

Lady Eleanor Talbot: New Evidence; New Answers; New Questions

JOHN ASHDOWN-HILL

Despite the fact that Richard III's claim to the throne was based chiefly on the presumption that Lady Eleanor Talbot was the legitimate wife of Edward IV,¹ prior to 1997 very little had been published about Eleanor. From 1997 the present writer has sought to remedy this in a series of papers.² Interesting new material in respect of Eleanor has now become available and is presented here.

The New Evidence

The documents upon which this study is based are now in the Warwickshire County Record Office, where they survive as part of an archive relating to the manor of Fenny Compton.³ The new evidence falls into two broad categories: first, the text of the documents; second, the seals attached to them.⁴ All the texts are written in Latin, and are largely formulaic (for which reason only particularly relevant extracts are quoted here).

The first document in the series which mentions Eleanor is a deed of gift

¹ 'King Edward was and stode married and trouth plight to oone Dame Elianor Butteler, doughter of the old Earl of Shrewesbury'. *Titulus regius*, 1484, RP, vol. 6, p. 240.

² J. Ashdown-Hill, 'Edward IV's uncrowned queen; the Lady Eleanor Talbot, Lady Butler', *The Ricardian*, vol. 11 (1997-99), pp. 166-190, and his, 'Missing molars: a genealogical conundrum', *ibid.*, pp. 340-44, 'Further reflections on Lady Eleanor Talbot', *ibid.*, pp. 463-67, 'Norfolk requiem: the passing of the House of Mowbray', *The Ricardian*, vol. 12 (2000-02), pp. 198-217, 'The inquisition *post mortem* of Eleanor Talbot, Lady Butler, 1468', *ibid.*, pp. 563-73; 'Lady Eleanor Talbot's other husband', *The Ricardian*, vol. 14 (2004), pp. 62-81; 'The endowments of Lady Eleanor Talbot and Elizabeth Talbot, Duchess of Norfolk, at Corpus Christi College Cambridge', *ibid.*, pp. 85-86; 'The go-between', *The Ricardian*, vol. 15 (2005), pp. 119-21.

³ One of the documents was mentioned *en passant* in L.E. Moye, 'The Estates and Finances of the Mowbray Family, Earls Marshal and Dukes of Norfolk 1401-1476', unpublished PhD thesis, Duke University 1985, p. 205. The present writer first encountered this material in the course of research relating to the Mowbray affinity. Coincidentally it was subsequently also mentioned to him by Brad Verity.

⁴ I am grateful to the staff of the Warwickshire County Record Office for their kind assistance to me during my examination of this material, and for permission to reproduce illustrations of some of the seals.

by her father-in-law, Ralph, Lord Sudeley, issued in Burton Dassett,⁵ and dated 10 May 31 Henry VI (1453).⁶ By it Lord Sudeley enfeoffed his son and heir, Thomas Butler, Thomas' wife, Eleanor – here described specifically as the daughter of John, Earl of Shrewsbury and Margaret, his wife⁷ – and the (hypothetical) legitimate issue of Thomas and Eleanor, with the manors of Burton Dassett, Griff and Fenny Compton, all in Warwickshire, together with the lands and tenements called 'Shipleys Thing' in Griff. The witnesses of this deed of gift included Sir William Catesby, William Lucy esquire, and Thomas Throckmorton. Catesby and Throckmorton are discussed below. As for William Lucy, it is not impossible that he was connected with Elizabeth Wayte (Lucy), who was to succeed Eleanor in Edward IV's affections. Links between Lady Eleanor and Elizabeth Wayte are also discussed below.

While it was already known that Thomas and Eleanor held the manors of Griff and Burton Dassett,⁸ it had not previously been remarked that they also held the manor of Fenny Compton, which is not mentioned in Eleanor's Warwickshire inquisition *post mortem*. This is for the simple reason that, as we shall see, Eleanor no longer held Fenny Compton at the time of her death. Meanwhile the deed of gift corroborates (if further corroboration were needed) the now well-established identities of Lady Eleanor's parents. It also confirms that Thomas and Eleanor were married before 10 May 1453. They had, in fact, married in 1449-50.⁹ Where, then, and upon what, had they been living up until this point?

Young brides of aristocratic family, when they first married, 'usually lived with the groom's parents until they came of age'.¹⁰ Eleanor had presumably done this. Eleanor had brought to her marriage a dowry of £1000.¹¹ In return for this generous sum,¹² paid on Eleanor's behalf by her father, the Butler family would provide her jointure: the property which her father-in-law would

⁵ Referred to in this document as 'Chepingdorset', one of several alternative names for Burton Dassett, attested also in 1397 and 1512. See J.E.B. Gover, A. Mawer and F.M. Stenton with F.T.S. Houghton, *The Place Names of Warwickshire*, Cambridge 1936, p. 268.

⁶ Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/79.

⁷ *Thome Botiller filio meo et heredi, et Alianore uxori eius, filie Iobanis Comitiss Salopie et Margarete uxoris eius.*

⁸ Ashdown-Hill, 'The inquisition *post mortem* of Eleanor Talbot, Lady Butler'.

⁹ Ashdown-Hill, 'Lady Eleanor Talbot's other husband', p. 69.

¹⁰ B.J. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women 1450-1550*, Oxford 2002, pp. 32; 192.

¹¹ The sum is stated in her father's will. J. Ashdown-Hill, 'The wills of John Talbot, first Earl of Shrewsbury, and of his sons, Lord Lisle and Sir Louis Talbot', *Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological and Historical Society* (forthcoming).

¹² The average size of dowry for a peer's daughter in the second half of the fifteenth century fell within the range 750-1000 marks. (One mark being equivalent to two thirds of a pound, 13s 4d.) Eleanor's 1000 pounds therefore represented quite a large dowry, although larger ones are recorded. Harris, *English Aristocratic Women*, pp. 46-47.

grant Eleanor and her husband for them to live on, and which Eleanor would retain for the term of her life, should she outlive her husband.¹³ Normally the landed property which was to comprise the jointure was specified in the marriage contract.¹⁴ Eleanor's marriage contract does not survive, but it is highly probable that Lord Shrewsbury had ensured that it stipulated details of her jointure. It is evident, however, from Eleanor's father's will, that Lord Sudeley had been dilatory in fulfilling his side of the contract, and had not granted Thomas and Eleanor the agreed lands – or indeed, any lands.¹⁵ In his will, drawn up at Portsmouth on Friday 1 September 1452, Eleanor's father had voiced his concern on her behalf. He had written: 'as to the £1000 that is paid for my daughter Eleanor's marriage, in case the covenants be not performed on the Lord of Sudeley's part, that then mine executors sue for the repayment of the sum aforesaid against the said Lord Sudeley'.¹⁶ However, when Lord Shrewsbury was killed in France, and his will was proved, the matter had already been resolved.

