

"Noble women in England were used as pawns by influential men to gain and maintain power and influence during the conflicts and political events from 1380-1484" Assess the validity of this statement?

During the Hundred Years War and the War of the Roses, powerful men in England did everything and anything they could to keep and gain power and control. Due to the events that occurred during this period the title of king went to seven different men. The king, or claimants to the throne used many methods to win battles and gain supporters, including using women to get what they wanted. Fathers married their daughters off to influential men and king's married daughters of foreign rulers to gain foreign support. However, many women turned the tables and used men, including their own children and husbands, as pawns in their games to get the throne of England and gain influence and power.

Dr Susan Johns, argues that during the Medieval period 'women are seen as the pawns in male marriage strategies, rather than as active participants in the complex world of the high political elite'¹. This interpretation proves the statement valid as it explains that most women, when they were young, were forced into marriage and used by their fathers to ally themselves with different nobles. Most nobles would marry their sons to these high-ranking noble girls to gain their dowry, this would be an amount of property or money brought by a bride to her husband on their marriage. This marriage settlement meant that the nobleman would gain the wealth of the girl and therefore improve their power, taking the woman's heritage and wealth for themselves. By marrying a daughter to a noble family close to the crown, a family would gain influence with the monarch and at court, and therefore increase their own wealth and status. It would then be the woman's job to produce many male heirs to carry on the family name and increase the family's fortune by marrying more influential women. The cycle continued and each time made the noble house more and more powerful and more influential, as they were connected to many great houses. Johns portrays that women were used as pawns by influential noblemen to gain alliances, this would then gain them power and influence with the monarch, making the statement valid.

Dr Johns' interpretation is credible as she is a historian and senior lecturer at Bangor University in the School of History and Archaeology. However, this interpretation was taken from a source that focuses on Wales in the Middle Ages, this means the source is not as useful when studying English history as the times and situations were perhaps different in each place. This book is based on a Princess in Wales in the 12th Century, Nest Ferch Rhys, who was married twice, raped, abducted and used by noblemen, thus making the source not fully reliable as it is based on a different country and time. Even though the situations were similar to the happenings in England, as they were all connected in what is now the British Isles, Wales was a separate country and nobles were few, meaning that it may have been more important for men to marry into rich families to secure their financial plans, not just for power and influence. Although, as it is by a lecturer of Medieval History it is seen as valuable as the author had access to many resources, also as a woman, her feminist views haven't distracted her from facts she has learnt and researched, proving the overall validity of the interpretation and therefore the statement.

¹ Dr Johns, Susan. Gender, Nation and Conquest in the High Middle Ages: Nest of Deheubarth. Manchester University Press, 2013.

During the 'Great Schism' of 1382 secular leaders had to choose which claimant they would recognise. Pope Urban VI's rival, Clement, had the backing of King Louis XI of France, a high power in Europe, therefore, Pope Urban VI needed to secure an alligance against his rival and have a powerful country and monarch backing him. This statement is valid as, by arranging the marriage between Anne of Bohemia, the daughter of Charles IV, Holy Roman Emperor, who had a great empire and King Richard II, the Pope secured two powerful countries. It is obvious that she was only used as a pawn by Pope Urban VI because the marriage did not see a good foreign military advance neither did it benefit trade much, it only meant that English merchants could trade within both Bohemian land and the lands of the Holy Roman Empire. Anne did not bring a dowry and the marriage bought few diplomatic benefits, therefore the match was not popular and opposed. This shows the statement is valid because it bought no advantages to England, it simply was the Pope using Anne for more power.

