than one of Warwick. Since Richard III's supplanter, Henry VII, singularly failed to find any convincing evidence that his dead predecessor had murdered his nephews the little princes in the Tower of London, he could not refute the candidature of York or of Edward V, whether impersonated or real. The story of changed imposture is not found in Vergil's original narrative where, after Warwick had been brought from Sheriff Hutton, it was rumoured that he had been murdered in the Tower.<sup>43</sup> This rumour prompted Richard Simons to adopt the impersonation of Warwick for Lambert Simnel, and to claim in Ireland that he had saved the earl from death. Neither the rumour of his murder nor of his escape from the Tower, however, is sufficient reason for counterfeiting Warwick. The rebels would have no way of proving if either rumour were true. For the impersonation of Warwick to succeed, they would need to have proof that the earl was either dead or had both escaped and then disappeared. Yet there were apparently rumours in the summer and autumn of 1486 that Warwick, or at least a son of the duke of Clarence, was out of England. In these circumstances an impersonation of Warwick would be difficult, unless of course the Irish pretender really was a son of Clarence.<sup>44</sup>

Vergil said that Lambert Simnel's imposture based on Warwick was the work of one corrupt priest, but it is hard to imagine how the 'lowborn' priest, Simons, could have possibly taught the 'ignoble' Lambert the necessary courtly manners at all.<sup>45</sup> The account in the late sixteenth-century *Book of Howth*, of how the priest prepared his pupil for the role of Warwick, has been dismissed as 'probably quite fanciful'.<sup>46</sup> Vergil wrote that Henry VII was disturbed to hear that the conspiracy was merely the work of a single priest, and later commentators have tended to disbelieve that Simons had no outside help in the plot.<sup>47</sup> Bacon, who considered Simons's enterprise 'scarcely credible', tried to make the plot more plausible by hinting at the collusion of Elizabeth Woodville, the queen dowager.<sup>48</sup>

Barrie Williams has suggested that the fifteen year-old Edward murdered in the Tower was Edward V, and that this murder led the queen dowager and fellow Yorkists to support Warwick for the crown against Henry VII. Perhaps some support for this view can be found in Vergil's stylistic distinction between the captive at Sheriff Hutton as the earl of Warwick and the pretender as the duke of Clarence's son.<sup>49</sup> Williams has provided a rational motive for the collusion of Elizabeth Woodville in favour of Warwick, but this would pre-empt support for her sons, one of whom was still alive, if the rumour from Ireland related by André was true. The dowager would also have been more use in an imposture of one of her sons rather than of Warwick.

### **The Council at Sheen**

The evidence so far examined would seem to imply that the pretender in Dublin was not a false Warwick (Vergil and Bacon), but a son of Edward IV (André) whether real or impersonated. The evidence for the pretender being truly Warwick (Molinet) is perhaps doubtful. In a letter to Sir Richard Plumpton dated 29 November 1486, Thomas Betanson wrote that little had been heard about Warwick, but that it was said that more would be heard of him after Christmas.<sup>50</sup> The letter made no mention of any murder or escape of Warwick, nor of any conspiracy surrounding him, and the hint that the government might be ready to use the young earl is supported by the issuing about this time of writs summoning Henry VII's council and the convocations to meet the following February.<sup>51</sup> Henry's council then met at Sheen, and according to Vergil three important decisions were taken: the proclamation of a general pardon, the exhibition of Warwick, and the confiscation of Elizabeth Woodville's property.<sup>52</sup>

### **The Exhibition of Warwick**

Henry VII's proclamation 'pardoned and excused from punishment all who were accused of treason or any other crimes', and was designed to prevent the Irish rebellion spreading. Messengers from Ireland had already been sent to known supporters of Richard III, 'to implore them to remain loyal and decide upon supporting the boy', and to Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy.<sup>53</sup> Margaret, sister of Richard III and Edward IV, and hence aunt to Warwick and the princes in the Tower, had lately been joined by Francis Lord Lovell, one of Richard's chief supporters. Henry's proclamation was aimed at winning over Sir Thomas Broughton of Furness Fells and others, but it was unsuccessful because they joined Lovell in Flanders.<sup>54</sup> That 'he himself was with Lord Lovell in Furness fells' was part of the confession of a twenty-eight year old priest William Simmons before the convocation of Canterbury in St Paul's cathedral in London on 17 February 1487. Previously 'he himself abducted and carried across to places in Ireland the son of a certain organ-maker of the university of Oxford; and this boy was there reputed to be the earl of Warwick'.<sup>55</sup>

This confession could be regarded as corroborated by the subsequent public showing of Warwick, also at St Paul's, as described in Vergil. Edward, the duke of Clarence's son, was publicly led from the Tower of London to the cathedral. After the service there, the boy 'spoke with many important people, and especially with those of whom the king was suspicious, so that they might the more readily understand that the Irish had based their new rebellion on an empty and spurious cause'.<sup>56</sup> The exhibition in St Paul's was probably too high a risk for Henry VII if the boy seen there were not Warwick, and this suggests that the king's prisoner was genuinely Warwick. The city of Oxford, mentioned in Simons's confession, was connected with alleged conspirators. The university protected Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, who was arrested in March 1487 and kept in custody for life.<sup>57</sup> Oxford was also close to Ewelme, the family seat of Richard III's heir Lincoln who, after the exhibition of Warwick, fled to Flanders to join Margaret of Burgundy.<sup>58</sup>

Henry VII's government probably thought that, by Simons's confession and Warwick's exposure, it had proved that the real earl was in London and a fake one in Dublin, but the proof is not wholly convincing. Simons's confession rested on known facts (the treason of Lovell and Furness Fells) or ones which could not be checked practically (the organ-maker), and it is odd that Simmons did not divulge the name of his impostor nor of the impostor's father. The escape to Ireland and the acknowledgement of the pseudo-Warwick look like what the English government wanted people to believe, and Bennett, who realised its importance, treated the confession with considerable scepticism.<sup>59</sup> Furthermore, despite Bacon's assertion that the earl was brought up in a court where infinite eyes were upon him, Warwick had probably been kept from public gaze. The boy would therefore not be easily recognised by those at St Paul's, and they might have acknowledged him out of expediency. He might be said to have failed to impress Lincoln, who was the lord who knew Warwick best.<sup>60</sup>

This exhibition of Warwick has been questioned by Barrie Williams because it is only found in Vergil. The chronicler may have confused it with a later joint showing of Warwick and Simnel, for which there is contemporary evidence. Given Henry VII's gift for propaganda, however, two exhibitions cannot be ruled out.<sup>61</sup> Leland mentioned a rumour that Lincoln noised abroad that he knew Warwick should be in Ireland, but it could be difficult to decide whether the rumour was true.<sup>62</sup> The real Warwick may have escaped, according to rumour, but the Dublin pretender seemed to be five years older than the earl. Williams remarked that people in high places may have forgotten how young the earl was, but this remark could hardly apply to Lincoln or to Margaret of Burgundy, who would have known Warwick well enough to know his real age.<sup>63</sup> The connection of Oxford with the alleged conspirators is not conclusive evidence in

favour of Simons' s confession. The city also had links with Henry VII's close adviser, Archbishop John Morton, who presided over the meeting of convocation before which the priest appeared, and who could have rigged Simons's confession.<sup>64</sup>

None of the arguments against the exhibition of the real Warwick in London seems conclusive. But does this mean that the pretender in Dublin was a fake, as claimed in Simons's confession? The arguments for and against the true Warwick being held by Henry VII presuppose Bennett's position that in 'the spring of 1487 there were two boys claiming to be the earl of Warwick, one in London and one in Dublin', and either one could have been the puppet. This presupposition rests on the English government's assertion that the Dublin pretender claimed to be Warwick, whereas the pretender himself might not have been making any such claim.<sup>65</sup> The need of the English government to convince people how the Irish had adopted a false Warwick could explain the unlikely story of the start of the conspiracy in favour of a pseudo-Warwick, the stories of Warwick's murder or escape, the rumour about Lincoln, and Simons's inadequate confession. No-one previously seems to have argued that the existence of the genuine Warwick in London does not preclude the Irish pretender from being a son of Edward IV. It had been apparently the revelations of Stillington in June 1483 which resulted in the marriage of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville being declared invalid.<sup>66</sup> This bishop could therefore have been arrested by Henry VII at this time because he had some knowledge of Edward IV's sons, in the same way as their mother was deprived of her property and immured in Bermondsey Abbey.

### **The Deprivation of Elizabeth Woodville**

Polydore Vergil gave the former queen's surrender of herself and her daughters to Richard III as the reason for her deprivation under Henry VII, but it is hard to demur from the view of commentators that this reason is incredible.<sup>67</sup> Consequently some have proposed that the dowager was not deprived at all, but that she retired voluntarily to Bermondsey, and her reasonable relations with her son-in-law are reflected in the language of the grants she received.<sup>68</sup> In terms of hard cash, nonetheless, Elizabeth Woodville fared worse under Henry VII than she did under her supposed arch-enemy Richard III, and her will implies that she died in penury.<sup>69</sup> The notion of the dowager's voluntary retirement is contrary to Vergil and Bacon, and these historians seem vindicated by Henry VII's grant of all of her property to her daughter Elizabeth of York, the king's own wife. His mother-in-law's property passed first into the king's hands 'by thadvise of the lords and other nobles of our counsaill for divers consideracions vs and theym moeuyng'. If the dowager merely wished to relinquish her property on retirement, why should the king not say so, and why should he need the council's advice at all?<sup>70</sup>

Since the king's council had just met at Sheen, Vergil's statement that Elizabeth Woodville had been deprived there seems justified. Apparently no-one has previously considered that Vergil's statement about her agreement with Richard III may have disguised the real reason for her deprivation. In the delivery of York to Richard in June 1483 and her failure to prevent the seizure of Edward V in the previous April, the dowager could be said to have surrendered her sons also. The surrender of her sons rather than her daughters would be relevant to the events at Sheen if she had supported one of these princes against Henry VII.<sup>71</sup>

The suggestion that Elizabeth Woodville knew that at least one of her sons was alive, and was confined by the king to prevent her divulging this secret, has been rejected by her biographer David MacGibbon. He argued that Henry VII would not in this case have concluded the treaty of November 1487 with Scotland, under which the dowager was to marry James III. The treaty was never fulfilled, however, and MacGibbon' s argument is considerably weakened by the admission that the marriage 'had already been agreed to by a clause in the Three Years Truce signed on July 3rd 1486'<sup>72</sup> This date was before the dowager could have been accused of any involvement in the Irish conspiracy, and changing the marriage clause later might not have been feasible.

Henry VII's suspicion of Elizabeth Woodville extended to her son Dorset. When after Sheen the marquess supposedly tried to bring his forces to join the king in East Anglia, Henry ordered his arrest by the earl of Oxford. In later editions of his *Anglica Historia*, Vergil gave as Henry's reason for the arrest that, if the marquess was as loyal as he claimed, Dorset would not object to being imprisoned for the duration of the rebellion.<sup>73</sup> The detention of both the dowager and the marquess recalls their *rapprochement* with Richard III, which Vergil' s excuse for the dowager's deprivation also highlights. The consistency in the behaviour of Elizabeth Woodville and Dorset, mother and stepbrother to the little princes, seems to suggest that they believed in the survival of at least one of Edward IV's sons, and that therefore Henry VII had good reason to distrust both of them.<sup>74</sup> It seems possible, then, that the Dublin pretender was claiming to be Edward V or York, rather than Warwick.

### From Sheen to Stoke

Henry VII's claim to hold the true Warwick rests on the assumption that two pretenders claimed to be Warwick, one in Dublin and one in London, and consequently the evidence of Simons's confession and the exhibition in St Paul's seems important. On the other hand, the London Warwick might be genuine or fraudulent if the Dublin pretender were not claiming to be the earl but a son of Edward IV, and therefore the evidence of the silencing of Elizabeth Woodville and Dorset appears more relevant. Bennett, who believed that there were two Warwick claimants, noted nevertheless that from intelligence reported to Henry VII after Sheen, which said nothing about the aims of Lincoln or the pretender, there may have been 'an alternative scheme, based on the impersonation of one of Edward IV's sons'. If there were two Irish pretenders in the spring of 1487, then it is incredible that the English government failed to ridicule the rebellion. Such a scheme would imply that Bacon's switch of imposture occurred very late in the conspiracy, and because of Sheen it is unlikely that the conspirators would have chosen the imposture of Warwick.<sup>75</sup>

The evidence, then, suggests a seemingly impossible conclusion: the pretender in London was Warwick, the one in Dublin claimed to be a son of Edward IV. If this conclusion is correct, then the confession of Simons and the exhibition of Warwick apparently lack any motive, unless it was to counter rumours from the Irish rebels with confusion. The confusion of Edward V and Warwick noted by Barrie Williams seems relevant in this context; Henry VII was using the young earl not because he was Warwick, but because he was called Edward. The confusion of the two Edwards is novel in the context of Sheen, but it could explain what was really happening at the council and afterwards. If the English government had previously circulated the rumour that the Dublin pretender was Richard, Duke of York, when he was in fact the deposed monarch, then there was a serious pressing motive for calling the council at Sheen. The government would be forced to change the pretender's name from Richard to Edward, and therefore would insist that the pretender was now claiming to be Warwick. The identity of the Irish claimant as Edward V can thus be used to explain the major events surrounding Sheen, whether favouring Warwick or a son of Edward IV.