By its failure to assign him any title, Lord Sudeley's deed of gift indicates that in May 1453 Thomas Butler had not yet received a knighthood.¹⁷ However, Ralph's recorded negotiations with his wife's cousin, the abbot of St Albans, in respect of the Hertfordshire manor of the More, explicitly describe Thomas as *miles* on 15 May 1456.¹⁸ Clearly Thomas Butler was knighted at some point between 10 May 1453 and 15 May 1456.¹⁹ It is not currently possible to specify the date more precisely, so that, while it is conceivable that Thomas was knighted following the first battle of St Albans (in which his father seems to have taken part), this is mere speculation. It is equally plausible that he was knighted quite soon after 10 May 1453. By its reference to hypothetical rather than actual offspring of the Butler / Talbot marriage, Lord

¹³ Harris, pp. 44-45. The jointure was normally expected to provide an annual income equivalent to about ten per cent of the dowry.

¹⁴ Harris, p. 46.

¹⁵ The normal jointure allocation was equivalent to ten per cent of the value of the dowry. Harris, p. 50.

¹⁶ Ashdown-Hill, 'The wills of John Talbot, first Earl of Shrewsbury, and of his sons, Lord Lisle and Sir Louis Talbot'. Dowries were often paid in instalments, and other fathers are known to have withheld payment if jointures were not granted as agreed. It is evident from the will, however, that Lord Shrewsbury had paid over the whole £1000 at the time of the marriage.

¹⁷ Thomas' name is unqualified. His father, by contrast, is both *dominus de Sudeley* and *miles*.

¹⁸ H.T. Riley, ed., *Registrum Abbatiae Iohannis W'bethamstede, Abbatia Monasterii Sancti Albani*, 2 vols., London 1872-73, vol. 1, p. 227.

¹⁹ In the same way it is possible to deduce that Eleanor's brother, Humphrey Talbot, was knighted by Edward IV in 1464 or 1465. An interesting date, which roughly coincides both with the announcement of Edward's Woodville 'marriage', and with a retrospective grant from the king to Eleanor's mother. *CCR 1461-1468*, pp. 177, 183, 290; A. Crawford, ed., *The Household Books of John Howard, Duke of Norfolk, 1462-1471, 1481-1483*, Stroud 1992, part 1, p. 165.

Sudeley's deed confirms that in 1453 Thomas and Eleanor were still childless. Since Eleanor was by that time about seventeen years of age, while Thomas was in his early thirties, one might expect the marriage to have been consummated. Sixteen was the normal age for the consummation of a marriage in which one (or both) of the contracting partners had been a minor.²⁰ Eleanor's marriage should therefore have been consummated in about March 1452, following her sixteenth birthday. The fact that six months later she had still not received her jointure may well account for the evident irritation expressed by Lord Shrewsbury in his will. Lord Sudeley's deed of gift grants the jointure, and presumably marks Thomas and Eleanor's establishment of an independent marital household.

Two related documents follow the deed of gift.²¹ Both are letters of attorney, and bear the same date as the deed. The first emanates from Lord Sudeley and carries instructions to give seisin of the three manors to Thomas and Eleanor. The second is from Thomas and Eleanor, instructing their attorney, Thomas Throckmorton, to accept livery and seisin from Lord Sudeley. Given their letter of attorney, it is not necessary to assume that either Thomas or Eleanor was present in person in Burton Dassett on 10 May 1453, and their whereabouts at that time remain unknown.

A gap of almost seven years intervenes before the next document in the series: a quitclaim from Lord Sudeley to Lady Eleanor in respect of the manor of Fenny Compton, dated 15 January 38 Henry VI (1460).²² From this quitclaim it emerges that Sir Thomas Butler died before 15 January 1460 – but probably not very long before: perhaps during December 1459. It is conceivable that he died as a result of injuries sustained at Blore Heath, but this is mere speculation. It was a normal part of a widow's duty to arrange, and pay for, her husband's exequies, and Eleanor may have done so for Thomas. There is no information on this point, nor is it known where Thomas was buried. By the quitclaim, Lord Sudeley resigned all title to the manor of Fenny Compton in favour of Lady Eleanor. From this point onwards the twenty-three year old Eleanor held Fenny Compton in her own right, and not in dower. Why Lord Sudeley should have so disposed of it must remain a matter for conjecture, but it may be not unconnected with the fact that Eleanor had returned to him the manor of Griff (continuing to hold in dower only the manor of Burton Dassett).²³ It may also argue a degree of regard and affection for Eleanor on the part of her father-in-law, which Eleanor may have reciprocated.²⁴ 'Co-resi-

²⁰ Harris, p. 45.

²¹ Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/80 and L 1/81.

²² Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/82.

²³ Ashdown-Hill, 'The inquisition *post mortem* of Eleanor Talbot, Lady Butler'.

²⁴ His soul was prayed for in her endowment at Cambridge. Ashdown-Hill, 'The endowments of Lady Eleanor Talbot ...at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge', pp. 85-86.

dence gave women an opportunity to develop a warm relationship with their husband's parents'.²⁵

The final value of Eleanor's jointure as a widow remains difficult to assess. The value of Fenny Compton is not recorded. Also it is unclear precisely what other lands Eleanor held, and when. Nor is it entirely clear whether Eleanor's lands (other than Burton Dassett) were strictly speaking part of her jointure. English aristocratic widows' jointures during the period 1450-90 seem to have ranged from £10 a year to well over £1000 a year. Daughters and wives of knights tended to have the smaller incomes, as might be expected, – generally less than £50. Daughters and wives of peers were expected to be better off than this, though to have a jointure which produced an income of more than £500 a year was quite exceptional.²⁶ Eleanor's manor of Burton Dassett produced an annual income of just over £30. The manor of Griff, which she had returned to Lord Sudeley, yielded an annual income of about £20.²⁷ Assuming that Fenny Compton brought in as much as Griff, Eleanor's annual income from her two Warwickshire manors must have totalled at least £50. Since, as we shall shortly see, Eleanor also held another manor elsewhere, together with rents and other sources of income, her total annual revenue may well have amounted to £75 or more.²⁸ This was a reasonable sum – though not lavish. As a total income, it approached the ten percent of the value of Eleanor's dowry which would normally have been expected to constitute her annual revenue from her jointure alone.²⁹

It was not unusual for noble widows to hold property above and beyond what constituted their jointure. Usually any such property was a gift or legacy from a husband. Occasionally the woman herself purchased land. It transpires that Fenny Compton was not the only manor which Eleanor held in her own right during her widowhood. At some stage she had also acquired property in Wiltshire, comprising the manor of Oare-under-Savernake, together with 'divers messuages, lands, tenements, rents, reversions and services in Draycote, Coldecot and Chikeladerigg', all in the same county (or counties).³⁰ There are various difficulties in respect of these Wiltshire properties, not the least of which is the fact that neither in the Wiltshire archives, nor in the national

²⁵ Harris, p. 192.