The Westminter Chronicle [see Appendix A], states that the 'king laid out no small sum to secure this tiny scrap of humanity'², proving that nobody was impressed with the match, by their choice of words to describe Anne, and not even the king showed much interest, it was forced upon him as it was her, as although he paid a large amount of loans to his brother in law, she wasn't worth it. The Westminster Chronicle is a single manuscript that provides a narrative continued from 1381-1394, by the monk, Richard Cirencester, working at Westminster. This makes the source reliable as it is a contemporary writing by a reliable source. The head of this part of the Chronicle was Adam Usk, who did little to conceal his hostility towards Richard II and his supporters. As it is a religious writing that documented history it wouldn't have been touched or edited and would have been kept safe in a library, especially at Westminster where it wouldn't have been affected by events like the Dissolution of the Monasteries so we know that the written word has not been edited. However, it has been translated recently from old Latin that has developed through the ages, to English, thus weakening its reliability as the translation could be wrong, but not enough to alter the meaning of the text drastically. The monks and scribes wouldn't have had much input into what was written as their job was to tell the story, they would not have had much inside knowledge and their opinions would have been biased towards the monarch so to not upset him, therefore affecting its reliability. This source adds to the statements validity as Anne of Bohemia is a prime example of women being used by influential men to gain alliance and thus power during the political events of 1380 to 1484. She is abused by the Pope to gain a political alliance with England which increased his power and influence which led to him keeping his control as Pope, this therefore shows how she was used as a pawn.

Margaret Beaufort is another example of a woman who was 'used absolutely as a pawn'³, perhaps even more so than Anne and proves this statement valid. 'She is married very young, she's bedded very, very young and she's sent off to live with her husband, she is of no importance to anybody personally, she's of importance only as a member of this great house.'⁴ Gregory clearly states that Beaufort was used at an early age to her father's or husband's advantage, which derives from her background research for her novel. Margaret Beaufort was the daughter and sole heiress to John

² The Westminster Chronicle, Adam Usk, Chronicle 6-7; Westminster Chronicle, 25; Tuck, Richard II, 61.

³ Gregory, Philippa. Philippa Gregory on Margaret Beaufort - The Red Queen (part 1). London: Simon and Schuster Books, 2011. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zO9PvmVBrEc>

⁴ Gregory, Philippa. Philippa Gregory on Margaret Beaufort - The Red Queen (part 1). London: Simon and Schuster Books, 2011. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zO9PvmVBrEc>

Beaufort, First Duke of Somerset who was the great grandson of King Edward III through his son John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster and Katherine Swynford, who only later became his wife.

Due to her name and status she was used as a pawn from an early age, proving this statement's validity. Beaufort was not even a year old when her father died and the king arranged her wardship to be granted to William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, she was then married to Suffolk's son, John de la Pole when she was a year old. The urgency of the marriage suggests that Suffolk needed it to secure his son's future, after he had been arrested, accused of treason and banished as a consequence of the failure of his foreign policy. Their marriage meant his son had a claim to the throne through marriage and their children were in line to the throne, should Henry VI fail to produce heirs. This marriage lasted until it was dissolved three years later. At this point in time Margaret had a lot of land and money, and a claim to the throne and she wasn't even a teenager. Edmund Tudor, the half-brother of Henry VI had been considered as an heir to the throne as Henry VI and his wife Margaret of Anjou were still without children. Henry VI granted Edmund Tudor, 24, the hand of marriage to Margaret Beaufort, 12. Edmund Tudor saw this marriage as convenient as it enabled any children to claim the English throne due to their relation to Henry VI and inheritance of Plantagenet blood from their mother. The marriage was consummated straight away, in Gregory's "The Red Queen" she explains that Owen and Edmund Tudor wanted "the son you [Margaret Beaufort] will bear"⁵, her name connected her to the throne and any child that she would bear with any noble would have a decent claim. This was important for the men as they wanted the glory and security of having a close relationship to the crown and holding many titles and land, this proves Gregory's interpretation correct. This also proves the statement to be valid, it shows that even the most noble of women, such as Beaufort, were used as pawns. Margaret was used by two different men in marriage so that their children may lay claim to the throne, which would improve their own status and power. It can be seen that as she was used at such a young age, unwillingly, and by so many, she is classed as more of a pawn than Anne of Bohemia who was only used by the Pope, compared to Margaret who was used by the Duke of Suffolk and the Tudors for her name and wealth.