That the Dublin pretender was a child of Edward IV was certainly believed by Margaret of Burgundy, according to André, and she sent letters to the pretender calling him to her, and he obeyed. This visit is not confirmed by other sources but after Sheen Henry VII was clearly expecting trouble from Margaret, and so patrolled East Anglia and had Dorset arrested.<sup>76</sup> The threat to the east coast did not materialise, however, as Lincoln and Lovell crossed to Ireland with an army of about two thousand German mercenaries under Martin Schwartz. According to Molinet, Schwartz and his company arrived to find the 'duke of Clarence' with Lincoln, Kildare, the deputy in Ireland, and the Irish nobles.<sup>77</sup> Vergil insisted that Molinet's duke was Lambert Simnel, 'whom falsely (as they very well knew) they called the duke of Clarence's son'. The lad was crowned, with the agreement of all the people by two archbishops and twelve bishops according to Molinet, in Dublin cathedral on Ascension Day, 24 May 1487, a parliament met at Drogheda, and coinage was minted.<sup>78</sup>

The rebel forces were augmented by the Irish under Thomas FitzGerald, and both Molinet and Vergil concur that the pretender's army landed in north Lancashire close to Furness Fells on 4 June. Molinet described the rebel force's crossing of the Pennines into Yorkshire.<sup>79</sup> André's narrative, on the other hand, gives the impression that the army reached the north coast direct from Flanders, but a section of the narrative dealing with the return to Ireland and the coronation may have been omitted by the chronicler or his amanuensis. André referred to the pretender as 'that miserable kinglet crowned, as I have said, in Dublin', whereas previously his narrative had only mentioned the rumour of a coronation early in the conspiracy.<sup>80</sup>

Few joined Lincoln and the rebel army in their progress through Yorkshire, despite both the Irish and the Germans announcing, according to Vergil, that 'they had come to restore the boy Edward, recently crowned in Ireland, to the kingdom'. 'Restore' would seem to suggest Edward V as the Irish king rather than Warwick.<sup>81</sup> The rebel army had reached Masham by 8 June, for on that day the city of York received a letter from the pretender, whom the civic records called 'king Edward the sixth', requesting that the city should open its gates. The records tell of an unsuccessful assault on the city gates in the name of king Edward by Lord Scrope of Masham and his relation, Lord Scrope of Bolton. According to Molinet, however, the rebels pushed back the forces of Sir Edward Woodville, Lord Scales, and after rumours about the retreat of Henry VII's vanguard, the city of York declared for the Irish king, and in London houses of Henry's supporters were ransacked.<sup>82</sup> Molinet's uneven account is not always corroborated, but it does reflect the confusion which preceded the battle of Stoke. Henry VII's actions, if anything, added to the confusion. The king had previously issued a proclamation against rumour-mongers, but although these people were punished, their rumours were not denied or corrected by proclamation. The uncertainty was such that the king's camp was beset by spies, tumults and desertions. Despite this, the Stoke campaign was apparently fought without any denunciations of the

impostor Lambert Simnel and his treasonable imitation of Edward, Earl of Warwick.<sup>83</sup>

When battle was joined in the fields around the village of East Stoke, near Newark upon Trent in Nottinghamshire, on 16 June 1487, superior numbers triumphed, and possibly only the royal vanguard under the earl of Oxford engaged with the rebels.<sup>84</sup> Vergil recorded Lincoln, Lovell, Broughton, Schwartz and FitzGerald as slain, whereas Molinet mentioned the deaths of Lincoln and Schwartz; perhaps Lovell and Broughton escaped.<sup>85</sup> According to Molinet only 200 of the rebel army escaped, of whom the Irish and English captured in the following two days were hanged, and only the foreigners dismissed.<sup>86</sup>

All of our four chroniclers recorded the capture of the rebel king. Molinet styled him 'King Edward', but André called him a good-for-nothing fellow. Both Vergil and Bacon recorded the capture of Lambert Simnel and his mentor, Richard Simons, and the capture at least of the pupil seems confirmed by Leland's transcription of the contemporary battle herald's account.<sup>87</sup> From Molinet's narrative one must assume, despite evidence to the contrary, that Henry VII only imprisoned Warwick permanently after the battle of Stoke. Other continental sources suggested that Warwick had escaped or was killed.<sup>88</sup>

The silence surrounding the rebel cause apparently persisted after the battle. According to André the rebel king confessed that he had been forced into becoming an impostor by 'certain men of his own shameless sort', and that his family and parents were common 'and in lowly occupations, unworthy of being inserted in this history'. André had forgotten that he himself had already said that the boy's father was a baker or shoemaker, and the meagreness of the supposed confession showed that André had discovered little or nothing about the boy.<sup>89</sup> Vergil noted that the false king Lambert and his mentor, Richard, were granted their lives; the boy was too young to have committed any offence, and his mentor was a priest.<sup>90</sup> Bacon opined that Henry VII did not take the boy's life because 'if he suffered death he would be forgotten too soon, but being kept alive he would be a continual spectacle and a kind of remedy against the like enchantments of people in time to come'. The priest was 'heard of no more, the king loving to seal up his own dangers'.<sup>91</sup> Vergil claimed that the king had commanded during the battle of Stoke that Lincoln should be captured alive, so that Henry might learn more about the conspiracy. The king failed to punish those who killed Lincoln, however, and apparently did not interrogate anyone else who could have told him about the plot. Vergil's claim therefore seems unlikely, and may be regarded as reinforcing the silence elsewhere, inasmuch as the claim sounds rather like a feeble excuse for the inability of the king clearly to identify the enemy whose defeat had occasioned so much slaughter.<sup>92</sup>

### **The Act of Attainder after Stoke**

Henry VII failed to conduct a public investigation into the rebellion after the battle of Stoke, presumably because of the pardon of Lambert and Simons mentioned by Vergil. Parliament meeting in November 1487 described the false pretender as Lambert Simnel, a child of ten years of age, son of Thomas Simnel, late of Oxford, joiner. This description squared with Simons's confession of the previous February to the extent that the impostor came from Oxford, but the occupation of joiner is more common than that of organ-builder. What was new in original English official sources was the impostor's name, his age, and the name of his father.<sup>93</sup>

The surname of Simnel seems otherwise unknown before this time in England or abroad, but echoes the surnames of Simons, the impostor's mentor, and of Fitzsimons, the archbishop who crowned the boy.<sup>94</sup> 'Simnel' means light grain, and simnel cakes were eaten during Lent. Hence, André's occupation of baker for the impostor's father might be seen as a corroboration of the surname.<sup>95</sup> Lambert was a very rare Christian name in England. St Lambert was buried at Liege, an area well known for the making of organs close to Burgundy. The name Lambert could thus be linked to the occupation of the impostor's father, and to the Duchess Margaret.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand, Bennett pointed out that the maiden name of Edward IV's mistress Elizabeth Shore, better known as Jane Shore, was Elizabeth Lambert. A new interpretation of the name Lambert could therefore be that it was a reference to a bastard of that king and Jane.<sup>97</sup> Henry VII left Sheen early in Lent after the council there, and a Lenten pretender (Simnel) who was Edward IV's bastard (Lambert) might have been Henry's explanation for the continuing rumour that the Dublin claimant was the Yorkist king's son. Hence 'Lambert Simnel' might have been a pseudonym used not by the conspirators, as Bennett thought, but by the English government, and the pseudonym may have been retained for consistency in the act of attainder.<sup>98</sup>

If 'Lambert Simnel' was a nickname, then there can be no certainty about the name of the father who, being dead or not traced ('late of Oxford'), could not vouch for his own name and occupation, nor for the name of his supposed son. The occupations attributed to the father are so diverse that the impersonator is sometimes described as the son of an Oxford tradesman.<sup>99</sup> Moreover, the boy's parentage must be regarded as doubtful when Henry VII seems to have told the pope after the battle of Stoke that the boy was illegitimate.<sup>100</sup> Although Polydore Vergil adopted the name of Lambert Simnel

and used it throughout his narrative of the rebellion, he did not follow the act of attainder in giving either the name or occupation of the father, or the son's specific age at the passing of the act.<sup>101</sup>

None of our four chroniclers assumed, as did the attainder, that Lambert was as young as ten, although this agrees with Vergil's statement that the impostor was spared because he was too young to have committed any offence. It would also be difficult to make the boy more than ten if the English government had previously been trying to insinuate that the Dublin pretender was a bastard of Edward IV and Elizabeth Shore, since the annulment of her marriage on the grounds of her husband's impotence occurred as late as 1476.<sup>102</sup> The four chroniclers suggest an age for the pretender of around seventeen at the time of Stoke, and Vergil later changed 'boy' to 'adolescent' in several places in his text.<sup>103</sup> Adolescence normally covers the ages of thirteen to eighteen, and if 'boy' is synonymous with 'adolescent' as Vergil's change implies, the boy Lambert should not have been less than thirteen. The description could be applied to a lad of sixteen or seventeen, but hardly to the ten-year-old specified in the act of attainder.<sup>104</sup> With some latitude 'adolescent' might fit the real Warwick, who was twelve in 1487. Pollard assumed that Lambert was born in 1475 from his impersonation of Warwick, who was born then. It is a plausible inference that an impostor should be the same age as the person being imitated, but none of the early sources confirm that Lambert was twelve at the time of Stoke.<sup>105</sup>

### **The Real Impostor?**

Whatever its shortcomings, however, the truth of the attainder seems supported by the later existence of a person claiming to be Lambert Simnel, the king from Dublin. He survived as turnspit and later falconer to Henry VII and Sir Thomas Lovell, and his survival had the persuasive propaganda value hinted at by Bacon. Vergil said the impostor was still alive when he wrote, a statement which, even if restricted to Vergil's first text, implied that Lambert Simnel survived until about 1513. A 'Lambert Symnell, yeoman' attended the funeral of Sir Thomas Lovell in May 1525, so Vergil's statement is probably correct for his printed edition of 1534, and a Richard Symnell, canon of St Osith's in Essex in 1539, could have been Lambert's son.<sup>106</sup> The death of Lambert is not recorded, but the survival of a supposed traitor until the age of fifty is unusual, especially when compared with the executions of other alleged impostors under Henry VII like Ralph Wilford (or Wulford) and Perkin Warbeck, or of the probably genuine Warwick, or even of the real pretender Suffolk.<sup>107</sup>

If the impostor survived the battle of Stoke, however, a consistent story would need to be told to fill the silence left by the death or disappearance of the conspirators, and by the lack of any public investigation. The varying narratives of Molinet, André and Vergil suggest there was no such consistency and, indeed, the new facts about the impostor's name, age and parentage in the act of attainder added to the confusion. A. F. Pollard sought to excuse this confusion surrounding Lambert by saying that 'the discrepancy between the various accounts suggests that the government and the chroniclers alike were ignorant of his real origin'.<sup>108</sup> But the excuse is a nonsense. An impostor calling himself Lambert Simnel was resident at Henry VII's court, to which both André and Vergil had access.<sup>109</sup> If the government and these chroniclers wished to discover the impostor's origin, then surely all they would have had to do was ask him. André's story of the impostor's confession after Stoke rather suggests that the lad confessed to anything the English government asked of him.<sup>110</sup>

However unsatisfactory the statements of Lambert may have been, the English government should have been able to use the confession of the impostor's captured mentor Simons. A puzzling problem first raised by Bennett, however, needs to be solved beforehand: how could Simons have been captured at the battle of Stoke, when he had already made his confession in captivity some four months previously? Bennett has suggested that there were two Simons brothers, both priests, the one William who was captured and confessed at the time of Sheen, and the other Richard who was taken at Stoke. No source supports this view, which contradicts Vergil's insistence that the Irish plot was the work of one priest. No Simons was mentioned in the attainder, and both William and Richard disappeared for ever.<sup>111</sup>

The problems about the mentor priest must raise the question of whether he was ever at the battle of Stoke, and if he was there, of whether he survived the battle. Indeed, the wholesale slaughter at Stoke related by Molinet and hinted at by Vergil would make the survival of either the pretender or Simons seem unlikely.<sup>112</sup> Furthermore, the age of the pretender according to the chroniclers would have been sixteen or seventeen before the battle, but according to the attainder only ten after it. No-one has previously highlighted this discrepancy. The impossibility of losing six or seven years in the course of a battle implies that the pretender before Stoke was a different person from the court impostor after it. Consequently there is no convincing evidence that Lambert Simnel was the king from Dublin, although the Lambert at the court of Henry VII was clearly an impostor. The replacement of the Irish pretender

presumably killed at Stoke could have been managed by the English government, and this would explain not only the impostor's survival and his propagandist value, but also the failure to provide a consistent account of the 1487 conspiracy. The imposture was created by Henry VII.<sup>113</sup>

### **Bellingham and the Irish**

This argument in favour of a government impostor leaves open the question of the identity of the Irish pretender, although the Tudor imposture might suggest that the pretender had been genuine and, from the evidence given above, could have been a son of Edward IV, probably the elder, rather than Warwick. If the Dublin king perished at Stoke, then the court impostor must have been substituted after the battle. This battlefield substitution seems to be contradicted by the evidence of the boy's captors, and of the well-known banquet of Lambert Simnel with the Irish. The capture of Lambert was first described in the almost contemporary herald's report of Stoke transcribed by Leland, which does not mention the capture of Simons. The boy's name also was not given as Lambert. In his examination of the original manuscript, Bennett found that the herald had written, 'And there was taken the lad the rebels call King Edward, whose name was indeed John, by a valiant and gentle squire of the king's house, called Robert Bellingham'. A 'King Edward' impersonated by a John seems to be a spontaneous invention recorded shortly afterwards. It would explain why the battle herald failed to record any later confession that the captured boy claimed he was the Dublin pretender, and his name was really Lambert. It also tends to confirm the government use of 'Lambert Simnel' as a pseudonym, but probably means that a real person bearing that name never existed.<sup>114</sup> Furthermore, as a member of the king's household, the boy's supposed captor Bellingham would have been in an ideal position to make a battlefield substitution without being challenged. A few weeks after Stoke, on 2 September 1487, Robert Bellingham abducted the heiress Margery Beaufitz and, although imprisoned for a while, later climbed in Henry VII's favour. The squire's escapade looks suspiciously like seizing his own reward for an action which made the king indebted to him. Providing Henry with a stooge rebel king is a possibility.<sup>115</sup>