²⁶ Harris, p. 130. Of the sample considered by Harris, approximately 36% had a jointure of less than £50 *per annum*; 28% had between £50 and £100, 25% had between £100 and £500, and 10% had more than £500.

²⁷ Ashdown-Hill, 'The inquisition *post mortem* of Eleanor Talbot, Lady Butler', p. 572.

²⁸ The total would depend, clearly, on the date at which additional property was acquired. This is unknown.

²⁹ Harris, p. 45.

³⁰ The MS has the abbreviation *in dict' com'*, which could imply one county or more than one.

archives does any record appear to survive of Eleanor's tenure of them. For reasons which will emerge below, it is also not entirely clear what is meant by 'the manor of Oare-under-Savernake'. Oare and the nearby forest of Savernake are situated about ten miles west of Newbury, a little to the south of Marlborough, in north east Wiltshire (near the Berkshire border). *Draycote* is clearly Draycot FitzPayne, which neighbours Oare. *Chikeladerigg* [Chicklade Ridge] refers to Chicklade, a tiny hamlet in south west Wiltshire, transected by the A303.³¹ It lies about ten miles west of Stonehenge and five miles south of Warminster, near the county boundary with Dorset. The 'Great Ridge', where Eleanor's land lay, rises up steeply on the northern side of the hamlet. 'Coldecot' is more of a puzzle. It may be Calcutt in Wiltshire, or possibly Caldecote in Warwickshire (north of Nuneaton).

Eleanor's tenure of the Wiltshire property is revealed by the next significant document in the Fenny Compton archive: a deed of gift issued on 4 June 8 Edward IV (1468).³² This deed was issued by Eleanor herself, in favour of her sister, Elizabeth, Duchess of Norfolk. Eleanor, describing herself as 'lately the wife of Thomas Boteler, knight, now deceased',³³ conveyed to her sister the reversion of all her Wiltshire property, which is specifically stated in the deed to be leased to John Cheyney for life. At the same time Eleanor made Elizabeth an outright gift of the Warwickshire manor of Fenny Compton. Harris has commented upon the degree to which aristocratic women in the fifteenth century developed networks centred on their female relations. 'These ties encouraged them to assist one another emotionally and materially throughout their lives and influenced the way in which widows distributed their property. Childless aristocratic widows often had particularly strong bonds with their sisters and nieces and chose them as major beneficiaries of their estates'.³⁴ The relationship between Eleanor and Elizabeth Talbot seems always to have been a close one. Elizabeth had protected and helped Eleanor, particularly since the death of her first husband. In return, what property Eleanor possessed, or the reversion thereof, now passed to Elizabeth.

How and when had Eleanor acquired her holdings in Wiltshire? There is no clue in the Fenny Compton archive. There are three possibilities. The Wiltshire lands might perhaps have come to Eleanor from her own family. Alternatively they might have been a gift from the king, designed, perhaps, to help to maintain Eleanor – or to keep her quiet. The third possibility is that

³¹ Chicklade seems too small to have qualified as a village in the middle ages. It has no medieval (or later) parish church.

³² Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/85.

³³ *Nuper uxor Thome Boteler militis iam defuncti*. It is difficult to see how else Eleanor could have described herself in a legal document at this juncture. If she were not a widow, her freedom to act in the matter would have been in question.

³⁴ Harris, p. 9.

Eleanor herself purchased them. The last of these options is difficult to evaluate. Did Eleanor have sufficient income to purchase land and manors? As for the other possibilities, for Eleanor to have brought landed property from her natal family to her Butler marriage would have been highly unusual, given that she was not an heiress.³⁵ Rather, Eleanor would have been expected to bring a cash dowry to her marriage. Indeed, we have already seen that she did so. 'A woman's dowry constituted her inheritance and forestalled her making any further claim on the family estates, although fathers could, and often did, leave their daughters additional legacies in their wills'.³⁶ Eleanor, then, would have had no claim on family lands, and is extremely unlikely to have acquired any unless by any chance her father chose to leave some to her.

In point of fact, however, no bequest to Eleanor is mentioned in the will of her father, the first earl of Shrewsbury, nor in the wills of Lord Lisle or Sir Louis Talbot, the two brothers who predeceased her.³⁷ As for the possibility that Eleanor might have been left the Wiltshire property by her mother, the dowager countess of Shrewsbury, who died on Sunday 14 June 1467,³⁸ there is a major difficulty with this explanation. Following Margaret's death, writs of *diem clausit extremum* were almost instantly dispatched to the escheators of the numerous counties within which she had held lands. These comprised Gloucestershire, Somerset, Staffordshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Devon, Worcestershire and Warwickshire. Writs were also sent to the mayors of Lincoln and London in their capacity as escheators of those cities.³⁹ No writ was dispatched to the escheator of Wiltshire. The clear implication is that Margaret held no lands in that county. She cannot, therefore, have left any to her daughter, Eleanor.

The lack of clarity as to what exactly Eleanor held in Wiltshire complicates the discussion. The forest of Savernake itself seems to have been under the control of Edward IV's great uncle, Edward, Duke of York, earlier in the fifteenth century. There is a record of a grant made by him in favour of the Carmelite friars, giving them the right to collect fuel there.⁴⁰ Subsequently the forest was certainly in the hands of the crown and was conferred on the royal consort. In 1452 Henry VI granted it to Margaret of Anjou and in 1466

³⁵ Harris, p. 43.

³⁶ Harris, p. 47.