Anne Neville is a case of a noble lady who was utilized by various men to pick up status and alliance amid the war, proving this statement to be very valid. When Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, her father, lost favour with King Edward VI after a foiled marriage alliance due to Elizabeth Woodville, Warwick allied with Edward's brother; George Duke of Clarence who together started a plot to overthrow the king and put Clarence on the throne. In 1469, Warwick failed to gain noble support and rule in Edward's name after capturing him. He then fled with Clarence after the Battle of Losecoat Field in 1470, an enemy of his once friend, the king. Clarence married Warwick's first daughter, Isabel, securing their alliance and Warwick's power. Warwick decided the next alliance would be with Margaret of Anjou, Henry VI's wife, who was gaining support abroad, this would secure his place of influence when her son Edward, Prince of Wales won the war. In return for Warwick's soldiers, Anne was to marry Anjou's son, their main aim turned from getting Clarence on the throne to restoring Henry VI's throne, with Warwick as Chief Minister; 'Daughters were valuable pawns in the making of advantageous political alliances'⁶. Anne's marriage to Edward ensured that Richard Neville would not go back on his word⁷. Although the marriage can be seen as Anne being used as a pawn by an

⁵ Gregory, Philippa. The Red Queen. London: Touchstone, 2010.

⁶ Weir, Alison. Queens of the Conquest: England's Medieval Queens. London: Jonathan Cape, 2017.

⁷ Gregory, Philippa. Edward of Lancaster. <http://www.philippagregory.com/family-tree/edward-of-lancaster>

influential woman to ensure Warwick's trust, it was equally used to guarantee Margaret's loyalty, proving the statement to be valid. She was a pawn in the political circumstances to ensure the difficult alliance between the former enemies, Margaret of Anjou and Richard Neville.⁸ After the death of her husband at the Battle of Tewksbury, 1471, Anne became the biggest pawn of George, Duke of Clarence, this certifies the validity of the statement further. She was an heiress to her parent's vast estates, Clarence, already married to Anne's sister Isabel, wanted to gain the entire inheritance, he took her in and treated her as his ward. Under his care he permitted her from marrying, for if she married, she would lay claim to all her inherited land, however as her protector he had a chance to claim her share for himself, along with his wife's half⁹.

The Croyland Chronicles [see Appendix B], written c.1486, mentions that Clarence, 'caused the damsel to be concealed in order that it might not be known by his brother where she was; as he was afraid of a division of the Earl's property, which he wished to come to himself alone in right of his wife, and not be obliged to share it with any other person.'¹⁰ By using the word 'damsel' it portrays Anne as a feeble woman in need of saving, this makes the tone demeaning, showing her as more of a pawn, as she couldn't help herself. This Chronicle is useful in showing that Anne was used as a pawn because it was written at the time and the likely authors of the 'Second Continuation', of which this reference is adapted from was John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, or Henry Sharp, Head of the Exchequer¹¹. Both had good access to events but didn't drive any. Russell was Richard III's Chancellor until dismissed in July 1485¹² and wanted to please the new King Henry VII, so was biased towards the new king and his family. The writer is also likely to be Russell or Sharp as it was written by someone who had good access to information of Richard III's court and was described as being a member of Edward IV's court. Therefore, the Chronicle, based on the years 1459-1486, may not be entirely factual, it would have been very critical of George, Duke of Clarence and Richard III, to appease the new king. Whether the author was Sharp or Russell, this source cannot be truly valid as the writer would have been influenced by Tudor propaganda, therefore is a very one-sided view. However, Anne Neville clearly proves that women were used by men; her brother in law and father both used her to gain political advantage and therefore power and status during the Wars of the Roses. She was used by her father to gain allegiance and her brother in law to gain money and inheritance, justifying the validity of the statement.