Some years after Stoke, when Henry VII gave audience to the earl of Kildare and the other Irish lords, he derided them with 'My masters of Ireland, you will crown apes at length'.<sup>116</sup> One day when the visitors were dining, they were told that their 'new King Lambarte Symenell brought them wine to drink, and drank to them all'. No Irish lord rose to the challenge except the Lord of Howth. He was a merry gentleman who could appreciate the joke, because he had never acknowledged Lambert's imposture. He accepted the challenge, and drank for the wine's sake, declaring that Lambert Simnel was a poor innocent.<sup>117</sup>

If Howth had never been a party to the impersonation, however, he had probably not met Lambert, and would therefore have been in no position to identify the boy serving wine as the king from Dublin. Howth is said to have prided himself on being an informant for Henry VII, to whom he could claim to be related. The king confirmed his lordship of Howth and gave him a large sum of money. Consequently it was perhaps collusion and bribery which induced the merry lord to play-act, in what seems to have been the deliberately staged scene of the banquet, and to acknowledge Lambert as the Dublin king, even if he knew such an acknowledgement was untrue.<sup>118</sup> The other Irish lords needed to be informed in advance that the serving boy would be Lambert, and such information seems to presuppose that they might not have realised that he had been the lad they had crowned in Dublin. Henry VII's jest about crowning apes may really have been a threat to force the Irish to acknowledge falsely that his ape Lambert was their king. Possibly the Irish, except for Howth, were prepared to remain silent over the identity of the Dublin claimant, but balked at the perjury of identifying him with Simnel.<sup>119</sup>

The name 'Lambert Simnel' also seems to have been little known even among the Irish loyal to Henry VII. The annulment of the acts of the rebel parliament of 1487, enacted at Drogheda in 1494, referred to the claimant merely as a 'ladde'. Similarly a petition by Thomas Butler to the Irish parliament of 1496 called the Dublin king an unknown lad, not Lambert Simnel. The evidence derived from sources close to the Butlers and other opponents of the 1487 rebellion seem to make the Irish king younger than the ten-year-old Lambert in the attainder of November 1487. This doubtful Irish evidence fails to compensate for the lack of official records, since the 1494 parliament successfully ordered the complete destruction of all records of the rebel assembly at Drogheda in 1487 on pain of treason. The retention of some records naming the Irish king as the earl of Warwick would have been helpful to Henry VII. The failure to retain any records at all suggests that the Dublin pretender did not claim to be the earl, and that Henry's allegation that the pretender was a false Warwick could only succeed in silence enforced by fears of trials for treason.<sup>120</sup>

This enforced silence was helped by the co-operation of the pope after Henry VII's complaints about the conduct of the Irish bishops in the 1487 rebellion. A bull forbade any Irish rebellion against Henry on pain of excommunication.<sup>121</sup> Contemporary Irish sources are scant. The 'son of the duke of

York' who occurs in the *Annals of Ulster* would best fit Edward V, since he is described as a young man and in exile.<sup>122</sup> Coinage issued during the rebellion simply called the Irish king *Edwardvs*.<sup>123</sup> *Edwardus* is found in a patent witnessed by Kildare as that king's Lieutenant. If he was known as Edward, the identity of the Irish king as Richard, Duke of York, would be ruled out. The patent is dated 13 August 'in the first year of our reign' and its seal appears to be that of Edward V. The most unforced interpretation of the evidence of the patent would seem to be that it was issued under Edward V in 1486.<sup>124</sup> The addition of 'the sixth' to 'Edward' in the York civic records is apparently not found in Ireland. There seems to be no extant contemporary Irish evidence, therefore, for 'Edward VI' (Warwick or pseudo-Warwick), and Irish evidence on its own, though favouring Edward V, is inconclusive as to the positive identification of the king from Dublin. Ironically in this situation the pretender's identity claimed by the English government needs some corroboration from the conspirators, who were scattered or dead after the battle of Stoke.<sup>125</sup>

### **Margaret of Burgundy**

The single major conspirator known not to have come to terms with Henry VII at this time was Margaret of Burgundy. She supported not only the alleged imposture of Lambert Simnel, but also later that of Perkin Warbeck. In 1493 Henry sent his envoys, Sir Edward Poyning and Dr William Warham, to her to protest about Perkin, and in the pretender's presence Warham, later archbishop of Canterbury, taxed the childless Margaret with having given birth to two princes aged 180 months, which is exactly fifteen years old.<sup>126</sup>

Warham's insult was said to have been directed against Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, and the jibe about giving birth suggests that both the alleged impostors were fifteen when Margaret could first have recognised them. Perkin impersonated York, who would have been exactly fifteen in August 1488, but there is no clear evidence at present that Margaret acknowledged this pretender so early.<sup>127</sup> This would seem to imply that it was the king from Dublin (allegedly Lambert Simnel) who was exactly fifteen when Margaret recognised him. Previously the identity of Margaret's claimant has been unknown, and Molinet, André, and Vergil each stated that the duchess had recognised his candidate (Warwick, pseudo-York, pseudo-Warwick) as the Dublin pretender.<sup>128</sup> In contrast to the chroniclers, does Warham's remark about his age reveal the identity of Margaret's claimant?

As mentioned above, the *titulus regius* of Richard III excluded from the throne the children of Edward IV through illegitimacy, and Warwick because of his father's attainder. From the time of the repeal of the *titulus* in November 1485, therefore, Margaret could have recognised the claims of Edward's sons, and of Warwick, and her claimant would then have been fifteen. The earl of Warwick was not fifteen until February 1490. Richard, Duke of York would have only been twelve in November 1485, and August 1488 when he was exactly fifteen was over a year after the battle of Stoke. Moreover, if she had backed the Dublin pretender as York, Margaret would have recognised two Yorks in this pretender and Perkin, and Warham could hardly have failed to deride such a double imposture. Warham's insult fails to fit either Warwick or York, the prime candidates for the Dublin pretender. There was, nevertheless, a son of Edward IV who, being born in November 1470, was exactly fifteen in November 1485 - he was Edward V.<sup>129</sup>

### **The Real Pretender Transformed?**

The king from Dublin, then, was not Lambert Simnel, but could have been Edward V. This possibility has not been canvassed before, and is disturbing. It is consistent, nevertheless, with the examination, with as few preconceptions as possible, of the 1487 rebellion. The conspiracy in favour of York could have been in favour of either of Edward IV's sons, and a false rumour about York's coronation could have been spread to stop Edward V. Upon examination the story of a conspiracy in favour of Warwick was found to be unlikely, but Henry VII certainly wanted such a story believed from the evidence of the council at Sheen. Henry's exhibition of Edward, Earl of Warwick, and Simons's confession have to be set against Henry's deprivation of Elizabeth Woodville for perhaps supporting one of her sons. The conflicting evidence surrounding Sheen can be resolved if the Dublin pretender was one of Edward IV's sons whose name was Edward; that is, Edward V. An attempt to bastardize a son of Edward IV as the Irish pretender could be the derivation of the name 'Lambert Simnel'. The silence of the English government between Sheen and Stoke, the conflicting evidence from the battle and the attainder, and Henry VII's efforts to induce the Irish to recognize Lambert, have to be set against Irish evidence which could favour Edward V. Warham's coded insult against Margaret of Burgundy seems to suggest she supported the deposed monarch.

An obvious argument against the possibility of the king from Dublin being Edward V is that the former king was not one of the candidates of the four chroniclers: pseudo-Warwick (Vergil, Bacon),

pseudo-York (André), or Warwick (Molinet), One is tempted, therefore, to fall back on the traditional story derived from Vergil, and to judge with Busch that Molinet's account was poetical and imaginative, André was more interested in rhetoric than history, and Bacon was derivative and untrustworthy.<sup>130</sup> Even if true, however, such judgements do not explain adequately why there are three different candidates as the Irish pretender. Moreover, attempts to reconstruct the events of the 1487 rebellion as if the pretender were one of these three candidates run into difficulties. In the case of the pseudo-Warwick of Vergil and Bacon, the difficulties include the initial adoption of the candidate, the motive behind the exhibition of Warwick, and the seemingly considerable errors of Vergil, possibly compounded by Bacon.<sup>131</sup> Molinet's genuine Warwick presents problems about the time of his escape, his wrong age, and his recapture at Stoke.<sup>132</sup> André's pseudo-York seems only supported specifically by a false rumour about his coronation, but there is evidence to support the Dublin pretender being a son of Edward IV.<sup>133</sup>

If Edward V was the king from Dublin, on the other hand, how could it happen that his candidature has not survived? To answer this question, the events of the 1487 rebellion have to be reconstructed as if the Irish pretender were the deposed monarch, Faced with André's rumour about a son of Edward IV, the government of Henry VII spread a counter-rumour of a crowned York to discourage support for Edward V.<sup>134</sup> The counter-rumour was bound to fail when the rebellion became serious, and the name of the pretender had to be acknowledged as Edward and not Richard (York). At least by the time of Sheen the government changed the name to Edward, but by the ruse of declaring that the pretender was now claiming to be Warwick, whom Henry VII conveniently held in prison. The ruse of the two Edwards (Edward V in Ireland and Edward, Earl of Warwick, in London) could have fooled Molinet into believing that the Edward in Ireland was truly Warwick.<sup>135</sup> Thus the identity of the Irish pretender was diverted early on by Henry VII to York and Warwick, although his real identity can still be recognised as a son of Edward IV (André) whose name was Edward (Molinet); that is, Edward V.

Sheen established the English government position that the Irish claimant was pseudo-Warwick, and in the light of that position rumour-mongers, and those like Elizabeth Woodville who knew otherwise, had to be dealt with, but without revealing the true identity of the pretender.<sup>136</sup> Pseudo-Warwick had to survive the battle of Stoke, and therefore Henry VII needed to eliminate the pretender and his English and Irish support in the battle, and then substitute his own impostor to continue the government story.<sup>137</sup> Survival of an impostor at Henry's court after Stoke has nearly always been regarded as conclusive evidence that the Irish king survived the battle, and was proved to be a fraud.<sup>138</sup> Yet at the time, apart from the doubtful confession in André and the acknowledgement of Howth, it seems no former rebel could be induced to support evidence for an Irish imposture and Henry's impostor Lambert Simnel.<sup>139</sup>

Henry VII may well have feared exposure if he pressed the claims of his impostor too rigorously, and the name of Lambert Simnel, perhaps originally a codename for Edward V, seems to have disappeared for a number of years.<sup>140</sup> Although all known evidence of their king was being destroyed, the Irish failed to adopt Lambert. Warham's insult about Margaret of Burgundy giving birth to fifteen-year-olds could have been used successfully in place of mentioning Lambert.<sup>141</sup> The failure of Henry VII to suppress oral as well as written evidence is reflected in the survival of stories about Warwick and a son of Edward IV, candidates respectively of Molinet and André, neither of whom named Lambert. Almost twenty years after his capture, therefore, the story of Lambert Simnel was still not believed in some quarters, even by those close to Henry VII, and one might still possibly conclude that the Irish pretender was Edward V.<sup>142</sup>

The name of Lambert Simnel was specifically mentioned again in Polydore Vergil, who was compiling his history at the request of Henry VII in the 1500s.<sup>143</sup> The king had just given out that, before his execution for treason, Sir James Tyrell confessed to the murder of the sons of Edward IV in the Tower of London at the behest of Richard III.<sup>144</sup> This timely confession indicates that the English government felt that, after so many years, it needed a convincing story of the murder of the little princes, and of the rebellions of Simnel and Warbeck. Vergil was to provide such a story, and it has become part of the national myth.<sup>145</sup> With regard to the so-called Simnel rebellion, Pollard opined that, as he 'was in the service of Henry VII', Vergil 'would naturally give the official view, whether true or not'.<sup>146</sup> Yet comparisons between Vergil's original narrative and the government sources of around 1487 (Simons's confession, the act of attainder, the herald's report) reveal that the chronicler's use of such sources was small and could have been gleaned merely from popular knowledge.<sup>147</sup> The popular assumption would have been that, since they supposedly survived the battle, both Simons and Simnel were captured at Stoke. That such an assumption should form the basis of Vergil's narrative bears out Busch's reservation that the chronicler's 'chronological arrangement of events, and his reason for connecting them together, are especially to be regarded with mistrust'.<sup>148</sup>

It could be argued that, despite Busch's reservations, Vergil's narrative provided a coherent framework on which to hang other sources, but the argument would not be a strong one. Personal

details about the pretender, which are often inconsistent among other sources, are lacking in Vergil's account of Lambert Simnel. The sources can therefore be seen to fit into the framework of Vergil's story because he avoided conflicting evidence, and not because the story itself was sound.<sup>149</sup> The changes between Simons's confession in February and the attainder of November 1487 tend to confirm that the character of Lambert Simnel emerged at the end of an *ad hoc* story, invented by the English government in response to the events of the 1487 rebellion. Vergil's narrative transposed Lambert back to the start of the conspiracy, and to this transposition can be attributed Vergil's mistakes (e.g. Warwick's age from Warham speaking about the pretender, and the capture of Simons) and the implausibility of the pseudo-Warwick plot.<sup>150</sup> It is small wonder, then, that Bacon should try to improve the story by involving Elizabeth Woodville, making Warwick two years older, and including a change of imposture from a son of Edward IV to Warwick.<sup>151</sup> Concessions over the age of the pretender and the survival of Edward IV's son, however, had already been made in later printed editions of Vergil, when any supervision by the English government would probably have been removed. By then, Vergil was about to be overshadowed by accounts of later historians derived from his, including that of Bacon.<sup>152</sup>

The conclusion that the king from Dublin was Edward V not only fits the events of the so-called Simnel rebellion of 1487, but also explains the differences in the narratives of Molinet, André and Vergil, and in their candidates for the Irish pretender. The transformation of the pretender from Edward V to Lambert Simnel can be traced through contemporary government invention to Vergil's improvement on this in the 1500s, and to Bacon's improvement on Vergil a century later.<sup>153</sup> This conclusion has been reached, however, at the expense of regarding the story of Lambert Simnel as a legend. If the legend is removed from Vergil's narrative, then there remains a pretender of fifteen or more, whose name was Edward, linked with Elizabeth Woodville, and returning to claim his kingdom. This pretender sounds like Edward V and, if the Simnel story is invented, then the pretender could be genuine.<sup>154</sup> This line of argument, however, could lead to overstatement. If Lambert Simnel was not the king from Dublin but a government impostor, one cannot assume that the king was necessarily Edward V. The pretender could have been another genuine candidate, such as Warwick, although from the difficulties over the claims of the chroniclers' candidates, this seems unlikely. Claims for candidates other than Edward V would need to explain the persistent accounts of the pretender being aged around fifteen, which fits the deposed monarch. If these accounts can be ignored, the identity of the king remains insoluble.<sup>155</sup>

Erring on the side of caution, then, one could say that it is possible rather than certain that the pretender in the Simnel rebellion was Edward V. The deposed monarch's candidature provides a neat solution to the pretender's identity, but nevertheless it raises a controversial complication. For if the Simnel pretender were really Edward V and the Warbeck pretender were really Richard, duke of York, then the sons of Edward IV would have survived Richard III to challenge Henry VII. Doubt would thus be cast on the traditional belief of the murder of the little princes in the Tower and the impostures of Simnel and Warbeck.<sup>156</sup> The need for this belief to justify his crown would be a powerful motive for Henry VII to make accusations of imposture, but the accusations were not necessarily true. Ideally the pantomime names of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck should be avoided by historians if possible, and at present it might be advisable to maintain that the impostures of those bearing these names were alleged rather than proven.<sup>157</sup>

## Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the stimulus of previous work, especially of Professor Michael Bennett and Barrie Williams. I am grateful for help from libraries at Epsom, Sutton, the University of London, and most notably the Institute of Historical Research. My special thanks go to our Society's Barton Library and Carolyn Hammond for her unstinting help and encouragement. I am indebted to the editor for advice on writing a more cogent paper, and to the forbearance of friends and colleagues while I was writing it.