³⁷ Ashdown-Hill, 'The wills of John Talbot ...and of his sons ...'. It was quite usual for siblings not to mention one another in their wills. According to Harris, less than 8% of them did so, p. 185.

³⁸ Eleanor's tenure would, in that case, have been of very limited duration, but she is only known to have held the Wiltshire lands in June 1468. It is not certain when she acquired them.

³⁹ *CFR 1461-1471*, pp. 195-97.

⁴⁰ Mentioned retrospectively in 1452. *CPR 1446-52*, p. 108.

Edward IV gave it to Elizabeth Woodville.⁴¹ If Eleanor's Wiltshire property included any part of the forest, such a gift can only have come to her from the king.

As for her manor of 'Draycote', by a very curious coincidence the manor of Draycot FitzPayne was held by the Skillings, the family to which the step-mother of Edward IV's mistress, Elizabeth Wayte (Lucy), belonged.⁴² However, there was also a second estate at Draycote, in addition to the one held by the Skillings. By 1242 this second estate was in the hands of the Berkeley family 'and was still part of the Lordship of Berkeley in 1401. ... Although said to be in Draycot until at least 1442 it became part of Oare tithing and the base of the reputed manor of Oare'.⁴³ It is tempting to conclude that this second Draycot manor formed part of Eleanor's holdings, and was an inheritance which came to her from her mother's Berkeley ancestors. Eleanor's choice of words when referring to her Wiltshire property, while in itself proving nothing, could be consistent with such a conclusion.⁴⁴ In fact, however, as we have seen, it seems impossible that Eleanor acquired any land in Wiltshire from her mother. Moreover, there are other difficulties about this explanation, which relate to the identities of the sub-tenants of the Wiltshire lands.

The sub-tenants of the Berkeley's manor of Oare were the Cotel family in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the lease was inherited by the Paultons in the fifteenth century. 'Before 1442 ... William Paulton (d. 1450) settled Oare on his daughter Gillian when she married John Cheney'.⁴⁵ Subsequently the Berkeley's manor of Oare remained in the hands of the Cheney family as sub-tenants until at least the late seventeenth century. However, the Fenny Compton archive contains a clear and unequivocal statement that all Eleanor's Wiltshire lands had passed, by 1474, into the hands of one Thomas Rogers.⁴⁶ This implies that whatever land Eleanor held in Wiltshire cannot have included the manor once held by the Berkeleys.

It would, of course, be extremely helpful if any confirmatory material in respect of Eleanor's Wiltshire tenures survived in the Wiltshire archives. Sadly, nothing of the sort has been found there, though there is certainly corroboration of the existence of John Cheney, and of his family's connection with the

⁴¹ CPR 1446-52, p. 559; CPR 1461-67, p. 482.

⁴² Ashdown-Hill, 'The elusive mistress: Elizabeth Lucy and her family', *The Ricardian*, vol. 11 (1997-99), pp. 490-505. This coincidence recalls the fact that William Lucy esquire had witnessed Lord Sudeley's gift to Thomas and Eleanor in 1453.

⁴³ VCH, *Wiltshire*, vol. 10, p. 195.

⁴⁴ Eleanor gave (*dedisse*) her sister the manor of Fenny Compton, which was not Eleanor's inherited property. On the other hand she granted Elizabeth the reversion (*reversione*) of the Wiltshire properties. This could be construed as implying some right of inheritance.

⁴⁵ VCH, *Wiltshire*, vol. 10, p. 195.

⁴⁶ See below and L1/93.

manor of Oare.⁴⁷ Naturally the Wiltshire holdings would not be mentioned in Eleanor's surviving inquisition *post mortem*, which was drawn up by the escheator for Warwickshire, and referred only to that county. If Eleanor held property in Wiltshire at the time of her death, as she clearly did, a writ of *diem clausit extremum* should also have been addressed on the king's behalf to the Wiltshire escheator, following which a separate inquisition *post mortem* should have been held for that county and a report returned to the chancery. It is very curious that there is no surviving trace of either document. On the other hand it is now clear why Fenny Compton is not mentioned in Eleanor's Warwickshire inquisition *post mortem*. Eleanor did not hold that manor at the time of her death. She had previously disposed of it to her sister. It can hardly be coincidental that this transfer took place only weeks before Eleanor died. The deed was sealed on Saturday 4 June 1468, the eve of Whit Sunday. Less than four weeks later, on Thursday 30 June, Eleanor was dead.

Was she already ill on 4 June? Did she know that she was dying? The chronology certainly invites these questions. The deed of gift is dated from Fenny Compton. Was Eleanor herself in Fenny Compton to issue it? And what happened afterwards? Having granted Fenny Compton away, Eleanor can hardly be supposed to have continued to reside there (if, indeed, she had ever done so). Her manor of Griff had been surrendered to Lord Sudeley by 1461 at the latest. Her property in Wiltshire was in the hands of a sub-tenant. The only property left to Eleanor where she might have resided for the last three weeks of her life was the manor of Burton Dassett.

There is, however, no evidence that Eleanor spent her last days at Burton Dassett. As we have seen, the present writer has previously argued that she died at Kenninghall in Norfolk. It was not unusual for a single woman to join the household of a married sister.⁴⁸ One apparent difficulty arises in respect of Kenninghall, in that Moye lists this as comprising part of the jointure of Eleanor Bouchier, Duchess of Norfolk (died 1474) and also as being part of the dower holdings of her daughter-in-law, Elizabeth Talbot.⁴⁹ This is theoretically possible, but it would imply that Elizabeth Talbot did not hold Kenninghall during her sister's lifetime. Moye's listings of the dower tenures of the Mowbray duchesses need to be treated with caution, however.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office: damaged deed and letters of attorney concerning John Cheyney, June 1466, ref. 490/1478; marriage settlement referring to John Cheyney of Oare, gentleman, 8 June 1678, ref. 9/26/176.

⁴⁸ Harris, p. 187. Harris, however, has a still unmarried woman in mind.

⁴⁹ Moye, Thesis, pp. 164, 223.

⁵⁰ There is, for example, some confusion relating to Earl Soham in Suffolk, which Moye also assigns first to Eleanor Bouchier and then to Elizabeth Talbot. In point of fact, however, it is clear from records of appointments to the living of Earl Soham that this manor was held by Catherine Neville until her death. Since Catherine outlived Eleanor Bouchier, the latter cannot have held the manor.