It can be agreed that Johns' view that all women were used as 'pawns in male marriage strategies'¹³ is correct, proving the statement to be valid. By looking at certain women like Beaufort, Neville and

⁸ O'Brien, Anne. *Anne Neville Biography*. <http://onthetudortrail.com/Blog/resources/biographies/anne-neville/>. **The Tudor Trail**

⁹ Johnson Lewis, Jone. *Anne Neville, Queen of England*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/anne-neville-facts-3529618> ThoughtCo, 2017.

¹⁰ The Quarrel of Richard Duke of Gloucester and George Duke of Clarence, 1472. From the Second Continuation of the Croyland Chronicle, [Latin, trans, H.T. Riley,469]]

¹¹ H.K.Riley. *The Crowland Chronicles Latin Translation - English historical documents*. 4. [Late medieval]. 1327 – 1485 p.g 314

¹² Pryde, E.B. Greenway, D.E. Porter, S. Roy, I. *Handbook of British Chronology*. Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp 88.

¹³ Dr Johns, Susan. *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the High Middle Ages: Nest of Deheubarth*. Manchester University Press, 2013.

Anne of Bohemia, it proves that marriage was a way that men could win status and women didn't really have a say, they were used because of their family name and power. Therefore, the statement is valid because these three women show that women were used by all different types of men, to gain advantage and power, Anne Neville being the most obvious example, after being used by her father for alliance, then her brother-in-law for wealth and power. She was used more as pawn than Margaret Beaufort, who used her marriage to her advantage, as will be discussed in the opposing view.

Opposing the view that all women were used as pawns, proving the statement invalid, is Albrecht Classen. He argues that 'the paradigm of medieval culture as a world in which women were entirely subjugated and made into pawns at the hands of their male contemporaries requires considerable adjustment, modification, if not complete rejection'¹⁴. This interpretation reviews the idea that now as more research and investigation has been completed the view of Middle Ages women being pawns should be revised, he believed some women actually used men to gain influence and maintain power. There are many examples showcasing this view like the aforementioned, Margaret Beaufort, and Elizabeth Woodville, this contradicts John's view. These women are examples of the many that used their sexuality as a weapon. Women were looked down upon in the 14th and 15th centuries; they were expected to be obedient to their husbands and marry whomever their parents chose, they were expected to provide heirs and their dowries were part of the negotiations which helped strengthen the man's finances, this meant that nobody would expect them to become cunning and the heads of armies and plots themselves.

Albrecht Classen is University Distinguished Professor of German Studies, researching and teaching European literature from 800-1800, this view was taken from his collective book about women's voices in Early Modern literature. He has 97 works in total, mostly essays about women, rape and love in the Middle Ages, although, he does write about other political and social events. His interpretation demonstrates that the views of women have changed and that in the Middle Ages women were seen feeble and weak and that now we should see them as headstrong game players in the events at the time. He has written many articles focused on history of gender studies, comparative literature and cultural history, he edited the Handbook of Medieval Studies as well as the Handbook of Medieval Culture. This portrays that he is well educated and his views are valid to the subject and plausible, making his interpretation valid and therefore the statement invalid. However, his work is cited on 'Medieval Feminist Forums'¹⁵, therefore showing that he has feminist views which invalidates his opinion, as he would be very biased towards women. His ratings as a professor portray him as 'unclear' and 'disrespectful'¹⁶, therefore the choice of tone and language have been used to make him sound more valid, over emphasising his view and making the statement invalid. He also focused on German Literature, not English History and therefore, his argument may not be valid as views and ways of life were different in different countries and the book is about how women were portrayed. He is also a lecturer on literature which at the time would have been very political and very male orientated as it

¹⁴ Classen, Albrecht. *The Power of a Woman's Voice in Medieval and Early Modern Literature; New Approaches to German and European Women Writers and to Violence Against Women in Premodern Times*. M. Sandidge, & A. Classen, Eds.) Walter De Gruyter. Berlin, 2007