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Pretenders to the English crown are the subject of J. Potter, *Pretenders*, London 1986, and include Henry VII as the pretender Henry Tudor. 'Pretender' and 'impostor' are often treated as synonymous, but strictly an impostor is someone who assumes another personality with deliberate intent to deceive. A pretender is someone who lays claim to a position, especially a crown, but although the claim may be make-believe, it does not necessarily involve deception, compare *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, under 'Impostor' and 'Pretender' and associated entries. Hence not all pretenders are impostors, and the only impostors meriting their own chapters in Potter's book are Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, both pretenders under Henry VII.

2. The possible identity of Perkin is discussed by A.N. Kincaid in his ed. of Sir George Buck, *The History of King Richard the Third (1619)*, Gloucester 1982, pp.327-29, and by Potter (see n.1), pp.91-112, among others. The case

for 'Perkin Warbeck' actually being Richard, Duke of York, as the alleged impostor claimed he was, has been made by D.M. Kleyn, *Richard of England*, Oxford 1990, but this view is not shared by I. Arthurson, *The Perkin Warbeck Conspiracy 1491-1499*, Stroud 1994.

3. *The Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter *DNB*), under 'Simnel, Lambert, fl.1487-1525' (A.F. Pollard). The names of Lambert and his teacher Simons are variously spelt.

4. F. Bacon, *The History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh*, ed. R. Lockyer, London 1971 (hereafter Bacon), pp.53-70.

5. P. Vergil, *The Anglica Historia A.D. 1485-1537*, ed with trans. D. Hay, London 1950 (hereafter Vergil). This gives the earliest Latin text and English translation on facing pages. For the 1487 rebellion (pp.12-27) the text is a transcription of Vergil's manuscript of 1512-13, and the passages different from this in the printed editions at Basle 1534, 1546, and 1555 are given in footnotes. Vergil's account formed the basis of those of Hall, Holinshed, Bacon, and most modern writers, M. Bennett, *Lambert Simnel and the battle of Stoke*, Gloucester 1987 (hereafter Bennett), p.11.

6. B. André, *De Vita atque Gestis Henrici Septimi Historia*, in J. Gairdner, *Memorials of King Henry the Seventh*, London 1858, pp.1-75 (hereafter André). André's account of the 1487 insurrection, pp.49-52.

7. J. Molinet, *Chroniques de Jean Molinet (1474-1506)*, ed G. Doutrepoint et O. Jodogne, 3 vols, Brussels 1935-37, vol. 1, pp.562-65 (hereafter Molinet).

8. W. Busch, *England under the Tudors: King Henry VII 1485-1509*, New York 1895 (hereafter Busch), followed Vergil and regarded him as occupying the first rank among authorities, p.395. Busch's classic standing is acknowledged by modern historians, e.g. S.B. Chrimes, *Henry VII*, London 1972, rep.1977 (hereafter Chrimes), pp. xi-xii, and compare Bennett, p.141, n.4. General histories add little or nothing to his account of the 1487 rebellion, thereby enhancing Vergil's pre-eminence.

9. *DNB* under Simnel; M.T. Hayden, 'Lambert Simnel in Ireland', *Studies: an Irish Quarterly Review*, vol.4 (1915), pp.622-38 (hereafter Hayden). Five quincenary publications were reviewed by D. Baldwin, *The Ricardian*, vol.8 (1988-90), pp.26-28, including Bennett. An appendix of key sources, Bennett, pp.121-38.

10. Bennett, pp.43-50. *DNB* under Simnel. B. Williams, 'Lambert Simnel's rebellion: how reliable is Polydore Vergil?' *The Ricardian*, vol. 6 (1982-84), pp.1.18-23 (hereafter Williams).

11. G. W., 'Richard, Duke of York, and Perkin Warbeck', *Notes and Queries*, vol.168 (1935), pp.309-11. Williams, pp.120-21. Bennett, p.48. I. Wigram, 'Richard III and the Princes by A. J. Pollard: review and comments', *The Ricardian*, vol. 9 (1991-93), p.217.

12. York was originally thought to have been born in 1472, e.g. according to *DNB* under 'Richard, Duke of York (1472-1483)' (J. Gairdner). 17 August 1473 is given in *The Complete Peerage*. . ., by G.E.C., new ed. V. Gibbs, London 1910-59 (hereafter *CP*), vol.12, pt. 2, pp.910-13 under 'York'.

13. *DNB* under 'Edward, Earl of Warwick (1475-1499)' (J. Gairdner) gives the earl's date of birth as 21 February, but *Complete Peerage* has 21 or 25 February. Edward IV is said to have styled the boy as earl of Warwick at his baptism, but the earliest reference to his title seems to be on 27 August 1479, after his father's death, *CP*, vol.12, pt.2, pp.394-97, under 'Warwick'.

14. Clarence's treason is described in P.M. Kendall, *Richard the Third*, London 1955 (hereafter Kendall), pp.121-27, and especially in M. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence: George, Duke of Clarence 1449-78*, rev. ed., Gloucester 1992, pp.114-54. Clarence was alleged to have tried unsuccessfully to suborn the abbot of Tewkesbury and Roger Harwell to substitute a strange child for Warwick, while John Taylor escaped with the real heir, *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, ed., J. Strachey, 6 vols, London 1767-83 (hereafter *RP*), vol.6, p.194. Taylor was later associated with the Warbeck conspiracy, Arthurson (see n.2), *passim*.

15. On the Mowbray marriage, see *CP* vol.9, p.610, under 'Norfolk'; vol.12, pt.2, pp.910-13 under 'York'; see also A. Crawford, 'The Mowbray inheritance', *The Ricardian*, vol.5 (1979-81), pp.334-40. Edward IV's brother Gloucester was said to have blamed the Woodvilles for the execution of Clarence, Kendall, p.454. Their possible suspicion that Clarence could have heard of the rumour of the invalidity of Edward IV's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville may have sealed the duke's fate, *ibid.*, pp.216-18.

16. Bacon, p.55; compare n.13 above. Clarence's son, Warwick, could not inherit his father's title because of his father's attainder, but the title of Warwick came through his mother Isabel and her marriage to Clarence, *CP*, vol.12, pt.2, p.394. It might be argued that young Edward did not fully become earl until the death of his maternal grandmother Anne, Countess of Warwick, shortly before 20 September 1492 (p.396), since in 1450 the earldom was granted to the widow in the event of the earl's death, and the Kingmaker never seems to have been formally attainted (p.392). Nevertheless in official documents the boy is called the earl of Warwick, e.g. W. Campbell, *Materials for a History of the Reign of Henry VII*, London 1877, vol.2, pp.37, 40, 59, 65-66, 130, 133, 161, 186-87, 189, 248. *DNB* under Warwick surmised Warwick's care under Gloucester after Clarence's death, perhaps from Gloucester's later protection of the boy when Richard III, but the lucrative wardship of Warwick went to Dorset, *CPR* 1476-85, pp.212, 283-84. The wardship obviously ended as a result of Dorset's involvement in the plot against Richard in June 1483, and the restoration of Dorset's rights and properties in November 1485 specifically excluded the wardship of Warwick, *RP*, vol.6, p.316. I am grateful to Carolyn Hammond for finding this reference.

17. On Gloucester's assumption of the crown and his claim, compare Kendall, p.222 and nn., to C. Ross, *Richard III*, London 1981 (hereafter Ross), pp.89-93. On the illegitimacy of Edward IV's children, alleged by Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, see Kendall, pp.219 and nn.; see also A. Williamson, *The Mystery of the Princes*, 2nd ed., Gloucester 1981, pp.53-61 and nn., and A.J. Pollard, *Richard III and the Princes in the Tower*, Stroud 1991, pp.99-101 and nn. On Clarence's possible knowledge of the invalid marriage, see n.15 above. Richard III's *titulus regius* was confirmed by the parliament of January 1484, *RP*, vol.6, pp.240-42.

18. Kendall, pp.290-91. There is no conclusive documentary evidence that Richard III made Lincoln his heir, but

Lincoln's appointment as lieutenant in Ireland seems to indicate this.

19. Bacon, p.55; compare n.13 above. The favourable evidence for Richard III's treatment of Warwick is summarized in A. O. Legge, *The Unpopular King: the Life and Times of Richard III*, London 1885, vol.2, pp.188-89, 257. Warwick went to Sheriff Hutton shortly after Richard III had invested his son as prince of Wales on 8 September, 1483. The castle was convenient for the Council of the North, which met at or near Sheriff Hutton, and Warwick had become a member of the Council before 13 May 1485, along with Richard's heir Lincoln, CP under Warwick; Kendall, pp.313, 407-08; Kincaid (see n.2), p.310.

20. The evidence about the murder of the princes remains inconclusive, see e.g. Williamson (n.11 above), and A. J. Pollard (n.17); earlier discussion in Kendall, pp.393-418, 495-98, and Ross, pp.96-104, 233-34. The favoured date for the murder is August 1483, but the killing of Edward V (and presumably of Richard, Duke of York) in June is recorded in the Anlaby Cartulary, C.F. Richmond, 'The death of Edward V', *Northern History*, vol.25 (1989), pp. 278-80; also in a king list in the Middleton Collection at Nottingham University, P. Morgan, 'The death of Edward V and the rebellion of 1483', *Historical Research*, vol.68 (1995), pp.229-32. For criticism of Richmond's paper, see J. A. F. Thomson, 'The death of Edward V: Dr Richmond's dating reconsidered', *Northern History*, vol.26 (1990), pp.207-11; M. Hicks, 'Did Edward V outlive his reign or did he outlive his life?', *The Ricardian*, vol.8 (1988-90), pp.342-45; S. J. Gunn, 'Early Tudor dates for the death of Edward V', *Northern History*, vol.28 (1992), pp.213-16.

Only Vergil logically linked the murder to the rumours of it by saying that Richard III had the princes executed, and then encouraged rumours of their slaughter to reconcile the people to his rule, H. Ellis, ed., *Three books of Polydore Vergil's English history*, London 1844, pp.188-89. The rumours, however, seem to derive from Richard's enemies. Comyns may have relied on hearsay from the court of the exiled Henry Tudor, Kendall, p.421. Henry's ally John Morton, then bishop of Ely, was active in Flanders, and could be the source for Molinet, see C. Weightman, *Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy 1446-1503*, Gloucester 1989, p.145; also for Adrien de But, *Chroniques relatives à l'Histoire de la Belgique sous la Domination des Ducs de Bourgogne: [tome I]: Chroniques des Religieux des Dunes*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, Brussels 1870, p.596. No contemporary rumour matches the detail of the traditional story of the princes' murder by Sir James Tyrell on Richard III's orders told by Sir Thomas More, see e.g. Kendall, pp.398-403.

21. On the *rapprochement* and Dorset's attempted escape as evidence of the murder by Buckingham, see esp. Kenda11, p.411-15, but compare Ross, pp.lii, 198,208 n.43. The same evidence might be used, however, to support the survival of the princes, see Williamson (see n.17), pp.121-33. A pact for their survival need be known only to a few: Richard III and his heir Lincoln on one side, Elizabeth Woodville and perhaps her son Dorset on the other. For Henry Tudor to succeed in bolstering his weak claim to the throne by marrying Elizabeth of York, her brothers would have to be dead in fact or by rumour, compare n.20 above; Williamson, p.195. Other rumours suggested that the boys were still alive. Elizabeth Woodville never claimed her sons were dead, J. Leslau, 'The Princes in the Tower', *Moreana*, vol.25 (1988), p.19. Her will of 1492, shortly before she died, contains no reference to the boys as such, Kenda11, p.495 n 4; Williamson, p.165.

22. Williams, p.120; Vergil, pp.2-3. Chrimes, p.51, stated that Elizabeth of York was taken from the Tower of London; the passage in Vergil is ambiguous, but the girl being 'brought to her mother in London' favours her being at Sheriff Hutton, as in e.g. Bennett, p.31. Vergil's statements seem at variance with evidence that Henry VII's mother Margaret, Countess of Richmond, had the keeping of the daughters of Edward IV, the young duke of Buckingham, and the earls of Warwick and Westmoreland, Campbell (see n. 16), vol.1, p.311. It has been suggested that the countess may have resided in the Tower, Legge (see n.29), pp.257-58; alternatively, Warwick could have been taken from her charge and put in the Tower later, M. K. Jones and M. G. Underwood, *The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby*, Cambridge 1992, pp.66-67, 74-75.