Kenninghall had never, in fact, been part of the Mowbray inheritance, and it is difficult to see how Eleanor Bouchier can have held it. Elizabeth Fitzalan, widow of the first Mowbray duke, had held Kenninghall in dower, but it came to her from her own family, and had reverted to the Fitzalans upon her death. The usual account states that it was then purchased by the third duke as part of the jointure of his daughter-in-law, Elizabeth Talbot, in which case it was at Elizabeth's personal disposal from October 1462, when Edward IV granted her control of her jointure.

At all events, there is no doubt that Eleanor Talbot was buried in Norfolk, at the Carmelite Priory in Norwich of which she seems to have been a *conversa* or oblate, subject to its rule of *stabilitas*. This rule would have required her to live in a fixed abode within a reasonable distance of the priory; an abode which she would then not normally have left. Her sister's dower house, East Hall, at Kenninghall, fits these requirements. Bearing all this in mind, are we to contemplate a dying Eleanor (having presumably obtained a dispensation from Prior Richard Water of the Norwich Carmel) setting off on the not inconsiderable journey from Norfolk to Warwickshire and back, just to cede her property to her sister? It seems improbable.

Eleanor's deed of gift is accompanied by letters of attorney.⁵¹ Between them, these three documents identify some of the people who formed part of her entourage at this period. It was normal for aristocratic widows to employ a number of people to handle their business interests, and Eleanor must have done so, but none of her servants have previously been identified. The witnesses of the deed are Sir William Catesby, Thomas Huggefurd esquire, and John Huggefurd esquire. Eleanor's instructions to deliver seisin to her sister are addressed to Sir Robert Handy and Sir Thomas Askill, and receiving the manor and reversion on behalf of the duchess were Thomas Throckmorton (who had acted previously for Thomas and Eleanor) and John Evars (or Eyuers).

Generally, the names of these men are not famous. An intriguing exception is Sir William Catesby, who also witnessed Lord Sudeley's deed of gift in 1453. The references must be to Sir William Catesby I (c.1408-78/9) rather than to his better-known son and heir, William Catesby II (1440-85), because despite the fact that the latter is often called 'Sir', he was, in fact, never knighted.⁵² William Catesby I was made a knight of the Bath in 1449,⁵³ and his second wife, Jane Barre (born c. 1420), was Lady Eleanor Talbot's first

⁵¹ Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/86 and L 1/87.

⁵² R. Horrox in the *ODNB*, vol. 10, p. 535.

⁵³ C. Carpenter in *ODNB*, vol. 10, p. 529. See also J.C. Wedgwood and A.D. Holt, *History of Parliament, 1439-1509*, 2 vols., London 1936-38, vol. 1, *Biographies*, p. 164.

cousin.⁵⁴ Sir William Catesby's relationship with Eleanor was clearly well known and acknowledged at the time. Even before Eleanor was born, Catesby had been linked with her father. It was, indeed, as a result of this connection that, in 1453, he married the earl of Shrewsbury's niece. Apart from the fact that he acted for Eleanor on the present occasion and in 1453, it is also known that he was the 'legal adviser and estate administrator for several landowners, among them Elizabeth Beauchamp (the widow of George Neville, Lord Latimer)'.⁵⁵ Lady Latimer (1417-80) also enfeoffed land to Sir William Catesby, John Wakes and Thomas Lymerik.⁵⁶ Since Lady Latimer was Eleanor's maternal aunt, while Catesby's wife was Eleanor's paternal cousin, their connection with one another is an indirect one which depended upon Eleanor. It may also have been through Eleanor that Sir William Catesby entered the affinity of the earl of Warwick, who was Eleanor's maternal uncle.⁵⁷

Sir William's son, William Catesby II ('the Cat' of the famous rhyme), was Jane Barre's stepson,⁵⁸ and therefore not directly related to Eleanor. Given his father's connection with her business interests, however, it is hardly conceivable that he did not know her. A rising young lawyer, he was subsequently the protégé of Lord Hastings, and had links to the duke of Buckingham. In 1483 he was appointed to the council of the Protector, Richard Duke of Gloucester. He was ultimately hanged by Henry VII in the aftermath of the battle of Bosworth. His connection with Lady Eleanor is certainly intriguing.

None of her other men of business had such a well-known name. They were nevertheless men of some local repute. Thomas and John Huggeford (or Higford) received a number of commissions of various kinds in respect of the county of Warwickshire, and John Huggeford was the sheriff of Warwickshire in 1465.⁵⁹ Like Catesby, the Huggefords were associates of Eleanor's uncle, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, and also of Lord Hastings, and of one Henry Boteler, who was probably related in some way to Lord Sudeley. Thomas Throckmorton was also sheriff of Warwickshire at some stage prior to 1469.⁶⁰ Robert Handy is named as a feoffee (with Sir William Catesby and his

⁵⁴ Jane Barre's mother, Alice Talbot, Lady Barre (c. 1390-1436), was Eleanor's aunt, being one of the first earl of Shrewsbury's sisters. Wedgwood and Holt suggest that Jane was Sir William Catesby's first wife, but the birth dates of the children of his two marriages appear to make this a chronological impossibility. Horrox confirms (*ODNB* vol. 10, p. 535) that Jane Barre was Sir William's second wife.

⁵⁵ Horrox in *ODNB*, vol. 10, p. 535.

⁵⁶ E.J. Bolden, 'Richard III: central government and administration', *The Ricardian*, vol. 12 (2000-02), p. 74.

⁵⁷ He had joined Warwick's affinity by 1466. Carpenter, *ODNB*, vol. 10, p. 530.

⁵⁸ The mother of William II was Philippa Bishopston, who probably died c. 1445. William I then married Jane Barre (c. 1446), who bore him a daughter, Alice, about a year later.

⁵⁹ *CPR 1461-67*, pp. 66, 202, 389, 450, 472, 489, 491; *CPR 1467-77*, p. 136.

⁶⁰ *CPR 1467-77*, p. 136. John Throckmorton, presumably a relative of Thomas, had been

son and various other men) of two manors in Northamptonshire in 1475.⁶¹ John Euyas [*sic*], gentleman, with various other people, received a royal commission in November 1470.⁶² Only Sir Thomas Askill seems to be otherwise unrecorded. Throckmorton and Evars delegated their task to John Seman and Gilbert Cockes or Cooke. Was it therefore the case that neither of the principals was in Warwickshire on 4 June 1468? Did their respective attorneys and assigns act for them? The duchess of Norfolk was very much preoccupied with other matters at the beginning of June 1468. Exactly two weeks after the date of the deed of gift, she was in London. On Saturday 18 June the king's sister, Margaret of York, set out from the royal Wardrobe on her wedding journey to Flanders. 'The bride's ladies were headed by the beautiful Elizabeth Talbot, Duchess of Norfolk,⁶³ who took with her her own large train'.⁶⁴ Preparations for the wedding journey had been in progress since May.