¹⁵ Hughes Edwards, Mari. *Albrecht Classen. The Medieval Chastity Belt: A Myth-Making Process. The New Middle Ages*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. <https://ir.uiowa.edu/mff/vol46/iss1/15/>

¹⁶ Albrecht Classen - <http://www.ratemyprofessors.com/ShowRatings.jsp?tid=495391>

was not seen as 'right' for a woman to write about her views, therefore his views are sided towards how women were portrayed in literature instead of women's political stance during this time.

'There were some women who exercised power, providing a challenge to the stereotypical image of medieval women', they 'could wield political power, especially as queens and regents'¹⁷. One woman who is a grand example of this, despite previously arguing the opposing view, is Margaret Beaufort, she can also prove the statement to be invalid and is an example of Classen's view. Opposing the previous view that Beaufort was a pawn, is Michael K. Jones who argues that Margaret Beaufort used men to achieve her own goals, especially Sir Thomas Stanley, her third legal husband. Previously she had used the 'Tudors'; Edmund Tudor and his brother Jasper had previously been appointed to ensure authority in Wales, this made them very popular there, thus gaining the support for her son that she couldn't have gained alone in Wales. Margaret 'negotiated the [marriage] settlement very much on her own terms and secured a generous annual allowance...she allied herself with another great noble house'¹⁸, therefore becoming close to the king. The marriage provided benefits, firstly, her husband was very powerful in the house of York and had a generous following of supporters; consequently, the army headed by Henry Tudor would be joined by an army in England ready to fight against the king. Secondly, the marriage tied her to the king and perceived her as being a Yorkist supporter, she had become a known supporter of the Lancastrian king, Henry VI, and her husband's rapport with King Edward and Yorkist's gained her respect and safety, building support for her son. Thus, she didn't make an enemy of herself; keeping the gate open for her son to come back and take the crown. Finally, Stanley was known for switching sides during battles and this view suggests, Margaret saw this as an opportunity for her to deceive the king and get Stanley to change sides for her son. By allying herself with a great house like Stanley, she was able to manipulate the king and court so that her son would have great success when he returned. This proves this statement to be invalid as it shows Margaret to be the cunning one who used men to gain alliance herself, she used her womanhood to disguise her cunning nature and used her husband to gain more power so that she could gain support for her son.

We know she is a powerful woman through how she is portrayed in the painting by Rowland Lockey [see Appendix C], presented by Clippersby in 1598. She is seen in prayer and surrounded by the coat of arms of both England and the Beaufort family, showing how important she is to the crown, government and religious bases of England. Above her head is the Tudor Rose, portraying the idea that she is the mother of the Tudor house; although, the Tudor Rose is a combination of Lancaster and York, which only occurred due to her son's marriage to Elizabeth of York. It is suggesting that the Tudor house would not have succeeded without her; without her son and husband she wouldn't have achieved victory, thus this painting shows how she used her male relations. In this painting she is wearing a ring on her left hand but only half way down, this could represent how she is only half married to her husband and doesn't base her power on her marriage but on her own fortune. Although this painting is from the time, it could not be completely valid in showing Beaufort's power. The artist would not have wanted to upset her son as it could end up in demotion, therefore she could have been painted more regal or powerful than she was to appease Henry. It was painted many years after

¹⁷ Bovey, Alixe. Women of Medieval Society. <https://www.bl.uk/the-middle-ages/articles/women-in-medieval-society>. British Library, April 2015.

¹⁸ Jones, Michael K, Underwood, Malcom G. The King's Mother: Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby. Cambridge University Press, 1993

her death and displayed at Cambridge University as the founder of Christ's College, this shows that the painting is not reliable as would have been painted to honour her, thus exaggerating her qualities and achievements. However, it demonstrates that the statement is invalid because she was still a prominent figure after her death and honoured herself, alone next to no husband, showing off her achievements as a lone woman. Beaufort is a prime example of how women used men to get what they wanted, however, she was still used herself. This shows that Margaret used men to her advantage a lot more than previously argued. The symbolism in the painting shows how she was a powerful woman herself, who used the men around her to grow, therefore proving the statement invalid.