23. Chrimes, p.66. All copies of the 1484 confirmation of Richard III's *titulus regius* (see n.17 above) were ordered to be seized and burnt, perhaps because its allegations were true, Kendall, pp.475-77. On the possibility of legitimizing Edward's children under Richard III, see Williamson (see n.17), p.129. The *titulus* invalidated Elizabeth of York's claim to the throne, and Henry VII's were of questionable legitimacy, see Bennett, p.30.

24. For a general description, see Chrimes, pp.330-31, app. D. The dispensation for the marriage dated 2 March 1486 described Elizabeth of York as 'the eldest daughter and undoubted heiress of the late Edward IV', which implied that her brothers Edward V and York were regarded as dead, and the confirmation of the dispensation on 27 March forbade absolutely disputes over the succession, *Calendar of Papal Registers*, vol. 14, *Papal Letters 1484-1492*, ed. J.A. Twemlow, London 1960, pp.1-2. Henry VII received considerable support from the papacy early in his reign, see C. S. L. Davies, 'Bishop John Morton, the Holy See, and the accession of Henry VII', *English Historical Review*, vol.112 (1987), pp.2-30.

25. Bennett, pp.27-32. Henry is often regarded as minimizing the claims of his wife, e.g. D. MacGibbon, *Elizabeth Woodville 1437-1493*, London 1938, p.189; CP, vol.3, p.441 n. a; *Calendar of Papal Registers* (see n.24), vol.14, p.2; but compare Davies (see n.24), p.28. Bacon, p.55, intimated that because of Henry's treatment of her daughter, Elizabeth Woodville instigated the Simnel imposture. Elizabeth of York was not crowned until November 1487, after the Irish rebellion, Bennett, pp.108-09, 113. As late as Lent 1488 the loyal city of Waterford validated Henry VII's title by citing precedents for the descent of kingdoms through females, Bennett, pp.126-27.

26. *Crudescente iterum filiorum Eduardi regis diro funere*: 'The issue of the cruel death of the sons of King Edward flaring up again', André, p.49, trans. by Bennett, p.132. The notion of the boys' survival (see n. 21 above) was not, of course, shared by André.

27. Hayden, p.638; Bennett, p.13. The confusion is apparently supported by *Pierquini confessio* (Perkin's confession) written in the margin of André's account of the 1487 rebellion, André, p.520. This annotation was regarded as evidence for his theory by G.W., see n. II above. André's description of the Perkin rebellion is extensive (pp.65- 75), and this marginal insertion is almost certainly a mistake. I am grateful to my colleague Mrs

Marion Morrison for pointing out the ultimate confusion between Lambert and Perkin in W. C. Sellar and R. J. Yeatman, 1066 *And All That*, London 1930, ch.30, also quoted in full by Arthurson (see n.2 above), p.vii.

28. Bacon, p.54: 'And all this time it was still whispered every where that at least one of the children of Edward the Fourth was living, which bruit [rumour] was cunningly formented by such as desired innovation'. The children mentioned were of course Edward's sons and not his daughters, since the girls survived.

29. Vergil p.13 n.: *quod in uulgo essent, qui suspicarentur filios Edouardi regis aliquo terrarum secreto migrasse*: (the fact that among the people there were those who suspected that the sons of king Edward had migrated secretly to some other country). Vergil then related the rumour that Warwick was, or shortly would be, put to death. The rumours about Warwick and Edward IV's sons Vergil considered were wholly idle.

30. Bennett, p.42. On the other hand, Hayden, p.625, noted that the time available to prepare for the imposture of Warwick 'must have been very short, as the plot cannot have been thought of till after Bosworth'. Consequently Simons and Simnel did not arrive in Dublin until 'some time early in the year 1487' (*ibid.*, p.626), which seems too late.

31. *quemdam vulgo natum, puerum, sive pistoris, sive sutoris, filium Eduardi Quarti scelerala mente jactaverunt*: 'they maliciously put up a certain boy, lowly born, the son of either a baker or a shoemaker, as the son of Edward IV', André, p.49, trans. by Bennett, p.132. Hayden, p.624, said that the pretender was the son of an actor or a cobbler, perhaps misreading *histrionis* for the *pistoris* of André.

32. Molinet, p.562, trans. by Bennett, p.130. The passage seems to imply that Edward was still alive when the author wrote, but the statement that Edward 'had come on splendidly among the fertile and aristocratic shrubs of Ireland' could be interpreted as sarcasm; was Molinet 'writing a little tongue in cheek', Bennett, p.145 n.9?

33. *Eduardi secundum filium in Hibernia regem coronatum fama retulit*: 'the report went out that Edward's second son was crowned king in Ireland', André, p.50, trans. by Bennett, p.132. Busch, p.395.

34. André, p.50, trans. by Bennett, p.132. The position of the herald's visit in André's narrative suggests that the event happened before the end of 1486, when the Council of Sheen was called.

35. Bacon could have roughly squared the ages of Warwick (supposedly ten in 1483, p.55) with that of his impersonator Lambert Simnel ('of the age of some fifteen years', p.54) if the impostor was fifteen in 1487 or thereabouts as A. F. Pollard suggested, *DNB* under Simnel. Warwick's age would still, of course, have been incorrect.

36. Bacon, p.54; compare nn. 22 and 34. Molinet, p.562, has *quant il a esté parcreu, flourit et eslevé en force*: 'when he was full grown, in the flower of manhood, and raised up in force', trans. by Bennett, p.130. Williams, p.120. Edward V was born 2 (or possibly 3) November 1470, *DNB* under 'Edward V (1470- 1473)' (J. G. Gardiner); *CP*, vol.3, p.441, under 'Cornwall'. This agreement on the age of the Dublin pretender by Molinet, André and Vergil (with Bacon) is reflected in the fifteen-year old claimant of later sources.

37. On the coronation André merely wrote that the rumour went out (*fama retulit*, p.50), which is not necessarily the same as saying that the conspirators spread it.

38. Vergil, pp.12-28; Bacon, pp.49-67.

39. Vergil, pp.12-13; Bacon, p.54, agreeing with André's *pistoris*. see n.31 above. Vergil nowhere mentions the impostor's father nor the father's occupation.

40. 'It came into this priest's [Simons's] fancy ... to cause this lad to counterfeit and personate the second son of Edward the Fourth, supposed to be murdered; and afterward - for he changed his intention in the manage - the Lord Edward Plantagenet, then prisoner in the Tower', Bacon, p.54.

41. Vergil, pp.14-15. Later printed editions add that both Lambert and the 'duke of Clarence's son' were of the same age, but not at that point how old the boys were, p.14 n. The departure to Ireland happened after a rumour that Warwick had been murdered became widespread.

42. Vergil, pp.12-13 claimed that Simons trained Lambert to deceive, but wrote later in his narrative that both Margaret of Burgundy (pp.16-17) and the Irish (pp.20-21) knew that the boy was an impostor. André seems to have thought the pretender was believed to be genuine, see n.34 above.

43. The lack of investigation of the princes' death by Henry VII is considered a factor in favour of the innocence of Richard III, R. Drewett and M. Redhead, *The trial of Richard III*, Gloucester 1984, p.160; Kendall, p.409. On the murder of Warwick, see Vergil, pp.12-13.

44. Even if Warwick had actually been murdered, Henry VII could have announced that he had died naturally (as Edward IV had done with Henry VI), or produced a substitute. If Warwick had escaped, he could have been recaptured, or made an unexpected appearance. The choice of Warwick for impersonation rather than the sons of Edward IV would therefore have been an inept one, especially if Henry VII really did hold Warwick. Bacon, pp.53-54, compared the rumour of the murder of Warwick unfavourably with that of the little princes, see n.20 above. According to Adrien de But (see n.20), p.665, the son of the duke of Clarence was seen in Ireland shortly after Henry VII's accession, presumably in late 1485 or 1486. This would suggest that he had not been captured at Sheriff Hutton (see n.22 above), or had escaped very early on. Rumours of Warwick's escape were heard at the time of Stafford's rebellion in April-May 1486, see C. H. Williams, 'The Rebellion of Humphrey Stafford in 1486', *English Historical Review*, vol.43 (1928), pp.181-89, esp. p.183. For a possible chronology, see Bennett, pp.49-50.

45. In his first version, Vergil called Simons *praesbyter uili genere natus*: a priest born from low people, Vergil, p.12 line 19; hence Hay's translation 'lowborn'. In later editions Simons is *presbyter, homo sordido loco natus*: a priest, a man born of base rank, p.12 n. At his coronation, Lambert is described as *Lambertum puerum sordido genere ortum*: 'the lad Lambert, of ignoble origin', p.20 line 23, trans.p.21 line 25. Bacon, p.54, strongly questioned the possibility of the priest's instruction, especially as Simons did not know the real Warwick.

46. Hayden, p.625. *The Book of Howth in Calendar of the Carew Papers preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth*, ed. J.S. Brewer and W. Bullen, London 1871, vol.5, p.188: Simons 'craftily feigned King E. 4's two sons

was [sic] away fled, and thought to feign this scholar [Lambert] to be one. This crafty and subtle priest brought up his scholar with princely behaviour and manners, literature, declaring to this child, what lineage he was of and progeny'; see also Bennett, p.42.

47. Vergil, pp.16-17. Although the various conspirators are perceived to have intrigued separately and become one conspiracy later on, this perception does not rule out the more probable unity of the movement from the beginning, Busch, p.326.

48. Bacon, p.54.1. Wigram (see n. 11), p.217, thought it 'inconceivable' that Elizabeth Woodville 'would support the claim of Clarence's son'.

49. Williams, pp.120-21. In his earliest account of the seizure of the boy at Sheriff Hutton, Vergil described the captive as the earl of Warwick (see n.22 above); elsewhere the boy is not called Warwick but merely the duke of Clarence's son. I am grateful to Mrs Diana Kleyn for the suggestion that a fifteen-year-old son of Clarence could have been a bastard, which is interesting in view of the later printed description of the captive, which omitted that he was the sole surviving son, Vergil, p.2 n. Hicks (see n.14), p.114, has found no evidence, however, that Clarence was unfaithful to his wife.

50. The *Plumpton Correspondence*, ed. T. Stapleton, London 1839, pp.53-54 (letter 15): 'Also here is but litle spech of the erle of Warwyk now, but after chistenmas, they say ther wylbe more spech of.' Chrimes, pp.75-76 n. 1, judged that this remark was 'too vague to build any theories upon', but the government use of Warwick in the new year 1487 (e.g. at Sheen in February) is probably a safe inference.

51. Writs of summons for the convocations of Canterbury and York to meet in February 1487 were issued on 16 December 1486 according to Campbell (see n.16), vol.2, pp.77-78. The bishop of London's certificate of 12 February 1487, however, dated the royal writ as 16 November, C. Harper-Bill, ed., *The Register of John Morton, Archbishop of Canterbury 1486-1500*, vol.1, York 1987, p.24, item 86. Presumably writs to individual members of the king's council were also issued in November and December 1486.

52. Vergil, pp.14-19.

53. Vergil p.14 lines 16-20 (Latin) = p. 15 lines 20-25 (English).

54. J. M. Williams, 'The Political Career of Francis Viscount Lovell (1456-?)', *The Ricardian*, vol. 8 (1988-90), pp.382-402; S. O'Connor, 'Francis Lovell and the Rebels of Furness Fells', *The Ricardian*, vol.7 (1985- 87), pp.366-70.

55. Bennett, p.121, translating D. Wilkins, ed., *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hibemiae A.D. 466-1718*, 4 vols, London 1737, vol.3, p.618. Wilkins's text has been corrected in places by A. F. Pollard, *The Reign of Henry VII from Contemporary Sources*, 3 vols, London 1913-14, vol.3, p.247; also translated and annotated, Harper-Bill (see n.51), vol.1, p.25, item 89.

56. Vergil, pp.18-19. The convocation of Canterbury met on 13 February 1487 at St Paul's Cathedral in London, where Warwick was also shown, compare nn.50 and 51 above.

57. Bennett pp.53-54; see also D. A. Lockett, 'The Thames Valley conspiracies against Henry VII', *Historical Research*, vol.68 (1995), pp.164-72.

58. Bennett, p.51, Vergil, pp.18-19.

59. Bennett noted that February 1487 was certainly a convenient time for a key figure like Simons to fall into the hands of the English government, p.44. Nevertheless Henry VII oddly failed to discover much about the plot, or the government was unwilling to divulge a satisfactory account of the conspiracy, which suggests that Simons was not an important conspirator, pp.48-49. The government seemed to behave as if it did not know who the pretender was, but pretended it did, p.44. Simons was probably 'a minor figure or even a government stooge', p.50.

60. Bacon, p.55. Bennett examined points both for and against the boy at St Paul's being Warwick, pp.43-44, and the involvement of Lincoln in the conspiracy, p.51. Both Lincoln and Warwick were members of Richard III's Council of the North, and perhaps both resident therefore at Sheriff Hutton, see n.19 above.

61. Williams, p.121; R. Firth Green 'Historical notes of a London citizen', *English Historical Review*, vol.96 (1981), p.589, where 'the duke of Clarence son and the other chield that was in Erleland' were shown at St Paul's in London on 8 July 1487.

62. Williams, p.120. Lincoln fled to Flanders 'noysing in that Countrey, that thErle of Warwik shulde be in Irelande, whiche himselfe knew, and daily spake with him at Shene afor his Departing', J. Leland, *De rebus Britannicis Collectanea*, ed. T. Hearne, 2nd ed., London 1770, vol.4, p.209. If true, Lincoln and Warwick would have been at Sheen before the council meeting of February 1487. This would rule out an escape in the reign of Edward IV, compare n.14 above, and Vergil's perpetual imprisonment of the boy in the Tower after Bosworth, nn.22 and 43 above. Rumours of Warwick's escape date back to the summer of 1486, see n.44 above, which seems too early and is contradicted by Betanson's letter, see n.50 above. Lincoln's statement, however, was made by Henry VII's herald and therefore a hostile source, whose intelligence about rumours in Flanders may have been surmise. The statement could have been a government rumour to make Lincoln's defection to pseudo-Warwick appear more plausible.