It might be appropriate at this point to consider why Eleanor decided to give Fenny Compton to her sister during her own lifetime, and why she granted Elizabeth the reversion of all her Wiltshire properties at the same time. The answer to these questions is related to the medieval legal position of wives and widows in respect of the making of wills and testaments. Wills and testaments in the fifteenth century were two quite different things. Wills disposed of real estate, testaments disposed of personal property. Fenny Compton and the Wiltshire estates represented the entirety of Eleanor's personal land holdings. The only other way in which she could have arranged for their transfer to her sister (or indeed, to anyone else) would have been by making a will. In Eleanor's own eyes, however, this may not have been an option open to her. According to medieval law, a widow was free to make a will, but a wife could not do so without the permission of her husband. If Eleanor considered herself married to Edward IV, then she was not free to make a will, and the only way to ensure that her lands passed to her sister was by a deed of gift executed in her own lifetime. It is interesting, therefore, to discover that this is precisely the course which Eleanor took. She was, of course, at liberty to make a testament, arranging for the disposal of her personal property after her death, and although no testament of Eleanor's appears to survive, it is certain that she made one, because Elizabeth later described herself as the executrix of

associated with Lord Sudeley in 1440. *CFR 1437-45*, p. 122.

⁶¹ *CPR 1467-77*, p. 531.

⁶² *CPR 1467-77*, p. 249. John Evers was later a feoffee of Alice Deincourt, the dowager Lady Sudeley. *CCR 1468-76*, p. 307, no. 1120.

⁶³ Elizabeth's beauty (which Eleanor may have shared) is vouched for by Olivier de La Marche, who met her in Flanders.

⁶⁴ C. Weightman, *Margaret of York, Duchess of Burgundy, 1446-1503*, Gloucester 1989, p. 47.

Eleanor's testament.⁶⁵ It cannot but be significant that in the matter of the disposal of her property, Eleanor chose to behave as a wife, rather than as a widow. This conduct was entirely consistent with the choice that she made in respect of her religious oblation (see above), when she also specifically selected for herself an option which was open to a married woman.

The transfer of Eleanor's property to her sister is almost the end of the Talbot sisters' story as revealed by the text of the Warwickshire documents. There are two brief postscripts to the documentary evidence. First, on 8 December 1468 Edward IV granted a 'general pardon to Elizabeth, wife of the king's kinsman, John, Duke of Norfolk, of all offences committed by her before 7 December'.⁶⁶ It is not explicitly stated that this pardon related to Elizabeth's acquisition of Eleanor's property without licence, but it would certainly have covered that situation. Second, there are, in the Fenny Compton archive, three further documents dating from the summer of 1474. In an *inspeximus* of 1 June 14 Edward IV (1474)⁶⁷ the East Anglian lawyer James Hobart, who acted frequently (though by no means exclusively) for the Mowbrays, records that Eleanor's deed of gift to her sister (L1/85) was then held by Thomas Roger who had acquired (presumably recently) all Eleanor's named properties in Wiltshire. An accompanying exemplification⁶⁸ records the enrolment of the *inspeximus* before Thomas Bryan in the court of common pleas at Westminster in the Trinity term (11 July 14 Edward IV [1474]).

At some point between 1468 and 1474 the manor of Fenny Compton had been conveyed by John and Elizabeth, Duke and Duchess of Norfolk, to John Wenlock, Richard Southwell and Robert Bernard. The first of these men, from a family long-established in the service of the Talbots,⁶⁹ had become an annuitant of the duke of Norfolk by the 1470s.⁷⁰ Southwell and Bernard were well-known members of the Mowbray affinity. Indeed, Southwell was the steward of Kenninghall⁷¹ and may have served Lady Eleanor. As for Robert

⁶⁵ Ashdown-Hill, 'The endowments of Lady Eleanor Talbot', p. 83. It should be noted that my translation at this point was inaccurate. It reads 'executrix of the *will* of the said Eleanor', but the Latin text says specifically 'executrix *testamenti* dicte Elianore'. The distinction is important.

⁶⁶ *CPR 1467-77*, p. 122. The duke and duchess of Norfolk had previously been granted such a pardon on 20 March 1468. *CPR 1467-77*, p. 83.

⁶⁷ Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/93.

⁶⁸ Warwickshire County Record Office, L 1/94.

⁶⁹ The 1492 will of Sir Humphrey Talbot, brother of Eleanor and Elizabeth, ordained prayers for the souls of his faithful servants, John and Elizabeth Wenlock. N.H. Nicolas, *Testamenta Vetusta*, 2 vols., London 1826, vol. 2, pp. 409-10. An earlier John Wenlock and a William Wenlock had served the Talbots at Blakemere during the period 1401-20. B. Ross, *Accounts of the Stewards of the Talbot Household at Blakemere, 1392-1425*, Keele 2003, pp. 45, 54, 117, 132, 137, 142-44.

⁷⁰ Moye, Thesis, p. 438.

⁷¹ In 1473-76 at least. Southwell probably succeeded Robert Arnold, but the precise date of

Bernard, in company with Eleanor's and Elizabeth's brother, Sir Humphrey Talbot, he had received the crimson Mowbray livery from the duke of Norfolk's cousin, Sir John Howard, on 25 May 1465. He was also a Mowbray annuitant.⁷²

The original quitclaim from the duke and duchess of Norfolk appears not to survive, but it is mentioned in a grant of 13 July 14 Edward IV (1474), whereby Wenlock, Southwell and Bernard enfeoffed of the manor of Fenny Compton Thomas Waldyf, John Aylesbury and Thomas Clopton. Nothing further is known of Waldyf and Aylesbury. Clopton, however, has two possible identities. He may have been a Suffolk man. The Suffolk Cloptons, based at Kentwell Hall, near Long Melford, were in the service of the Mowbrays. A Thomas Clopton was the younger brother of Sir(?) William Clopton of Kentwell Hall (c. 1402-46), and the uncle of John Clopton Esquire of Kentwell Hall (c. 1427-97). John Clopton certainly served the duke of Norfolk in the 1460s.⁷³ However, a Clopton family also existed in Warwickshire. The Suffolk and Warwickshire Cloptons bore quite different arms, and if the two families are connected, that fact is not documented. The existence of the Warwickshire Cloptons is first attested in 1236. Nine generations later, in the reign of Edward IV, the head of this family was also called Thomas. The Suffolk and the Warwickshire Thomas Cloptons are both plausible recipients of the Fenny Compton enfeoffment.