One of the most manipulative women in power and not used as a pawn, was Elizabeth Woodville, she proves that this statement is not valid, even more so than Margaret Beaufort, as she gained herself the highest rank of any woman. Alicia Carter states that 'during her life, Elizabeth Woodville was perceived as a greedy commoner who promoted the interests of her large clan using the king as a tool in order to increase her family's wealth and influence'¹⁹. This interpretation proves the statement to be invalid and proves Classen's views true. Elizabeth Woodville used men, specifically the king to get what she wanted. Woodville was a widow, to the late Lancastrian knight Sir John Grey, who died in the Yorkist victorious Battle of St Albans in May 1455. Unable to support herself as her husband's lands had been confiscated, Elizabeth moved back to Grafton with her two young sons, many see this as the starting point of her 'revenge' or craving for power. In early 1464 she purposely waited in a spot where King Edward IV would pass and seduced the king.²⁰ They married in secret and when Edward announced his marriage, Edward's Chief Minister, Warwick, was 'infuriated'²¹ with Edward; he had promised the French that Edward would marry a French Princess to seal their alliance. Woodville had managed to bring herself up from being a widow of a knight to the Queen of England, her mix of seductive methods and proof that she could produce male heirs convinced the king to marry and coronate her, however her reasons may have been for love but most likely fuelled by the want for power, proving this statement invalid. In this case it is in fact a woman who is using men, in fact the most powerful man of England, to gain power and influence.

In an extract taken from an account of Richard III's usurpation [see Appendix D] written by Italian scholar, Dominic Mancini, who was in England at the time describes the Queen's actions. He explains '[the queen] attracted to her party many strangers and introduced them to court, so that they alone should manage the public and private business of the crown, surround the king, and have bands of retainers, give or sell offices and finally rule the king himself.'²² This extract exclaims how Elizabeth had grasped control and placed many of her family members in offices and titles, for example her sons were given stately titles such as Marquess of Dorset and Constable of Chester Castle. The 'many strangers' she had appointed were her family or loyal people who had served her, these were seen as commoners and made nobles angry that she was polluting the court with non-worthy and wealthy

¹⁹ Carter, Alicia. The Women of the Wars of the Roses: Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort and Elizabeth of York. London: 2013.

²⁰ Licence, Amy. Edward IV & Elizabeth Woodville: A True Romance. Amberley Publishing Limited, 2016

²¹ Pollard, A.J. Warwick the Kingmaker: Politics, Power and Fame During the War of the Roses. Bloomsbury: 2007. Pp. 192

²² Mancini, Dominic *The Usurpation of Richard the Third*, trans. and ed. C.A.J. Armstrong (Oxford, 1969), pp. 64-7.

people, this increased her family's fortunes as she had many people who owed her for their new-found wealth. She controlled who was in positions and placed them very carefully around the king, to increase her influence, as they would have supported her. The statement is invalid because she used an influential man as a pawn herself, the source shows that she had managed to manipulate her position and control the actions of the king, she had showed this early in her stages by seducing the king enough to ditch an alliance with the French and marry her. Woodville is a pronounced example of how not all noble women were used, thus proving this statement invalid. She shows that women used men to gain power themselves as she herself used the king as a pawn to gain the title of Queen, then favour for her family, increasing her own influence.