63. Williams, p.120. It seems hardly likely that Margaret and Lincoln would only have discovered the discrepancy in age after they had committed themselves to the conspiracy.

64. After his arrest for his part in the Hastings conspiracy of June 1483, the university of Oxford interceded for the release of Morton, then bishop of Ely, D. Mancini, *The Usurpation of Richard III*, ed. C. A. J. Armstrong, Gloucester 1984, p.126 n. 82. Morton was elected chancellor of the university early in 1495, *DNB* under 'Morton, John'.

65. Bennett p.43. Wigram (see n.11), p.217, has recently pointed out that 'it was not known for certain who the boy in Ireland was claiming to be'.

66. See nn.17 and 23 above, but see also S. B. Chrimes, *English constitutional ideas in the fifteenth century*, Cambridge 1936, p.266 n.4.

67. Vergil, pp.16-17; and compare n.21 above.

68. The idea of Elizabeth Woodville's voluntary retirement is found in e.g. MacGibbon (see n.25), pp.191-93. It is favoured by some traditionalists, e.g. Chrimes, p.76 n.3, but by no means all; the idea is not found in e.g. J. D. Mackie, *The Early Tudors*, Oxford 1952. Busch, p.327, noted that the idea ran contrary to the very precise old account, and hinted that her punishment was for trying to change sides again, pp.35-36.

69. Kendall, p.495.

70. Campbell (see n.16), vol.2, pp.148-49, transcribed the deprivation of 1 May 1487, and took Bacon to task for insinuating that Henry VII benefited from the confiscation (p.xxi; and see Bacon, p.60), whereas the beneficiary was his wife Elizabeth of York (Campbell, p.142). The only property which Elizabeth Woodville had was apparently granted to her by Henry in satisfaction of her dower, MacGibbon (see n.25), p.190. The grant of 10 March 1488 to the 'right dere and right welbeloued Quene Elizabeth, late wif vnto the noble prince of famous memory King Edward the Illith, and moder vnto oure derrest wif the quene', Campbell (see n.16), p.273, and compare also p.555; this sounds unctuous rather than sincere. For other grants, see pp.225, 319-20, and 322.

71. Legge (see n.19), p.51, suggested that Henry's treatment of the ex-queen 'disclosed his apprehensions that one of her sons was still living'; see n. 21 above, and Mac Gibbon (see n.25), p.194 n.3.

72. The treaty was not fulfilled because of the murder of James III after his defeat at the battle of Sauchieburn in June 1488, MacGibbon (see n. 25), p.194 and n.2.

73. Vergil, pp.20-21 n.

74. Kendall, pp.413-15, argued forcefully that the conduct of Elizabeth Woodville and Dorset in 1484 and 1487 was evidence of the guilt of Buckingham, Henry Tudor's co-conspirator of 1483, but it could be seen as evidence that the sons of Edward IV survived, compare n. 21 above. I. Wigram (see n.11), pp.216-17, has also linked the survival of at least one of the sons with the belief of Elizabeth and Dorset that the Irish pretender was one of them.

75. Bennett, pp.54-55, where he canvassed a possible link with the future alleged impostor Perkin Warbeck and Perkin's master Sir Edward Brampton, see n.2 above; also Bennett p.51, and p.145 n.23. Such early support for Perkin as Warwick could explain alleged sightings of the earl on the continent and in the Channel Islands, see n.44 above; but compare the rumours in nn.62-64. On the timing of the conspiracy, see n.30 above.

76. 'And since she held it for certain that he [the pretender] was the issue of Edward himself, the Lady Margaret, widow of Charles the most famous duke of Burgundy and Edward's sister, sent letters calling him to her; and he secretly slipping away, with a few accomplices in such a great treachery, speedily set out towards her' André, p.50, trans. by Bennett, p.132. There is no extant record of a son of Edward IV as such in the Low Countries at this time, but C. Weightman (see n.20), pp.158-59 has discussed an intriguing record of July 1486 of a gift of wine to the *some van Claretie uit Ingelant* ('the son of Clarence from England'), which looks like André's visit of the pretender but as Warwick. Margaret did not mention any king Edward VI in Dublin, however, the 1487 expenditure referring only to support for Lovell and Lincoln, Weightman, p.160. The existence of three Warwicks (in London, Dublin, and the Low Countries) is very unlikely; perhaps references to a son of Clarence rather than to Warwick indicate a royal bastard, compare n.49, but see n.75 above.

77. *le duc de Clarence*, Molinet, p.563: 'the duke of Clarence (*recte* his son)', Bennett, p.130. Molinet failed to realise that Warwick, whom he did not name as such, could not become Clarence because of his father's attainder, see n.16 above.

78. Vergil, pp.20-21. Molinet's account is perhaps somewhat exaggerated. In his letter to the pope, Henry VII implored censure against two archbishops (Dublin and Arrnagh) and only two bishops (Meath and Kildare), *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII*, ed. J. Gairdner, 2 vols., London 1861-63 (hereafter *LP*), vol.1, pp.94-96, trans. A. F. Pollard (see n.55), vol.3, pp.156-57. The pope ordered an enquiry into the activities of these four prelates, dated 5 January 1488, *Calendar of Papal Registers* (see n.24), vol.14, pp.307-08.

The list of pardons for the 1487 insurrection, issued on 25 May 1488, is headed by the archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, and the bishops of Cloyne, Meath and Derry, besides six abbots and three priors, Campbell (see n.16), vol.2, pp.315-17. Octavian de Palatio, Archbishop of Arrnagh, later declared he had opposed the coronation, Hayden, pp.626-27; Bennett, p.66. Hayden, pp.634-37, showed from list of rebels that nearly all the support came from the Anglo-Irish, and virtually none from the native Irish; the Irish in the rebel army were therefore mercenaries. She suggested that Kildare 'can scarcely have really believed in the false prince' (p.626), but Donough Bryan, *Gerald FitzGerald, the great Earl of Kildare (1456-1513)*, Dublin and Cork 1933, pp.100-05, maintained that the earl believed that the Irish pretender was genuine. The Irish chancellor Thomas FitzGerald was an enthusiastic supporter, and was to fall at Stoke. The FitzGerald's rivals the Butlers, led by the earl of Ormond, remained aloof, Bryan, p.106. In contrast to the Irish, the pretender was to gather no noble support in England, except possibly Bodrugan, who had already foiled a warrant for his arrest dated 8 February (compare the date of Sheen); his involvement is questionable, A. L. Rowse, 'The turbulent career of Sir Henry de Bodrugan', *History*, vol.29 (1944), p.26, but compare Bennett, pp.64, 147 n.20,

79. The landing at Furness is found in Molinet, p.563, Vergil, pp. 20-21, and *RP*, vol.6. p.397. Bennett, pp.70-75, has reconstructed the probable route of the rebel army from its landfall on 4 June into Yorkshire.

80. André's narrative, p.50, trans. Bennett, p.132, seems to suggest the rebels landed in the northeast, not the northwest. His description of the pretender (*...nebulonum ille regulus in Hibernia ut ante dixi coronatus misellus*, p.52, trans. Bennett, p.133) apparently confused the rumour of the coronation with the later reality, see n.33 above.

81. Vergil, p.22 lines 23-24: *se uenisse ad restituendum in regnum Edwardum puerum nuper in Hybemia coronatum*. *Restituere* means 'to put back, replace, restore; to reinstate, re-establish; to repair, make good'. The verb is found earlier in *pro restituendo puero in regnum* (p.141lines 12-13: 'to restore the boy to the throne', p.15 line 17), and was more appropriate to Edward V, who had lost the throne to Richard III rather than to Warwick, who had

still to gain the crown. Also marginally more favourable to Edward V is the remark about Ireland as 'that land, where (so he [Simons] had heard) the name and family of King Edward were always cherished'; p.15.

82. For the pretender's letter see A. Raine, ed., *York City Records*, York 1941, vol.2, pp.20-21; Bennett, pp.120-21; L. C. Attreed *The York House Books 1461-1490*, 2 vols, Stroud 1991, vol.2, p.570. Raine's 'Edward V' is a mistranscription of 'Edward VI', Bennett, p.141 n.5. The assault on the gates is described in the city's accounts of the Stoke campaign, Raine, pp.22-24; Bennett, pp.123-24; Attreed, *York House Books*, pp.571-73. On the Scropes, see L. C. Attreed, 'An Indenture between Richard Duke of Gloucester and the Scrope Family of Masham and Upsall', *Speculum*, vol.58 (1983), pp.1018-24, and P. S. Routh, "'Lady Scroop Daughter of K. Edward": an Enquiry', *The Ricardian*, vol.9 (1993), pp.410-16. The second wife of Scrope of Bolton was godmother to Edward V, Attreed, 'Indenture', p.1023 n.33. The deposed monarch's sister Cecily married Ralph, younger brother of Scrope of Masham but the marriage was dissolved in 1486, Routh, pp.411-12. Full pardon was granted to both the Lords Scrope in 1489, Attreed, 'Indenture', p.1024.

The accusation that York declared for the rebels is not supported by the city's house books but these records were written after the rebellion had failed, Molinet, p.563; Bennett, p.148 n.29. From the excuse that the Lords Scrope had been constrained by their followers, which could have been used after the Scropes were captured, the city records may not have been made for quite a few weeks. The appellation 'Edward VI' was therefore almost certainly post-Stoke, and perhaps much later. The ransacking of the London houses of Henry VII's supporters is corroborated by the king's letter to the pope (see n.78 above). The cry of the ransackers 'Vive Werwic au roy Edowart!' ('Long live Warwick. To King Edward'), would seem to imply they recognised the rebel king as Warwick, Molinet, pp.563-64; Bennett, p.131. This recognition, however, could have been based on a rumour which was false like that of Henry's defeat.

83. Henry VII issued a proclamation against 'feigned, contrived, and forged tidings and tales' without specifying their subject; see *LP*, vol.2, pp.288-89 (where a note says that the original was headed *Anno Secundo Henrici Septimi, 1486*, but from the regnal year could presumably be before August 1487) or A. F. Pollard (see n.55), vol.2, p.110. Problems amongst the king's army before the battle mentioned in his herald's report given by Leland (see n.62), vol.4, p.213, modernised by Bennett, p.128, are: 1. 'which evening were taken certain spies, which noised in the country that the king had fled. And some were hanged on the ash at Nottingham bridge end'; 2. 'And that evening there was a great scry [tumult], at which scry there fled many men'; 3. 'That evening there was a great scry, which caused many cowards to flee'.

84. Many of the details of the Stoke campaign are unclear, see, for example, Bennett, pp.68-103, and the books reviewed by Baldwin (see n.9), but they have been omitted since they have no bearing on the pretender's identity.

85. Our three earlier chroniclers mentioned the deaths of Lincoln and Schwartz, Vergil, pp.24-25; Molinet, p.564, trans. Bennett, p.131; André, p.52, trans. Bennett, p.133. Bacon, p.67, noted those of Lincoln, Kildare (really his brother Thomas FitzGerald), Lovell, Schwartz and Broughton, but reported that Lovell may have escaped. On the fate of Lovell and Broughton, O'Connor (see n.54), pp.368-69; J. M. Williams (see n.54), pp.396-97; D. Baldwin, 'What happened to Lord Lovel?', *The Ricardian*, vol.7 (1985-87), pp.56-65. Some historians, e.g. Kendall, p.373, have suggested that Lincoln was using the Irish pretender as a stalking horse to gain the throne for himself, and indeed the *Chronicle of Calais* and Kingsford's *Chronicle of London* mention Lincoln but not Lambert Simnel, Pollard (see n.55), vol.1, p.51. The suggestion derives from Vergil, pp.22-23, and is more persuasive if the Dublin king was an impostor as in Vergil. Barrie Williams, p.121, has noted, however, that Vergil also has a far-fetched story that Tyrell in murdering the princes (see n.20 above) was helping Suffolk, Lincoln's brother, so Vergil's suggestion about Lincoln should be considered as surmise.

86. Molinet seems to be corroborated by Vergil's statement that the fleeing rebels were either killed or captured, Molinet, p.564, trans. Bennett, p.131; Vergil, pp.24-25. Adrien de But (see n.20), p.674, also wrote that Henry ordered all the Irish to be hanged, *omnes de Yrlandia captivos strangulari mandavit*.

87. The capture is related by Molinet, p.564 (trans. Bennett, p.131), André, p.52, (trans. Bennett, p.133), Vergil, pp.24-25, and Bacon, p.67. See also Leland (see n.62), vol.4, p.214.

88. Molinet, p.564, trans. Bennett, p.131. Molinet did not explain how the pretender could have truly been Warwick if the Stoke captive was a fake, a problem avoided by the earl being killed in battle, as in the 1487 entry in L. Visser-Fuchs, 'English events in Caspar Weinreich's Danzig Chronicle 1461-1495', *The Ricardian*, vol. 7 (1985-87), p.317. This entry also mentions aid from Margaret of Burgundy, and regarded the pretender as being genuinely the son of the duke of Clarence (as in Molinet), and called George (Clarence's name). Adrien de But (see n.20), pp.674-75, confusingly related that the son of Clarence was taken from the battlefield when the odds against his army were seen to be heavy, and carried over to Guines by the earl of Suffolk. The chronicler seems to envisage the boy fighting again against Henry VII, pp.675, 678; his account is contemporary because Adrien died in 1488, *Chroniques Relatives* (see n.20), p.xvii.

89. The captive 'who having been asked by what effrontery he dared to commit so great a crime, did not deny that he had been forced to it by certain men of his own shameless sort', André, p.52, trans. Bennett, p.133. The marginal note *Pierquini confessio* (see n.27) occurs here. André is the only chronicler specifically to mention such a confession. As he despised the impostor (see n.80 above), André seems to have made little or no effort, despite his fine language, to check whether what the boy said was true, or indeed whether the confession actually existed; there is none extant. By contrast, despite his substantial account looking as if it was based on one, Polydore Vergil nowhere mentioned a confession.