The Evidence of the Seals

One other aspect of the Fenny Compton archive merits attention, namely the seals employed on the documents. Ralph, Lord Sudeley consistently employed a circular seal matrix engraved with his arms and style. This is of relatively modest size (39mm in diameter), and no counterseal is used. The single-sided, red wax impressions produced from this matrix are attached to their documents by strips of parchment in the usual way, as indeed are all the seal impressions in this collection. Impressions of Lord Sudeley's seal survive in varying states of preservation on Warwickshire Record Office L1/79, 80, 82 and 88. None is complete, but the best preserved is that on L1/82. The arms shown are quarterly 1 and 4 Butler, 2 and 3 Sudeley. The inscription is incomplete, but appears to run: *sigillu]m radulphi buttler d[om]ini [de?] s[u]del[ey]*

All the other seals used on this series of documents, including that of the duchess of Norfolk, are much smaller than that of Lord Sudeley. Apart from that of Lord Sudeley they are generally small round or oval seals. In some cases

his appointment is not known. Moye, Thesis, p. 432.

⁷² Crawford, *Howard Household Books*, part 1, p. 165; Moye, Thesis, p. 427.

⁷³ He was a member of the Mowbray affinity in 1465. For details of the Clopton family, see J. Corder, ed., *The Visitation of Suffolk, 1561*, London 1981, pp. 20-28.

it is clear that the matrix formed part of a signet ring. In other cases it is difficult to be certain whether the matrix was a signet or a pyramid seal. The seal matrix used by Eleanor on L1/85 is of an unusual trapezoid shape. It is clear, nevertheless, that this seal formed part of a signet ring.

Thomas Butler did not employ a heraldic device.⁷⁴ His seal matrix, the impression of which is found only on L1/81, was probably a signet ring (though a small pyramid seal is also a possibility). The red wax impression shows a hart, impressively antlered, partially surrounded by what may be intended as an elaborate letter 'T'. The seal is circular, roughly 10mm in diameter, and the beading which bordered the design is partly visible, particularly around the top of the impression.⁷⁵

Eleanor uses three different seals, none of them heraldic. 'It was not unusual for an individual to own more than one seal'.⁷⁶ On L1/81 a signet ring was used. This is evident from the fact that the scalloped shoulder of the ring bezel has left its impression in the wax, rising up at an angle around the central field of the seal. The bezel was circular, 9mm in diameter, engraved with a single flower with ten petals.⁷⁷ Beneath the flower are two sprigs of leaves, crossed in saltire, and there seem also to be smaller flowers flanking the large central one. Probably a daisy, or marguerite, is represented. Such a flower would not have been a particularly appropriate symbol for Eleanor herself, but the marguerite is known to have been used by Eleanor's mother, Margaret Countess of Shrewsbury, as her name emblem.⁷⁸ Possibly the countess gave her daughter this signet ring. There are known instances where 'the seal of someone closely related' was employed.⁷⁹ This seal, like the accompanying one of Thomas Butler, is finely engraved, despite its diminutive size.

L1/85 also appears to have been sealed using a signet ring – but a different ring. In this case the bezel is in the form of an elongated trapezium, somewhat irregularly shaped, and wider towards the top. The design engraved on this is at first sight difficult to interpret. It appears to represent a piece of cloth. On the lower part of the bezel a rectangular area is clearly marked with a criss-cross design indicating woven fabric. A larger, bunched shape towards the top of the

⁷⁴ Apart from that of Lord Sudeley, the only heraldic seal on any of these documents is that of Richard Southwell on L1/95. This is a small signet depicting the Southwell arms: azure, a chevron engrained between three falcons argent. See C.R. Humphery-Smith, *General Armory Two*, London 1973, p. 145.

⁷⁵ The beading tends to imply a signet. Pyramid matrices do not usually have a decorative border.

⁷⁶ P.D.A. Harvey and A. McGuinness, *A Guide to British Medieval Seals*, London 1996, p. 83.

⁷⁷ Possibly five bifurcated petals, though the flower does not appear to be intended as a rose.

⁷⁸ The countess of Shrewsbury's use of the marguerite emblematic of her name is illustrated in her book of hours. Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, MS 41-1950.

⁷⁹ Harvey and McGuinness, p. 87.

design, while somewhat worn in the surviving seal impression, appears to bear the same criss-cross pattern. In the centre (between the two areas representing fabric) there is a pointed oval shape, resembling an eye or a mouth. It seems that what is intended is a representation of a scapular. This is a rectangular length of cloth, with a hole in the middle through which the head and neck pass. It is worn hanging down over the wearer's chest and back, as part of the religious habit of certain orders, including the Carmelites. On the seal impression, the lower, rectangular area of fabric is that portion of the garment which hangs down in front, over the wearer's chest, while the larger bunched portion towards the top of the design is the part of the garment which covers the wearer's back. The eye-shaped object in the centre would be the hole to accommodate the wearer's head and neck. The brown scapular of the Carmelites was originally worn by the friars of the order. Its use was extended to lay oblates in the later Middle Ages, and then to Carmelite nuns (when these came into being in the sixteenth century, during the Counter Reformation). If Lady Eleanor was a *conversa*, or Carmelite oblate, she would certainly have been entitled – even expected – to wear the brown scapular. The use of religious devices on seals is well-attested,⁸⁰ but it seems indicative of the strength of Eleanor's religious commitment that she should have chosen to represent this simple garment on one of her seal rings.

L1/86 was probably also sealed using a ring. The impression is in the form of a slightly irregular oval, about 20mm in width by 13mm in height. Towards the left is the bust of a woman, veiled, and possibly nimbate, facing three-quarters right. Behind the woman's right shoulder there is a letter 'M', suggesting that this may be intended as a representation of the Virgin Mary. Once again a connection with Eleanor's Carmelite oblation may be implied, since under her title 'Flower of Mount Carmel' (*flos Carmeli*) the Blessed Virgin is patroness of the Carmelite order. The right-hand side of the impression is indistinct. The whole design has a border of beading.