Overall, mostly this statement is valid as the evidence collected shows that most noble women were used as pawns during the events of the Middle Ages and the Wars of the Roses. Although Albrecht Classen's argument challenges and proves the statement invalid as women are now being seen as scheming and using men as pawns themselves, for example Elizabeth Woodville, who used strategy and her womanhood to become Queen herself. The evidence displays that only a few women were victorious in using men to their advantage as more women were used as pawns themselves. The few women who manipulated the noble men and used their gender to their advantage, as they would not have been seen to be trying to prosper or gain influence as they were 'only women', were more strategical and more successful in their schemes, however, this was only a short selection of noble women. Margaret Beaufort used her son and husband to gain power for her family, however she was used by men at a young age. Dr Johns argues that all women were used in marriage strategies and schemes. Anne of Bohemia was used by the Pope and Anne Neville was used for her family name and wealth, along with Margaret Beaufort, these women prove that more women were used as pawns than weren't, not all women were used, however, the majority were. Although these women went on to become powerful and influential, they only could, due to their positions that influential men had used them to gain. Therefore, this statement is valid, due to the large example of noble women who were used as pawns, compared to the small number of women who used men to their advantage.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Westminster Chronicle, Adam Usk, Chronicle 6-7; Westminster Chronicle, 25; Tuck, Richard II, 61. Extract taken from: Rigby, Stephen. Wisdom and Chivalry: Chaucer's Knight's Tale and Medieval Political Theory, 156

The Quarrel of Richard Duke of Gloucester and George Duke of Clarence, 1472. From the Second Continuation of the Croyland Chronicle, [Latin, trans, H.T. Riley,469]]

Painting by Rowland Lockey, presented by Clippersby in 1598, University of Cambridge: Artwork of Lady Margaret Beaufort

Dominic Mancini, *The Usurpation of Richard the Third*, trans. and ed. C.A.J. Armstrong (Oxford, 1969), pp. 64-7.

Secondary Sources

Bovey, Alixe. Women of Medieval Society. <https://www.bl.uk/the-middle-ages/articles/women-in-medieval-society>. British Library, April 2015.

Carter, Alicia. The Women of the Wars of the Roses: Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort and Elizabeth of York. London: 2013.

Gregory, Philippa. Edward of Lancaster. <http://www.philippagregory.com/family-tree/edward-of-lancaster>

Gregory, Philippa. The Red Queen. London: Touchstone, 2010.

Gregory, Philippa. Philippa Gregory on Margaret Beaufort - The Red Queen (part 1). London: Simon and Schuster Books, 2011. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zO9PvmVBrEc>

Hughes Edwards, Mari. Albrecht Classen. The Medieval Chastity Belt: A Myth-Making Process. The New Middle Ages. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. <https://ir.uiowa.edu/mff/vol46/iss1/15/>

Johnson-Lewis, Jone. Anne Neville, Queen of England. <https://www.thoughtco.com/anne-neville-facts-3529618> ThoughtCo, 2017.

Licence, Amy. Edward IV & Elizabeth Woodville: A True Romance. Amberley Publishing Limited, 2016

Murray Kendall, Paul. Richard the Third. W. W. Norton & Company, 2002, pp128

O'Brien, Anne. Anne Neville Biography. <http://onthetudortrail.com/Blog/resources/biographies/anne-neville/>.
The Tudor Trail

Pollard, A.J. Warwick the Kingmaker: Politics, Power and Fame During the War of the Roses. Bloomsbury: 2007. Pp. 192

Pryde, E.B. Greenway, D.E. Porter, S. Roy, I. Handbook of British Chronology. Cambridge University Press, 1996. Pp 88.

University of Cambridge: Artwork of Lady Margaret Beaufort: <https://artuk.org/discover/artworks/lady-margaret-beaufort-14431509-at-prayer-countess-of-richmond-and-derby-mother-of-king-henry-vii-and-foundress-of-the-college-139441#1>

Weir, Alison. Queens of the Conquest: England's Medieval Queens. London: Jonathan Cape, 2017.