90. Vergil, pp.24-25.

91. Bacon, p.67.

92. Vergil stated (pp.26-27) that when Henry VII saw the enemy line broken, the king commanded that Lincoln should be spared. If Henry ever gave the order, one wonders why he left it so late (too late?), and whether the

frontline troops ever received it (*'it is said* that the soldiers refused to spare the earl', emphasis supplied). Was the king truly interested in what Lincoln would have to say after capture?

93. 'oone Lambert Symnell, a child of x yere of age, sonne to Thomas Symnell, late of Oxforde Joynoure', *RP*, vol. 6, p.397. Compare the confession of February 1487, nn.55 and 59 above.

94. Fitzsimons certainly crowned the Dublin pretender (see n.78 above), and was later taken into favour by Henry VII as Irish lord deputy (1492 and 1503) and lord chancellor (1496 and 1501), see *DNB* under 'Fitzsimons or Fitzsymond, Walter, (d.1511)' (B. H. Blacker). A 'marginal note to a MS of the *Book of Howth* in Trinity College, Dublin, calls him [Lambert] Simons' son', that is, the illegitimate son of a priest, Hayden, p.624.

95. For 'Lambert Simnel', see Bennett, p.47; for 'Simnel', the *DNB*. Simnel cakes were sold in Oxford, Bennett, p.54; both André and Bacon said that the pretender was the son of a baker. Bacon had probably heard of simnel cakes whereas André as a Frenchman probably had not, but André's apparently unconscious endorsement of the surname would not apply if the pretender's father was a cobbler, see nn.31 and 39 above.

96. For 'Lambert', see Bennett, p.47. 97. Bennett, p.45. For Edward IV's mistress, see N. Barker, 'Jane Shore, part 1: The real Jane Shore', *Etoniana*, no.125 (1972), pp. 383-91. She was also the mistress of Dorset and Hastings, and most probably involved in their plots against Richard III, Kendall, p.209.

98. Bennett, p.47

99. Lambert Simnel was variously described as the son of an organ-builder, joiner, barber, baker, actor or cobbler, Hayden, p.624; it is small wonder that Mackie called him the 'son of an Oxford tradesman', De (see n.68), pp.68, 69 n.

100. *DNB* under Simnel, where there seems to be some confusion. In his letter to the pope, Henry VII referred to the Stoke captive as *spurium quemdam puerum*. 'a certain spurious lad', *LP*. vol.1, p.95, trans. A. F. Pollard (see n.55), vol.3, p.157, also trans. Bennett, p.123. In his mandate of 5 January 1488 (see n.78 above), Pope Innocent VIII described the captive as *quendam puerum de illegitimo thoro natum*, 'a boy of illegitimate birth', Wilkins (see n.55), vol.3, p.623, trans. *Calendar of Papal Registers* (see n.24), vol.14 p.307. This description could fit the notion that Lambert was a clerical bastard, see n.94 above. It is just possible, however, that the pope or his officials misinterpreted Henry VII's letter, which implies the Stoke captive was an impostor ('spurious') but not necessarily illegitimate. Since the king's letter mentioned privilege of sanctuary, Henry VII was writing letters to the pope on other matters besides the rebellion, and the captive's illegitimacy could have been discussed there.

101. Besides details about Simnel's age and father, Vergil failed in his manuscript of 1512-13 to use the herald's report of the rebel king's capture, see n87 above. The name Lambert Simnel (from the attainder) and the connection of Oxford and Ireland with the plot (from the attainder and Simons's confession) could derive from common report.

102. For Vergil see n.90 above. For Elizabeth ('Jane') Shore's husband, see A. Sutton, 'William Shore, Merchant of London and Derby', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal*. vol.106 (1986), pp.127-39, and for the annulment of their marriage, Barker (see n.97), pp.387-88, and Sutton, pp.130-31.

103. *puero* changed to *adolescentulo* (Vergil, p.14 line 1), *pueri* to *adolescentis* (line 11), *puerum* to *regium adolescentem* (line 18), and *puer* to *adolescens* (p.18 line14). All these changes were made between the editions of 1534 and 1546.

104. The medical definition of adolescence, used by the United States National Library of Medicine in indexing, is, between the ages of thirteen and eighteen. Such a definition would, of course, only be a rough guide to the use of 'adolescent' by non-medical writers.

105. *DNB* under Simnel; compare Vergil's amendment, n.41 above.

106. Bacon, p.67; *DNB* under Simnel; Vergil, pp.24-25. Vergil made no further correction to indicate Lambert's death, so strictly interpreted Lambert could only be said to be still alive when the chronicler completed his manuscript in 1512-13. Hay dates Vergil's revised draft for the first printed edition of *Anglica Historia* to between 1521 and about 1524, Vergil, pp.xv-xvi; the impostor's attendance at the funeral of Sir Thomas Lovell could mean that Vergil checked if Simnel was still alive during this draft.

107. Wilford claimed that he was Edward, Earl of Warwick, and was executed in February 1499, see *DNB* under 'Wulford or Wilford, Ralph (1479?-1499)', (A. F. Pollard); Kleyne (see n.2), pp.153-54; Arthurson (see n.2), p.202. Henry VII's Warwick and his fellow prisoner Perkin Warbeck were accused of a plot, possibly engineered with the connivance of the English government, and both were executed in November 1499, Kleyne, pp.154-57; *DNB* under Warwick. Earlier in 1499 Edmund, Earl of Suffolk, younger brother of Lincoln, had fled to Flanders but later returned. He escaped again in July or August 1501, and was only secured in March 1506 with assurances by Henry VII for his safety. Nevertheless Suffolk was executed by Henry VIII in 1513, Chrimes, pp.92-94. Among those convicted of supporting Suffolk was Sir James Tyrell who, before his execution in May 1502, was said to have confessed to the murder of the princes in the Tower on Richard III's orders in the summer of 1483, compare nn.20 and 85 above.

108. *DNB* under Simnel.

109. André was tutor to Henry VII's eldest son Arthur, and lived at court, Busch, pp.393-94. Vergil was often in London on behalf of the chapter of Bath and Wells, and the fact that 'Henry VII asked Vergil to undertake a full-scale work' implies connections with the court, Vergil, pp.ix, xi, xx n.1.

110. See n.89 above.

111. Bennett, pp.44, 48-49; Harper-Bill (see n.51), vol.1, p.25 item 89, n. The alternative to Vergil's error over Simons, or Bennett's hypothesis of two Simons brothers, would be that the priest was captured at Stoke, but that his confession was interpolated in the records of convocation. The confession interrupts the discussion of church reforms, and the text would read quite well without it. Furness Fells would be known as the landing place for the rebels in June, n.79 above.

On the other hand, an interpolator would hardly omit further details of Lambert Simnel found in the act of attainder,

n.93 above, or leave out the name of the impostor's father, as was done in Simons's confession, *cujusdam - Orgininales* in Wilkins (see n.55), vol.3, p.618, corrected to *cujusdam [ ] orginmaker* by A. F. Pollard (see n.55), vol.3, p.247. The lack of substantial detail in the confession before convocation lends weight to its being written in February 1487 rather than later, compare n.55 above. A meeting between Archbishop Morton and 'certain lords of the king's council' seems to coincide with the exhibition of Warwick in St Paul's where convocation was assembled, Harper-Bill (see n.51), vol.1, pp.25-26 item 90; compare n.56 above. The events of convocation suggest close co-ordination between Morton in London and Henry VII at Sheen, and it seems probable that for both of them church reform was less important than the Irish rebellion.

112. See n.86 above.

113. For the age of the pretender as sixteen or seventeen, see n.36 above, and as ten, see n.93.

114. Bennett, pp.45-47, including a facsimile of the original manuscript. 'John' was merely corrected to 'Lambert' in Leland (see n.62), vol. 4, p.214; and see n.87 above. On the idea of a pseudonym, see nn.97, 98, and 102 above.

115. Bennett, p.108, p.150 n.9. See also Campbell (see n.16), vol. 2, p.264 (prison delivery 2 March 1488) and p.395 (20 marks reward, Michaelmas Term 1489). Bennett, p.109, has noted that the parliament of November 1487 spent more time legislating against Henry VII's supporters than the rebels, and it was followed in December by sedition in the king's own household (not apparently mentioned in Vergil).

116. *Book of Howth* (see n.46), p.190; Mackie (see n.68), p.74; Potter (see n.1), p.90. There is no firm date for the Irish visit with its jokes about apes and Lambert Simnel's banquet, but it may be as early as February 1489, when Henry VII reaffirmed the titles of the Irish lords at Greenwich, *CP*, vol.1, p.458, app. A. Henry perhaps intended a pun between *simia* (Latin for ape or monkey) and 'Simnel', *CP*, vol.7, pp.229-32, under 'Kildare'. In his transcription of the visit from the *Book of Howth*, Pollard pointed out that there were apes on the Geraldine coat of arms, A. F. Pollard (see n.55), vol.3, p.264 n.; the apes would have been in the crest or supporters, as the arms themselves were 'Argent, a saltire gules', *CP* under Kildare.

117. The banquet story has been charmingly told by Mackie, based on the *Book of Howth*, see n.116 above. Hayden, p.637, judged the story 'far from reliable'.

118. *DNB* under 'St Lawrence, Nicholas. . .baron Howth, d. 1526' (E. I. Carlyle) stated that Henry VII rewarded Howth 'by presenting him with three hundred pieces of gold, and confrmring the lands of Howth to him by charter'; see also *Book of Howth* (see n.46), p.190. The *DNB* claimed that Howth's mother was Joan, daughter of Edmund, Duke of Somerset and great-uncle to Henry VII, but Joan was his stepmother, *CP*, vol.6, p.605 under 'Howth'. The general pardon for the Irish rebellion, dated 25 May 1488, included 'Nicholas Sent Carens, lord de Houth', Campbell (see n.16), vol.2, p.316; but Henry VII could have included Howth to allay suspicion. The *Book of Howth*, p.189, declared Howth to be Henry's informant about the Irish rebellion, although this honour was claimed for Thomas Butler, Hayden, p.627. Howth later became a devoted partisan of the lord deputy Kildare, and Howth's third wife was the sister of Archbishop Fitzsimons, *DNB* and *CP* under 'Howth'. Both Kildare and Fitzsimons were leading Irish figures in the 1487 rebellion, and Howth would have been in a position to keep an eye on them.

119. Henry VII failed to secure an Irish confession over support for Lambert Simnel, and his lenient treatment not only of Howth but also of Fitzsimons and Kildare (compare n.118 above) could be attributed to the king's fear of exposure. Kildare was later accused of conspiring with Perkin Warbeck but was still restored to favour, Bryan (see n.78), pp.154-56.

120. Hayden, p.629. Butler's petition claimed that he was Henry VII's informant in 1487; compare Howth in n.118 above. The poem of Lent 1488 from pro-Butler Waterford to Dublin called the pretender 'a boy, a lad, an organmaker's son', Bryan (see note 78), p.103; Bennett, pp.126-27; compare Simons's confession, n.55 above. The *Book of Howth* (see n.46), p.188, puns the boy as 'an organ of his [Simons's] feigned enterprise', which tempts one to speculate that the organ-maker of Simons's confession may originally have been a pun, not an occupation, compare n.99 above. The *Book of Howth* seems to regard the pretender as a child, since he was borne on the neck of great Darcy of Platan so that he could be seen. A letter of the Mayor of Waterford stated that the 'major of Dublin took the boye in his arms, carried him about the cite', suggesting a small child, Bryan, pp.107-08. The archbishop of Armagh is said to have told the pope that he was convinced by the archbishop of Canterbury (Morton) that the pretender was 'the son of Edward, Earl of Warwick', not even the earl himself, Bryan, p.105.

121. Hayden, pp.622-23. The papal bull in response to Henry's letter of complaint about the rebel Irish bishops (n.78 above) is reminiscent of the earlier bull prohibiting disturbances about Henry VII's succession (n.24).

122. The *Annals of Ulster, otherwise Annals of Senat: a Chronicle of Irish affairs*, 3 vols, Dublin 1887-1901, vol.3, ed. B. MacCarthy, pp.299, 315, 319. Rather than being in exile, Warwick is rumoured to have escaped, compare nn.44, 62 above. The Irish king is described as the sole survivor of the blood royal, *Annals*, p.299, 315. Points against the argument that the Irish king was Edward V are that the real Edward IV is not called duke of York by the annalist, but only 'son of the Duke'; the title of duke is given by the annalist to Edward IV's father Richard, p.205. The pretender could therefore be the duke's grandson, which would apply not only to Edward V and York but also to Warwick, as in the correction made by Hayden, p.631. The annalist knew of the pretender's defeat, but not his fate, *Annals*, p.319.

123. After Richard III's death Kildare first issued coinage in Dublin omitting the king's name, and then with *Edwardvs* after the coronation of 1487, P. Seaby, *The Story of British Coinage*, London 1985, pp.187-88.

124. The patent is described as a grant by 'Edward, by the grace of God, king of England, France and Ireland' to Peter (Piers) Butler, witnessed by 'Gerald, Earl of Kildare, our Lieutenant' in the first year of Edward's reign, D. Bryan (see n.78), pp.283-85; E. Curtis, *Calendar of Ormond Deeds, vol 3: 1419,1509*. Dublin 1935, pp.261-63. In Edward IV's first year (1461-1462) the earl of Kildare was not Gerald, but Thomas, Gerald's father. By the first year of Edward VI (1547-1548) Piers Butler was dead. Edward V's reign lasted only from April to June 1483. August 1483 was in the first year of Richard III and, since he did not oppose Richard's assumption of the crown as he did Henry

VII's, Kildare could hardly have witnessed Edward V's grant in the reign of his successor.