One curious fact is that L1/85 and L1/86 have the same creation date and place. (Both are dated Fenny Compton, 4 June 1468.) If Lady Eleanor sealed both documents at the same time and in the same place, one might logically have expected her to use the same seal on each of them. The fact that this was not done would be consistent with the thesis that Eleanor, who may already have been seriously ill at the time, was not personally present in Fenny Compton on 4 June 1468 and that the documents (or at least one of them) may have been sealed by others acting on her behalf – in which case the finger prints surviving as impressions in the wax on the the reverse of the seal impressions would not be those of Eleanor herself.

L1/87 bears three seals, the central one being probably a seal of Elizabeth,

⁸⁰ Harvey and McGuinness, p. 89.

Duchess of Norfolk.⁸¹ The other two seals are presumably those of Thomas Throckmorton and John Evars. All three are small circular seals, the impressions probably produced using signet rings. The central seal, 12.5mm in diameter, and very finely engraved, despite its small size, bears the head of an elephant facing right. Behind the creature's head runs a chain, presumably attached to its collar, while in front of the beast's neck is a tiny sprig of three flowers. The flowers appear to be upright on their stems, not pendulous, and each flower has five, pointed petals. Although the engraving is of good quality, the whole seal is so small that, even with magnification, the detail of the design is difficult to discern. It seems likely, however, that the flowers represented are the tiny, star-shaped, blue flowers of borage.⁸²

It is already known that Elizabeth Talbot, like many of her contemporaries, made use of a flower emblem. In her will, she left to Thetford Priory (where her husband and his parents were buried) 'a pair of altar cloths of red damask and black embroidered with my lord's flowers and mine'.⁸³ John Mowbray's 'flowers' were actually sprigs of mulberry leaves,⁸⁴ but the identity of Elizabeth Talbot's flower emblem was hitherto unknown. However, an inventory of the contents of Framlingham Castle taken in 1524 records the presence there of a number of heraldic badges: Mowbray and Howard white lions, and de Vere stars, the latter being relics of the de Vere occupancy of the castle after Bosworth. The inventory specifically states that the castle furnishings included old items, some of them well-worn. Various flowers are mentioned, including roses, lilies, borage flowers and columbine. 'In the young ladies' chamber [were] five pieces of old English say [serge], paned with green and red, embroidered with borages', while a silver parcel-gilt ewer in the ewery also bore a borage flower.⁸⁵ It appears likely that borage was Elizabeth Talbot's chosen flower emblem: a fitting badge for a daughter of the first earl of

⁸¹ Another (quite different) seal of Elizabeth Talbot is to be found on her Corpus Christi College indentures.

⁸² The other possible contender as the flower emblem of Elizabeth Talbot is the columbine (see below). Columbine flowers, however, would be pendulous and larger, and their petals are not pointed.

⁸³ Will of Elizabeth Talbot, dowager Duchess of Norfolk, 1506, PRO, PROB 11/15, f. 196v, published in Ashdown-Hill, 'Norfolk requiem', p. 213.

⁸⁴ R. Marks and P. Williamson, eds, *Gothic, Art for England 1400-1547*, Victoria and Albert Museum, London 2003, p. 204: 'The mulberry was a punning device favoured by the Mowbray dukes of Norfolk. Thomas, the first duke, had the crimson trapper of his horse decorated with mulberry trees and white lions for his proposed combat with Bolingbroke in 1398'. An example of such a badge is illustrated, p. 205, no. 68f (BM, MME 56, 7-1, 2111).

⁸⁵ J. Ridgard, ed., *Medieval Framlingham: Select Documents 1270-1524*, Woodbridge 1985, pp. 141, 154. A representation of a columbine is also recorded on a silver parcel-gilt basin in the ewery.

Shrewsbury, since according to Gerard's *Herbal*, 'borage gives courage'.⁸⁶ Curiously, the borage flower was also one of the badges used after 1485 by Lady Margaret Beaufort. It is displayed, together with her coat of arms (with yale supporters), the red rose, the crowned portcullis and the daisy on the gateways of both her Cambridge foundations: Christ's and St John's Colleges.

Conclusions

The Fenny Compton archive constitutes further evidence of the apparently cordial relationship which ultimately existed between Lady Eleanor and her father-in-law, Lord Sudeley. It also proves beyond doubt that Sir Thomas Butler held his knighthood for only a brief period, and that he died before 15 January 1460. The dating of L1/79 appears to confirm that the birth date of 1436 (proposed for Eleanor in an earlier study) is very probably correct. This archive shows Eleanor to have been better-off during her last years than was previously supposed, since in addition to Burton Dassett (held in dower), she held in her own right the manor of Fenny Compton in Warwickshire from 1460 to 1468, together with various further property in Wiltshire (from an unspecified date until her death). Through its seal impressions the archive implies confirmation of Eleanor's status as a Carmelite lay oblate from 1463 to 1468. The transactions undertaken by Eleanor in June 1468 show her choosing to act as though she thought of herself as a married woman rather than a widow.

At the same time, intriguing new questions arise from this material: there are questions relating to Lord Sudeley's provisions for Thomas and Eleanor prior to 1453, questions relating to Eleanor's state of health in the summer of 1468, and very important questions relating to her Wiltshire holdings. It remains unclear exactly what estates Eleanor held in Wiltshire. More significantly, it remains unclear how she acquired them. A degree of mystery appears to surround these Wiltshire holdings. There is a lack of documentation relating to their acquisition, together with the apparent omission of the normal legal formalities in respect of their disposal after Eleanor's death. This invites speculation. For the present there are no answers.

⁸⁶ Gerard's *Herbal* as cited in C. Loewenfeld and P. Back, *The Complete Book of Herbs and Spices*, London 1974, p. 71.



**Fig. 1 Warwickshire County Record Office L1/82
Seal of Ralph Butler, Lord Sudeley**



**Fig. 2 Warwickshire County Record Office, L1/81:
Seal (signet), possibly belonging to Margaret Beauchamp,
Countess of Shrewsbury, but used by her daughter, Lady
Eleanor Talbot**



**Fig 3 Warwickshire County Record Office, L1/87:
seal (signet) of Elizabeth Talbot, Duchess of Norfolk**

Reproduced by kind permission of the Warwickshire Record Office

First published in *The Ricardian* Vol. 16 2006.

© Richard III Society

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