Interpretations

Classen, Albrecht. *The Power of a Woman's Voice in Medieval and Early Modern Literature; New Approaches to German and European Women Writers and to Violence Against Women in Premodern Times*. M.Sandidge, &A. Classen, Eds.) Walter De Gruyter. Berlin, 2007

Dr Johns, Susan. Gender, Nation and Conquest in the High Middle Ages: Nest of Deheubarth. Manchester University Press, 2013.

Reading

Castor, Helen. *She Wolves: The Women Who Ruled England Before Elizabeth*, 2011

Jones, Dan. *The Hollow Crown: The Wars of the Roses and the Rise of the Tudors*, 2015

Lander, JR. The Wars of the Roses. Sutton: 1965.

Skidmore, Chris. *Richard III: Brother, Protector, King*.

Rigby, Stephen. Wisdom and Chivalry: Chaucer's Knight's Tale and Medieval Political Theory, pp. 156

Appendix A

The Westminster Chronicle, Adam Usk, Chronicle 6-7; Westminster Chronicle, 25; Tuck, Richard II, 61.

... ceremony in spite of not having yet received the pallium from the pope.¹ About this queen somebody wrote the verse: Worthy to enjoy manna. To Englishmen is given the noble Anna; but to those with an eye for the facts it seemed that she represented a purchase rather than a gift, since the English king laid out no small sum to secure this tiny scrap of humanity.² On the feast of St. Milburga the Virgin [23 February] the aldermen of London, together with the mayor and members of all the city crafts, forming a party of about 600, visited the king...

Appendix B

The Quarrel of Richard Duke of Gloucester and George Duke of Clarence, 1472. From the Second Continuation of the Croyland Chronicle, [Latin, trans, H.T. Riley, 469]

It is my intention here to insert an account of the dissensions which arose during this Michaelmas Term [1472] between the two brothers of the King, and which were with difficulty quieted. After ... the son of King Henry, to whom the lady Anne, the youngest daughter of the Earl of Warwick, had been married, was slain at the Battle of Tewkesbury, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, sought Anne in Marriage. This proposal did not suit the views of his brother, the Duke of Clarence, who had previously married the elder daughter of the earl. Such being the case, he caused the damsel to be concealed, in order that it might not be known by his brother where she was, as he was afraid of a division of the earl's property, which he wished to come to himself alone in the right of his wife, and not be obligated to share it with any other person.

Appendix C

Painting by Rowland Lockey, presented by Clippersby in 1598, University of Cambridge:
Artwork of Lady Margaret Beaufort



Image © 2018 Dean and Chapter of Westminster

Appendix D

Source extract comes from Dominic Mancini, *The Usurpation of Richard the Third*, trans. and ed. C.A.J. Armstrong (Oxford, 1969), pp. 64-7.

‘[The queen] attracted to her party many strangers and introduced them to court, so that they alone should manage the public and private business of the crown, surround the king, and have bands of retainers, give or sell offices, and finally rule the very king himself. At this point it seems imperative to say something of the character of the king and of those who were then very powerful at court. Edward was of a gentle nature and cheerful aspect: nevertheless should he assume an angry countenance he could appear very terrible to beholders.

He was easy of access to his friends and to others, even the least notable. Frequently he called to his side complete strangers, when he thought that they had the intention of addressing or beholding him more closely. He was wont to show himself to those who wished to watch him, and he seized the opportunity that the occasion offered of revealing his fine stature more protractedly and more evidently to on-lookers. He was so genial in his greeting, that if he saw a newcomer bewildered at his appearance and royal magnificence, he would give him courage to speak by laying a kindly hand upon his shoulder. To plaintiffs and those who complained of injustice he lent a willing ear; charges against himself he contented with an excuse if he did not remove the cause. He was more favourable than other princes to foreigners, who visited his realm for trade and any other reason. He very seldom showed munificence, and then only in moderation, still he was very grateful to those from whom he received a favour. Though not rapacious for other men’s goods, he was yet so eager for money, that in pursuing it he acquired a reputation for avarice...’