The title 'king of Ireland' was not adopted by English monarchs until Henry VIII, and so this title rather than the usual 'lord of Ireland' implies an Irish monarch, E. Curtis, *A History of Medieval Ireland from 1086 to 1513*. Dublin, 1938, p.347 n.1. According to the city of Waterford loyal to Henry VII, Kildare's messenger called the Irish king 'lord of Ireland', Bryan, p.285 n.; such Butler sources might, however, be unreliable, compare n.120 above. No English king ever made Kildare lieutenant. 1487 is a possible year because of Kildare's late submission to Henry VII, Bryan, p.285; Curtis *Calendar*, p.263; on the other hand, issuing patents in the rebel king's name after Stoke might appear unlikely. 1485 is also possible if 13 is a mistake for 23, since 23 August was the day after Richard III's death at Bosworth. If the rebel king's reign was deemed to start after Bosworth or later, and the date is correct, then the year would be 1486. Bryan and Curtis suggest that Edward V's seal could have come into the possession of the Yorkist party in Ireland. A new king, however, should warrant a new seal.

125. It has been argued that as the Irish king was crowned Edward VI, no pretender under Henry VII claimed to be Edward V, e.g. Williamson (see n.17), pp.117, 162. This argument now seems to have no support, compare nn.65 and 82 above.

126. The fullest description of the Warham-Margaret exchange is Kleyn (see n.2), pp.74-75. Warham may seem to regard Simnel and Warbeck as impersonators of the sons of Edward IV, when he complained that Margaret 'regularly contrived to discover such scoundrelly nephews from among her brother's children', Vergil, p.71 lines 18-19; but the English translation has a misplaced apostrophe, i.e. brothers', *ex fratribus*, p.70 line 14.

A tradition which accepted that the Dublin pretender was fifteen can be traced in a line through first printings of Vergil (1534), Hall (1548), Holinshed (1578), Gainsford (1618), Bacon (1622), and Ford (1634). Warham's complaint was that within a few years Margaret had brought forth two children, Lambert and Perkin, not after eight or nine months, as was natural, but 180 months, Vergil, pp.70-71 n. Hall and Holinshed both specifically mention 180 months, *Hall's Chronicle*, London 1908, p.466; Holinshed's *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, London 1808, vol.3, p.506. The youngest boy, presumably Simnel, was fifteen years old, according to Thomas Gainsford, *The True and Wonderful History of Perkin Warbeck, proclaiming himself Richard the Fourth*, in *Harleian Miscellany*, London 1745, vol.6, p.519. - Bacon, p.142, merely described the two boys as 'of many years' and 'tall striplings' (the lusty younglings mentioned by both Hall and Holinshed), but he had already said that Lambert was fifteen, see n.35 above.

Warham's specific reference to Lambert Simnel in Vergil, pp.70-71, was repeated in Hall, Holinshed, Gainsford, and Bacon. Margaret's reply in Gainsford, however, did not mention Lambert, and she would have done so if she had answered 'to every Point delivered' as this author claimed, Gainsford, pp.519-20, summarised in Kleyn, pp.75-76. According to the act of attainder (see n.93 above), the boy would have been ten at most when Margaret allegedly recognised him. Lambert was therefore probably not referred to specifically in addition to Warham's coded insult about fifteen year old princes.

Warwick would be excluded as Margaret's pretender, since her retort that 'Sons are to be preferred to Daughters' would refer to the superior claims of the sons of Edward IV over their sister, Henry VII's wife Elizabeth, Gainsford, p.519; compare n.25 above. The accuracy of Margaret's speech as reported in Gainsford may be questioned, however, because it contained a vicious attack on her brother Richard III which the duchess could hardly have made, Kleyn, p.75.

127. There was a Burgundian connection with Warbeck through Fryon, M. Ballard and C. S. L. Davies, 'Etienne Fryon: Burgundian Agent, English Royal Secretary and "Principal Counsellor" to Perkin Warbeck', *Historical Research*, vol.62 (1989), pp.245-59, but no firm evidence that Margaret supported the pretender before 1492, pp.252-54, esp. nn.41 and 42; but see also Chrimes, p.88.

128. Molinet said Edward son of Clarence made his enterprise known to Margaret (Molinet, pp.562-63, trans. Bennett, p.130), André that York visited her (see n.76), and Vergil that although she considered the matter false, Margaret supported the conspiracy for impersonating Warwick (see n.42 above).

129. The birth of the male heir to the house of York occurred in circumstances which both Warham and Margaret could hardly forget. Edward V was born on 2 (or possibly 3) November 1470 to Elizabeth Woodville in Westminster Abbey, after she had fled there for sanctuary during the brief readeption of Henry VI, see n.36 above. His father Edward IV did not see his baby son until his re-entry into London in April 1471, Kendall, pp.88, 92. That the fifteenth anniversary of Edward V's birth coincided with his incidental legitimisation in November 1485 would not be beyond the wit of Margaret or Warham. The coded insult would have allowed Warham to refer to Margaret's support of Edward V without exposing the English government's attempts to insinuate that the Dublin king was an impersonator of Warwick.

130. Busch wrote at length on the value as original authorities of André, Vergil, and Bacon; see esp. Busch, p.394 for André, p.396 for Vergil, and p.423, a devastating and influential criticism of Bacon. For Busch's judgement of Molinet, see p.326.

131. For Vergil's error on Warwick's age, see n.36 above, and on Simons, n.111. Bacon changed Vergil's story on the involvement of Elizabeth Woodville (see n.48) and Warwick's age (see n.35).

132. Molinet said Warwick was nearly grown up when he was only twelve (see n.36), the time of his escape cannot be determined (see n.62), and Molinet ignored problems about his recapture (see n.88).

133. On pseudo-York, see nn.33 and 37 above, but for evidence for a son of Edward IV compare nn.26, 28, 29, 31 and 34 also.

134. See n.37 above. For the age of the pretender, see n.36.

135. For the confusion of Edward V and Edward, Earl of Warwick, see Williams, p.120. Continental sources, e.g. Molinet, Weinreich and Adrien de But, regarded the Irish pretender as genuinely Warwick, but failed to agree on his fate, see n.88 above. They also assume that Richard III murdered his nephews, compare n.20 above. The evidence

of these sources therefore probably amounts to the pretender having the same name as Warwick. Some sightings of Warwick might refer to Edward V, see n.44 above. Possibly rumours about Warwick were spread by the English government even before Sheen.

136. On the non-specific proclamation about rumours, see n.83 above. Elizabeth Woodville, Dorset, and Lincoln, with Richard III, would have been the group who could have known of the fate of the princes, see n.21.

137. The chances of the king from Dublin surviving the battle of Stoke would have been small, see nn.86 and 92 above. A battlefield substitution by Bellingham would have been quite feasible, see nn.114, 115. The description of the so-called pretender in the act of attainder afterwards is scarcely corroborated, compare nn.93-100.

138. On the confession according to André, see n.89 above. Thus, for example 'From what happened after his arrest in 1487, it is difficult to credit that the pretender was Warwick or any other royal prince', Bennett, p.48.

139. André's story of the confession could be second hand, see n.89 above. Howth's acknowledgement could have been bought, see n.88. Henry VII's joke about Simnel and apes appears to have fallen flat and received no further recognition, see nn.116, 117. Sources describe Lambert Simnel as handsome, intelligent and courtly: a boy with an entirely innocent character, Vergil, p.13 n. 'a gentle nature and pregnant wit', *Book of Howth* (see n.46), p.188; 'comely youth and well favoured, not without some extraordinary dignity and grace of aspect', Bacon, p.54; and see also Hayden, p.625 and Bryan (see n.78), pp.100-01. Such descriptions could derive from government attempts to pass off their impostor as a plausible Irish pretender; compare Henry VII's studied contemptuous dismissal of Warbeck, a pretender whom the king was trying to brand as an impostor, Gainsford (see n.126), p.546.

140. The only extant contemporary allusion to the boy's name between the attainder of November 1487 and Polydore Vergil is the herald's report, where the captive claimed his name was John, Bennett, p.45.

141. For the Irish evidence, see nn.116-25 above. If the duke of York mentioned in the *Annals of Ulster* is Edward IV and the most unforced interpretation of Kildare's patent is correct, then independent evidence favours Edward V, see nn.122, 124. This candidature would seem to be corroborated from Warham's *contretemps* with Margaret of Burgundy, nn.126-29.

142. Since the English government seem to have manipulated so much of the written evidence, the oral evidence of the 1487 rebellion is potentially of more value than usual. André was dependent on oral testimony because he was blind, Busch, p.394; although he was a muddled reporter, he was not a dishonest one in inventing sources, compare the story of Perkin's Jewish educator later revealed as Sir Edward Brampton, outlined in Ballard and Davies (see n.127), p.253, nn.40, 42. It is therefore unlikely he would have confused Lambert with Perkin, n.27 above; André's account suggests that there were rumours even around the court of Henry VII that the 1487 pretender was a son of Edward IV, and compare Vergil's mention of the sons, n.29 above. By contrast with André, oral evidence for Molinet's Warwick probably derived from the foreign trading community, and the sources are contradictory and unreliable, see nn.20, 88, 135 above.

143. Vergil probably started some kind of journal in 1503, and was asked to write a history by Henry VII in 1506, Hay in Vergil, p.xx. The king seems to have been involved with the history up to at least folio 241 of the manuscript, which ended with the battle of Stoke, Vergil, p.12 n. mentioning Federico Veterani, custodian and occasional annotator of the manuscript (about whom see pp.xiii-xv). The final draft of the manuscript was composed in 1512-13, p.xx.

144. The confession of Tyrell is now treated with caution even by traditionalists, who sometimes concede that the timing was expedient, e.g. Chrimes, p.93 n.; compare n.107 above.

145. On the pervasiveness of the chronicler's view of history, Hay has remarked that from 'the usurpation of Richard in 1483 to the death of Wolsey in 1530, the main participants are still valued popularly as Vergil valued them ... From the wicked uncle to the grasping prelate, Vergil's story has become part of the national myth', Vergil, p.xxxix.

146. *DNB* under Simnel.

147. Vergil may have relied on oral information from More, Fox and Urswick, Vergil, p. xix; these were all associated with Henry VII or his Archbishop Morton. Vergil may not have seen the act of attainder, since there is no reference to the parliament of November 1487 in Hay's index to Vergil. As he used Vergil as a source, the omission may help to explain Bacon's confusion about this parliament, criticised by Busch, p.419. On the other hand, this assembly seems to have been largely concerned with the excesses of Henry VII's followers, see n. 115 above; the omission may have been deliberate, and Vergil could have known of the attainder. Hay suggested that Vergil may have used the battle herald's manuscript for his muster of gentlemen at Stoke, Vergil, p.xix, n.; compare Vergil, pp.22-23 n., to Leland (see n.62), pp.214-15; or compare Bennett, p.129, to his p.136. Vergil's list is in later printed editions, not in his original narrative, and the chronicler failed to change the name of the captured king to the herald's John, see n.114 above.

148. Busch, p.398, previously noted by Williams, p.120.

149. It is a pity that Vergil's 'smooth and stylish narrative has left few rough edges of circumstantial detail', Bennett, p.11. The detail amounts to the use of Lambert Simnel's name and his Oxford origins but not about his parentage or directly his age, see n.101 above.

150. On the changes, compare nn.55-59 and 93 above. On the capture, compare nn.87 and 111.

151. Bacon regarded Vergil's story of the conspiracy being the work of one priest as incredible, see n.48 above. Bacon insinuated that Elizabeth Woodville was involved in training the false Warwick, thus trying to make the dowager's detention more plausible, nn.45, 68-72. Adding two years to Warwick's age made his impersonation by the older Lambert Simnel appear more likely, see n.35. Bacon's story of the change of impersonation from a son of Edward IV to Warwick accommodated André's false imitation of York, see n.40; this could have been helped by Vergil's later concessions over the sons of Edward IV, see n.152 below.

152. On Vergil's concessions, see nn.29 and 103 above. These admissions were made in the printed editions of

Vergil from 1534 onwards, when any interest of the English government had probably been removed, compare n.143. With Henry VIII's break with Rome in the 1530s, Vergil became suspect from a religious viewpoint; sustained attacks on his work began with Leland in 1544, and Edward Hall's English history was first published in 1548, Vergil, pp.xxxix-xxxvii.

153. What is disturbing about the improvements of Vergil (nn.147, 149 and 150 above) and Bacon (n.151) is that they are not necessarily based on historical evidence, but seem to be attempts to cover up weaknesses in their original stories.

154. The pretender of at least fifteen years old derives from the mistaken age of Warwick, see nn.35-37 above. Edward was the pretender's name, Vergil, pp.14-15, 20-21; Molinet, pp.562-64 throughout. Edward V's mother lost her property possibly through her support of him, see nn. 67-74. The Irish and Germans claimed they were restoring their king, see n.81.

155. On the difficulties over the claims of the chroniclers' candidates, see nn.131-33 above. On difficulties over the traditional Lambert Simnel story, see nn.142-53. The notion that Lambert and the king from Dublin were two different people rests on the difference of six or seven years in the ages of the alleged pretender between Stoke and the attainder, see n.113.

156. The murder of the little princes and the alleged impostures of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck are three mysteries which Henry VII should have disposed of, but failed to do so. If the mysteries are all considered to be false, a consistency results. For if the princes were not murdered by Richard III and the real pretenders were neither Lambert (but Edward V) nor Perkin (but York), then there are no mysteries, G. Smith, *Ricardian Bulletin*, June 1993, p.27. This consistency is not necessarily true, of course, but it is certainly odd.

157. 'Simnel pretender' and 'Warbeck pretender' still retain the taint of the alleged impersonations, since it can be assumed that these pretenders were impostors, compare n.1 above. Warner's *Albion's England* of 1586 called Simnel, Warbeck and Wilford the 'three Phaetons', Ford (see n.126), p.179. Referring to these pretenders as Phaetons A, B and C respectively seems pretentious, but some neutral form of reference is required.

First published in *The Ricardian* Vol. 10, No. 135 December 1996.

© Richard III Society

This document is not to be reproduced without the permission of the Society.